I N D E X

STATEMENTS OF:	Page
Mr. Howard Zahniser, Washington Representative of the Trustees for Conservation	40
Mr. J. W. Penfold, Conservation Director, the Izaak Walton League	42
Dr. Olaus J. Murie, President and Director of the Wilderness Society	43
Mr. David R. Brower, Executive Director of the Sierra Club	44
Mr. Richard W. Westwood, President of the American Nature Society	44
Mr. Michael Nadel, Of the New York State Conservation Council	45
Mr. Daniel A. Poole, Editor of "Outdoor News Bulletin."	47
Mr. Sigurd Olson, Ely, Minnesota	50
Mr. George B. Fell, Executive Director of Nature Conservancy	51
Mr. Fred A Packard, Executive Secretary of the National Parks Association	52
Dr. Paul Sheppard, Jr., Conservation Chairman of the National Council of State Garden Clubs, Inc.	53
Mrs. Carl Shoemaker, National Council of State Garden Clubs	54
Mr. John A. Dyer, Representing the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, the Mountaineers, and the Seattle Audobon Society	55

I N D E X
(Continued)

STATEMENTS OF:	page
Mr. William L. Berry, Chief, Division of Resources Planning Department of Water Resources, State of California	62
Honorable Henry Aldous Dixon, a Representative in Congress from the State of Utah	77
Honorable Don Magnuson, a Representative in Congress from the State of Washington	84
Honorable Barratt O'Hara, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois	85
Mr. Radford Hall, Executive Secretary American Cattlemen's Association	89(a)
Mr. Paul M. Dunn, Technical Director of Forestry for the St. Regis Paper Company	90
Mr. W. Howard Gray, Chairman, American Mining Congress	91
Mr. Joseph E. Choate, National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers	92

H. R. 361 - H. R. 500 - H. R. 540 - H. R. 906

H. R. 1960 - H. R. 2162 - H. R. 7880

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 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.

- - -

FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1957

House of Representatives,

Subcommittee on Public Lands
of the Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs,

Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, in Room 1324, New House Office Building, the Honorable Gracie Pfost (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mrs. Pfost. The subcommitee on Public Lands will now come to order for further consideration of H.R. 361 and other related bills.

The House is going to meet this morning at 11 o'clock, and of necessity we will have to divide the time equally between the proponents and the opponents. It is now 10.10. Therefore, that allows 25 minutes for the proponents to be

heard and 25 minutes for those persons here in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Aspinall. Let the record show that the gentlewoman from Idaho and the gentleman from Colorado tried to get permission to sit while the House is in session this afternoon. The Speaker did not desire to give uspermission because the rules of the House are contrary.

Mrs. Pfost. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. We did desire to sit this afternoon and give a greater length of time to those who wish to appear here, both for and against this bill, but in view of the fact that general debate was concluded yesterday on the bill that was before the House --

Mr. Saylor. I would like to get into the record I know that the chairlady went to see the Speaker in that regard and was refused. I think the people here, for or against the bill, should appreciate the fact that the chairlady did attempt to get time so that we could sit this afternoon.

Mr. Engle. May I suggest that in view of the fact that so many people came such distances to be here that some of us would be willing to sit a while tomorrow morning if necessary in order to give these people an opportunity to be heard. If it is possible to secure the attendance of one Republican and the chairlady, we can proceed, I think. I am simply suggesting that. I would be glad to spend some time here. It is unfortunate. We have lost two hours. We cannot help it. The situation on the floor is such that although occasionally we

can sit during general debate, it is prohibited under the conditions of the legislation on the floor now. I do feel for the people who have come here a long way and do not get a chance to state their case.

Mrs. Pfost. I would like to say to the gentleman I have already contacted some of the members of the committee to see if sufficient committee members can be present in the morning but timehas not permitted enough contacts to where I feel there would be a representative number. I think this is important legislation and I feel that at least three members on each side should sit and hear the proponents and the opponents of the bill. I thought at a later hour this morning when the other committee members appear we would see if we could get a representative number so that we might sit for two hours tomorrow morning.

Mr. Engle. I am now going to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to try to save some money. My leaving does not indicate any lack of interest in these proceedings.

Mr. Aspinall. Will the gentleman be here in the morning?

Mr. Engle. Indeed I will.

Mrs. Pfost. The first witness we have scheduled for this morning to give an over-all presentation of the bill is Dr. Olaus Murie, Director of the Wilderness Society. However, Mr. Zahniser tells me he would like to introduce at this time the various witnesses who have come from a distance to the committee members and have their statements made a part of

the record. Then at a later time, if there is time, we will hear from those witnesses. Do you wish to proceed in that order, Mr. Zahniser?

STATEMENT OF MR. HOWARD ZAHNISER, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TRUSTEES FOR CONSERVATION

Mr. Zahniser. I would be very glad to follow that suggestion.

Mrs. Pfost. I thought there was a request from the witnesses that that was a schedule that you people had determined. Is that true?

Mr. Zahniser. That has been agreed to by the ones who are here.

Mrs. Pfost. If you would like to introduce the people who are in the audience this morning very briefly and offer their statements for the record you may do so. I would suggest, however, those who wish to make brief oral statements should be given the time at the time of their inroduction. I will leave it to your discretion as to how you wish to introduce them.

Mr. Zahniser. I will just say at this time, Madam Chairman, that my name is Howard Zahniser. My address is 6222 43rd Avenue, Hyattsville, Maryland, and I am representing here this morning the trustees for conservation and other groups, as explained in a prepared statement which I will be glad to submit for appearance in the record as though read at this time, and say n othing further myself now.

Mrs. Pfost. Does anyone have any questions?

Mr. Zahniser. At the conclusion of the prepared remarks there are some requests for inclusion of material in the record which I earlier wrote. I know the committee may wish to postpone until after this presentation by others the decision with regard to that, and then for a similar presentation of other statements I would like to introduce those who are here and after that introduction and presentation of statements I would suggest that the chairlady call on those who have come from a distance to make such oral statements as the committee would have time to hear.

Mr. Aspinall. The statement of Mr. Zahniser has not been accepted for the record as yet.

Mr. Saylor. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Zahniser as presented be accepted and inserted ~~in the~~ record at this point as though read.

Mrs. Pfost. Is there any objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

amends
9A

OUR COOPERATIVE APPROACH TOWARD WILDERNESS LEGISLATION

A statement by Howard Zahniser, Washington Representative of Trustees for Conservation, before the Public Lands Subcommittee, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U. S. House of Representatives, in support of the Wilderness Bill, June 21, 1957.

MADAM CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: My name is Zahniser - Z as in Zebra - A - H - N - I - S - E - R -- first name Howard. I am the Washington Representative of Trustees for Conservation. My address is 6222 43rd Avenue, Hyattsville, Maryland. Trustees for Conservation is an organization of fifty-one individuals endeavoring to secure the support of the people and the government in preservation of national parks and monuments, wildlife, and wilderness areas. We are a task force applying ourselves especially to the need for seeing conservation represented in connection with legislation. Our president is Ansel Adams. Our vice presidents are Weldon F. Heald, Wallace Stegner, and Dr. Edgar Wayburn. The secretary is Stuart R. Dole, the treasurer Clifford V. Heimbucker, and our executive secretary William J. Losh. Headquarters of Trustees for Conservation are at 251 Kearney Street, San Francisco, 8, California.

Not only as Washington Representative of Trustees for Conservation, but in various other capacities, I have been deeply involved in efforts to develop sound and acceptable legislation to protect our remaining resources of wilderness. As vice chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, as formerly Washington Representative of the Council of Conservationists, as honorary vice president of the Sierra Club, most importantly, perhaps, as executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, as well as in some other relationships, I have been much concerned with the development of the Wilderness Bill which is here under consideration. However, my appearance today is in behalf of Trustees for Conservation.

SRP00587

I have, however, also been requested to express support for the Wilderness Bill in behalf of Friends of the Forest Preserve, an organization with headquarters at St. Davids Lane, Schenectady, New York for which I am National Representative. Mr. Paul Schaefer, of Schenectady, president of Friends of the Forest Preserve, has sent me the following telegram:

> PLEASE REPRESENT FRIENDS OF FOREST PRESERVE INC WITH MEMBERSHIP IN N Y STATE EMBRACING LEADERS OF MORE THAN 1,000 ORGANIZATIONS FAVORING SENATE 1176 HOUSE 500 WILDERNESS BILL AS OUR NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE WILL YOU PLEASE DO ALL YOU CAN TO IMPLEMENT SUCCESSFUL ACTION ON THIS MEASURE
>
> PAUL SCHAEFER
> ST DAVIDS LANE

Mr. D. K. Bradley, chairman of the American White Water Affiliation's conservation committee, has also asked me to speak in his behalf in support of the Wilderness Bill. I am glad to do so, but I note by way of a carbon copy that Mr. Bradley has addressed to you, Madam Chairman, a letter dated June 19, 1957, and so I believe it is enough for me merely to refer here to Mr. Bradley's request and to the support of the Wilderness Bill by the American White Water Affiliation.

We who are situated here at the capital are glad, of course, to serve thus in behalf of the various groups throughout the country who have no headquarters here. On this occasion it is for us another welcome demonstration of the wide interest and support engendered by the proposed Wilderness Bill.

Madam Chairman, our approach to this legislation has been as cooperative and constructive as we could make it. We have not been critical in an adverse or fault-finding way of any agency, group, or interest. We have not disparaged our predecessors, nor have we bewailed any of the forces that today make wilderness

preservation difficult. On the contrary, while realizing and emphasizing that the circumstances in which we live are such as to threaten any area of wilderness, we have been most appreciative of the fact that there is still remaining such a marvelous resource of wilderness. Our effort has been to make sure that we duly cherish and protect what we have, thankful to those who have so far protected these areas, and who have thus given us our opportunity.

In cooperating closely with the sponsors of the Wilderness Bill in both Senate and House, we have sought to develop a program that could be supported by those who are concerned with natural resources for commodity purposes. There is, for example, within our proposed system of wilderness areas no area that is now available for lumbering. Giving these areas firm legal sanction and protection should thus be a measure that can be supported by any lumber interest. That is one example.

We have sought to develop a program that could be supported by the administrators of the lands that are involved. We propose no change of jurisdiction. We propose no new land administration. We respect the uses for which these lands are now being administered. Continuing to administer them in such a way as to preserve their wilderness character should certainly prove to be a convenient undertaking for the administrators, who will indeed find their hands strengthened in carrying on the programs they have developed.

The sponsors of this legislation and we who have been cooperating with them, have sought to obtain the cooperation, criticisms, and suggestions of all who are involved and to modify, clarify, and correct the bill in accordance with the comments received. Successive drafts before even the bill was introduced incorporated the resulting changes. Copies of the bill were widely distributed last summer and fall, and the bills introduced in the 85th Congress have incorporated a great many results of the comments received.

Since the introduction of the bill, we have continued to note criticisms. Those making constructive suggestions have been embraced. Criticisms in opposition

have been pondered and followed by attempts to adapt the bill so as to meet the criticisms.

The comments received between the introduction of the House bills early in January and the introduction of S.1176 in the Senate on February 11, 1957, were incorporated in the Senate bill. Representative Charles O. Porter's H. R. 7880 introduced on June 3, 1957, is identical with this Senate bill and thus incorporates the various suggestions stimulated by the January introductions.

We are now ready to suggest additional changes that are a response to the comments received more recently. I should like to introduce into the record at this point a copy of H. R. 500 with the changes incorporated. They greatly reduce its length.

Here then is the bill as we should now like to recommend it.

------ INSERT NEW TEXT OF BILL ------

One criticism has been against inclusion of a long list of specific areas. We had wondered ourselves whether or not to name specific areas and had concluded to do so for two reasons: It would kindle the imagination of our supporters and show inspiringly the extent of our preservation opportunity; for those who might be suspicious of intentions stated in general terms, naming areas would show precisely what we meant. But, these purposes having been served, we are certainly now glad to substitute inclusive language and omit listings.

For example, with regard to national forests, in subsection (2) of Section 2 on Page 4 of H. R. 500 beginning at line 23 we might well say:

> (a) The System shall include the areas within the national forests classified on June 1, 1957, by the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or roadless.

This would make it possible to take out the rest of Page 4 and all of Pages 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 down to line 8, except that on Page 6 at line 7, we should say simply:

> Additional areas for inclusion in the System may be designated within national forests by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Another criticism has been that the Forest Service (and other agencies that administer lands in the System) would become responsible to the Council which this bill would establish. That, in part, we conclude has been based on a misunderstanding of the intention in providing that additions or changes in an area of wilderness should be reported to the secretary of the Council, and by him forwarded to Congress. This provision is in the sentence that starts with line 9 on Page 6, and also is in similar language in lines 20 to 22 on Page 9. It would be just as well to delete these provisions, and, as will be pointed out presently, provide for the direct submission of reports to Congress.

To make these alterations of subsection (a) complete, the word "primitive" should be inserted in line 9 on Page 9 after "wild".

As regards the National Park System areas, similar change can well be made. In subsection (b) of Section 2 on Page 10, the list of areas can be omitted and the first paragraph be changed to read as follows, beginning at line 2 on Page 10:

> (b) At the times and in the manner hereinafter provided for, the System shall include each park, monument, and seashore recreation area in the National Park System on June 1, 1957, embracing a continuous area of 5,000 acres or more without roads.

Then there is no need for a listing of specific areas in the National Park System.

To complete this alteration, the word "included" should be substituted for the words "named for inclusion" in line 22 on Page 11.

Clarifying the role intended for the National Wilderness Preservation Council has suggested other changes. H. R. 500 itself includes one addition for this purpose; namely, the explicit provision in lines 8, 9, and 10 on Page 19 that the Council "shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction." Further changes can well be made to avoid any misunderstanding which might give a supervisory interpretation to the Council's purpose.

In subsection (f) of Section 2, which begins at the bottom of Page 16, it can be made plain that the Council is not to come between the executive departments and the Congress in any supervisory way. We can do this by providing for the direct submission to Congress of the reports referred to, with a provision for submission of copies to the Council, for the System files.

This can be done by deleting from pages 16 and 17 the first six lines of subsection (f) and substituting the following:

> (f) Any proposed addition to, modification of, or elimination from the areas of the National Wilderness Preservation System established in accordance with subsections (a) and (e) of this section shall be reported to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or other official or officials having jurisdiction over the lands involved and shall take effect upon the expiration of the

The following sentence should then be inserted in line 10 on Page 17:

> A copy of each such report submitted to Congress shall at the same time be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council.

In accordance with these changes, the sentence beginning in line 23 on Page 22 should be deleted.

A further change to remove the impressions that this Council is intended to have super-bureau powers might be the elimination from lines 13 to 15 on Page 23 of the words "the President, the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, and other."

Finally, to remove any lingering suspicion that this Council might be intended to override the Federal land management agencies, we would suggest a change in the make-up of the Council.

As provided in H. R. 500 this Council comprised fifteen members, four of whom would be legislators, four of whom bureau heads, one the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and six citizens.

We should now like to suggest that the number of citizens be reduced to three, that there be no legislators in this Executive Department Council, that the Director of the Bureau of Land Management be added. Thus the Council would comprise five bureau heads, the Smithsonian Secretary, and three citizens. We are confident that it will thus serve well its true purposes and that the land-administering agencies will need fear no overriding. The first sentence of Section 4 (a), beginning in line 19 of Page 21 should then read as follows:

> Section 4 (a) - A National Wilderness Preservation Council is hereby created to consist ex officio of the persons at the time designated as the Chief of the United States Forest Service, the Director of the National Park Service, the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and also three citizen members known to be informed regarding, and interested in the preservation

of, wilderness, one of whom shall be named initially for a term of two years, one for a term of four years, and one for a term of six years, by the President.

As to the Council it is not the intention that it should be an agency that would threaten to control or override the land-administering bureaus. This should now be very certainly clear.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, have we who have been intimately associated with the development of this proposed legislation continued in our efforts to be cooperative and constructive and to take advantage of all criticisms and suggestions.

There is another suggestion that I should like to make along this line. It was made to us by Mr. Hugh Woodward of New Mexico, one of the leaders of the National Wildlife Federation and a southwestern conservationist long interested in wilderness. It would mean changing the period at the end of Page 18 to a comma and adding the following -

> and the areas within the System shall be so managed as to protect and preserve the soil and the vegetation thereon beneficial to wildlife.

Mr. Chairman, there are many things that I might say in pleading the needs for wilderness areas, and the needs for wilderness preservation legislation. There are many things I might say in interpretation of the Wilderness Bill, which we urge should be clarified, corrected as necessary, and enacted. But others, either in their remarks or in materials submitted for your examination, have explained the bill, its purposes, and the needs for it so fully that I hesitate to anticipate your further interest and instead might better at this time conclude my remarks in hopes that questions may reveal any further contribution I might make at this time.

I should like to have a few items included in the record at this point and, if desired, I should be glad to prepare an extension of my remarks to include detailed information about the proposed System and the areas within it.

1. On March 1, 1949, I prepared a memorandum for the Legislative Reference Service in response to a questionnaire on wilderness preservation, answering ten questions. This memorandum, I believe, would be of value to all who will be consulting the record of this hearing, and I should like to include it here. It is entitled "A Statement on Wilderness Preservation in Reply to a Questionnaire".

2. On May 24, 1955, before a meeting of the National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces, I spoke on "The Need for Wilderness Areas". In a somewhat edited form this paper appears in the Winter-Spring 1956-57 issue of The Living Wilderness, and I should like to suggest that in that form it be included here.

3. & 4. On February 1, 1956, in connection with the resolution of the controversy over the proposed Echo Park dam and in response to a letter from Representatives Wayne H. Aspinall and William A. Dawson, I wrote a letter stating the purposes and cooperative attitude of The Wilderness Society, which I should like to have appear at this point, along with the editorial on this same matter which I wrote for the Winter-Spring 1955-56 issue of The Living Wilderness.

5. & 6. Finally, Madam Chairman, I have in two papers discussed the Wilderness Bill in greater detail than the present occasion warrants, and I should like to have these extensions, as it were, of my present remarks entered in the record at this point. The first of these, entitled "The Wilderness Bill and Foresters", I presented at a meeting of the Society of American Foresters on March 14, 1957, as vice chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources. The other is an article which I prepared as executive secretary of The Wilderness Society for the April-June, 1957, issue of National Parks Magazine entitled "The Wilderness Bill and National Parks".

~~7. Madam Chairman, this occasion today is in a sense a culmination to date of events that began on June 4, 1948, when the Honorable Raymond H. Burke of Ohio, then chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Conservation of Wildlife~~

9A follows

7. At the request of Representative John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania I commented, in a letter to Mr. Saylor dated January 30, 1957, on questions that Mrs. Martha Ann Platt of Portland, Oregon, had raised about the Wilderness Bill. I should like to have this letter appear in the record at this point as a final supplement to my own testimony.

8. Madam Chairman, this occasion today is in a sense a culmination to date of events that began on June 4, 1948, when the Honorable Raymond H. Burke of Ohio, then chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, to undertake a study that was issued as a committee print on September 8, 1949, with the title "The Preservation of Wilderness Areas (An Analysis of Opinion on the Problem, by C. Frank Keyser, Regional Economist, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.)" Only a few copies of this report were printed, and few are now available. Because of the basic importance of this study and the value of the factual information which it includes I should like to suggest that the Committee may wish to incorporate it in the record of these hearings at an appropriate place, and I am glad to append for this purpose one of the very few now available. I am not requesting that it appear at this point, and I know that you may wish to consider very carefully its inclusion in the record because of its length. I wish only to suggest your consideration of this and comment that it does include factual information that is not otherwise available in one place and was collected by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in the course of an extended study.

SRP00596

~~Resources, requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, to undertake a study that was issued as a committee print on September 8, 1949, with the title "The Preservation of Wilderness Areas (An Analysis of Opinion on the Problem, by C. Frank Keyser, Regional Economist, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.)" Only a few copies of this report were printed, and none are now available. Because of the basic importance of this study and the value of the factual information which it includes I should like to suggest that it be incorporated at this point in the record of these hearings, and I am glad to append for this purpose one of the very few now available.~~

Madam Chairman, the American people of today and their posterity will long be appreciative of the interest that you and the other members of this committee and your colleagues in this 85th Congress are taking in the heritage of wilderness which is still ours to cherish and preserve. To participate in this effort to secure a living wilderness for America present and future I count the greatest privilege that has come to me as a worker in the field of conservation, and I do indeed appreciate your allowing me to share in these historic hearings. Thank you very much.

(All)

Mr. Zahniser. I would like not to introduce Mr. J. W. Penfold, Conservation Director, the Izaak Walton League of America.

STATEMENT OF MR. J. W. PENFOLD, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR, THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. Penfold. I have a statement that I would like to submit for the record as though read.

Mr. Saylor. I ask that the statement of Mr. Penfold be inserted in the record at this point as though read.

Mrs. Pfost. You have heard the unanimous consent request. Is there any objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

31 N. State St.,
Chicago 2, Illinois

COMMENTS OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA WITH RESPECT TO WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

The Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., has had a deep, sincere and continuing interest in the wilderness resources of the Nation since its organization over 35 years ago. It can be said that threats to the roadless lake country of northern Minnesota, the Quetico-Superior, furnished considerable motivation for the founding of the League. Certainly the threat of senseless roads, destructive power dams, ill-advised logging proposals and, most recently, encroachment by aircraft have kept succeeding generations of Waltonians busy in striving to preserve that last great wilderness canoe country.

I am sure the Committee is familiar with the land purchase program through which the League has assisted in the elimination of within holdings which have constituted one of the most serious threats to the primitive character of the area.

The League has involved itself in most every threat to wilderness preservation - and they have been endless in number and variety, and in every part of the country. For this we make no apology, as we firmly believe that wilderness is an essential, logical and desirable aspect of the Nation's over all land, water and resource use pattern.

We have, over the years, worked closely and cooperatively with the several Federal land management agencies which have wilderness preservation as operating policy and program. (State agencies, as well) We have not always seen eye to eye with them on specific problems, nor they with us. Yet, our differences, for the most part, have been minor in relation to the broad picture and illustrate, more than anything else, how little any of us know about protecting intangible values in the face of prodigiously

expanding population, industry, mechanization and all the other material facets of our social and economic complex.

It is important to recognize at the start that wilderness is not something separate and apart from the rest of our world. I've suggested before that "wilderness begins at home". By this I mean, among other things, that in both the materialistic and resource-using sense and in the human experience sense, wilderness values may be preserved only as we preserve other values to the utmost.

For example, it seems obvious that the better job we do in managing timber resources located elsewhere, the less will be our material need for timber within wilderness. The better job we do with respect to water development outside wilderness, the less need to exploit dam sites within wilderness. The better conservation job we do with minerals available outside, the less need to exploit those within.

We all look forward to the day when all renewable resources will be managed on the optimum sustained yield principle, and when all non-renewable resources are husbanded realistically. We shall eventually be forced to do so to meet the demands of a vastly increased population and to continue as a strong people able successfully to maintain a free world

In the process, we shall see great changes in the face of the landscape. The changes due to intensified agriculture are becoming more and more apparent. Water development in the West is well on the way to doing so, while increased demands for water supply in the more humid regions foretells the same. Intensified management of forest lands for timber and pulp will be universal before long.

I predict that within a half century most of what we now call "wild land" will be managed in a manner that more nearly resembles an agricultural operation We shall grow more timber and pulp, utilizing close to 100% of material harvested; more grass and forage; in all liklihood, more wildlife

Multiple use, which today in too many instances is merely superimposing several uses one upon the other and then trying to resolve the inevitable conflicts, will come of age. All uses will be coordinated and where one use must be dominant because of its paramount value in that place, other uses will be permitted and coordinated in terms of the paramount use. Thus the moral objective of "the greatest good to the greatest number in the long run" will be measured Nation-wide, rather than locally as if each locality were independent of the rest of the country.

It is very probable that lands and waters so managed will produce far more recreation for the public in the aggregate. It is just as probable that the scope of recreation opportunity will contract and thereby tend toward uniformity and loss of quality in human experience. For example, the opportunity to picnic in a city park is of inestimable value and one which should be expanded throughout the country. Yet, picnicking in one city park is little different from picnicking in another. It seems to me that the ultimate value in any outdoor recreation activity is gained from the possession of the whole range of outdoor recreation opportunity, experienced before or anticipated. The fishing trip conversation around the campfire seems about equally divided between reminiscences of experiences that were poor and those that were good, highlighted by hopes of someday getting to the lakes and streams lying beyond the next range.

Lands and waters so managed will produce more recreation, but will not provide the opportunity for wilderness adventure, because the lands will no longer be wild. Wild lands will remain to us and to future generations only as we specifically provide for them in selected areas where wilderness opportunity is the dominant use

While pondering these things one night, during a cross country flight, I picked up a science fiction paper-back, and wiled away an hour or two It contained some colorful language which illustrates the point:

"Old earth was in better shape than ever before. Her cities were bright with plastic and stainless steel. Her remaining forests were carefully tended bits of greenery where one might picnic in perfect safety, since all beasts and insects had been removed to sanitary zoos, which reproduced their living conditions with admirable skill. Even the climate of Earth had been mastered. Farmers received their quota of rain between three and three-thirty in the morning. People gathered at stadiums to watch a program of sunsets, and a tornado was produced once a year in a special arena as part of the World Peace Day Celebration."

Silly? Sure! Fanciful? Perhaps, because when we consider scientific advances made during the past few decades, I, for one, find it difficult to discount even more fantastic possibilities. The plot of the science fiction yarn concerned the leading character's frustration in satisfying his simple and fundamental urges which science and technology had singularly failed to provide in the antiseptic world it had produced. We shall need to preserve opportunity as well as to provide it, if future generations are to have their heritage based on incentive, initiative and the opportunity for individual growth in respect to outdoor recreation as to every other aspect of our civilization.

If wilderness begins at home, then it constitutes a variety of conditions - from the natural area in which there is no human use or modification for any purpose, except the scientist in the interest of knowledge, to the heavy use areas where the public concentrates. There is today a considerable number of "degrees" of wilderness, springing from patterns of relatively uncontrolled human use, recreation as well as other. We need to know more about these factors as we plot our course for the future. We have learned from city and metropolitan zoning, based on all needs and ambitions, that it can produce greater and more enduring values for everyone, even though each may lose a little momentarily. The principle

holds equally for long range planning on what we now call our wild lands.

The Izaak Walton League sees in the legislation before you two principle objectives. The first: to obtain from Congress itself recognition that wilderness preservation is a sound, sensible and logical aspect of the over all land, water and resource management pattern. We endorse that objective. The second: to seek through Congress itself some means whereby the limited remaining areas of wilderness may better withstand the pressures which would destroy them, pending development of policies, patterns and programs which will preserve wilderness in all its phases as sound operating principle. We endorse this objective.

We commend the sponsors of the legislation who through a specific proposal have brought the problems involved out where they may be fully and carefully examined and studied by all citizens. We hope that the Committees will be able to continue these hearings in the field, close to where wilderness exists, so as to extend to more citizens and interests the opportunity to look at it closely and express their viewpoints.

We commend the Committee for its interest and its dedication to finding proper solutions And we commend the legion of people both within and outside of government whose efforts have retained for all of us some of America's unspoiled beauty. May we be successful in retaining that heritage for the future.

Presented by J.W.Penfold, Conservation Director, Izaak Walton League of America

Mr. Zahniser. I would now like to present Dr. Olaus J. Murie, Director of the Wilderness Society.

STATEMENT OF DR. OLAUS J. MURIE, PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

Dr. Murie. I have a statement and some conclusions. I would like to make a few remarks if I may.

Mrs. Pfost. We will call on you at the end of the presentation of the proponents who are here this morning. If there is time left we will call on you for your personal remarks.

Mr. Saylor. I ask that the statement or Mr. Murie be inserted in the record at this point as though read.

Mrs. Pfost. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

THE WILDERNESS BILL

A statement by Olaus J. Murie, President and Director of The Wilderness Society, a national, non-profit conservation organization with headquarters at 2144 P Street, N. W., Washington 7, D. C., on a bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System.

Prepared for presentation to the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, at hearings on June 20 and 21, 1957.

My name is Olaus J. Murie, and I have come here from my headquarters in Moose, Wyoming, to represent The Wilderness Society, of which I am the Director. Gentlemen, in the Wilderness Bill now before you, we are dealing with an historical American trend that has caught the imagination of the world. I should like to discuss this trend, since it has a direct bearing on this proposed legislation. I have had occasion to visit various Congressmen and Senators in their offices and have been impressed with the great burden of work each must carry. Numerous matters need your attention to meet a need of the moment, some obvious current problem. But at times there comes before you something which has a long-time important significance in our way of life. I feel that this wilderness preservation bill is one of these.

The value of the out-of-doors to human beings was spoken of almost as long ago as we have written records, for example, in the Book of Isaiah. Our people came to this continent in the early Pilgrim days when it was only sparsely inhabited by its first immigrants, the Indians. There followed the pioneer era, when people had a taste of what life could be when they could travel in big country and enjoy the freedom which comes to those who have the opportunity to be individuals.

I want to stress that these were Europeans, who came from long-filled lands, where such a degree of individual freedom was impossible. They came to a new continent at a period in human history when appreciation of such an environment was possible to them. As we pushed our settlement from one coast to another, a great number of active, virile Americans did not want to see this nation entirely lose this invigorating frontier atmosphere. Our early American literature was enhanced by such writings as those of Emerson, Thoreau, John Muir and many others. Imbued with the pioneer spirit, many began to urge that we so plan for the use of our land that future citizens might have some bit of experience of the kind enjoyed in such full measure by our earlier forebears. You all know that our first national park, the

Yellowstone, was established in 1872. This was done largely in response to an unselfish decision of a group of humble men who camped there, whose action is a bit of American history we are proud of. But it was not until 1916 that our Congress took the necessary step to create a National Park Service. Perhaps it was not so necessary up to that time.

The same far-seeing American imagination began to look into the question of saving the big trees of California. We should grant the highest honor to those public-spirited owners of forest tracts who donated large areas of redwood forests for this noble purpose, for all the people.

I also want to mention a state across the continent, New York, which had the foresight to put into its constitution early in its history, a provision for maintaining the Adirondacks "forever wild."

In the meantime other nations began following America's example. Japan now has about four percent of its land in national parks. New Zealand has six percent of its land in national parks. Russia has national parks. There are large ones in Africa, and other nations are trying to find some areas suitable for that purpose. As in our country, the national parks in New Zealand had no controlling administrative body until recently, when a National Parks Authority was created, similar to our National Park Service.

In more recent years a new development took place. People began to want certain parts of our national forests dedicated as pure wilderness, a direct attempt to provide for all people of the future an opportunity to see and to have experience in, those bits of America as Nature had created it.

As this desire for the wholesome outdoors grew, we found that to preserve our wildlife it was necessary to dedicate refuges for those fellow creatures, places in which they can live. Now, when our commercial pressures have become more intense, we have had to plan more carefully, and we find that a number of those refuges, under the administration of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, can serve a double

purpose by having some portions of them devoted to wilderness preservation as well. There are also some wilderness areas which in the past have been so designated, on Indian Reservations.

On April 18, 1957, Hon. Wayne Morse of Oregon had read, in the Senate, a speech by Hon. John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania, in which Mr. Saylor said: "We owe the leaders of the National Park Service a great debt for the way in which they have fostered the wilderness idea, but we must recognize that the wilderness concept is compatible with, not identical to, the national park idea - an enrichment certainly of the national park purpose but not the genesis."

As Mr. Saylor also pointed out, the national forests also have some areas of wilderness, and thus the forests as a whole serve many purposes.

Similarly, the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge also affords a unique type of wilderness; the Charles Sheldon Antelope Range in Nevada has some beautiful canyon and sage wilderness sections, with their bird and mammal inhabitants, offering a rich experience to people; and some of the Aleutian Islands afford outstanding refuges for seabird rookeries, and at the same time furnish a possible wild country experience in a unique northern ocean setting.

Thus, over the years, the people throughout the world have come to cherish those areas of wilderness which we still have left. And throughout this development, America has provided leadership. This is a leadership of truly humanitarian proportions. And I would stress that this is the highest form of leadership - not by propaganda, but by example. We have undertaken to provide for our own people the opportunity to experience a way of life that is invigorating, and certainly will tend to maintain a strong culture in our land. Other countries have been applying the same idea in their lands. And we have been told, in books by writers of other lands, in effect: "You in America have something precious! Hang on to it!"

We now have numerous organizations in America devoted to the cause of wilderness preservation. And we have the "International Union for the Conservation of Nature." Truly this is an important unselfish effort on the part of mankind to keep certain parts of the earth for our re-creation, in the true sense of that term.

But we are having difficulties. The wilderness quality may be found in various situations, and under different administrative controls. This diversity of administration, for diverse purposes, is all to the good. But there is a great complexity of interests and our administrators are under heavy pressures. What wilderness we have on public lands, for use by all people, is being maintained by administrative decisions. As one forester put it: "A forester is kept upright by pressures on all sides."

The many thousands of Americans who have sincerely nurtured the wilderness concept through the years, who have been loyally defending certain areas under the administration of federal agencies, were greatly heartened by the fact that so many Congressmen, in both Houses, and in both parties, so enthusiastically sponsored the bills now before the Congress.

We feel, gentlemen, that this American wilderness tradition, developed through a period of about a century, now deserves the backing of our Congress, so as to give this wholesome idea a national standing, a national policy. As a former president of The Wilderness Society expressed it; we need "...to put wilderness legally on the map of the United States." I believe everyone agrees that the specific areas should remain in the jurisdiction they now have. But these bills would strengthen the agencies and strengthen the efforts of all who are now devoting their energies to cooperate with those agencies. Just as Congress took action in 1916 to establish the National Park Service, so as to give a firm foundation to the emerging National Park concept, so now I honestly believe it is time for Congress

SRP00609

to give similar attention to the broad principle of retaining wilderness areas for public use. The bills now before you serve that purpose.

This past winter I met with many groups in the western states, on their invitation, to discuss the wilderness program. These included dude ranchers, scientific organizations, foresters, educators, Audubon Societies, among others. They are all in accord with this proposed legislation. I have just now returned from an inspiring trip in many parts of Alaska, on the invitation of sportsmen's groups and women's clubs, to discuss what we should do about designating as wildlife range under wilderness conditions certain portions of northeast Alaska. What I found in the thinking of Alaskans, men and women, from one end of the country to the other, was indeed heartening. Everywhere today, throughout our continent, there is a wholesome interest, a growing one, in what we know as wilderness. There is widespread gratitude to those of you who have observed this trend and sponsored the present bills.

In the history of our country certain events stand out as landmarks which we revere as marking progress in our American civilization. A few years ago Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill expressed his poetic concept in "The Song of the Capitol Dome" in which are these lines:

> "I have not yet found the cadence
> Of the song of the Capitol's Dome
> It is a long slow measure;
> The swing of the decades is in it
> And its best is the timing of generations."

Last year Senator John F. Kennedy published a book, "Profiles in Courage" in which he relates the convictions and actions of certain members of our Congress through the years, men who had sincere convictions on matters that were important in the development of our culture. I feel, as many do, that this wilderness preservation legislation, is another landmark, perhaps a more subtle one, which has a profound importance in shaping the course of our development as an American society.

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

SRP00610

At the annual meeting of the Council of The Wilderness Society last September in northern Minnesota, the following resolution was adopted:

"We of The Wilderness Society, organized in 1935 to promote the concept that wilderness environment provides for people esthetic experience, wholesome serenity, and scientific and recreational opportunities of a high type, have seen the public need and general approval of these principles growing over the years. The membership of our society has grown, and we have seen many other organizations adopting as an important part of their concern the national need for wilderness. So widespread has this public desire to defend our national parks and other wilderness areas become that in recent years there has been much public support of wilderness at various hearings that have been held on proposals to invade with inappropriate commercial developments certain national parks and other scenic country, and such proposals have been widely opposed. So great has become the public concern with this wilderness program that a number of Representatives and Senators have become much interested, and bills have been introduced in both houses of Congress to give congressional approval and protection for our national wilderness system, in order to provide greater stability for this natural resource.

We feel that these bills, supported as they are by forward-looking people in our Congress, are in line with the work of The Wilderness Society. A reading of the bills as now drawn up reveals that they are concerned with the permanence of the esthetic, recreational, scientific, and educational values in our American out-of-doors, objectives which are being promoted by our quarterly magazine and by our staff and members.

"Therefore, we are convinced that in the course of our work in promoting appreciation and increased knowledge, of our wilderness heritage, we the members of the Council of The Wilderness Society, endorse these bills that have been drawn up and urge our members and our staff to support this proposed legislation as being in the highest public interest. We urge that both sides of any differences of opinion be examined fairly, but we feel that as a society we have high ideals for which we are striving and that we are obligated to work for these. We feel that these high ideals, for which we have stood as a Society for more than twenty years, make it mandatory that we give our unqualified support to these forward-looking measures."

On behalf of the numerous members of The Wilderness Society, and the many other people who believe as they do, I earnestly urge that you give favorable consideration to the wilderness preservation legislation now before you for consideration.

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

SRP00611

May I add that I was privileged, on April 14, 15, and 16, 1953, to deliver a series of lectures in the eighth annual series of Isaac Hillman Lectureships in the Social Sciences at Pacific University in Forest Grove, Oregon. These lectures, entitled respectively "God Bless America--And Let's Save Some of It!", "Wild Country Round the World," and "Beauty and the Dollar Sign," were reprinted as a special issue of THE LIVING WILDERNESS, Summer 1953, published by The Wilderness Society, under the general title of "Wild Country As A National Asset." I hold a copy of this special number in my hand, and ask permission to have it included in the record as a part of my statement.

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Mr. Zahniser. I would now like to present Mr. Brower, Executive Director, Sierra Club.

STATEMENT OF MR. DAVID R. BROWER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE SIERRA CLUB

Mr. Brower. I have a statement that I would like to submit for the record as though read.

Mr. Saylor. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Brower be inserted in the record at this point as though read.

Mrs. Pfost. Is there any objection?

Mr. Aspinall. Reserving the right to object, I make a reservation that I be permitted to look at the statement.

Mr. Brower. If it is in order at this point within the statement there are separate requests for inclusion in the record subject to the committee's consent, all of which appears there.

Mr. Metcalf. Perhaps we can proceed with some other statements while the committee has an opportunity to examine this one.

Mrs. Pfost. That is a good suggestion. You may proceed, Mr. Zahniser.

Mr. Zahniser. I would like to present Mr. Richard W. Westwood of the American Nature Association.

STATEMENT OF MR. RICHARD W. WESTWOOD, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN NATURE ASSOCIATION

Mr. Westwood. I have no statement. It would be merely repetitive of all the statements my colleagues are making.

SRP00613

I would like to record myself in favor of this bill.

Mr. Zahniser. I would now like to introduce Mr. Michael Nadel.

STATEMENT OF MR. MICHAEL NADEL, OF THE NEW YORK STATE CONSERVATION COUNCIL

Mr. Nadel. I have a statement on behalf of the New York State Conservation Council that I would like to submit for the record, together with an exhibit, and I have also a statement in behalf of the Appalachian Mountains Club, together with an exhibit, that I would like to submit for the record, with your permission.

Mrs. Pfost. Without objection, the statement of Mr. Michael Nadel will be made a part of the record as though read.

(Thestatement referred to is as follows:)

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

A statement by Michael Nadel, in behalf of the New York State Conservation Council, on a bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System. For presentation to the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, at hearings on June 20 and 21, 1957.

I am Michael Nadel. I have been requested by the New York State Conservation Council through the Council's State Representative, Mr. Herman Forster of New York City, to present a statement in behalf of that organization endorsing the legislation for a National Wilderness Preservation System.

The New York State Conservation Council is a statewide organization of sportsmen's groups which are affiliated with it on the basis of representation by counties. These affiliations represent in all, I believe, a membership of nearly a million sportsmen.

I am particularly pleased that it has fallen to me, through the circumstance that neither the president of the Council, Mr. Robert Thompson of Waverly, nor Mr. Forster, the State Representative, can be here because of other commitments, to make this presentation.

For several years I served as a vice president of the New York Conservation Council, and as editor of its quarterly Bulletin, before coming to Washington to join the staff of The Wilderness Society as assistant executive secretary. In other respects also I have been closely associated with the sportsmen of New York State, as a member for four annual terms of the State Conservation Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Fish and Game, as a vice president of the regional Sportsmen's Council of the Marine District of New York State, as a trustee of the Friends of the Forest Preserve, and in other associations in various capacities as an officer, conservation chairman, or editor.

SRP00615

Much of the force of the movement for the preservation of wilderness came from this state. In 1885, six years before the federal law creating the national forests, the state legislature authorized the creation of a state forest preserve, to put a check upon ruinous exploitation of the state's forest lands. Commercial-minded interests found loopholes through which to chisel at the forests, until public indignation, at the constitutional convention of 1894, forced an amendment to the state constitution, approved by the voters, granting protection to the Forest Preserve. The memorable words of the protective clause read:

> "The lands of the State, now owned or hereafter acquired, constituting the forest preserve as fixed by law shall be forever kept as wild forest lands. They shall not be leased, sold, or exchanged, or be taken by any corporation, public or private, nor shall the timber thereupon be sold or removed."

Later the words "or destroyed" were added, to prevent flooding of the preserve.

Special interests sought increasingly to corrupt this constitutional protection through crippling amendments, which the people time and again rejected. These efforts caused the great constitutional lawyer, Louis Marshall, the centenary of whose birth was honored in 1956, to address the chairman of the state constitutional convention of 1915 with these remarks:

> "If I were asked," said Louis Marshall, "to state what the most important action of the convention of 1894 was, I should say without the slightest hesitation that it was the adoption of section 7 of article VII (now section 1 of article XIV) of the Constitution which preserved in their wild state the Adirondack and Catskill forests."

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

SRP00616

As recently as November 1955, after a series of protracted battles between the conservationists and those who sought without letup to breach the constitutional barrier, the people at the polls voted 1,500,000 to 600,000 -- almost three to one -- against an amendment to build Panther Dam, which would have invaded the Forest Preserve.

Those who wish to change the "forever wild" provision have an opportunity under the constitution to make their play. But the people also have their choice. They know what they have in their Forest Preserve wilderness, and they accept the responsibility of keeping it. Thus it is when the people really have their choice, and can support their land administrators against pressures which can prove intolerable.

The protected wilderness in the Adirondack Forest Preserve consists of over 2,200,000 acres within the Adirondack Park, which itself contains over a half million acres. Since this is a state forest preserve, it does not come within the scope of the National Wilderness Preservation System bill, which pertains only to federally managed lands.

The New York Forest Preserve is mentioned here as an example in wilderness preservation through constitutional protection. But the Forest Preserve has also another importance to the historian of wilderness. It was in the Adirondacks that Bob Marshall, son of Louis Marshall, whom I quoted earlier, developed his rich appreciation of the "freedom of the wilderness," and accumulated that qualitative experience which made him in time one of the eminent exponents of wilderness preservation. With his brother George, he climbed the 46 peaks in the Adirondacks 4,000 feet or more in elevation. Twenty-one of these 46 peaks are still without trails.

Involved as it has been in the forefront of numerous battles to safeguard the constitutional protection of its state Forest Preserve against the pressures of powerful commercial interests, or the panic of changing administrators, the

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

SRP00617

New York State Conservation Council has a sense of what is at stake in the National Wilderness Preservation System bill. As a conservation organization it is conscious of a heritage which it shares with all American citizens in the federally owned lands which would be embraced by this System. Consequently, the Council embraces this legislation, and urges your Committee to give it favorable consideration.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit for the record as part of my statement, pages 51 to 60 of the Winter-Spring 1956-57 number of THE LIVING WILDERNESS, containing an article I wrote entitled "They Say." This is an account, with exhibits, of the response from individuals, organizations, and newspapers from all parts of the country to this legislation. The following editorials are reproduced within the pages of this article:

Page 51, editorial, "The Wilderness Bill," Christian Science Monitor, July 3, 1956.

Page 52, editorial, "The Wilderness and the Future," San Francisco Chronicle, April 14, 1957.

Page 53, editorial, "Value of Wilderness Areas," Sunday Journal, Portland Oregon, April 15, 1956.

Page 53, editorial, "Man Needs Nature," New York Times, April 29, 1956.

Page 54, column, "Conservation: by John B. Oakes," New York Times, May 13, 1956, February 3, 1957, and March 3, 1957.

Page 55, column, "Conservation: Program to Save the Wilds," by John B. Oakes, New York Times, May 5, 1957.

Page 56, column, "Woods and Waters," by Jack Van Coevering, Detroit Free Press, April 1, 1956.

Page 57, editorial, "The New Wilderness Preservation Bill," Eugene (Oregon) Register-Guard, June 18, 1956.

Page 58, editorial, The Desert Magazine, March 1957.

Page 59, "Bill to Form Wilderness Preserve Appears Again," by James McClatchy, The Sacramento Bee, February 18, 1957.

Page 59, "Water Developers Fight Wilderness Area Proposal," by James McClatchy, The Sacramento Bee, February 19, 1957.

Page 60, "The Conservation of Man and Nature," by Paul Shepard, Jr., Conservation Chairman, The National Gardener, Jan.-Feb. 1957.

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Mr. Thompson. I reserve the right to object -- and I am not going to object -- in deference to the people who have come from long distances. I think it is unfortunate that these rather voluminous statements must come to us in this fashion without an opportunity to inquire of these witnesses as to the people they represent and the activities they are particularly interested in in an effort to work out what might be a reasonable solution here. I am not going to object to these requests. We do have a number of various interests involved here, particularly those who repres nt western areas. I am sure these people also represent the many other problems that we have in our area.

The reason that I voice this reservation now is because now we have here people from the Appalachian Society, and so forth. Maybe we ought to get some wilderness area in the Appalachians. We have a lot of wilderness areas in Wyoming that are not being used. We also have difficult problems as far as municipal water supply and things like that are concerned that we must further consider.

I am sure the witnesses appreciate the complexity of our problem in the West.

Mrs. Pfost. Just before the gentleman came in we attempted to determine whether we would be able to sit tomorrow morning for two hours and hear these out-of-state witnesses and at a later time, when more committee members are present, we are going to take stock and see if we can have a

SRP00619

sufficient number here for two hours tomorrow. At that time we will divide the time between the opponents and the proponents. So we are hopeful that we will be able to hear these witnesses, particularly those who have come from great distances. Those in Washington, D. C. may be scheduled at a later date.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you. I certainly want to make it clear that I am not criticising the handling of this committee hearing because the chair is in a difficult position, and by permitting the filing of statements I commend the chair.

Mrs. Pfost. I thank the gentleman.

Without objection, the further statemen and the appendage, the Appalachia, handed in by Mr. Michael Nadel, will be made a part of the file.

Mr. Zahniser. Any of these witnesses will be glad to be interrogated and make themselves available for oral or any other testimony.

I would now like to presnt Mr. Daniel Poole of the Wildlife Management Institute.

STATEMENT OF MR. DANIEL A. POOLE, EDITOR OF "OUTDOOR NEWS BULLETIN"

Mr. Poole. I would like to submit the statement we have prepared in support of the objectives of this bill and ask also in addition to the statement this comment on the wilderness bill by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Presidentof the Wildlife Management Institute, accompany it in the hearing at this

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

point.

Mrs. Pfost. Without objection, the statement of Mr. Daniel A. Poole, will be made a part of the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE
Dedicated to Wildlife Restoration
WIRE BUILDING, WASHINGTON 5, D. C.

Statement of Daniel A. Poole
before the
Subcommittee on Public Lands
of the
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
on H.R. 1960 and similar bills
June 21, 1957

Mr. Chairman:

I am Daniel A. Poole, editor of the "Outdoor News Bulletin," a news service issued by the Wildlife Management Institute. The Institute is a national membership organization and its program is dedicated to the improved management of natural resources in the public interest.

The Institute supports the objectives of H.R. 1960 and all the similar so-called "wilderness bills." We believe that the preservation and maintenance under natural conditions of wilderness tracts is most desirable. It is important, we believe, because of the primary relationship existing between wilderness and the comfort and security now being enjoyed by the peoples of our nation. From the natural resources wealth of early America, we have evolved a standard and a way of life unequalled in the history of man. What better monument could there be to show appreciation for the bountiful resources that have and continue to energize this nation than the preservation of selected samples of wilderness America? Surely, a nation as large, as wealthy, and as proud as the United States can afford to set aside scattered tracts in order that present and future citizens can see for themselves what primitive America was--and is--like.

We believe wilderness areas are desirable for still another reason. As a response to the way of life that has evolved from our great natural resources base, we have become a nation of recreation-minded persons. The figures rise each year. More and more persons seek the solace that comes from wilderness experience. They desire to get away from the blatant and the commonplace of daily existence and undergo the revitalization that comes from the out of doors.

Legislation of the type now under consideration would be of assistance to the administrators of the Federal land management agencies in preserving the areas of wilderness that have been established in the past. Any agency head who can effect change by the relatively simple expedient of administrative decision is subject to varied and subtle pressures. Regardless of how well intentioned an administrator might be, there always is the danger in the absence of a law requiring public hearings and a period of review, that there might not be brought to his attention all the facts on which to base a decision. There also is protection in a law for administrators in that it provides a shield against political pressures that otherwise might be brought to bear whenever the authority and responsibility for making a decision rests with the executive agencies.

All of the 79 areas that have been designated for protection as wilderness within the national forests were set up by administrative designation. Under present practice, a Secretary of Agriculture can abolish or seriously reduce any one or all of these wilderness areas. Only through statutory recognition of the nation's wilderness will the public be assured that adequate consideration would be made for any modification, deletion, or addition to wilderness areas.

The Institute is pleased that the proposals under consideration stress the coordinating, educational, and informational aspects of the job that is required to further public understanding of wilderness. It also is reassuring that these proposals contemplate the establishment of a National Wilderness Council among whose membership are the directors of pertinent land management agencies. This provision will bring about greater understanding of wilderness objectives among these administrators, while at the same time giving sustenance to the concept of wilderness preservation from the experience and knowledge of these men.

There is no doubt that the American people are deeply interested in wilderness. It is fully expected that as the system is defined, and as the information about specific areas is brought to the attention of the public, there will be stimulated an even greater and far reaching interest in wilderness preservation and enjoyment.

Mr Aspinall. I made a reservation some time ago. With regard to the statement by Mr. David Brower, I would suggest that that part of the statement down to the middle of page 19, "Summary of Proceedings," be made a part of the record, and that the rest of the prepared statement be made a part of the file until further determination by the committee.

Mr. Saylor. I think that is perfectly all right. I have discussed the matter with Mr. Metcalf, and the only thing that I would ask is that when the final report is made up that it will be noted that in the file there is a summary of the proceedings that occurred when this bill was drafted.

Mr. Aspinall. With that understanding, I will withdraw my reservation.

Mrs. Pfost. Is there any objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

SRP00624

THE NEED FOR THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Statement by David R. Brower,
Executive Director, Sierra Club,
for presentation to the

Public Lands Subcommittee of the
Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs, U. S. House of Representatives, at hearings held in Washington, D. C., June 20 and 21, 1957.

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

My name is David R. Brower, Executive Director of the Sierra Club, with offices in San Francisco. I am appearing in behalf of the Sierra Club and its more than 11,000 members living in all parts of the country, as well as in behalf of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs--some thirty of them in California, Oregon, Washington, and Utah. I also bring to you the recommendations and summary of proceedings of the Fifth Biennial Wilderness Conference as they pertain to the proposed legislation. All these are concerned with the enjoyment and preservation of our major scenic and wildlife resources.

I have been traveling quite a little lately, and there isn't much of our country left that I haven't looked upon from two or three miles up. When you're traveling on the ground on some of the Western highways you get the impression that there is endless open space. A generation ago you might have felt the same impression from air travel. But that isn't true any more. With axe, plow, bulldozer, and derrick, we have changed the face of our land. Almost all of it, but not quite.

I believe, and I feel that you agree, that we must not change it all. That we must save for our children, hoping that they will save for theirs, as generous a sample as we can of how America used to look everywhere, and how it felt to pioneer, to be out on the land on your own good feet.

Places where we can see these things and feel these things won't save themselves. We're too ingenious with our gadgets for that to happen by accident. We have to save them, and save for our children the chance to choose what they want to do with them, even as an earlier generation has given us this choice by preserving some of the best of America's heritage of beautiful land and the wildlife that belongs on it. These places have been handed down to us in our great national parks and monuments, in our forest wilderness areas, in our wildlife refuges, on our public domain, and are there for us to enjoy as guests on some of the Indian lands. These are places which we can forever enjoy by living not on their capital, but on their income. There are already some capital resources on these lands--minerals, virgin forest, and so on. But I am convinced that with wise planning we shall never be so poor as to need this capital. Our national wilderness system can be the place where Paul Bunyon's ghost can be assured of something to do--but never do it. Here we can let nature's own processes go undisturbed--processes which have produced the grandeur we know in these places in our time.

Men of great vision in this Congress have proposed that we formally recognize this national wilderness system--recognize and protect it, agree that whatever commodity values these lands may contain, we can do without those commodities better than we can do without some beautiful wilderness, somewhere within reach, always. This wilderness system, for example, would preserve the back country of the national parks. It would protect the magnificent wilderness of the Sierra Nevada in California, much of which is now set aside in the three national parks, Yosemite, Sequoia, and Kings Canyon, which John Muir did so much to establish. It would also include the great Gila Wilderness in New Mexico, a memorial to Aldo Leopold, one of the first to see how the wilderness idea could become part of the multiple-use management of national forests. I think it would be well actually to name one of the wilderness reserves in our national system of wildlife refuges after Aldo Leopold, who contributed so greatly, also, to our knowledge of wildlife

management, and to our knowledge that many species of wildlife need wilderness to survive in.

The wilderness system would also include the Bob Marshall wilderness in Montana, named for another man who contributed so much toward the novel idea of having civilization include wilderness. On the Indian lands still others might well be named for notable leaders of the earliest inhabitants of this land, who, having learned to leave no sign where they walked, have allowed the wilderness to live into our time, for us and men of the future to explore, enjoy, and protect.

Congress would thus give its recognition and protection to an American idea that we have been perfecting since the nation first set aside a national park--Yellowstone--85 years ago. And this would be the kind of protection Congress have given our National Park System since the National Park Act of 1916--protection in which Congress never faltered.

No one will be able to take off for the remote heart of some wilderness every year. Some people never will. I myself can no longer do it very often. But I think we are all happier to know that the solace, solitude, and beauty of wilderness are there for whoever needs it. The next generation will need it more than we do.

An extraordinary record of today's widespread interest in wilderness preservation comes from the Pacific Coast, where six wilderness conferences have been held since 1949, attracting in all more than 1,200 conservationists and resource managers from all over this country and from other countries as well. Some individuals are counted more than once in that attendance total, but the widespread interest is nonetheless remarkable. Five of the conferences are in the series of biennial wilderness conferences sponsored by the Sierra Club. The sixth was the Conference on Northwest Wilderness sponsored by the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

I have here a summary of the most recent of these, which in itself contains notes on the earlier conferences upon which its discussions and actions were based. It will bring to your record for the information of Congress the equivalent of several field hearings on the subject of wilderness preservation which is embodied in the legislation before you.

I would call your attention to the great diversity of individual professional background represented in the discussions which are summarized, a diversity so broad that even a series of field hearings might be hard put to bring together its equal.

I realize, of course, that such conferences are not likely platforms for full expression of the ideas of people who oppose the wilderness-preservation idea. I would stress, however, that if this is a noticeable omission, it can lead to no permanent harm. In the debate about wilderness, the proponent of preservation is in a unique position and deserves special consideration. He can win only a temporary victory at best. The wilderness he saves today can be unsaved tomorrow. If he doesn't save it today, it will be unsaved tomorrow anyway. If he loses it today, it's gone for all our time.

The exact opposite is true on every count for wilderness opponents. We, the proponents of this legislation, naturally feel that we are correct and just in each of our contentions. I am convinced that we are. But if we should somehow happen to be wrong in every respect--this to me is beyond conceiving--and if the Congress, in heeding us, enacts this legislation, then nothing will have been done that cannot be undone should a contrary case ever be made.

For instance, water is important to our way of life. Some people have argued that this proposed legislation would imperil water development. We don't think it will. But to take an absurd example, suppose it is proved that it is in the long-range public interest to strip certain watersheds of all vegetation, including watersheds now admirably protected by nature, we think, in wilderness. Suppose it is proved that stripped watersheds will yield more and better water, and that this is more important than anything else these watersheds could ever provide mankind. If this were to be proved, nothing in this legislation would prevent the appropriate government agency from deciding that a given watershed be shorn of its flora and fauna and its wilderness protection; and, if it were proved, the Congress would voice no objection, and so it would be shorn.

Other examples would follow the same pattern. You have heard, or will hear, from people who think the present legislation will imperil production of timber, forage, minerals, and possibly even of mass-recreation facilities. They think so. So long as they only think it, the Wilderness Bill could conceivably stand in their way. It won't stand in their way, however, if they can prove it--if they can prove that the exploitation of the vestige of commercially valuable resources that is set aside in our wilderness is vital to the long-range public interest. They will have to prove it not only to the administrative branch of the government, but to the legislative branch as well, every member of which must stand before the people regularly and justify <u>to</u> them what he has done <u>for</u> them and for the nation.

We are not urging the wilderness bill as a temporary measure. We hope it sticks. We hope that we can succeed in enlisting the next generation in making it stick for their time, and that they will do the same for their successors. We hope wilderness preservation can remain an important and vital part of our civilization. That is our burden. The burden on our opponents should always be the burden of proof. We ask the Congress to make this distribution of burdens. We think it is right, and the wilderness bill does it.

* * * * *

The foregoing is a summary of some of the essential considerations which we hope will help you in reaching your decision. With your permission, I should like to go further into some of the philosophy and detail that has brought us to the conclusions I have summarized, and to do this in a separately titled part of my testimony.

WILDERNESS--CONFLICT AND CONSCIENCE

You like wilderness, let's suppose, and you want to see some of it saved. Not just a thin strip of roadside with a sign saying "Don't pick the flowers." Not just a wild garden behind the hotel or a pleasant woods within shouting distance of the highway. But real wilderness, big wilderness--country big enough to have a beyond to it and an inside. With space enough to separate you from the buzz, bang, screech, ring, yammer, and roar of the 24-hour commercial you wish hard your life wouldn't be. Wilderness that is a beautiful piece of world. Where as you start up a trail and your nine-year-old Bob asks, "Is there civilization behind that ridge?" you can say no and share his "That's good!" feeling.

Yes, a place where you can rescue your self from what Ortega calls the other--all the extraneities that pile you too deep. So deep, to quote my wife Anne's bon mot, that "the life you lead is not your own."

So you want a place where you can be serene, that will let you contemplate and connect two consecutive thoughts, or that if need be can stir you up as you were made to be stirred up, until you blend with the wind and water and earth you almost forgot you came from.

You like wilderness, then, and need it. And suddenly you encounter a practical man who never learned that he needs it too, or doesn't remember. It doesn't take you long to encounter him, because there are a lot of him, many of his number in places of influence, all of him adding up to a political force that can jeopardize wilderness if it chooses to, and choose it seems to.

You can malign him, and insure that the conflict will continue over the need for wilderness. But let's assume you'd rather align him, get straight to his conscience, end the conflict, and save the wilderness. Then what?

At the Fifth Biennal Wilderness Conference, on March 15 in San Francisco, I tried to develop one approach and I have drawn upon it fully in what follows, adapted from my remarks there. Let's call it a starting point, and let us hope that it will suggest to you a different and better approach to a goal that happily still remains and should persist.

* * * * *

To start with, let's address ourselves to a very important question. How much right does one generation have to another generation's freedom? Can we of this generation, in conscience, pay for our freedom by mortgaging the freedom of our children? Is it our ethic that we are privileged to write the rules to which all the subsequent generations of our civilization must be committed, and by which they must abide, irrespective of their own wishes?

Thomas Jefferson, long ago, said that one generation could not bind another; each had the right to set its own course. Go out across this land and try to find someone to argue that he was wrong. You won't find a taker.

But deeds are not matching words. This generation is speedily using up, beyond recall, a very important right that belongs to future generations--the right to have wilderness in their civilization, even as we have it in ours; the right to find solitude somewhere; the right to see, and enjoy, and be inspired and renewed, somewhere, by those places where the hand of God has not been obscured by the industry of man.

Our decisions today will determine the fate of that right, so far as people of our time can pass opportunity along to our sons. Apathy here can mean that we pass them a dead torch. Or we can keep it aflame, knowing that this is a very special torch that man cannot light again.

Belatedly we are becoming generally concerned about our scenic resources and about resolving conflicts that must be resolved if we are to retain islands of open space in the sea of tomorrow's civilization. The early history of civilization dealt with the problem of finding enough enclosed spaces--caves in the beginning, then crude shelters, then walled cities, followed by the early beginnings of suburbia when there was not longer room enough within the walls for all the people of the cities. Only recently have we begun to change our concern. The problem seems no longer to be one of enclosing space, but of leaving enough of it open to meet our needs for greenery and for every man's "slice of sky" Wallace Stegner speaks of. We know we need some of this in our own garden for the edges of our daily existence--something to look out upon at breakfast, or before dinner. We need more space near by for our weekends, where on a March day a boy may fly a kite, or a family may picnic and stroll. For our holidays we need accessible open space within range of our faster transportation, and better roads, bearing in mind that we shall soon have more three-day weekends than we have now. For our lengthening vacations we'll need the big spaces of national parks and wilderness.

These outdoor spaces--daylight-saving plots, weekend and holiday areas, and vacation regions--won't set themselves aside. We have to plan for them as the population avalanche flows over the land, and plan generously if civilization is not only to improve living standards, but also to sustain man's standards for life.

* * * * *

The Sierra Club has been concerned with man's use of wildlife, wilderness, and national parks ever since John Muir founded the club in 1892 with the general purpose of exploring, enjoying, and protecting our scenic resources. In none of its 65 years has the club been free of the controversy that results when one seeks to protect what another would exploit. That has meant 65 years' experience in trying to resolve a crescendo of conflicts--experience that we can draw upon as we consider today's major controversies and the still more critical contests that tomorrow will inevitably bring.

These conflicts will underline the need for conservation education; more than that, they will require the education of conservationists. There's quite a difference.

On the one hand, conservation alludes to management of the commodity resources, to using them wisely that they may last longer. We all approve of conservation, even as we approve of motherhood -- even while we go on expending our nonrenewable resources at a constantly accelerating rate (more in this century than in all previous history). We intend to do better. In the end, however, we know that no matter how well we manage our commodity resources and our raw materials, time will catch up with us. Conservation means spreading a given resource over a given period of time. Time finally runs out and the resource is gone, or at best, is a rarity.

On the other hand, the conservationist, and I stress the -ist, has come to be known as the man who is concerned with preserving for all our time certain important scenic resources -- our resources of wilderness, parks, wildlife, and the recreation and inspiration man may always derive from them. Always, that is, if each generation, including ours, takes care of the few places we have left where those resources still survive.

To use a figure, there are two sides to conservation just as there are two sides to a coin. On one side, tangible quantities; on the other, intangible qualities. Each side is presently oriented to look in opposite directions. Yet each must live with the other. We may need a coin of transparent material, so that each side can look in both directions.

The conservationist, then, is the man more concerned about what certain natural resources do for his soul than for his bank balance. Every man is a conservationist part of the time in his thinking, if not in his action.

There are a great number of people who are conservationists in their action also -- more than 11,000 in the Sierra Club, and about two million who are loosely organized in the Natural Resources Council of America. The numbers are growing more rapidly than is our population. Every time a scenic hill is bulldozed for a new tract of houses, or a new freeway blots out more acres of green quietude, or a new dam inundates a trout stream, or there's a vacant space where a great tree was, or another whooping crane turns up missing -- every time one of these things happens, the conservationist force grows stronger as more people realize the need to protect a rarity from extinction. Theirs is not a force of blind opposition to progress, but of opposition to blind progress. Theirs is a force determined to see that progress does not take away important things from mankind, forever, in order to benefit a few men now.

The conservationist force, I submit, is not a pressure group. It merely demonstrates the pressure of man's conscience, of his innate knowledge that there are certain things he may not ethically do to the only world he will ever have, and to the strictly rationed resource of natural beauty which still exists in that world. The conservationist force does not need to be pressed into action. It needs only be made to realize what is happening, and its voice of conscience speaks.

That sounds simple. It isn't. I need not go into any detail to convince you of the difficulty of making people realize something -- of their making it real to themselves, not imaginary, but actual. You know how hard it is to be heard in the clamor around us. And we all know how hard it is to get the voice of conscience to speak audibly enough to have effect. For example, how many times a

week do you feel something needs to be done for the public good -- and how many of those times can you find the few minutes to do something about it yourself?

So the conservationist force, for all its conscience, still needs to realize more, and to speak more. Conservation controversies, like prefabricated telephone booths, are ubiquitous. All of them are conflicts for space. The resolution of these conflicts should depend upon the answer to the question -- Who needs the space most? Unfortunately, many of the decisions are being made now, and irrevocably, not on the basis of who needs the space most, but on who got there first with the most dramatic plan of development and the biggest earth-moving equipment.

It would be helpful, in resolving the coming conflicts for space, "to have on hand a battalion of men with the wisdom of Solomon." Not having even one Solomon, let us nevertheless see what we can do to: consider a few of the conflict types in some detail; list the tools we have for resolving conflicts; try to arrive at the criteria for decision; and suggest some courses of immediate action. This is a big order. If in the course of this I make noises like an oracle, please forgive me. To be brief, I'll stick to direct sentences. In your own mind please add "it seems to me" to each sentence.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE CONFLICTS?

Man Against Numbers.--Man has demonstrated, as clearly as he has demonstrated anything, that he is prolific enough to explode across the land -- not with the rapidity of an epidemic, of course, but more thoroughly and with far more lasting devastation of the natural resources of the only world he has yet contrived to live upon. We can label this statement "neo-Mathusiasn," but the labeling solves no resource problem. The members of what we could label "the Science-Will-Save-Us-Society," will have quite a burden to prove that science really can save us. Science can do wonderful things, but our scientists can only begin to gather data on the new problems civilization presents every year, and in turn can only begin to publish and interpret their data.

A serious problem confronting scientists, and one upon which no conservation organization I know of has adopted a policy, is the population problem -- an especially touchy cat to put a bell on.

Natural scientists know full well what happens when there is an explosion of population in deer; the deer themselves lose vitality and starve by the thousands because they have overloaded their range. Mankind has a range too, and it has a maximum carrying capacity consistent with a good life -- a life with enough resources on hand for all to spare us the final quarrel over them. We may argue about how many people the range can withstand, but we can hardly argue that there is no limit. We have strong intimations, as we watch the sea of smog rise around us, that the limit is approaching faster than we thought, and from a different quarter. It may well be shortage of clean air, not of water, that brings us to a sudden halt in California.

Whatever the limiting factor, and, though our engineers cover the earch with a mezzanine floor, we know that we shall come to a day when we can no longer double our population, or even add to it, without lasting regret. Perhaps we shall continue to worship Growth until midnight of that last day.

But there is a brighter possibility and it is worth working hard for. When the light turns red, you stop before you hit the car ahead. If you don't, you're in trouble. The margin between us and trouble is our scenic open space and our wilderness. We vaguely sense the shape of this need; later and wiser men will know it surely, in the crowded world we are letting their heritage become. For them, we could choose to skimp a little on gadgets, even our most elaborate gadgets, even as they shall one day be forced to skimp, and with so much less wild world to repair to than we have.

The brighter possiblility, then, is to look for substitutes before we have completely used up a given resource. Perhaps we, as present stewards for the natural resources of all generations, could revive the practice of tithing -- saving ten per cent for the future. Not ten per cent of what this generation received from the last, but a tithe of what was here, in our best estimate, when white man began to spread over this continent. If that sounds overgenerous, remember how few the generations who have used up the ninety per cent, and how many generations will need what's left, to leaven their otherwise ersatz world.

Water Development.--Where water development and wilderness preservation are in conflict, we can remember that gravity will take water through parks and wilderness and out to places where man wants to use it or store it. Optimum development downstream can preclude irrevocable damage to wilderness values upstream. Quite often it will cost less; but even if it were to cost more in dollars, it would save what dollars cannot put together again.

The conflict with hydroelectric development is more direct, for man wants to get energy from the water that gravity brings down. Alternate sources of energy are coming fast, however, and we can affort to wait for their perfection rather than sacrifice scenically important streams and valleys. We need to remember that our choice to preserve is a temporary determination at best. Our choice to sacrifice, however, requires all future men to living by our choice. We will have written the rules for them, and indelibly.

Wood Products.--The Timber Resources Review recently completed by the Forest Service has demonstrated that our principal opportunity to meet the future's need for timber lies elsewhere than in the virgin forests of our best wilderness and park lands. The National Lumbermen's Association has gone even further. Its recent releases have stressed the need for expanding the timber market and have stated that we are growing one-third more timber than we are harvesting; they therefore opposed the timber-reserve part of the Soil Bank. Plywood people want much less plywood imported. Moreover, in the immediate future we can see a minor revolution in the wood-products industry in the promise of the chipper, particle board, and alternate sources of cellulose that will have to substitute for virgin-forest timber sooner or later.

In the absence of a policy which provides specific criteria for determining how much wilderness we shall need to preserve, and in the presence of abundant promise of substitutes for wilderness timber, and considering also the many values for mankind the wilderness forest affords -- multiple use of the highest, most diverse order,-- we should not be hard put to decide the course to vote for in the timber-versus-wilderness conflict.

Highways.--These had better go around our scenic gems, not through them, unless we want the face of our land crisscrossed by high-speed routes to beautiful places

that might have been. We have the potential of drowning ourselves with automobiles, of so overloading our hardened arterials that first the pleasure of driving will disappear -- and then the motion!

Our children shall need parklike places where they can have a change of pace and mood -- there they can spend a good chunk of time and become part of the scene for a while. It will be enough for them to screech to a stop because of traffic light or traffic jam, then roll down the window for a quick sniff of the great outdoors before the man behind blows his horn. Many people fear that our engineers are more skillful at moving vehicles than at moving people, and that a lot of space is being too freely used up in the process.

We are enamoured of horsepower, of highways and freeways, of covering more ground more quickly and with greater safety. In our ardor, however, we may well consider that it is very hard to undo a freeway and impossible to redo a wilderness.

Other Conflicts.--There are other conflicting demands for our present scenic open spaces, conflicts brought on by our needs for flood control, industry, mining, food and forage and fiber, by urbanization, and by recreation too. There is no need to go into detail about them now. They all come from the real needs for things we want and believe in. But with reasonable restraint we can eat cake and have some too--have conveniences and wilderness, so long as we remember that there are some areas where convenience costs too much.

WHAT TOOLS FOR RESOLVING CONFLICTS?

What tools have we already fashioned, or what can we invent, to resolve these conflicts?

Facts.--First, we need facts about resources. Many organizations are assembling them, and more help is needed. For scenic resources, the organizations prepared to do the best job nationally are the National Park Service, which has a program based upon a 1936 law and Mission 66; the Forest Service, which has now come up with its Operation Outdoors; and the Fish and Wildlife Service, now developing its own Operation Waterfowl. California is off to a good, if late start with imminent recreation plans now before the Legislature. Many other agencies are involved, and coordination is essential. The proposed national Outdoor Recreation Resource Review will help get this started.

Interpretation.--But facts are not enough. One of our unheralded national surpluses is the surplus of undigested data which, if laid end to end, would reach too far. A fact has meaning only when it gets from producer to market, only when it is published and interpreted well. We are badly in need of equitable interpretation of the facts we are gathering about our natural resources.

Most important, as pointed out in "Scenic Resources for the Future,"* "We must to the best of our ability project all future needs on the same screen with

---

* SCB, December 1956.

the same projection distance and same focal length of lens for each scene, and also, to the best of our ability, with the same illumination. Let the light be a cool one."

So far we have had quite a disparity in distances, lenses, and light. In California, for example, we know that water development is going to make heavy demands upon what land we have for other purposes. To project that scene, we have elaborate equipment that has been derived from an eight-year effort at a cost of better than $1 million per year. But water isn't all we'll be needing in the year 2,000, it is only one of many things.

What kind of equipment do we have, whether in California or in the country as a whole, to project our other needs. By comparison, we can project our needs for scenic resources with little more than a 19th century magic lantern, lit by a lone flame. Unless we can demonstrate the need for equity, we stand a good chance, so far as this particular conflict goes in California, of having the best-watered, most populous crowded, biggest grossing, state in the union--and the least beautiful one. Our white-water streams will be so fully harnessed for use that you can't see running water; each pleasant little valley in the hills and mountains will be replaced by a fluctuating reservoir, its water-shed cropped and gravely impaired; and suburbia will spread almost everywhere else. Bear in mind that our State Director of Water Resources, in opposing the current wilderness bill, listed in his reasons for doing so that the bill would hamper California Water Plan hopes for dams or water structures in Lava Beds and Joshua Tree National Monuments and Yosemite National Park, as well as the Plan's hopes to use the Marble Mountains Wilderness as a dumping place for spoil. We don't need water that badly. And no bill would stop these things if the people should ever really need them.

Public Information.--The public needs information, too. All our facts and interpretation will mean little if the public isn't taken into confidence. After all, the public must consent to whatever proposal we come up with. "The engineering of consent" is the concise definition of public relations. Meetings such as the wilderness conferences are a starting point. What we do after we leave such meetings will determine how far the cause moves.

Legislation.--An informed public will want a clear statement of policy, which is a statement in law, and will want continuing legislative interest in what happens under the policy. Congress, for example, is the nation's board of directors. It should reserve the power to review irreversible staff decisions which lead to the extinction of a given resource.

Administration.--The executive branch, armed with administrative regulations based upon law, will supply the preponderance of protection, for only this branch of government has staff enough to do the job full-time. Loosely worded regulations, which were adequate for a loosely populated land largely free of conflict, will have to become specific--and must in turn be based upon more specific law if we are to avoid a dangerous overconcentration of discretion. For instance, there will need to be a clearer understanding of the full meaning of multiple use, and of the limitations of multiple use. This has never meant a great number of cooks working over the same pot of broth although many people have thought this was the meaning.

SRP00635

Education.--The legislative and executive branches, with help from lay organizations, will then need to continue the effort of public education--the engineering of support. The need for this is stressed whenever two people discuss the subject of conservation, and sometimes even when the discussion is only a monologue. We have a great opportunity, or stated in another term, we've a long way to go.

These are the tools. They are all necessary. Those named last will be of little use if we don't have equitably interpreted facts to start with.

WHAT CRITERIA FOR DECISION?

Let us go back briefly to that matter of correctly interpreting facts, for it is from this interpretation that we shall have to derive our criteria for decision.

We must make one decision before we shall know how to sort out our facts. Shall we on the one hand resurrect the philosophy of aprés moi le déluge, or on the other hand shall we seek the exact opposite for those who follow us--for them a world as beautiful as ours? I don't think this will be a hard decision to make but we shall need to keep reminding ourselves that we made it.

Since wilderness is our primary concern here, let us list the points we need to consider in weighing wilderness preservation against a potential conflicting use. The weighing will set a pattern for the scenic resources which are less fragile than wilderness. And wilderness conflicts are hardest to solve and most critical.

1. The wilderness we have now is all that we, and all men, will ever have.

2. Much of our wild land which is presently used for its wilderness will be lost to wilderness use. It has not been dedicated, and remains only by accident or oversight, or because of the slight value of its raw materials. When it goes, its human load must be added to that placed upon dedicated wilderness, wherever it is left.

3. We don't know what the carrying capacity in terms of people is or may be, either for accidental or dedicated wilderness--carrying capacity that should be expressed in two ways: (a) What human use will a place withstand and still recover naturally, and (b) how many people will it withstand at a given time without their eliminating its esthetic value at the time?

With respect to recoverability: We must not be fooled by vastness of a total area. The key terrain, or the heartland, or the living space, or the camping base--whatever you may call it--is that rare, scarce oasis that has real scenic appeal, that has water and shade, wood and forage, that is gentle enough in slope to camp on, and that possesses a wild setting (without which one might as well camp in Central Park). There is precious little key terrain, even in the vastest reserves. And what key terrain there is is likely also to be a good reservoir site.

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

With respect to esthetic capacity: Wilderness cannot be false front wilderness and fulfill what man needs in it--no green-belt fringe obscuring a periodic sea of stumps. There must be assurance that a man's wild slice of sky won't have too many elbows in it, or administrative conveniences either. There must be room enough for time--where the sun can calibrate the day, not the wristwatch, for days or weeks of unordered time, time enough to forget the feel of the pavement and to get the feel of the earth, and of what is natural, and right.

4. Whatever the carrying capacity turns out to be, we can predict that it will be limited--so limited that wilderness can probably never again be abundant enough for every man to walk in it. But after all, only the small child must handle a thing to know it; adults need only look. Those in between need a little of both. So some people will be able to walk in wilderness and most of them will be the better for it. Some may wish to but never make it. Some may not think they care to at all, nor expect their sons to care. But wilderness must be there, or the world's a cage.

5. It follows that our expanding population will need more wilderness than exists, and far more than has yet been set aside for preservation.

6. Therefore, we can conclude that any step to discard our vestige of dedicated American wilderness, or to prejudice its protection, is premature at this time. And knowing this, we are obligated to insure its protection by law as well as by fiat and decree.

To those who for materialistic convenience want to extinguish just part of that dedicated wilderness we can cite Solomon's precedent. We all remember his most famous decision, when one mother wanted the child divided, and the other wanted the child spared, even if she herself were not to have it. Let the judgment favor those who want the wilderness to remain whole. A decision adverse to that whole can never be rescinded.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

It will take time to seek out facts, ideas, and decisions in the long-range public interest--three years at the very least. In the interim an immediate holding action is needed, and I have a brief suggestion. Let federal and state executives appoint task forces who can set about promptly to put up three kinds of signs in places where it is the consensus of conservationists that they belong:

"Sample, Don't Sell" we can place, figuratively, by our crown jewels--our parks, dedicated wilderness, or their equivalent in scenic caliber.

"Closed During Inventory" ought to be posted on certain areas in controversy in which the scenic, recreational, and scientific values are probably high, lest we find that the forthcoming inventory of our scenic resources consists of checking off our choicest treasures as they are carried out the door.

"Business As Usual" signs can be posted everywhere else.

In any event, some kind of moratorium is essential. A three-year wait on some of our development projects is not long compared to the eternity our descendants shall otherwise have to live by any mistakes we make out of premature commitment. To illustrate, consider the tragically premature decision at Hetch Hetchy, in Yosemite National Park,* a controversy that is all water behind the dam--the dam in Hetch Hetchy Valley from which San Francisco gets the same water it could have diverted outside the park. There was one unclouded crystal ball four decades ago, and William E. Colby, now Honorary President of the Sierra Club, was looking into it when he wrote the club's membership on the last day of 1909:

"I predict that long before Hetch Hetchy could possibly be needed for a water supply for San Francisco, the travel thither will have become so great and its needs as a campground, particularly in relation to the surrounding park, so urgent, as to preclude the possibility of its use as a reservoir. What I am opposed to is the determination right now that the Hetch Hetchy shall be flooded fifty years from now. I feel that the decision ought properly to be reserved for those who live fifty years hence. We surely can trust that their decision will be a wiser one than any we can make for them."

The decision, we know, would have been entirely different in 1959. But how many wrong decisions are we rushing to make now that will erase other Hetch Hetchys, unconscionably for all time? Our children deserve better.

* * * * *

Or to put it in annotated allegory:

This, our civilized world, is the house that Jack built. We like most of it.

And this, our living wilderness, is the garden that Jack didn't build on, the open space and the wild-land beauty that graces his house. It is his only garden, and we know that there is no more where it came from.

Jack is very capable; he can doggedly expand his house, build a three-car garage, and pave the remaining space except for an outcrop or two of rock in the northwest forty. And we can see that he's on the verge.

If only Jack would pause a moment, to look up and to see! He isn't going to like the end result himself, and his children surely will prefer to inherit a balanced estate, for they will have no place else to go.

* * * * *

Finally, I should like to include, with your permission, the recommendations and summary of proceedings of the Fifth Biennial Wilderness Conference that I mentioned in the summary of my own statement here today. In one sense it is long; but in another sense it is extremely brief, because it distills

---

* See "Hetch Hetchy--Once Is Too Often," SCB, June 1954. See also Sierra Club sound-and-color film, "Two Yosemites."

with a remarkable economy of words the essence of what so many people, of so many walks of life, have contributed in their thinking and work to enable us to reach the historic milestone we find ourselves at today. The record of this hearing will become, I am convinced, an important sourcebook on the relationship of wilderness to law. What follows is the best reflection I can find of the broad grass-roots support for what you are seeking to accomplish.

THE WILDERNESS CONFERENCES

A decade ago Norman B. ("Ike") Livermore, Jr., then a Director of the Sierra Club, urged a joint meeting of the administrators (Park and Forest Service officials) and users (hikers, riders, campers, packers) of Sierra Wilderness areas. In the spring of 1949 the Sierra Club sponsored the High Sierra Wilderness Conference. Two days of meetings at the Claremont brought together nearly 100 officers and individuals from the federal and state services, the Packers' Association, and outing clubs.

Probably the most important result of that first Conference was the discovery--not entirely unexpected--that the concerns of each of the groups were shared by a number of the others. Just realizing that someone else was "helping them worry" seemed to encourage people, and the approaches to some of the problems suddenly became less difficult. The groundwork was thus laid for cooperation between various workers who had not until then recognized from what quarters help might be expected. One of the best of the decisions reached by the first Wilderness Conference was that others should be held.

The Second Wilderness Conference, in 1951, took cognizance of the findings that whatever threatens a wilderness in the Sierra is essentially the same as what threatens unaltered lands in any other part of the world. More people came to this meeting than to the first and from farther afield. The nature of the threats to natural lands was more clearly recognized and defined, and it was urged that conservationists work for a national wilderness-preservation system, with legislation to strengthen the protection of our preserves from destructive exploitation, either in inappropriate activity or in too intensive use.

The 1953 Wilderness Conference drew 145 participants from all over the West and from such distant places as New York, Washington, Alaska, and Bavaria; it was remarkable for the great fundamental agreement among the majority of the participants. It was characterized by a search for ways to express the values of wilderness in non-commercial terms; it was clear that the esthetic and spiritual worth of wild country is recognized.

An important accomplishment of this third Conference was the recognition that some of the values of wilderness are to be found even in city parks, although those values are more numerous and more significant as we get farther from urban centers and closer to the heart of true wilderness. Clear statement of this concept illuminated the possibility of beginning education for proper wilderness use even on city playgrounds and progressing as the user's experience progresses from the familiar to the new--from the city to the unaltered wilderness. The place to <u>start</u> wilderness education is wherever receptive subjects may be found.

The 1955 Conference, again the biggest yet, pressed for clear administrative policy on wilderness and for expression of concepts in a form suitable as a basis for legislation. It was obvious that the individuals and groups present were ready to say "O.K.--we understand one another now and we have a pretty good idea of what we want. Let's go after it!" As this conference met, the struggle to protect the wilderness and park values of Dinosaur National Monument was nearing its climax, and served to postpone the following through of many of the recommendations. However, the first draft of legislation creating a National Wilderness Preservation System was introduced in the 84th Congress, Second Session, by Senator Hubert Humphrey, Representative John P. Saylor, and others, and was ready for unveiling at the first Conference on Northwest Wilderness held in Portland in 1956. Major forward steps were taken in 1957, as will be seen herein.

THE FIFTH CONFERENCE

The Fifth Biennial Wilderness Conference brought 400 conservationists and resource administrators from 19 states, Alaska and the District of Columbia who are affiliated with some 120 conservation agencies and organizations.

The potentialities of the Wilderness System and Recreation Resource Review were the subject around which the Conference was conducted. It was the fifth such Conference organized by the Sierra Club. This year it was co-sponsored by the American Planning and Civic Association, the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Parks Association, the Wilderness Society and the California Academy of Sciences. Directors of the principal federal land administering agencies presented five of the 16 papers and took part in the discussions.

The Conference voted all recommendations at its closing session, as in previous Conferences. All votes were voice votes and all but a minor one of the eight resolutions were voted unanimously. Federal agencies were considered as abstaining inasmuch as they had not yet determined the relation of the recommendations to the President's program.

Text of the recommendations follows:

THE EIGHT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review

A satisfactory and well-rounded standard of life for our growing population calls for enhanced appreciation of outdoor scenic and recreational values.

Exactly what acreage is required for fulfillment of the various needs is unknown, but it is known that numerous superb areas, small and large, have been lost, or have been whittled away during the past decade, and more are slated for destruction. It is also known that areas not specifically set aside for protection with strict boundaries and with strict standards of quality have little chance for survival in our civilization.

The valid pressures for raw materials (including water); agricultural products; military requirements; transportation; growing urbanization and industrialization; and commercial, mechanized recreation, and mass entertainment are of such great intensity that in our preoccupation with them, we could lose sight of scientific and inspirational values. This great and prosperous nation can afford to give attention to the values which are more than the material and are indispensable to the welfare of our people.

Developmental and resource surveys have been undertaken for land and water uses, including forest products, minerals, water, highway, military and urban development. However, these surveys have to date given scant, if any, consideration to wilderness and other scenic and outdoor recreational needs.

It is essential to know before it is too late that wilderness, wildlife, scenic, and other outdoor recreational resources still are available, where they are, and what is the type and quality of each, and their relation to the preservation of wilderness. It is also essential to estimate how many and what types of each we shall need in fifty and a hundred years, and how we may best save those selected for preservation with high standards of size and quality in perpetuity. If the opportunity remaining to save these outdoor recreational resources is lost now, it will be lost forever.

To this end, we recommend in principle the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Bill (S. 846, H.R. 3592, and others).

We further recommend legislative provision for temporary protected status, pending completion of the inventory contemplated in the Outdoor Recreation Resource Review, of certain lands of probable high scenic, recreational, and scientific potential as determined by the Commission; on lands so protected there should be no intrusion or development that would preclude their subsequent use in the highest public good in accordance with criteria developed in the course of the inventory.

We urge that the legislation establishing the survey not be misinterpreted so as to interfere with the adoption of other legislation to provide for the immediate protection of wilderness and of resources in need of such immediate action.

2. Basic Wilderness Protection

In accordance with proposals made, studied, and developed in 1951 and 1953, during the second and third biennial wilderness conferences, the Fourth Biennial Wilderness Conference meeting in Berkeley, California, two years ago on March 19, 1955, adopted a "major recommendation" urging basic Federal legislation for wilderness preservation. This resolution was as follows:

"We recommend basic legislation, or a joint resolution of Congress, to establish a system of wilderness areas and to provide for their protection specifically by law regardless of what agency they may be under at present. However, we recommend that the agencies at present administering these areas continue to administer them."

The Fifth Biennial Wilderness Conference, meeting in San Francisco, California, on March 16, 1957, is encouraged to note that such legislation has now been introduced in the Congress of the United States.

Commonly known as "the wilderness bill," S-1176 in the Senate, and a series of similar measures in the House of Representatives have been sponsored by a number of legislators in the Senate by Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota and a group of co-sponsors of both political parties from coast to coast: Senators Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Pennsylvania, Frank J. Lausche of Ohio, Paul H. Douglas of Illinois, Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin, Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota, James D. Murray of Montana, Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson of Washington, and Wayne Morse and Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon; in the House by Representatives John F. Baldwin, Jr., and George P. Miller of California, Lee Metcalf of Montana, Henry S. Ruess of Wisconsin, Barratt O'Hara of Illinois, and John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania.

We commend these legislators for their leadership in sponsoring this measure and, supporting the bill in principle, we urge that it be further studied through adequate hearings, clarified, perfected, and enacted.

We believe that large-size wilderness should be protected in perpetuity under true wilderness conditions, and that its preservation is essential to the cultural, historic, esthetic, recreational, and scientific needs of the country, and to the physical well-being of all its people. To provide therefor, we conclude that:

1. A continental wilderness system representing all major types of wilderness must be established firmly, to include units of such quality, size, and variety as to provide adequate scope and space.

2. Most of the units that qualify for this sytem have either already been designated by the Forest Service, or exist without specific designation on national forests or on lands administered by the National Park Service and by other government agencies, and these agencies should continue to protect the areas of wilderness on the lands under their jurisdiction.

3. Inasmuch as the mounting pressures for raw materials and development are predictably capable of encroaching upon and modifying all the remaining natural land of the country, it is now necessary: (a) to make the clearest possible statement of national wilderness policy, (b) to reinforce it with full public understanding of wilderness values, and (c) to provide maximum legislative and administrative protection.

4. Administrative agencies are to be commended for advancing the concept of wilderness protection. Without specific legislative authority and review, however, some agencies cannot now withstand mounting pressures for commodity development on lands that should remain wild, and other agencies are becoming progressively less able to do so. A clear legislative basis for wilderness protection is needed.

The Fifth Biennial Wilderness Conference accordingly endorses the National Wilderness Preservation System Bill, realizing that this generation's decision to preserve wilderness will be subject to each succeeding generation's review,

but that it will not have this choice unless an adequate preservation program is now developed.

3. Arctic Wilderness

Virtually all of Northeast Alaska lying east of the Canning and upper Chandalar rivers and Old Woman Creek and north of latitude 65° 15' N is still a primeval Arctic wilderness not elsewhere duplicated in our nation, and studies indicate that the highest and most productive and sustained economic, scientific, and cultural use of this area, for Alaskans and for the entire nation, will be as a perpetual wilderness.

We recommend that the Bureau of Land Management formally designate and administer this area as an Arctic wilderness; that the assistance of appropriate sister agencies be invoked where advisable, and that suitable regulations be established to recognize and perpetuate its primitive conditions and to encourage all types of economic and cultural use that are compatible with the paramount objective of maintaining unimpaired the ecological conditions within the area;

We further recommend with regard to other areas in the Brooks Range that a cooperative investigation be made by Alaskans, by the Bureau of Land Management and appropriate sister agencies and by wilderness organizations looking toward the establishment of additional wilderness areas in the Brooks Range.

4. Three Sisters Wilderness, Oregon

In order to permit further consideration of the wilderness terrain of the Three Sisters region before irreversible action has been taken to destroy it, we recommend that the 53,000-acre portion not included in the Three Sisters Wilderness Area be allowed to continue in its present primitive condition, without roads and without logging, at least until the completion of such studies as contemplated in the proposed Outdoor Recreation Resources Review, including an evaluation of the relation of the Three Sisters to the national requirement for wilderness preservation.

5. Northern Cascades of Washington

We recommend that the Forest Service invite the participation of other public agencies and qualified representatives of the public in a continuation and broadening of the land-management study of the wild and superlatively scenic areas of the Northern Cascades of Washington between Stevens Pass and the Canadian boundary, to the end that the highest public use of this area may be assured in the long run.

6. Nonconforming Uses in Wilderness

We are disturbed by the existence of certain nonconforming practices within certain wilderness areas which now undermine and which, if not checked, will destroy the wilderness values of these areas. Among these practices are prospecting and mining, the building of access roads to mines and other inholdings, and the landing of private planes on inholdings and in wilderness areas.

SRP00643

We recommend, therefore, that wilderness, wild, primitive and roadless areas be withdrawn from mineral entry, the landing of airplanes within these areas be terminated, and vested rights and inholdings be purchased so that nonconforming uses may be excluded from these areas.

7. Wilderness of the Olympic Strip, Washington

We recommend that the Ocean strip which is part of Olympic National Park and which contains the last primitive beach in the United States, should be preserved as wilderness, and that in order to provide for this preservation the National Park Service should acquire sufficient land adjacent thereto to accommodate any coastal highway constructed in this region.

8. 1959 Conference

We recommend that the continuity of the Wilderness Conferences over the past years be continued for the future under a chairman to be named by the Sierra Club as the sponsoring organization.

Mr. Aspinall. Do I understand that there is a request to make this newspaper article a part of the record?

Mrs. Pfost. Mr. Poole made that request.

Mr. Aspinall. I will object to that. It is not Mr. Poole's statement. It is Dr. Gabrielson's statement. I am sure that Dr. Gabrielson can make his appearance some time during these hearings and ask for that to be included. It may be placed in the file for whatever it is worth, but I am not permitting anybody to make a statement as part of the statement here and not be present for cross examination on the statement.

Mrs. Pfost. You have heard the request that the article be made a part of the file. Without objection the Gabrielson newspaper statement will be made a part of the file.

Mr. Zahniser. I would like to preent Mr. Sigurd Olson of Ely, Minnesota.

STATEMENT OF MR. SIGURD OLSON, ELY, MINNESOTA

Mr. Olson. I have a statement that I would like to submit as though read in the record.

Mr.Saylor. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Olson be inserted in the record at this point as though read.

Mrs. Pfost. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

June 20, 1957

STATEMENT OF SIGURD F. OLSON

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, regarding the establishment of a Wilderness Preservation System.

My name is Sigurd F. Olson, my residence - Ely, Minnesota. While I am affiliated with a number of conservation groups in an official, advisory, and consultant capacity, I am speaking today as an individual inasmuch as the groups with which I am associated are submitting their own statements through others. As an individual, I am paying my own expenses and not drawing on the funds of any organization. I do this because of my lifelong interest in the matter of Wilderness Preservation and because I am much concerned as to the future of our remaining wild areas.

In my early years, I was a guide to wilderness expeditions, exploring new country, carrying on scientific investigations, fishing and hunting, and during those years I came to realize that the wilderness experience was very important to many people, one that contributed to happiness and contentment. I became so impressed with what wilderness did to me that I decided to do whatever I could to preserve it.

Since those years, while I have continued my personal exploration of wilderness all over the continent, I have seen as all of you have its steady diminution. All of you know what it means to see a wild place of primitive beauty desecrated and more and more, in the face of our expanding economy, and swiftly rising population, this seems inevitable. I have been greatly concerned about this gradual disappearance of natural areas, because I feel it indicates a trend of development which ultimately might destroy the last vestiges of the America that was.

I am convinced that wilderness is necessary to the welfare of our people, that without it they will not survive the stresses and strains of a mechanical age.

Dr. William C. Menninger, the famous psychiatrist, said just a short time ago "Today mental health is perhaps the greatest menace to the equilibrium of American life. Mental relaxation is far more important than physical rest."

Exactly what does he mean by such a statement? Why do we as Americans fill over half of our hospital beds with the mentally ill? Why do we consume 45 million aspirin tablets daily, 2 million sleeping pills, 40 million prescriptions of tranquilizers? Why is one child in ten suffering from some mental affliction? Why is heart decease, high blood pressure and related disturbances at an all time high? Why, in spite of comforts, conveniences, and a high standard of living, are we such a nervous, high-strung, jittery people?

I believe the answer to these questions involves a look backward into our past as a race. Harrison Brown in his book "Man And The Future" says:

> "Man has been on this planet for perhaps a million years, having arrived through the slow and tortuous processes of evolution some three billion years after the earth was formed."

According to Harrison Brown, if we were to compress the age of the earth to one year, man would only be three hours of age, an infant among species. But only during the past 100,000 years less than 20 minutes out of this three hour time span, has he emerged from the primitive and assumed the stature both physically and mentally of the Homo sapiens we know today. This period included the Stone Age of the primitive hunter and fisherman, the endless nomadic wanderings, the Paleolithic and Mesolithic cultures from which all of us have come. Gradually man evolved into a tribal and community era in which the first attempts were made to till the soil, make provision for the future, and to live with his fellows for mutual protection.

But only during the last 10,000 to 20,000 years, 2-minutes on this time clock, has there been any evidence of real cultural advance. During this half-minute of man's three hour history, he built the ancient civilizations of the near east. Archeologists are unearthing them today, digging them out from the windblown dust that has covered them. To us they seem very old, but actually they are young. Most north Europeans however need not look that far back before they find their own primitive beginnings and the birth of their particular cultures and we must remember that even as late as the Roman conquests, a mere few seconds away, many of their ancestral stocks were living primitive lives.

Even a hundred years ago, 1-second of the earth's history, we were close to the soil and though our civilization was changing swiftly, it was still predominantly agrarian, very much a part of a pattern of life that with few exceptions had been one with the slow rhythms of nature. Then around the turn of the century we began to experience the first explosions of technological advance. Two great wars added impetus and urgency to scientific research and suddenly we found ourselves hurled into the whirring complexity of the machine age.

Today millions are cut off from any direct contact with the earth, are discovering they can live without having to gather wood, carry water, or hunt food, that matters of security and community welfare are taken care of by others who are never seen. It is an exciting world in which to live and to many it seems as though the millenium is at hand. No longer is there anything to fear except man's own ingenuity and he can devote himself in large part to the pursuit of pleasure and to the arts.

But evidence is appearing that all is not well. There is wide unrest, frustration and even boredom with the new life. It is the pace, say the experts, the speed of modern city life, Freudian complexes, new foods, the wars, a thousand aberrations of the mind, but none of them tell all the truth, none of them place their diagnostic fingers on the whole trouble, that man is not yet ready for his machine civilization, that physiologically and psychologically he is still so close to the simplicities and elemental struggles from which he recently evolved that he cannot forget.

The fact is that modern man in spite of his seeming urbanity and sophistication is still a primitive roaming the forests of his range, killing his meat, scratching the earth with a stick, gathering nuts and fruits and harvesting grain between the stumps of burned out trees, that the old fears as well as the basic satisfactions are still very much a part of him.

Even though he is embracing new religious beliefs, new philosophies and nostrums which attempt to explain his relationship to the universe and to God, there is a sense of incompleteness. Within him is a powerful nostalgia, he cannot understand, a gnawing unrest that the new world of gadgetry, and amusement cannot still. He dashes from place to place filling his leisure time with diversions, never daring to be alone with his thought. The old sense of belonging is gone and the inherent need of being part of a stabilized ecological complex. In spite of comforts and almost complete control of his environment, he is confused and unsecure.

A strange and violent world is his with the great silences replaced by the roar of jets and the cities he has built vibrating with noise. The smells of woods and fields and forests are replaced by those of combustion and industry, and his senses are bombarded with impressions he has never known before. He has come a long way during the past 100,000 years and were it not for the submerged nine tenths of his subconscious, a subconscious steeped in a racial experience that knew nothing of technology, he might make his adjustment more easily. But unfortunately the biological and mental processes of any species simply refuse to be hurried. Adaptations take aeons of time.

G. M. Trevelyan once said, "We are literally children of the earth and removed from her our spirit withers and runs to various forms of insanity. Unless we can refresh ourselves at least by intermittant contact with nature we grow awry."

The great historian was right. We are literally children of the earth. When modern man steps into a dimly lighted cocktail lounge for a meeting with his fellows, he is back in his cave; when he checks the thermostat of his apartment, he is still kindling a fire; when he steps out on the street at night and sees Orion glowing in the sky even though it is dimmed by the lights of the city, he is doing what men have done since the dawn of the race. Man of the atomic age and its conflicting ideologies is still part of the past.

The pioneer days are over and the entire complex of American life has changed. The land is harnessed now, roads everywhere, telephone and power and oil lines enmeshing more and more tightly the last wild areas. Only in a few places is there any wilderness left. The rest is tamed and subject to the will of man and all this has taken place in the short space of four hundred and fifty eight years and most of it actually within the last century.

Ours is a prosperous land and all the good things of life seem available for everyone. In spite of the tensions of the cold war and the outbursts of violence in many quarters of the globe, there is optimism and hope. Business is expanding and the national income growing by leaps and bounds. Housing and industrial expansion are swiftly filling in the blank spaces between the towns. The face of the earth is being changed and with tremendous ingenuity in the invention and manufacture of earth moving equipment, we are turning loose fleets of gigantic behemoths which are altering the courses of rivers, building super highways across terrain that until now was considered impassable.

It is not easy for a people who are only a few generations removed from the frontier to change the pattern of their thinking swiftly. Millions still refuse to believe that resources are not inexhaustible and the frontiers a thing of the past. Inherently Americans are still part of the boom days with the exploitation of all resources and elimination of the wild the expected course of events. Talk of spiritual values still does not take equal place with the concrete evidence of an expanding economy.

However, we have set aside some 55 million acres of wilderness encompassed by our national parks and monuments, our national forests, wild life refuges and Indian Lands. Since these reservations were established they have been constantly challenged and weighed in the light of the old pioneer philosophy that has dominated thought on the North American continent since the days of discovery. Today we are forced to justify them constantly to protect them from industrial exploitation or commercial developments which could destroy them. During the past few years, we have fought invasions of the national parks, national forests, and wildlife refuge systems.

The battles go on constantly and are increasing in intensity. The great task today of all interested in the preservation of natural areas is to justify them in the eyes of a people the majority of whom are still convinced that nothing should interfere with the grinding progress of our mechanical age. Even though these areas are seemingly protected by law and administrative decrees, it has become necessary to justify their protection from every conceivable angle.

To place a precise value on wilderness is as difficult as to place a dollar sign on the worth of an heirloom or a landmark. There are certain things that cannot be evaluated because of their emotional impact. Wilderness is in this category. While certain areas might have worth as a museum piece or because of certain scenic, scientific, or economic factors, its real worth will always depend on how people feel about it and what it does to them. If it contributes to spiritual welfare, if it gives them perspective and a sense of oneness with mountains forests and waters, or in any way enriches their lives, then the area is beyond price.

Wilderness fills a vital need today as a spiritual backlog to the high speed mechanical world in which we live. It is surprising when production lines and synthetic pleasures fail to satisfy the ancient needs of modern man that he instinctively turns toward the wilderness to find the naturalness and stability the race once knew. The fifty odd million who visited the national parks and forests last year thought they went for the scenery and the joy of travel, but what they really went for was to catch a hint of the primeval, a sense of the old majesty and mystery of the unknown. A mere glimpse of the wild set in motion dormant reactions long associated with solitude.

It behooves us to look long and searchingly at our last wilderness regions before we abandon them. We must not fail in our engrossment with physical needs to also make provision in equal proportion for the satisfaction of cultural needs. Wilderness regions may be a key to equilibrium in an age where technological advance has far outstripped man's knowledge of his humanitarian and spiritual needs. Any nation which today has the vision to set aside and hold for the future sanctuaries of the spirit is acting in accordance with man's profoundest requirements. In the days to come, the wilderness concept must be clear and shining enough to capture imaginations. It must take its place as a cultural force with all expressions of man's deepest yearnings and his noblest achievements in the realm of the mind. It must be powerful enough to withstand everywhere in the world, the coming and enormous pressures of industry and population. - A great decision faces us today and in the choices that must be made may lie the future of the race and the road man must follow. America can ill afford not to do everything in its power to preserve the wild areas which have such importance to our welfare.

Mr. Zahniser. I would like to present Mr. George Fell, Executive Director of Nature Conservancy.

STATEMENT OF MR. GEORGE FELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF NATURE CONSERVANCY

Mr. Fell. I have a statement.

Mrs. Pfost. Without objection Mr. George B. Fell's statement will be made a part of the record at this point as though read.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF GEORGE B. FELL
BEFORE THE
PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
ON H. R. 500

June 21, 1957

I am George B. Fell, Executive Director of the Nature Conservancy. On behalf of our Board of Governors, I wish to place our organization on record in favor of H.R.500 and similar bills to protect our remaining wilderness areas.

The Nature Conservancy is a fairly new institution on the American scene. It is a nationwide nonprofit membership society devoted primarily to bringing about the preservation of natural areas for their scientific, educational, and esthetic values. It was formed by scientists who have become increasingly concerned about the need for preserving natural areas for use in biological research. It is engaged in an active program of establishing nature preserves under its own administration or under the ownership of other agencies. Thus far, it owns nine tracts in four states and has participated in the preservation of at least 20 other areas. These nature preserves are essentially little wilderness areas that supplement the magnificent wilderness preserves in Federal ownership. They are located in our more populous regions where large wilderness areas no longer exist.

The direct efforts of our organization, however, are inadequate before the onslaughts of the organized forces of exploitation. We can save from desecration plots here and there but we must look to government action to preserve the larger areas in public ownership.

Wilderness areas have very great values from a scenic and recreational standpoint. In addition, they have inestimable scientific and educational values. These preserves are the laboratories, and the myriad kinds of plants and animals that live within them are the raw materials, for future biological research. They are storehouses of scientific treasure ranking with libraries and museums. Scientists have hardly begun the task of unlocking the knowledge and benefits hidden within them. It has been pointed out, for instance, that despite the

SRP00651

existence of many thousands of plants which may have crop potentials, modern agriculture is still wholly dependent on a few dozen that were domesticated by our prehistoric ancestors back in the stone age. Wilderness areas also provide scientists with "check areas" or experimental "controls" to gauge the effects of farming, forestry, grazing, and other practices on similar lands. Ecologists carrying on long-term research on the relationships within various natural plant-animal communities are dependent on the existence of preserved areas.

We particularly wish to commend the proposal in the present bill that the Smithsonian Institution maintain the headquarters and records of the National Wilderness Preservation Council. This should assure adequate recognition of the scientific value of the wilderness areas and of the records to be accumulated by the Council over the years.

Because wilderness is so readily destroyed by our modern civilization, we believe adequate checks and balances are an essential part of a wilderness preservation system. The fate of these areas should not be in the hands of single individuals or agencies. We believe the present bill provides appropriate safeguards.

It cannot be overemphasized that we in this generation have the last chance to set aside wilderness. Only those lands which we deliberately establish as preserves will remain in anywhere near their natural condition for the benefit of future generations. All the rest of our landscape will be progressively altered to serve man's interests. The next generation, and the generations following, will always have the choice of exploiting the areas we have preserved but they will not be able to preserve the areas we have exploited.

* * *

SRP00652

Mr. Zahniser. I would like now to introduce Mr. Fred A. Packard, Executive Secretary of the National Parks Association.

STATEMENT OF MR. FRED A PACKARD, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Packard. I have a statement of the National Parks Association dealing with the national park aspects of this bill. I will submit it for the record.

There is attached to it an article relating to the wilderness bill and the national parks, part of which I request be submitted in the record. I understand it has already been submitted.

Mrs. Pfost. Without objection Mr. Packard's statement will be made a part of the record as though read and his attachments will be made a part of the file.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

SRP00653

RECORDER'S COPY

NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION
2144 F STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON 7, D. C.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 1960 AND RELATED BILLS

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM
June 20 and 21, 1957
Fred M. Packard
Executive Secretary

The National Parks Association is a non-governmental citizens' organization dedicated to the continued preservation of America's national park system and to stimulating an informed public understanding and appreciation of the values represented by these reservations to the welfare of our people now and in the future. The purposes and provisions of the Wilderness Bill are directly within the province of the Association and they have been discussed thoroughly by its Executive Committee since it was first proposed that such legislation be introduced. On April 2, 1957, the Executive Committee unanimously adopted the following resolution endorsing the pending proposals:

"The protection and perpetuation of wilderness is one of the primary purposes for which the National Parks Association was established. From its founding in 1919, the Association has steadfastly supported programs for the preservation of our wilderness resources in our national parks, national forests, state parks and wherever it remains as part of the American scene.

"The reservation of the national park system and of the Wilderness Areas and Wild Areas in the national forests has stimulated public recognition of the outstanding contributions preservation of the natural outdoors makes to the welfare of the people. Increased population pressures, combined with more leisure time, have multiplied the pressures on our national parks and similar areas and have made imperative permanent reservation of suitable lands to fill this need.

"Perpetuation of the wilderness resource is contingent on the strongest possible safeguards to prevent its destruction or dilution, once it has been determined this resource represents the highest and wisest use of a particular land area. The Association believes recognition of the value of wilderness as a policy of the Congress is essential to ensure permanence to this program.

"Therefore, the National Parks Association affirms its support of legislation now before Congress to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, and endorses that legislation in the belief it is essential to the welfare of the nation."

Since other witnesses will give special consideration to the features of these bills which relate to national forest areas, national wildlife refuges and Indian lands, this statement is confined to discussion of the sections dealing with the national park system.

A basic question is whether any of the provisions including national parks and monuments within the National Wilderness Preservation System would have adverse effect on or weaken the existing laws under which the National Park Service administers itsareas, or interfere with such administration as now conducted. We believe no such effect will result. Section 2(b) conforms to present legal requirements that only Congress can abolish a national park or national monument. It provides for the designation of those particular places within the national parks and monuments that shall be used for developmental purposes, and that the remainder of these areas shall be kept in the original wilderness state unmodified by such development. This appears to be in accord with National Park Service thinking and with the Mission 66 program, for Park Service officials refer to the areas to be developed as "sacrifice areas" and Mission 66 planning contemplates restriction of construction activities to such places.

This proposed law would, in all likelihood, make such planning more permanently effective and ensure that the care with which this program is being conducted will

not be controverted by future action. Indeed, we believe just this kind of thinking led John Muir and the other great pioneers of the national park concept to found the national parks for the preservation of outstanding natural features for the enjoyment of the people under developmental policies that will not impair these features. This concept was eloquently written into the foundational Act of August 25, 1916, and is re-emphasized in the present proposed legislation.

There is one feature of this legislation about which there is some variance of opinion among the members of the Executive Committee of the National Parks Association, namely, whether it is essential or desirable that individual units of the national park system be selected for inclusion by name. Some members thought it preferable that the provisions of Section 2(b) and other pertinent parts of the legislation serve to bring all units of the national park system into the National Wilderness Preservation System. It is quite possible to suggest some areas, in addition to those named, as qualified because they contain wilderness - as, for example, the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park and the anticipated Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park, to name but two. The Association has no firm opinion on the point, and relies on the wisdom of the Congress to determine which approach best serves the purposes of the bill.

Finally, it should be noted that enactment of this proposal may well have far-reaching effects toward advancing sound conservation thinking in many other nations. More than 40 other countries have followed America's example by establishing national parks, and many of them have other kinds of wilderness reserves as well. In some countries the park systems are most ably protected and administered, notable examples being those of Japan and of Belgium in the Belgian Congo, and of Brazil.

Other nations, however, have a less mature attitude toward such reservations; they have not formulated definite policies and are prone to protect such areas only so long as some powerful politician or interest does not exert pressure to exploit them. Sometimes their national parks are thought of mainly as attractions to reap tourist revenue. To the dedicated administrators and citizen conservationists

SRP00656

confronted with such attitudes, positive expression by the Congress of the United States that preservation of wilderness in its natural state is a policy of the United States government will be encouraging, gratifying and stimulating.

I request permission to submit for the record an article "The Wilderness Bill and the National Parks" from the April-June 1957 issue of National Parks Magazine.

Mr. Zahniser. I would like now to introduce Dr. Paul Sheppard, Jr.

STATEMENT OF DR. PAUL SHEPPARD, JR., CONSERVATION CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE GARDEN CLUBS, INC.

Dr. Sheppard. I have a statement that I would like to submit as though read.

Mrs. Pfost. Without objection the statement of Dr. Paul Sheppard will be made a part of the record at this point as though read.

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

SRP00658

Recorder's Copy

STATEMENT
of

Dr. Paul Shepard, Jr., Conservation Chairman
The National Council of State Garden Clubs, Inc.
160 Central Park So., New York, N.Y.

Before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at Public Hearing on June 21, 1957

Congressman Pfost and Members of the Subcommittee on Public Lands:

My name is Paul H. Shepard, Jr., of 586 Olive St., Galesburg, Illinois. I am chairman of the Conservation Committee of the National Council of State Garden Clubs, an organization of 46 state federations with a membership of about 390,000 men and women. I am authorized by the president, Mrs. Daniel J. Mooney, of Butte, Montana, to present a statement to you expressing our interest in and support of H.R. 1960.

At its annual meeting this year in Miami, Florida, on March 3, delegates to the National Council resolved in support of ~~H.R. 1960~~ S. 1176. We believe it will help ensure the preservation of wilderness areas by giving organizations such as ours an opportunity to be heard concerning the administration of those lands. It appears that, while interested groups do enjoy the privilege of such hearings as this concerning legislation, there is often less such opportunity or forewarning regarding administrative decisions which might seriously affect wilderness areas. This legislation would help remedy this situation by establishing a council to disseminate information. Besides serving as a clearing house, the Council might also provide us with sources and materials useful in conservation education. The effect would be that appreciation of wilderness could take its rightful place in the education for the conservation of natural resources. This educational activity is, of course, one of the primary activities of many of our clubs.

Garden Club members are vitally interested in the preservation of natural and wilderness areas. We recognize that, of all resources, it is a relatively new and unique concept, not yet obvious to the man in the street. Vigilant protection of our national parks was carried on for 80 years by a handful of Congressmen and others who foresaw their future value. Now the public in general is beginning to appreciate that heritage. In wilderness preservation we are perhaps still engaged in such rear-guard action. But increasing use of wilderness points to a growing recognition of its values in a world of increasing speed and overcrowding.

As an ecologist, may I add that scientists are only beginning to realize the complexity of the natural habitat -- just as others are discovering its psychological value to people. There are new techniques and new inclinations in science for learning that cannot be gotten in a laboratory or in the rural landscape. H.R. 1960 provides for the kind of centralized agency that will facilitate research in wilderness lands.

Mr. Zahniser. I would now like to introduce Mrs.Carl Shoemaker of the National Council of State Garden Clubs.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CARL SHOEMAKER, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE GARDEN CLUBS

Mrs. Shoemaker. I am submitting a resolution on behalf of the National Legislative Committee o the National Council of State Garden Clubs.

Mrs. Pfost. Without objection the statement will be made a part of the record at this point as though read. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Statement on Behalf of The
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE GARDEN CLUBS
In Support of
A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Before The
Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee
June 20-21, 1957

Presented by Mrs. C. D. Shoemaker, Washington, D. C.

.....

The National Council of State Garden Clubs, an organization of more than 300,000 members, is composed of affiliated garden clubs in 45 states and the District of Columbia. Embraced in its broad program of conservation interests is "the preservation of special areas." At its annual convention in Miami, Florida in April of this year, the National Council adopted a resolution endorsing S. 1176 by Senator Hubert Humphrey, and others, "To establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System...."

I quote from that resolution, as follows:

> "In recognition of the ~~diminishing~~ portion of the United States that remains in its primitive condition, and of the increasing importance of wilderness areas to the people of a technological society, a plan which would help perpetuate these lands has been submitted to Congress.
>
> "We believe that in the conservation of natural resources wilderness preservation has a place; that wilderness areas have unique values which are esthetic and spiritual as well as scientific and educational. In the broad field of planning for the future, perhaps no type of land use requires such explicit and firm designation as these areas which are so vulnerable to an expanding economy. The wilderness areas of America are living historical museums. They are the areas to which many of our crowded and anxious population of the future may look for perennial recreation."

Again we welcome the opportunity to endorse and strongly support legislation now pending before your committee which is designed to establish a positive program for preservation of the living wilderness.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Zahniser. We certainly appreciate the graciousness of the committee in conducting this hearing in this manner.

As our final spokesman I would like to presnt Mrs. John A. Dyer, who has come here from Auburn, Washington, near Seattle. I would suggest since she has a prepared statement that the committee hear her as it wishes and then request any of the rest of us for such time as we have.

Mrs. Pfost. There are three minutes remaining on the division of time. We did not start until 10.10, with half the time for the opponents and the other half for the proponents.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JOHN A DYER, REPRESENTING THE FEDERATION OF WESTERN OUTDOOR CLUBS, THE MOUNTAINEERS, AND THE SEATTLE AUDOBON SOCIETY

Mrs. Dyer. I would like to include with my prepared statement a letter signed by the President of the Federation of the Western Outdoor Clubs whom I am representing today be included with my statement.

I am also representing the Mountaineers and the Seattle Audobon Society.

Mrs. Pfost. Without objection the statement of Mrs. Dyer, together with the statement of the President of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, will be made a part of the record at this point as though read. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, June 21, 1957
on
H. R. 500, A Bill to Establish a National Wilderness Preservation System

by

Mrs. John A. Dyer, 116 J St., N. E., Auburn, Washington representing the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, The Mountaineers, and The Seattle Audubon Society.

- - - - - -

I am Mrs. John A. Dyer, from Auburn, Washington speaking for the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, which has thirty-one member clubs, and I also am here on the behalf of The Mountaineers of the State of Washington and the Seattle Audubon Society. These groups all have a primary interest in wilderness through their various activities of hiking, mountain climbing, camping. The mountaineering enthusiasts do not find the same pleasure in scrambling up man-made edifices when occasionally practicing on rock walls or the stairs of an office building. These may strengthen the muscles or give some experience in technical climbing problems, but it takes nature-made environment to put that special appeal in mountaineering. The hiking or walking groups share the climber's innate love for wilderness, but are content to look at but not scale higher slopes. Both groups experience delight and peace and loveliness, all of which are man-regenerating forces (and it's not limited to the adult male but finds its way into the inner being of women, boys and girls.) These unmatched inspirational experiences are found at their best in only God-touched forests, wildlife-grazed meadows, unscarred mountains, lake gems, rustling rivers and streams reaching for their original destinies.

We do hike in second growth forests, but sawed-stump evidences of past logging obliterates the inspiration sought in wilderness. For many people seeking small things thriving in wilderness gives extra pleasure -- the deerfoot vanilla leaf carpeting a forest floor, an avalanche lily rushing into bloom even before the

snow completely melts around it, a glimpse of a water ouzel flying barely above a stream's splashings, and sneaking upon a marmot sunning himself before he has a chance to warn all wild folks in his plot that a stranger is present looking at them.

It is difficult to express what there is about wilderness, but these few words are in hope that you will understand a little why we support this Wilderness Bill being considered today. The lines of Edna St. Vincent Millay, "World, world, I cannot get thee close enough" is the feeling that permeates my entire being while in untrammeled country.

This is the first national conservation measure for which the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs and the Mountaineers have sent a delegate before Congress from the Pacific Northwest. We strongly feel that congressional sanction for wilderness as contained in this bill will give the additional strength needed to maintain existing Forest Service Wilderness Areas, will permit the National Park Service to be more explicit as to how and where to conserve forever their precious wild lands beyond road ends accomplished under Mission 66. Each agency administering our federal wild country will be better able to give wilderness a higher priority with the backing of Congress through the Wilderness Bill.

To us on the Pacific coast the bill seems to lack any provision for an important federal wilderness land category. The very fine existing Forest Service Wild and Wilderness Areas are included in the bill, attention is paid to inclusion of Primitive Areas when they are reclassified to wilderness status. However, in Washington and Oregon, the U. S. Forest Service has fourteen Limited Areas. In 1952 these were listed by the Regional Office in Portland as "Proposed Wild and Wilderness Areas". "Limited Area" is a term used primarily in Region 6, and they are administered in the same manner as wilderness -- no roads, timber removal, mechanical means of travel or buildings are allowed except on approval of the Regional Forester. This seems to be at his discretion and not necessarily a

practice that would be binding on future regional foresters. These limited areas might be described as a "Stop, Look and Listen". In other words their high wilderness value had been recognized, and until the region determines what commodity values they may have through examination they will remain wilderness. The 90-day notice given in formal reclassification of wilderness isn't required in these cases, but the Region has done so in the two cases of classifying them into wilderness. There now are fourteen Limited Areas in the two states are: Alpine Lakes, Cougar Lake, Glacier Peak, Monte Cristo, Packwood, and St. Helens in Washington, and Anthony Lake, Diamond Lake, Eagle Creek, Illinois Canyon, Sky Lakes, Snake River and Umpqua in Oregon.

With the wilderness in these areas already recognized we wonder if it wouldn't be desirable to include them in the Wilderness Bill in the same manner as Primitive Areas are, and also specifying that the public be given the same opportunity to be sure of having a voice in their final disposition.

The Glacier Peak Limited Area is one of the most magnificent regions in the nation. It has beautifully forested valleys penetrating high peaks. Nearly twenty years ago it had been proposed for Wilderness Status, but progress stopped, the area was halved and the remaining portion given Limited Area standing. It is now again being studied for wilderness designation, but regulations do not require a public hearing. The Forest Service is aware of the intense public interest in this area, however, and will undoubtedly conduct one. It is an example of an area that should be given recognition in the Wilderness Bill.

Prior to the opportunity of sending a representative to be here today, the President of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs had prepared a statement, copies of which had already been forwarded to the committee by him. I would like to read it at this time.

(Insert statement of June 17, 1957 by Karl Onthank.)

END

(Pauline Dyer)
Mrs. John A. Dyer

SRP00665

FEDERATION OF WESTERN OUTDOOR CLUBS

Established in 1931 for Mutual Service and for the Promotion of the Proper Use, Enjoyment and Protection of America's Scenic, Wilderness and Outdoor Recreational Resources

1956-1957

President, KARL W. ONTHANK
1653 Fairmount Blvd., Eugene, Oregon

Secretary, FRANCES S. NEWSOM
708 11th Avenue East, Eugene, Oregon

Treasurer, IRMA O. BROWN
11275 La Maida Street, North Hollywood, California

Editor of "WESTERN OUTDOOR QUARTERLY"
LUELLA K. SAWYER, 50 Molino Avenue, Mill Valley, California

California Vice-President, GEORGE V. HALLORAN
2024 14th Avenue, San Francisco 16, California

California Deputy Vice-President, FORREST H. KECK
306 Edgerton Drive, San Bernadino, California

Oregon Vice-President, PAUL GERHARDT
4240 S.W. Altadena Street, Portland, Oregon

Utah Vice-President, ELIZABETH V. LARSON
1384 South 14 East, Salt Lake City, Utah

Washington Vice-President, PHILIP H. ZALESKY
2402½ Virginia Street, Everett, Washington

MEMBER CLUBS

ALPINEES, INC. Hood River, Oregon
ANGORAS Astoria, Oregon
BERKELEY HIKING CLUB Berkeley, California
CALIFORNIA ALPINE CLUB San Francisco, California
CASCADIANS Yakima, Washington
C.W.C. OUTDOOR CLUB Ellensburg, Washington
CHEMEKETANS Salem, Oregon
CONTRA COSTA HILLS CLUB Oakland, California
CRAG RATS Hood River, Oregon
DESOMOUNT CLUB Los Angeles, California
HOBNAILERS Spokane, Washington
INTER-MOUNTAIN ALPINE CLUB Richland, Washington
KLAHHANE CLUB Port Angeles, Washington
MAZAMAS Portland, Oregon
MT. BAKER CLUB Bellingham, Washington
MT. ST. HELENS CLUB Longview, Washington
MOUNTAINEERS, INC. Seattle, Washington
OBSIDIANS, INC. Eugene, Oregon
OLYMPIANS, INC. Hoquiam, Washington
O.S.C. MOUNTAIN CLUB Corvallis, Oregon
RAMBLERS, INC. Altadena, California
RIMROCK MOUNTAINEERS Coulee Dam, Washington
ROAMER HIKING CLUB Los Angeles, California
SAN ANTONIO CLUB Alhambra, California
SIERRA CLUB San Francisco, California
SPOKANE MOUNTAINEERS, INC. Spokane, Washington
TAMALPAIS CONSERVATION CLUB San Francisco, California
TRAILFINDERS Banning, California
TRAILS CLUB OF OREGON Portland, Oregon
J of O ALPINE CLUB Eugene, Oregon
WANDERERS Olympia, Washington
WASATCH MOUNTAIN CLUB Salt Lake City, Utah
WASHINGTON ALPINE CLUB Seattle, Washington
WY'EAST CLIMBERS Portland, Oregon

June 17, 1957

RECD JUN 20 1957

Honorable Gracie Pfost
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Pfost:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs requests that this statement, including the resolution below, passed at its last annual meeting in Spokane, Washington, September 1st, 2nd and 3rd 1956, be made a part of the record of the Hearing on H.R. 1960 and related bills to establish a National Wilderness System, scheduled for June 20th, 21st, 1957.

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs comprises some thirty mountaineering, hiking, "outdoor" and conservation organizations west of the Rocky Mountains, aggregating over twenty-five thousand members. This annual meeting was attended by delegates from the member clubs and by numerous individual members who participated in its business, including the unanimous approval of the following resolution:

> "RESOLUTION NO. 4 - WILDERNESS PRESERVATION BILL
> IT IS RESOLVED that, to give Congressional recognition and protection to the nation's wilderness areas, the Federation urges the creation of a National Wilderness Preservation System as proposed in the legislation introduced in the 84th Congress by Senator Hubert Humphrey and others in the Senate and by Representative John P. Saylor and others in the House."

I regret that it is not possible for an officer of the Federation to appear at the Hearing but we have asked Mr. Howard Zahniser, Executive Secretary of the Wilderness Society and Mr. David Brower, Executive Director of the Sierra Club, one of the constituent members of the Federation, to speak for us at the Hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Karl W. Onthank
President

KWO:mm

Mrs. Pfost. Does that conclude your presentation of your witnesses, Mr. Zahniser?

Mr. Zahniser. It does.

Mrs. Pfost. That leaves about two minutes to hear from Dr. Murie.

Dr. Murie. Madam Chairman, I have a statement written out which is fairly brief, and I would like to summarzie by saying that we think wilderness bill is representative of a trend in American social life. It began with the National Park Service long ago, which was organized by the Congress, and more recenly we feel that the trend is culminating in this public demand for wilderness. It is time Congress take note of that. What I would like to say is that is a summary of my paper.

We so often get confused between the administrative mechanics and the objective of people. I know that the people throughout the country with whom I have been in close contact for half a century are thinking of these things in a very personal way. They do not care whether a piece of America is a national park, a national forest, or a game preserve, they react to that piece of America as a country. That is the attitude of the people as distinct from these administrative ambitions and complexities. I would ask the committee to give particular attention to the human aspirations.

I have here a statement giving the philosophy of the

Wilderness Society as a whole, and all the people associated with it.

Some years ago I was invited by the Pacific University in Oregon to give a series of lectures. They asked me to talk on wild country as a national asset. That is a very broad philosophy. I would like, if possible, to have those lectures which were published in our magazine inserted as a part of my testimony today.

I shall not go into any detail on my brief report, but I would like to submit this for your consideration because I think this gives the philosophy of the people who are in favor of this wilderness preservation bill.

Mr. Metcalf. Reserving the right to object, I would like to examine it.

Mrs. Pfost. What page is the statement on?

Dr. Murie. They published the whole thing. It is three lectures. The titles give the content "God Bless America," "Let's Save Some of the Wild Country Around the World," and "Beauty and the Dollar Sign."

That summarizes our attitude toward wilderness.

Mrs. Pfost. You wish the entire pamphlet that you handed us made a part of the record?

Dr. Murie. I would like for it to be made a part of the record because it gives our philosophy and the philosophy of thousands of people in America who are now working for it.

Mr. Aspinall. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Lushin
1040am.

SRP00669

hin
:45 am
31-57
t & Ins
b on
Pub Lands

Mr. Murie. I realize the complexity of this. It is one of the difficulties that is nobody's fault, but we certainly do have a hard time to get ourselves heard. You will appreciate that, too.

I know that Members of Congress have much more work than they should be asked to do and I do not know the answer. That is just my feeling about it.

Mr. Thompson. I want to reserve the right to object to this pamphlet. We are talking about the Living Wilderness?

Mrs. Pfost. Yes, but it is perhaps not the same issue. This is filled with articles by Dr. Murie. I believe there are three sections; is that true?

Mr. Murie. Yes. I would like to explain that the rules of that lecture series were that it must be published so we devoted one number of our magazine to those lectures.

Mr. Saylor. I realize, Madam Chairman, that this will add something to the record. These articles have been written by the witness and they are not trying to attach some other statement and explain the philosophy of not only Dr. Murie but the people he represents.

I ask unanimous consent that it be included as a part of the record.

Mrs. Pfost. Is there objection?

Mr. Aspinall. I am reserving the right to object. I am not objecting, but I do not want to have any member of the Society anyplace complain about the cost of Government.

Mr. Thompson. He reserves the right to object?

Mrs. Pfost. Yes.

Mr. Thompson. I would like to ask some questions about this. However, I am reluctant to do this because Dr. Murie is from my State.

Mr. Aspinall. May I raise a point of order? We asked unanimous consent that they have half the time and the opponents half the time. The time has now expired for the proponents by at least six minutes.

Mrs. Pfost. That is true. We can settle this one unanimous consent request and then we will proceed. If we can obtain a commitment from the various members, we will give the opponents some additional time tomorrow to make up for this morning, I hope. We have certainly exceeded our time considerably.

Mr. Murie. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Thompson. Madam Chairman, can we withhold our reservation or right to object to this bill until we put this over?

Mrs. Pfost. Yes.

SRP00671

Mr. Thompson. I have an idea that since this has been published, it has been circulated more than the reports of this committee have been circulated.

Mrs. Pfost. The time of the witness has expired.

The first witness on the opposition side is Mr. William L. Berry, Chief, Division of Resources Planning, Department of Water Resources, State of California.

We apologize, Mr. Berry, for the delay. I know that you have a commitment on the Senate side and I am very sorry that we have held you here.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM L. BERRY
CHIEF, DIVISION OF RESOURCES PLANNING
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Berry. Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee,

I am William L. Berry, a registered civil engineer and Chief of the Division of Resources Planning of the Department of Water Resources of the State of California. I am appearing today on behalf of that Department and Mr. Harvey O. Banks, the Director of Water Resources. My remarks were prepared in consultation with the State Directors of Fish and Game and Natural Resources of the State.

Seven bills have been introduced in the 85th Congress proposing the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System. These bills provide that designated wilderness, roadless, and primitive areas in the national forests, designated national parks, certain water fowl management areas, and certain roadless areas in Indian reservations shall initially constitute the System. Areas within the System could be increased or modified by action of the Federal agency that has jurisdiction of the particular class of area. This action would automatically become effective unless vetoed by a resolution of one house of the Congress within the first 120 days in which Congress is in session after the administrative action has become final.

Of the seven bills now pending, six were introduced in the House of Representatives and one in the Senate. They are: H.R. 361, H.R. 500, H.R. 540, H.R. 906, H.R. 1960, H.R. 2162, and S. 1176. The purposes and procedures of all these bills appear to be substantially the same, although there are some differences in phraseology and approach. For purposes of discussion and suggested amendments, I will confine my remarks to H.R. 1960, although they will be equally applicable to any of the other bills with slight modifications.

Since the introduction of S. 4013 in the 84th Congress, the California State Department of Water Resources has consistently supported the principle that reasonable measures should be taken for the preservation of wilderness areas. We believe, however, that reasonable measures for the preservation of wilderness areas need not, indeed must not, conflict with vitally needed development of water resources. We are firmly of the opinion that measures for the conservation and preservation of one natural resource should not be so worked out as to impede or perhaps preclude the conservation of another natural resource, and especially one so vital as water.

As a Department concerned with the conservation of water resources, we must also be concerned with the conservation of other irreplaceable natural resources. The benefits of preserving wilderness areas cannot be doubted. The historic, scenic, educational, and recreational values of these areas are unique and constitute an important part of the heritage of the Nation and of California. Preservation of these areas will also make an

important contribution to water conservation. Many of the wilderness areas constitute the watersheds in which originate large amounts of the water supplies of the State. Preservation of these areas in their natural state prevents the rapid, destructive runoff that would occur from denuded watersheds and thus reduces the danger of flooding and erosion. Preservation of these watersheds in a natural state, in effect, increases the effectiveness of downstream reservoirs by holding back and regulating the runoff. It also protects the reservoirs from being filled with eroded silt and thereby lengthens their usefulness by many years.

Our Department has just completed the preparation of The California Water Plan, which has been published as our Bulletin No. 3. With the consent of the Committee I would like to now submit a copy of Bulletin No. 3 for your records.

Mr. Aspinall. I reserve the right to object and I shall object unless it is made a part of the file.

Mr. Berry. I am sure that this is not appropriate for the record.

Mrs. Pfost. You have heard the unanimous consent request. Is there objection?

This will be made a part of the file.

Mr. Saylor. Will you see to it that all members of this committee receive a copy?

Mr. Berry. I will be very happy to do that.

We are naturally deeply concerned as to the effect of any land use program, such as the proposed Wilderness Preservation System, on this Plan.

The preparation of The California Water Plan has involved a decade of study and the expenditure of more than eight million dollars. It is a master plan for the development of all of California's water resources to meet the ultimate water needs for all purposes, of a population estimated at three times the present total. The Plan includes 376 surface reservoirs with a storage capacity of approximately 51,000,000 acre-feet and thousands of miles of main and subsidiary conduits. The Plan, as presently outlined, is intended only as a framework for future water development and therefore is flexible and subject to revision. Such revisions will be made constantly to keep the Plan

in step with changing needs, techniques, technology, and economic conditions.

In evaluating the impact of the wilderness preservation proposals on the development of water resources in California, it must be kept in mind that The California Water Plan indicates only the probable key features that will be required for the expected growth and development of the State. Details as to location of units have not yet been fully worked out. Major reservoirs may have to be located upstream or downstream from the locations so far considered, and conduits, regulating reservoirs, and other works may be in considerably different locations after further study has been given to the problems presented. Such detailed planning can only be accomplished with profit shortly before the inception of a unit, utilizing the data that will then be available, and taking into consideration the then existing conditions, including costs.

In some cases, features of The California Water Plan must of necessity be physically located within areas proposed for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System; there are no feasible alternatives available. From a reasonable viewpoint, however, there is no necessary conflict between the two. With proper planning, operation, and maintenance, reservoirs can add to the beauty and recreational potential of these areas. Other features, such as conduits and tunnels, need leave scarcely a visible trace after the completion of construction. Proper planning, construction and operation would allow the integration of features of The California Water Plan into wilderness areas

with a minimum disturbance of natural conditions and with a maximum of added recreational value.

Among the restrictions included in Section 3(b) of H.R. 1960 is a provision, reading in part, that ". . . no portion of any area constituting a unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to . . . water diversion, water management practices involving manipulations of the plant cover, water impoundment or reservoir storage . . ." A careful review of the situation has convinced us that in its present form this provision is far too drastic and would seriously interfere with the effective and economic development of the water resources of California, and thus would have a severely detrimental effect upon the future growth and economy of the State.

As an example of the possible consequences of the present Section 3(b), the Rubicon Diversion must be located in the Desolation Valley Primitive Area; physically, it cannot be located elsewhere. This diversion is a necessary part of an important hydroelectric project planned for construction in the near future by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. Examples of other works contemplated by The California Water Plan which will probably be located within the wilderness system areas are: small reservoirs which may be required to supply water to Surprise Valley that will probably be located in the South Warner Wilderness Area; a tunnel in connection with the Feather River Project that will probably traverse the San Rafael Primitive Area; and a terminal storage reservoir that will probably be required in the Devil Canyon-Bear Canyon Primitive Area.

As a part of the recreational developments proposed under The California Water Plan, works to maintain stream flow to improve the fishery resources in many small tributary streams are planned. This program will require the construction of small reservoirs on the head waters of these streams, many of which will be located within areas proposed for inclusion in the wilderness system. Forty-four of these small head water reservoirs are now in operation in the national forests within the State, and an equal number are planned for early construction. These reservoirs store some of the snow melt high in the mountains for gradual release during the summer when the high, rocky stream beds would otherwise dry up. Reservoirs such as these, contemplated for construction in connection with The California Water Plan in wilderness areas, are built so as to harmonize with, rather than mar, the natural beauty. They offer a good example of planned, integrated development, for they will provide hundreds of miles of new summer and fall fishing streams, as well as water supplies for other wildlife. They also provide good water supplies for those camping, hunting, and fishing in these remote areas. Such developments would be impossible under the legislation now being considered. Attached to this statement is a resolution adopted on April 4, 1957, by the California Fish and Game Commission opposing the enactment of Wilderness Preservation Legislation and pointing out that such legislation would frustrate the program for stream flow maintenance reservoirs.

There can no longer be any question as to the vital importance of the development of water resources. Seen from a

reasonable viewpoint, however, these vitally needed developments are entirely compatible with a wilderness preservation plan. Properly planned reservoirs and controlled stream flow will produce recreational benefits which will far outweigh any impairment of the wilderness status of the areas involved. Opportunities will thus be provided for the enjoyment of the recreational potential by a far larger number of people.

It must be recognized that the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System as proposed would be a very sweeping and far-reaching measure. It would virtually freeze the land use status for millions of acres. Although we believe the effect of establishing such a System would be salutary, great care must be taken in framing legislation so as not to damage other vital interests, such as the development of water resources. Even in the outdoor recreation field, consideration should be given to all of the many recreational possibilities. Coordination of Federal, State, and local activities can produce greater recreational benefits. Full consideration must be given to all aspects of the problem including fire prevention and control, sanitary measures and the like.

Before enactment of a measure establishing a Wilderness Preservation System, I should like to recommend that you give consideration to holding hearings in various sections of the country to allow all those who might be affected to present their views. This could be accomplished either directly by Congressional committee or through the medium of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission such as that proposed in

SRP00680

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6691

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 5, 1957

Mr. REUSS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

A BILL

To authorize a ten-year program for acquiring national migratory-bird refuges and areas.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act
4 of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as
5 amended, is further amended to read as follows:
6 "All moneys received for such stamps shall be accounted
7 for by the Post Office Department and paid into the Treasury
8 of the United States, and shall be reserved and set aside as
9 a special fund to be known as the Migratory Bird Conserva-
10 tion Fund, to be administered by the Secretary of the In-
11 terior. There shall in addition be deposited into such Fund

1 all money received from the sale or other disposition of sur-
2 plus wildlife or of timber, hay, grass, or other spontaneous
3 products of the soil, shell, sand or gravel, or from oil or
4 minerals, or from other privileges on refuges established
5 under sections 715–715d, 715e, 715f–715k and 715l–715r
6 of this title or under any other law, proclamation, or execu-
7 tive order, administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service of
8 the United States Department of the Interior, less money
9 paid out to counties pursuant to section 715s of this title.
10 All moneys received into such fund are appropriated for
11 the acquisition, by purchase, lease (without being subject
12 to the limitation on improvements contained in Revised
13 Statutes, section 355, of June 28, 1930), condemnation or
14 otherwise, of suitable areas, in the United States or in
15 Canada, for migratory-bird management areas, refuges, res-
16 ervations, or breeding grounds, and shall be available there-
17 for until expended. The Secretary of the Interior shall
18 acquire such areas at such a rate as to add to the Federal
19 system as close to 400,000 acres a year as possible for each
20 of the ten years following fiscal 1957. If the sums herewith
21 made available shall in any year prove insufficient for this
22 purpose of acquisition, the Secretary of the Interior shall
23 so advise the Congress: *Provided,* That in the discretion of
24 the Secretary of the Interior not to exceed 50 per centum
25 at any one time, of any area acquired in accordance with

1 the provisions of sections 718–718h of this title, may be
2 administered primarily as a wildlife management area not
3 subject to the prohibitions against the taking of birds, or
4 nests or the eggs thereof, as contained in section 715i of
5 this title, except that no such area shall be open to the
6 shooting of migratory birds when the population of such
7 birds frequenting the area or in the migrations utilizing such
8 area is on a decline, nor prior to the date upon which the
9 same has been fully developed as a management area, refuge,
10 reservation, or breeding ground.

11 SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp
12 Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b),
13 as amended, is further amended by striking the words "two
14 dollars" and inserting the words "three dollars".

SRP00683

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6691

A BILL

To authorize a ten-year program for acquiring national migratory-bird refuges and areas.

By Mr. REUSS

APRIL 5, 1957
Referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

H.R. 3952, which was the subject of hearings before this committee last month. This recommendation is based in part on the fact that the areas proposed to be included initially in a Wilderness Preservation System are already protected to a considerable extent and a reasonable time for consideration would not harm the program.

With respect to the bills now before the committee, we have three suggestions for specific changes. As presently framed H.R. 1960 and the other bills would seriously hamper the vitally needed development of California's water resources. If, however, such vitally needed projects are excepted from the restrictions of these bills, this disasterous result can be avoided without impairing the purposes of the wilderness system. The following amendment is suggested to accomplish this end. On page 21 commencing at line 20 insert a new subsection 3(c) (5) reading as follows:

> "(5) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting or intended to prevent or interfere in any way with the use of those public lands within said National Wilderness Preservation System for the construction and operation of necessary water resource development projects and related facilities, including necessary access roads, if the construction and operation of such projects would otherwise be permissible under the laws of the United States."

If an amendment should not be adopted along the lines we have suggested exempting necessary water resource developments, the inclusion of the areas enumerated in H.R. 1960 could seriously impede future necessary development of California's water resources.

An even greater threat is posed in H.R. 1960 and the other bills by the possibility of adding vast tracts of land to the wilderness system by administrative action subject only to a

Congressional veto within a period of 120 days. We are, therefore, suggesting for consideration that the bill also be amended to require Congressional action to add areas to the System. This could be accomplished by the following amendment to H.R. 1960. Strike out the first sentence of the present subsection 2(f) on page 17, lines 8-19 of the bill and insert in its place the following:

> "Any addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be by act of Congress."

It would also be necessary in section 2(e) and other parts of the bill to change the authority of the administrative agencies to designate additional areas to an authorization for recommendations to the Congress. In addition to requiring Congressional action to enlarge the System, the affected states must be given advance notification concerning areas located within them which are recommended for inclusion. The primitive areas listed in Section 2(a) should be the subject for study and further recommendations in the System. These primitive areas include in California those most likely to impede water development.

This committee is very familiar with the serious problems concerning the validity of State water law that have been brought about by court decisions in recent years, and especially by the Pelton Dam decision (Federal Power Commission v. Oregon, 349 U.S. 435 (1955)). I am not a lawyer, and I will only talk generally about these legal problems. As I understand it, however, the Pelton Dam case may be a precedent for holding that State water law has no validity on reserved or withdrawn Federal land. Some agencies of the Federal Government interpret the

case that way, as evidenced by the refusal to comply with State law at the Hawthorne Naval Depot in Nevada. This committee held extensive hearings on these problems during the last Congress.

The bills now before you would include large areas of national forests and wildlife management land in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and would, in Section 2(e), provide for the addition of any other public land. The federal courts might well hold that land within such a System was reserved in the same sense as the land involved in the Pelton Dam case, that the Desert Land Act did not apply, and that State water law need not be followed. This problem would only be partially met by the amendments that have been suggested. To avoid any further impairment of State law, an amendment, utilizing the applicable language of H. R. 5871, 85th Congress, the "Western Water Right Settlement Act of 1957," is proposed. On page 24, line 18, of H. R. 1960, renumber section 5 and insert a new section 5 as follows:

> "Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and subject to existing rights, all unappropriated navigable and non-navigable ground and surface waters within the area of the National Wilderness Preservation System are reserved for appropriation and use of the public pursuant to State law, and rights to the use of such waters for beneficial purposes shall be acquired under State laws relating to the appropriation, control, use, and distribution of such waters: Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit any person or entity to acquire the right to store or divert waters in any National Park or Monument unless otherwise authorized by Act of Congress."

We are all very deeply interested in the progress of water development. I feel sure that you share my conviction that every effort should be made to reconcile necessary development of water resources with the preservation of wilderness areas. I hope

that the amendments that I have suggested may be a starting point for reaching an amicable solution that will be equitable to all interests.

Approved:

Harvey O. Banks
Director of Water Resources, State of California

Concur:

Seth Gordon
Director of Fish and Game, State of California

DeWitt Nelson
Director of Natural Resources, State of California

RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION, DATED APRIL 4, 1957, OPPOSING ANY FEDERAL LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD INTERFERE WITH THE PROPER MANAGEMENT OF WILDERNESS AREAS BY THE U. S. FOREST SERVICE

WHEREAS, Several bills have been introduced in the current session of Congress to create a "National Wilderness Preservation System". To date these bills are H.R. 361, 500, 540, 906, 1960 and 2162, 85th Congress, and would greatly curtail the authority of the United States Forest Service and other Federal land agencies in the management of these areas; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the California Fish and Game Commission opposes enactment of any one or all of the foregoing bills, or other bills of similar purpose, on the ground that such bills would fix by statute the boundaries of wilderness areas and preclude the administrative latitude now resting with the said Forest Service to establish and modify such boundaries. Under such legislation it is conceivable that wilderness areas might no longer be a part of the national forest system. This would be adverse to the public interest since the most important function of these high mountain areas is control of snow pack and water runoff, and the watersheds must at all times be managed as natural watershed units. Moreover, the said bills, if enacted, would frustrate the cooperative program by the said Forest Service and the California Department of Fish and Game under which many small check dams in the High Sierra have been built to store water and to maintain better summer flows for fish life and indirectly to better provide summer flow. This program could be stopped under this legislation even though the program is of great public interest and adds significantly to recreational values without hurting the wilderness environment; and further be it

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution, duly adopted by this Commission at Los Angeles, California, on April 4, 1957, be transmitted to each member of the California delegation in Congress.

- - - -

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Mr. Berry.

Mr. Westland. Mr. Berry, you mentioned a resolution passed by someone.

Mr. Berry. The Fish and Game Commission of the State of California.

Mr. Westland. Do you have a copy of that?

Mr. Berry. It is appended to ~~the copies~~ of my prepared statement which and before you.

Mrs. Pfost. Are there any further questions or comments?

Mr. Rhodes. I have one question.

Mr. Berry, as I understand your statement, you feel that this bill might fly in the face of the multiple use of public lands?

Mr. Berry. That is correct. We feel that all uses of lands and water should be given due consideration before decision is made.

Mr. Rhodes. Thank you.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much.

At this time, we will hear from Dr. Dixon, a Congressman from the State of Utah.

SRP00690

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HENRY ALDOUS DIXON,
A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. Dixon. Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the few minutes you have given me and I shall try to make my statement brief. I will make a brief summary of about five minutes and then ask for consent to revise and extend my remarks, which will not be more than four pages typewritten.

Mrs. Pfost. You have heard the request of the gentleman to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(The additional material and revisions mentioned are as follows:)

SRP00691

Mr. Dixon. I would also like to include a letter of opposition to this bill from the Governor of Utah, the Honorable George Dewey Clyde.

Mrs. Pfost. Without objection, the letter from the Governor will be included.

(The letter referred to follows:)

SRP00692

Acknowledged 6/27/57

1957

STATE OF UTAH
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
SALT LAKE CITY

GEORGE D. CLYDE
GOVERNOR

June 19, 1957

Honorable Gracie Pfost, Chairman
Sub-Committee on Public Lands of the House
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
House of Representatives
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pfost:

With reference to hearings by your Honorable Committee on HR-500 (Saylor), HR-906 (Reuss), HR-1960 (Metcalf), HR-361 (O'Hara of Illinois), HR-540 (Baldwin), HR-2162 (Miller of California), and HR-7880 (Porter), may I urge that you report unfavorably on this legislation for the following reasons:

1. The proposed legislation seeks to establish the principle that "The preservation of wilderness shall be paramount".

Such a theory is not only dangerous, it could well be disastrous. Many extensive areas of Utah will, by their very nature, remain primitive and wilderness areas but to seal up vast areas which hold great undeveloped resources would be economic folly and a travesty on the heritage of future generations. The conservation and wise use of Utah's water, mineral and grazing and recreational resources is at stake and the proposed legislation is of grave concern to my State. The resources of our great Nation determine our ability to meet national emergencies and maintain sound economic growth. Full development and multiple use of our resources for the benefit of the greatest number of our people must be our guiding principle.

2. The proposed legislation would impose another authority over those agencies presently responsible for administering public land areas and would contribute to impractical and inefficient land management.

An overlapping, inflexible super-administrative body is not the solution to recreation problems. The overall interests of the people of the Nation would not be served by a council whose members represent "Established National Organizations Interested in Wilderness Preservation".

3. The proposed legislation will not be in the national interest nor will it provide a sound approach to the preservation and use of our recreation resources.

A comprehensive survey and evaluation of present and future recreational resources as contemplated by HR-3592, the National Outdoor Recreation Review Commission, is a more desirable approach.

I, therefore, urge you to use all devices at your disposal to defeat this bill because it is extreme, dangerous and not in the national interest.

Yours sincerely,

GDC/deB

cc: Honorable Arthur V. Watkins
Honorable Wallace F. Bennett
Honorable William A. Dawson
Honorable H. Aldous Dixon

Mrs. Pfost. You may proceed, Dr. Dixon.

Mr. Dixon. In summary, my reasons for opposing this bill are as follows: First, that it destroys the multiple use concept of the use of public domain along the established principle that I refuse to destroy. In the second place, no one knows how many million additional acres may be added, without Congressional approval or without respect of the wishes of the legislatures or State irrigation laws. Third, the multiple use concept has stood the test of time and should be preserved. Fourth, the national forests and parks from the wilderness value standpoint are being protected, I think we have magnificent services doing that and then in the next place the bill only gives the control of these wilderness areas or continues the control to the people already in control of them. If they are not doing a good job, why give the same people the continuous control of it?

Then in the fifth place, I think it is incumbent upon the proponents of the bill to prove that these values are not being preserved as far as it is practically possible to have them preserved.

For these reasons, I do not think the bill is needed.

With regard to this multiple use concept, the miners want exclusive use of our public domain. Our lumber people

want exclusive use of our public domain. Our sheep men want exclusive use of our public domain. Our cattlemen want exclusive use of our public domain. Our sportsmen want exclusive use of our public domain. Our recreation people want exclusive use -- many of them -- and especially as has been testified, our people needing water.

In the State of Utah, all four of our rivers rise in a primitive area and they feed the entire population for culinary and other uses. There is a threat to the entire economy of the State,if this bill is passed, by anyone who had control of it and who wanted to exercise arbitrary use of it. We should not freeze these areas because the full values of these area resources are not known yet. In proof of this, we have just opened up one of the richest oil fields on the continent, the Anath Basin, which is quite a large area mostly on public domain. We have huge oil shale potentials that can be developed that might come in these areas. For example, take gilsonite and uraninum. I do not know what we would do for our defense effort if some of these areas were frozen. We cannot foresee what is going to happen and how we will need them.

Then, again, what is a wilderness area? Can we have a paved road in there with commercial enterprise along it? Can we have a dirt road with commercial enterprises or a

dirt road with none? Can we have a trail or can we even blaze a way through it on trees designated? Literally, that is a wilderness area. We can go to such a ridiculous extreme.

I have been in these wilderness areas in the middle fork of the Salmon. The only people who get there are the wealthy people who can go to dude ranches and hire a guide for $50 a day and enjoy it. That is not my idea of democracy. I have not been able to afford to get into this wilderness area and some states, like Wyoming, require you to have a guide and that is $50 a day.

This bill keeps the west unnecessarily wild because we have about 163, I think, total wilderness areas and 27 States east of the Mississippi only have 15. Then from the Mississippi to a line drawn down through Colorado, there are only ten States with 9. Then there are eleven western States with 129 of these wilderness areas, which we think is all out of proportion to what should be expected of the ten Western States.

In the seventh place, this measure could partially destroy the economy of our States by freezing our culinary water and such, by destroying our livestock industry, too. Over 60 per cent of our agricultural income comes from livestock and many of them range on wilderness areas. If you take the range away from the ranches down below then

you destroy the ranches. It seems utterly preposterous to consider, on the spur of the moment, anything as far-reaching and as damaging as this might be.

In the Engle Bill this committee saw the wisdom of limiting military withdrawals to 5000 acres. This present wilderness bill could sneak in huge areas and give the opponents only 120 days to stop them through Congressional legislation. You folks know how much of a chance anyone has to get laws through Congress in 120 days. There is a barrier there that makes this bill unworkable and it would threaten to do tremendous damage without our having time to protest or having recourse. This bill works just the opposite of the Engle Bill because that requires an Act of Congress. This committee passed it out. Before,you could take over 5000 acres of land for military reserves.

I thank you kindly, Madam Chairman, and Members of the Committee for this opportunity to appear.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Dr. Dixon, for your contribution.

Are there questions of Dr. Dixon?

Again, thank you, and you will be able to extend your remarks.

I have two statements, one from the Honorable Don Magnuson from the State of Washington in favor of the bill.

Without objection, his statement will be made a part of the record, as if read.

I also have a statement from Mr. Barratt O'Hara, from the Second District of Illinois. His statement will also be made a part of the record, without objection.

Mr. Rhodes. I am reserving the right to object. I would not object, but I think it would be better form to have the statements placed in that part of the record to which they refer.

Mrs. Pfost. I thank you, gentlemen.

I think that order should be used and the statements in favor will be placed at the beginning of the hearings where the other Members of Congress appeared.

Without objection, it will be handled in that manner.

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(The two statements referred to follow:)

SRP00699

In favor

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DON MAGNUSON BEFORE THE PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, June 21, 1957, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1960 AND SIMILAR LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

Mr. Chairman:

I appreciate this opportunity to present to the subcommittee these views on establishment of a national wilderness preservation system, as set forth in H.R. 1960 and a number of similar measures.

Such a system, Mr. Chairman, has become imperative if the remaining wilderness areas in our nation are to be kept for their highest and most beneficial use. A feature of this legislation which appeals to me is the fact that it would put into effect by specific law the preservation of areas which already, by administrative action, are withdrawn for wilderness purposes. These various areas in the national forests, the national parks and the wildlife refuges now are withdrawn from entry for purposes which would interfere with their wilderness state. There is a great deal of pressure to break down the administrative regulations now handled in a piecemeal fashion among the various federal agencies.

In my congressional district, the State of Washington, are some of the nation's finest scenic, recreational and wildlife areas. Two of the most outstanding national parks, Mt. Rainier and Olympic, are situated in my state. Sections of the rugged Cascade Mountains with wilderness still not entered by man are in the national forests of the state. There have been and will continue to be differing opinions between natural resource industries and those interested in preserving these wilderness areas. This legislation, I feel, offers an outstanding opportunity for the resolution of these conflicts on a basis which all interests may understand. Commercial activities are restricted in these areas now, and I see great benefits in the consolidation of the preservation programs under one set of rules, as called for in these bills.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, that the subcommittee give favorable consideration to this legislation. Thank you.

In favor

Mr. Chairman: I am Barratt O'Hara, Representative from the Second District Illinois. I am interested in the legislation you are now considering because: (1) I am co-sponsor of H.R. 361 to provide for wilderness preservation, and (2) large numbers of my constituents are actively interested in conservation and preservation of the wilderness. Last year when the Dinosaur National Monument was threatened by the Colorado River Project and again when the Witchita Mountains Wild Life Refuge was in danger of being taken over by the Army for a firing range, my office was deluged with letters of protest from my constituents.

We in the United States have learned from the sad experience of Europe the value of and need for Conservation. Statemen of the stature of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot have made conservation an American tradition. Recently, however, we have been so consumed by admiration for our own creations of concrete and steel as to lose sight of the values which are ours in the God-given wilderness. Unless we pause, take stock, and work out a positive program for wilderness preservation our great heritage, the American Wilderness, may be lost irrevocably to future generations.

The wilderness exists on various species of Federal lands, thanks to kind Providence and the foresight of statesmen of other generations: Those who measure values in terms of concrete and steel, profits and cash have, particularly in recent years, turned appraising eyes upon that wilderness not to measure its spiritual, health, and scientific values to our nation now and in the future, but rather to convert it into bank balances.

Those who are interested in conservation of that wilderness are worried. They see the pressure that is coming and realize that it is our duty to do something. Those areas that now constitute our National Wilderness must be secured. Some parts of America must always remain untrammeled by man, unspoiled by machines.

SRP00701

Today as never before we have need of the superlative values of the wilderness. We are fortunate in having large areas of wilderness which are federally owned. There are 50 national parks and monuments which have unspoiled areas large enough to be called wilderness, about twenty wild life refuges, eighty areas that have been designated by our Forest Service for protection of wilderness. There are in Indian Reservations 15 areas classified as roadless wilderness.

At present there are no Congressional enactments which protect such areas. Even in the National Parks and Monuments the pressure for roads, recreational and tourist developments threaten.

Alerted by conservationists among my constituents, among whom Dr. R. M. Strong, Chairman of the Conservation Council of Chicago, Mrs. Donn B. Moir, Mrs. Margaret M. Nice, one of America's great ornithologists, Mr. Raymond Mostek, Vice President of the Illinois Audobon Society to mention a few from a long list of nature lovers and scientists, I have, as co-sponsor, introduced H. R. 361.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide a positive program of wilderness preservation now and in the future. The legislation creates no new bureau . It requires no new lands. Its purpose is to insure existing wilderness areas in National Parks, forests and wild life refuges. Above all it contains provisions for orderly planning for future needs through a National Wilderness Preservation Council representing Congress, the departments and the lay citizen.

I am aware of the opposition to this legislation on the part of the Department of the Interior. I have read their statement covering almost eight pages of objections. However, it seems to me that these objections are directed against specific items which your Committee in its wisdom

SRP00702

and experience is in a position to consider carefully . In cases where you find such objections valid the legislation can be modified or amended.

There is on the other hand need for a positive program of wilderness preservation which only Congress can initiate. I thank you for the opportunity to present my testimony and I urge the enactment of H.R. 361.

Mrs. Pfost. We have been able to discuss the matter of hearings tomorrow morning and we have agreed upon three Members being present on each side. If we are able to have three Members on each side present tomorrow morning we will resume hearings at ten o'clock. Therefore, the proponents and the opponents both should appear here again tomorrow, who would like to be heard. The proponents consumed 31 minutes this morning and the opponents consumed 18 minutes. Tomorrow's time will be divided to take up further discussion of this bill and the time will be evened up so that the opposition, if they desire, may be heard an equal length of time.

Mr. Saylor. I ask unanimous consent that the four witnesses' statements -- three of whom are here -- be permitted to insert their statements in the record at this point as though read.

Mrs. Pfost. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Saylor. Yes.

Mrs. Pfost. Would the gentleman make a unanimous consent request to incorporate the statements of any witnesses who happen to be in the room who happen to be in opposition to the bill?

Mr. Saylor. Are there any other witnesses in opposition to the bill who desire to submit a statement?

Mrs. Pfost. First of all, we have the statement of

Mr. Radford Hall before the committee.

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Pomeroy?

Mr. Pomeroy. My name is Kenneth B. Pomeroy and I would like to appear later when you reconvene or have Mr. Craig, our editor,present our statement rather than to submit it without vocal presentation.

Mr. Rhodes. Madam Chairman, I have a statement which was given to me by Mr. Paul Jones, Chairman of the Travel Counsel of the Navajo Tribe. I would like the time to paraphrase it sometime tomorrow, if I may be allowed that privilege, and then submit the statement for the record as though read.

Mrs. Pfost. Do you not desire to make that a unanimous consent request?

Mr. Rhodes. No, just for information.

Mr. Dunn. My name is Paul M. Dunn and I am the Technical Director of Forestry for the St. Regis Paper Company. I wish to appear on behalf of the pulpwood, pulp, paper and paperboard Industries. However, I will not be able to appear in the morning and I would like to request my statement be included. Mr. Mosebrook Forester of the American Pulpwood Association will be present and present certain views at that time. That is, if there is a committee meeting.

Thank you.

Mr. Saylor. We have certain other witnesses who have indicated their desire to appear.

Mr. Salvati. My name is Raymond Salvati and I am with the American Mining Congress and I would like to submit our statement for the record.

Mr. Rule. Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Gordon W. Rule of the National Association of Engine~~Engineers~~ and Boat Manufacturers, Incorporated. I am the Washington Counsel for that organization. We are opppsed to certain specific provisions in the bill with respect to the creation of a system, as a whole, and we say that we do not, or will not know, until the Resources Review Commission, which your committee is studying, has made their study. We are opposed to certain provisions in the bill as it stands today.

Mrs. Pfost. Mr. Rule, will you be here tomorrow?

Mr. Rule. I am sorry I will not be. I promised to take my wife to the beach.

Mrs. Pfost. That is a perfectly legitimate reason and we will expect your statement for the record.

Mr. Abbott. Madam Chairman, I believe that there is a file for proponents and opponents. The statements or other

SRP00706

communications which the organizations have requested be made a part of the record might be made subject to examination by the committee.

Mrs. Pfost. Will counsel please withhold that?

I have the original copy showing those names and any other statements.

Are there any other people in the room who desire to have their statements made a part of the record?

Without objection, the statements of Mr. Radford Hall, Executive Secretary of the American National Cattlemen's Association; the statement of Mr. Paul M. Dunn, Technical Director of Forestry for the St.Regis Paper Company; the statement of W. Howard Gray, Chairman, American Mining Congress, and the statement of Joseph E.Choate of the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, Incorporated, will be made a part of the record as if read in full.

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statements referred to follow:)

Submitted by Gordon Rule

SRP00707

89-A

STATEMENT OF

Radford Hall, Executive Secretary

801 East 17th Avenue

Denver, Colorado

American National Cattlemen's Association

WITH RESPECT TO HR 1960
and related bills

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

June 20-21, 1957

The American National Cattlemen's Association was organized in 1898. It is a voluntary association of commercial cattlemen and cattlemen's associations. Twenty-eight state cattlemen's associations are affiliated in the American National.

In January the American National Cattlemen's Association held its 60th Annual Convention in Phoenix, Arizona. During that convention the following resolution was approved without a dissenting vote:

RESOLUTION NO. 20
Wilderness Preservation System

WHEREAS, S. 4013 and H.R. 11703 if enacted would establish a National Wilderness Preservation System covering and setting aside many, many thousands of acres of federal lands to the exclusion of all private or economic use in productivity; and

WHEREAS, This would represent a serious step backward from the multiple use principle in management of federal lands; therefore be it

Resolved, That we oppose this type of legislation and recommend S. 4013 and H.R. 11703 be not enacted into law.

NOTE: Bills mentioned in this resolution refer to the 84th Congress.

This resolution was approved in general session of the convention following a detailed study of the matter by the staff and officers of the Association, a thorough and complete discussion in the Public Lands Committee meeting and further consideration by the Resolution Committee of the Association.

We sincerely believe that the enactment of this negative legislation for a number of reasons would not be in the best interests of the nation. We believe it would be a serious blow to the economic development of the states in which the lands that would be involved are situated.

It is our firm belief also that it would not even serve the purposes for which it is supposedly intended. Rather, it would serve only the selfish interest of a very minute segment of our citizenry.

It would also hamper the sound, proper and efficient administration of these lands by the public agencies now charged with that responsibility.

This proposed legislation, if enacted into law, could seriously affect the defense of our nation.

True conservation should not mean neglect and waste such as this legislation would encourage.

The great bulk of the lands under consideration in this legislation are located in the eleven western states which are to a considerable extent still in the process of attaining full economic development. Much time and effort has been spent on the perfection of the multiple use principle of obtaining maximum economic benefits for all concerned from the natural resources of the area. The principle industries involved -- grazing, mining, lumbering, irrigation, and recreation -- have each been attempting to integrate their needs with those of the others. They have attempted to understand the problems of other industries and to adapt their operations so that all may have their fair share of the values these lands are capable of producing.

Now comes this effort on the part of a selfish few to scuttle these efforts and forever lock up all the other resources in order that the visionary values placed by some people on "unspoiled nature" shall be available to them and them only.

This proposal is ostensibly for the "public" benefit. Gentlemen, I ask you, who is the "public"? We believe it to be the 171 million people in the United States. We believe it includes the New Yorkers who eat "western beef", the Chicagoans who have houses built of western pine, the Pennsylvanians who drive cars made with western metals regardless of whether they ever take a hiking or horseback trip into a western wilderness or not.

We believe the protection of the stockpile of atomic bombs is more important to the great majority of the people on the East Coast than is the fact that a certain hillside in Wyoming has never heard the ring of the woodsman's axe or the putt-putt of a jeep engine.

The advocates of this legislation have told us that they want to "save" these areas in a primeval state for posterity. Do you believe that future generations will be any more interested in forsaking all modern conveniences and protections to strike off into completely undeveloped wilderness than is this generation?

The tourist business is one of great importance to the western states, and is growing each year. Why is it growing? Is it because there are more horses in the mountains to carry visitors up where they can pitch a tent and it would take a doctor several days to get to them in case of sickness or accident?

A short time ago an airplane crashed in what would make a good wilderness area in Wyoming. A man and wife were in the plane. After 4 or 5 days the man died. The woman remained with his body for 19 days before a rancher seeking livestock spotted the plane and she was rescued alive. If that had been a wilderness area, as proposed by this legislation, there would have been no livestock to be searched for and no rancher searching and a woman would have died in a "beautiful unspoiled wilderness".

Very few tourists want to "enjoy such unspoiled pleasures".

The tourist business is growing in the West because the mountains and plains are being "cut up and despoiled" by safe modern paved highways lined by hotels, motels and resorts that furnish every modern convenience obtainable in the finest eastern hotels. Even the "typical mountain cabin" of just a few years ago is now becoming quite generally equipped with inside plumbing, electric lights, and bottled gas cook stoves.

There are still quite a few who want to rough it -- but just how rough do they want it? If they want it as rough as this legislation would indicate, you gentlemen in Congress are surely wasting millions of dollars building recreational facilities in the National parks and National forests.

We don't believe you are. We believe most of the hardy souls who want to "camp out" still prefer to be able to drive to the camp. They appreciate the sanitary facilities, the fireplaces, the picnic tables and other conveniences provided by the government agencies.

Please ponder for a moment on how many of you or your friends and acquaintances want to rough it to the extent of riding a horse or walking back into a country where there are no roads, no telephones, no ranch homes, absolutely no conveniences, where there are no residents to look to for help in case of sickness or accident. It is for those few who do want to forsake everything that the modern world offers that this legislation is proposed. We submit that they are only a minute fraction of even the tourists of the nation.

We believe this legislation would also defeat its avowed purpose by placing a huge stumbling block in the path of those government agencies charged with the protection and maintainance of these areas.

We are certain that all of you are aware of the fact that many forest bush and grass fires are started by lightening. You all know that the more remote those fires are, the more damage they are apt to do. The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have spent tremendous sums building fire roads so as to be able to more quickly reach such fires, and they also make use of access roads and trails built by stockmen, lumbermen, miners and others. Yet here we have a proposal to deliberately isolate millions of acres from that protection and to subject them from the grave danger of having not only the beauty but the economic values destroyed by fire while the agencies charged with their protection stand helplessly by for lack of access roads.

In one instance in Wyoming a fire road into the forest was deliberately blocked by huge boulders and bridges were sliced in half to prevent jeeps from entering a "wilderness area". Obviously no thought was given to the possible need for that road to protect the valuable forest in that wilderness area.

To be efficient in the administration of these areas, the agency in charge must have freedom of action and simply must not be tied down and hamstrung by restrictive legislation such as proposed.

This legislation would not only hamper efforts to fight fires, but it would also greatly increase the fire hazards. The wise cutting of timber and proper use of the grass crop removes the greatest potential for a serious fire.

Tall dry grass burns like tinder and spreads a fire as though it were intended for that very purpose.

A few years ago Camp Carson was established as a military base near Colorado Springs, Colorado, and grazing of livestock was discontinued. After a year or two of non-use, a fire occurred and witnesses said the long dry grass exploded like dynamite. Several soldiers were killed in the effort to control that fire. Other examples can be cited of disastrous fires that have occurred in ungrazed areas in the Custer State Park in the South Dakota Black Hills and the non-grazing areas of the Salt Lake City, Utah, watershed. Proper utilization of grass reduces the fire hazard the same as cleaning combustible trash out of a basement as insisted upon by all good fire departments.

Wise lumbering also keeps forests healthy. Trees, like all living things, are more vigorous when young and growing. More long-lived than most things, trees reach a maturity and then go into decline. At that point they either must be cut or they become a progressively greater liability. Old trees are more subject to attack by insect pests and plant disease. Witness the havoc wrecked on the formerly beautiful White River National Forest in Colorado. Congress found it necessary to appropriate millions to control the beetles that turned that forest into a shamble. Thousands of acres of dead tree trunks stand as mute testimony to the fact that a healthy forest is a young, growing forest. Forestry experts tell us that the beetle attacks principally old over-ripe trees and that this forest was over-ripe.

A few years ago we were told by the Director of Markets for the City of New York that few people in that city were interested in the wildlife or scenery of the western mountains because only a few were able to make the trip west to view them, but he said virtually everyone of them is vitally interested in the quantity, quality and price of beef and lamb produced and sent to New York from them.

SRP00713

Also we submit to you with full confidence that you will agree that the average tourist thoroughly enjoys the sight of a herd of whiteface mother cows quietly grazing on a mountain meadow with their playful frisky calves. We sincerely believe that livestock grazing adds to the beauty and enjoyment of the tourist.

Had this proposed legislation been enacted several years ago, much of the Four Corners region where Utah, Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico join, would very likely have been included in a "wilderness area", forever closed to "exploitation" by miners, for at that time it was just about as much of a wilderness as could be imagined.

Yet that is the area from which has come the material for the stockpile of atomic weapons which now stands between this country and possible complete annihilation of the entire population.

Who knows what lays before us? Who knows what research and exploration will develop in the future?

Gentlemen, we are living in a world that is moving too fast, changing too fast that we can afford for you to lay the dead hand of such negative legislation on such a large area of a growing nation.

# # # #

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF
THE AMERICAN PULPWOOD ASSOCIATION
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
IN OPPOSITION TO HOUSE BILLS NOS.
361, 500, 906, 1960, 2162, and 7880

June 20th-21st, 1957

I am Paul M. Dunn, Technical Director of Forestry for the St. Regis Paper Company, and a member of the American Pulpwood Association's Committee on Forest Management, but speaking here as representative of the pulpwood, pulp, paper and paperboard industries as a whole. The American Pulpwood Association is composed of pulpwood producers, dealers, consumers of pulpwood and others directly or indirectly concerned with the growing and harvesting of pulpwood - the principal material used in the manufacture of paper and paper products. All members of this Association are vitally concerned with the utilization of the commercial forest resources to be found on Federal lands and believe that these lands should be managed under the principle of multiple-use. The headquarters of this Association is at 220 East 42nd Street, New York City.

We are grateful for this opportunity to present our views in opposition to bills before this Subcommittee which would establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, but we would also strongly urge that this Subcommittee give due consideration to holding hearings in the West where the economy would be seriously affected by this legislation. In opposing a National Wilderness Preservation System, I should like to make it clear that our industry recognizes and supports a national policy of protecting and preserving wilderness areas for the enjoyment of the American people where such use constitutes the predominant

value. We will continue to support a national wilderness policy which will protect, preserve and maintain those areas predominantly valuable for that purpose, at the same time having due regard for the use of other resources, such as timber, minerals, water, and opportunities for mass recreational use which may be needed by our growing population. Decision as to the predominant use of each area should be made after an impartial consideration of all the resources present, all uses and all users. We do object to setting up a "preservation system" on the basis of boundary lines drawn up years ago, many of them wholly inconsistent with reality because of lack of proper survey or classification at the time they were drawn.

I should like to outline briefly why this industry feels that the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System as proposed in the legislation before you would not be consistent with sound wilderness policy in which wilderness values can be fully appraised against other values in the light of ever changing economic conditions:

A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM IS NOT NECESSARY

These bills would blanket into a Wilderness Preservation System, perpetually for all practical purposes, against roads and all other commercial uses, almost all of the national parks, many national monuments, the primitive, wilderness, wild and roadless areas within the national forests, many wildlife and game refuges, and some Indian reservation wilderness areas. It is possible that a maximum of almost 54 million acres could be blanketed into a Wilderness Preservation System immediately under this legislation. The great bulk of this area is in the western states and Alaska,

areas economically dependent upon the maximum use of all resources. There is no accurate estimate available as to the amount of resources, including timber, which would be "frozen" in these areas and seriously retard further industrial development of the western states and Alaska. The legislation is inconsistent in that it would permit the continuation of many activities presently being carried on in these areas, and at the same time require the administering agency to see that the areas in the system under its jurisdiction remain wilderness areas. This makes it appear that many of these areas to be blanketed into a Wilderness System should not be classified as wilderness at all.

The proposal to create a National Wilderness Preservation System and a National Wilderness Preservation Council is not only unnecessary, but it is unwise. It implies a criticism of the administration of wilderness areas by the respective agencies in the Interior and Agriculture Departments. The national forests have been governed on the principle of multiple-use and sustained yield of products and services for the greatest possible number of people - a principle to which my industry heartily subscribes.

Wilderness areas have been established in the national forests where wilderness values are predominant to other uses. The important thing is that the Forest Service has been able to exercise administrative elasticity and to revise its wilderness policies and areas as changing times and conditions have dictated.

Of key importance is the fact that the Forest Service has never granted special rights to one category of use or user. In our opinion the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System would grant special privileges to a small group of national forest users, the wilderness enthusiasts, who are less than one percent of the recreational public.

What has happened to national forest wilderness areas under the Forest Service? Although sizeable boundary adjustments have been made as economic conditions have changed, the Forest Service reports that there is a net increase of 65,376 acres of wilderness administered by that agency since the wilderness regulations were established in 1939. A total of 14 million acres set aside as wilderness areas in the national forests demonstrate a recognition by the Forest Service of a continuity of policy and purpose in the protection and preservation of lands for wilderness use.

Our industry believes that evaluation of national forest wilderness areas should be continuously made and local hearings called in the areas affected to assure that wilderness values in areas so classified remain the dominant use.

National parks and monuments comprise those areas which are of such superlative scenery, natural and historic values that they are of national importance to all our people. They are managed on the principle that they shall be handed over to future generations "unimpaired," but actually the organic National Park Service Act of 1916 offers nearly as much flexibility in managing recreation resources as the multiple-use principle of Forest Service administration.

Changes in the national park boundaries can be made only by Congress and you are well aware that proposals to build dams in national parks have recently met with strong opposition by the public and in the Congress. The Park Service has devoted considerable attention to preserving the natural character and wilderness aspects of the national parks and at the same time to bring people into them for their enjoyment.

Wildlife refuges and roadless and wild areas within Indian reservations are now administered under regulations by the Secretary of Interior. Indian reservations, which are the property of the

Indians themselves and administered in trust by the Federal Government, contain many valuable resources which are utilized for the economic betterment of the American Indian. A proposal to freeze further economic utilization of these resources, even with their consent, shows little concern for the economic well being of these American citizens. The only equitable solution as far as the Indians are concerned would be for the Federal Government to purchase these lands from the Indians. We would be absolutely opposed to this on the basis that far too much land and resources are already owned and controlled by the Federal Government.

The administration of wilderness areas under regulations of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior and under various Acts of Congress has provided a degree of flexibility and continuity of purpose to give us confidence in the continuing management of wilderness areas by Executive agencies without establishing a Commission to ride herd on them.

IT WOULD ELIMINATE THE MULTIPLE-USE MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS

Under the terms of this legislation all commercial use of wilderness areas would eventually be eliminated without any regard for the people and communities dependent upon proper utilization of the resources found in these areas. Practically every wilderness area contains timber, water, minerals and other resources, and the combination of uses which will yield the highest net returns, benefits and services has to be determined for each individual area based on a thorough and impartial study of the pertinent facts. Under a Wilderness Preservation System, wilderness areas would tend to perpetuate themselves regardless of whether they were wisely selected in the first place or whether changing conditions would make a different evaluation necessary.

The pulpwood, pulp, paper and paperboard industries depend upon wood as their chief raw material. The consumption of pulpwood in this Country increased 267 percent since the close of World War I and is expected to increase another 84 percent in the next twenty years. Although we have been getting only 9 percent of our pulpwood from government forest lands over the whole United States but 16 percent in the West, we believe that all federal forest lands in the future must provide a greater share of our raw material. We favor a multiple-use management for the national forests where dominant uses can be reviewed from time to time after adequate inventories and classifications of land have been made to determine whether adjustments are needed.

Under this legislation a National Wilderness Preservation Council would be created. We maintain that it would be just as equitable to establish a Federal Timber Users Council to make sure we get enough timber from Federal forests or a Grazing Council or a Water Users Council. Certainly the forest resources of this Nation contribute as much or more as wilderness to the economic well-being of this Nation.

It has been estimated that 99 percent of all the people who hunt, fish, picnic or look at scenery never get into wilderness areas. In 1955 there were 45½ million visits to the national forests for recreational use - expected to climb to 66 million in 1962 and 100 million by 1975. The Forest Service has "Operation Outdoors" and the Park Service has "Mission 66" to develop these mass recreational opportunities. In our opinion these mass recreational users present a greater threat to wilderness areas than timber or grazing or any other use of these areas.

My industry recognizes the need of the public for recreational areas in the forest and is providing these opportunities on company-owned lands. Locking up vast areas of land permanently in a wilderness system will serve to intensify the pressures on other areas for recreational use. Only a flexible system geared to meet these new conditions can deal with such a problem.

ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION FOR WILDERNESS AREAS SHOULD REMAIN WITH THE EXECUTIVE

The Wilderness Preservation System legislation proposes setting up a National Wilderness Preservation Council. This would establish a potential bottleneck in the matter of additions, deletions or management of wilderness areas. Such a mode of operation would prove cumbersome and ineffective for the agencies administering such areas under existing Acts or regulations. In practice such a Council would either be totally ineffective or over a period of time would assume broader powers and act as a very effective lobby to get additional wilderness areas set aside and to resist changes in administration.

The preservation of wilderness values is not solved simply by setting aside areas into a wilderness system and prohibiting building of roads or commercial utilization of resources. Fire, insects, disease and windthrow are not only a constant threat to wilderness values, but these destructive forces may also spread to adjoining public or private forest areas. Legislation isn't going to solve this problem - indeed legislation of this type would only make it worse by denying the administering agency the lattitude of administrative judgment necessary to cope with such problems. If we set aside wilderness areas that are too large without any access and with little regard for re-examination from time to time, we may find enormous wilderness values may be destroyed by the forces

of nature, and along with them other resources of great value which our economy needs. This is a terrific cost and a risk we can ill afford to take.

We believe it would be contrary to the public interest to interpose a National Wilderness Preservation Council between the Congress and the Executive agencies. Why should six citizen members of the Council "known to be informed regarding, and interested in the preservation of, wilderness" and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution sit between the Congress and the Executive agencies in the administration of wilderness areas? This Council would not function in a purely advisory capacity, but would tend to assume ever-increasing powers over a period of time.

AN INVENTORY OF OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES AND NEEDS HAS NOT BEEN MADE

Legislation is still pending before this Subcommittee to establish a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. This Commission would undertake an inventory of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities. No such inventory or over-all appraisal has ever been made. The Wilderness Preservation System legislation proposes to freeze large areas into a perpetual wilderness system without regard for the future needs for this type of resource or other resources found in wilderness areas.

Although such a vast system of wilderness areas, almost 54 million acres, would be economically unsound at any time, further inventory and appraisal of the values of all resources should be made by the Executive agencies to guide them in future plans and programs for wilderness and other recreation areas. The establishment of a huge National Wilderness Preservation System without adequate inventory and land classification study would be haphazard and injurious to the future economic development of this Country.

CONCLUSION

The pulpwood, pulp, paper and paperboard industry is opposed to legislation establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System which would benefit only a handful of American citizens who are hardy enough to hike into wilderness areas, and at the same time retard the economic utilization of many badly needed resources. This legislation constitutes a "single purpose" and a "special privilege" for these few users at the expense of other citizens. Wilderness areas are necessary for the preservation of wilderness values, but the size and management of these areas should be determined by policies which are flexible enough to meet changing economic conditions. The multiple-use management of Federal lands is the most equitable to all uses and users of these lands.

There is nothing fundamentally wrong with the present method of administration of wilderness areas by Executive agencies. The most outstanding of these areas are already encompassed within the National Park system where they are adequately protected from other uses and subject to major change only with the approval of Congress. The Forest Service has a good record of administration of the national forests for multiple-use, with due consideration given to wilderness values when these values are paramount to all other resources. The administration of federal lands should always be flexible enough to make allowances for changing conditions. The legislation before this Subcommittee would for all practical purposes freeze nearly 54 million acres in permanent wilderness areas and at the same time hamper efficient management of these areas by the Executive agencies.

Thank you for the privilege of presenting the views of this industry in opposition to legislation establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System.

91

AMERICAN Mining CONGRESS

RING BUILDING
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

PRESIDENT
HOWARD I. YOUNG

VICE PRESIDENTS
WORTHEN BRADLEY
ANDREW FLETCHER
RAYMOND E. SALVATI

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY
JULIAN D. CONOVER

DIRECTORS
HORACE M. ALBRIGHT New York, N. Y.
JOEL M. BOWLBY Cincinnati, Ohio
WORTHEN BRADLEY San Francisco, Calif.
LOUIS S. CATES New York, N. Y.
GEORGE J. CLARK Pottsville, Pa.
CHARLES H. COX New York, N. Y.
RUDOLPH T. ELSTAD Duluth, Minn.
ANDREW FLETCHER New York, N. Y.
GEORGE B. HARRINGTON Chicago, Ill.
JACK H. HOW San Francisco, Calif.
HERBERT C. JACKSON Cleveland, Ohio
L. RUSSELL KELCE Kansas City, Mo.
GEORGE H. LOVE Pittsburgh, Pa.
O. S. McBRIDE Philadelphia, Pa.
F. S. MULOCK Boston, Mass.
CHARLES J. POTTER Indiana, Pa.
L. J. RANDALL Wallace, Idaho
RAYMOND E. SALVATI Huntington, W. Va.
MERRILL SHOUP Colorado Springs, Colo.
HARRIES TAYLOR Cleveland, Ohio
WALTER A. WECKER Chicago, Ill.
CLYDE E. WEED New York, N. Y.
J. F. M. WILSON Columbus, Ohio
GUY V. WOODY Milwaukee, Wis.
HOWARD I. YOUNG St. Louis, Mo.

June 20, 1957

House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee
1324 House Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Re: National Wilderness Preservation System

Gentlemen:

The American Mining Congress, a national organization composed of both large and small producers of all metals and minerals mined in the United States, wishes to register its opposition to pending measures which would establish a "National Wilderness Preservation System" on the public lands of the United States.

The mining industry, meeting in Los Angeles, California in October of last year, adopted a Declaration of Policy which reads in part as follows: "We oppose the withholding of public domain lands from mining location * * * We consider as unwarranted any withdrawals precluding mining development on large areas even though undemonstrated objectives thereof may have been documented as defense or conservation."

This same policy statement made it clear that the mining industry is firmly behind the system established by the general mining laws for the location and patenting of mining claims as the means of encouraging and providing for development of the mineral resources of the public domain through private initiative and enterprise.

The pending measures, which have as their objective the creation of a permanent National Wilderness Preservation System, are contrary to the principles long espoused by the mining industry and are in contradiction of those principles, carried out by intrepid prospectors, which have furthered the development of our Western States. The great natural resources of the Western States formed the foundation for the development of the industrial and agricultural economies of those States and have made possible their rapid growth and progress over the years. Any measure which would deter further mineral development through the curbing of the ardor of the prospector would result in a great disservice not only to the Western States but to the Nation as a whole.

We in the mining industry cannot understand why legislation is believed to be required to provide for the creation of wilderness areas and for their extension through the acquisition of other areas when such power

already resides within the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. This power in the past has been confined to activities in national parks, monuments and forests and has been respected and upheld by the mining industry. Those wielding the administrative authority have, for the most part, recognized that mineral development, particularly in our national forests, has been a necessity to the further development and utilization of our natural resources. We see no reason why this situation should be changed at this date.

Congress throughout the years has made it clear that mining on the public domain was to be encouraged in order that the resources of the public domain might be fully developed for the benefit of the Nation as a whole. Thus, the incentive for prospecting, exploration, development and mining through the assurance of ultimate private ownership of the minerals and lands so brought into economic development has been recognized by Congress since 1872. Under existing laws, a prospector may go out on the public domain, locate a mining claim, search out its mineral wealth and, if discovery of minerals is made, can then obtain a patent to those lands. That property, upon the issuance of a patent, becomes the individual's, to develop or sell according to his initiative or desire. Without such an incentive the future development of mineral resources on the public domain is likely to wither on the vine.

We submit that the pending measures are neither in the public interest nor would they result in the development of industrial enterprises necessary to the future progress of our Western States.

Section 3(b) of the bills now before you states as follows: "No portion of any area constituting a unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to commodity production, to lumbering, prospecting, mining or the removal of mineral deposits (including oil and gas), grazing by domestic livestock (other than by animals in connection with the administration or recreational, educational, or scientific use of the wilderness), water diversions, water management processes involving manipulation of the plant cover, water impounded on reservoir storage or to any form of commercial enterprise except as contemplated by the purposes of this Act."

So far as the mining industry is concerned, this provision constitutes the heart of the measures before you. This section would prevent any prospector from setting foot upon any wilderness areas authorized by the Act. The development of untold mineral assets necessary for the economic well-being of the Nation, or for the advancement of science requisite for national defense, could be denied by such a law.

Another provision in the measures now pending would require the Federal Government to institute a program to reacquire, by "agreement", the vested rights of those who now hold such rights in wilderness areas or future wilderness areas. No doubt the implication of these measures also, is that the Federal agencies, by denying means of ingress or egress or by setting up permit systems for roads, access to water, use of timber or other such practices, could make life so miserable for those private citizens now holding lands within the wilderness areas that they might be forced to divest themselves of those rights, hard-earned though they might have been, to the Federal Government.

The Congress of the United States over the past several years has made plain its intent and has explicitly required the encouragement of the multiple use and development of the natural resources of our public domain lands. It specifically set forth this objective in Public Law 585 of the 83rd Congress, and further reiterated its belief in these principles in Public Law 167 of the 84th Congress. Your Committee itself, no longer than two years ago, in reporting on what later became Public Law 167, stated in its report, "Historically, the Federal Mining Law has been designed to encourage individual prospecting, exploration, and development of the public domain." Your Committee further expressed its interest in the development of legislation and regulations thereunder which would operate "to encourage mining activity on our vast expanse of public lands compatible with utilization, management and conservation of surface resources." The Senate Committee, also, significantly stated:

> "The broadest possible use of all of the resources of our public lands and forests for the benefit of the American people is a matter of great national import. The rapidly expanding population and economy of our Nation and of the Western States in particular, have been accompanied by an ever-growing need for more general and more intensive use of our natural resources. The high tempo of our housing industry has brought about heavy demands for timber; stock growers need more grazing area to meet the increasing consumption of meat, leather and wool; our mining industry is under the constant necessity of exploring for and developing additional sources of new and old minerals to meet the ever-increasing requirements of our national security and industrial economy; and our growing population requires expanded recreational areas.
>
> "Conflict between surface and subsurface uses of our publicly owned lands is as old as the West itself, where most of the remaining public domain lies. Surface uses include stock grazing, forestry, soil-erosion control, watershed purposes, fish and wildlife preservation, and recreational areas. The subsurface use is that of development of the minerals that have been a basis for our great industrial and economic development.
>
> "As long as there was plenty of land that could be dedicated to each use, separately, the results of conflicts between surface and non-surface uses were generally local and minor in character.
>
> "However, in recent years our security needs, the growth of our population, and the expansion of our economy have brought about a situation in which it is no longer in the national interest that the public domain should be used for one of the uses to the exclusion of the other."

We do not see how your Committee, which has so clearly expressed its conviction that multiple use of our natural resources on the public domain is of prime national interest, could approve the measures now pending before you.

We in the mining industry are unalterably opposed to the "locking up" of natural resources of any kind from development for the public good.

We believe that the future of the Nation, and of the Western States in particular, lies in continued development of these resources. For these reasons and those cited before, we urge you to disapprove the measures now pending before you which would establish a public system devoted to "National Wilderness Preservation" and would prevent development of those areas now open for mineral location.

Very respectfully yours,

Public Lands Committee
AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS

W. Howard Gray

W. Howard Gray, Chairman
Ely, Nevada

SRP00727

NATIONAL ASS'N of ENGINE and BOAT MFR'S, Inc.

420 LEXINGTON AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
OREGON 9-4888

RALPH G. KLIEFORTH, PRESIDENT
FRED L. HEWITT, JR., 1ST VICE PRESIDENT
CLYDE C. WILLIAMS, 2ND VICE PRESIDENT
LEON E. TRAVIS, TREASURER
JOSEPH E. CHOATE, SECRETARY

June 20, 1957.

(Submitted by Mrs. Gordon Rule)

Hon. Gracie Pfost, Chairman
Subcommittee on Public Lands
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
House of Representatives, U. S.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Pfost:

Thank you for your letter dated June 4, 1957 concerning the hearings to be held on June 20 and 21 by your Subcommittee on H R. 1960, and related bills, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System.

The National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, Inc. is a non-profit trade association incorporated in 1904 (under the laws of the State of New York) for the purpose of promoting the interests of its members as manufacturers of pleasure boats, engines and motors, and all kinds and types of gear and accessories that go on or in pleasure boats. Today, we have 335 member firms, all of which are in some way connected with recreational boating in the United States. We are the only national association representing all types of boat builders and engine manufacturers, i.e., inboard and outboard, sail, canoes, etc. Between meetings of the Board of Directors, our Association functions under a Committee system and this statement has been approved by the Legislative Committee.

The National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, Inc. appears here today in opposition to two specific provisions contained in H.R. 1960. Both provisions relate to the use of motorboats in the areas to be included in the System.

These two provisions are as follows:

Sec. 3 (b), line 7, page 20:

"Within such areas, except as otherwise provided in this section and in section 2 of this Act, there shall be no road, nor any use of motor vehicles, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft, nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any structure or installation in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 3 (c), line 21, page 20:

"Within national forest areas included in the System grazing of domestic livestock and the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become

well established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Chief of the Forest Service deems desirable. Such practices shall be recognized as non-conforming 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."

The first of these provisions seems to be an absolute prohibition against any new use of motorboats in the wilderness areas, while the second obviously would be a mandate from the Congress to eliminate those already in the areas as soon as possible.

Insofar as the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture is concerned, there is in effect now a regulation concerning motorboats in wilderness areas as follows:

Reg. U-1 (b) dated November 1955 (Title 36, CFR, § 251.20)

"(b) Grazing of domestic livestock, development of water storage projects which do not involve road construction, and improvements necessary for the protection of the forest may be permitted subject to such restrictions as the Chief deems desirable. Within such designated wildernesses when the use is for other than administrative needs and emergencies the landing of airplanes and the use of motorboats are prohibited on national forest land or water unless such use by airplanes or motorboats has already become well established and the use of motor vehicles is prohibited unless the use is in accordance with a statutory right of ingress and egress." (Emphasis added)

There is no comparable regulation in effect with respect to the National Parks and thus, as to those National Park areas to be included in the System, the motorboat prohibitions contained in H.R. 1960 would constitute new and additional restrictions on the use of such boats.

Our position with respect to the use of motorboats in any wilderness areas is that we feel the administrative agencies concerned should be left with the authority and power to regulate such matters and that the Congress should not legislate such restrictions. To our knowledge, the Forest Service has not been guilty of any abuse of discretion in the regulation of motorboats and we suggest to your Committee that until or unless there can be shown such abuses, the Congress should continue to have faith and confidence in their administrative control over this matter.

Our opposition at this time is limited to these two provisions for the reasons stated. We do not endorse or oppose that part of H.R. 1960 which would set up the System itself because we do not possess sufficient knowledge at this time to enable us intelligently to evaluate the necessity or desirability of so doing. We are hopeful that the proposed study of all outdoor recreational resources in the United States, which we endorsed before this Committee last month, will provide us with the required knowledge.

NATIONAL ASS'N of ENGINE and BOAT MFRS Inc

Your Committee knows that in this country today, Americans of all income brackets are on the move, spending more and more recreational time in the outdoors. 52.6 million recreational visits to the national forests in 1956 as compared with 18.2 million in 1946, 56.5 million recreational visits to National Parks in 1955, and 91 million visitor days to the Corps of Engineers' reservoir projects in 1956, testify to this movement by Americans.

You ladies and gentlemen may be surprised to learn that in 1956, more than 28 million Americans went afloat in 5,971,000 pleasure boats in this country. The large majority of these boats are outboard boats and in 1956 there were 750,000 boat trailers in use. Boating today in the United States is the nation's number one family sport and the tremendous growth of the sport is attributable in part to more leisure time, higher pay and participation by the middle and lower income groups in our country. (We are enclosing herewith the complete 1956 statistics on boating as compiled by the Industry Advisory Committee on Statistics of our Association.)

We urge your Committee and the Congress not to legislate limitations or restrictions on the boating public. We urge that you leave to the cognizant regulatory agencies of our government the job of administering these areas in the same reasonable manner that is in effect today. We do not believe that the record indicates any necessity for, or sound reason why, the Congress should specifically legislate such restrictions as those set out above.

We thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph E. Choate

Secretary

JEC:jvs.
encl.

IN

1956

28,000,000

Americans

Spent

$1,250,000,000

ON

BOATING

The Nation's Top Family Sport

ACCORDING TO THE

National Association of
Engine and Boat Manufacturers, Inc.

THE INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STATISTICS

OF THE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ENGINE AND BOAT MFRS., INC.

offers the following estimate of the extent of recreational boating at the end of 1956

397,000 Motor boats numbered by the U. S. Coast Guard for use on federal waters, including inboard cruisers and runabouts, outboard boats over 16 feet and auxiliary sailboats, based upon USCG registration figures as of Sept. 1956.

450,000 Inboard motor boats (unnumbered) in use on waters not under federal jurisdiction.

4,000 Inboard cruisers and auxiliary sailboats five net tons or over documented by U. S. Bureau of Customs.

4,545,000 Outboard motors in use in U. S. including 584,000 new units sold in 1956 based on figures of the Outboard Boating Club of America. The I. A. C. estimates that there is one small craft (outboard runabout, dinghy, pram, canoe, dory or rowboat) for each motor in use.

575,000 Sail boats without inboard power on all waterways.

5,971,000 Total number of pleasure craft estimated to be in existence on all U. S. waters. One for every 28 persons.

434,000 More boats afloat in U. S. in 1956 than the previous year. This includes about 280,000 new outboard boats (according to the O. B. C.), with the remaining 154,000 divided between inboard cruisers and runabouts, sailboats and miscellaneous small craft.

$1,250,000,000 (one and a quarter billion dollars) Spent at the retail level for new and used boats, accessories, safety equipment, fuel, insurance, docking, maintenance, etc., during calendar 1956. Of this $316,440,000 was spent for the purchase of new outboard boats and motors, according to O. B. C. Overall expenditure is up approximately 13½ per cent over the previous year.

28,000,000 Persons estimated to have taken part in recreational boating, making use of the waterways more than only once or twice during 1956, or about 17 per cent of all persons living in continental United States, according to U. S. Bureau of Census figures.

750,000 Boat trailers in use.

55,000 Marine radiotelephones on pleasure craft according to Federal Communications Commission figures, compared with 8,204 in 1947.

5,000,000 Square feet of natural and synthetic cloth sold for use as sails. (Estimated that approximately 95 per cent is synthetic, with sailmakers reporting dacron as the most popular material.)

10,000 Marinas and waterfront docking and launching facilities for recreational craft on all waterways offering some service to boat owners. Of these, perhaps 2,000 can be considered first rate marinas offering a wide range of facilities and accommodating up to 400-500 craft each.

807 Yacht clubs listed in Lloyd's Register of American Yachts. The North American Yacht Racing Union, supervisory body for sailboat racing on this continent, claims about 820 yacht clubs are affiliated with it.

300 Motor boat racing organizations affiliated with the American Power Boat Association, supervisory body for inboard and outboard motor boat racing.

850 Local boating groups, outboard cruising clubs and the like unaffiliated with any nationwide group.

13,000 Linear miles (approximate) of general tidal shoreline of the United States, measured at the three-mile limit, according to the U. S. Coast & Geodetic Survey, courtesy National Geographic Society.

60,000 Square miles (approximate) of natural and man-made inland waters in the United States, including rivers, lakes, ponds and reservoirs. Based upon figures of the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, through courtesy of the National Geographic Society.

95,000 Square miles (approximate) total area Great Lakes, courtesy of National Geographic Society.

IMPORT — EXPORT

$25,000,000 Worth of boats, marine engines and nautical accessories exported by the United States during 1955 (last complete year available), according to U. S. Dept. of Commerce.

$4,500,000 Worth of boats, marine engines and nautical accessories imported into this country in 1955.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS CONSUMPTION BY PLEASURE CRAFT — 1956

331,000,000 Gallons of gasoline divided 137,000,000 gals. for inboards and 194,000,000 for outboards. Based upon an estimate of 150 gals. per year used by inboards and 42.6 gals. per year used by outboards.

17,500,000 Gallons of diesel fuel.

15,225,000 Gallons of lubricating oil, divided 3,100,000 gals. for inboards and 12,125,000 gals. for outboards.

(NOTE: These consumption figures do not include commercial fishing craft, eliminated from last year's figures.)

GROWTH IN RECREATIONAL BOATS IN USE IN U. S.

YEAR	NUMBER OF BOATS
1904	15,000
1913	400,000
1930	1,500,000
1947	2,440,000
1953	5,023,000
1956	5,971,000

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
ENGINE AND BOAT MANUFACTURERS, INC.
420 LEXINGTON AVENUE

Mrs. Pfost. The Committee stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

(Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 11:10 A.M.)

(T/6-19-57)

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION
232 Carroll Street, N. W.
Washington 12, D. C.

Insert in record for June 21st

A STATEMENT OF
STEWART M. BRANDBORG, Assistant Conservation Director

On H. R. 500 and Related Bills
To Establish a National Wilderness Preservation System

Before the
Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

June 20, 1957

I am Stewart M. Brandborg, Assistant Conservation Director of the National Wildlife Federation.

The National Wildlife Federation, a nation-wide organization of sportsmen and lay conservationists, is deeply concerned about the preservation and future protection of wilderness in the United States and the Territory of Alaska. Many of the contributors to the Federation's conservation program, the thousands of people who faithfully send in their dollars in return for National Wildlife Conservation Stamps, recognize the need for careful protection of our remaining areas of wild and undeveloped country. They share the concern of the leaders of our state affiliate organizations which is expressed in the resolution that was passed at the 21st Annual Meeting of the National Wildlife Federation, last March 1, 2 and 3, here in Washington:

> WHEREAS wilderness, wild and primitive areas are steadily diminishing before the pressures of expanding human population and industrialization on the North American continent, and
>
> WHEREAS the recreational, esthetic and scientific values of wilderness grow in direct proportion to the increasing urbanization of American civilization, and
>
> WHEREAS certain rare and valuable wildlife species are endangered by the disappearance of wilderness habitat, now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED: The National Wildlife Federation request the Congress to enact legislation to accomplish the following: (1) Establish wilderness preservation as a national policy; (2) provide greater security for the designated wilderness, wild and primitive areas within the National Forests, now maintained only by executive policy, and (3) encourage the preservation of the wilderness character of certain areas within the National Parks, National Wildlife Refuges and other public lands of the United States.

I would like to request that the article "Wilderness Issue," by Ernest Swift, Executive Director of the National Wildlife Federation, as published in the December 1, 1956, issue of Conservation News, be included in the record at this point.

This resolution and article define the interests of the National Wildlife Federation that can be related to the legislation being considered today. In general, these bills appear to satisfy the requirements set forth in the resolution by establishing wilderness preservation as a national policy and by designating those areas which must be protected as part of a National Wilderness Preservation System.

Those who debunk the idea of wilderness preservation argue that only a small group of so-called "purists" share any real concern for wilderness. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear now that millions of sportsmen and other outdoor enthusiasts claim an important stake in the areas of undeveloped country which would be classified as wilderness under the definitions of this legislation. Many are frequent visitors to these areas. Others can only hope that some day they will have an opportunity to get into "the back country," and they want it to be there if and when that day comes. The hunter or fisherman who plans a trip into one of these wilderness or primitive areas places a high value on the outdoor experience that it affords him. And he takes the responsibilities of public ownership of these areas seriously by his staunch defense against intrusions upon them.

Funds Needed for Wilderness Management

The federal agencies, which are responsible for the administration of the various units proposed for inclusion in the wilderness preservation system, have been seriously handicapped by shortagesof funds for access and recreational improvements within the outdoor areas under their jurisdictions. For example, in the case of wild, wilderness and primitive areas administered by the Forest Service, the horse and foot trails which were once considered to be arterial lanes for fire protection and maintenance of an extensive lookout system have been abandoned as a result of the improvement in methods of forest fire detection and suppression. Pack strings and thousands of miles of fire trails have been replaced to a great extent by aerial patrols and modern fire suppression techniques. But only limited funds have been provided for continuing the maintenance of trails which could be used for foot and horse travel by the wilderness user.

The high quality of administration of the millions of acres of land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs -- the same agencies who would manage wilderness lands under provisions of this measure -- speaks for their competence. It is understandable that administrators might favor road development in those vast undeveloped areas of wilderness where their attempts to provide fullest public use have been frustrated by the lack of funds for maintenance of trails which are in keeping with the wilderness character of these areas. Under such conditions there might appear to be little justification for continuing the protection of the areas in primitive and natural status. On the other hand, the pressure for heavy use of roaded and developed portions of such areas as are included in our National Parks System can lead to the extension of roads into those areas which have been previously set aside for preservation

as wilderness. The fact that hundreds of thousands of people are rapidly becoming more dependent upon roadless wilderness areas for their outdoor recreation justifies the investment in trails which must be made if this use is to be encouraged.

The relative abundance of wilderness in some regions of the country is also a factor. A few of the western states each contain several million acres of lands that would be classified as wilderness under this legislation. To some of the people who are closest to these, there may appear to be more than is needed, or even justified, for recreational use. It is hard to properly assess the wilderness values of such areas until you live without them. But one fact stands out in clear perspective: We must save what we have, regardless of location, for use of Americans who are now demonstrating their need and desire for wilderness experience.

Wilderness and Over-Populations of Big Game

In some of the existing wild, wilderness and primitive areas of the National Forests, populations of deer and elk have outgrown the carrying capacities of their natural ranges. As a part of a National Wilderness Preservation System, these would be subject to the same management procedures as are now applied by the state fish and game agencies. But to accomplish adequate harvest within some of the units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, it will be necessary to provide good networks of access trails. In addition, it may become necessary to provide reasonable packing services to take hunters and their equipment back into the remote areas under a system of management which provides for adequate dispersal of their camps. The same provisions for management of other recreational uses would be required for those units of the system within the National Forests, Parks and Monuments, Wildlife Refuges and Indian lands, where public hunting is not permitted.

At the last Annual Meeting of the National Wildlife Federation there were discussions of the need for language in this measure to prevent damage to basic soil, plant and water resources that might be caused by over-populations of big game herds. It is recommended that such language be considered for inclusion in this legislation. This would provide for necessary control of over-populated game herds as required for the protection of the natural character of a unit of the wilderness system.

Justifying Wilderness

The attainment of fullest possible use of wilderness for the enjoyment by the outdoor public has not yet even been approached. Much can be done to bring this about through enactment of this legislation which recognizes wilderness preservation as a national policy.

If wilderness preservation can be established as a national policy, public use of wilderness will justify this. The management of areas for use as wilderness promises to be as much a challenge to the public land administrators of the federal agencies involved as use of other public lands for production of timber, grazing, or other recreational purposes. This will be a recreational yield of particularly high quality which will require careful controls so that the unspoiled and primitive character of the thing being enjoyed -- wilderness -- will not be destroyed. The task of bringing people into back country areas, in such a way as to leave only trails as evidence of their visits, will require a high degree of professional skill, as well as a much larger investment in wilderness management programs. The latter calls for more generous appropriations for use by the agencies in doing their jobs.

The National Wildlife Federation endorses the provision of this bill which leaves the administration and management of the designated units of this system in

the hands of the present administering agencies: The U. S. Forest Service, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As previously pointed out, the competence of each of these agencies has been demonstrated and it is desirable that the Wilderness Preservation Council, as established by this bill, would not seek to replace or overlap any of their administrative functions. Neither would it interfere with the management or jurisdiction of any unit of the Wilderness Preservation System which is designated within the National Parks, National Monuments, National Forests, National Wildlife Refuges, Indian Reservations, or any other federal lands.

The National Wilderness Preservation Council will draw upon the experience of those public land administrators who are best qualified to guide the development of educational and fact finding programs consistent with the purposes of the legislation. Representation on the Council by citizen members will provide assurance of full protection of those public interests to be represented by it.

By establishing wilderness preservation as a national policy and encouraging the preservation of the wilderness character of certain areas within the public lands held in trust by the federal government, this bill satisfies the requirements specified in the resolution passed last March by the National Wildlife Federation. Its provisions to allow Congressional consideration of additions, modifications or eliminations of units of the system with proper public notice of proposed changes, would safeguard the public interest by providing adequate opportunity for expression of reaction to the suggested alterations. Where such changes are considered to be inadvisable, they could be denied through passage of a resolution by either House of Congress. Where they are shown to be desirable because of shifting patterns of public use, national

SRP00740

emergency, or other unforeseen conditions of the future, there is complete authority for necessary changes based upon recommendations of the administering agencies.

This legislation is a major step toward the protection of wilderness for multi-purpose recreational, scenic, scientific, educational and historic purposes. I wish to endorse it with the hope that those who are not in full agreement with its objectives and provisions will offer suggestions for its improvement and ultimate refinement so that an effective program for wilderness protection can be written into law in the near future.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

SRP00741

IRA N. GABRIELSON
President
C. R. GUTERMUTH
Vice-President

REC'D JUN 22 1957

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

ROBERT C. HADLEY
Board Chairman
R. F. WEBSTER
Treasurer

Dedicated to Wildlife Restoration
WIRE BUILDING, WASHINGTON 5, D. C.

June 21, 1957

The Honorable Gracie Pfost, Chairman
Subcommittee on Public Lands
House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee
New House Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Congresswoman Pfost:

You will recall that at the hearings before your Committee on the "Wilderness Bills" this morning, I requested permission of the Committee to have included in the printed record of the hearing following the statement given by me for the Wildlife Management Institute a brief article written by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Institute, which appeared in "The Living Wilderness" winter-spring, 1956-1957. Congressman Aspinall objected to the unanimous consent request for the article to appear in the printed record and stated that he thought Dr. Gabrielson should have the opportunity to appear in person.

I learned subsequently that Congressman Aspinall would have no objection to the inclusion of the article in the hearing record providing it was made clear that Dr. Gabrielson had authorized me to submit the article in his name. May I say that in my preparation of the brief statement I submitted in behalf of the "Wilderness Bills" for the Institute, Dr. Gabrielson directed and authorized me to use the enclosed article which appears over his name as a part of the Institute's testimony on those bills.

The Institute would be appreciative, consequently, if this article could be produced in the hearing record as an adjunct to the Institute's statement.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Poole

Daniel A. Poole, Editor
Outdoor News Bulletin

DAP:bbs

SRP00742

For inclusion in hearing record with statement of David A. Poole

THERE IS SOMETHING about the word "wilderness" in the sense of meaning unspoiled country that has a deep appeal to many Americans who have not themselves visited such a place. Just to know that such places exist and are being preserved brings a deep inner satisfaction and a thrill to many of us.

"STRENGTHEN THEIR HANDS"

This indicates that there is deep within people who are engaged in hectic and busy lives of modern America a spark of the pioneer and an interest in adventure in land that has not been intensively modified or "developed" for intensive human use.

An increasing number of conservationists are agreeing with John Muir that "this is fine and natural and full of promise."

As John Muir noted more than helf a century ago, there is also among Americans a "tendency nowadays to wander in wildernesses." As Muir described it:

> Thousands of tired, nerve-shaken, over-civilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home; that wilderness is a necessity; and that mountain parks and reservations are useful not only as fountains of timber and irrigating rivers, but as fountains of life. Awakening from the stupefying effects of the vice of over-industry and the deadly apathy of luxury, they are trying as best they can to mix and enrich their own little ongoings with those of Nature, and to get rid of rust and disease."

It is to this deep-seated, inner impulse that we owe the movement to preserve wilderness as we know them today.

We can all be proud of the excellent job that has been done in preserving these areas. There are few of them left to be preserved other than those that have already been set aside by the far-sighted vision of the administrators of the executive agencies which have control of them. This applies particularly to the U. S. Forest Service, which has been a leader in this field, but also to the National Park Service and to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service as well.

These executive agencies have done a magnificent job with all too little public support for their efforts to preserve unspoiled some of the great outdoor heritage of this nation.

However, growing pressures of population and demands of industry are making it more and more difficult to resist encroachments and invasion of these magnificent areas.

I believe that legislation of the type that has now been introduced in Congress, generally known as "the Wilderness Bill," would greatly strengthen the hands of these administrators in preserving the areas that they have battled so successfully to care for during the past many years.

The fact that this legislation makes the top officials of the various land management agencies the core of the Council which it proposes to establish, is definite recognition of the excellent job that has been done and, at the same time, an effort to strengthen their hands against what most conservationists believe are going to be increasingly difficult pressures to withstand.

The principles of this bill, if enacted into law, cannot help but be a long step forward in preserving some of the magnificence of America for those who come after us.

—IRA N. GABRIELSON
President, Wildlife Management Institute
Formerly Director, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The
LIVING WILDERNESS

PUBLISHED BY THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY
2144 P STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON 7, D. C.
HOWARD ZAHNISER, *Editor*

NUMBER 59 . . . . . WINTER-SPRING 1956-5.

Entered as Second Class Matter April 8, 1946, at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

In This Issue

"STRENGTHENING THEIR HANDS" ii
(*By Ira N. Gabrielson*)
SAVING AMERICA'S WILDERNESS 1
(*By John P. Saylor*)
CONNOTATIONS 12
(*A Poem by Eddie W. Wilson*)
THE WILDERNESS BILL 13
(*By Hubert H. Humphrey*)
THE TEXT OF THE WILDERNESS BILL 26
OUR WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM 30
(*A Map by Caroline Holcomb*)
THE NEED FOR WILDERNESS AREAS 37
(*By Howard Zahniser*)
WHY I AM OPPOSED TO THE WILDERNESS BILL 44
(*By Richard W. Smith*)
"THEY SAY" 51
(*By Michael Nadel*)
WILDERNESS IS WHERE YOU KEEP IT 61
(*By David R. Brower*)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES