

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System.

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

The bill (S. 4013) to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do this in accordance with the remarks I made to the Senate on February 29, 1956. At that time I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a selection of comments that had been received regarding such a proposed wilderness preservation system from people in many walks of life—lay people and professional people, educators, physicians, scientists, conservationists—people with a deep concern to preserve their heritage of the magnificent, almost untouched, natural areas in our national parks and monuments, our national forests and wildlife refuges. Since then, additional comments urging the need to preserve wilderness have been received. The proposal of which I then spoke has now been given bill form, preliminary drafts have been referred to interested and competent persons, and I am now happy to be able to join with a number of my colleagues in introducing in the Senate this measure that gives expression to a policy which has long been a reality in the minds and hearts of the American people but has never yet been embodied in legislation.

It is indeed fortunate that after the centuries we have spent in developing this continent we do still have some large areas of wilderness. It is doubly fortunate that many of these areas are federally owned and are also included in parks, forests, or refuges, or other kinds of reservations within which the wilderness has so far been preserved in keeping with the purposes of the reservations.

Some 50 or so national parks and monuments have within them unspoiled areas large enough to be called wilderness. Some 20 or so of the national wildlife refuges and ranges do too.

Within the national forests there are some 80 areas that have been designated by the Forest Service for protection as wilderness. Indian reservations contain 15 areas that have been classified as roadless or wild areas.

Putting all these together, we have 165 or so areas of wilderness that are in Federal ownership or control and that also, I wish to emphasize, are inside areas within which wilderness can be preserved consistently with other purposes, as part of what might be called a multipurpose wilderness preservation program.

At present, however, there are no laws of Congress which protect these areas of wilderness as wilderness. Even in the national parks and monuments the pressures for roads and nonwilderness recreational and tourist developments threaten in many places to destroy the primeval back-country wilderness. In the national forests the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas have been set up administratively and could be abolished or greatly reduced by a future Secretary of Agriculture. Wilderness within the national wildlife refuges is in a precarious position because the refuges themselves lack adequate legal protection against pressures for commercial or exploitative encroachments. In fact, none of our Federal wilderness has the protection which Congress could give by providing for wilderness preservation as a national policy applied to a definite system of areas.

I note at this point that one of my reasons for introducing this bill on behalf of myself and the cosponsors—and one of the cosponsors is the Presiding Officer, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD]—is the rapid growth of our population, and the resulting tremendous pressures for opening up these wilderness areas for commercial and economic purposes. If that trend continues, it will mean that our Nation, in the years to come, will be without our great system of national parks, recreational areas, wilderness areas, and forest preserves, which mean so much to the mental health, as well as to the physical health of our people.

ESTABLISHING A POLICY

It is accordingly the first purpose of this bill to establish firmly a clear-cut national policy for preserving, for both the present and the future, some of what remains of our resource of wilderness. In line with such a policy the Congress in this proposed measure will give its sanction to the policies and programs of the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and our other Federal conservation agencies under whose wise administration a great resource of wilderness has so far been preserved. Finally, this measure proposes a way whereby this policy and this sanction can take effect in a practical program.

Of central importance in this program is the establishment of what is to be called our National Wilderness Preservation System, to be made up of areas of primeval America that are still wilderness and in Federal ownership or control and capable of being kept that way without interfering with other present purposes now being served by these lands.

I hasten to emphasize that this will not involve any further acquisition of wilderness areas by the Federal Government. Nor will it mean any transfer of areas from one agency of Government to another, nor any change of jurisdiction. No new land-administering agency will be created. The fact should be emphasized that this National Wilderness Preservation System will be made up of areas that are already in Federal ownership or control and are already within parks, forests, refuges, or reservations.

Furthermore, it must also be stressed, for clear understanding, that the areas within this proposed System are areas where wilderness conditions have so far been preserved while, at the same time, the various purposes have been realized for which these parks, forests, refuges, and reservations were established. It is our purpose, therefore, that this preservation continue and be made secure for the future. The establishment of the National Wilderness Preservation System will be a recognition of this purpose, a recognition of the importance of continuing to preserve the wilderness character of these selected areas.

This selection, this recognition, will give each of these areas its place in the System. Each such area will remain, as at present, park, forest, or refuge, as it is now administered. It will continue to serve the multiple purposes it now serves and under the jurisdiction of the same agency that now protects it. The difference will lie in the fact that from now on the agency having jurisdiction over any area within this System will have the sanction and encouragement of Congress and the legal responsibility for preserving the area's wilderness character. It will have the responsibility for seeing that other purposes continue to be served in such a way as to prevent damage to the wilderness.

Each such area will thus come under special protection as part of the Nation's still unspoiled heritage of the primeval.

A WILDERNESS COUNCIL

In order to provide a focus for the interest in the wilderness character of these diverse areas that will be serving multiple purposes there will be established by this measure a National Wilderness Preservation Council. The agencies that administer the areas in our wilderness system have various purposes and many interests. Their concerns with wilderness may represent only one phase of multiple purposes. Our proposed wilderness council, therefore, will provide a center for all these various interests, interests in the many wilderness values of different kinds of areas.

The Council will not have any administrative jurisdiction whatever over any of these areas, nor over any of the agencies that do have such jurisdiction. It will provide a repository for the files that pertain to the National Wilderness Preservation System and will serve as a gatherer and disseminator of information regarding wilderness preservation and use. It will make an annual report to Congress. The Council will be made up of representative legislators, administrators, and citizens all concerned with wilderness preservation, and will thus

represent our special and distinctive national interest in our wilderness resource.

In administering national park areas of wilderness, the National Park Service will continue to think of their administration for the recreational use and enjoyment of the people. In administering national forest areas, the Forest Service will continue to be concerned with the multiple-purpose program it now operates with prime concern for the protection of watersheds and preservation of forests. The Fish and Wildlife Service will continue to administer the areas of wilderness within its jurisdiction as areas for wildlife, areas that may have no legitimate use at all for the kind of recreation that is the principal activity in a national park, for example.

The various units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, though protected as wilderness, will thus be managed for various purposes. Within the National Wilderness Preservation Council, the heads of the various administering agencies, the ranking members of the Senate and House committees concerned, and representative citizens, will bring to a wilderness-preservation focus all the various and appropriate interests.

A MULTIPLE-PURPOSE PROGRAM

Besides giving expression to a national policy, providing for the establishment of a wilderness preservation system, and creating a National Wilderness Preservation Council, this bill also, Mr. President, describes and provides for the proper use of the areas of wilderness it is designed to preserve.

In this connection, I should like to emphasize at once that this proposal is not one for any "special-use," or "special-privilege" legislation.

The first and topic sentence of the section of this bill that relates to uses of the areas within this System expresses a key concept in this proposal. It states firmly that "nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal land area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area."

Under this proposal, for example, the parts of the national forests involved would continue under the same kind of administration they now have. Grazing permits, for instance, could be continued as at present. The basic multiple purposes of the national forests would be maintained. These purposes are defined as watershed protection and forest preservation. Giving these areas a permanence as wilderness will thus not interfere with the multiple purposes they now serve but will actually help to realize the dominant use of the national forests for water conservation.

National parks, national wildlife refuges, and any other areas would also, as already pointed out, continue to serve their own distinctive purposes.

No use privileges of any kind will be created by this proposed law. The only added responsibility of each administer-

ing agency will be to see that the areas in the System under its jurisdiction remain wilderness—as they now are. I reiterate, this bill deals only with preserving wilderness as such in connection with various other land uses and does not create any "special privilege," nor provide for any special users.

Existing uses and privileges are respected in this bill, and private rights are protected. It is true that no mining or prospecting will be permitted except where it is already in existence and represents a private right. Otherwise, or perhaps I should say, even so, this is not essentially a reform measure but rather a measure to insure the preservation of a status quo which fortunately includes a great resource of wilderness.

THE BILL DESCRIBED SECTION BY SECTION

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

The opening section defines the term "wilderness" both in the abstract and as used specifically in this bill and, recognizing the hazards to wilderness in the midst of our civilization, declares it to be a desirable policy for our health, welfare, and happiness to preserve wilderness as an enduring resource for the benefit of present and future generations. Accordingly, the continued preservation of federally owned areas of wilderness is given congressional sanction and a National Wilderness Preservation System is established to "serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment by the people."

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

NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS

Subsection (a) designates 27 areas within the national forests to become units of the National Wilderness Preservation System. These are not entire national forests; they are special areas inside the forests. The Forest Service has found them to have highest value as wilderness. Three of these areas are named roadless, 14 are wild areas, and 10 are called wilderness. In addition, there are 52 areas now classified as "primitive" that are earmarked to be included in this System when the Forest Service has carried out its plans to reclassify them as either "wilderness" or "wild" areas. A 10-year period is provided for this reclassification program. Including all these primitive areas which are to be added eventually, this System will have within it special areas within some 80 of the 149 natural forests. Out of the 181 million acres in our national forests some 14 million acres will be in this System. Practically as at present, the administration of the national forest areas will be in accordance with regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture. This bill, either in section 2 or in section

3, makes provisions that in effect give sanction to and continue the present regulations that have been so ably developed by the Forest Service for the sound administration and protection of wilderness. An additional safeguard against an undesirable elimination of any wilderness is provided in that, after completing the process for such action as now provided by Department regulations, such proposed action will have to be reported to Congress, where for 120 days it is subject to disapproval. Additional areas may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, and such additions must also be reported to Congress, and for 120 days be subject to disapproval by either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

WILDERNESS IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Subsection (b) of section 2 designates 49 out of the 181 areas in the National Park System as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, 26 of which are national parks, 21 are monuments, 1 is a recreational area, and 1 is a memorial park. Our national parks and many of our national monuments include within them our superbly beautiful pristine areas of wilderness. The chief threats to their preservation as such, under our present legislation, come from prospects for the extension of roads and the intrusion of recreation developments, perfectly good in themselves, that nevertheless are out of place in wilderness: Unless provision is made to protect the primeval within the parks, eventually the developments may take over. This process may be gradual, but, nevertheless, it is a prospect against which we can now set guards with no sacrifice. There are other places for the development of our recreation facilities that require roads and other conveniences. Our parks are reservoirs of wilderness.

It is true, however, that certain portions of the parks must be used for the roads and accommodations that make them accessible and hospitable. Accordingly this bill provides for the designation of such portions for this purpose. A 10-year period is provided for the several designations, and the provisions of this law will not take effect for any park or monument until the designations have been made. The National Park Service, under its so-called Mission 66, is undertaking to provide systematically during the next 10 years for the proper and economical development of the roads and accommodations within the parks and monuments. The designations of the areas provided for in this bill can thus be made, park by park, as the plans for Mission 66 materialize, and provision will in this way be made for the proper handling of developed areas but also for the protection, without development, of our wilderness in the back country.

If ever additional areas are needed for developments, they can be designated, but only after a public notice that will give all concerned an opportunity to weigh the importance of diminishing the area of wilderness. In any case, wilderness preservation becomes a congressional policy in the specified national parks and monuments. The primeval

back country receives an added protection. At the same time, this bill takes care to point out that within the areas designated for developments the present protection afforded by the National Park Act of 1916 is not affected.

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

WILDLIFE REFUGES

Subsection (c) of section 2 designates 13 national wildlife refuges and 7 ranges as parts of this System. As with National Park System areas, provision is here made for designation by the Secretary of the Interior of areas that are required for roads and installations inconsistent with wilderness. In this instance these are required for administration of the refuge or range for wildlife. Refuges or ranges could be added to the System by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to congressional disapproval within 120 days. Only Congress could remove a refuge or range from the System.

THE INDIANS' WILDERNESS

Subsection (d) of section 2 designates 12 roadless areas and 3 wild areas within Indian reservations as possible units in the National Wilderness Preservation System, but no such area will actually become a part of the System unless its inclusion is approved by the Indians. The consent of the Indians is also required for the regulations by the Secretary of the Interior that are to govern the administration, addition, modification, or elimination of areas. This subsection is so drawn as to give the Indians the privilege of having included in this System their areas that have been classified as roadless or wild, but the principle of doing nothing with regard to Indian lands without Indian consent has been observed. Care is taken also to say that no Indian treaty is abrogated nor any hunting or fishing rights affected.

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

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

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

USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Section 3 specifies the proper uses of areas within the System and the practices that are to be excluded. It includes special provisions with regard to existing "nonconforming" uses of areas of wilderness included in the System. At the outset this section says that nothing shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose for which any of the lands involved were set aside, except that "the

wilderness character of the area" is to be preserved. This concern, it may be noted, is not with any special use or user, but with the character of the area. Hunting, for example, will continue to be a major recreation within many national-forest units of the System and will be prohibited in national parks. Where there is hunting, it will be wilderness hunting. Uses will thus continue to vary in the various kinds of lands involved. The common concern is that wilderness conditions shall persist whatever the uses. The System will be devoted to public purposes that are summarized as recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservational, and historical. All use will be in harmony with the wilderness environment and its preservation.

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

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

The exception to which I refer has to do with mining. It relates primarily to the areas within the national forests. Spokesmen for the United States Forest Service, as well as other conservationists, have long and insistently warned that a prime threat to the preservation of wilderness within the national forests comes from the prospect of mining. After careful thought it seems unwise to propose wilderness legislation that does not deal with this threat in these national forest areas. Accordingly this bill provides that there shall be no mining—although, of course, existing private rights are protected in this case as in all others.

A WILDERNESS COUNCIL

Section 4 will create a National Wilderness Preservation Council to serve as a focus for the various interests in wilderness represented in the System, to provide an information clearing house and a headquarters for the records relating to the System as such, and to provide a medium through which information regarding wilderness and its use and preservation may be gathered and made available. The Council will have no administrative jurisdiction over the areas of wilderness within the System, nor over any of the agencies that will continue to have such jurisdiction. The Council will not even have any coordinating responsibilities with regard to the administration of these areas. It will comprise legislators, administrators, and citizens, and will represent our special and distinctive interest in our wilderness resource as wilderness and will make annual reports to Congress regarding the System.

The legislators on the Council, four in number, will be the chairman and ranking minority members of the respective Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and House of Representa-

tives. The administrators will be the heads of bureaus that administer areas within the System—Forest Service, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Indian Affairs Bureau—and also the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Six citizen members will complete the 15-member Council.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution will be the secretary of the Council, and will maintain its files and provide its headquarters. This arrangement will help make clear that the Council is not responsible for any area or agency administration. Involved with no land areas within the System, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution will not be concerned with any inter-agency administrative problems regarding such areas. Selection of this official as secretary of the Council further emphasizes the function of the Council as an information focus and a repository of records. It likewise will serve to bring to attention the scientific interest in wilderness preservation and the values of wilderness areas as living museums.

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

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

A CAREFULLY THOUGHT-OUT PROPOSAL

I know that this bill will be carefully studied by conservationists and other interested groups and by the agencies of government under whose jurisdiction the areas of the proposed National Wilderness Preservation System are administered. This is a far-reaching, carefully thought-out proposal. It deserves and requires the consideration of all who are concerned with the values that we place on our wilderness. Many of its details are concerned with the central effort to provide for wilderness preservation without disruption of our status quo. Particularly I invite the sympathetic consideration of this bill by administrators within our Federal conservation bureaus. I know that early tentative drafts of this legislation have not been thoroughly understood and have raised questions. I trust the bill, as it is now clarified and revised, will be more readily understood, and that its proposals will receive the concerted support of the administrators and other conservationists who are so deeply interested in wilderness.

Two years ago, at the 1954 annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters, Dr. James P. Gilligan, from the forestry department of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, speaking on wilderness preservation, commented as follows:

Wilderness supporters have been chiefly defense minded, rushing to prevent developments that may have been carefully drawn and justified. The majority of areas now called wilderness exist because recreational or industrial developments have not, as yet, been economically feasible. If there were well defined purposes and plans for a national wilderness system which could generate common support, the wilderness movement might well be irrepressible. As it is,

the disagreement among wilderness proponents is a highly important deterrent to wilderness preservation in this country.

Here is a bill which I trust can generate this support.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, and be followed by a statement both summarizing and quoting comments on this proposed wilderness preservation measure.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 4013) and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) The national wildlife refuges and ranges herein or hereafter designated as units of the National Wilderness Preservation Sys-

tem, except those portions set aside hereunder for roads and installations of buildings and other facilities;

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

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

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

(a) The System shall include the following roadless, wild, and wilderness areas within the national forests: Caribou, Little Indian Sioux, and Superior Roadless Areas, Superior National Forest, Minn.; Chiricahua Wild Area, Coronado National Forest, Ariz.; Galluro Wild Area, Crook National Forest, Ariz.; Sierra Ancha Wild Area, Tonto National Forest, Ariz.; Mount Zirkle Dome Peak Wild Area, Routt National Forest, Colo.; Gates of the Mountains Wild Area, Helena National Forest, Mont.; San Pedro Parks Wild Area, Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; Linville Gorge Wild Area, Pisgah National Forest, N. C.; Gearhart Mountain Wild Area, Fremont National Forest, Oreg.; Kalmiopsis Wild Area, Siskiyou National Forest, Oreg.; Mount Hood Wild Area, Mount Hood National Forest, Oreg.; Mountain Lakes Wild Area, Rogue River National Forest, Oreg.; Strawberry Mountain Wild Area, Malheur National Forest, Oreg.; Goat Rocks Wild Area, in portions of Gifford Pinchot and Snoqualmie National Forests, Wash.; Mount Adams Wild Area, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Wash.; Mazatzal Wilderness Area, Tonto National Forest, Ariz.; Superstition Wilderness Area, in portions of the Crook and Tonto National Forests, Ariz.; Marble Mountain Wilderness Area, Klamath National Forest, Calif.; Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, in portions of the Flathead and Lewis and Clark National Forests, Mont.; Gila Wilderness Area, Gila National Forest, N. Mex.; Pecos Wilderness Area, in portions of the Santa Fe and Carson National Forests, N. Mex.; Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, in portions of Willowa and Whitman National Forests, Oreg.; North Absaroka Wilderness Area and South Absaroka Wilderness Area, both in the Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Teton Wilderness Area, Teton National Forest, Wyo.

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

The administration and any proposed addition, modification, or elimination of wilderness, wild, or roadless areas shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this Act, and any such proposed addition, modification, or elimination shall be reported with map and description to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Any addition, modification, or elimination, except as provided in section 3, subsection (c), paragraph (1), shall take effect as provided in subsection (f) below.

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

Additional units of the National Park System may be designated for inclusion in the System by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President. No unit of the National Park System shall be removed from the System except by Act of Congress.

Ninety days after giving public notice the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within each unit of the National Park System named for inclusion in the System such area or areas as he shall determine to be required for roads and accommodations for visitors. A notice of each such designation together with a map and description of the affected area or areas shall be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Each such unit of the National Park System shall become part of the National Wilderness Preservation System when this designation has been made. Designations shall be made not later than January 1, 1966, or within 2 years after the unit has been added to the System, whichever is later. Should the Secretary fail to make such a designation for any such unit of the National Park System within the time limit specified, that unit shall automatically then become a part of the System.

No designation of an area for roads and accommodations for visitors shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the Act approved August 25, 1916, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes."

(c) The System shall include the following national wildlife refuges and ranges: Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Tex.; Bogoslof National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Cabeza Prieta Game Range, Ariz.; Cape Román National Wildlife Refuge, S. C.; Charles Sheldon Antelope Range, Nev.;

Delta National Wildlife Refuge, La.; Desert Game Range, Nev.; Fort Peck Game Range, Mont.; Kenai National Moose Range, Alaska; Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Kofa Game Range, Ariz.; Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge, Maine; National Bison Range, Mont.; Nunivak National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga.; Red Rock Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge, Mont.; Seney National Wildlife Refuge, Mich.; Sheldon National Antelope Refuge, Nev.; Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, Okla.

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

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

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

The administration and any proposed addition, modification, or elimination of roadless and wild areas on Indian reservations shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act subject to the consent of the several tribes or bands, through their tribal councils

or other duly constituted authorities, each with regard to the area or areas within its jurisdiction. Any addition, modification, or elimination shall be reported, with map and description, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council. Nothing in this Act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any band or tribe of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect existing hunting and fishing rights or privileges.

(e) The System shall also include such units as Congress may designate by statute and such units as may be designated within any Federally owned or controlled land and/or water by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved. The administration, modification, and elimination of such units shall be as prescribed by Congress or in accordance with regulations that shall be established in conformity with the purposes of this Act by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved.

(f) Any proposed addition to, modification of, or elimination from the National Wilderness Preservation System otherwise than by Act of Congress, except on Indian reservations and except as provided in section 3, subsection (c), paragraph (1), shall be reported to Congress by the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council upon receipt of notice and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 120 calendar days, of continuous session of Congress, following the date on which the report is received by Congress; but only if during this period there has not been passed by either House of Congress a resolution opposing such proposed addition, modification, or elimination. Within any Federally owned unit within the National Wilderness Preservation System the acquisition of any privately owned lands is hereby authorized and such sums as the Congress may decide are hereby authorized to be appropriated for such acquisition out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

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

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

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Roads over national forest lands reserved from the public domain and necessary for ingress and egress to or from privately owned property shall be, and roads over national forest lands otherwise acquired may be, allowed under appropriate conditions determined by the forest supervisor. Upon allowance of such roads the boundary of the area shall thereupon be modified to exclude the portion affected by the roads. The new boundaries shall be reported, with a map, through the Chief of the Forest Service to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council. All such changes shall be included in the next following annual report of the Council but need not be separately reported to Congress.

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

(3) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou Roadless areas in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses including that of timber, the primitive character of the roadless areas, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages.

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

SEC. 4. (a) A National Wilderness Preservation Council is hereby created to consist ex officio of the persons at the time designated as the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Chief of the United States Forest Service, the Director of the National Park Service, the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and also six citizen members known to be informed regarding, and interested in the preservation of, wilderness, 2 of whom shall be named initially for terms of 2 years, 2 for terms of 4 years, and 2 for terms of 6 years, by the President. After the expiration of these initial terms, each citizen member shall be appointed for a 6-year term. When initial or subsequent appointments are to be made to this Council any established national organization interested in wilderness preservation may make recommendations to the President regarding candidates any of whom would be deemed suitable for appointment to the Council. The Council shall choose from among its members a chairman who shall serve for a 2-year term. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall be the secretary of the Council and, subject to the Council, shall maintain its headquarters.

(b) The Council shall serve as the repository for, and shall maintain available for public inspection, such maps and official papers regarding the National Wilderness

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

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

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

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—A SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

When a draft of the wilderness preservation bill was presented at a conference held in Portland, Oreg., by the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs on April 7, 1956, the conservationists present felt that a historic step was being taken. I was greatly encouraged to receive the following telegram from the federation's president, Dr. Karl Onthank, of Eugene, Oreg.:

PORTLAND, OREG., April 8, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The Conference on Northwest Wilderness, in session in Portland, Oreg., has heard the proposed national wilderness preservation bill outlined and discussed and has responded with enthusiasm to the opportunity it pre-

sents for a historic step in American conservation.

Your initiative in bringing about the formulation of this bill has been warmly commended, and we all wish to express our appreciation of your leadership in bringing it to the attention of Congress. We eagerly await the introduction of the bill and opportunity to support you in working for its enactment.

As president of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, which has sponsored this conference, I am also writing a letter in support of the proposed measure to the Senators of the Western States where the federation's 31 organizations with a total membership of more than 25,000 have been working for years toward the opportunity that you have now helped so greatly to create.

KARL ONTHANK,
President, Federation of Western
Outdoor Clubs.

David R. Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club, who was present at that Portland conference, when this wilderness system was discussed, said: "There was something that made us sense that we were participating in an event of special significance." Mr. Brower wrote as follows, on the letterhead of the Sierra Club from its headquarters at 1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif.:

APRIL 11, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I write you as a constituent, believing that I am in a way a constituent of any Member of Congress who acts in behalf of a National Wilderness Preservation System. I believe a great many citizens from all over the country must feel the same way. I saw much evidence of this at the Conference on Northwest Wilderness, just held in Portland, and attended by conservationists from Oregon, Washington, California, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Maryland, Virginia, and British Columbia—more than 200 all told, and I am not sure that I am calling the roll of all the States represented.

The proposal to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, in which your role is so prominent, was presented to us and talked about in great detail at the conference banquet—its first unveiling before the general public. Then, and all the following day, there was something that made us sense that we were participating in an event of special significance. There were some of the elements of the famous Yellowstone campfire where the idea took form of preserving, for a noble public purpose, national parks for all the people. We were reminded of other conservation milestones—the setting aside of the reserves that became the national forests; the creation of and protection of a National Park System by the 1916 act.

The Sierra Club helped establish the national forests, and it was on a Sierra Club outing in the wilderness country around Mount Rainier that Steve Mather formulated the idea of a National Park Service.

We take special pleasure in the wilderness bill because it constitutes a step toward which our organization, together with many other groups and individual conservationists, has been working so long. The four biennial wilderness conferences we sponsored were all moving in that direction. The enclosed copy of the proceedings of the fourth conference tells something of this effort, and how broad the interest has been. The people who value the things that make America beautiful will be ever grateful for what you are doing to translate these plans into actual legislation.

In this National Wilderness System, under whatever jurisdiction the various elements will be, we are confident that the future will see one of the finest examples of multiple use of land without using up its wilderness resource. The system will provide the best

possible protection of all-important watershed. It will constitute the best of outdoor laboratories, that need never deprecate, for scientific study of the natural equilibrium between all forms of life and the land. It will be a sanctuary for man himself, who needs periodic renewing such as wilderness recreation can give. This wilderness system will be and will remain what we might call the national gallery of primeval art, the carefully guarded treasure of the finest natural scenes left in America.

We thank you for your leadership and offer you our support in creating and strengthening the National Wilderness Preservation System. You have our gratitude, and as the proposal becomes widely known, we are sure that others mindful of the permanent public good will share the enthusiasm we have. I'm confident that you'll have posterity's gratitude, too.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. BROWER,
Executive Director.

The president of the Sierra Club, Dr. Alexander Hildebrand, of 738 South Bright Street, Whittier, Calif., had earlier expressed endorsement of the club. On April 6, 1956, he had wired:

"The Sierra Club strongly endorses the objectives of this bill. We have no criticisms or suggestions at this time but will let you know if any arise after more detailed study. The Sierra Club has sponsored four biennial wilderness conferences which have urged the form of wilderness protection which appears to be skillfully embodied in this bill. We appreciate your role in furthering it."

The president of the National Parks Association, Mr. Sigurd F. Olson, from his headquarters in Ely, Minn., had also commended this proposal, saying he feels strongly that this is the last chance to preserve the wilderness on this continent. Later, on May 10, 1956, at its annual meeting, the National Parks Association adopted a formal resolution saying:

"The preservation of wilderness areas to perpetuate unspoiled examples of the natural American landscape is one of the most essential requirements for the continued well-being of the American people. While several agencies are administering lands under their jurisdiction under excellent policies that protect the wilderness resource, the board of trustees of the National Parks Association believes it desirable that the integrity of such reservations, and the importance of the wilderness concept as an attribute of fundamental American culture, should be given congressional recognition. The board is in sympathy with the purpose of suggestions that have been formulated to achieve this objective, and urges that they be submitted to the people and their representatives in Congress for thoughtful consideration."

The full text of Mr. Olson's letter was as follows:

ELY, MINN., April 3, 1956.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: I was glad to get your letter asking my opinion of the bill you plan on introducing to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. I have worked closely with Howard Zahniser and others for some time on this measure and feel that in view of the mounting pressures of population, commercialization, and industrial expansion, that the only way to assure future generations that there will be any wilderness left for them to enjoy is to give such areas congressional sanction now.

To be sure, wilderness has been given protection in the national parks, national forests, and wildlife refuges, but such protection has never been actually spelled out. In all the services concerned there has been a

sincere desire to protect the wilderness character of the regions entrusted to them but this has largely been because of a concept of administrators enforced by departmental policy. While a splendid job has been done in many areas, it seems to me that it would have been much easier to hold the line, had the issues been clear. The National Wilderness Preservation System bill will clarify the complex problems constantly arising through giving congressional approval of the wilderness concept.

In short the bill will give approval to policies the services have inaugurated and have fought for against tremendous odds for a long time. It will enable the departments to say:

"Now for the first time, the preservation of wilderness has assumed the stature of a congressional mandate. Above political or industrial pressures, it is no longer subject to the vagaries of administrative change. Now we have the strength and assurance that what we had planned is the will of the people and with that knowledge can look far ahead."

I feel strongly that this is the last chance to preserve the wilderness on this continent for we are on the verge of an era where the pressures to destroy or change it will become greater than anything we have ever experienced. All of us concerned are appreciative of your great interest and you can be assured of our support.

Regards.

Sincerely yours,

SGURD F. OLSON.

A noted photographer and outdoorsman of the Far West, Mr. C. Edward Graves, of Carmel, Calif., the western representative of the National Parks Association—has also expressed appreciation of this proposal to establish a national wilderness system. On May 28, 1956, he wrote as follows:

"The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I should like to express to you my sincere appreciation of your sponsorship of the proposal to establish a National Wilderness System. There is no question but that we need to protect our fast-vanishing wilderness by law. There is equally no question but that the proposal will meet with opposition from commercial groups who are continually professing to be afraid of 'locking up' our natural resources. Personally I should welcome a showdown fight on the subject and I am glad to know that you are willing to back us up.

"Population pressure to build roads and develop every last bit of our rapidly receding frontier is hard to resist. We need a weapon such as your bill, if it becomes law, will give us. Think, for instance, of what will happen to our wilderness, when in perhaps 50 years from now, certainly within the lifetime of the oncoming generation, people will own helicopters or flying saucers as commonly as they now own automobiles. We shall certainly need legal protection, well tested by efforts to overthrow it, in order to maintain the small amount of wilderness that we have so far been able to save.

"I am glad that there are legislators with the vision to see this, and I am delighted that you are willing to take a position of leadership in this group.

"Very sincerely,

"C. EDWARD GRAVES,

Western Representative, National Parks Association."

The president of The Wilderness Society, Dr. Olaus J. Murie, wrote as follows from his headquarters in Moose, Wyo.:

MOOSE, Wyo., May 3, 1956.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Needless to say, I am much interested in your bill to give

congressional backing to the growing popular interest in our wilderness places. I grew up in your State, Minnesota, and I remember so vividly how we youngsters gloried in the woodlands along the Red River near Moorhead. Our country was new then, and I can remember some pieces of original unbroken prairie, where the prairie chickens used to boom, and we saw the red foxes. And about 4 miles south of Moorhead was a piece of woods that we young people knew as "The Wilderness," where we used to camp and fish for catfish and goldeyes.

It would take more than the skill of a poet to put into words what that life meant to us, as we went barefoot and carefree, and enjoyed the "freedom of the wilderness," to use a term that perhaps characterizes our way of life. I am certain that those earlier days have left in our lives certain influences and memories that have helped to mellow our later years.

More recently those circumstances, those opportunities, have gone, in much of our country. But people are trying to retain some of the frontier beauty of our country, for the satisfactions that are inherent in such environment. Sportsmen of our country, seeing the habitat for much of our wildlife disappearing, joined with other like-minded people, and over the years have succeeded in establishing a system of national wildlife refuges. This proved to have a more widespread importance than was at first anticipated, for now in many of those refuges are bits of wilderness that contribute to those satisfactions that we as youngsters enjoyed on so large a scale.

We have our national parks, now visited by millions who have in them that racial, nostalgic craving for nature's beauty in the out-of-doors. We also have certain wilderness areas on our national forests, and on the Indian reservations there are some. These last seem all the more appropriate, since they appear to be an expression of the original world of those first Americans, who came to this continent and found it good.

These are the areas we Americans cherish. But unfortunately, circumstances arise when other considerations take our attention so that we forget for the moment these higher aspirations. We have had to defend these areas against some of the commercial drives of some of us. And especially, those earnest people throughout our country who strive to keep alive our deep and worthy human impulses, must defend the quality of our use of these areas.

Therefore, Senator HUMPHREY, we come to the important mechanics of the kind of government we have set up in the United States. These wilderness areas, of several kinds, are the product of the thinking of people. In our form of government there is one ultimate resource the people have, where they are directly represented, and that is Congress. Those of us who have been interested in our America have had amicable cooperation with many of the administrative agencies. We have reached the high point where we now are, through such close cooperation. But we have come up against situations in which the immediate administrator found himself helpless and without voice. And we people, on the outside, have found ourselves floundering and doing the best we can to defend these areas and their policies.

We have a Government based on checks and balances. We believe that such an important question, involving the kind of place we people shall continue to live in and enjoy, should have the sanction of Congress. We do not ask any changes in the actual administration of these areas. But we cannot anticipate what may occur in future years, and we would like to have a place to go in the last resort, our Congress.

These are some of the thoughts I have on the wilderness bill you are introducing.

Needless to say, you will have the well wishes of people from all parts of our country, and I am sure that people in other countries also will be much interested in the outcome.

Sincerely,

CLAUS J. MURIE,
President.

The president of the Izaak Walton League of America, Mr. L. H. Dunten, wrote as follows from the league's headquarters at 31 North State Street, Chicago, Ill.:

APRIL 4, 1956.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of March 29 with reference to a proposed bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, permit me to thank you in behalf of the League for permitting us to see a draft of this Act. As you realize, the time permitted to analyze the Act is quite limited as you wanted a reply by April 10. Consequently, I have not been able to submit it to technical people in the League.

From my examination of the bill, I believe that it is completely in line with Izaak Walton League policies. Personally, I should like to see the Act completely abolish grazing in any of the wilderness areas.

With reference to section 4, my feeling is that the language is not strong enough to prohibit the exploitation of wilderness areas under the guise of prospecting.

Most sincerely yours,

L. H. DUNTEN,
President.

(The bill's provisions regarding prospecting have been strengthened, as Mr. Dunten suggested, but no attempt has been made to "completely abolish grazing.")

Concluding his opening address at the North American Wildlife Conference in New Orleans, La., on March 5, 1956, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, described this bill as then "in preparation" and as "of interest to many groups." He said: "This bill may well represent a tremendous advance forward both for those who are interested in wilderness recreation and for those who are interested in wilderness wildlife and its values."

The comment of the press has likewise been an encouragement. Some weeks ago, in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press for April 1, 1956, Jack Van Coevering, devoted his Woods and Waters column to a discussion of our proposed National Wilderness System. Mr. Van Coevering, one of our foremost outdoor writers, wrote as follows:

"Beginning with grade school, people are taught that the wilderness is something to be conquered. The pioneers did it. That's how they built this country.

"Now that the wilderness is almost gone, a change of sentiment is creeping across the Nation. If we lose the last remnants of wilderness, people are saying, we will lose certain values that our civilization needs.

"As a result of this realization, groups interested in saving remnants of wilderness are ready to introduce a bill in Congress to create a national wilderness system.

"This bill will not set up new bureaus of bureaucrats. It will simply establish a commission (something like the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission) under whose guidance wilderness areas may be established and protected.

"This may represent a tremendous advance both for those who are interested in wilderness recreation and wilderness wildlife," said Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute.

"The effort to save the last bits of wilderness before it is too late is typical of the way we do things.

"In this State, we have a few acres of pine forests as museum pieces of the past.

"We make a great to-do about saving trumpeter swans when they are about to

perish. We begin worrying about prairie chickens when they are on the skids. When it seems as though roadbuilders and developers will take over the last big tract of wilderness, we begin to act. We prize these 'pieces of long ago.' We do not want to lose them.

"There is something downright practical about the desires of many people to save the wilderness, too. It is still the best environment for physical adventure.

"In a wilderness a person cannot buy transportation or services. He must provide his own.

"This, if nothing else, gives not only opportunity to develop self-reliance but also to brush off any false sense of self-sufficiency. These seemingly opposite facets of character are essential if we are to develop well-rounded qualities of leadership.

"Probably the most profound values of wilderness are educational. In the wilderness are opportunities for gaining true understanding of our past, ourselves, and our world.

"Only against a perspective of wilderness can we enjoy the conveniences and liberties of our urbanized, mechanized, industrialized civilization, and yet not sacrifice an awareness of our human existence as spiritual creatures nurtured and sustained by and from the great community of life that comprises the wilderness,' is the way Howard Zahniser, secretary for the Wilderness Society, said it.

"Objectives of wilderness devotees, as set forth in the bill to come before Congress, are twofold:

"1. To preserve an adequate system of wilderness areas.

"2. To allow nothing to alter the wilderness character of the preserves.

"This will set aside wilderness areas in our national parks, national forests, Indian reservations, wildlife refuges, even in State parks and other areas that are already being protected in a way to safeguard wilderness."

The Sunday Journal of Portland, Oreg., on April 15, 1956, commended this proposal in its leading editorial and also devoted its cartoon that day to this same subject. The editorial, entitled "Value of Wilderness," was as follows:

"Outdoor recreationists in the United States include a breed of men and women who love on occasion to escape the sight and sound of civilization and all its comforts.

"In relation to the total, their number is not large, but it is growing—and so is their influence.

"They are concerned that steps be taken to preserve for all time certain wilderness areas which are now units of national parks and monuments, national forests, wildlife refuges, and Indian reservations.

"Their efforts have found their way into a bill presented to Congress by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, which has bipartisan backing, to establish a national wilderness preservation system.

"The legislation would not create a new land administrative agency, nor call for any changes in jurisdictions. It would simply charge the agency administering an area designated as a unit of the system with preserving its wilderness character. It would give congressional sanction to keeping unchanged existing wilderness areas, thus guaranteeing them against encroachments of a commercial nature.

"Senator HUMPHREY's bill is the culmination of a campaign born a year ago last May in a paper delivered at a Washington, D. C., conference by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, a headline speaker, incidentally, at the Portland conference last weekend of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

"Zahniser's presentation of his wilderness philosophy was like a stone tossed into a pool. It has been gaining converts ever since. And the proposed legislation which it

inspired won the unqualified endorsement of the federation meeting here, representing 31 organizations with more than 25,000 members in Western States.

"Out of the wilderness has come the substances of our culture," says Zahniser, "and with a living wilderness we shall have also a vibrant vital culture—an enduring civilization of healthy, happy people who renew themselves in contact with the earth."

"Like Zahniser and his cohorts, we believe there is value in having places where man can get away from all the reminders of his workaday life. At present, areas of this character are not guaranteed that their borders will not be violated by the markings of civilization. Passage of the proposed legislation will give them this guaranty."

The reference to Mr. Howard Zahniser's paper delivered in May of 1955 is to the address which I had the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 1, 1955, an address entitled "The Need for Wilderness" delivered by Mr. Zahniser at the National Citizens' Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People, in Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1955. The Oregon Journal's editorial reference to this address as being "like a stone tossed into a pool" suggested a cartoon to the artist Bonelli. For the paper's editorial page cartoon on April 15, he drew a beautiful wilderness scene, tall evergreens beside an unspooled lake. On the surface of the deep pool of the lake the widening circles that follow the tossing of a stone are drawn and labeled: Increasing demands to preserve certain wilderness areas perpetually free of commercial encroachment.

Two weeks later, on Sunday, April 29, 1956, the New York Times, in an editorial entitled "Man Needs Nature," added the weight of its endorsement. The Times called attention to the fact that "Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in cooperation with the Council of Conservationists and some other leading conservation groups, has been working on a bill that would give duly designated wilderness areas the permanent legal protection that would safeguard them for the enjoyment of future generations of Americans, who will need unspoiled natural areas even more keenly than their forefathers do today." The Times commended "the desirability of establishing on a statutory basis a national wilderness preservation system." Said this editorial:

"As our urban, mechanized society spreads itself with increasing speed and destructiveness across the land, the human need for preserving contact with natural areas, with living, wild and growing things, becomes more explicit and more pervasive. As natural areas rapidly diminish, the battle to keep the best of the remaining ones intact grows more intense."

Later, an article by John B. Oakes, entitled "Wilderness Areas," appeared in the New York Times conservation department for Sunday, May 13, 1956, as follows:

"WILDERNESS AREAS

"Civilized Americans are becoming increasingly conscious of a paradox that affects us all: our mechanistic society is rapidly destroying every vestige of primitive and unspoiled nature, while we daily realize with ever greater force the need for maintaining contact with the natural community. While we are pushing the frontiers of nature further and further back, we are at the same time being starved for contact with nature, a basic need of the human animal. This isn't just a question of city folk seeking outdoor recreation, or enjoying spectacular scenery, or breathing unpoisoned air. It goes much deeper; it springs from the inextricable relationship of man with nature, a relationship that even the most insensitive and complex civilization can never dissipate. Man needs nature; he may within limits control it, but to destroy it is to

begin the destruction of man himself. We cannot live on a sterile planet, nor would we want to.

"TO PRESERVE THE WILDS

"A conservationist philosophy such as this could not fail to be sympathetic with the movement, spearheaded particularly by The Wilderness Society, to establish permanent legal protection for such remaining unspoiled wilderness areas as this country still possesses. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota—who has the superb Quetico-Superior wilderness area in his own State—is sponsoring a bill that would set up a national wilderness preservation system, largely out of lands already contained in our national parks, forests, Indian reservations, wildlife preserves, etc., that are already under jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The relatively few wilderness areas that are already so designated by administrative order would be expanded and merged into a vast system of rigidly protected natural preserves. The idea is certainly worth exploring—if what is left of our country in a natural state is worth saving, as many of us believe it is."

The Conservation News, published by the National Wildlife Federation, contained in its May 1, 1956, issue an article entitled "Senator HUMPHREY Drafts Wilderness Bill," which effectively introduced this subject as follows:

"No outdoorsman needs to be reminded that wilderness is a rapidly disappearing thing in America. Places where a man may get himself lost in the woods, hunt without fear of plugging a friend, fish without hooking a buddy, hike without dodging automobiles, or camp beyond earshot of roaring trucks, are becoming increasingly hard to find.

"The special value of wilderness is difficult to define, but it is nonetheless real to those who know it. It is an intangible thing sorely missed by a certain stripe of man and deeply needed by many others for whom it unfortunately is often an unknown hidden hunger—especially important in these days when the pressures of everyday living cause queues at the prescription counters for equinol.

"Probably all who go hunting and fishing feel the need for wilderness to a greater or less degree. So do hikers and mountain climbers and the youth groups to whom adventure in the outdoors is so important. In fact, nearly all Americans have some interest in the wilderness because of their outdoor backgrounds and its prominent part in our history."

Commenting that fortunately there still remain some large areas of wilderness, the article then pointed out:

"Some 50 or so national parks and monuments have within them unspoiled areas large enough to be called wilderness. Some 20 or so of the national wildlife refuges do, too. Within the national forests there are some 80 areas that have been designated by the Forest Service for protection as wilderness. Indian reservations contain 15 areas that have been classified as roadless or wild areas.

"Putting all these 165 or so areas together, out of more than 2¼ billion acres in our total land area (of which 741 million acres are federally owned), we have a total of about 55 million acres of wilderness in Federal ownership or control. They are parts of public lands within which wilderness can be preserved consistently with other purposes, as part of what might be called a multipurpose wilderness preservation program."

The National Wildlife Federation article emphasized the need for legislation as follows:

"At present, however, there are no laws of Congress that protect these areas of wilderness as wilderness. Even in the national parks the pressures for roads and nonwilderness recreational and tourist developments

threaten in many places to invade the primeval backcountry. In the national forests the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas have been set up administratively and could be abolished or greatly reduced by a future Secretary of Agriculture. Wilderness within the national wildlife refuges is in a precarious position because the refuges themselves lack adequate legal protection against pressures for commercial or exploitative encroachments. In fact, none of these areas has the protection that Congress could give by providing for wilderness preservation as a national policy applied to a definite system of areas."

Then summarizing the proposals of this bill, the article said:

"This System would be made up of the areas of primeval America that are still wilderness and in Federal ownership and capable of being kept that way without interfering with other purposes now being served by these lands. The areas to be included are named in the bill. These areas would continue to be administered by the existing Federal agencies that now handle them. Uses now being made of the areas would be permitted to continue, but the administering agencies would be charged with responsibility to protect the areas as wilderness. There would be no new overhead or coordinating agency created, but there would be a commission to serve as a clearinghouse for information and a repository for the maps and official papers having to do with the System."

After pointing out the bill's purpose to protect all wildernesses from mining, the article said that "otherwise the bill is not a reform measure" and continued:

"The grazing now permitted on national forest wildernesses, for example, could continue; special uses now permitted on some refuges would also not be interfered with. National parks would remain inviolate as to mining, grazing, or other such uses. The Secretary of the Interior would designate the parts of each park and monument needed for roads and visitor accommodations, and then the rest of each park would be preserved as wilderness. The bill thus proposes to take the wilderness now suitable for the purpose and provide for its permanent protection under congressional sanction."

The article concludes as follows:

"Proponents of the Humphrey bill have emphasized that the proposal is not special-use or special-privilege legislation.

"National forest areas involved, they point out, would continue to be administered under the present Forest Service regulations (which provide, for example, for grazing permits), and these areas also would continue to serve the basic purposes of the national forests. These purposes are defined by law as watershed protection and forest preservation. Setting these areas aside as wilderness, it is explained, will thus not interfere with the multiple purposes they now serve but will actually help to realize the dominant use of the national forests for water conservation.

"National parks, national wildlife refuges, and any other areas would also continue to serve their own distinctive purposes. No special-use privileges of any kind would be created by the proposed law. The only added responsibility of each administering agency would be for seeing that the designated wilderness under its jurisdiction remain wilderness.

"The title of the bill describes it as 'for the permanent good of the whole people' and the enacting clause says that the National Wilderness Preservation System is 'to serve the public purpose of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use and enjoyment by the people.'

"The section of the bill dealing with uses says that nothing within the Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose for which any of the lands involved were orig-

inally set aside, 'except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall in its administration for whatever other purpose be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area.'

"The areas within this System,' says the bill, 'shall be devoted to the public purpose of recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservation, and historical uses and all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and its preservation.'

"The executive committee of the Council of Conservationists, which is active in support of Senator HUMPHREY's proposal, includes David R. Brower of San Francisco, Ira N. Gabrielson and Howard Zahniser of Washington, D. C., Carl O. Gustafson and Fred Smith of New York, and Joseph W. Penfold of Denver. Gabrielson and Zahniser are also chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources which also has espoused the wilderness bill as one of its positive projects."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his introduction of this bill. I feel privileged to be listed as a cosponsor of the measure. The Senator from Minnesota will be interested to learn that he is introducing this bill at an extremely appropriate day. This morning, before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, one of the most illustrious women in our land testified in favor of a resolution that would commemorate the First Governors Conference on Conservation, which was called at the White House nearly half a century ago by President Theodore Roosevelt.

This very outstanding woman in the life of our country is Mrs. Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, the widow of Gifford Pinchot, the founder of the United States Forest Service, and perhaps the greatest conservationist produced by our country in modern times, if not, indeed, in the entire history of the United States. I think if Gifford Pinchot were here today, he would be a cosponsor of the bill of the Senator from Minnesota. I recall with pleasure standing in the company of Mrs. Pinchot at LaWisWis Forest Camp in the Pacific Northwest, when the great Gifford Pinchot National Forest was dedicated some years ago to the memory of her late husband. The dedication, as I recall, was supervised by Lyle F. Watts, one of my distinguished Oregon constituents, who then was Chief Forester of the United States. Mr. Watts, incidentally, was a protege in the Forest Service of Gifford Pinchot.

Unfortunately, no country has used up its natural resources in so short a time and as quickly as has the United States of America. Only a century and a half have gone by since Lewis and Clark crossed our continent. They were the first Americans to reach the Pacific coast and fly our flag beside the shores of the Pacific Ocean. Yet in that century and a half, the people of this country, oftentimes recklessly, wantonly, and profligately, have made terrible inroads on our natural resources.

When Lewis and Clark crossed the country, there were around 60 million bison on the American plains. When Theodore Roosevelt and others formed the American Bison Society, shortly after the turn of the century, they had a difficult time finding 6 or 8 hundred bison scattered over this vast country which could be used to breed a few captive herds, so our boys and girls could in the future see what bison looked like.

Passenger pigeons once were so numerous that their flights darkened the skies and broke the branches of trees. There is not a single passenger pigeon left. No matter how long mankind remains here on this planet, there never will be another passenger pigeon. The last one died, I believe, in the Cincinnati Zoological Gardens in 1914.

Yet, despite these lessons which have come down to us from very recent history, we still continue to make mistakes. Right at this very hour, as the Senator from Minnesota stands here, having completed the introduction of the bill, oil drilling and gas leasing are taking place on lands which were set aside for nesting and breeding for the flights of migratory fowl, which take place between the Canadian Arctic and the birds' winter homes in the Caribbean and South America. Therefore, we have relatively few resources left from which to set aside a wilderness reservation system, such as the Senator from Minnesota and his cosponsors are now proposing.

I believe that if such legislation is not proposed today or in the immediate future it will be too late; that there will not be left the great upland solitudes and the great forests and the timbered lake areas, such as there are in the State of the Senator from Minnesota, as to which the bill can be put into operation.

Actually, it is almost the 11th hour so far as the wilderness system in our country is concerned. It seems to me that the Senator from Minnesota has rendered a distinct public service by working with various conservation groups, such as The Wilderness Society and others, to develop and formulate legislation such as this. I want him to know that I consider myself very highly privileged to work in the ranks with him, and under his guidance, toward this great goal.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said this is a Teddy Roosevelt fight. I think it is not only a Teddy Roosevelt fight, but also is a fight for the things that enlightened Americans in our generation must stand for, if we are to fulfill our obligation to the next generation of Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an introduction I wrote to a pamphlet entitled "Conserving Our Great Outdoors," which was published under the auspices of the Tamiment Institute, of New York, as a public service. The pamphlet was written by me in an effort to acquaint the American people with the need for the type of conservation principles which are embodied in the bill introduced today by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

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

When I am at my desk in the Senate Office Building, I look out on a world of concrete, steel, and asphalt. Massive temples of Government dominate the horizon. Torrents of traffic pour along the streets. Civilization has crowded nature into the distant background. When I take a train to New York from Washington, I ride for over 200 miles through a continuous avenue of factories, switching yards, crowded tenement districts, and warehouses. This is where we have paved the ground, clouded the air with soot and smoke, and breached rivers and lakes with our wharves and gravel fills.

Yet, there comes a time when the teeming spectacle mercifully fades, and a totally different vision appears. I may be looking at a squat blast furnace where hundreds of men are employed, but my thoughts flee to the mile-deep canyons where the Salmon and Snake Rivers unite in a cavernous union. My wife and I are trudging with knapsacks to Heaven's Gate Lookout, which commands this majestic panorama. Butterflies dot the mountain sky, and lodgepole pines sway in the breeze from out of the twin chasms. We are alone, many miles from the nearest neighbors. The mule deer foraging on the steep slopes are safe. In this secluded heart of Idaho's Nez Perce National Forest, mighty ridges split the clear air like the humps of a gigantic camel cavalry. Light-heartedly, we cook our supper of eastern brook trout and fried potatoes in a grove below the frowning ramparts of He-Devil Peak.

Or we are on the twisting Lolo Trail, where Lewis and Clark nearly starved to death 150 years earlier. We stand beside three jumbled rock cairns in a waving meadow of white bear-grass. These are relics of the first westbound Americans, yet the cairns still dot the high divide above the rumbling Lochsa fork of the Clearwater River. The rush of civilization has passed them by. Reading from the explorers' famous Journals, we try to build our campfire exactly where the ashes of some bleak bivouac must have lain on that original trek. When Maurine puts on her bathing suit and frolics beneath an icy waterfall, we wonder if it was in this brook that Lewis and Clark filled the rusty iron kettle which boiled a scraggly timberwolf that was their only food. And did the mournful howl from beyond the fire's flickering circle last night come from some remote descendant of that historic beast?

Perhaps, in my reverie, I am off to the north, on the unfortified boundary between British Columbia and the State of Washington. I am walking along the corridor of spruce and Douglas fir which marks the international border. Snow powders the needle boughs and branches. Mount Baker hovers like a domed citadel in the sky. At my side is red-headed John Piper, staff sergeant in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who shares my pride in the dark shawl of evergreen forests sprawling across the frontier. If only such magnificent trees might endure forever.

I am at the spray-spattered foot of the hissing column of water known as Yosemite Falls, with a friend named Adlai Stevenson. We do not speak, for no human voice is stentorian enough to be heard above this thunder. But why words, after all? Can mankind have any except a single thought amid the sublime grandeur of a waterfall half a mile in height? What is the mystery of the Creator's infinite wonders, which dwarf and shame the works of mankind? * * * And would the musings of my companion be different from those of another friend, the late Haldane (Buzz) Holmstrom, when he and I stood on the north rim of the Grand

Canyon of the Colorado and looked down into that abyss, which only Holmstrom ever had traversed alone by boat?

FIFTY MILLION CAR OWNERS CAN'T STAY HOME

Public life often can be a sort of prison, so my visits to these beautiful places today are rare, indeed. Yet it reassures me to know that they continue to exist—that, somewhere, the sparkling Lochsa foams toward the sea with the same lilting resonance and over the same mossy rocks as when Capt. Meriwether Lewis called it Kooskooskee, the river which flows fast and clear.

I know that millions of Americans feel likewise. They gain both security and comfort from the fact that a segment of the old original wilderness has been saved. The whole continent has not yet been tilled, paved, or settled. Some of these people may never see the real wilderness; their sentiments are purely vicarious. But they are aware of it, nevertheless—just as Mount Everest and K-2 inspire pride among people in remote parts of India.

Still, the attention to our own outdoors becomes less intangible and more direct with each passing day. Americans now own more than 50 million motor cars. Bryce Canyon and Mount Hood are just beyond everybody's radiator cap. The call of the open road is heard in millions of apartments and bungalows. In the past, much of our travel was dependent upon common carriers like trains and buses; an extra ticket had to be bought for each member of the family. But, in an automobile, the same fuel and monthly down-payments transport father, mother, children, and in-laws—perhaps even the family dog or cat. Widespread ownership of automobiles has widened the vista and the travel radius of every American household.

The pressure on our recreational resources was never so great, and this is but the beginning. If we do not spare these resources—nay, expand and also improve them—we shall find that eventually our families have no place to go, despite finer and faster automobiles and more leisure time.

Maurine and I sat with my mother at the hearthfire of a quaint little lodge in the fairy-like Yoho Valley of British Columbia. Our companions, whom we had met a few hours earlier beside the roaring Yoho River, were a refugee doctor from Europe and his pretty blonde wife. "At the start," said the doctor, "we went to many of your national parks and national forests. But now they are so very crowded—how you say it? Like Coney Island, maybe. Thus, we turn to Canada, where it is not yet elbow to elbow in the most wonderful places to see."

When we came down out of the uplands on a Canadian Pacific train, an item in the press told us that Canada's Minister of Resources had rejected flatly a request that the mining of a great lode of uranium be permitted inside the borders of Banff National Park. The park was reserved for recreation, said the Minister, and that ended the matter. Yet Canada has far more of its area devoted to outdoor pastimes than has the United States, particularly when comparative populations are considered. Are we letting commercialism and exploitation rob us of our chance for unfettered enjoyment under the blue heavens and the stars?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I conclude, I merely wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for his cosponsorship of this measure and for his very enlightened and thoughtful remarks relative to the bill which has been introduced today.

I think every Member of this body recognizes in the junior Senator from

Oregon one of the foremost conservationists in the land. His writings prior to his coming to the Senate gained him national recognition and fame. His intimate knowledge of the great natural resources of the United States and of what has been happening to them has been heralded many times by universities and conservation groups and by the American press and journals.

So, Mr. President, in introducing this bill, I am merely acting as the catalyst, so to speak. In bringing this matter to the attention of Congress, I have had the advice and counsel of both the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I consider myself very fortunate to be able to work with these two fine Senators, who have placed the principles of sound conservation at the top of their public service, as priority items not only for the Americans of today, but for generations yet unborn.

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I may say that it is a great honor to join the Senator from Minnesota as a cosponsor of the bill. I have the suspicion that as we introduce the bill today its full implications will not immediately catch the imagination of the American people. In my judgment, the Senator from Minnesota is adding another great foundation stone to his record of public service in the Senate. Once again he is demonstrating that one of the responsibilities of statesmanship is the duty to look ahead to the needs and the benefits and the problems of future generations of Americans.

Sometimes I feel that in our day, the mad race to make money, the mad race to feed the economic appetites of the people, is causing us to forget to protect the greater values.

The Senator from Minnesota is talking about one of those greater values, which are essential to human happiness. I say that because if we, in our generation, do not do the kind of conservation job the Senator is calling for in the bill he is introducing, of which I am honored to be a cosponsor, the history of our generation as it will be written by future generations of American boys and girls would not make pleasant reading for any of us if we could return from our graves.

Although many people do not seem to realize it, it is clear that one of the great issues, one of the great problems confronting us, is the fulfilling of our trusteeship over the natural resources God has given us.

The natural resources which are referred to in the bill do not belong to us; neither do they belong to the private utilities to which the present administration has given so many of them. Neither do they belong to the oil companies which have been permitted by the administration to rape some of the natural resources, as is shown by the record which the administration has made in its leases of refuges in the wilderness areas.

So when the Senator from Minnesota raises this issue today, he is raising one which is of great concern to the happiness of future generations of American boys and girls.

Let us look at history for a moment, for the sake of the record today. I want the Senate to consider what has happened to some other great civilizations of centuries gone by. They had wilderness areas, too. They had forests, too. They had great water resources, too. Yes; they had deep topsoil, from which could grow a surplus of food so essential to a high civilization.

The Senator from Minnesota has heard me say this before, but it needs to be repeated in connection with his bill. No civilization can climb except with surplus food. Yet the American people are being given the impression by the present administration that in our time surplus food seems to be a great national calamity and liability. But food is one of the greatest essentials to a high standard of living, in a climbing civilization.

The Senator from Minnesota and I in fighting for the bill are really fighting for the carrying out of a trusteeship obligation which our generation owes to American boys and girls yet unborn.

What we are doing by the bill, if we can get our colleagues to raise their sights high enough today to do some thinking in terms of the next 100 years, is making a plea to preserve the natural resources of the United States for the human happiness of boys and girls who will follow us, instead of depleting them and economically raping them for a profit of a few hundred dollars which will not serve our Nation well after we have gone.

China once had plenteous natural resources. China's mountains were once covered with forests and great wilderness areas. China once had deep topsoil. China once had surplus water resources. China once was a great natural resource country. China had the greatest civilization on the face of the earth when it had those gifts of God and treasured them and protected them.

I happen to believe that we ought to take an intellectual approach to the matter of the Nation's natural resources; that we ought to learn from history; and that we ought to see to it, before it is too late, that this is the generation which will assume the obligation of stopping the serious trend toward the depletion of America's natural resources.

The Senator from Minnesota and I are not the only persons in the history of the Senate who have raised voices in a plea to protect and conserve the interests of America. There were greater men before us, on both sides of the aisle, in the history of this Chamber, and also in the administrative branch of the Government, who fought for the protection of the natural resources of the United States. There were great conservationists who preceded us in this Chamber—a Hiram Johnson, of California, a Bob La Follette, of Wisconsin, a George Norris, of Nebraska, to mention only a few. There were great statesmen in the executive branch of the Government, such as the great Republican, Gifford Pinchot, who is recognized really as the father of

the modern conservation movement in America; Teddy Roosevelt, who fought the interests, too. That monopolyst-buster did a job that Dwight D. Eisenhower ought to try to emulate. In Teddy Roosevelt's day, the monopolist tried to do to the heritage of the American people the injury the monopolies in 1956, under Dwight D. Eisenhower, are succeeding in doing to the Nation's natural resources under the Eisenhower giveaway program.

I am perfectly willing to take all the abuse, criticism, and castigation for standing on the floor of the Senate and the platforms of America and saying that Eisenhower is doing a tremendous disservice to future generations of American boys and girls in the field of natural resources. Does the Senator know why? Because Eisenhower simply does not understand the true meaning and value of natural resources. He has never comprehended the problem. He does not know the history of natural resources; and he has demonstrated it time and time again by the terrible record of disservice which he has performed as President of the United States in the field of natural resources.

So when we support the bill today, we are making a Teddy Roosevelt fight; we are making a Gifford Pinchot fight; we are making a George Norris fight; we are making a fight to try to awaken the American people again, before it is too late, to the fact that the natural resources, of which we are the trustees, are being depleted across the land, and as we deplete them we chip away at the foundations of our very civilization itself, and, as a people without natural resources, we become a decadent people. That is history. Dwight D. Eisenhower cannot rewrite history in the field of natural resources. He cannot deny the effect of natural laws upon a civilization.

When we consider our natural resources, it is either to preserve them, conserve them, and develop them for the benefit of the people, or to strike a blow at the standard of living of the people, which is how China lost her once high standard of living. Let me say that we had better be on guard lest we bring about an eroded America, as there has been brought about an eroded China. We had better be on guard lest we have a devastated America, as China has become a devastated nation. We had better be on guard lest we waste or destroy the potentialities of the water resources of America, because within the field of natural resources water is dominant when it comes to maintaining the high standard of living of the people.

The difficulty confronting us is to get the people to think in terms of these basic principles. The average American citizen simply takes water for granted. Most Americans never stop to think about our obligation to develop, preserve, and conserve the water resources of our country. The Senator from Minnesota will remember the debate in the Senate last year on the upper Colorado project, when we began to recognize the water resource phase of that project and the obligation to provide future generations in that area of America with an

adequate water supply. We were fighting in our day to provide the boys and girls of a future day with enough water—perhaps just enough water—to make it possible for them to have a decent standard of living, because without enough water there cannot be a decent standard of living.

I appreciate the Senator's permitting me to make these comments in the midst of his speech, but I think the subject is so important that when a major piece of proposed legislation such as this is before the Senate, we should tie it down to its great objective, so far as ideals are concerned. It is a great ideal for which the Senator from Minnesota is fighting. As the Senator knows, I think statesmanship calls upon us to put the ideals into practice. We are putting them into practice in this great conservation bill, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the Senator from Oregon. If the Senator will permit me to do so, in order to have the RECORD reflect continuity in the section-by-section analysis of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's observations may follow the completion of my prepared statement on the bill.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point also, and as a part of my request, I may say that the Senator from Oregon has again demonstrated his fearlessness, his wisdom, and his statesmanship. His support of conservation programs is a tribute to his character and sense of public duty. I could agree entirely, and I do agree entirely, with the Senator's observations relating to the urgent necessity of having this generation of Americans continue—in fact, to step up—our conservation policies and programs. The pressure of economic development, population pressures, the whole period of tension in which we live, can very well get us into a position where we will ignore the God-given resources of land, water, minerals, and timber. If we ignore their preservation now, it will be centuries before they can ever be reclaimed, and some of them may never be reclaimed.

The Senator's comments relating to history are as true as Scripture. Not only are his statements about China true, but if one peruses the Old Testament, he will read about areas in the Middle East which today are arid and barren, but once were fertile valleys and hills covered by green grass and wonderful forests, and rich in fruit and crops. But today they are barren wilderness areas, which have to be reclaimed at tremendous cost in time, money, and energy; and some of them are beyond the capacity of modern man to reclaim.

After the conclusion of Mr. HUMPHREY's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for the comments he has made.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota needs yield to no other Member of the Senate for the leadership he is

giving the Senate and the country in the field of sound conservation. I am sure I voice the view of my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] when I say that we are proud to join forces with the Senator from Minnesota in carrying out what I referred to earlier in my remarks as our trusteeship, for our generation, over the natural resources of the country.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE UNITED STATES CAN LOSE THE ATOMIC POWER RACE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, possibly no issue is of greater importance to the future of the free world and our domestic economy than the rapid development of economic power from the atom.

The Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the private utilities have pursued a dangerous policy of drifting and of unwatchful waiting, while the Soviet Union pursues an aggressive program of building atomic reactors.

Many of us who serve in the Congress advocate an all-out Federal program for the development and operation of demonstrator plants to get the United States program "off the ground." The Gore-Holifield bill would do just that.

Mr. President, this proposal, which I strongly endorse, has caused consternation in the ranks of the Atomic Energy Commission and the private utilities. The basic data on this controversy appear in the hearings on the Gore bill, which were held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I wish to compliment the chairman of the joint committee, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], on those hearings and on related hearings which were held in an effort to lay before the public and the Congress the status of our program and that of the Russians.

The committee has been hampered by the secrecy of the Atomic Energy Commission. Reportedly, the Atomic Energy Commission has been classifying material from Soviet sources. What can be the purpose of keeping such data from the American public? If the data comes from Soviet sources, obviously Russia already knows about the data, and the American people should have them. Of course, that is only another example of the dangerous trend, under the Eisenhower administration, toward government of secrecy. Let me say that freedom and government by secrecy cannot be reconciled.

Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission and the private utilities are continuing their campaign to attempt to persuade the public that atomic power is premature, and that they are making all possible speed. However, the facts belie their propaganda. The picture is one of a man who, although running furiously, remains in one place.

Mr. President, I have before me a series of articles which bring into focus a few salient points which I believe should be considered by every Member of Congress and every American citizen. I desire particularly to commend the Portland

Oregonian, which is not a "Morse newspaper," but which has written a fine editorial on this atomic energy program, under the heading "Get Off Our Backs." In fact, I wish to commend the Portland Oregonian for the leadership it has been giving to public opinion in my section of the country, in support of the development of atomic power reactor resources at Hanford, where the American taxpayers have a tremendous investment. Let us not forget that in the country as a whole the American taxpayers have an investment of \$14 billion in the atomic energy program. We, the taxpayers, have paid for it, lock, stock, and barrel. It belongs to the American taxpayers.

Here is one Senator who does not propose to give it away to the private utilities, but who believes that, in cooperation with private industry, we should proceed with all possible speed to the maximum development, in the shortest possible period of time, of the atomic energy resources of science. That means, Mr. President, that we should proceed with some so-called pilot reactor plants for the Government, because—as I said the other day in my testimony before the Gore committee—the record is perfectly clear that the private utilities are not going to do it for years, and that if they do it, we shall have to subsidize them. Their scheme—by way of tax benefits and insurance benefits and requests that the Government assume all the risks of liability which may develop from a private utility's building a reactor—is in large measure to have the taxpayers pay for the reactors, which then would belong to the private utilities. It is the same old private-utility shell game, Mr. President, which they tried to play to too great an extent in this administration—but to too great an extent to get by with, Mr. President—in the field of hydroelectric power. We should stop them before they start in the field of atomic power.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Portland Oregonian for the support it has been giving to at least one issue for which I have been fighting in the Senate; I completely endorse the Portland Oregonian's editorial, under the heading "Get Off Our Backs," which deals with the question of the need for the development of atomic reactors by the Government itself. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have both that editorial and a series of articles dealing with the same subject matter, and taken by me from the press, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Portland Oregonian of June 4, 1956]

GET OFF OUR BACKS

President Eisenhower's request for an \$82,500,000 boost in Atomic Energy Commission funds, partly for an accelerated program of civilian reactor development, is good news for those who believe this phase of Federal atom research has been wrongly deemphasized.

The current attitude of a majority of the AEC parallels that of the private electric power industry that Uncle Sam should not get too deeply involved in the business of

generating electricity with nuclear energy. Any large-scale Federal experimentation and construction, private interests feel, might put the Government even farther into the power business than it already is.

But the private utilities are not ready to handle the atom by themselves. The technology of atomic power generation is not yet sufficiently advanced to make it attractive to risk capital. Problems of insurance and the extent of liability for mishaps are unsolved. Thus the net effect of the restrictive attitude held by private interests and accepted by the AEC is to delay the solution of these problems.

A good example of how this dog-in-the-manger policy works against the public interest is the situation at the Hanford, Wash., plutonium plant. This plant drains a secret, but admittedly enormous, amount of power from the Bonneville system. But in the process of manufacturing plutonium the plant generates and wastes enough heat to run steam generators capable of producing all the electric power it needs and then some. A great new block of power would become available for Northwest homes and industries if this were done.

In recent testimony on behalf of the Gore bill, which would authorize construction of six new Federal demonstrator atomic power plants, including a dual purpose power-plutonium reactor at Hanford, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE pointed out that the present AEC budget calls for expenditure of many millions of dollars for modernization and improvement of the Hanford works, but without the power-generating facilities that would take its power load off Northwest backs.

Senator MORSE said this seems to him to be "the height of improvidence." It seems that way to us, too.

[From the New York Times of June 3, 1956]
CURTAINS PARTED ON SOVIET SCIENCE; UNITED STATES EXPERTS SAY RUSSIAN HOSTS LET THEM VISIT ANY ATOM SITES THEY WISHED
(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

The recent visit of United States scientists to Moscow produced probably the most intimate picture of Soviet science ever obtained by outsiders.

The Americans mingled freely with about 1,000 leading Soviet physicists. They were entertained in the homes of their Russian colleagues. Both groups spoke freely not only of scientific problems but also of many personal problems and questions of principle that concerned physicists dealing with the atom.

The American physicists spent 10 days in Moscow. They were permitted to visit any physics experimental facilities and laboratories they desired. They said there was no restriction on what they were permitted to see.

"They asked us to tell them what we wanted to see," one scientist said. "We saw everything we wanted. They answered every question. We were permitted to bring our cameras right into their experimental laboratories and take pictures of everything we wanted."

The Americans learned at firsthand the difficulties that many Soviet scientists encountered during the Stalin era. Some of the most brilliant Russian physicists, it was learned, were kept under surveillance, arrested or exiled during the years between the end of World War II and Stalin's death.

Prof. Victor F. Weisskopf, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who speaks Russian, said Soviet research was already benefiting from the return to universities and institutes of scientists who had been held in labor camps.

"The camps have been opened," he said. "Tens of thousands of ordinary citizens have already passed through special restitution