SRP05374

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

256

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

BILLS TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM FOR THE PERMANENT GOOD OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JANUARY 13 AND 14, 1964—LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Serial No. 15

PART III

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
28-413 WASHINGTON : 1964

SRP05375

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado, *Chairman*

LEO W. O'BRIEN, New York
WALTER ROGERS, Texas
JAMES A. HALEY, Florida
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma
WALTER S. BARING, Nevada
THOMAS G. MORRIS, New Mexico
RALPH J. RIVERS, Alaska
ROY A. TAYLOR, North Carolina
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
HUGH L. CAREY, New York
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona
ELIZABETH KEE, West Virginia
RAY ROBERTS, Texas
ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Oregon
COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., Idaho
JOHN O. MARSH, JR., Virginia
EDWARD R. ROYBAL, California
THOMAS P. GILL, Hawaii
A. FERNÓS-ISERN (Resident Commissioner), Puerto Rico

JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania
J. ERNEST WHARTON, New York
E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota
JACK WESTLAND, Washington
CRAIG HOSMER, California
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Colorado
JOHN KYL, Iowa
HOMER E. ABELE, Ohio
JOE SKUBITZ, Kansas
CHARLOTTE T. REID, Illinois
LAURENCE J. BURTON, Utah
ROGERS C. B. MORTON, Maryland
PATRICK MINOR MARTIN, California
MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

WALTER S. BARING, Nevada, *Chairman*

LEO W. O'BRIEN, New York
RALPH J. RIVERS, Alaska
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona
RAY ROBERTS, Texas
ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Oregon
COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., Idaho
JOHN O. MARSH, JR., Virginia
A. FERNÓS-ISERN (Resident Commissioner), Puerto Rico

JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania
J. ERNEST WHARTON, New York
E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota
JACK WESTLAND, Washington
JOHN KYL, Iowa
ROGERS C. B. MORTON, Maryland
MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota

MILTON A. PEARL, *Consultant on Public Lands*
T. RICHARD WITMER, *Counsel*

CONTENTS

Hearings held on— Page

January 13, 1964 611

January 14, 1964 849

Statement of—

Abbott, George, Gardnerville, Nev., counselor, Central Committee, Nevada State Grazing Boards 635

Adams, Morgan, Jr., San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, 1541 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif 791

Alkire, Robert, White Pine County Chamber of Commerce and Mines, McGill, Nev 849

Amend, Howard E., 1362 Morada Place, Altadena, Calif., representing the Barton Flats Camping Society 773

Austin, Edward J., vice president, Southern Chapter, Nevada Academy of Sciences, 1111 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Las Vegas, Nev. 856

Barker, Elliott S., 343 Palace Avenue, Santa Fe, N. Mex 868

Bear, Robert G., Post Office Box 716, Banning, Calif., representing the Trailfinders 861

Behr, Armin, 2620 Marlin, Las Vagas, Nev 986

Blatt, John M., 45-272 Lassen Court, Indio, Calif 821

Bradley, Philip R., California Mine Operators Association, 2801 Oak Knoll, Berkeley, Calif 951

Brassey, Bart A., managing director, Associated Industries of Idaho, Room 408, Simplot Building, Boise, Idaho 670

Broadbent, J. R 837

Browning, Ernest, immediate past president, Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, Adams Hotel Lobby, Phoenix, Ariz 707

Calhoun, Stanley T., 631 North First Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz 713

Carpenter, John, president, Nevada Woolgrowers' Association, Elko, Nev 834

Charles, Cecil, 2450 Chelsea Place, Santa Monica, Calif 825

Cina, John, president, Big Bear Associates, San Bernardino County, Calif 807

Clauser, Don, Sante Fe, N. Mex 916

Corbell, V. I., president, Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz., as read by Robert P. Moore 918

Cornwall, Sidney, 743 Tularosa Drive, Los Angeles, Calif 813

Cox, Royce G., North Idaho Forestry Association, Box 600, Lewiston, Idaho 943

Craig, George A., Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc., 681 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif 950

Cummings, Veigh, vice president, Utah Wool Growers Association 836

Curtis, Henry S., Nevada Mining Association, Inc., Henderson, Nev. 693

Dalton, Vernon, Wells, Nev., representing the Cattle Advisory Board, Humboldt National Forest 845

Davis, John, M.D., president, Lahontan Audubon Society, Reno, Nev 732

Deacon, James E., Ph. D., president, Southern Chapter, Nevada Academy of Sciences, 3100 Oxford Lane, Las Vegas, Nev 854

Denton, Ralph, Clark County commissioner, Las Vegas, Nev 627

Dozier, John C., American Forest Products Corp., North Fork, Calif 711

Ellison, Stanley C., Nevada State Grazing Board 643

Falconer, Smith, Jr., president, Arizona Parks and Recreation Association, 104 East 6th Street, Tempe, Ariz 624

Fischer, Virlis L., 1612 Houssels, Las Vegas, Nev 927

Flournoy, D. J., president, California Wildlife Federation, P.O. Box 34, New Cuyama, Calif 972

Frankfort, Philip E., executive vice president, Southwest Forest Industries, Inc 827

Statement of—Continued Page
Freeman, Robert, Box 677, Big Bear Lake, Calif. 806
Glascock, H. R., Jr., forest counsel, Western Forestry and Conservation Association, 712 U.S. National Bank Building, Portland, Oreg. 678
Glaser, Norman D., president, Nevada Farm Bureau, 575 Mill Street, Reno, Nev. 840
Goodman, Mrs. John D., Mahali Juani, P.O. Box 314, Mentone, Calif. 822
Gray, Mrs. Edna L., Las Vegas, Nev. 988
Hardinge, Mervyn G., Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, Calif. 814
Harshbarger, John W., professional geologist and mining engineer, Tucson, Ariz. 716
Hauk, Andrew, San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc., Union Oil Center, Los Angeles, Calif. 776
Hudson, Sally Neidlinger, 306 Amalfi Drive, Santa Monica, Calif. 813
Hull, Mrs. Arthur N., 3708 East Flamingo Road, Las Vegas, Nev. 974
Ives, Mrs. Robert T., 1022 Harvard Avenue, Claremont, Calif. 976
Jerome, Stanley E., associate director, Nevada Bureau of Mines, Reno, Nev. 693
Johnson, Arthur B., treasurer, the Desert Protective Council, Inc., 201 South Ashdale Street, West Covina, Calif. 925
Jones, Marjorie, 3340 Mayfield Avenue, San Bernardino, Calif. 815
Just, Evan, Department of Mineral Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. 719
Kamb, Barclay, professor of geology and geophysics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif. 721
Knight, Frank P., director, Department of Mineral Resources, State of Arizona, Mineral Building Fairgrounds, Phoenix, Ariz. 612
Krueper, Mrs. Harry J., 4296 Mountain View Avenue, San Bernardino, Calif. 817
Lamb, Harold B., Utah Audubon Society, 2604 Evergreen Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah 726
Leffler, Herb C., president and general manager, Mount Baldy Ski Lifts, Inc., Mount Baldy, Calif. 805
Liggett, Howard B., 425 North Pine, Orange, Calif. 771
Lynn, Art, Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 930
Mann, Kenneth L., Central Committee, Nevada State Grazing Boards, Post Office Box 512, Elko, Nev. 647
Marshall, Robert R., treasurer, Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness, Post Office Box 777, San Bernardino, Calif. 765
Marvel, John, Nevada State Cattle Association, Battle Mountain, Nev. 843
Miller, Richard Gordon, Washoe Valley, Carson City, Nev. 924
Mills, W. L., Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, Boise, Idaho 630
Momyer, Joe R., president, Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness, 7092 Garden Drive, San Bernardino, Calif. 734
Monroe, Warren L., State senator and member of the board of directors of the Elko Chamber of Commerce, Elko, Nev. 664
More, Howard V., 3077 East California Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif. 794
McCrea, Joel, Nevada State Grazing Boards 660
McGowan, Wilson, Nevada State senator 660
North, Chandler P., Southern Council, Far West Ski Association, 10741 La Grange Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 800
Potter, Grant B., California Forest Practice Committee, Western Pine Association, Dinuba, Calif. 947
Rector, Mrs. Gwen, 5107 Willow Road, Rolling Hills Estates, Calif. 818
Romney, Miles P., manager, Utah Mining Association, and chairman, Mining Committee, Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah 701
Sadler, Mrs. Robert C., Arizona Federation of Garden Clubs, 8314 North 7th Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. 621
Schofield, W. B., consulting engineer, 681 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. 922
Shively, Paul E., president, California Forest Protective Association, San Francisco, Calif. 723
Sill, Richard C., associate professor of physics, University of Nevada, Reno, Nev. 978

Statement of—Continued Page
Sims, Bert, Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Los Angeles, Calif. 826
Smithee, Kenneth J., past president, Arizona Conservation Council, Post Office Box 864, Phoenix, Ariz. 619
Smith, Roger, vice president, Nevada State Cattle Association, Ruby Valley, Nev. 842
Snyder, Chancie L., director, Sportsmen Association of Southwest New Mexico, Silver City, N. Mex. 865
Spaw, Mrs. Scott, chairman, Conservation Committee, Maricopa Audubon Society, and secretary, Arizona Conservation Council (as read by Miss Jeannette Davis) 621
Speicher, Len, Far West Ski Association, 1710 Camino Palermo Avenue, Hollywood, Calif. 796
Spencer, John W., Izaak Walton League of America, 1353 Sonoma Avenue, Santa Rosa, Calif. 851
Spillman, Robert, Arizona Game Protective Association, Inc., 3218 West Missouri Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. 625
Stallings, E. R., president, National Horsemen's Association, 928 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, Calif. 673
Strosnider, Fred, Nevada State Grazing Boards, Yerington, Nev. 637
Swallow, George N., Nevada State Grazing Boards, Ely, Nev. 638
Thomas, Robert F., first vice president, Nevada Farm Bureau, 575 Mill Street, Reno, Nev. 839
Tyler, John, vice chairman, Southern California Chapter, the Nature Conservancy, 603 Alta Avenue, Santa Monica, Calif. 967
Tyndall, Tommi 808
Unger, Karl H., president, Southern Council, Far West Ski Association, 3923 Stevely Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 798
Vaughn, Josephine C., San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society, San Bernardino, Calif. 725
Verity, Victor, Arizona Small Mine Operators Association, 902 Phoenix Title Building, Tucson, Ariz. 614
Weber, Paul, Bernalillo Log & Lumber Corp., Bernalillo, N. Mex. 831
Whiting, A. Milton, Kaibab Lumber Co., Post Office Box 1468, Flagstaff, Ariz. 830
Whyte, Bradley Graham, 211 East Highland Court, La Habra, Calif., representing North Orange County YMCA and affiliated youth organizations 824
Williams, Nelson N., 5763 Madera Circle, Las Vegas, Nev. 859
Winkelman, Dane, 25626 27th Street, San Bernardino, Calif. 810
Woodhouse, Edwin D., 5733 Canyonside Road, La Crescenta, Calif., representing the Division of Camping of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles 809
Wright, Mrs. Carol, 644 Rapallo Avenue, San Pedro, Calif. 820
Young, Roy, assemblyman, Nevada Legislature, Elko, Nev. 658
Zahniser, Howard, executive director, Wilderness Society, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 989
Statements submitted for the record—
Adams, Wesley, Mountain View Guest Ranch, Cowles, N. Mex. 882
Allen, Howard and Harriet, 3750 El Canto Drive, Spring Valley, Calif. 991
Barker, Ethel M., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 900
Barker, Tommy, University Park, N. Mex. 894
Bartlett, Albert B., 1045 Rancheros, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 992
Belen Game Protective Association, Belen, N. Mex. 877
Bibo, Harold S., State personnel director, 138 South Capitol Street, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 891
Biology Club, University of Nevada, Southern Regional Division 973
Boddy, A. W. "Bud", Alaska Sportsmen's Council, 939 West 10th Street, Juneau, Alaska 886
Booth, Howard G., 3617 Stanley Avenue, North Las Vegas, Nev. 987
Borzea, John C., president, the Wyoming Conservation Association, 1306 Kimberly, Rock Springs, Wyo. 888
Boshen, Robert, D.D., 1561 Camino Amado, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 909
Bratton, Howard C., chairman of the Public Lands Committee, New Mexico Oil & Gas Association, Petroleum Building, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 993

Statements submitted for the record—Continued

	Page
Burnside, Mrs. Linda Lee, Route 3, Camino Corrales, Santa Fe, N. Mex	892
California State Horsemen's Association	675
Campbell, Dawson A., Gila Hotsprings Ranch, Box 679, Silver City, N. Mex	868
Clark, M. E., secretary, Iowa Wildlife Federation, 1535 B Avenue NE., Cedar Rapids, Iowa	887
Cleaver, Gordon, 1183 East 28th Street, San Bernardino, Calif	994
Coss, Ronald W., 903 Rio Vista, Santa Fe, N. Mex	911
Cottam, Walter P., 1114 McClelland Street, Salt Lake City, Utah	730
Craighead, John, president, Montana Wilderness Association, Missoula, Mont	888
Curry County Game Protective Association, Clovis, N. Mex	881
Dick, B. G., 1377 Butler Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah	732
Dodge, Matt Noyes, 465 Camino Manzano, Santa Fe, N. Mex	910
Dressler, Fred H., past president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, Gardnerville, Nev	846
Elmore, Linda, Albuquerque, N. Mex	894
Elmore, Paul E., Jr., 10428 Bellamah NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex	902
Fish, E. E., Taiban, N. Mex	890
Fishburn, Luke, executive secretary, University Religious Conference	753
Frew, Duncan W., 22 Oakvue Court, Pleasant Hill, Calif	740
Gardner, Robert C., 571 North Hermosa Avenue, Sierra Madre, Calif	995
Gayman, Herley, 4529 Abbey Place, Los Angeles, Calif	746
Gherman, Dr. M. E., Big Bear Lake, Calif	808
Gilbert, Harry, chairman, Chemistry Department, Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, Calif	749
Grant County Archaeological Society, Francis B. Parsons, president, 1822 Yucca Drive, Silver City, N. Mex	867
Hansen, Leonard C., secretary, Fish and Wildlife Committee, Fort Wingate Army Depot, Gallup, N. Mex	908
Harding, Arthur G., Post Office Box 306, Anthony, N. Mex	900
Hart, Ernest H., president of the Grants, N. Mex., Chapter of the New Mexico Wildlife and Conservation Association, 1620 Del Norte, Grants, N. Mex	877
Hayes, Robert D., Southern Idaho Forestry Association	672
Hernandez, F. Louis, president, New Mexico Conservation Council, 449 Ash NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex	878, 899
Hyde, Lee C., D.D.S., 3115 Silver SE., Albuquerque, N. Mex	903
Idaho Bureau of Mines and Geology, Moscow, Idaho	995
Idaho Cattlemen's Association, 414 Simplot Building, Boise, Idaho	632
Janney, D. H. and Joan S., 229 Barranca Road, Los Alamos, N. Mex	996
Janson, DelMar, 3406 East Country Club Lane, Sacramento, Calif	996
Johnson, Richard G., 791 Hillview Way, Chico, Calif	997
Kiebsch, Howard K., 1162 Quince Avenue, Upland, Calif	997
Las Vegas Rifle & Revolver Club, Inc., Post Office Box 671, Las Vegas, N. Mex	880
Lincoln, Ray, president, Idaho Wool Growers Association, Box 2596, Boise, Idaho	998
MacDonald, Harrison, law librarian, Supreme Court Library, Santa Fe, N. Mex	902
Mandolf, Henry I., 4671 East Talmadge Drive, San Diego, Calif	999
Millar, A. E., president, Nevada Mining Association, Inc., 206 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev	1000
Miller, Byron, Box 308, Silver City, N. Mex	867
Miller, Hugh M., 1021 Governor Dempsey Drive, Santa Fe, N. Mex	910
Mulaik, Stanley B., executive secretary, Utah Nature Study Society	729
Murphy, Mrs. Daniel E., 1340 Old Mill Road, San Marino, Calif	1001
McCauley, John P., 135 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, N. Mex	908
Nutting, Bernard L., senior vice president, Medford Corp., Medford, Oreg	1001
Orr, Paul W. and Violet M., 2312 Glenrose Avenue, Altadena, Calif	1002
Piggott, Marget H., secretary, Uinta Regional Group, Sierra Club	729
Reavley, William L., 3125 East 34 South, Salt Lake City, Utah	728

Statements submitted for the record—Continued
Redlands Fish and Game Conservation Association Post Office Box 487, Redlands, Calif. — Page 751
Richards, Edward G., president, Utah Wildlife Federation, 1102 Walker Bank Building, Salt Lake City, Utah — 730
San Miguel County Area Development Committee, Box 795, Las Vegas, N. Mex. — 880
Scheid, Dr. Vernon E., director, Nevada Bureau of Mines — 695
Schoknecht, Mark, manager of lands and logging, St. Regis Paper Co., Libby, Mont. — 942
Searle, Richard F., professional engineer, 4511 Adam Road, Santa Susana, Calif. — 758
Shaffer, David S., president, New Mexico division, Izaak Walton League of America — 904
Sheeline, Randall D. and Elizabeth S., 2211 Cass Avenue, Woodland Hills, Calif. — 761
Shiffer, H. A., Pacific Institute of Earth Sciences, 448 North Avenue 56, Los Angeles, Calif. — 1002
Simms, Roger, 217 Camino Encantado, Santa Fe, N. Mex. — 908
Smelser, Obed E. and Marguerite A., 1212 Scenic Drive, San Bernardino, Calif. — 1004
Spencer, Albert, Post Office Box 6, Angelus Oaks, Calif. — 761
State Game Commission of New Mexico, State capitol, Santa Fe, N. Mex. — 881
Steinitz, Fred E. and Irma, 11809 South Street Andrews Place, Los Angeles, Calif. — 1005
Thompson, Dana L., 292 Langley Way, Hayward, Calif. — 764
Trimmer, Mrs. Maurice, 112 Valley Drive, Santa Fe, N. Mex. — 891
Union County Wildlife and Conservation Association, Clayton, N. Mex. — 884
Vlasveld, Peter J., 3420-166th Avenue, SE., Bellevue, Wash. — 760
Wahrhaftig, Austin L., chairman, conservation committee, Wasatch Mountain Club, 425 South 8th West, Salt Lake City, Utah — 728
Walsten, Mrs. Carl, 767 West Marshall Boulevard, San Bernardino, Calif. — 762
Ward, Bessye Cowden, Box 1868, Odessa, Tex. — 913
Weber, Henry M., M.D., conservation chairman, California Garden Clubs, Inc., 82259 Miles Avenue, Indio, Calif. — 864
Weisel, George F., president, Western Montana Fish & Game Association, Post Office Box 1037, Missoula, Mont. — 888
Wheatley, Robert N., 1314 Skyline Drive, Fullerton, Calif. — 1005
Whittier, Rev. Chester E., 109 Camino Matias, Santa Fe, N. Mex. — 909
Communications submitted for the record:
Albuquerque Chapter, New Mexico Wildlife & Conservation Association — 889
American Camping Association, Central Arizona District, Tempe, Ariz. — 622
Amneus, Thomas, Los Angeles, Calif. — 1006
Anderson, Kenneth R., Roseville, Calif. — 1006
Andrews, Jeanne E., M.D., Cleveland, Ohio — 914
Arizona Association of Landscape Architects, 902 West Roma Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. — 623
Arizona Bow Hunters Association, 3301 West Mariposa, Phoenix, Ariz. — 622
Arizona Camera Club Council, 610 North Fourth Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. — 622
Arizona Game and Fish Department, State Office Building, Phoenix, Ariz. — 623
Arizona State Horsemen's Association, Scottsdale, Ariz. — 623
Armitage, John D., Jr., San Jose, Calif. — 741
Arrowhead Area Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, San Bernardino, Calif. — 1006
Arroyo Grande Sportsmen's Club, Inc., Arroyo Grande, Calif. — 1007
Baden, O. M., life science counselor, Fullerton Junior College, Fullerton, Calif. — 748
Banning Sportsmans Club, Inc., Banning, Calif. — 1007

SRP05381

Communications submitted for the record—Continued Page
Barnes, Mrs. Portia, Beaumont, Calif. 1007
Barta, John L., Anaheim, Calif. 1007
Barton, Mrs. Arthur G., Glendale, Calif. 1008
Beilke, Gilbert H., San Diego, Calif. 1008
Belen Game Protective Association, Belen, N. Mex. 904
Berry, Dick W., Flagstaff, Ariz. 1009
Bingham, Elisabeth and Harold, Altadena, Calif. 1011
Border Game Protective Association, Deming, N. Mex. 878
Braff, Ben 899
Bradley, R. N., Carlsbad, N. Mex. 880
Brooks, Adin P., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 912
Brush, R. P., Los Angeles, Calif. 741
Burke, Clement J., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 897
California Garden Clubs, Inc., conservation committee, Palomar district, La Mesa, Calif. 741
California State Horsemen's Association, region 11, San Bernardino, Calif. 1012
Camenson, Bernard B., vice principal, Leffingwell School, Whittier, Calif. 743
Campbell, H. R., Jr. 893
Camp Fire Girls, Mt. San Antonio Council, Pomona, Calif. 746
Carlsbad Sportmen's Club, Carlsbad, N. Mex. 882
Chandler, Mrs. L. R., Norco, Calif. 1012
Charlton, R. J., Northridge, Calif. 1013
Clark, Mr. and Mrs. Nathan C., 1422 Montecito Drive, Los Angeles, Calif. 745
Clites, Mrs. Barbara, San Diego, Calif. 1013
Clites, Wayne R., San Diego, Calif. 1013
Clyde, Hon. George D., Governor of the State of Utah 705
Coeur d'Alene Wildlife Federation, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 1014
Connor, Harold G., La Habra, Calif. 1014
Creamer, Neale E., Los Angeles, Calif. 1014
Cresto, Pete B., Gallup, N. Mex. 907
Daggett, Mrs. Helen N., Long Beach, Calif. 1015
Daywalt, Stephanie and W. E. 1015
DeAnza district, California Federation of Women's Clubs, Indio, Calif. 1015
Deck, Don M., 2533 Littleton Road, El Cajon, Calif. 745
DeLapp, K. D., Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 899
Desomount Club, Los Angeles, Calif. 747
Dewitt, John B., Sacramento, Calif. 1016
Dolan, Walter G., Huntington Park, Calif. 1016
Dunbar, G. H., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 898
Durand, Harvey S., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 912
Elko County Sportsmen's Association, Inc., Elko, Nev. 847
Ferguson, James, youth director, First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood 826
Fischer, Daniel L., Riverside, Calif. 1017
Fisk, Robert G., San Bernardino, Calif. 1017
Flanders, Mrs. Margie, Arlington Heights, Ill. 913
Florida Nature Conservancy, Miami, Fla. 1017
Fountain, Freeman P., M.D. 905
Frazier, Mrs. Margaret, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 1018
Fresno County Sportsmen's Club, Fresno, Calif. 1018
Frow, David, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 894
Fry, Cyril H., Glorieta, N. Mex. 903
Fullerton Saturday Morning Y's Men's Club, Fullerton, Calif. 743
Gahr, Charles R., Bellflower, Calif. 1018
Gammon, Hugh J., Orange, Calif. 1019
Gardner, Max C., director, Utah State Land Board, Salt Lake City, Utah 706
Gateway Club, Afield and Afloat, Needles, Calif. 1019
Gayman, Herley, Los Angeles, Calif. 1019
George, Duane, associate director, Long Beach Recreation Commission, Long Beach, Calif. 1020
Gerstung, Eric Robert 1020
Giers, Paul E., D.D.S., Coronado, Calif. 915

Communications submitted for the record—Continued Page
Golden Gate Audubon Society, Oakland, Calif. 1020
Gordan, Theodore R., Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 891
Gordon, Ladd S., director, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, B. Mex. 885
Graves, C. Edward, Carmel, Calif. 1021
Griffith, Robert B. III, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 903
Hammond, Jack A., Canoga Park, Calif. 913
Harding, Mrs. Arthur G., Anthony, N. Mex. 1021
Harmon, Roger J., Los Angeles, Calif. 1021
Heinberg, Sylvester, coordinator of athletics and chairman, Division of Physical Education, San Bernardino Valley College. 1022
Hicks, Dorothy, Beaumont, Calif. 1022
Hines, James H., Albuquerque, N. Mex. 890
Hirt, Edward C., Albuquerque, N. Mex. 905
Hoffman, Virginia, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 906
Hopp, Victor A., Ringwood, Ill. 747
Houghton, Samuel G., Reno, Nev. 1023
Howland, W. W., Anaheim, Calif. 747
Hoyert, John H., College Park, Md. 1023
Hubbard, Pauline and Russell, Los Angeles, Calif. 1024
Hull, Kathleen P., Las Vegas, Nev. 975
Hutcherson, Brian and Carola, Reno, Nev. 1024
Hyatt, Foster H., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 891
Hyatt, Mrs. Foster H., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 897
Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, Pocatello, Idaho. 1025
Jall, Richard M., Los Angeles, Calif. 749
Jewell, Ruth, assistant director of outdoor education, Olympic College, Bremerton, Wash. 750
Johnson, Horton, Saugus, Calif. 1025
Jordan, Mrs. Grace Gore, Whittier, Calif. 750
Joseph, Celia B. 905
Keeler, Kenneth M., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 911
Keeler, Mrs. Kenneth M., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 912
Krebs, Lois C., San Bernardino, Calif. 750
Lawrence, E. Margaret, San Bernardino, Calif. 751
Leadingham, Grace, Los Angeles, Calif. 755
League of Ohio Sportsmen, Columbus, Ohio. 1025
Lebeck, Albert O., Jr., House of Representatives, State of New Mexico, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 907
Lee, Levon, chief of game management, State of New Mexico, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 905
Lee, Vincent R., Gardnerville, Nev. 1025
Leonard, Richard M., San Francisco, Calif. 1026
Lesley, Charles, Salt Lake City, Utah. 1026
Levin, Dan L., Newport Beach, Calif. 1026
Lewis, Frank W., Van Nuys, Calif. 1027
Life Sciences Division, Fullerton Junior College, Fullerton, Calif. 740
Lindroth, Eric, M.D., San Bernardino, Calif. 1027
Liska, Donald J., Seattle, Wash. 751
Long Beach Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, Long Beach Calif. 739
Long Beach Council, Camp Fire Girls, Inc., Long Beach, Calif. 744
Los Alamos Chapter, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Los Alamos, N. Mex. 882
Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, International Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners, Scottsdale, Ariz. 833
Martel, Henry, Celia, and Erich H., Paramus, N.J. 1028
Mason, Curtis W., San Marino, Calif. 1028
Maxwell, Rodney, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 897
Menapace, Robert E., Gallup, N. Mex. 907
Mendoza, Harry H., Gallup, N. Mex. 906
Meredith, Janice M., San Diego, Calif. 1028
Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Charles B., Carmichael, Calif. 1028
Moore, J. C., Jr., La Canada, Calif. 753
Moore, R. C., Las Vegas, N. Mex. 879

Communications submitted for the record—Continued
Page
Moore, R. C., secretary, San Miguel County Game Protective Association 879
Morgan Horse Club of Southern California, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif 1029
Mulvaney, E. A., San Bernardino, Calif 1029
Munchheimer, Kurt H., M.D., Rio Dell, Calif 1030
McConnell, Margaret W. and F. Wright, San Diego, Calif 1030
McGlone, David B., et al., Los Angeles, Calif 753
McKinley County Wildlife Conservation Association 886
McLandress, Smith, Appleton, Wis 913
Nature Friends, Los Angeles local 757
Neidham, Mrs. Marie C 896
Newfield, Arthur F., Santa Fe, N. Mex 910
Newton, C. V. and Virginia M., Altadena, Calif 1030
Nilsson, George W., president, Mining Association of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif 1031
Nix, E. L., Albuquerque, N. Mex 904
Oasis Garden Club of Indian Wells Valley, Ridgecrest, Calif 1033
Ocker, Arnold E., secretary, Priest River Wildlife Federation, Priest River, Idaho 1033
Orange Y's Men's Club, Orange, Calif 754
Pacific Beach Garden Club, San Diego, Calif 1034
Page, Mrs. Robert D., San Luis Obispo, Calif 1034
Pankow, Mrs. Carolyn, Glendale, Calif 755
Parker, G. Vaughan, Santa Barbara, Calif 1034
Parkes, Robert B., D.D.S., Jackson, Miss 912
Pasadena Audubon Society, Pasadena, Calif 1034
Petition signed by 80 Albuquerque, N. Mex., residents 1035
Philadelphia Conservationists, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa 1035
Phillips, James G., scoutmaster, troop 23, Santa Fe, N. Mex 883
Poland, Roscoe A., Wilma D., and Stephanie L., San Diego, Calif 1035
Pomona Ebell Woman's Club, Pomona, Calif 1036
Powell, Herbert J., Los Angeles, Calif 756
Pullara, Mrs. Santo, Syracuse, N.Y 756
Puzio, Frank, Jr., Bronxville, N.Y 915
Resources Agency of California, State capitol, Sacramento, Calif 1036
Rhode Island Wild Life Federation 889
Rich, Arthur A., Woodland Hills, Calif 1036
Roamer Hiking Club, Los Angeles, Calif 1037
Rogers, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel C., Albuquerque, N. Mex 904
Runnette, Miss Evelyn, Denver, Colo 887
Rutherfurd, Robert A., Rialto, Calif 1037
Safe Progress Association, Miami, Fla 1038
San Bernardino Area Motel Association, San Bernardino, Calif 1038
San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors, San Bernardino, Calif 1038
San Bernardino Horsemen's Association, San Bernardino, Calif 1039
San Diego Natural History Society, San Diego, Calif 738
San Luis Obispo Sportsmen's Association, San Luis Obispo, Calif 1039
Sasmor, Daniel J. and Bette P., Albuquerque, N. Mex 904
Sattler, Mr. and Mrs. William, Concord, Calif 1040
Sawyer, Luella K., Mill Valley, Calif 758
Schaar, Edward, Los Angeles, Calif 759
Schneider, Henry, Riverside, Calif 1040
Schonborn, Robert J., Temple City, Calif 1040
Seery, Charles E., Belen, N. Mex 892
Shaw, Miss Catherine D., Los Angeles, Calif 1041
Sheets, Raymond F., M.D., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 739
Sierra Club, Rio Grande chapter, Los Alamos, N. Mex 1041
Sierra County Wildlife & Conservation Association, Truth or Consequences, N. Mex 881
Sierra Hi-Teens Club, San Bernardino, Calif 752
Slamal, Thomas M., San Bernardino, Calif 1041
Smith, Ronald E., Bishop, Calif 1043
Stewart, Polly, Salt Lake City, Utah 1043
Stiens, Marion B., Chicago, Ill 814
Surber, James W., Santa Fe, N. Mex 893

Communications submitted for the record—Continued Page
Taft Sportsmen's Club, Inc., Taft, Calif. 1043
Terakowski, Eugene A., Pomona, Calif. 1043
Thomas, Mr. and Mrs. William H., San Diego, Calif. 1044
Thompson, William P., assistant professor of forestry, Arizona State College, Flagstaff, Ariz. 1045
Tiano, John E., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 885
Tracy, Mrs. Thomas F., Banning, Calif. 1047
Trinder, Harold J., Carlsbad, N. Mex. 896
Tropical Audubon Society, Miami, Fla. 1047
Truskier, Pete, Long Beach, Calif. 763
Tulare Fish & Game Protective Association, Tulare, Calif. 1048
Union County Wildlife & Conservation Association, Inc., Clayton, N. Mex. 900
University of Utah Ute Alpine Club 732
Van Meter, W. J., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 889
Van Vessem, Alvin D., Los Alamos, N. Mex. 901
Vidal, Charles, Gallup, N. Mex. 907
Weaver, Hazel F., Victorville, Calif. 763
Wells, Herbert C., University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nev. 1048
Welsh, Arthur L., Albuquerque, N. Mex. 893
Western Mining Council, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif. 1049
Wheatley, John, Clayton, N. Mex. 897
Wherritt, Charles R., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 890
Whittier Audubon Society, Whittier, Calif. 755
Williamson, Betty, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 896
Williamson, Jane, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 895
Williamson, L. A., Albuquerque, N. Mex. 893
Wilmington, George and Patricia, Los Angeles, Calif. 1049
Wilson, David B., Upper Marlboro, Md. 1050
Wilson, Richard, Gallup, N. Mex. 906
Wittek, Rudolph J., Van Nuys, Calif. 1050
Woman's Club of Hawthorne, Hawthorne, Calif. 1050
Woman's Club of Indio, Indio, Calif. 1051
Wood, Earl P., Santa Fe, N. Mex. 898
Wyss, Betty, San Bernardino, Calif. 763
Yeaw, Effie C., Carmichael, Calif. 1051
YMCA, Alhambra district, Alhambra, Calif. 754
Yucaipa Valley Garden Club, Yucaipa, Calif. 1051
Yurcic, Joe, Gallup, N. Mex. 906
Zappettini, George, State forester, Carson City, Nev. 1051

SRP05386

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1964

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Las Vegas, Nev.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:45 a.m. in the Las Vegas Convention Center, Hon. Walter S. Baring (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. BARING. The Subcommittee on Public Lands will come to order for the purpose of studying wilderness legislation.

I would like to take this time to introduce my colleagues from the House Interior Committee who have accompanied me on this trip.

On my left is Compton White, Congressman from Idaho. Sitting next to Mr. White is Bob Duncan, Congressman from Oregon. On my right is the committee counsel, Milton Pearl. On his right is Congressman John Saylor, of Pennsylvania, and on his right the Congressman from Washington, Jack Westland.

We are very happy to have been able to come here and be with you today, but there are a few rules that I might impress upon the audience. There will be no tape recorders used or pictures taken during the session. This is a rule of the House of Representatives. No broadcasting will be done. If there are photographers who would like to take pictures of certain witnesses, we will, after a certain time, declare a short recess for 2 or 3 minutes, during which we will allow pictures, but none are to be taken while the committee is in session.

I would like to impress upon the audience, like I did in Denver and in Olympia, that we have so many hundreds of witnesses we will have to ask you to cooperate with the committee. I say this because we want to give everybody a fair chance to speak. Just because a membership contains some thousand members or 30,000 members does not mean that this is a popularity contest and to present so many letters of one opinion will not sway the committee.

We will continue the hearing tomorrow morning, if we have to, to finish the witnesses that are scheduled at this hearing. If you will cooperate with the committee, we will very definitely try to get you all in during the next 2 days. When we recess today, it will be until tomorrow morning at 9:30, and we will continue until possibly 1 if the list is not finished. Some of the members have been invited to attend the work up at Mercury, so that we would like them to be able to fly up there tomorrow afternoon while they are in the State and get back tomorrow night in order to catch the plane for Washington.

With that, I will call the first witness for this morning. The first witness is Frank P. Knight, director, Department of Mineral Resources, State of Arizona. Mr. Knight, we welcome you before the committee and you may proceed.

SRP05387

STATEMENT OF FRANK P. KNIGHT, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES, STATE OF ARIZONA, MINERAL BUILDING, FAIRGROUNDS, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. KNIGHT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Frank P. Knight, director of the Arizona Department of Mineral Resources, and am making this statement pursuant to instructions of the board of governors of this department. I appeared before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at its hearings at Sacramento on November 6, 1961, in opposition to the wilderness bill, S. 174, then before it.

The wilderness bill, S. 4, now before the subcommittee, is, I believe, identical with S. 174. The 13 House bills, which with S. 4 comprise the first category of bills being considered at this hearing, are identical or similar. Therefore, my 1961 statement is applicable to this category of bills also.

The second category consists of two identical bills, H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9101. Although these bills require affirmative action by Congress and are much preferable to the bills of the first category, they still aim at the setting aside of large areas of the public domain for single-purpose, wilderness use. Once set aside for such use, the areas would be effectively barred to most prospecting and all mining.

The third category of bills, consisting of four identical bills, H.R. 9162, H.R. 9163, H.R. 9164, and H.R. 9165, is a near approach to title II of the amended bill, H.R. 776, which was reported favorably by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on October 3, 1962. This title II is the most acceptable to the mining industry of any proposed wilderness legislation so far considered by either the House or Senate. But, it would have retained mining laws effective in an area at the time if its establishment as a wilderness area, only until December 1987, after which time such multiple use would have ceased unless continued by an act of Congress. The third category bills place the limiting date 14 years earlier.

The principle of multiple use is too important to the Nation's welfare and defense to be discarded at any time in favor of a single use unless the single use is clearly determined to be not only the highest use, but also one which is incompatible with another. Wilderness use has not been so determined. Therefore, the enactment of legislation proposing to set aside single-use wilderness areas prior to such determination, is protested.

There is no evidence that the present national forest wilderness, wild, and other areas available for enjoyment of wilderness in its natural state, are inadequate, or need further wilderness legislation, or that future wilderness needs cannot be met best under the laws now in effect.

As wilderness needs arise, need of minerals, timber, and other forest uses will also. So will the need of application of the principle of multiple use, and at a higher rate.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Knight.

Are there questions on the part of the committee?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Knight, on page 2 of your statement you say that there is no evidence the present or future needs of a wilderness can-

not be met under the laws now in effect. What are the laws now in effect?

Mr. KNIGHT. I think you have a very valid point there, Mr. Saylor. It is, after all, administratively done.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to you, Mr. Knight, to save you any further embarrassment, I would correct that statement, because there are no laws, and that is the reason the wilderness legislation is before us.

The Constitution of the United States places the control of public lands under the Congress of the United States. Back in the middle 1950's, this matter was brought to my attention that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior have made determinations on their own, without any laws of Congress whatsoever, and I introduced the first piece of legislation back in 1956. There are no laws covering the establishment of wilderness areas.

Mr. KNIGHT. I only have the solicitors opinion of the Department of Interior to back me up. I am not an attorney, Mr. Saylor. I am perfectly willing to correct that, but I think it is a pretty well-established wilderness.

Mr. SAYLOR. There are established wilderness areas. This is true, but they have been established by Executive order, not by law.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would just like to ask you, Mr. Knight: You say you are making the statement pursuant to instructions of the board of governors of the Department of Mineral Resources. Could you tell me in general terms who are the board of governors?

Mr. KNIGHT. The board of governors is a five-man board appointed by the Governor of Arizona.

Mr. WESTLAND. Has this statement of yours been given an OK by by the Governor of Arizona?

Mr. KNIGHT. By the Governor of Arizona, no.

Mr. WESTLAND. Has it been submitted to him?

Mr. KNIGHT. The Legislature of Arizona has previously adopted a resolution against the wilderness bill. It has that background.

Mr. WESTLAND. You feel you are speaking, not only for the Department of Mineral Resources, but for the State of Arizona?

Mr. KNIGHT. We are speaking for mining in Arizona. The Department of Mineral Resources is charged statutorily with the duty of furthering mining interests insofar as possible.

Mr. WESTLAND. You are a State agency?

Mr. KNIGHT. A State agency; right.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is all.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Knight.

Mr. KNIGHT. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Victor Verity, Arizona Small Mine Operators Association, Tucson, Ariz. He also speaks for the Western Governors' Mining Advisory Council.

Mr. Verity, we welcome you before the committee, and you may proceed.

SRP05389

STATEMENT OF VICTOR VERITY, ARIZONA SMALL MINE OPERATORS ASSOCIATION, TUCSON, ARIZ.

Mr. VERITY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Victor H. Verity, attorney at law, Tucson, Ariz., representing the Arizona Small Mine Operators Association and the Arizona delegation of the Western Governors' Mining Advisory Council. I have practiced law in Tucson for more than 27 years, representing individuals and organizations engaged in mining, particularly the exploration phase of the industry.

A mineral deposit with sufficient value to be operated as a mine is unique and might even be called a freak of nature. Where and when exploration will result in the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit cannot be predicted. Persons not thoroughly familiar with the mining industry are seldom aware of the incredibly large amount of effort, time, and money required to discover and bring into production a valuable mineral deposit. There is no area in Arizona that can be said to be without possibility of a mineral deposit of high value beneath the surface. No area should be closed to the search for minerals except for reasons of absolute necessity. Looking back to the turn of the century, we can readily see how unwise it would have been to withdraw from mineral entry the lands in Arizona in which there have been found the mines which now account for more than half of all the copper produced in the United States as well as other metals and minerals in very substantial amounts. It would be equally unwise to obstruct potential mineral production by present-day legislation.

For every ton of ore removed today we must have already developed another ton in reserve for tomorrow's production. The magnitude of this ore reserve requirement can be more readily understood when it is realized that in 1963 approximately 80 million tons of metal-bearing ore were mined in Arizona. To merely maintain existing levels of production for each succeeding year requires the exploration, discovery, and development of approximately the same tonnage. In addition, we must discover and develop additional ore reserves to provide the increment needed to supply the increased necessities of our constantly rising standard of living. If we are to maintain the required rate of new discoveries to keep pace with our national economy and defense needs we must adhere to a multiple-use principle on our public lands and such use must, of necessity, include mining.

The organizations and clients I represent do not oppose the concept of a wilderness, but do question the necessity of wilderness legislation. We see no reason why the existing wilderness, wild, and primitive areas cannot continue to be administered by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture to allow multiple use and preserve the wilderness character of the land. New withdrawals for such purposes should be by the Congress after adequate study and not by administrative decree.

Going now to H.R. 9162 and similar bills, we are pleased to see that Congress asserts its prerogative and its duty to legislate relating to administration of our public lands and that the Congress shall have the final word as to incorporation of lands into a wilderness system.

We are pleased to see that some recognition is given to multiple use in H.R. 9162 and similar bills, as contrasted to earlier ones which proposed a single use. H.R. 9162 (sec. 4(d)(2)) provides:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight December 31, 1973, laws of the United States pertaining to mineral leasing and mining shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extend to those lands designated by this Act as "wilderness areas"; subject, however, to such reasonable regulations governing ingress and egress as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture consistent with the use of the land for mineral location and development and exploration, drilling, and production, and use of land for transmission lines, water lines, telephone lines, or facilities necessary in exploring, drilling, producing, mining, and processing operations, including where essential the use of mechanized ground or air equipment, and restoration as near as practicable of the surface of the land disturbed in performing prospecting, location, and in oil and gas leasing, discovery work, exploration, drilling, and production, as soon as they have served their purpose. Mining locations and patents to mining claims lying within the boundaries of said wilderness areas shall be held and used solely for mining or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto: * * * Subject to valid rights then existing, effective January 1, 1974, the minerals in lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act and all amendments thereto.

The right of mineral entry is for a term of approximately 10 years only. At high elevations where snow lies on the ground, an elapsed time of 10 years is in reality closer to 5, so far as exploration is concerned. However, whether the term be for 5, 10 or in fact any fixed number of years, the inclusion of a time limit will, for all practical purposes, be the equivalent of closing the areas to mineral entry from the inception of the act. My reasons for this statement are as follows:

In my State there is not a single major mining district that has been fully explored, notwithstanding exploration programs that have been carried on with reasonable continuity over three-quarters of a century in some instances. Exploration is proceeding now and will continue for more years than any of us can predict.

Let's examine a specific case with which I am familiar and can speak from firsthand knowledge. The Pima Mining District south of Tucson, Ariz., is easily accessible by road, and the climate is such that exploration work is seldom affected by weather conditions. Mining was first done by Indians and later by Spaniards in the 16th century, but discoveries and production were minor until recent years. The major copper ore bodies in the district which have excited so much recent attention are overlain by alluvial overburden varying in depth from 40 to over 400 feet. There are but few surface outcrops. Geological studies were begun in 1949, followed by geophysical prospecting and then by drilling to determine the significance of the anomalies disclosed by geophysics. The ore body now known as the Pima mine was discovered by such drilling over an anomaly. This led to further exploration until now, 15 years later, the area is probably the most intensely studied mineralized area in the United States. Four major copper mines have come into production as a result of this activity, and the search continues at an accelerated pace for others. Exploration personnel responsible for the original discoveries and others who are

 SRP05391

now devoting a substantial part of their time to the area advise me that the year 2000 will not see the district fully explored.

The cost of exploration, delimiting the ore bodies, establishment of a mining system, concentrating mills and other necessary facilities to bring the Pima, Banner, Mission, and Esperanza mines into operation is estimated to have been well over $100 million.

Any major producing mine requires an investment of many millions of dollars. Before an investor is warranted in undertaking an exploration program that may require an investment of that magnitude, it is an indispensable requisite that the mining laws provide irrevocable, unlimited applicability both as to time and space and the further right to develop and operate any ore body discovered by such explorations.

All available geological knowledge indicates that mineral deposits occur at depths which have not yet been discovered. As the years go by and newer and better scientific prospecting techniques are developed, such ore bodies will be found; but there are so many obstacles to overcome that it will require the efforts of the best available talent working diligently and continuously to discover and develop these ore bodies.

There are several areas of great interest in my State which are being explored and others will unquestionably be explored, but time is a factor. Surely it will be unwise to predict that any given area, whether it be in Arizona or elsewhere, can be prospected, explored, and the existence or nonexistence of the valuable mineral deposits determined in the course of 10 years or in fact any given number of years. No test is known that can prove for all time that any region is devoid of valuable minerals. As a matter of fact, we do not know what minerals may be considered valuable in the future. A legislated cutoff point on mineral exploration in a wilderness area demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the time factor in the search for and discovery of mineral deposits. We must not intentionally place insurmountable obstacles in the path of the searchers for such deposits.

The principle of multiple use must be the guide for drafting legislation pertaining to the use of our public lands. No one group of our citizens should be given an exclusive right to the use of our public lands. The phrases "highest and best use" and "the greatest good for the most people" are often used in connection with discussions about our public lands. Such phrases have meaning only when analyzed in the light of what is best for all the people of the United States. No group, however, small, should be denied the use of our public lands under such rules and regulations as are reasonable, but neither should any group be shown a preference to the extent of denying use of the public lands to others. By far the greater part of our population by reasons of physical, financial, or time limitations, can never enjoy the seclusion and solitude of the proposed wilderness areas, and still others will be able to make but extremely limited use of wilderness areas. On the other hand, the mining industry performs a service and supplies a product to fill the needs of every individual in this United States, without exception.

The mining industry does not oppose the use of public lands as wilderness areas, even though it deems wilderness legislation unnecessary. It recognizes the fact that permitting groups other than mining interests to occupy and use the public lands is truly multiple use. The

industry further recognizes that when two or more groups use the public lands there may be conflicts, but it believes that conflicts between the ideologies or the proposed uses of different groups should cause the lands to be closed forever to use by one group or the other only when it is clearly demonstrated that such action is absolutely necessary in the public interest.

If the test of "the greatest good for the most people" is applied to wilderness legislation, then the equities favor mining, and certainly mining cannot be excluded under any standard of sound judgment and equality under the law.

Conflicting multiple uses should be governed by reasonable rules and regulations that will permit each group to carry out its desired objectives within reasonable limitations on such use. The mining industry recognizes that to preserve the wilderness character, adequate regulations must be adopted to control access and use. All users of the wilderness areas should be consulted and their advice heeded in the formulation of such regulations. Furthermore, mineral entry should not be conditioned on the issuance of such regulations but rather become subject to such regulations when issued. It would be preferable, of course, to establish guides for such regulations in the act. It should be kept in mind at all times that with modern techniques, vast areas are explored by geophysical, geological and geochemical methods which leave little or no trace of the work. Where anomalies indicate the possibility of mineralization, and drilling becomes necessary, the drill rigs and accessories occupy a site of very small dimensions.

A point that must never be lost sight of is that the supply of minerals is not forthcoming upon demand from an undiscovered mineral deposit. Due to the inherent nature of ore deposits, most exploration work for minerals is not productive of satisfactory results, because areas are found to be barren of minerals or mineralization is of such a low grade as to be uneconomical. If, as, and when exploration work may disclose an area with the potential of a valuable mineral deposit, to delimit the ore body by drilling, ascertain the grade, compile the facts necessary to determine what system of mining shall be used, obtain and install the necessary equipment, and put the property on a producing basis, the elapsed time on a major mine varies between 5 to 15 years. This indicates the absolute necessity of a policy that prospecting and exploration be continued without interruption at all times so that if, as, and when an emergency exists, the minerals will be available.

The public interest is best served by keeping the public domain open for the discovery and mining of minerals. A lesson can be learned from the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 which withdrew uranium from location under the mining laws. The errors of such a policy soon became apparent, and uranium was restored to location under the mining laws. With an incentive, prospectors soon became active throughout all sections of the country and the number of discoveries and the volume of uranium ores produced is eloquent testimony to the wisdom of the philosophy behind the mining laws of keeping the public domain open for discovery and mining of minerals.

I ask the members of this committee to bear in mind that the number of mineral deposits in the United States is fixed. Man cannot

 SRP05393

enlarge that number, but by closing public domain to mineral entry he can greatly reduce the availability of such deposits to mankind.

The Department of Interior is now proposing a bill to stimulate domestic exploration for minerals. This may be a tacit recognition by the Department of the fact that the creation of a wilderness system, closed to mineral entry, will adversely affect the production of minerals, and the proposed legislation is intended as an effort to offset this factor. The fact remains that there is no substitute for the vast number of prospectors (individuals, partners, and companies) who will prospect indefatigably on public domain open to mineral entry without bonuses or rewards other than the incentive that goes with the possibility of making a profit upon the discovery and development of a producing mine.

The public lands must be kept open to mineral entry. The mining industry will support wilderness legislation which will adequately protect the wilderness environment but at the same time will allow efficient, modern mineral exploration and, when ore bodies are discovered, their development and operation. I believe the industry would go along with regulations requiring that after exploration activities are discontinued the ground should be restored so far as it is feasible to do so. It is well recognized that mining operations which eventually follow the discovery of a valuable ore body usually take a relatively small surface area. The total of the wilderness, wild, and primitive areas in Arizona is about 674,000 acres. The land area disturbed by the mining operations of a major mine represents considerably less than 1 percent of that total.

The industry is strongly opposed to any system whereby wilderness areas are created by administrative or executive decision without effective public discussion of the pros and cons and without congressional approval.

There is still room in the exploration end of the mining industry for the small operator under the general mining laws where public domain is open to mineral entry. When an area is closed to mineral entry and requires administrative action to authorize prospecting within a given area, the small operator is through. His lack of resources prevents him from bringing about the necessary execution of executive or administrative procedures to make the land again available for mineral purposes.

As an attorney representing mining clients and having a mining background which antedates my law practice, I am fully aware of the fact that the subsurface values of land are at least as valuable and as important to the public and as vital to our economy as the surface values.

The predominant position of the United States in world mineral production is not something that just happened. First, of course, our Nation was blessed with lands containing minerals; but however abundant the supply of minerals in the ground may be their value is nil until discovered, mined, and converted into forms usable by industry to manufacture consumer goods for the people. The wise policy expressed in the mining law of 1872 wherein it was stated that "all valuable mineral deposits in lands belonging to the United States * * * shall be free and open to exploration and purchase" proved to be an amazingly successful policy. Under this law incredible amounts of energy and money have been expended in the search for and discovery

of mineral deposits resulting in production of untold billions of dollars of mineral wealth. It is an inescapable fact that upon the minerals we take from the earth is based our standard of living and our source of self-protection from hostile nations. It is not in the best interests of the people of the United States to erect legislative barriers to the search for minerals in the public domain.

If there is a need for wilderness legislation it is not urgent, inasmuch as such areas have been administered for many years by the Forest Service, and it appears qualified to continue functioning in this respect. The House now has before it H.R. 8070 which would provide for a public land law review. Proposed wilderness legislation would be a proper subject for review. Since wilderness legislation is not necessary legislation, it appears advisable to defer interim wilderness legislation until the proposed land law review has been resolved.

I thank you on behalf of the organizations I represent for this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee and express our views.

Mr. BARING. It is a very interesting statement.

Are there any questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Verity.

Mr. VERITY. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Kenneth J. Smithee, past president, Arizona Conservation Council, Phoenix, Ariz. We welcome you and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH J. SMITHEE, PAST PRESIDENT, ARIZONA CONSERVATION COUNCIL, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. SMITHEE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am Kenneth J. Smithee, immediate past president of the Arizona Conservation Council, representing the council's current president, Glenn C. Taylor, Jr., who could not be present today due to unavoidable commitments.

The Arizona Conservation Council is composed of 16 statewide organizations in the fields of conservation, recreation, and education, representing some 30,000 Arizonians who are members of these organizations. Affiliated organizations are:

Arizona Federation of Garden Clubs, Inc.
Arizona Federation of Women's Clubs.
Arizona Game Protective Association.
Arizona Education Association, executive committee.
Arizona Outdoor Writer's Association.
Arizona Parks & Recreation Association.
Maricopa Audubon Society.
Arizona State Parks Association.
Arizona State Horsemen's Association.
Arizona State Rifle & Pistol Association.
Arizona Association of Landscape Architects.
Arizona Bow Hunters Association.
Arizona Camera Club Council.
Arizona Zoological Society.
Central District, American Camping Association.
Wildlife Conservation Club.

These are State agencies.

SRP05395

Representatives of some of our affiliated agencies will testify later at this hearing. Unfortunately, several of the representatives could not be present, thus I am testifying in their behalf.

The council, we feel, has appropriately been described as the "Conservation Conscience" of Arizona. It is in this light that the Arizona Conservation Council wishes to strongly endorse the principle of wilderness preservation. I will not attempt a detailed analysis of the many fine bills pending before this subcommittee as this has already been accomplished by professional conservation agencies. The Arizona Conservation Council urgently requests that the strongest possible legislation be enacted early in this session of Congress. We believe that the Nation's remaining wilderness areas should be brought under the protection of congressional action without further delay. It is the council's belief that the legislation which your committee approves should include the strongest possible safeguards against despoiling of the wilderness by commercial interests.

The council, which is restricted to nongovernmental membership, believes it is the overwhelming desire of Arizonians that a meaningful wilderness bill be passed and enacted into law in order to protect what amounts to a very small part of our total public domain (approximately 2 percent). We believe time is running out and that if an adequate wilderness system is to be preserved in perpetuity for succeeding generations, action must be taken now. Delaying tactics and other methods used to keep this bill from being considered by the total membership of Congress should come to an end and the overwhelming wishes of our citizens complied with, which we believe would be the establishment of a wilderness system based on principle, fairness, and reason; meeting the criteria of the greatest good for the greatest number of people over the longest period of time.

We sincerely believe that when this measure is placed on the floor of Congress, it will pass overwhelmingly, thus showing the intense interest of the American people toward preserving a small part of their heritage or rather, their inheritance, as it should properly be called.

In summary, on behalf of the many citizens of the great State of Arizona, we respectfully request that the House Subcommittee on Public Lands and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee permit a meaningful wilderness bill to be voted on by Congress in this current session. The time to act is long past due.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Smithee.

Are there questions on the part of the committee?

Mr. DUNCAN. Did you say all of the agencies listed on the first page are official agencies of the State of Arizona?

Mr. SMITHEE. They are not agencies of the State of Arizona. We are not a governmental agency. They are members of our board of directors and affiliated agencies of the Arizona Conservation Council.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is the Arizona Conservation Council an official agency of the State of Arizona?

Mr. SMITHEE. It is not. By constitution it precludes governmental agencies.

Mr. BARING. Is it your desire to have other members come up with you at this time?

Mr. SMITHEE. There are two others here to make statements.

Mr. BARING. You people may come up and sit with Mr. Smithee.

Mrs. Sadler, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ROBERT C. SADLER, ARIZONA FEDERATION OF GARDEN CLUBS, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mrs. SADLER. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, the Arizona Federation of Garden Clubs, Inc., and National Federation wish to go on record as endorsing the enactment of H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162 bills, and any similar bills which have been or will be introduced with the necessary amendments.

Our organization has 89 statewide clubs and a membership of approximately 2,800. We are an affiliate member organization in good standing, of the Arizona Conservation Council.

I have the permission of our State president, Mrs. B. Mergen, to write this letter and as State conservation chairman and State representative to the Arizona Conservation Council wish to submit this letter as our vote of approval.

As time is running short, we respectfully request this committee to favorably consider and the Congress to enact, this vital legislation in this current session with God's blessing and approval.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Miss Jeannette Davis, secretary of the Maricopa Audubon Society. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. SCOTT SPAW, CHAIRMAN, CONSERVATION COMMITTEE, MARICOPA AUDUBON SOCIETY, AND SECRETARY, ARIZONA CONSERVATION COUNCIL (AS READ BY MISS JEANNETTE DAVIS)

Miss DAVIS. The Maricopa Audubon Society is represented at today's hearings, Convention Center, Las Vegas, Nev., by its authorized spokesman, Mr. Kenneth J. Smithee, speaking in favor of certain wilderness legislation, in behalf of all members of the Arizona Conservation Council. The Maricopa Audubon Society is one of 16 organized conservation units in Arizona which comprise the statewide Arizona Conservation Council. Individual membership in the council adds up to some 30,000 conservationists.

The Maricopa Audubon Society, in line with the policies of the National Audubon Society, endorses and urges the passage of H.R. 9070 (Saylor), et al. The Maricopa Audubon Society finds no serious objections to H.R. 9162 (Dingell) et al., and endorses its passage as an alternative to H.R. 9070.

You, the chairman of the committee-in-hearing, are fully aware of the rush of industry and people into the regions of the West. Arizona is a most willing target for much of this influx, but our State's conservationists join in spirit and action with those in authority and those interested citizens making an effort to legislate, regulate, and preserve a good national wilderness policy. Wilderness areas guarantee survival to plant and animal and refreshment to natural man. Without

SRP05397

sound wilderness areas, the day might be seen when outdoor nature will be an artificial aspect of American life, doled out to our children in the concept of a zoo.

Our spokesman, Mr. Kenneth J. Smithee, is the director of the Maricopa County parks system, and past president of the Arizona Conservation Council. He is accompanied by the secretary of the Maricopa Audubon Society, Miss Jeannette Davis.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

At this point, I will ask permission to insert a series of letters in the record.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The letters follow:)

ARIZONA CAMERA CLUB COUNCIL,
Phoenix, Ariz., January 9, 1964.

Hon. WALTER BARING,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Lands,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: As a representative of the Arizona Camera Club Council, composed of 300 members in 9 camera clubs in the State of Arizona, I wish to state we are vitally interested in the preservation of the scenic areas of these United States.

To protect such areas, our council certainly favors the passage of the wilderness bills, H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, H.R. 9520, or other bills similar in content, with strengthening amendments, and respectfully requests the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Congress to pass this needed legislation at the current session.

Time is running out, and delay will result in another instance of too little too late.

Respectfully,

(Miss) DOROTHY O'ROURKE,
ACCC Representative to the Arizona Conservation Council.

ARIZONA BOW HUNTERS ASSOCIATION,
Phoenix, Ariz., January 9, 1964.

Hon. WALTER BARING,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Lands,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the membership of the Arizona Bow Hunters Association I would like to testify in favor of the passage of wilderness bills H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, H.R. 9520, H.R. 9558, H.R. 9162, or bills similar in content with the necessary strengthening amendments.

We believe that time is running out for the implementation of a meaningful preservation of our natural wilderness. Because the 400-plus membership of our association, and the people of Arizona are in favor of these bills, we respectfully urge your committee and the Congress of the United States to enact this legislation in the current session.

Yours truly,

ALFRED K. HENDERSON, *President.*

AMERICAN CAMPING ASSOCIATION,
Central Arizona District, Temple, Ariz.

Hon. WALTER BARING,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Lands,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: This organization wishes to go on record as approving and urging the passage of H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, H.R. 9520, and H.R. 9558. We further favor the strengthening of these or similar bills to insure the perpetuation of the wilderness areas in the public domain.

Sincerely,

ERNEST E. SNYDER, *Secretary.*

ARIZONA ASSOCIATION OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS,
Phoenix, Ariz., January 9, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, House Subcommittee for Public Lands,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please consider this letter as favorable endorsement by the Arizona Association of Landscape Architects of the wilderness legislation as represented in varying degrees by the following listed bills: H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, H.R. 9520, H.R. 9558, and H.R. 9162, or bills providing similar features.

It is the opinion of this writer that so-called wilderness legislation is a reflection of the strong desire of this Nation's conservationists and outdoorsmen to preserve the natural beauty of our land, be it mountain or seashore.

Sincerely yours,

JIM LEADER,
Conservation Chairman.

ARIZONA STATE HORSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Scottsdale, Ariz., January 7, 1964.

Hon. WALTER BARING,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Lands, care of Mr. Ken Smithee, Maricopa County Park and Recreation Department, Phoenix, Ariz.

DEAR MR. SMITHEE: The ASHA is in complete accord with those who wish to extend and strengthen the wilderness areas. We oppose commercial entry into a wilderness area in any form. We believe the wilderness areas should be left in their natural state for equestrian and hiking use.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT C. BOHANNAN, JR., *President.*

ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT,
Phoenix, Ariz., January 10, 1964.

Representative WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARING: On behalf of the Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, I wish to be recorded as favoring the enactment into law of H.R. 9070, commonly known as the wilderness bill.

This approval is based on the current version of the bill, as introduced by Representative Saylor on November 7, 1963. We would particularly like to emphasize the retention in the bill of paragraph 7, section 4(d), which insures that hunting and fishing shall be permitted in national forest wilderness areas, and "that nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in wilderness areas."

Both the commission and the department have gone on record as approving the wilderness principle, and we believe H.R. 9070 best expresses the desires of the people we represent—some 300,000 hunting and fishing license buyers in the State of Arizona.

Sincerely,

R. J. SMITH, *Director.*

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions from members of the committee?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Smithee, the 16 organizations which you say are members of the conservation council, were they contacted before your coming before this committee?

Mr. SMITHEE. They were all notified I was coming; that is correct, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. And do you have their approval to speak for them?

SRP05399

Mr. SMITHEE. I have the approval of their representatives on our board of directors, which, in practically all cases, is tantamount to the approval of the organization.

Mr. SAYLOR. Do you know whether or not these 16 organizations have individually adopted a resolution or statement similar to those presented by Mrs. Sadler and Miss Davis?

Mr. SMITHEE. Yes. I brought some of those with me. Those are the letters you were talking about, Congressman Baring. There are others.

Mr. SAYLOR. They are some of the letters from these organizations which were entered into the record by the chairman?

Mr. SMITHEE. That is correct. I might add, at our last board meeting we were not able to contact some of the officers. Those letters will be forthcoming.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Smithee, and thank you, ladies.

The next witness is Smith Falconer, Jr., president, Arizona Parks & Recreation Association. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF SMITH FALCONER, JR., PRESIDENT, ARIZONA PARKS & RECREATION ASSOCIATION, TEMPE, ARIZ.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Smith Falconer, Jr., president of the Arizona Parks & Recreation Association.

The association at its January 10, 1964, meeting—this incidentally is our 14th year—directed that I appear before you here in Las Vegas, Nev., to enter as strong a plea as is possible for the best possible legislation to forever protect our national wilderness areas from the host of groups who would see them decimated.

Our association is well aware that for more than 7 years Congress has had pending before its legislation to establish a national policy in regard to wilderness areas, however we believe the time has now arrived when legislation must be enacted "to insure that the American people of this and future generations shall be able to enjoy the benefit of an enduring system of wilderness. It is an investment in the future of America but it can be lost forever unless prompt action is taken"—Congressional Record, speech of Hon. Jeffery Cohelan in the House of Representatives, December 19, 1963.

In closing, I believe it would be well to remember a statement by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall in the foreward of his recent book, "The Quiet Crisis."

> America today stands poised on a pinnacle of wealth and power, yet we live in a land of vanishing beauty, of increasing ugliness, of shrinking open space, and of an overall environment that is diminished daily by pollution and noise and blight.

The Arizona Parks & Recreation Association believes that when meaningful legislation is presented to the Congress of the United States that it will pass with a large majority thus demonstrating the great interests of our Representatives in seeking that a small part of America is preserved as it was for ourselves and all those who come after us.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Falconer.

Are there any questions?

Thank you very much.

Mr. FALCONER. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is J. P. Clemons, president, Arizona Game Protective Association.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT SPILLMAN, IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT, ARIZONA GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, INC., PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. SPILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Robert Spillman, and I am the immediate past president. I am attending on behalf of Mr. Clemons, who had a conflicting engagement.

The Arizona Game Protective Association is a statewide organization consisting of affiliated sportsmen's and conservation clubs and business and industrial supporting members. The association has been in continuous existence for in excess of 40 years and is now chartered as a nonprofit corporation.

The Arizona Game Protective Association, throughout its history, has participated actively in matters involving conservation.

We support the establishment of wilderness preservation and believe that legislation by Congress provides the most adequate assurance of the fulfillment of this goal.

The merits of such legislation and the objections thereto are well known and have been comprehensively stated during past years of debate and prior hearings.

It would be needless reiteration to elaborate further concerning the objectives of such legislation.

Progress in accomplishing the establishment of wilderness preservation has been made if past debates and hearings have narrowed the areas of controversy. We believe this to be the case from a review of pending legislation and from our awareness of the many comments and assumed positions concerning the pending legislation.

Flexibility and the willingness to consider alternative proposals has been and is being demonstrated by proponents of wilderness preservation. We cannot, however, support legislation recognizing by preamble the merits of wilderness preservation and providing by subsequent sections thereof, the means by which such purposes may be thwarted or unrealized. Certainly, we cannot advocate the passage of legislation which imperils the continuation of favored status for areas now managed pursuant to regulation prior to congressional determination. We are here to attempt to secure something additional for present and future generations and not to effect an exchange.

Our analysis of House bill 9070, introduced by Representative John P. Saylor, leads us to believe that this wilderness bill adequately provides for the establishment of wilderness preservation and reasonably meets the objections to previous bills. We hope that the willingness of the proponents of wilderness legislation to seek unity and compromise with opponents to the legislation will not serve to signal additional and previously withheld objections.

SRP05401

Considerable attention has been focused on House bill 9162, introduced by Representative John Dingell. Although this bill also seeks to meet objections to previous bills, some provisions therein, along with significant omissions are cause for concern.

We feel that the purposes for which wilderness areas shall be devoted should be delineated in a wilderness bill.

We furthermore feel that provisions should be made for the continued administration of primitive, park, and refuge areas as on the date of enactment of wilderness legislation until Congress has acted on a recommendation of the President, or until Congress has determined otherwise.

Additionally, the continued allowance of mining activity for an additional 10 years would, in our opinion, potentially nullify the objectives of wilderness legislation.

However carefully the proposed legislation may be drafted and thoroughly discussed, complete unanimity will not be attained. Any acceptance of the basic objectives set forth for the enactment of wilderness legislation necessarily contemplates preservation of the status quo whereas commercial progress involves change.

We feel, however, that the lasting benefits obtained through the passage of wilderness legislation, will reflect the desires of the general public and will not materially hinder commercial progress.

We earnestly solicit Congress to enact favorable wilderness legislation at an early date.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Spillman.

Are there any questions from the committee?

Mr. DUNCAN. It is a good statement.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Spillman, you represent mainly conservation organizations and sportsmen organizations. Are a majority of your members hunters and fishermen?

Mr. SPILLMAN. I would say the majority are, sir, yes.

Mr. WHITE. Then the question I would like to ask you is this, sir; Do you feel that hunting is compatible with wilderness?

Mr. SPILLMAN. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel the natural balance that nature would provide would not be adequate, that there should be a harvest in the area?

Mr. SPILLMAN. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel the same way about the timber in the area?

Mr. SPILLMAN. No. I would say probably our organization does not take that attitude concerning the logging.

Mr. WHITE. When are the two incompatible?

Mr. SPILLMAN. We feel, as far as game is concerned, we can remove the game from the area without changing essentially the nature or description, the geography of the area.

Mr. WHITE. Do we not change the habitat, the browse conditions which these animals have?

Mr. SPILLMAN. We feel reducing the number of game animals helps preserve the natural habitat.

Mr. WHITE. I did not ask that question, whether you preserve it or not. I said, did you change it?

Mr. SPILLMAN. By the removal of animals, sir?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. SPILLMAN. Potentially, yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel that hunting is a special use?

Mr. SPILLMAN. I would say hunting is a use. I do not know if you would classify it as a "special use" or not.

Mr. WHITE. I am just wondering what special use you would permit in the wilderness area and what special uses you would not permit in the wilderness area.

Mr. SPILLMAN. Essentially, as I understand the legislation, we would preserve most of the recreational uses, if they would not involve any particular commercial change involved in the area. We consider hunting and fishing and camping and hiking recreational uses.

Mr. WHITE. Granted they are recreational uses, but at the same time I will say to you I feel you will find people argue the point that this is not the true concept of wilderness management, the removal of the game in the area.

Mr. SPILLMAN. I appreciate that, sir.

Mr. BARING. Are there any further questions?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Spillman, I would like to commend you and also the other witnesses that have appeared so far, both proponents and opponents of this legislation, because, as a member of this committee for a number of years, it is evident to me that the witnesses who are appearing today are a great deal better informed about this legislation than the witnesses when the field hearings were held 2 years ago. From proponents and opponents we have had recommendations with regard to specific pieces of legislation. This shows that attention has been paid to the bills that have been introduced.

In the hearings which were held in the field 2 years ago, many of the people who appeared, both proponents and opponents, admitted time and time again that they had never read any of the bills, and I am delighted to see this change.

Mr. Spillman, I want to commend you for a very fine statement.

Mr. SPILLMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Thank you very much.

Mr. SPILLMAN. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Ralph Denton, Clark County Commissioner, Las Vegas, Nev. We are very happy to welcome you before the committee this morning.

STATEMENT OF RALPH DENTON, CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONER, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, my name is Ralph L. Denton. I am appearing as a member of the Clark County Commision, representing the Nevada Association of County Commissioners in the first instance.

First, I would like to congratulate the committee on scheduling these field hearings—the better to find out how the pending wilderness legislation would affect the local areas. There is no substitute for grassroots opinion—especially in matters affecting public lands—and it was a Washington official, Gifford Pinchot, father of the Forest

 SRP05403

Service, who first advanced this truth as gospel when he made as one of his administrative rulings that:

"Questions will be decided by local officers on local grounds."

You see, it is perhaps very difficult for people in other parts of the country to realize what it is to be strapped in—to be landlocked—by the Federal domain and the archaic laws and administrative rules which govern more than 86 percent of the State, our strappling cities need growing room to achieve maturity. Instead, they are stunted and frustrated by a Federal land policy straitjacket—that has grown up like Topsy.

When public lands are released—such as small tract sales—instant slums are often created because the tracts have not had the benefit of proper planning, zoning, or other urban services. The acute inflammation resulting from Nevada urban needs contrasted with Federal land law and policy is not an isolated disorder endemic only to our cities.

Why is ranching—the hallmark of American independence and the symbol of the western frontier, and dependent on the public domain for grazing—mortgaged up to the hilt, and the prices for its products the lowest in 15 years and its net return averaging less than 2 percent per year? Could it have something to do with unsatisfactory Federal policies—including land administration which takes the incentive out of improving grazing lands because of the insecurity of tenuous year-to-year grazing privileges?

Why do sportsmen and other recreationists often scream "foul" at their fellow user of the public domain and demand sole right of use? Is it because a patchwork policy—not built on a total rationale—can never satisfy anybody?

Surely, it must be apparent that growing up like Topsy simply isn't good enough for a policy which governs the public land—our most precious resource. What our time calls for, indeed, cries out for, is the kind of broad thinking that George Perkins Marsh advocated 100 years ago—but is ever more pertinent today.

What we must do is to conduct a total land classification study of the public lands. We must determine how they should properly serve mankind now and for generations to come—a national land resource planning project, if you will.

Just as the "dirty thirties" was a time when the land blew away, when our economy blew up, and when the souls of men withered in the process, now the 1960's are showing some of the degenerative symptoms of that former generation. We must halt the death of our ranching industry; we must scourge the public land slums growing around our cities; we must resuscitate our cities with breathing room; and we must provide an escape hatch of unfettered nature into which our people can flee from suburbia.

All of this and much more can be done with the public land, but it must be done as the result of planning, not capriciously locking it up like Midas' gold or fitfully disposing of it like throwing chaff in the wind.

Therefore, I would propose that this committee consider the drafting and passage of legislation to initiate such a land resource planning project before any further large-scale disposition of the public lands is contemplated.

Next, the whole gamut of public land law and administrative rulings which impinge upon this law must be reviewed for its pertinence and equity and in the light of today's and tomorrow's needs. Such a review, I believe, is embodied in the pending Public Land Law Review Commission (H.R. 8070). I would recommend this committee seriously consider adopting this bill.

This land law review should run concurrently with the resource planning project and both studies should have definite time schedules that will allow Congress to move on the public land problem with alacrity—once our needs are known and planned for.

However, should Congress consider passage of wilderness legislation prior to the completion of the land law review and resource planning, then the lands involved in wilderness determination should receive first priority for study as to suitability—such as the 3- and 5-year deadlines in H.R. 9070 with an act of Congress necessary for inclusion of areas into the wilderness. However, there should also be the provision that should Congress fail to act on the President's recommendation during the session of Congress that the recommendation is introduced, then the recommendation shall fail for lack of action.

Assuming that Congress passes legislation—either the wilderness legislation before us or any other laws—which might arise out of resource planning, Congress should, nevertheless, reserve the right for periodical review of ascribed uses under such legislation. This feature is conspicuously absent from the wilderness bills. Without the periodical review of Congress, uses might well get out of tempo with our needs and technology.

In the administration of any area of the public domain—wilderness not excepted—as much responsibility and authority as possible should be conferred on qualified local governing bodies:

Allow our county commissioners and city councils the opportunity to advise and mold regulations involving urban needs.

Give dignity and status to the counsel of the grazing boards where that activity is concerned.

Share management responsibilities of mineral lands with our State departments of mines.

Conserve and manage our fish and wildlife resources through the cooperative efforts of State fish and game departments and the Federal Government.

Finally, Congress should undertake the responsibility of laying down guidelines for the administration of the public lands—pertinent to whatever uses they may be put. Excessive administrative latitude in public land matters—such as that found in the wilderness bills before us—has made for a lack of clear policy continuity and has resulted in hardship to the users and the public generally.

Related to this problem is the need for Congress to set a cutoff date within any bill which would dispose of certain lands—such as the wilderness lands named in the bills being considered. Since this nomenclature is administratively ascribed, Congress, by setting a cutoff date before passage would make certain that lands contemplated during passage could not be enlarged upon or constricted or changed between the time of passage and becoming law.

Still another facet of the administration of public land laws is the need to write provisions guaranteeing judicial appeal of administrative decisions—in the judicial district where the dispute arises.

 SRP05405

Again, it is the local area where the problem exists and it should be there that it is settled.

Indeed, a full rewriting of the wilderness bills seems indicated—both as to making them more specific as to administrative authority and clarifying the extent of multiple use to remove such use from the control by whim of the Secretaries. We feel the bill should be changed to provide that when the area is increased it should require affirmative action by the Congress, rather than, as some of the bills provide now, if the President makes a recommendation and the Congress does not act the wilderness areas increase. We feel this should take further Congressional action.

However, in the light of the fact that there are yet thousands of acres of the public domain that have yet to be surveyed—let alone fitted into the complex pattern of this generation's ecology and that of generations to come—it seems rather premature to dispose of millions of acres now.

Rather let us dispose first of our longstanding obligation to plan for the wise use of our public lands.

Thank you. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. BARING. Ralph, I might say, on the part of the subcommittee, that this subcommittee and the full committee has already passed H.R. 8070. It was passed and sent to the floor of the House shortly before Christmas, but due to the heavy schedule, it had no time to be scheduled. I believe it will be one of the first orders of business in the new year now.

Mr. DENTON. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that is a tremendous step forward.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to congratulate you on what I feel is a very fine and objective statement on behalf of your association of county commissioners.

I want to assure you that Congress always has the right to review. No act of Congress that any session of Congress passes can bind any succeeding Congress. In all of the bills that are being considered, even including the one that has been passed by the Senate, there is required annual reports by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress, and the Congress, particularly the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate counterpart committee will be given an opportunity to review what has been done with regard to each of these areas.

Mr. DENTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Denton.

Mr. DENTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is W. L. Mills, Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, Boise, Idaho. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF W. L. MILLS, IDAHO STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BOISE, IDAHO

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I am W. L. Mills of Boise, Idaho. I am director of governmental affairs for the Boise Cascade Corp., and also here today representing the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce,

and I would also submit a statement for the Idaho Cattlemen's Association.

I would like to compliment the members of this committee and the full committee, and also the Members of the House of Representatives for their attention to this legislation. As you know, the State of Idaho for the past several years has been a leader in opposition to wilderness legislation. I think the statements I will present here today will show a complete change of attitude on the part of individuals and organizations. I think it is well that you people have given the attention you have to a conciliatory attitude on the part of the Congress and I think these statements show that in our State there is some reciprocity among our people.

First I will read the statement of the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce. The following local chambers of commerce also endorse my statement:

Greater Boise Chamber of Commerce.
Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce.
Gooding Chamber of Commerce.
Idaho Falls Chamber of Commerce.
Lewiston Chamber of Commerce.
Moscow Chamber of Commerce.
Orofino Chamber of Commerce.
Pocatello Chamber of Commerce.

We wish it understood that we are still of the opinion that wilderness legislation, providing for the establishment of a wilderness system, is not necessary for the preservation of wilderness in the United States, because we are blessed in this country with an abundance of wilderness type country which can only remain in this condition and because the present legislative structure is entirely adequate for the preservation of wilderness and wild areas. We further feel that the establishment of a wilderness system can only lead eventually to the administration of such a system under one department, even though this is not contemplated in the present bill.

With the above objections or reservations in principle spelled out, we believe that H.R. 9162 is getting much closer to a compromise solution to the wilderness controversy. There are certain reservations that we must make and certain suggestions for amendment which we would like to propose to further clarify the bill and make it more acceptable from our standpoint.

First, we feel that it is not desirable to include national park lands or wildlife refuge and game range land in a National Wilderness Preservation System. These lands are already administered for specific purposes by the agencies designated by act of Congress. Full authorization for their administration as wilderness areas already exists without further action.

Second, the act should spell out definitely the status of lands which are now in primitive area status and which have not been reviewed within the 10 years specified in the act for such review. The consensus seems to be that these lands would revert to regular national forest status, but the bill doesn't say so.

Third, regulations U-1 and U-2 should be specifically set aside. If this is not done, the power to set aside additional primitive areas would continue to rest with the Forest Service.

SRP05407

Fourth, in the matter of submission of recommendations to the President by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior under (C) on page 7 of this bill in lines 1, 2, and 3, we feel that the submission of opinions by Federal agencies concerned should be mandatory and that the Federal agencies should be named specifically as they have been in some previous bills.

Fifth, under "Prohibition of Certain Uses" (C) on page 9, line 20, we feel that the words "protection and management" should be added after the word "administration," because we feel that it is as necessary to protect and manage wilderness lands as any other area.

Sixth, we feel very strongly that some provision must be made for periodic review and reevaluation of the lands contained within the boundaries of wilderness areas. This should be done, not with the idea of ascertaining their continued suitability as wilderness, but with the idea of inventorying their entire potential and determining their greatest use. These reviews should be required and conducted at regular specified intervals of time, perhaps each 25 years.

Seventh, under "State and Private Lands Within Wilderness Areas," section 5(a) there is a provision for exchange of Federal land for State-owned land. No such provision is contained in the bill in the case of private land. We feel such a provision should be added to this bill. We further feel that the "or" in line 10 on page 15 should be changed to "and" for the sake of clarity.

Finally, we feel that the Dingell bill goes a long way toward resolving the controversy over wilderness in the Western United States and that if this kind of legislation is deemed necessary and is enacted it must be kept under the direct control of the Congress. Furthermore, there must be provision in the act for review and change commensurate with the needs of our changing, vital economy.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the statement of the Idaho Cattlemen's Association will be made a part of the record at this point.

STATEMENT OF IDAHO CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, BOISE, IDAHO

The Idaho Cattlemen's Association has been and at its recent annual convention reaffirmed its opposition to wilderness legislation because our industry feels it is unnecessary. The present status of these lands and administrative authorities are adequate to protect and preserve Federal lands for the generations of the future.

H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162 are of some improvement over previous legislation. They leave primitive areas out of the wilderness system; add new areas to those initially included by these bills, only by approval of Congress. They allow ingress and egress to privately owned lands and valid mining claims surrounded by national forest wilderness areas. Provision is made for planned, recurring surveys of national forest wilderness areas by Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines to determine mineral values. Established grazing shall be permitted to continue subject to reasonable regulations. However, H.R. 9162 improves over H.R. 9070 by allowing 10 years (instead of 5) for review and recommendations by the appropriate Secretary on primitive areas and units of national park and wildlife refuge systems. H.R. 9162 is perhaps more workable and less confusing.

The proposed legislation still provides for establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System that lumps together Federal lands of three different authorizations administered by three separate agencies into a common system for a single specialized use.

This is unnecessary and will only create confusion and increase the national budget. H.R. 9070 allows only 5 years for review, hearings, and recommendations to Congress on primitive areas, national parks, monuments, and wildlife units in contrast to 10 to 14 years specified in S. 4 and H.R. 9162. No exchange provision has been made in case of surrounded privately owned lands.

If Congress is to enact wilderness legislation, this association hopes it will be confined to national forest lands now classified as "wild" and "wilderness" and those portions of primitive areas found, after review within 10 or more years to be predominantly valuable as wilderness and approved for "wilderness" designation by affirmative acts of Congress.

The Idaho Cattlemen's Association respectfully requests that this statement be entered in its entirety in the record of the hearing at Las Vegas, Nev., January 13, 1964.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I will now give the statement for the Boise Cascade Corp. Our general offices are in Boise.

I want you members of this Subcommittee on Public Lands to know how much I appreciate your courtesy in allowing me to testify here today. You gentlemen, the other members of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Members of the House of Representatives are to be congratulated on the fine work you have done in bringing close together the once widely varying views of many individuals and organizations on a question so controversial as the establishment of wilderness areas in the United States. Because of your diligence and commonsense approach, you appear to be close to a solution to the problem. The American people owe each of you a debt of gratitude.

In speaking for my corporation, today, my position is one of general support for H.R. 9162. We would prefer some technical changes in the bill which we feel would strengthen the legislation and make land management easier and better under the Wilderness Act. I hope the committee will consider these suggestions and then promptly act on the bill so that it may be passed by the Congress. A great deal of time has already been spent by the Congress, by organizations, and individuals on the matter. I believe most people are now anxious to have a fair, workable bill become law.

In the matter of suggestions for improvement of H.R. 9162, I respectfully suggest:

First. I feel that it would be better to establish wilderness areas rather than the wilderness system. The use of the term "area" would be less confusing to the agencies charged with administration.

Second. Providing for periodic reviews of all resources appears to be good management practice under the multiple-use concept.

Third. Under section 3 there seems to be no clear understanding of what final disposition is made of lands not receiving the approval of Congress for inclusion in the wilderness system. I feel this should be corrected in order that a definite pattern may be established for the disposition of the lands not selected by Congress for positive wilderness designation.

My corporation feels strongly that one of the most vital points of the legislation is the inclusion in H.R. 9162 of the provision that the Congress must act affirmatively on the recommendations received from the agencies in order that the areas be designated as "wilderness." I most strongly urge that this feature be included in any legislation passed by Congress.

Again, I want to thank you members of the subcommittee for your patience and for the interest you have shown in the management of our public lands.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

SRP05409

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to welcome you here, Mr. Mills.

To clarify, Idaho has, over a period of time, been one of the leaders of opposition to wilderness, and perhaps because one of the greatest amounts of wilderness proposed is in the State of Idaho. Also, we have talked about the figure of 2 percent of the total area being wilderness. It is not only quantity but quality of wilderness, and this has a point on each side. But in the State of Idaho some of the finest lands in the State, the most productive land, is proposed for wilderness. Perhaps there would not be so much opposition to wilderness in Idaho if they would take some of the land adjacent to the Crater of the Moon National Park where it is little use to the people.

I suppose today others will make the point on the 2-percent figure. I think it is a figure that does not mean too much unless we think of the quality of the land as well.

Thank you for coming here.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct, and in our State we have a lot of the total wilderness area of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Mills, did you ever stop and think how much land is proposed to be taken out of the State of Idaho in wilderness?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Do you know how many acres it is?

Mr. MILLS. Somewhat over 3 million acres.

Mr. WHITE. I have thought about it, and it is equivalent of a strip of land from New York to Seattle a mile wide and then back to Chicago that has to come out of the State of Idaho, a State already 66.6 percent owned by the Federal Government, with a narrowing tax base as one of the problems we have in the State of Idaho.

I think you made a fine statement. Thank you for appearing.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Mills, I want to commend you for a very fine presentation. As a proponent of the wilderness legislation, I am delighted to see the change in attitude that these statements you have presented here today represent.

In the first statement you made, I am particularly intrigued with the statement that appears on page 2. I would like to have you explain that a little more, if you will.

> Third. Regulation U1 and U2 should be specifically set aside. If this is not done, the power to set aside additional primitive areas would continue to rest with the Forest Service.

Would you please explain that further?

Mr. MILLS. Congressman, if I understand this, these are the regulations by which these areas are set aside now as wilderness. This was on the part of certain chambers of commerce within our State who insisted that this be included in the record. This was their decision. This should be part of their statement.

Mr. SAYLOR. It is my understanding that these regulations to which you refer are the regulations, issued by the Forest Service, which would allow the Department of Agriculture to review the primitive areas and to classify them as wilderness. There is nothing that I know of that would allow in these regulations, the setting aside of additional primitive areas by the Department of Agriculture. I want to assure you I will look into this very carefully and make sure that, if

what is suggested here in your statement is correct, this will not continue.

In the statement you have submitted for the Cattlemen's Association, you recommend that the legislation be confined to national forest lands and that it not include, apparently, anything in the national parks or in any other areas. In view of the fact there are very few national parks or monuments in which grazing is now permitted, do you have any idea why Mr. Eaton has included that in his statement?

Mr. MILLS. No; I do not, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say, for the record, we have found there are at the present time in the Idaho wilderness-type areas in the national forests 2,630,298 acres, and in addition there are some other areas that might qualify: the Selway-Bitterroot, Craters of the Moon National Monument, and the portion of Yellowstone National Park which is in Montana, the total area in Idaho, totaling about 80,000 acres.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. Next will be a group appearing for the Nevada State Grazing Boards: Fred Strosnider, Yerington, Nev.; George N. Swallow, Ely, Nev.; Robert Cowles, 535 South Arlington Avenue, Reno, Nev.; George W. Abbott, attorney at law, Minden, Nev.; Kenneth L. Mann, Post Office Box 512, Elko, Nev.; and Roy Young, State assemblyman from Elko County, Nev.

Mr. ABBOTT. If we may, Mr. Chairman, we propose Mr. Strosnider, Mr. Swallow, and Mr. Ellison, E-l-l-i-s-o-n, and myself in this group, followed by Mr. Mann, Mr. McGowan, M-c-G-o-w-a-n, Mr. Young, and Mr. McCrea, M-c-C-r-e-a.

Mr. BARING. I want to welcome all of you in our own State here. I know you have prepared very fine statements. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE ABBOTT, GARDNERVILLE, NEV., COUNSELOR, CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF NEVADA STATE GRAZING BOARDS

Mr. ABBOTT. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is George W. Abbott, I am an attorney at law residing at Gardnerville, Nev., with offices at Minden, Nev. I appear here today in—I guess—three capacities: as special legal counsel to the Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards, a committee established in Nevada about 25 years ago, by act of the legislature, and representing approximately 1,043 Nevada livestock operators who hold Taylor Grazing Act permits or licenses; as special legal counsel to the National Public Lands Coordinating Committee, a group having as its purpose coordination of efforts, and exchange of ideas among users of public land resources, and other interests, in the 11 Western States and Alaska, to the end that balanced, orderly, and effective managemet, use, and disposition of such resources can be assured; finally, because of some past service in both the legislative and executive branches of the National Government, I have a private citizen's interest in the subject of these field hearings.

SRP05411

There has been handed to your staff members for inclusion in these proceedings or for filing, if more appropriate, copies of a memorandum dated December 29, 1963, entitled "Comments on Pending Wilderness Bills," prepared for the Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards.

At gatherings of Nevada and other western livestock, general agriculture, mining, oil and gas, wildlife, recreation, and governmental representatives during the past 2 years one fact emerges: there is no consensus of opinion on approach by the Congress to wilderness legislation. Our memorandum reflects what were believed to be some 12 to 15 major points deserving of consideration in any markup of the pending bills of which four points, in summary fashion, particularly deserve emphasis:

(1) That the Congress, and not the executive branch should retain full and continuing control of public land resources management, use, and disposition—whether there is involved wilderness values, or all or any other resources.

(2) That authority given the Secretaries of the Interior and of Agriculture, or the President, should be bullet slim and clean, not shotgun broad, ragged, and fuzzy.

(3) That the economies and historic uses of resources in the more than 400 counties of the 11 Western States and Alaska be fully weighed in the balance with other considerations in wilderness—or any and all other resources—policy measures.

(4) That the Congress enact H.R. 8070, or similar legislation, to establish a Public Land Law Review Commission, so that such study group can complete its mission. The Congress can then consider needed revision of our public land laws for all resource values, including wilderness values.

In my observation the vast majority of those who live—and must make a living—in the outdoors, love the outdoors. A person can be for fullest and wisest possible use of natural resources without being against wilderness values. Few are. One can be protimber harvesting without being antiwilderness preservation; he can be devoted to motorboating without hating hiking. To include fishing and hunting, and grazing in an overall resources plan—in their proper places—surely does not call for excluding wilderness preservation, in its proper place. "Preservation" can mean saving, or it can mean wasting, just as "use" can mean destruction.

Developments of hundreds of pages of testimony on wilderness has taken time, and produced no little heat. But it has also blunted some tempers—on both sides—and created a good deal of light. Because you are holding hearings in the West, my closing comments:

Clock and calendar tell us that the time is now for Western interests—for people in the public lands States—to awaken, find their common problems, pool their common interests. And make common cause toward sound resources policy, since at least one-half of the West's alltime future is anchored to the roughly half of its area in Federal ownership.

If the Mountain and Pacific States, with Alaska, are to have a balanced living base, playing base, taxing base, and community expansion base to match the westward population surge, then it is imperative that their spokesmen have a larger voice, and be permitted to

be heard, on those important public land and associated resource policy matters. Your subcommittee hearings are an important part of such requirement.

If local and area economies dependent upon full and balanced Federal resources use are to be sustained and a balance continued, I am convinced safeguards are needed to assure that local and area requirements will be fully weighed in effecting Federal land policies. The review and public hearing provisions of H.R. 9162 are a step in the right direction.

If governmental subdivisions seriously concerned about revenues to make their governments run are to be able to plan for tomorrow, they must be coarchitects of today's Federal land policy planning. And if the pattern for tomorrow's use and disposition of one-half of the land area of the West is being set today—and it is—then any amount of time consumed toward a proper decision, before such planning patterns become frozen, serves, truly serves, the public interest.

We are not at war with the wilderness concept; we support the basic objectives of this legislation. We do offer our comments, and some criticisms of the pending proposals, in that vein.

Thank you, Chairman Baring, for permitting me this time on behalf of those with whom I work on resources matters.

I would commend to your attention the position of the people who accompany me, beginning with Mr. Strosnider.

Mr. BARING. You many proceed, Mr. Strosnider.

STATEMENT OF FRED STROSNIDER, YERINGTON, NEV.

Mr. STROSNIDER. Congressman Baring and Members of Congress, my name is Fred Strosnider and I reside at Yerington, Nev., and am engaged in the livestock business. I am chairman of the Central Committee of the Nevada Grazing Boards. This board has been established by the Legislature of the State of Nevada and is made up of two members of each local advisory board. I have had the good fortune to have served as chairman since its organization.

The duties of this committee are varied, but include making of studies, research and correlation of programs affecting the livestock industry which is dependent upon the Federal range and administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

It is the policy of our committee to present to the Congress a positive and constructive program, as it appears to us, on the many bills now introduced there concerning public lands. We are in accord with the provisions of the proposed establishment of Public Lands Law Review Commission. This legislation should be passed as soon as possible. The subject of wilderness legislation should be among the first requirements of the Commission for study and disposition. Further, our committee recommends the following subjects outlined as our statement of policy and for guidelines for legislative action: (1) Multiple use of resources; (2) continue present uses and assured tenure; (3) more State and local responsibility and participation in decisionmaking regarding public lands; (4) adoption of Congressional standards in legislation, with reduced emphasis on Executive rulemaking and unrestricted discretion; (5) preservation of private property ownership rights in any program setting up wilderness or primitive areas; and (6) continued attention to land classification and

SRP05413

its relation to historic uses and local economies. These are all factors in any program setting up necessary and essential legislation.

It is the experience of seeking the great need for revision of the public land laws that prompted the introduction of H.R. 8070 providing for a Public Land Law Review Commission, for the correlation of all land laws.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are many people here to present statements or testimony for the record. I would like to have your permission to extend appropriate and statistical material for the record.

I thank you.

Mr. BARING. Now, Mr. George Swallow.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE N. SWALLOW, ELY, NEV.

Mr. SWALLOW. Congressman Baring and members of the Public Lands Subcommittee, I wish to express appreciation personally and on behalf of the Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards for the opportunity of presenting our views regarding wilderness legislation at this scheduled hearing of the House Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

My name is George N. Swallow. I reside at Ely, Nev. I am vice chairman of the Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards. I am a member of the National Advisory Board Council representing Nevada. I am also a Nevada rancher. I operate sheep and cattle.

Today I appear in opposition to Senate bill S. 4 which passed the Senate on April 9, 1963, and 13 bills introduced by Members of the House of Representatives similar to or identical with S. 4; and in opposition to two identical bills—H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9101.

I also appear in opposition to four identical bills: H.R. 9162, introduced by Representative Dingell, Democrat, of Michigan; H.R. 9163, introduced by Representative Reuss, Democrat, of Wisconsin; H.R. 9164, introduced by Representative O'Hara, Democrat, of Illinois; and H.R. 9165, introduced by Representative Bennett, Democrat, of Florida.

The preamble of S. 4 states as follows: "To establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes."

The statement of policy contained in S. 4 states in part as follows:

> The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness.

The definition of wilderness as contained in S. 4 is as follows:

> A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding oppor-

tunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

Of all the special provisions contained in S. 4 relating to the use of aircraft, motor boats, prospecting, exploration for oil and gas, mining, maintenance of reservoirs, transmission lines, road construction, grazing of livestock, and so forth, are subject to such regulations as the appropriate secretary finds necessary. I am sure we will all agree that a Secretary of the Interior who wishes to impose very restrictive regulations could close a wilderness area and make it impossible for the multiple use principle to survive.

S. 4 and all of the House bills introduced with respect to proposed wilderness legislation would eventually include a substantial acreage out of federally owned lands contained within the boundaries of all the Western States, including Nevada, to be part of a wilderness system. Before this is accomplished by legislation, all federally owned lands in all of the Western States should be classified to determine the proper disposition.

The weekend of April 6, 1961, Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall, Justice William Douglas, and others, deeply concerned with conservation, gathered at the Sheraton Palace Hotel in San Francisco, Calif., for the Seventh Biannual Wilderness Conference. About the same time, Rutherford Plat, a botanist, explorer, and author ("The Green World") who in a single afternoon saw bulldozers scoop up a tropical Hawaiian wilderness of great splendor, in a postscript to a book called "Wilderness," said:

> I find myself holding a few fragments of a living wilderness that was the depth of our being and the wealth of our land—and these are slipping through my fingers.

After some fancy legislative maneuvering, a bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system died with the adjournment of the 87th Congress. This did not stop the determined conservationists. For many years they have argued that a national system was necessary to give legal protection to federally owned wilderness lands to preserve some portion of U.S. lands in their natural state.

In the 87th Congress, the first U.S. legislative action was taken on a wilderness system. Both the conservation and economic interests saw some success in the accompanying infighting, but action ended in a deadlock.

History and so-called conservationists proves and contends that animal life has suffered as man has made progress. History has proved the clearing of the forests, the draining of the swamps, and the damming of the rivers, and other steps taken for the development of agriculture, mining, and industry have been of great benefit to civilization. The so-called conservationists contend that when man makes progress wild animal life disappears because of the destruction of their natural homes. These so-called conservationists who believe the forest primeval, where man can commune with nature and enjoy certain esthetic values, should contain at least 50 million to 60 million acres. These same individuals press panic buttons, excite people, spread fear among thousands because the plump passenger pigeons which used to be abundant in the Eastern and Midwestern United

 SRP05415

States can no longer be seen anywhere; because only a few buffalo remain protected in national preserves and on private ranches.

As a matter of fact, most nations protect wildlife by laws which seek to preserve the useful species of land animal, bird, or fish.

A few people raised their voices in protest against the reckless destruction of America's animal life in the middle 1800's. But little of practical nature was done for 50 years. California passed the first law for the creation of wildlife refuges in 1870. The Lake Merrit Wild Fowl Sanctuary, now in the city of Oakland, was established under this law. But no other States followed until 1903, when Indiana established its first wildlife refuge. The national park program was an early aid to the saving of wildlife. Yellowstone Park was created by an act of Congress in 1872, and in 1894, the killing of all wildlife within the park was prohibited. The first Federal wildlife refuge was established by President Theodore Roosevelt at Pelican Island in Florida in 1903.

Between 1913 and 1925, wildlife refuges were established in 24 States. Some refuges selected in the early experimental years were later abandoned. But the idea of refuges become firmly established as a part of the American system of wildlife management. The first Federal refuge, especially for big-game animals, was the National Bison Range established on the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana, 1909. In the same year, the Olympic National Monument was set aside for the protection of the Roosevelt Elk.

Let us pause and review what has been administratively set aside and included in the wilderness system to date—14.3 million acres have been set aside. Let us ask this question: Do we need more than 14 million acres set aside as a wilderness area? Is the problem one of numbers of acres or is it one of effective acres? Is it a matter of acres of land and water available to the public? It would appear that wilderness areas can be proposed with restrictive provisions by a limited number of people. Is the proposal to include approximately 15 million acres in wilderness system intelligent, when we consider that this area may contain vast supplies of valuable minerals and products which may be needed by future generations? Many people do not realize that wilderness legislation closes the door to normal recreational use, and would limit the opportunities for them to enjoy the scenic beauties of nature. There are significant differences in the desire for outdoor recreation between young and old, rich and poor, city people and suburbanites. This would especially apply to the tourist who travels our country in great numbers today. They do not have the time to leisurely take hikes and pack trips into the back country, so must rely on roads and highways if they are to enjoy the wonders of nature.

The impact on the economy of the West might have a serious effect in the future. We are a rapidly expanding part of the Nation and future development is closely tied to the use of grazing, minerals, forests, and development of water resources. Once the wilderness areas are established, it may be impossible to secure changes of use, and if so, on a very limited scale.

I feel that if S. 4 is passed by the House and the Senate and is enacted into law, it would be poor public policy. This would hold true of two identical bills: H.R. 9070, introduced by Representative Saylor, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and H.R. 9101, introduced by Representative Quie, Republican, of Minnesota.

This would also hold true in the third group for identical bills: H.R. 9162, introduced by Representative Dingell, Democrat, of Michigan, H.R. 9163, introduced by Representative Reuss, Democrat, of Wisconsin, H.R. 9164, introduced by Representative O'Hara, Democrat of Illinois, and H.R. 9165, introduced by Representative Bennett, Democrat, of Florida.

Regarding present bills proposed, there is no guarantee that the Federal Government would allow mining and forestry operations in areas where it is economically feasible. After careful study of these bills, it appears that if the President can actually condemn all privately owned land, the Executive in fact can add as much land as he wishes to the wilderness area and the only power that can stop him is the veto of Congress.

What this would mean in actual practice is that the President can seize as much land as he wishes and to stop him would take a two-thirds vote of Congress.

This is just one more example of how so-called conservationists propose to ruthlessly take over a large part of our national resources here in the Western United States.

A study of the wilderness bills shows that the bills advocated are completely misleading in their comments in favor of such legislation. If proposed legislation is passed, it may truly turn all of the West into a wilderness.

The so-called conservationists and others who are pressing for the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system state that it is necessary because of our increasing population that immense areas be designated as wilderness—where the forest's primeval will exist—where land, water, and forest untrampled by man can continue and where man can commune with nature and enjoy its esthetic properties.

Can these same people tell us where we should stop in eras of time, in geological history and preserve for future generations the flora, the fauna, the minerals, the science, the civilization then existing. Should we have set aside 50 million acres during the era when dinosaurs roamed the countryside or should wilderness preservation systems have been established during the old stone age, the ice age, the warm post-glacial Europe, the neolithic era, Egyptian era, the Phoenecian era, the Assyrian era, the Semitic era, the era of Minoans and the Homeric, the Homeric Mycenaeans of the Aegean or the era of the gay gifted Etruscans or the era of the wanderers of the North, the Celtic and Scythian tribesmen, the era of the Imperial Inca of the Andes or should the establishment of a wilderness area have taken place 10 million years ago or should we make the decision for 1964, the year 2000, 4000, or 10,000 A.D.? Where do we start? Where do we stop? Are the so-called conservationists and the people who advocate the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system viewing it from a selfish standpoint or from a standpoint of what is best for generations of people to come?

It has been forecast that between the years 1960 and 2000 the Nation's population will double. Nevada with a 17.3 percent population gain for a 2-year period since 1960 census is the fastest growing State in the Nation, new Census Bureau statistics reveal. A check of population growth between April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1962, show the Nevada population rose from 285,278 to 335,000 during the period.

SRP05417

The sunny South and West, according to Census Bureau estimates, are outstripping the East and Middle West in growth.

The world population is increasing at the rate of 2 percent a year. This means that today's 3 billion persons would double by the year 2000 and would double again every 37 years thereafter.

The world as a whole by the year 2000, according to the 1963 RFF annual report, might require increases in supply of food, energy, and minerals as follows:

(1) A tripling of aggregate food output just to provide adequate calories and considerable more to provide adequate proteins and vitamins.

(2) A fivefold increase in energy output.

(3) Perhaps a fivefold increase in output of iron ore and ferroalloys and somewhat less in copper, but a much larger increase in bauxite-aluminum.

(4) A possible tripling or more of lumber output.

When we look ahead, the question inevitably arises, can this Nation afford to arbitrarily legislate to set aside approximately 50 million acres from which we may produce important minerals and minerals not yet discovered, products, energy, timber, et cetera, and which will be needed by this Nation in the future?

If we do not plan wisely and classify our Federal lands before wilderness areas are established, the plagues and famines of ancient Egypt can reappear in the year 2000. We must classify our Federal lands and plan for the orderly disposal of these lands in a manner that will result in the greatest amount of benefit to the greatest number of people.

In view of the future needs of this Nation, it is the position of the Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards that the entire subject of wilderness legislation is a proper subject for the proposed Public Land Review Commission as proposed by H.R. 8070.

Section 1 of H.R. 8070 declares that it is the policy of the Congress that the public lands of the United States shall be retained or managed, or disposed of, all in a manner to provide the maximum benefit for the general public. We sincerely request that before any wilderness legislation is enacted by Congress that Congress make a study and determine the proper classification and disposition of all Federally owned lands; further, that such study take into consideration the economic effect such Federal lands have on the economy of the areas where these lands are located. Also, the advisability of returning the Federal lands to the several Western States wherein those lands are located.

It is more important that we breathe the pure clean air of free enterprise than we set aside wilderness areas in the magnitude of 50 million acres and lose the best form of government known by mankind on the face of the earth today. I quote from William F. Schroder:

> The change in emphasis from disposal to reservation is a relatively new and certainly different concept than that which Americans' destiny manifest.

If Nevada continues to grow in population, expand industry, develop socially and economically, the Federal lands within the borders of Nevada must be returned to State ownership instead of being reserved and set aside as part of an immense and vast wilderness system.

Alone among all creatures on earth, man has a sense of destiny. He is haunted by the conviction that he is more than an animal. His restless inquiring brain has not been content to believe that his is the highest consciousness on earth or the mysterious universe.

At a given stage of human development, man plus fertile river valleys equals civilization. We sincerely request that you Members of Congress do not stop the progress of civilization by enacting laws which will set aside vast wilderness areas; instead we ask you to preserve the dignity of man and the sovereignty of the State of Nevada.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Stanley C. Ellison.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY C. ELLISON, NEVADA STATE GRAZING BOARD

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Stanley C. Ellison. My occupation is that of a rancher, running both cattle and sheep. I have served the livestock industry as a president of the Nevada Woolgrowers Association, a member of district grazing advisory boards, and a member of the State board of agriculture.

The pending bills before this committee have an effect on a number of ranchers, and a high potential effect, even though they may only apply to forest lands. The forest lands in Nevada are high elevation areas with relatively high annual moisture when compared to the rest of the State. Thus, as a general rule, these lands constitute the most desirable and best summer range areas. I believe it is generally acknowledged that when Nevada's lands are classified on a seasonal basis, that good summer range is the shortest in supply. In operating a ranch properly, one must have forage and feed available for every season of the year. If we were to assume a situation where any substantial acreage of this good summer range were closed to grazing, such action would constitute very poor management and conservation. It would increase demands on other seasonal ranges, it would disrupt balanced livestock operations and it would result in a great waste of resources. It would set off a chain reaction which would affect many ranges and ranch operations far beyond the loss of grazing in such forest areas. We have been working toward balanced, multiple use. To eliminate any portion of our short supply summer ranges would lead to unbalance, would undo what we have been trying to accomplish and would just be bad conservation.

The livestock industry using public lands has lived under close Government supervision for many years. We have learned to be very skeptical of such phrases which would allow livestock to continue grazing "subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture." The Forest Service has a multitude of regulations now. We see no need for any emphasis to be placed on the law which would indicate any need for special regulations. Even now, we may be told where to put salt, where to bed the sheep, when and where to move a band and so forth. Thus, the manner that any particular forest supervisor or ranger adopts can very drastically affect our day-to-day job in running a ranch. I see no need for any special rules or regulations in wilderness areas. I believe that it must be made very clear, in the law itself, that existing permitted grazing use is of equal importance in these areas as the wil-

 SRP05419

derness values. Otherwise, the rules and management, if pointed primarily toward the wilderness use or function, may well make grazing in such areas difficult and intolerable. We ranchers speak from experience on this subject. We recognize the need for conservation. We want to be partners in that conservation and we feel we know businesses. There is a vast difference between sharing the responsibilities of management and merely taking daily orders from the administrators. Therefore, we ask that it be made very clear in any legislation that grazing use is equal in priority to wilderness use.

In conclusion, I suggest that this entire subject might very well be examined by the proposed Public Land Review Commission before any legislation is finally adopted. I object to the provisions of S. 4 which allow Executive recommendations to take effect in certain areas unless one of the Houses of Congress approves a resolution declaring itself opposed to the recommendation. I wonder what would happen if other legislative functions, such as appropriating money, were handled in this manner.

I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity of presenting this statement regarding my views.

Mr. BARING. Does that complete your panel?

Mr. ABBOTT. Yes.

Mr. BARING. Are there questions on the part of the committee?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. First I want to say to Mr. Abbott, as a former member of the staff of the House Interior Committee, he was noted for his fine use of phrases and his exciting language. When he says, "That authority given the Secretary of the Interior and of Agriculture, or the President, should be bullet slim and clean, not shotgun broad, ragged, and fuzzy," I am sure, George, that even coming out to Nevada has not changed your propensity for the catching phrase.

Mr. ABBOTT. Thank you, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Mr. SAYLOR. I have one more, Mr. Chairman. On page 9 of your statement you said:

> It is more important that we breathe the pure clean air of free enterprise than we set aside wilderness areas in the magnitude of 50 million acres and lose the best form of government known by mankind on the face of the earth today.

As a rancher, do you have a license to graze cattle on the public domain?

Mr. SWALLOW. In the interest of the Nation's best welfare, we do our best to operate under the free enterprise system and contribute to the Nation's economy. By the year 2000, we will need a tripling of aggregate crude output just to provide adequate calories and considerably more to provide adequate proteins and vitamins. We will need a fivefold increase in energy output; perhaps a fivefold increase in output of iron ore and ferroalloys and somewhat less in copper, but a much larger increase in bauxite aluminum; and a possible tripling or more of lumber output.

We are one of the few industries that is trying to contribute to the Nation's economy and maintain the free enterprise system.

Mr. SAYLOR. Well, that is a fine statement, but you have not answered my question. Do you have a license from the Federal Government to graze cattle on the public domain?

Mr. SWALLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. Or in the national forest?

Mr. SWALLOW. Yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. In other words, I want to know how that is free enterprise. You had to go to your Government to get a license to allow you to run cattle on that domain. I want to know where this fits in with your concept of "free enterprise." Uncle Sam and you are in business together.

Mr. SWALLOW. We do this because it is mandatory under present laws and regulations. It is not compatible with the free enterprise system, but under present laws and regulations, we are forced to take these steps.

Mr. SAYLOR. You are forced to take those steps, because the land in the national forests and land in the public domain belongs to all of the people of the United States, whether you live in Nevada, the 17 Western States, or whether you live in Hawaii, Alaska, or New York City. Is that not right—the public domain and national forests belong to the people of the United States?

Mr. SWALLOW. That is technically a correct statement. However, this Nation was not built upon that concept. The Eastern States, the Southern States, and the Midwest States were built upon the concept and theory of private ownership of land; and, if we are going to continue as a republic, we cannot continue unless we emphasize the concept of private ownership and free enterprise in this Nation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Of course, you must understand that after the Thirteen Colonies formed the United States, they looked at the vast expanses of the West, and that the people who had seen the mistakes even in the late 1700's, realized there had to be a different position taken with regard to the new States to be admitted to the Union. Congress has many times from that time down until now changed its views as to what should happen in the West. We gave away land: We gave it to railroads, we gave it to people to homestead, we gave it to States.

It is always interesting to me, as an easterner, to come out in the West and find the folks in the States like certain provisions in their constitution which their forebears saw to it were put in at the time they were admitted to the Union. For example, the constitution of this State says that the people of Nevada shall own all of the water that falls here. That you like but you do not like the provision in your constitution that says that the land that the Federal Government owns in the State shall belong to all of the people. The one you would like to keep, the other you would like to change.

The thing I have got to try to tell some of the folks out West is that you cannot have it both ways. I would like to see you have it both ways, but it just does not work that way. You folks here in Las Vegas should know that better than anybody else: You cannot have it both ways; the house makes money.

Then on your last page you have this sentence, and it is a true statement: "At a given stage of human development, man plus fertile river valleys equal civilization." Yet, your Government and, I am sure, many of the people from the West have gone along with bills which have allowed the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to put concrete in a lot of places, every time they saw a couple of hills coming together, and they have dammed up some of the finest river valleys we have.

SRP05421

The late Usher Burdick, Member of Congress, took me over his farm out in North Dakota and showed me where such action which the Corps of Engineers was going to take would wipe out a productive area that was not equaled anywhere in this continent and probably only equaled in the Nile Valley. Yet, as a matter of progress in this country, that is what we did.

So, from time to time, you know we have had to fill up some of these fertile valleys. Is that not correct? You have got to do it to maintain the water.

I went out here yesterday afternoon and took a look at Lake Mead. Now, the lake is down a good bit, but I want to know whether anybody out in this area would like to get rid of Hoover Dam or Lake Mead. I have not heard anybody coming along and asking us to remove that from the Colorado River.

Do you care to comment?

Mr. SWALLOW. As civilization progresses, we must make the best and highest use of our resources, and placing our resources in a deep freeze won't contribute to the progress of civilization.

Mr. SAYLOR. Do you not concede that one of the great, if not the greatest, resources of this country is still its people? As far as I am concerned, you need not answer that.

The greatest resource, in my mind, in this country or any country is its people. What we are trying to do, those of us who are in favor of this wilderness legislation, is to set aside a section of our land just for people, who are our greatest natural resource.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I don't think one remark here should go without comment. I feel a great deal of thankfulness for the great generosity of the gentleman's people in the eastern part of the United States that gave away so much in the western part of the United States.

Mr. SAYLOR. It was ours to give away.

Mr. WHITE. I said I appreciate it, Mr. Saylor. It was more than just a giving, there was an obligation to the man that went out on the homtsead to take his family and build his home and till the ground and come up with a part of the building of the economy that furnishes some of the raw materials that go into the State of Pennsylvania. So I think it is a two-way street. It is not one way.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. ABBOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I may say, affectionately, Mr. Saylor, I think the same colorful words I have heard from you are still forthcoming. I think it is refreshing.

Mr. BARING. The next witnesses will be Kenneth Mann, Mr. Roy Young, Wilson McGowan, and Joel McCrea. We welcome you gentlemen before the committee and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH L. MANN, CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF NEVADA STATE GRAZING BOARDS, ELKO, NEV.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my name is Kenneth L. Mann. I am a lawyer in Elko.

I am appearing before this committee as one of the attorneys for the Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards, and also as a lifelong resident of the State of Nevada.

Our major concern is the protection of Nevada's livestock industry.

We are fully aware of the fact that the latest series of bills dealing with the establishment of a wilderness preservation system, S. 4, H.R. 9070, and H.R. 9162, purport to protect established grazing use under such regulations as may be established by the administrative agency involved. In view of such expressed purpose in the proposed legislation, one might reasonably ask why we express some concern. However, we anticipate, in view of the expressed position of various interests, that such protective clauses may be attacked and that this committee may be asked to strike from the bills those provisions relating to the protection of establishing grazing. Therefore, we appreciate the opportunity of presenting testimony to this committee with respect to the necessity of protecting grazing as it now exists.

We have attached to this statement various exhibits, which we will ask to be incorporated in the record, relating to the livestock industry in Nevada.

Exhibits 1 through 5 compile certain data relating to the importance of the livestock industry and other rural activities to the tax base of Nevada's 15 smaller counties. These exhibits show the following:

(1) In 13 of the 17 counties of Nevada, the rural or country areas of Nevada are assessed at a higher value than urban areas.

(2) In these same counties, the assessed value of livestock, the rancher's stock in trade, is substantially higher than all merchandise inventories, the merchant's stock in trade.

(3) That agricultural values are an integral part of the tax base of these counties and that the agricultural values are related almost entirely to livestock production.

(4) Proceeds of mines taxes generally exceed merchandise inventories.

These conclusions are not surprising in view of the vast areas of Nevada and our reliance on the use of the Federally owned lands located within our borders. This poses no deep or dark secret. We rely upon the utilization of our land resources just as do the people of Illinois and New York. We have certain handicaps to the development of an intensified manufacturing industry, which makes us even more dependent upon the land—and it has ever been this way in Nevada. The fact that the Federal Government owns some 87 percent of our land does not change this fact. Thus, we are very basically and critically affected by any legislation affecting the use of such lands.

SRP05423

Now, what is happening to the livestock industry in Nevada? While most industries in the Nation are forging ahead, we submit our exhibits 1 through 10 to establish the following:

(1) The value of farm products sold is decreasing.

(2) The number of cattle and sheep grazing on the public domain is decreasing.

(3) The price per pound of beef, lamb, and wool is decreasing.

Thus, under Federal stewardship, we are going backward. Recent studies by the Department of Agriculture, the University of Nevada, and other western universities establish that the rancher's rate of return on his investment ranges from a figure of about 2½ percent to a minus figure. Thus, we have to be concerned about every movement which would affect the livestock industry and its operation.

The next series of exhibits, Nos. 11 to 12, are submitted to establish the fact that Nevada is more dependent upon the use of public lands for its livestock industry than any of the Western States, and that the nature and character of the lands which we have to use is generally less productive in terms of forage per acre than any of the other Western States. Due to a lack of rainfall, we are normally short of lush summer range areas. In general, the national forests supply a good portion of this summer range. It is just not a simple matter to remove a certain number of livestock from a particular forest area, and to say that some other area can be found for them to utilize. Such is not possible, and use of the present forest areas is absolutely necessary to maintain the balance between proper use of our winter, spring, and fall ranges and the rancher's base property. If any portion of the short-supply summer range is eliminated from the operation, it will almost invariably involve a loss of that number of livestock on a year-round basis, and will result in serious dislocations.

The Central Committee of Nevada State Grazing Boards requests this committee to postpone any final action on so-called wilderness bills until such time as the Public Land Law Review Commission Act, as proposed by H.R. 8070, has either been established or rejected by the Congress. If established, the question of wilderness legislation would be a proper subject for review by such Commission. This committee will hope to present a comprehensive report to such Public Land Law Review Commission on the problems and status of the livestock industry in Nevada.

We are committed to multiple use of resources, and would propose that the grazing of livestock shall be continued in any wilderness area. We believe that any legislation should make it abundantly clear that such established grazing use is of equal priority with the wilderness use. In addition to grazing of livestock, this guarantee should extend to stock trails and stock driveways.

We will urge the adoption of a policy wherein regulations of the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture may be more readily subjected to Congressional review, and that any legislation affecting the public lands should establish standards which are set forth in the legislation by Congress. We believe that the discretion of the executive department in rulemaking should be restricted by such Congressional standards. As applies to the pending legislation, we are concerned about the provisions which allow grazing to continue subject

SRP05424

to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture.

We would object to the provisions in the pending legislation which would confer the power of eminent domain upon the Federal Government to take private property for inclusion in any wilderness area. We have such a small amount of land which is subject to private ownership in the State of Nevada at the present time, that we could not support any provision which would authorize the taking of more of that land and returning it to Federal ownership. We must always protect the private ownership of the right to use water beneficially in the State of Nevada, and the existing wild area in Nevada is an important watershed for the livestock industry. One simple example that might be brought to your attention is the problem of beaver dams. Unrestricted construction of beaver dams has critically affected the flow and runoff of water, and it will continue to do so in the future, unless we have some freedom of operation in governing our water supplies.

We object to the provisions of the Senate bill which would require that in the modification or adjustment of boundaries, and in certain other areas, that the recommendations of the President shall become effective unless one of the Houses of Congress passes a resolution disapproving such action. The power to make laws respecting the Federal lands is very clearly delegated to the Congress by the Constitution. We believe that the Congress should only delegate administrative activities to the executive departments in connection with such legislation. It appears that adoption of the provision in S. 4 confers upon the executive department the right to make policy decisions, and that the provisions which would in effect limit Congress to vetoing such policy decisions is a drastic departure from traditional legislative procedures.

The necessity of having a clear congressional statement that grazing in such areas is of equal priority with wilderness use, and some limitation upon the right of the executive department to establish regulations for grazing is necessary so that the individual user might be allowed to object to management practices within any wilderness area that might be established by the act, and to guarantee that he has a right of appeal through the administrative procedures.

We believe that we may as well face the fact that enactment of such legislation at the present time may very well be an opening wedge for increasing demands for the elimination of grazing from public lands. On page 129 of the House committee report on H.R. 776, in the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the old cliche is stated again by the chairman of the citizen's committee that "the purpose of the substitute seems to be to preserve for a minority of commercial interests an opportunity to exploit any area of the public's land that may attract them." The people of Nevada have been subjected to this type of attack for many years, by various groups throughout the Nation. We do not expect that enactment of the pending legislation will eliminate this type of activity, and that these groups will continue to press for elimination of, or drastic restriction of grazing on the public lands.

It is apparent that we cannot establish a true wilderness system, ignoring the fact that man actually lives upon and occupies the areas

 SRP05425

involved. We cannot even establish an island and set it aside as if the white man had never come to this continent. It is necessary to regulate and police the wilderness areas, to make sure that the visitors to such areas comply with rules and regulations relating to camping and fire and to insure that they only make a use compatible with the wilderness nature of the area. It is necessary that the areas be managed so that fire, insect, and plant diseases do not develop in such wilderness areas and spread beyond its boundaries.

The livestock industry is not attempting to exploit, commercialize, or substantially change the natural condition of these lands. As a matter of fact, the grazing of livestock is best done in an area where there is a lack of commercial activity and where nature is allowed to work its wonders in converting moisture and sunshine into grass and where the livestock can peaceably graze. The livestock industry in Nevada annually contributes hundreds of thousands of dollars to range improvement and soil and moisture projects on the public lands. This is done by them in a situation where there is little assured grazing tenure. The livestock people, more than any other group, know the serenity and enjoyment that can be obtained by being out in the open spaces. We even appreciate the beauties of our so-called desert and arid regions of the State. We actually know what it is like to sit on a horse and be able to look ahead for 40 miles, and see very little of civilization from that vantage point. This is a part of the personality of Nevada, and it is presently available for enjoyment by those who would care to avail themselves of that opportunity.

The fact of the matter is that very few of our fellow citizens have this same inclination. Exhibits attached to this report show that of the 710 people who visited the Jarbidge Wild Area in the past year, that only 80 went to the area for purposes associated with true wilderness values. The remainder were hunters and fishermen, and the vast majority of visitors to this division of the national forest, went there for camping or picnicking purposes and hunting. This is true of other areas outside of the formal wild area. Of these 80 people who visited the Jarbidge Wild Area, I would expect that a majority of them were local residents. This refers to only one of the ranger districts in Elko County, and it is significant that only 80 out of some 14,000 visitors to that particular ranger district, were interested in wilderness purposes as the primary motive for their visit. There are huge areas in central Nevada where people can now go and be effectively withdrawn from civilization. It is true that these areas are not thickly forested and that water is scarce and that the type of vegetation is that associated with a semiarid climate. We feel that these areas have beauty. Apparently others do not. However, the point is that there is opportunity, existing at the present time, and without legislation, for people to get away and camp for as long as they want to, and it is highly remote that they would see more than 2 people in any week. This situation has existed in Nevada for a period of 100 years, and it is highly probable that it will continue for an indefinite period of time in the future.

We have been constantly dismayed, and often very hurt, by this attitude on the part of some of our fellow citizens who ascribe to us the appellation of economic royalists, selfish self-interest groups, or other such classification. Our existing livestock industry is an important element in establishing the personality of the State of Nevada.

Our forefathers helped develop the State of Nevada by utilizing available natural resources. We proudly admit that we enjoy living in Nevada and enjoy these natural beauties. We invite other people to live in Nevada and enjoy them in the same manner. If we did not enjoy living in Nevada, I expect that we would move someplace else. We therefore ask some of these groups to accept the fact that we are reasonable people, that we are not harvesting huge profits from the use of our limited natural resources, that we are interested in conservation and that we are very definitely interested in maintaining the open range, with opportunities available for the grazing of domestic livestock, the harvesting of game animals, and ample opportunity for recreation.

In 1962, there were 12,959 sheep permitted to graze in the Jarbidge Wild Area. When the area was established in 1958 there were some 950 cattle which grazed partially within the area. By this, I mean that during a portion of the grazing season they were in the wild area. This wild area now has five sheep permittees and two cattle permittees. At the present time, grazing is allowed on the Sheldon Game Refuge Area, by virtue of leases of base property by the Fish and Wildlife Service to various operators, and by virtue of some grazing permits allowed in the area. Grazing has been allowed on a seasonal basis where land has been withdrawn for military purposes. Elimination of this grazing use would have a drastic effect upon the economy of important areas of the State of Nevada. We would suggest that any legislation involving the establishment of game refuges as wilderness areas should likewise contain adequate protection for existing grazing use, and that continued grazing should be specifically authorized by Congress. As to the future, we would like to point out that some of the area which might logically be incorporated into wild or wilderness areas in the national forest system contain substantial amounts of privately owned land. This is particularly true in a large portion of the Ruby division of the Humboldt National Forest. In other areas of Nevada, we have placed in private ownership the small portions of land which were allotted to the State by the Federal Government in very strategically located areas, primarily around water sources. The shortage of water has caused us to appropriate and use almost all available surface water resources. Therefore, it would be very difficult to establish wilderness areas without drastically affecting the limited private ownerships which we now have.

In conclusion, may I say that we appreciate the opportunity afforded to present our views to this committee, as we are well aware of its interests and concern for the West and the entire Nation. We submit that any analysis of the situation will indicate conclusively that grazing use is not inconsistent with the preservation of the handwork of nature. We emphasize that opportunities are now available, in unlimited areas of Nevada, for people to enjoy these resources. We have no quarrel with the motives of those fellow Americans and groups which are concerned about the future of public lands. We merely ask for understanding, and a recognition of the fact that the livestock interests are equally concerned, and we have the firm conviction that these resource values can be maintained under the multiple-use principle, without unnecessarily restrictive Federal legislation. We ask also for some recognition of the fact that we live in the State of Nevada by choice, that we are as interested in taking care of the lands and

SRP05427

resources of Nevada as the residents of New York or New Jersey, or any other State. We feel that we are more concerned.

May I say we are very gratified that no one has appeared and called us economic royalists or a selfish self-interest group. I want to assure the committee and the recreationists here that the livestock industry in Nevada contributes hundreds of thousands of dollars a year for range improvement, soil and moisture conservation work, and other things. We want recreation in Nevada. We believe in multiple use and we seek to establish a balancing of interests here that we think will work for the State.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the exhibits submitted by Mr. Mann will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The exhibits follow:)

NEVADA EXHIBIT 1

NARRATIVE STATEMENT

The following exhibits, Nos. 2 through 5, collect certain data from a publication of the Nevada Tax Commission, which is a comparative statement of the segregations of tax rolls by counties and classes. The figures given ref to assessed valuations and no attempt has been made to correlate assessed valuation with actual market values. There are other taxable classifications such as public utilities, railroads, vehicles, patented mining claims, which are not included in the selected classifications which we used. Similarly, mining improvements and mills are not included.

With reference to the classification of country personal property, this would not refer to agricultural property exclusively. However, in the counties concerned, country personal property other than that related to agricultural pursuits would be very nominal, with a possible exception of White Pine, Lyon and Nye, wherein mining is an important factor.

Due to the nature of the counties involved, it is submitted that all of the taxable values relating to rural areas is affected by use of the public lands in one way or another, and of this use, agriculture is the most significant. The grazing of livestock in Nevada is the basic agricultural value, as most agricultural enterprises are related to the livestock industry, either the raising of the stock in the first place, or the feeding of same.

NEVADA EXHIBIT 2

1962-63 property valuations, northeastern Nevada counties (Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, White Pine)

Line	Classification of property	Rural	Urban
1	Special and cultivated	$2,910,416	
2	Meadow and wild hay	4,833,841	
3	Pasture	2,839,287	
4	Arable	321,932	
5	Grazing	6,807,387	
6	Railroad lands	1,298,521	
7	Livestock	10,065,787	
8	Merchandise		$2,172,676
9	Town real property		4,286,603
10	Town improvements		17,412,674
11	Town personal property		3,860,941
12	Country personal property	4,671,615	
13	Country property improvements	2,574,837	
14	Total	36,353,623	27,762,794
	COMPARISONS		
15	Excess valuation, rural over urban	$8,590,829	
16	Excess valuation, livestock over merchandise	7,893,111	
17	Proceeds of mines valuation	7,945,609	
18	Excess valuation, proceeds of mines over merchandise	5,772,933	

NEVADA EXHIBIT 3

1962–63 property valuations, west-central Nevada counties (Pershing, Churchill, Lyon, Douglas)

Line	Classification of property	Rural	Urban
1	Special and cultivated	$7,487,931	
2	Meadow and wild hay	404,695	
3	Pasture	824,030	
4	Arable	418,723	
5	Grazing	1,789,134	
6	Railroad lands	1,302,610	
7	Livestock	3,105,740	
8	Merchandise		$1,488,785
9	Town real property		1,682,302
10	Town improvements		10,996,402
11	Town personal property		971,425
12	Country personal property	5,687,564	
13	Country property improvements	4,860,603	
14	Total	25,881,030	15,138,914
	COMPARISONS		
15	Excess valuation, rural over urban	$10,742,116	
16	Excess valuation, livestock over merchandise	1,616,955	
17	Proceeds of mines valuation	10,381,693	
18	Excess valuation, proceeds of mines over merchandise	8,892,908	

NEVADA EXHIBIT 4

1962–63 property valuations, south-central Nevada counties (Esmeralda, Lincoln, Mineral, and Nye)

Line	Classification of property	Rural	Urban
1	Special and cultivated	$1,439,867	
2	Meadow and wild hay	145,457	
3	Pasture	285,538	
4	Arable	154,386	
5	Grazing	319,081	
6	Railroad lands	104	
7	Livestock	1,378,842	
8	Merchandise		$385,682
9	Town real property		1,416,794
10	Town improvements		4,792,378
11	Town personal property		1,387,805
12	Country personal property	6,116,548	
13	Country improvements	603,721	
14	Total	10,442,244	7,982,659
	COMPARISONS		
15	Excess valuation, rural over urban	$2,459,585	
16	Excess valuation, livestock over merchandise	992,800	
17	Proceeds of mines valuation	517,974	
18	Excess valuation, proceeds of mines over merchandise	132,292	

 SRP05429

NEVADA EXHIBIT 5

1962–63 property valuations, western Nevada counties (Ormsby and Storey)

Line	Classification of property	Rural	Urban
1	Special and cultivated	$779,301	
2	Meadow and wild hay	11,130	
3	Pasture	21,930	
4	Arable	4,575	
5	Grazing	440,992	
6	Railroad lands	2,104	
7	Livestock	34,952	
8	Merchandise		$887,909
9	Town real property		3,257,085
10	Town improvements		7,676,971
11	Town personal property		1,537,503
12	Country personal property	305,044	
13	Country improvements	323,140	
14	Total	1,923,168	13,359,468
15	Net proceeds of mines	$364,138	

NEVADA EXHIBIT 6

Selected data on agricultural employment, 1950 [1]

County:	*Percent to total work force employed in agriculture*
Churchill	30.7
Clark	2.8
Douglas	41.1
Elko	23.5
Esmeralda	18.3
Eureka	38.0
Humboldt	21.8
Lander	20.4
Lincoln	13.6
Lyon	48.8
Mineral	3.4
Nye	21.2
Ormsby	4.8
Pershing	23.6
Storey	4.0
Washoe	4.1
White Pine	9.8

[1] Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, County and City Data Book, 1952. Includes employed persons so would not include family labor force not employed.

NEVADA EXHIBIT 7

Trend in Nevada livestock prices, 1950–61

Year	Beef cattle (per hundredweight)	Calves (per hundredweight)	Sheep (per hundredweight)	Lambs (per hundredweight)	Wool (per hundredweight)
1950	$23.10	$26.50	$9.91	$23.86	$59.6
1951	29.70	33.20	13.55	30.45	82.1
1952	24.40	27.20	10.53	25.07	56.2
1953	15.70	16.90	6.58	17.67	55.3
1954	15.10	17.80	5.90	17.99	66.1
1955	14.40	17.60	5.39	17.56	46.1
1956	13.50	16.90	4.66	17.58	43.7
1957	16.40	19.50	5.72	19.54	51.7
1958	20.90	26.80	7.00	20.63	40.3
1959	21.40	27.00	6.00	18.50	42.0
1960	18.90	22.60	5.10	16.80	41.8
1961	18.19	24.34	4.51	15.85	38.8
12-year average	19.31	23.03	7.07	20.12	51.1

Source: Mimeo Circular 166, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Nevada.

NEVADA EXHIBIT 8

Analysis of Nevada agricultural economics [1]

I. FARM INCOME

	Total livestock [2]	All farm products [3]
1961	$42,392,000	$59,888,000
1960	44,471,000	64,924,000
1951-61 [4]	45,067,000	63,626,000

II. INCOME FROM MAJOR LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS [5]

	Cattle [6]	Sheep [7]	Wool
1961	$32,473,000	$2,312,000	$1,035,000
1960	34,003,000	2,681,000	1,087,000
1951-61 [4]	32,720,000	3,821,000	2,000,000

[1] Information obtained from survey made by William Neely, extension production economist, University of Nevada.
[2] Livestock includes all domestic animals raised on the farm for profit.
[3] This figure varies from USDA statistical reports by the inclusion of valuation of crops consumed on the farm.
[4] These figures reflect a 10-year average.
[5] Gross receipts received for the product during the period.
[6] Valuation determined by utilization of following prices: Cows: 1961, $14.40 per hundredweight; 1960, $14.30 per hundredweight; 10-year average, $12.60 per hundredweight. Steers and heifers: 1961, $20.75 per hundredweight; 1960, $21.20 per hundredweight; 10-year average, $19.40 per hundredweight. Calves (up to 475 pounds): 1961, $24.80 per hundredweight; 1960, $22.60 per hundredweight; 10-year average, $22.80 per hundredweight.
[7] Valuation determined by utilization of following prices: Lambs: 1961, $15.30 per hundredweight; 1960, $16.80 per hundredweight; 10-year average, $20.10 per hundredweight. Ewes: 1961, $4.30 per hundredweight 1960, $5.10 per hundredweight; 10-year average, $6.90 per hundredweight.

NEVADA EXHIBIT 9

Total license obligation, number of stock [1]

	Cattle and horses	Sheep and goats
1961	341,355	434,852
1960 [2]	335,687	446,848
1960 [2]	441,999	733,987
1959	442,808	775,829
1958	446,581	854,887
1957	464,231	853,244
1956	[3] 450,759	[3] 887,273

[1] Data obtained from annual grazing statistical report, now reported on Form 4-1137. Total license obligation includes authorized active use, free-use licenses, and crossing permits.
[2] In 1960, the Bureau changed its reporting system from the fiscal to the calendar year. The larger 1960 entry reflects the fiscal entry. Conversion to the calendar year may be significant in analyzing the large stock decrease occurring at that time: assuming both reports reflect a 12-month period, logic argues other explanations for the decrease.
[3] Accepting the data as reported, a 24-percent decrease in numbers of cattle and horses and a 51-percent decrease in numbers of sheep licensed on the Federal range is reflected during the 7-year period. This compares with a 23-percent decrease in animal units during the period 1956-calendar 1960, as presented in the Statistical Appendix to the Annual Report of the Director, Bureau of Land Management, table 83. No attempt has been made to adjust or compare the "animal units" reported in said exhibit to the total license obligation here reported.

 SRP05431

NEVADA EXHIBIT 10

AUM's available for livestock (fiscal year basis)

Year	Elko	Winnemucca	Carson City	Ely	Las Vegas	Battle Mountain	Susanville
1948	952,017	523,576	294,074	570,315	316,549	.....	.....
1951	940,747	534,652	310,826	538,810	300,000	.....	.....
1955	836,470	490,359	258,493	556,895	289,958	636,202	197,627
1959	798,712	496,878	207,614	559,950	257,740	561,767	196,511
1962	800,297	467,000	221,259	551,203	257,740	552,961	193,381
Difference, 1948-62 [1]	151,720	56,576	72,815	19,112	58,809	83,241	4,246
Percent change	−15.9	−10.8	−24.7	−3.3	−18.5	−13.1	−2.1

[1] For Battle Mountain and Susanville, the comparison is between 1962 and the 1st year listed.

NEVADA EXHIBIT 11

Livestock actually grazed in Nevada under permit

Year	Cattle	Horses	Sheep	Goats	Big game [1]
1948	323,737	10,150	775,510	361	50,003
1951	315,975	9,007	546,560	50	59,520
1952	300,386	7,084	557,002	50	68,225
1954	365,760	9,182	584,084	115	91,189
1956	353,307	7,325	532,543	75	87,490
1958	358,836	6,378	524,315	.....	125,493
1960	324,876	5,869	410,887	.....	109,442
1954-60 percent change [2]	−11.2	−36	−12.5	−29.6	+20

[1] It is not known how this number is computed so its accuracy is unknown.
[2] All data from State reports. Comparisons are within 1954, since both Battle Mountain and Susanville were included in the State reports in that year.

Number of permittees

Year	Cattle	Sheep
1948	933	155
1954	972	168
1960	820	134
1954-60 percent change	−15.6	−26

NEVADA EXHIBIT 12

Grazing districts in the 10 Western States

TABLE I

State	Animal unit months in grazing districts [1]	Acres in grazing districts [2]	Average acres per animal unit month	
			Public lands [3]	Total lands [3]
Nevada	3,132,639	43,017,355	13.7	15.2
Utah	2,313,993	24,146,068	10.3	11.2
New Mexico	2,238,481	12,667,162	5.6	6.2
Wyoming	1,778,881	13,308,118	7.5	8.2
Idaho	1,408,087	11,085,513	7.9	8.9
Montana	1,290,682	5,201,225	4.0	6.0
Oregon	1,112,835	12,261,450	11.0	12.1
Arizona	780,821	10,539,791	13.5	16.2
Colorado	773,414	7,484,702	9.7	10.3
California	405,184	2,596,338	6.4	9.7

TABLE II

State	Number of operators [4]	Grazing leases in force [5]	Rank by State
New Mexico	4,033	669	7
Montana	3,045	1,554	2
Utah	2,908	.....	10
Idaho	2,388	830	4
Colorado	1,696	703	6
Wyoming	1,238	2,698	1
Oregon	1,172	778	5
Nevada	936	40	9
Arizona	542	633	8
California	359	984	3

[1] Table 83, fiscal year 1960.
[2] Table 82, 1961 (includes only public lands).
[3] It is assumed that the animal unit months in grazing districts relates to public lands within the district. On this assumption, col. 3 first computes the acres per animal unit month. If the animal unit months are considered as applying to total lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management within grazing districts, as reported in table 82, col. 3, then lists second the acres per animal unit month.
[4] Table 84, calendar year 1960.
[5] Table 89, 1961.

Source: All data from 1961 Statistical Appendix to the Annual Report of the Director, Bureau of Land Management.

Analysis of relative district carrying capacities

District	Animal unit months available for livestock [1]	Total usable acres [2]	Acres per animal unit months [3]
Elko	800,297	8,220,679	10.2
Winnemucca	467,000	7,007,290	15.0
Carson City	219,560	4,317,720	19.6
Ely	551,203	7,785,239	14.1
Las Vegas	257,740	7,530,275	29.1
Battle Mountain	561,767	1,882,078	13.7
Susanville	191,381	1,882,078	9.7

[1] From data furnished by BLM.
[2] From condition and trend records furnished by BLM.
[3] Some adjustment should be made as column 2 does not show animal unit months set aside for wildlife, as the information is unavailable. If the wildlife demand is a uniform 10 percent the column is still valid for comparative purposes and the acres per animal unit month would only be adjusted slightly.

SRP05433

NEVADA EXHIBIT 13

Recreational uses for 1963 in the Jarbidge ranger district, Humboldt National Forest[1] (includes the Jarbidge Wild Area, which constitutes a part of this ranger district)

	Number of visitors	Man-days	Average visit length, days
Campgrounds, Jarbidge Canyon	1,790	5,930	3¼
Wilderness areas	710	1,080	1½
Other forest areas	12,220	24,440	2
Total	14,720	31,450	

Primary purpose of visit

Camping	1,000
Picnicking	300
Hunting:	
Big game	5,610
Small game	890
Total	6,500
Fishing	1,600
Hiking and riding	40
Wilderness travel	80
General enjoyment and sightseeing	4,450
Gathering forest products for pleasure	350
Scientific study and hobbies	400

[1] From ranger's annual statistical report.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Mann.

You may proceed, Mr. Young.

STATEMENT OF ROY YOUNG, ASSEMBLYMAN, NEVADA LEGISLATURE, ELKO, NEV.

Mr. YOUNG. My name is Roy Young. I have served as assemblyman in the Nevada Legislature for the last 8 years. I live in Elko, Nev., where I operate a cattle ranch.

I wish to refer to a statement made by Governor Sawyer of Nevada to the Nevada cattlemen and the Nevada woolgrowers a few weeks ago when he said the people of Nevada lie in a landlocked position with millions of acres of Federal land and we only own 13 percent of it.

This may sound unrelated to the subject of wilderness legislation, but to me it is very similar as the people of the State of Nevada do oppose setting aside large areas of land where someday we fear we may lose grazing of livestock, the privilege of hunting and fishing, and the enjoyment of camping in our mountains.

Actually, Nevada has always been faced with formidable problems in opening up the State for development and settlement. Our mountains, deserts, and long distances between settlements, coupled with a sparse population, have made it very difficult to build roads, secure airline service, and maintain good bus and rail connections. Many of our people who live in rural areas still have to drive through mud, snow, and dust, depending on the season, to get to town. It therefore seems strange that we should now be proposing to set aside certain areas where this condition would be fixed forever.

SRP05434

In 1959, the Senate and the Assembly of Nevada passed Resolution 11—

memoralizing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation to enact the Wilderness Preservation System as proposed in the Wilderness Act, and all other legislation and regulation not in accord with the multiple-use principle in the management of Federal land.

It is interesting to note that Alaska and all of the Western States except Montana and Oregon have passed similar resolutions.

Livestock is one of the most important industries in the State and certainly any loss of grazing on any of the Federal range in the State would mean a loss to vital economy.

Hunting of wild game is another very important part of the economy in Nevada and we would hate to see anything happen which might have a tendency to hinder or reduce our hunting areas.

It is hard for me to understand the need for wilderness legislation when I look at the millions of acres of land in Nevada in which altitude, climatic conditions, and so on, make them natural wilderness areas as it is. We may find a few livestock or a few hunters, or a few campers in such areas, but normally they could be classed as "wilderness areas" by nature.

We have vast areas of Nevada remaining which are largely uninhabited. Much of it is mountainous. True, a good portion of it is desolate and poorly watered. Those people who like to explore relatively uninhabited areas can do it in Nevada to their heart's content. We would welcome their visit to the State. The truth is that the demand for this type of recreation in our State is practically nonexistent.

We are most interested in the bill in Congress, H.R. 8070, which allows for a Land Review Commission. It would be my hope that this bill be passed as soon as possible and that no further bills relating to public lands be passed until the Commission has been set up and allowed to function long enough so that we may see what their results will be.

Although I have noticed that you have made reservation in each of the bills that I have read for a reasonable amount of grazing and that present roads shall be recognized, I worry about any legislation that might interfere with Nevada people being eliminated from using the lands which they have been enjoying the use of for the last 100 years.

I have followed my father in the ranching business, and he started in Elko County in 1889, and certainly it is my feeling that the land is in just as good condition now as it was then, and I am sure that we all are interested in keeping it that way for the next 100 years so that we may all be allowed to enjoy the resources from it that we have in the past, and therefore, it would be my hope that no further wilderness legislation be adopted.

We object to the provisions of S. 4 which, in effect, requires Congress to veto the action of the executive department in modifying and adjusting the boundaries of wilderness areas. As a legislator, I could not approve of delegating the legislative function in that manner. I could not approve of any such measure which, in my judgment, seeks to bypass the established and customary legislative procedure.

SRP05435

In conclusion, I would like to state that Nevada has been seeking to grow and develop for 100 years. Even though large areas of wilderness may not be set aside in Nevada under this bill, it is still a strange philosophy, in my judgment, to now reverse directions. I can assure this committee that the State is proud of its western heritage of pure air and open space, and that this tradition itself will insure that there will be large areas in Nevada open to visitors with a minimum of habitation to bother them.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Young.

You may proceed, Senator McGowan.

STATEMENT OF WILSON McGOWAN, NEVADA STATE SENATOR

Mr. McGOWAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am Wilson McGowan, a Nevada State Senator and a rancher.

We have already witnessed substantial withdrawals of public lands in Nevada for defense purposes, game refuges, and for other purposes. In some of these areas grazing is allowed to continue upon one basis or another. This is proper.

I would request that any legislation approved by this committee should very clearly authorize grazing as it presently exists, that it is compatible with wilderness uses, and establish rules and regulations which are consistent with our present grazing procedures, and that it include language stating that there will be no exemption from established State water laws.

Nothing is more true than the observation that "gold is where you find it." This is true of all minerals and the State of Nevada is a very mineralized area. I believe it is impossible to determine now what lands may be valuable in the future for the production of minerals. I believe it is unwise to restrict orderly development of our natural resources.

Nevada's economy is not greatly diversified. It is very dependent upon development and use of natural resources, and the production of forage for grazing livestock is such a resource. Continued withdrawals of land are bound to hurt local economics. As a State legislator, I would ask that any legislation adequately protect all multiple uses that now exist, and I think it should be made clear that these multiple uses will have some future guarantee and that this proposed legislation will not be the forerunner of more and more legislation which will subject our local areas to even more Federal restrictions.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

You may proceed, Mr. McCrea.

STATEMENT OF JOEL McCREA, NEVADA STATE GRAZING BOARDS

Mr. McCREA. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Joel McCrea, and among other pursuits, I am engaged in ranching in California and Nevada.

I do not pose as an expert on wilderness or public land uses. However, my background has, I feel, given me the opportunity to see both sides of the issues involved. There must be a balancing, it seems to me, on two or three points. The more than 17 million people in California

and additional millions who visit and vacation in the West place tremendous pressure on our recreational resources. I have been impressed with Nevada's recreational potential and the existing inaccessibility of many of its millions of acres.

Therefore, it seems to me that though we may set aside areas that qualify as true wilderness, we must also keep in mind the necessity of opening up many existing areas for increased recreation. This will require, at least in Nevada, new and better roads, campgrounds and facilities to serve the public.

In preparing for greater development, we must also protect local economies dependent on public lands.

This, I believe, will be done by this committee, and I trust that the questions raised by this legislation will be framed with clear Congressional standards with a minimum of executive discretion.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions on the part of the committee?

The gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. DUNCAN. I would just like to say I think these are rather eloquent and good presentations of the point of view of the people involved. I join with Mr. Mann's comment that he is pleased that nobody has called them economic royalists since we started that.

I would like you people to know that one thing that characterized the hearings in Washington and Colorado and here is the almost complete absence of such name calling by one group as against the other, which is all to the good, because that type of argument advances the cause of no one, does not help the committee one iota to secure the information they need on which we are to reach a reasonable basis of assaulting this very, very difficult problem. I just want to underscore Mr. Mann's comment because I think it is a good one.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. First of all, I would like to ask Mr. Young whether or not he has read H.R. 9162.

Mr. YOUNG. Who is the introducer?

Mr. WESTLAND. This is Mr. Dingell's bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, I have, sir.

Mr. WESTLAND. I think you ought to read it again, because your statement seems to me aimed mostly at S. 4 which seems to be pretty much out the window, and there is considerable difference between those two bills, Mr. Young. I hope you recognize the differences.

For example, the memorial from the Legislature of Nevada in 1959, was, of course, directed at Senate bill 174 or S. 4.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. WESTLAND. But there is considerable change in H.R. 9162. It might be well for your legislature to consider that legislation or Mr. Saylor's bill, which is a little bit different than H.R. 9162. There has been quite a change in circumstances in the last 4 years in this regard.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, I am sure there has.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would like to point that out.

I have one question for Mr. Mann. In your statement you say you would object to the provisions in the pending legislation which would confer the power of eminent domain upon the Federal Government

SRP05437

to take property for inclusion in any wilderness area. I would like to ask you where you find that provision in H.R. 9162, to be specific.

Mr. MANN. There was a clause in the Senate committee—I would have to get the bill. When we went through it at our committee meeting, in one of the bills pending before the committee we did find some language which appeared to us to authorize the taking of private property within wilderness areas.

Mr. WESTLAND. I suggest you take another look, Mr. Mann, at H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162 and perhaps revise part of your statement at least. I am sure you, as a lawyer, realize that eminent domain exists in the Federal Government and it does not take any provision in writing a bill or a law by Congress to confer this power upon the Government. Quite the contrary.

In the second place, to the extent that is possible, in H.R. 9162 at least, we try to restrict the Secretary of Agriculture in the acquisition of privately owned lands, where we say you can only do it, provided, first, that Congress appropriate the funds; secondly, if the owner concurs in such acquisition. This is going, it seems to me, considerably further than Congress has ever gone before.

Mr. MANN. This is in 9162 where it states that "subject to the appropriation of funds by Congress"?

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes.

Mr. MANN (reading):

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

It would be my opinion, now, that the acquiring of land for inclusion in the wilderness area is not a public purpose as exists under the present laws of Congress. Certainly the Government has the power of eminent domain, but it must take legislation to say what is a public purpose and what is not, I believe, before it can exercise that power.

Mr. WESTLAND. I certainly do not want to get into a legal argument with a lawyer, but it is my understanding that the Federal Government and the Secretary of Agriculture, specifically, has the power of eminent domain at this time, and this paragraph which you quote is the one I had in mind that actually puts a restriction on him.

Mr. MANN. I just feel it makes this a public purpose, the acquisition of land for wilderness purposes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Do you think the Secretary of Agriculture today does not have the authority of eminent domain within a wilderness area?

Mr. MANN. No, I do not think he does.

Mr. WESTLAND. You do not think he does?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, I must disagree, within the perimeter of those areas. As I say, I am not a lawyer, but I would think that he did. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have one question. You four men and the four men that preceded you are all representatives of the same group. Is that correct?

Mr. MANN. We belong to various groups, but it is all a part of the livestock industry, except Mr. Young and Mr. McGowan who are legislators.

Mr. SAYLOR. Legislators; that is right. But basically all belong to the Central Committee of the Nevada State Grazing Boards; is that right?

Mr. MANN. No, Mr. Young and Mr. McCrea do not. They are not committee members. They belong to it in the sense that they have licenses, that lead to the election of these members.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Mann, I want you to turn to page 4 of your statement, because here you have a very fascinating sentence, a portion of a paragraph:

> The livestock industry is not attempting to exploit, commercialize, or substantially change the natural condition of the lands. As a matter of fact, the grazing of livestock is best done in an area where there is a lack of commercial activity and where nature is allowed to work its wonders, in converting the moisture and sunshine into grass and where livestock can peaceably graze.

Very frankly, my conclusion, after hearing that is, you are perfectly willing to do for cows what you do not want us to do for people.

Mr. MANN. No, I don't think that way, Mr. Saylor. We like to have people come out and enjoy some of our areas. I can take the people down south of Eureka where they can camp for 2 months and never see two people. We encourage people to come and enjoy those things.

Mr. SAYLOR. Even though it might disturb a cow?

Mr. MANN. We don't feel they particularly disturb the cows.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Westland said the cows are more likely to disturb the people.

Mr. McCrea, I want to commend you on the statement you have made, because I think you have pointed up in a very short statement the real problem that this committee faces. We have got this tremendous amount of people in California and in the other rapidly growing Western States that are placing demands upon the Congress for increased recreational uses, and, on the other hand, the people from the local areas are dependent upon the Congress to try and allow mining, agriculture, grazing, and other forestry and timbering industries to continue also. It is to try and solve the problem of the equities between the two that is placed upon this great committee. I think the statement you have made really points that matter out very well.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to concur. It is not very often I do this, but I would like to agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania at this time.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The next witness is Warren L. Monroe, State senator from Elko County, representing the Elko Chamber of Commerce. Warren, we are very happy to welcome you before our committee this morning.

SRP05439

STATEMENT OF WARREN L. MONROE, STATE SENATOR OF NEVADA, REPRESENTING THE ELKO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MONROE. Thank you, Walter.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as has already been pointed out, I am State Senator Warren Monroe, serving as State senator from Elko County, and I represent the Elko Chamber of Commerce.

> An increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition.

This is the "central reason" for wilderness legislation as set forth by the U.S. Senate in passing S. 4, the Senate's version of the so-called wilderness bill which has now been before Congress for nearly 8 years.

If this is, in truth, the basic reason behind the efforts of many inspired lovers of the great outdoors, to bring about legislative expression of an enduring wilderness philosophy then we should examine and analyze well this simple cause celebre.

The Senate's conclusion that all areas within the United States are eventually to be occupied and modified by an expanding and mechanized population must of necessity be based on the premise that all such areas are capable of being occupied and modified by our predicted mass populations which are scheduled to arrive in one huge population explosion which only now is beginning to reverberate through the world's social structure and which will reach a deafening crescendo by the year 2000 or thereabouts.

This is patently not true. At least, it is not true on the basis of today's concept of living standards and the physical requirements to fulfill those standards. How anyone could visualize sustained living on a modern scale in the high back country of any of today's existing wilderness, wild, or primitive areas, is difficult to understand. Even if we accept a very modified definition of the word "occupy" as meaning only limited periods of occupation such as occur in the more accessible areas of the outdoors during vacation seasons, it is still not realistic to suppose that any vast invasion of these inaccessible areas of our Nation will take place. The cost alone of maintaining the required supply lines to preserve human life in these areas over any extended period of time presents a logistics problem which would limit any such "occupation" to the comparative few who today are privileged to pack into the wilderness for brief stays.

As for modifications, there is concern today about the development of methods of transportation which permit mechanized travel over terrain which previously was inaccessible to any type of vehicle. Certainly filling the peace and calm of a true wilderness area with the disrupting clatter of a tote-gote or similar bicycle-type vehicle, is not to be desired. But we have within the administrative powers of existing agencies ample means of controlling this trend and certainly we do not need to enact vast new policy forming legislation to meet this problem. In fact, vehicular travel of all kinds is currently prohibited in most of the areas in question. Someday, as I will submit later herein, there may be a need for modification of this rule but let us consider this problem in a more logical order.

SRP05440

In the foregoing, I have been speaking of areas which possess true wilderness status and which, if a system were to be established, would beyond any reasonable doubt, qualify for inclusion in such a system.

There are undoubtedly other areas in the Nation currently classified as "wild," "primitive," or "canoe," or designated as game ranges, which might invite some limited occupation were they to be made accessible by building roads. Perhaps an exploding population might some day be pushed into these fringe areas of human habitation for permanent living but it is unlikely.

It is much more logical to assume that these fringe areas will be taken over and occupied in the broad sense for recreational uses but even so it is difficult to envision how human beings under such circumstances could overcome the physical obstacles of a vast area such as the Idaho primitive area, for instance, and do very much to remove it from its natural wilderness status.

These things being true, it would appear that the "central cause" or need for wilderness legislation, as subscribed by the Senate measure, is falsely assumed.

The weakness here disclosed is hinted at in a recent statement contained in the "Wilderness News," published regularly by the Wilderness Society with offices at 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. This statement also bears examination. It follows:

> So much discussion in the controversy of recent years has dealt with arguments about how wilderness will be handled that the basic needs * * * may have been too much taken for granted.

It is my belief that our discussion today must necessarily deal with the basic need, and the ultimate wisdom, as well, of legislation which will direct the selection of vast acreages of public lands for designation as wilderness and which will express legislative intent to lock up these lands as inviolate from human modification in any way forever. And I want to emphasize the word "forever." That carries us a long way out into the future into a world which you and I cannot conceive.

I think there is a prevailing acceptance today, even among opponents of current wilderness bill proposals, that "we should continue to preserve wilderness." I think the opponents of current legislative proposals, as is so often the case, have pointed their opposition at the "how" of continuing the job, assuming, perhaps mistakenly, that questioning the "why" of it all might be futile although deep down in their hearts they have felt that such legislation as has been proposed is basically not needed or not wise.

Even if we are to assume that there is a need for wilderness preservation, we need not necessarily agree that legislation establishing a system, giving legality to the philosophy of preservation and delineating the procedures for effecting such a move is needed to accomplish this end. Wilderness areas are enjoying a very excellent custodial position within the framework of existing governmental agencies. It is true that present law leaves their fate within the purview of administrative agencies. But the management of the public lands and the control and regulation of our irreplaceable natural resources is an administrative responsibility.

The conditions which determine the status of our lands and their riches both material and esthetic are variable and unpredictable and demand day-to-day flexibility of rule and operation to afford their best

SRP05441

utilization by the public. To limit such resource management by inflexible, point-by-point legislative enactment would be to invite yearly amendment of such acts in what undoubtedly would be a futile effort to keep abreast of changing administrative requirements.

Today, as an example, the law would prohibit adequate access to make possible harvesting of the available game supplies. Tomorrow there would be a cry for relaxing of the laws to permit more hunting as the game began to multiply out of control. Or today's banishment of the miner and prospector from the wilderness may be changed tomorrow as the Nation's diminishing gold supply drags us into an economic crisis and requires that we resort to every possible source and method of bolstering our dwindling reserves. We even must contemplate in the more distant future a much greater use of every land surface in the production of food and today's legislative barrier against modification of the wilderness might necessarily be sacrificed to permit as yet undiscovered agricultural uses for our rugged back country.

Most people, including myself, subscribe to the necessity of preserving the inaccessible areas of our vast hinterland as inviolate from the encroachment of man's handiwork up to the point where such preservation represents the highest priority of beneficial use. It is here that we differ with the all-out proponent of wilderness preservation. He would attempt to decide for all future generations what is the highest beneficial use for the areas of land under discussion. We, as the opponents of the "forever" principle, ask that these areas of land remain under the custody of existing administrative agencies to be managed under the administrative rules arrived at on the basis of need factors as determined by the most beneficial use requirement of the prevailing times.

Certainly we cannot be blind to the fact that there are movements underway to change the status of some wilderness regions.

One of the most notable at the moment, perhaps, is the effort on the part of Idaho interests to change the status of the Sawtooth Primitive Area encompassing most of the Sawtooth Range of mountains in the Sawtooth National Forest.

A move was launched to seek wilderness designation for this rugged mountain vastness which presently includes two areas of attraction, the high, rugged country in the Sawtooth range and the lower alluvial lands above Stanley basin which contain forest areas, lakes, and streams and which is currently accessible to some motorized use.

Counteracting the move to obtain wilderness status has been a chamber of commerce inspired effort to attract attention to the area as a national park, a change which would modify the wilderness aspect and certainly lead to an eventual increase in public use and, coincidentally, an increase in Idaho tourist business.

It is no doubt galling to supporters of wilderness legislation to hear demands that we sell our soul-saving wilderness for a paltry profit. Frankly, I cannot give support to any proposal which involves surrender of any of the previous values to be found in our outdoors for commercial gain. To me, this is the far reach of the swinging pendulum of diversified opinion on the wilderness question.

Someday the development of the lower regions in the Sawtooth area may come about. But if we let the normal trend of events in this great Nation take their course, development of these areas for greater

SRP05442

public use will come about because there will be a great public demand for such a move on the part of the outdoors people and the nature lovers and recreationalists.

And I think that what we must recognize and which, to me, is the most compelling point of all in opposition to the "forever" concept of wilderness areas, is that this tremendous population expansion which is now frightening most all agencies of Government, and against which S. 4 would guard our wilderness, someday will make it absolutely necessary that we open up some of our present reserved scenic lands to greater public use. Even today the unrestricted and unreserved scenic areas of America are becoming so hopelessly commercialized and so woefully crowded that people who have enjoyed visits to these areas in the past are now turning to less attractive places for their enjoyment of the outdoors.

Lake Tahoe in the Sierras is an excellent example of what is happening to our scenic areas which are open and accessible to the public without restriction. Today a four-lane highway with stop lights, lined almost solid for 10 miles with commercial developments has almost obliterated the "outdoors" aspect of the southern end of the lake. Similar developments have gone far toward blocking access to the lake at the north end. Private ownership of lands on both the east and west sides of the lake have retarded spread of commercialism in these areas but they have also served to deprive the public of use of lake frontage for enjoyment of one of nature's greatest water attractions.

I am sure that wilderness proponents would use this as their strongest argument for preserving other areas of similar beauty which have as yet been unspoiled by man. But they, too, swing the pendulum too wide.

Somewhere between the "forever" view and the wide-open-to-the public view there must be a happy medium which, under the flexibility of administrative rule, can provide modified uses of some portions of existing reserved areas as public demand grows incessant enough to assure administrators that such modification is necessary.

It seems to me that if the population does explode and that if all the predictions of outdoor recreational need come true, that it would be a completely intolerable situation to permit the milling masses of people in the year 2000 to literally crowd themselves out of the accessible areas of our great country—the parks, the forest lands, and the limited offerings of the Bureau of Land Management—and permit millions of acres of our choicest outdoors to sit by comparatively idle and available only to the fortunate few who are well enough off or hardy enough to avail themselves of the rare beauty of these areas.

I am firmly convinced that regardless of what a well-meaning Congress might do today to satisfy the purists in this controversial outdoor question, could very easily be undone and perhaps even to the extent of going full swing with the pendulum, by another Congress less than half a century from now. Meanwhile, the restrictive effects of presently conceived legislation might very easily work to do more harm to our wilderness than could ever happen from the chamber of commerce pressures on dedicated public lands administrators.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Senator.

Are there any questions?

Mr. DUNCAN. Were you born and raised here in Nevada, Senator?

Mr. MONROE. No, sir; I was born in California.

Mr. DUNCAN. You have lived in Nevada for how long?

Mr. MONROE. I have been in Nevada since 1922.

Mr. DUNCAN. You suggested, on the first page of your statement, that it is difficult to visualize sustained living on a modern scale in the high back country of wilderness areas, as one of the reasons why we do not need a wilderness bill today.

Mr. MONROE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Because they are areas that are so foreign to human habitation whose environment, geographical and climatical, is such that human beings would not be apt to go there?

Mr. MONROE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. What did Las Vegas look like when you came to Nevada?

Mr. MONROE. Well, it was flat, and they had water to some extent, and certainly those two things make settlement possible. I would not suggest anybody live on the face of one of these granite slopes in the wilderness areas such as Sawtooth in Idaho.

Mr. DUNCAN. My only point is that the environment of Las Vegas looked very forbidding, I know, when I came through here hitchhiking to California before World War II, and I certainly could not have envisioned what has been produced here by mankind.

I think one of the things this committee has to do, with the help of you people, is to plan ahead, not just a decade, perhaps many decades, perhaps even centuries. Certainly we may guess wrong, but it is our job, with your help to do the best we can.

Mr. MONROE. I agree. And the point of time will come when we must face the possibility of surrendering some of this wilderness to greater public recreational use and it is permitted today, because——

Mr. DUNCAN. That is right, and I think Mr. Saylor already pointed out that none of the statutes or laws that Congress passes are immutable. They are all subject to change. It used to be every 2 years, but now it is constantly, because Congress seems to be in constant session.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. How long have you been a member of the Senate of the State of Nevada?

Mr. MONROE. I have been there 6 years. I was in the assembly three times previously to that.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am not familiar with all of the divisions of your State constitution, but, if there were a provision in the State constitution that said that the Legislature of the State of Nevada had upon it certain responsibilities, what would you feel if one of the agencies of your State government took over and had handled that responsibility for a number of years?

Do you feel you would be violating any responsibilities to the people of the State if the legislature decided they would tell the executive branch of Government they were going to take back that authority and to handle it themselves?

Mr. MONROE. Well, Mr. Saylor, I believe that would depend a great deal upon the circumstances involved. If the agency in question had been doing as good a job with their problem as our agencies in the

Federal Government have been doing in the management of wilderness, I believe there would be very little reason to stir up a fuss about it.

Mr. SAYLOR. You know there have been lots of protests. Maybe you have not heard about it in Nevada, but every time the Secretary of Agriculture decides that he is going to change the perimeter of a primitive area and holds public hearings to do it, there is a tremendous uproar in that area, and the local people get quite aroused. Some want more land included, some want less land included; some want the boundaries moved so it will not take in his property or will take in his neighbors. It is always a typical situation that you are in favor of Uncle Sam doing something, or the State government doing something, as long as it takes your neighbor's property and does not affect yours. Most of us are quite human in that respect.

What these bills are trying to do, both the one that was passed in the last session by the Senate and the one that the Senate passed this year, S. 4, and the bills that have been introduced in the House, is to try to give Congress the control over these areas that have been classified as "primitive," "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe." And the areas are already known. There is not anything in any bill, there never has been anything in any bill, to allow them to go out and take in any new areas.

That is all we are trying to do, and as one of the sponsors of these bills, I am trying to get Congress to step up and measure up to their own responsibility.

Mr. MONROE. My point is, Mr. Saylor, if you pass congressional action on this point, you remove our side of the picture. It becomes a law then. As it is now, your administrative agency has a public hearing when there is some change coming up. In the future there would be no change. It would be forever locked up under the law.

Mr. SAYLOR. Oh, yes, but you see, if you allow your Congress to do it, you may have some right of recourse. If you allow the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to do it, you have no recourse. You would be surprised how arbitrary some people can get in various agencies under the system that we know as the civil service system. They are immune to Presidents. In fact, as I heard one of their leaders say one day, Presidents come and Presidents go, but we go on forever.

So what I am trying to do is to give you the opportunity as citizens of this country, to have your Congress do something about the present situation. You have been in the room all morning and you have heard some other people talk about, "Watch out what you are allowing the Secretary of the Interior to do by executive order." That is what we are trying to save you fellows from—yourselves. Sometimes I do not think you want to be saved.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Senator.

Mr. MONROE. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. Next is the Nevada Farm Bureau, Robert F. Thomas and Norman B. Glaser.

I am informed they will not be here until this afternoon.

The next witness is John Sanborn, director, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, Pocatello, Idaho. Is he here?

(No response.)

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Bart Brassey of Boise, Idaho, managing director of Associated Industries of Idaho.

You may proceed, Mr. Brassey.

SRP05445

STATEMENT OF BART A. BRASSEY, MANAGING DIRECTOR OF ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF IDAHO, BOISE, IDAHO

Mr. BRASSEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Bart A. Brassey of Boise, Idaho, managing director of Associated Industries of Idaho. I am here to present the views of this association on S. 4, H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162.

Associated Industries of Idaho has been privileged to present its views on wilderness bills before this subcommittee on several previous occasions. Thank you for the opportunity to again express our opinion.

The association I represent is composed of chemical, timber, mining, utility, food processing, and other manufacturing interests that are basically concerned with Idaho's natural resources. As an association and as individual companies we are vitally interested in Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture land policy. Any wilderness bill will eventually affect the natural resource users of our association and the eventual development of our State.

Associated Industries has never quarreled with the concept of wilderness preservation. We believe it is desirable that examples of our Nation's primitive natural environment be left inviolate. We have, however, disagreed with previous wilderness bills.

The bills, S. 4, H.R. 9070, and H.R. 9162 that are being considered here today are, in our opinion, an improvement over previous bills. Congressman Saylor and Congressman Dingell are to be particularly congratulated for their attempt to meet what we have always felt were valid objections.

Land area inclusion in a wilderness system should, as H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162 specify, require a positive action of Congress.

Local units of government, commercial interests and private citizens near primitive areas have always felt that past wilderness bills have called for the inclusion of excessive acreage. H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162 have partially answered these objections.

The concept of primitive land area review and the necessity for Congressional action before these lands fall under the national wilderness system are excellent. These features of H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, are applauded by our association.

May I briefly state proposals that will equitably protect the individual States containing proposed wilderness systems and will equitably protect the rights of local units of government, private citizens, wilderness advocates, and commercial interests.

May I respectfully request that your committee consider:

1. Legislation should specify wilderness areas rather than the establishment of a wilderness system.
2. Periodic review, not only for wilderness use, but also for multiple use of designated areas.
3. Clearly spell out what will happen after review.
4. Clearly spell out that both private and State lands in created wilderness can be exchanged for Federal land.
5. Carefully consider the overwhelming need for accessible outdoor recreational areas as opposed to large acreages inaccessible except to a small minority.

In our State of Idaho this seems to be one of the most pressing problems we have. As Congressman White knows, we have a large extensive area of that, whether it has been officially designated wilderness or not, is in the wilderness, and our problem seems to be around some of our lakes and some of the mountain areas that we need more roads and more access and more places for people to park trailers and more accommodations for the traveling public than we do a specific wilderness area.

6. Clearly spell out that proposed areas are to be intensively inventoried before inclusion in a wilderness area.

7. Consider legislative priority for H.R. 8070. Land review is basic and fundamental to any wilderness legislation, and in the opinion of our association H.R. 8070 should receive favorable consideration before the enactment of any wilderness bill or any other public land legislation.

Mr. Chairman, you said that probably would be one of the first actions of business in the new session. We are very hopeful this bill can be passed before we do have any wilderness legislation.

Let me congratulate the committee and particularly Mr. Saylor and Mr. Dingell, for the efforts they have made to meet some of the objections that commercial interests have had in the past wilderness bills. We think their attitude is very laudable, and we are most appreciative they have been able to see what we think are valid objections to previous bills.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity to present the views of our association.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Brassey.

Are there questions on the part of the committee?

The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I certainly want to congratulate you on your presentation, Mr. Brassey. I know you represent a majority of the commercial interests of the State of Idaho, and they have been a very active and very fair-minded group of people in trying to work out with the Government some logical use of the public lands in the State of Idaho. I believe the timber industry has made a real step forward in reforestation, proper multiple use, and sustained yield on the properties they have held in the State of Idaho. I welcome you and am glad you were able to come down.

Thank you.

Mr. BRASSEY. Thank you, Mr. White.

Mr. BARING. Are there any further questions?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Brassey, one question: In view of certain of the decisions of the Supreme Court with regard to water rights, stating that certain provisions in State constitutions are probably not controling and that the Federal Government and not the States control water within the boundaries of certain States, I was wondering whether or not your organization or the people that you represent would like to see included in the study made by the Commission suggested in H.R. 8070, not only the land review but a review of the water problem in the States of the West as well?

Mr. BRASSEY. Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Saylor, I presume that would probably be a good thing. My understanding is—and of course, this

SRP05447

is clouded—we have some very able water attorneys in the State of Idaho now working on a committee that is working on this problem. It is their impression, and they have so publicly announced in the press, that the prior rights that have been established by the State and the rights that have been established by former Governors, will probably preempt the usage of water by any other State unless these potential water users could secure the cooperation of the State government. This is a question that has not legally been decided in the Idaho Supreme Court, and of course it would hinge, too, on Federal law. They are studying this right now.

Mr. SAYLOR. This is what I hoped would be the law. But in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Pelton* case and in the case in California known as the *Fallbrook* case, with which I am sure Mr. McCrea is familiar where the Federal Government is trying to claim rights which exceed all of the rights which the State of California ever gave to a Santa Margarita ranch, create questions in which everyone in the West should be vitally interested.

Mr. BRASSEY. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Saylor, this is very true. Of course Idaho is most concerned with this, and it is probably one of our most pressing problems right now because of, at least, the publicity that has been given to the so-called attempt by Los Angeles interests to take Idaho water.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have always told the people in the Pacific Northwest to watch out because those folks in California sure had their eye on the Columbia River for water.

Mr. BRASSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. Are there any further questions?

Without objection, the statement of the Southern Idaho Forestry Association will be made a part of the record at this point.

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF ROBERT D. HAYES, SOUTHERN IDAHO FORESTRY ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Robert D. Hayes, and I am representing the Southern Idaho Forestry Association, organized under the laws of the State of Idaho to conserve the forest resources of southern Idaho, to promote practical forestry, and to advance the standards of forestry education, training, and practices.

The Southern Idaho Forestry Association believes that the creation of a wilderness system is unnecessary. The association does believe that H.R. 9162 is much closer to an acceptable solution. However, if Congress is to enact such legislation, there are some things that should be provided for and specifically spelled out in the bill:

1. Any legislation must contain a provision for periodic review of wilderness areas in the light of the multiple-use concept. These reviews should be required at least every 25 years with an inventory of the potential values in the areas, and considering the changing needs and conditions.

2. Lands now in primitive areas which after review do not become wilderness areas, should be returned to regular national forest status.

3. Provisions should be made so that the U.S. Forest Service cannot set up additional primitive areas which are, in essence, wilderness areas and which impose all of the same restrictions that wilderness areas have.

SRP05448

4. National parks and wildlife refuges should not be included in a wilderness system, because in most instances national parks and wildlife refuges are not wilderness-type lands as we envisage them, and they have to be managed not as wilderness, but for the specific purpose for which each park or refuge was created.

5. A provision should be made for exchange of private lands within a wilderness area for lands of like value and type, without the wilderness area, similar to that provided for State lands, and with the concurrence of the private owner.

The Southern Idaho Forestry Association thanks the chairman and committee for the opportunity to present this statement and requests that the statement be entered in the record of the Las Vegas hearing of January 13, 1964.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is E. R. Stallings. He is president of the National Horsemen's Association. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF E. R. STALLINGS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL HORSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is E. R. Stallings, 928 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, Calif. My occupation is that of county manager of the county of San Mateo, Calif. I am here today as the president of the National Horsemen's Association which, as you may know, has a vital interest in principal legislative measures affecting conservation of our beautiful wildlife country and its retention as a place of beauty for the enjoyment of future generations.

The National Horsemen's Association was formed in the late spring of 1963 by a group of dedicated horsemen cognizant of the immediate need to preserve and foster areas throughout the United States for the enjoyment not only of horse enthusiasts but of all of the public.

Horsemanship generally has not been considered as a recreational activity. More often it is looked upon simply as a skill associated with ranch operations or transportation in remote areas difficult or impossible to traverse in automotive equipment. Quite to the contrary it is the No. 1 dollar volume recreational activity in the United States. There are well over 10 million equine enthusiasts in this country. A substantial proportion of these devotees own horses, and all of them participate in affairs involving the animals, such as polo, racing, trailriding, rodeos, and the like. Hundreds of thousands of children occupy their pleasure time working with and learning about horses. Seldom does one see an ardent young horse lover among those classified as "juvenile delinquents."

Our organization represents something less than 5,000 members at the present time; yet I am confident that I speak on behalf of the aforementioned 10 million persons because I know from experience that they share the point of view that I will present to you today.

S. 4, as presented to the House of Representatives by the Senate, is a masterpiece of draftsmanship and undoubtedly is based upon many years of study and consideration by not only the agencies of the Federal Government and other groups interested in conservation, but by the Senate and the House of Representatives as well. It pro-

SRP05449

poses a program which seems to meet the objections that have been raised in the past, and if it becomes law, I am sure it will be one of the most beneficial and farsighted pieces of legislation that your Congress has adopted in many a session.

As I understand S. 4, it would create a National Wilderness Preservation System from existing Federal lands. It would involve neither the acquisition of additional lands nor interference with utilization of any existing federally owned areas for purposes such as timbering, grazing, or mining. Instead, it would preserve a natural resource that man could never reproduce were it to be destroyed. It will maintain for posterity the scenic values that we today are privileged to enjoy in the wilderness areas, in the wildlife areas, and in our national park system. This legislation would, and this I consider to be extremely important, establish as congressional policy the preservation of some Federal lands as wilderness areas. Further, it would provide a program for implementing this policy through the administration of existing wilderness under the jurisdiction of the national park system and other Federal agencies without disruption of present land use purposes or programs and without transferring lands from one jurisdiction to another.

Gentlemen, it is almost too late to take action as proposed by S. 4. Daily, with the encroachment of urban development and with the depletion of our wilderness areas and our remote wooded sections by commercial undertakings, by exploitation, by other devices, we rapidly are seeing the end of beautiful areas where men, women, and children may remove themselves from the manmade facilities that we live with every day and can commune with nature, can experience spiritual rejuvenation and can appreciate how infinitesimal is the individual as compared to the great out of doors and the universe. The horse enthusiast is one of the many who enjoy getting out into the open country away from the sounds and noise of cities, commercial enterprises, highways and freeways and to seek the mental balm of even a few hours comparative solitude in a countryside in its natural state.

This type of activity is becoming more and more essential as a recreational outlet and as an opportunity to relieve oneself of the day-to-day pressures of our modern society. We like to feel that as horsemen we can contribute to the other recreational proponents by adding our support to this legislation.

My statement has primarily been directed toward S. 4. Perhaps, as an opportunist, I thought it more expedient to make a pitch for this legislation because it has already cleared the Senate. However, our organization is interested primarily in the establishment of a wilderness preservation bill at this session of Congress and we have no pride as to the authorship of any one of the bills that are being considered by your committee.

We urge that action be taken now, and, if I might paraphrase, what we horsemen like to do, an old Western song, let's take steps not to fence us out.

SRP05450

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your taking me out of order this morning. I have an important commitment tomorrow. Having arrived here yesterday, one might say I have an economic reason for wanting to get back.

If I may take one further moment, Mr. Chairman, subsequent to my request to your committee, I was asked by the California State Horsemen's Association, as director and as president of the national association, to represent their point of view here today. They are primarily interested in enactment of the wilderness bill, that is, one of the wilderness bills. They are partcularly concerned that no amendment be offered to these bills which would specifically exclude San Gorgonio area or any portion of it from the area ordinarily designated as a wilderness or wildlife area in that particular section of the country.

They feel commercial establishments are not consistent with the wilderness program, that they should be confined to the areas where commercial development already is in existence and can be expected to accommodate the skiers.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the statement submitted for the California State Horsemen's Association will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF CALIFORNIA STATE HORSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

My name is E. R. Stallings, 928 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, Calif. As president of the National Horsemen's Association, I have been asked to represent here today the California State Horsemen's Association in their concern and support for the passage of S. 4. The California State Horsemen's Association is wholeheartedly in accord with the version of the legislation as passed to you from the Senate and urges that you adopt this legislation without further amendment.

Sepcifically, the California group is vitally interested in the preservation, as wilderness, of the San Gorgonio area. In the past, strong pressures have been exerted and many overtures have been made by commercial ski operators to have this area exempted from the wilderness bill or to have amendments presented which would permit the opening up of a portion of the area as a ski resort. While the horsemen, many of whom also are avid skiers, totally endorse the objectives of the ski enthusiasts, we do not believe that a ski resort is compatible with the preservation of a wilderness area; we believe that there are many areas in which ski resorts can be developed adjacent to existing commercial developments so that the facilities required for the skier can be provided with existing facilities or reasonable expansion thereof. The California Horsemen's Association urges that you not consider favorably any amendment which would have the effect of deleting from the San Gorgonio National Forest Wild Area any segment for any other purpose than its preservation as a wilderness area.

Similarly, there are other areas in which overtures are made for exemptions from the provisions of the wilderness preservation bill. Adequate provision is made within the proposed legislation to permit the President to submit to Congress revised descriptions of wilderness areas or to delete certain areas from the wilderness classification to provide for specific activities. We strongly urge that this discretion be left to the President and to the Congress without writing into the legislation permanent exclusions of any of the areas presently classified as wilderness, in order that we might present a total wilderness program at the outset for review, for further consideration, for unemotional study, and for allocation in the best interest of all of the public of the country.

 SRP05451

There are other areas that would classify similarly to the San Gorgonio area, and we would ask that the same consideration be accorded these areas. Specifically, as president of the National Horsemen's Association and as director of the State Horsemen's Association, I urge that you not approve any amendments which would piecemeal or delete any areas from the wilderness program as envisioned by S. 4.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I express my appreciation for the opportunity of presenting our views to you today. May I say that we greatly appreciate your making available to us the opportunity to be heard in the various sections of the country. May I urge that you take these thoughts back with you to Washington and recommend expeditious action by the full Committee of the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs to place S. 4 before the Congress for its early enactment. I am sure that, had the chance been presented our late President Kennedy, an avid horseman himself, a lover of the outdoors, a great proponent of recreation and conservation, he would have expressed the hope that we would act to preserve for our posterity some of the remote wilderness country that constitutes the greatest natural resource that we in the United States possess.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions from the committee?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask you just one question, sir.

Mr. STALLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. You make the point about skiing not being compatible with wilderness. Would you like to see trails constructed in the wilderness areas for horseback access, all of the windfalls out of the trails, and the trails extended, or do you feel like going in and fighting through the brush as you encounter it?

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Chairman and Congressmen, there are already a number of trails in the wilderness area. It is not necessary to follow a prepared or manmade trail; there are animal trails that can be followed. I certainly have no objection, nor do the horsemen to skiers entering the wilderness areas for skiing but we do not wish to see commercial establishments, the hotels and motels, the lodges, the ski lifts, et cetera, constructed in these areas.

Mr. WHITE. I think my question could better be put this way: Would you like to see the trails maintained that are now existing in the wilderness areas, or extended, if the system is enacted into law by this legislation?

Mr. STALLINGS. We certainly would like to see them maintained and perhaps even expanded, not only for the horsemen but for the public as well who must, if they are going to get out in the country and enjoy the beautiful scenery there, have some kind of foot access through the area.

Mr. WHITE. And this is compatible with your concept of wilderness?

Mr. STALLINGS. Yes; it is.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman from Idaho has asked one of the questions I had in mind, and I am pleased to get your response, Mr. Stallings.

I have had a fellow from my district ride the Cascades trail from the Canadian border to the Mexican border and I doubt he would see very many people on that route except where he had to cross the Columbia River and a few places like that.

I want to ask you this: Has your association considered either 9070 or 9162?

Most of your testimony again is directed to S. 4.

Mr. STALLINGS. Yes; this is true.

Mr. WESTLAND. I wondered whether or not your association considered these other two bills and whether or not you had any comment to make on them.

Mr. STALLINGS. I cannot speak for the chairman of our legislative committee, Mr. Westland, but I do know they did review both of these pieces of legislation to which you make reference, and I believe we would make no objection to the adoption of either one of them. We are not exclusivists.

Mr. WESTLAND. If your association can consider either one of those two bills, and make some comment on it for the record, which will be kept open another couple of weeks at least, I think the committee would appreciate hearing from you.

Mr. STALLINGS. We will certainly do that and appreciate having the opportunity.

(Mr. Stallings subsequently wrote as follows:)

NATIONAL HORSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 15, 1964.

Congressman WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Congressional Subcommittee on Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: It was a privilege, on behalf of the horsemen throughout the United States, for me to have had an opportunity of expressing to you and the members of your committee our interest in the proposed wilderness preservation system. You may recall that my testimony was directed primarily to S. 4, and at the completion of my testimony Congressman Jack Westland asked that we review further H.R. 9070, H.R. 9162, and H.R. 9520, all of which are modifications of the provisions contained in S. 4.

After review of this legislation, I am pleased to inform you that we see nothing in any of these proposals that would be inconsistent with our position on S. 4. We believe that all three of the House bills are, in effect, improvements over the provisions of S. 4, and further believe that H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 would be more generally accepted than the other wilderness bills which we have reviewed.

Whatever form is followed, however, may we again urge that meaningful legislation be adopted without undue delay so that a wilderness system of which this country can be rightly proud can be established, not only for us but for future generations.

It would be greatly appreciated if these comments can be added to the testimony submitted during the hearing in Las Vegas on January 13, 1964.

Respectfully submitted.

E. R. STALLINGS, *President.*

 SRP05453

Mr. WESTLAND. That is all.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Stallings.

Mr. STALLINGS. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is H. R. Glascock, Jr., forest counsel, Western Forestry & Conservation Association, Portland, Oreg. You may proceed, Mr. Glascock.

STATEMENT OF H. R. GLASCOCK, JR., PORTLAND, OREG., FOREST COUNSEL, WESTERN FORESTRY & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. GLASCOCK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Western Forestry & Conservation Association appreciates fully this opportunity to express its views on new versions of a legislative proposal so largely affecting the West. That subcommittee members would take from their precious time to make sure that individuals and groups in the areas affected were heard on new developments in an old issue is most gratifying. As forest counsel for the association, I would personally like to thank each member present.

The position of this 54-year-old forest protection and conservation organization on wilderness legislation was recommended by our broadly representative western forest land use committee and approved by the officers and board of trustees. Our position is as follows:

Western Forestry & Conservation Association firmly believes that additional wilderness legislation is unnecessary. If Congress is to enact such legislation, the association hopes it will be confined to national forest lands now classified as wild and wilderness and those portions of primitive areas found after review within 10 years to be predominantly valuable as wilderness and approved for wilderness designation by affirmative acts of Congress.

As an organization which strongly supports reservation and effective protection of a reasonable acreage of undeveloped country for primitive recreation, we cannot help but observe that events during the period since the first wilderness system bill was debated in 1957 reinforce our belief that additional legislation is unnecessary to accomplish this end. Net acreage in national forest wilderness-type areas has increased during this period from 14.2 to 14.7 million acres. More than 9 million acres of undeveloped land have been added to the national wildlife refuge and game range system. The national park system has encompassed a number of new areas retaining their primeval environment. And during this time, while grave fears have been expressed and wilderness administration scrutinized critically, Congress has not received testimony indicating any significant violations of the wilderness environment of these areas.

Truly, then, the administrative departments and agencies have been most generous in assigning lands to wilderness use and most assiduous in their protection. The argument that we must enact wilderness legislation now because administratively selected and protected wilderness is going down the drain fails to hold up on objective review of

the facts. If there is to be such legislation, there is surely time to obtain all of the facts and consider dispassionately all of the several legislative approaches which could be used. The wilderness system approach is only one of these.

In a very real sense, enactment of a wilderness bill would constitute additional wilderness legislation. Western Forestry and Conservation Association urged amendment of the multiple use bill in 1960 to include mention of wilderness as one of the valid national forest uses under the multiple-use concept. This was done and the following language appears in the Multiple Use Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-517):

> The establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this act.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area in the Superior National Forest, Minn., is under its own protective acts of Congress. They set forth the general purpose of maintaining the primitive character of the area without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including timber harvesting and motorboating. The pending wilderness system bills disclaim any interference with these provisions, so it is difficult to see why the area is proposed for inclusion.

The National Park Act of August 25, 1916, sets forth the protection objective for national parks in these words:

> * * * To conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

This language has been interpreted by the National Park Service as a directive to preserve the natural environment unmodified. The Service has no plans to extend roads or facilities into the same 90 percent of the system which qualifies as roadless wilderness.

We, therefore, must persist in the conclusion that additional legislation to protect wilderness is not needed. But if the Congress in its wisdom is to decide otherwise, we are glad to see that the newer proposals being heard here today provide for review of the uninventoried national forest primitive areas before their placement under the legislative cloak of wilderness protection. The provision for positive congressional action on all proposed additions or deletions is also a great improvement. One recalls that this is the tried-and-proven method which has been used for the establishment of all of our great national parks.

We are still left to wonder what would happen to those primitive areas not acted on by the end of the review period. They should, of course, be returned to the status of unreserved national forest land within a reasonable period of time if not acted upon.

One of the most serious inequities in all of these bills is the failure to provide for exchange of Federal land for surrounded private land to be acquired as is so wisely provided in the case of surrounded State land.

 SRP05455

The simple withdrawal and protection by legislation of wilderness areas is confused by the proposal to establish a "national wilderness preservation system" contained in all of the current bills. To try to house public lands of three different authorizations (multiple use, park and wildlife management) and three separate administrations (Forest Service, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service) under one legislative roof in a common system for a highly restrictive use is a most ambitious undertaking. The attempt has resulted in extremely complex and confusing legislative proposals. They tediously provide for continuance of the differences in administration of the different lands, disclaim any interference with the several basic acts under which the lands are variously authorized, and go on to develop some sort of ambiguous bond among them.

At the very least, the system approach accomplishes nothing which is not done better in other ways. It would create confusion on the part of the administrative agencies involved. It is by no means clear, for instance, what uses compatible with wildlife production would have to be given up on included national game ranges where prescribed timber harvesting, grazing, and hunting are now used as tools in game management. And how can Secretaries of Interior well determine within 10 years' time, or 20 years for that matter, what roadless portions of the national parks will ever be needed for visitor access and living facilities? The important point is that park management and wildlife management often do not coincide with wilderness management; that none of these management programs has yet been so fully worked out as to enable proper determination of the areas of compatibility.

At the worst, the system approach could lead to the subsequent transfer of the lands included to one agency, possibly a new one, most nearly specializing in wilderness administration. Thus could come the opening wedge in fragmentation of the national forests, an eventuality our association would most certainly oppose with vigor. If there is justification for further wilderness law, it should concern itself with carefully selected portions of the national forests and not involve them with other lands.

We are also disappointed that all current bills to give wilderness legislative protection fail to provide specifically for regular, periodic reviews of the resources involved, by appropriate agencies. It can well be wondered if this does not violate the Multiple Use Act of 1960 which states:

> In the administration of the national forests due consideration shall be given to the relative values of the various resources in particular areas—

and which mentions providing——

> sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions.

We are happy to report that the delegates to our 54th Western Foresty Conference in San Francisco 1 month ago unanimously resolved to commend the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on its action in reporting favorably legislation to establish a Public Land Law Review Commission, quite probably the most important public land legislation in recent times. If established, Western Forestry and Conservation Association will cooperate fully with the Commission and urge others to do likewise. We sincerely hope that Congress will enact this fundamental legislation without delay.

We thank the chairman and each member of the subcommittee for this opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, we have prepared a chart which compares point by point all of the three current versions of wilderness system legislation with the existing situation. This is appended to our statement and we respectfully request this be made a part of the record.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The charts follow:)

SRP05457

Comparison of 3 current wilderness bills with existing situation

Item	Existing situation [1]	Dingell bill (H.R. 9162)	Saylor bill (H.R. 9070)	S. 4
Length of bill		15 pages and 5 lines	15 pages	21 pages and 3 lines.
Title	1. National forest wilderness, wild, canoe, and primitive areas. 2. National park system. 3. National wildlife refuge and game range system.	To establish National Wilderness Preservation System, etc.	Same as H.R. 9162	Same as H.R. 9162.
Purpose	1. To secure benefits of enduring resource of wilderness. 2. To conserve and enjoy scenery, natural and historical objects unimpaired. 3. To protect and manage wildlife resources.	To secure benefits of enduring resource of wilderness.	do	Do.
Definition of wilderness	1. Tract of land established under regulation U-1 (or U-2) in which the primitive environment has been preserved. (Forest Service Manual). 2. None. 3. None	Area "untrammeled by man" where man is visitor only. 5,000 acres or more undeveloped Federal land retaining primeval character.	do	Do.
Extent of system in wilderness administration.	1. National Forest wilderness-type areas, 14.7 million acres. 2. National Park system, 22 million acres. 3. National wildlife refuge system 25 million acres.	8.6 million acres at outset. Potentially over 60 million acres with additions by acts of Congress.	do	14.7 million acres at outset. Potentially over 60 million acres unless vetoed by Congress.
Commercial forest land included.	1. 4.7 million acres, 32 percent (USDA, Feb. 23, 1961). 2. Unknown. 3. Unknown.	2.9 million acres on national forests at outset. Potentially 4.7 million acres in national forests and unknown amount in national parks and wildlife refuges with additions by acts of Congress.	do	4.7 million acres, or 32 percent of national forest wilderness-type areas (USDA, Feb. 23, 1961). Unknown amount in national parks and wildlife refuges.
Percentage of system in West.	1. 94 percent in 11 Western States. 2. About 90 percent. 3. Same.	About 90 percent	Same as H.R. 9162	Same as H.R. 9162.
Addition or deletion	1. By executive order of Chief of Forest Service or Secretary of Agriculture. 2. By proclamation of President or Act of Congress. Total elimination by act of Congress. 3. Same.	By act of Congress	By act of Congress	By executive branch recommendation and failure of Congress to veto.
Review period	1. Indefinite for primitive areas. 2. No review period for parks. 3. No review period for refuges or ranges.	10 years for primitive areas and national parks and wildlife units.	Total of 5 years for primitive areas and national parks and wildlife units.	10 years for primitive areas and national parks and wildlife units.

Criteria for recommended inclusions.	1. "Forest officers will analyze all public values of the land and determine the highest public value." (Forest Service Manual.) 2. Meet national park standards. 3. Meet national wildlife refugee and national game range standards.	Primitive areas: "Suitability for preservation as wilderness." National park: "Roadless portions of" suitable "for preservation as wilderness." Wilderness refuge: "Portions of" suitable "for preservation as wilderness."	Primitive areas: "Suitability for preservation." National park: "5,000 or more contiguous acres" without roads suitable "for continued preservation as wilderness." Wildlife refuge: 5,000 or more contiguous acres without roads or "roadless islands within" suitable "for continued preservation as wilderness."	Primitive areas: Included at the outset. Possible deletion after review of "portions not predominantly of wilderness value." National park: "5,000 acres or more without roads "which Secretary recommends not needed" for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations." Wilderness refuge: "Such portions" as Secretary "may recommend."
Status of primitive areas during review period.	1. Continue to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as primitive areas.	"Continue to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as primitive areas" during 10-year review period or until Congress has acted.	"Continue to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as on the date of this act until Congress has acted on or has determined otherwise."	Primitive areas included in system at outset.
Status of primitive areas not included after review period.	1. Become unreserved national forest land.	Not clear	Remain primitive areas until Congress acts on.	When no recommendation for continued inclusion of an area in system has become effective within 14 years, area "shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system."
Roads	1. No roads permitted in national forest primitive, wilderness, wild, or canoe areas except for ingress to or egress from privately owned property. 2. Roads permitted in national parks to meet minimum requirements of administration. Some 90 percent of system without roads and policy to keep it that way. 3. Roads permitted in wildlife refuge units to meet minimum requirements of administration. In practice, held to minimum.	"No permanent road. No temporary road * * * except as necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act * * * subject to existing private rights."	"No permanent road * * * nor any temporary road * * * in excess of minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act * * * subject to any existing private rights."	Same as H.R. 9070.
Motor transportation and mechanized equipment.	1. Not permitted in national forest wilderness-type areas. 2. Permitted only in roaded portions of national park system. No off-highway use. 3. Permitted only in roaded portions of national wildlife refuge system.	"No use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motor boats, no landing of aircraft nor other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation * * * except as necessary to meet minimum requirements for administration."	No "use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motor boats, 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," etc.	Do.

Footnote at end of table, p. 686.

Comparison of 3 current wilderness bills with existing situation—Continued

Item	Existing situation [1]	Dingell bill (H.R. 9162)	Saylor bill (H.R. 9070)	S. 4
Established use of aircraft or motorboats.	1. Permitted where established on national forest wilderness-type areas. 2. Landing of aircraft prohibited. Motorboats by permission of park superintendent. 3. Not permitted unless compatible with refuge and range objectives.	"May be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Secretary * * * deems desirable."	Same as H.R. 9162	"Shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary finds necessary."
Protection against fire, insects, and diseases.	1. Protection measures permitted by administrative discretion on national forest wilderness type areas. 2. Protection measures permitted when considered necessary on park units. 3. Protection measures permitted as necessary to wildlife protection and management.	"Such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such conditions as the appropriate Secretary deems desirable."	do	"Such measures may be taken as are necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary finds necessary."
Commercial timber harvesting.	1. None except in Boundary Waters Canoe Area under special act of Congress. 2. None in national park units. 3. Permitted as tool in wildlife management.	None except in Boundary Waters Canoe Area.	None except in Boundary Waters Canoe Area.	None except in Boundary Waters Canoe Area.
Grazing of livestock	1. Regulations permit on national forest wilderness-type areas. Often excluded. 2. Generally excluded on national parks. Some grazing on monuments. 3. Permitted as tool in wildlife management.	Where established on national forest areas, "shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture."	Same as H.R. 9162	Where established on national forest and public domain areas, "shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary."
Mining and mineral leasing.	1. Mineral leasing and mining laws continue in force on national forest wilderness-type areas. 2. Mining excluded from national parks with few exceptions. 3. Mining permitted when compatible with wildlife management.	Existing laws pertaining to mineral leasing and mining extended to Dec. 31, 1973, on areas in system. After that date no patents shall issue "except for valid claims filed on or before Dec. 31, 1973."	Prospecting for minerals can continue within national forest areas if "compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment." Periodic mineral surveys by Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines on national forest areas. No provision for development and mining of minerals.	Within national forest and public domain areas included in system, "President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize * * * prospecting and mining."
Water and power projects.	1. Permitted according to withdrawals by Federal Power Commission (private projects) or Bureau of Land Management (public projects).	Within national forest areas in system, "President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize pros-	Same as H.R. 9162	Within national forest and public domain areas included in system, "President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem de-

SRP05460

	2. Not permitted in national park units. 3. Generally not permitted in national wildlife refuges and game ranges.	pecting for water resources, the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, power projects, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof * * *."		sirable, authorize * * * establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof * * *."
Commercial services	1. Permitted when compatible with wilderness administration. 2. Permitted when compatible with national park objectives. 3. Permitted when compatible with wildlife management goal.	"May be performed * * * to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other wilderness purposes of the areas."	do	Same as H.R. 9162.
Hunting and fishing	1. Permitted on national forest wilderness-type areas. 2. Fishing permitted on most park units. Hunting not permitted. 3. Hunting permitted on national game ranges, not on wildlife refuges. Fishing permitted on both.	"Secretary of Agriculture shall * * * permit hunting and fishing * * * to the extent that it is not incompatible with wilderness preservation" and without affecting jurisdiction of States.	do	Not clear. Nothing in act to affect jurisdiction or responsibilities of "* * * States with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests."
Surrounded non-Federal land.	1. Can be exchanged or purchased when funds authorized. 2. Same. 3. Same.	Where its land is completely surrounded by lands in system, State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access * * * or (2) * * * lands in the same State, not exceeding the value of the surrounded land in exchange. "Where privately owned lands (or) mining claims * * * are wholly within a wilderness area * * * Secretary of Agriculture shall, by reasonable regulations consistent with preservation of the area of wilderness, permit ingress and egress by means * * * customarily enjoyed." Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire private land within the perimeter of any area if (1) the owner concurs or (2) if acquisition is authorized by Congress.	Same as H.R. 9162. (No provision in any of bills for lands in exchange for surrounded private lands as provided for surrounded State lands.)	For surrounded State land, same as H.R. 9162. For privately owned land "within any portion of * * * system under his jurisdiction" Secretary of Interior and Agriculture subject to approval of funds by Congress, "are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system." Does not confer right of condemnation or impair "customary" access rights.

Footnote at end of table, p. 686.

Comparison of 3 current wilderness bills with existing situation—Continued

Item	Existing situation [1]	Dingell bill (H.R. 9162)	Saylor bill (H.R. 9070)	S. 4
Public hearings	1. Held by Forest Service in local areas on proposals to reclassify primitive areas. 2. Held by House and Senate Interior Committees on national park legislative proposals. 3. Held by House and Senate Interior Committees on national wildlife refuge legislative proposals.	Prior to submitting any recommendations to President on suitability of any area for preservation as wilderness, Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall give appropriate public notice and hold public hearing or hearings convenient to area affected and invite views on proposed action by Governor of State, governing board of each county or borough (Alaska) and Federal departments and agencies concerned. Such views included with recommendations to Congress.	Same as H.R. 9162	Same as H.R. 9162 except that 10 Federal agencies concerned are listed and "it shall be the responsibility of each named Federal agency to submit its independent views concerning the designation of an area as 'wilderness' giving an analysis of the comparative values that may be involved as between wilderness and that type of development or uses for which the Federal agency has administrative responsibility."
Land use Commission	1. None. 2. None. 3. None.	None provided	None provided	Presidential Land Use Commission established for "any State having more than 90 per centum of its total land area owned by the Federal Government on January 1, 1961" (Alaska). Commission "shall make recommendations to the appropriate Secretary as to how the federally owned land can best be utilized, developed, protected, and preserved". Such recommendations to accompany any recommendations to Congress.
Periodic review	1. Periodic reviews of all resources of values permitted by law in areas administered for wilderness, but not conducted in practice. 2. Same. 3. Same.	None provided	None provided except for "planned, recurring" survey of mineral values by Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines. Results to be available to public and submitted to Congress.	None provided.

[1] Numbers used under "Existing situation" indicate: 1. On national forest units; 2. on national park units; 3. on national wildlife refuge and game range units.

Wild, wilderness, primitive, and canoe areas

State and forest	Area	Area in thousand acres		
		Total national forest	Reserved commercial forest land	Noncommercial forest land
Arizona:				
Apache	Blue Range Primitive Area [1]	180	34.5	3.0
Do	Mount Baldy Primitive Area	7	6.4	.7
Coconino, Kaibab, Prescott.	Sycamore Canyon Primitive Area	46	.2	5.7
Coronado	Chiricahua Wild Area	18	8.8	9.0
Do	Galiuro Wild Area	55		.8
Prescott and Tonto	Pine Mountain Primitive Area	18		1.0
Tonto	Mazatzal Wilderness Area	205		.7
Do	Sierra Ancha Wild Area	21	3.0	7.1
Do	Superstition Wilderness Area	124		1.3
Total		674	52.9	29.3
California:				
Angeles	Devil Canyon-Bear Canyon Primitive Area.	36	1.0	3.0
Cleveland	Agua Tibia Primitive Area	26	.6	4.5
Eldorado	Desolation Valley Primitive Area	41	3.3	6.6
Inyo, Sierra	Mount Dana-Minarets Primitive Area	82	2.2	15.9
Inyo, Sierra, Sequoia	High Sierra Primitive Area	394	10.2	108.6
Klamath	Marble Mountain Wilderness Area	213	109.6	78.3
Klamath, Shasta-Trinity	Salmon Trinity Alps Primitive Area	223	71.4	57.3
Lassen	Caribou Peak Primitive Area	16	1.0	10.5
Do	Thousand Lakes Wild Area	16	3.0	5.4
Los Padres	San Rafael Primitive Area	74		3.6
Do	Ventana Primitive Area	52		1.0
Mendocino, Shasta-Trinity.	Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness Area	109	39.9	27.5
Modoc	South Warner Primitive Area	69	21.0	7.6
San Bernardino	Cucamonga Wild Area	9		6.5
Do	San Gorgonio Wild Area	34	20.0	5.0
Do	San Jacinto Wild Area	21		8.6
Stanislaus	Emigrant Basin Primitive Area	97	1.1	4.2
Toiyabe, Inyo	Hoover Wild Area	43	2.2	5.1
Total		1,555	286.5	359.2
Colorado:				
Arapaho, White River	Gore Range-Eagle Nest Primitive Area	61	9.9	24.4
Gunnison	West Elk Wild Area	62	8.0	34.0
Rio Grande	LaGarita-Sheep Mountain Primitive Area.	38	5.0	14.6
Do	Upper Rio Grande Primitive Area	57	22.1	7.1
Roosevelt	Rawah Wild Area	26	9.8	2.2
Routt	Mount Zirkel Dome Peak Wild Area	53	2.6	32.9
San Juan	San Juan Primitive Area	238	53.1	58.0
San Juan, Uncompahgre.	Wilson Mountains Primitive Area	27	10.4	.7
Uncompahgre Primitive Area.	Uncompahgre Primitive Area	53	12.5	2.1
White River	Flat Tops Primitive Area	118	39.3	5.4
Do	Maroon Bells-Snowmass Wild Area	66	20.0	17.9
Total		799	192.7	199.3
Idaho:				
Boise, Challis, Sawtooth.	Sawtooth Primitive Area	201	63.2	86.3
Challis, Salmon, Payette.	Idaho Primitive Area	1,225	935.3	175.1
Clearwater, Nezperce, Lolo, Bitterroot.	Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area [2]	1,578	568.0	732.0
Total		3,004	1,566.6	993.4
Minnesota: Superior	Boundary Waters Canoe Area	887	648.0	13.1
Total		887	648.0	13.1
Montana:				
Beaverhead, Bitterroot, Deerlodge.	Anaconda Pintlar	145	89.4	30.0
Bitterroot, Lolo	Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area [2]	291	132.0	185.0
Flathead	Mission Mountains Primitive Area	73	16.0	50.0
Flathead, Lewis and Clark.	Bob Marshall Wilderness Area	950	500.0	200.0

Footnotes at end of table, p. 688.

SRP05463

Wild, wilderness, primitive, and canoe areas—Continued

State and forest	Area	Area in thousand acres: Total national forest	Reserved commercial forest land	Noncommercial forest land
Montana—Continued				
Gallatin	Absaroka Primitive Area	64	29.4	20.5
Gallatin, Custer	Beartooth Primitive Area	230	4.6	69.0
Gallatin	Spanish Peaks Primitive Area	50	20.0	21.6
Helena	Gates of the Mountains Wild Area	28	2.0	18.0
Kootenai, Lolo, Kaniksu	Cabinet Mountains Primitive Area	90	38.0	33.9
Total		1,921	831.4	628.0
Nevada: Humboldt	Jarbidge Wild Area	65		20.0
Total		65		20.0
New Hampshire: White Mountain.	Great Gulf Wild Area	5	0.6	2.7
Total		5	.6	2.7
New Mexico:				
Apache	Blue Range Primitive Area [1]	37	6.8	.7
Carson	Wheeler Peak Wild Area	6		2.1
Gila	Black Range Mountain Area	169	49.0	99.0
Do	Gila Primitive Area	130	30.0	34.8
Do	Gila Wilderness Area	438	50.0	213.0
Lincoln	White Mountain Wild Area	28		8.0
Santa Fe	San Pedro Parks Wild Area	41	12.0	22.1
Santa Fe, Carson	Pecos Wilderness Area	165	54.5	56.8
Total		1,014	202.3	436.5
North Carolina: Pisgah	Linville Gorge Wild Area	8	4.6	
Total		8	4.6	
Oregon:				
Deschutes, Mount Hood, Willamette.	Mount Jefferson Primitive Area	87	4.6	61.3
Deschutes, Willamette	Diamond Peak Wild Area	35	11.4	22.2
Do	Three Sisters Wilderness Area	197	143.0	30.2
Do	Mount Washington Wild Area	47	23.9	11.6
Fremont	Gearhart Mountain Wild Area	19	13.9	4.3
Malheur	Strawberry Mountain Wild Area	33	12.1	17.9
Mount Hood	Mount Hood Wild Area	14	4.5	2.7
Rogue River	Mountain Lakes Wild Area	23	16.9	4.7
Siskiyou	Kalmiopsis Wild Area	78	21.2	37.3
Wallowa-Whitman	Eagle Cap Wilderness Area	216	.5	127.2
Total		749	252.0	319.4
Utah: Ashley, Wasatch	High Uintas Primitive Area	241	76.5	4.0
Total		241	76.5	4.0
Washington:				
Gifford Pinchot	Mount Adams Wild Area	42	8.3	11.1
Gifford Pinchot, Snoqualmie.	Goat Rocks Wild Area	83	47.0	17.9
Mount Baker, Wenatchee	Glacier Peak Wilderness Area	458	93.7	120.8
Okanogan, Mount Baker.	North Cascade Primitive Area	801	50.7	474.1
Total		1,384	199.7	623.9
Wyoming:				
Bighorn	Cloud Peak Primitive Area	94	7.5	17.5
Bridger	Bridger Wilderness Area	383	14.0	8.0
Shoshone	Glacier Primitive Area	177		43.4
Do	North Absaroka Wilderness Area	360	55.0	153.7
Do	Popo Agie Primitive Area	70		19.0
Do	South Absaroka Wilderness Area	506	79.6	161.3
Do	Stratified Primitive Area	202	8.9	56.6
Teton	Teton Wilderness Area	563	212.5	57.7
Total		2,355	376.9	517.2
Grand total		14,661	4,690.7	4,146.0

[1] Blue Range Primitive Area lies in both Arizona and New Mexico.
[2] Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area lies in both Idaho and Montana.

SRP05464

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions on the part of the committee?

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have only one comment, and that is, Mr. Glascock, that with the advent of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area, I think you should revise your figure to a million and a half rather than a half a million acres.

You have got Glacier Peak Wilderness Area, a little over 400,000 acres, and northern Cascades, about a million and quarter, so you have about 1,600,000 acres at least that I know of.

Mr. GLASCOCK. The recent additions during consideration of this legislation have been significant. We will be glad to check those figures and revise them accordingly.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is all.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Glascock.

Mr. GLASCOCK. Thank you, gentlemen.

(Mr. Glascock subsequently submitted for the record the following material:)

MANAGING CALIFORNIA'S SNOW ZONE LANDS FOR WATER

(By Henry W. Anderson)

THE AUTHOR

Henry W. Anderson has been with the Forest Service Experiment Station in Berkeley since 1946, except for 2 years at the San Dimas Experimental Forest, Glendora, Calif. He was first a hydrologist in the station's division of flood control surveys, then did research on soil stabilization, became head of watershed studies in the Sierra snow zone in 1955, and is now in charge of water source hydrology research in the wildlands of California and Hawaii. He is the author or coauthor of more than 45 technical publications on hydrology, sedimentation, and watershed management. Born in Des Moines, Iowa, he earned both his bachelor's (in 1943) and master's degrees (in 1947) in forestry at the University of California, Berkeley.

FOREWORD

Since 1956, the Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station and the California Department of Water Resources have conducted the California cooperative snow management research program. Other organizations cooperating in the project include the University of California, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Weather Bureau, Fiberboard Corp., and Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

This report summarizes the results of basic studies of snow zone hydrology completed during the first 7 years of this joint program. It describes the results of the first application of management tests for improved water yield in the California snow zone.

We hope soon to have more elaborate techniques to meet the specific problems of increasing the amount of water yield, improving the timing of water yield, and preventing floods and sedimentation.

We do not yet know all there is to know about managing high elevation forest lands for improved water yield. But the information now available may help those who must decide about water resources management and plan for the future.

EFFECTS OF LOGGING ON WATER YIELD

Experiments in Fraser, Colo., started in 1943, have contributed to our knowledge of the effects of logging on water yield. The studies of Wilm and Neiderhoff (1941) and Wilm and Dunford (1948) on the effects of forest cuttings on snow accumulation and melt, snow evaporation, and soil moisture losses have lead to predictions of increases of "water available for streamflow."

These predictions have been tested on whole watersheds and the data analyzed by Goodell (1958). Cutting of 39 percent of a lodgepole-spruce-fir forest in strips

SRP05465

of 1, 2, 3, and 6 chains was begun in 1954 and completed in 1956. Associated with the logging was an average of 4.03 area-inches of streamflow from the watershed in 1956 and 1957. Peak discharges from the logged watershed was 50 and 45 percent greater in 2 years (1956 and 1958) and 23 percent less in 1 year (1957) after logging. Similar effects were found in a Sierra Nevada watershed under quite different conditions.

The effect of management on total water yield is largely through change in the water loss by evapotranspiration. We may say, "Snow management will control delivery of water from the snowpack; loss management will control total water yielded as streamflow." Logging effects and duration of these effects on loss differ widely between winter and summer.

Water losses in winter and spring

Winter and spring water losses occur when most of the ground is snow covered. During that period, the losses consist chiefly of interception of snow and winter rain by the trees, evaporation from the snow surfaces, and transpiration by the trees or other vegetation. First, we must admit that we have not found a way of measuring the winter transpiration loss by trees when the ground is snow covered. Estimates of these losses range from 2½ inches to 9 inches (Anderson and Gleason, 1959; Miller, 1955). We do have, however, good estimates of interception loss and evaporation from snow under various conditions of logged and unlogged forest.

Interception loss is the water lost by evaporation from the wet tree parts or from the snow clinging to the trees. Interception loss from a dense lodgepole pine stand at the Central Sierra Snow Laboratory in April 1958 was 8 percent of the precipitation (West and Knoerr 1958). Interception during snowstorms in an 80-year-old ponderosa pine stand at Bass Lake, Calif., was 10 percent of the precipitation (Rowe and Hendrix 1951). Kittredge (1953) gives similar data for other forest types. Interception losses for an average size snowstorm of 2 inches of precipitation—assuming stemflow amounting to 3 percent of the precipitation—were: 11 percent of the precipitation for stands of mature ponderosa pine, 15 percent for stands of mixed conifers, and 16 percent for dense stands of mature red or white fir.

The effect of cutting the forests on interception loss is about proportional to the amount of the cut. In a selectively cut mixed forest, Kittredge (1953) found that interception decreased by 50 percent when 50 percent of the tree canopy was removed. Anderson and Gleason (1959) have estimated reductions in interception loss due to logging when winter precipitation was 38 to 41 inches. The saving was 3.4 inches for a strip-cut area, 2.3 inches for a block-cut area, and 1.6 inches for a selection-cut area.

Evaporation losses from snow have been found to be small in the Sierra Nevada, except in wide open areas and on exposed ridges. During the winters of 1958 and 1959, at 7,000 feet elevation near the Central Sierra Snow Laboratory, West (1959) found that annual snow evaporation losses under forest stands were 0.4 and 0.9 inch; in small forest openings losses were 1.1 and 1.7 inches. In a 10-day study in April 1959 evaporation from a large open area was 1.7 times that from the small opening, and evaporation from exposed ridges was three times that from the small opening. These results indicate that cutting of areas in strips and blocks can be expected to increase evaporative losses by ½ to 1 inch per year. Clear cutting of large areas might increase losses by 1½ inches per year, on exposed ridges by 3½ inches.

We have concluded that logging reduces the total winter water loss. Combined interception, snow evaporation, and winter transpiration have been estimated to be 5.4 inches less in a cut strip, 3.6 inches less in a cut block, and 2.5 inches less in commercial selection cutting than in an uncut forest (Anderson and Gleason (1959)).

Water losses in summer and fall

Water lost from the soil during summer and fall must be replaced by fall precipitation or by winter snowmelt before streams will start to rise. Summer and fall storms may lose much of their effectiveness because of interception by the forest trees and other vegetation. How forests are logged can affect these losses. We have studied the amount of water losses under various types of timber harvest and the duration of the logging effects.

Summer and fall soil moisture losses were taken as a difference in stored moisture in the soil at the end of the snowmelt in the spring and at the beginning of the next winter storms. Soil moisture was measured by a nuclear soil moisture

SRP05466

probe. Summer and fall precipitation was added to the soil moisture losses to give total summer water losses. In natural forest sites near the Central Sierra Snow Laboratory, soil moisture deficits ranged from only 3 inches on bare soil sites to as much as 17 inches in heavily forested sites with deep soils.

Logging effects on summer water losses were evaluated by measurements taken under three types of logging and under adjacent unlogged forest stands. Differences in summer water losses between forest cut in strips, in blocks, and by commercial selection cut were compared (Anderson and Gleason 1960). In each case, logging saved water.

Strip cutting saved water by reducing the summer and fall soil moisture losses. Savings for the first 3 years after logging differed with soil depth (table 3), averaging 2.2, 4, and 4.6 inches for the 3-, 4-, and 5-foot soil depths, respectively.

Duration of summer savings resulting from cutting of strips is important to any evaluation. Savings were greatest the first years after the cutting and in the deepest soils (table 2). For 4-foot soil, the savings was 4.9 inches the first 2 years, but decreased to 3.4 inches the fourth year after the logging.

Ziemer[1] traced the long-term effects of logging by measuring soil moisture losses in forests logged at times ranging to 12 years before. He found that the logging effect averaged 6.9-inch increase the 1st year after logging and this diminished to zero by the 16th year. Total savings in the cut strip for the 16-year period were estimated as 34 inches.

Other data are consistent with the above. For example, a powerline cleared 10 years ago, then widened 5 years ago, showed savings of 1 inch and 3 inches, respectively. It must be pointed out that savings other than summer soil moisture diminish much more slowly with time, interception taking perhaps 35 years to "recover" and evapotranspiration during the spring, fall, and winter somewhat less. These slower diminutions are suggested by the slow decrease in snowpack differences—only 23 percent in 10 years.

Block cutting effects on summer water losses were dependent on the size of the block and the residual trees left in the cutting or the regeneration coming into the stand. A large open block with some residual stand had one-half inch less saving than did the cut strip of table 2. Similarly, the data of Ziemer can be interpreted to show one-half inch less saving in a circular opening (one tree-height across) than in a cut strip. Thus, some of the advantage of small openings in snow accumulation is offset by additional summer water loss by root penetration from the trees at the cut margin.

Selection cutting has a small effect on soil moisture losses. Saving was nearly 2 inches the first 2 years after the logging and diminished to about 0.8 inch the fourth and fifth years after the logging. Data for a 4-foot soil were:

Soil moisture storage at end of summer

[In inches]

	Nov. 2, 1958	Sept. 2, 1959	Sept. 15, 1960	Sept. 8, 1961	Aug. 16, 1962
Treatment:					
Logged (A)	8.25	7.34	6.60	6.86	8.96
Unlogged (B)	6.33	6.12	5.56	6.12	8.11
Saving	1.92	1.22	1.04	.74	.85

The trend indicates a zero saving by about the 12th year, with a total soil moisture saving over the 12-year period of 7.5 inches.

We see that in the area cut the summer soil moisture savings resulting from strip cutting is more than six times that of selection cutting.

Commercial selection cutting.—Basic studies and plot tests can give us first clues to differences which management alternatives may be expected to produce, but measured streamflow is the final check. The effects on streamflow of a commercial selection logging were evaluated at the 4-square-mile Castle Creek watershed near Donner Summit in the Sierra Nevada. Most trees exceeding 20 inches in diameter in a 1-square-mile area were cut, leaving a good stand of pole sized

[1] Ziemer, Robert R. Summer evapotranspiration trends as related to time following logging of high elevation forest stands in Sierra Nevada, 1963. (Unpublished master's thesis on file School of Forestry, University of California, Berkeley.)

trees and reproduction. We found that water yield as streamflow apparently increased by the equivalent of 7 inches deep (in the area logged) for at least 2 years after logging (Anderson and Richards 1960, 1961; Rice and Wallis 1962). These increases were brought about in the 2 subnormal runoff years of 1959 and 1960. About half the increase came in June. How long the logging effect persisted after 2 years is not known, because a freeway was built on the watershed.

Three cuttings compared.—In another test, we compared water available for streamflow under logged and unlogged conditions for commercial selection cutting, strip cutting, and block cutting for the year starting April 15, 1958 (Anderson and Gleason 1959). The results were obtained from the standard water balance equation: yield equals precipitation minus interception, winter evapotranspiration, summer evapotranspiration, and fall evaporative losses. The method is useful in comparing relative effectiveness of different treatments, but does not give exact values of yield. In making estimates of the water yield, we supplemented our soil moisture loss measurements with snow evaporation data from Kittredge (1953) and West and Knoerr (1959), and with snow interception measurements of Rowe and Hendrix (1951) and West and Knoerr (1959).

Precipitation for the year at the three sites was similar—46 to 47 inches—so that differences in water yield attributable to the logging methods can be compared:

[In inches]

	Water loss	Water saved
Forest condition:		
Unlogged	21	
Strip cut	12	9
Block cut	15	6
Selection cut	18	3

Water yield increased under each logging method, ranging from 3 to almost 9 inches. The strip cut was the most effective in saving water, the block cutting next, and the commercial selection cut least.

About half the differences between the commercial cut savings and the strip and block cut savings were in soil moisture losses—water that is held over at the end of fall. That water will be yielded with the first winter melt, or sometimes with late fall floods.

Slash disposal.—The method of slash disposal may affect water losses in summer. Losses of water from the soil during the first three summers after logging at the Swain Mountain experimental forest were somewhat different within cut strips under two slash disposal methods:

[In inches]

	Summer soil moisture loss		
	1959	1960	1961
Slash treatment:			
Piled and burned	3.2	3.7	3.1
Left where it fell	3.8	4.0	3.8

Summer water losses were nearly the same in both treatments. Combined losses from interception and evaporation from the soil were slightly less in the bare soil area in each year. The magnitude of summer losses depended upon the amounts and time of occurrence of the summer precipitation, and upon the evaporation rate.

Mr. BARING. Next are the representatives for the Nevada Mining Association, Inc.; John C. MacDonald and Henry S. Curtis. You may proceed.

SRP05468

STATEMENT OF HENRY S. CURTIS, HENDERSON, NEV., NEVADA MINING ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I am Henry Curtis. Mr. MacDonald was unable to attend this meeting because of other commitments.

I would like to read the short statement of the Nevada Mining Association.

DEAR SIRS: To supplement the statement dated December 28, 1963, and filed with your committee on behalf of the Nevada Mining Association, we wish to establish our position with respect to specific bills under consideration at this time.

We are opposed to S. 4 completely, as passed by the Senate, for the reasons outlined in our statement of December 28, 1963.

With respect to H.R. 9162, we consider this a major improvement over S. 4; however, we are opposed to any time limitation on the general applicability of the mining laws in wilderness areas. In addition, we urge that consideration be given to amending the bill to specify clearly that all owners of lands within the boundaries of wilderness areas, whether such lands are now owned or hereafter acquired, can be assured of continuing adequate access to their property.

Respectfully submitted.

NEVADA MINING ASSOCIATION, INC.,
M. J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, *President*.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Curtis.

The next witness is Stanley E. Jerome, associate director, Nevada Bureau of Mines.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY E. JEROME, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NEVADA BUREAU OF MINES, RENO, NEV.

Mr. JEROME. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Stanley E. Jerome. My professional experience mostly has been that of an exploration geologist working in the Western United States with several major mining companies; it also has included university academic work. For the past 3 years I have been associate director of the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Nevada Mining Analytical Laboratory in Reno, Nev. Both organizations have public service and research responsibilities. Within the limits specified by enabling legislation, we assist individuals and organizations on many problems involving mineral prospecting (including geology, geochemistry, and geophysics), assembling and dispensing geological and commodity maps and certain statistics, chemical and instrumental mineral and rock analysis, mining methods, ore testing methods, and so forth. One of our staff members handles the daily business of the Nevada Oil & Gas Conservation Commission. To facilitate the accomplishment of some of our duties, we have cooperative arrangements with the U.S. Geological Survey and the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

This statement reflects the personal attitudes of myself and my colleagues. We are not ashamed to say that we are vitally interested in the continued health of the mineral industry in Nevada. This industry contributes more to the economy of the State than any other natural resource industry. It will continue that contribution, provided it is not strangled by one self-interest group or another. The

 SRP05469

mineral industry here and in other States is a most important underpinning to the health, wealth, happiness, and security of the Nation. Anything that pretends to weaken this underpinning should be rejected summarily by legislative bodies and the citizens they represent.

Public halls, for quite a few years now, have been the scenes of hearings on a variety of proposed bills dealing with today's subject of wilderness preservation. Newspapers and public records have reported so much testimony pro and con that both sides are hard pressed to come up with new points of view. By this time it would appear that our democratic processes would have produced at least one bill that would fairly reflect the true total needs of everyone concerned. This is not the case, as in every other hearing, the bills being considered contain the same bitter, indigestible pill of lockup of major amounts of public land for the single-purpose use of a small group.

Today the difference seems to be that an open-choke shotgun approach—his is a different one from George Abbott's—an open-choke shotgun approach is being used, so that come hell or high water, the pill will end up in the unwilling patient.

It is true that some of the bills have thin sugar coatings on the pill such as: 10 years to appraise the land to be withdrawn (but after appraisal, then what?); decisions by the legislative body rather than the executive; and the possible right, subject to eventual governmental decision, to develop a deposit if it is found after the bars are in place. These coatings are designed to appease those who eventually might wish to make some commercial use of the land. However, no coatings have been designed for the general public which has been deluded into supporting the ethereal concept of great wilderness areas. The wilderness advocates, while trying to save John Citizen from himself, have neglected to advise him adequately that after he has supported their cause, he, his family, neighbors, friends, and relatives will find it difficult to make full recreational use of wilderness once set aside.

While man in many ways is a pretty unsatisfactory animal, he is here, and to meet all of his needs he must make full, or multiple, use of everything found in his environment—not just today, but continuously. Peoples interpretation of multiple use varies. Some believe that the land can be divided into portions and that a one-shot decision can be made as to the best possible use for all time of each portion. True multiple use, however, calls for flexible maximum use in a variety of ways for the same piece of land; it is the right to use our public lands in this true sense that should be protected for all American citizens by its legislative body, not taken away by them.

The idea that in 10 years it would be possible to evaluate for all time the total mineral potential of the approximately 60 million acres of lands proposed for the lockup is patently ridiculous. Not even 25 years would suffice for this job. We are not wise enough today to define man's total mineral needs, nor to specify absolutely that a piece of ground does or does not contain below its exposed surface a mineral of potential value. This is no reflection on the capability of persons seeking mineral deposits; it merely indicates the current state of our technology and knowledge. The earth down to the limits of practical drilling depths is the exploration geologist's laboratory; if he is prevented access to any part of it, appraisal and intelligent development

SRP05470

of all parts is inhibited. Imagine what a setback civilization would suffer if a small group of antiresearch zealots could lock the chemists, physicists, medical researchers, and so forth, out of their laboratories. The adverse results of wilderness lockup might not be as immediate or extreme on the minerals industry, but they would be just as real.

The uranium potential of lands on the Colorado Plateau would never have been determined if the land had not been available for prospecting. Concentrated, modern prospecting proved its potential and made the Nation self-sufficient in a commodity we formerly had to import to design a means to win a war. There were only two or three tungsten mines in Nevada until the requirements of the Korean war encouraged additional prospecting. The results: literally hundreds of new tungsten deposits were found and mined in Nevada and adjoining States. Only persistence found beryllium in rocks in western Utah that most people believed incapable of containing this material. What happened? Prospectors and geologists now are taking a more careful look at similar kinds of rocks all over the Western States. Would they do this on wilderness lands in the blind hope that a benevolent executive or legislative group might let them develop a deposit if they found one? No; because even today certain Government groups are interfering with the right to develop known mineral deposits on public domain claiming they are uneconomic. Few I talk to are naive enough to think this will get better. My observation is that the situation is worsening.

Let us hope that Congress will recognize the right of every American citizen to make full use in a sensible way of all public lands. This can be accomplished by proper and moderate legislation and sensible administration. The proposed legislation at hand is neither proper nor moderate.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my views today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record the statement of Dr. Vernon E. Scheid, the director of the Nevada Bureau of Mines.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. VERNON E. SCHEID, DIRECTOR, NEVADA BUREAU OF MINES

My qualifications to testify before this committee follow: Bachelor of arts (geology) 1928, Johns Hopkins University; master of science (geological engineering) 1940, University of Idaho; and doctor of philosophy (economic geology) 1946, Johns Hopkins University. Many years with Federal, State, and private organizations doing fieldwork in geology and economic ore deposits. Many years as professor of geology and ore deposits at Johns Hopkins University and the University of Idaho, and for the past 13 years, professor of mineral sciences, director of the Nevada Bureau of Mines, and dean of the Mackay School of Mines, University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.; and concurrently, director of the Nevada Oil and Gas Conservation Commission. I am a member of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers, of the Geological Society of America, and of the Society of Economic Geologists. I am a registered professional engineer in Nevada, license No. 924.

It is axiomatic to most Americans that all the natural resources of our country should be used for the maximum good of our citizens for all time. I am fully aware that the lands, within the areas proposed for the creation of wilderness areas, contain many natural resources; among which are: Trees, water, grazing areas, wildlife, mineral deposits, as well as recreational opportunities for our people. These and other natural resources must be considered in arriving at a decision to produce the greatest benefit for the longest possible period of time.

SRP05471

The conservation of natural resources is imperative; in order to keep our country strong. One must be careful, however, to distinguish between conservation and preservation. I should like to quote the well-known conservation pledge, and I quote: "I give my pledge as an American to save and faithfully to defend from waste, the natural resources of my country—its soils and minerals, its forests, waters and wildlife." You will note that; although, this conservation pledge mentions many types of natural resources; it says nothing about preservation—it merely states that we shall defend these natural resources from waste.

True conservation is the wise use of natural resources without waste. The idea of wise use of all types of resources is built into the American way of life. Our national economic life would be strangled without it. All of us are familiar with historic examples of great accumulation of immense wealth by eastern potentates, tyrants, and kings. Such wealth was not wisely used; for it was kept in storehouses as useless material. Our American tax structure is designed to prevent the massive accumulation of idle money. We believe that wealth, as well as natural resources, should be kept in use to benefit the economy of our country. This philosophy is now well established and accepted.

The concept of setting aside valuable natural resources, so that they may never be used by the people of our country, is no longer tenable. In the past, when our country was small, it might have had meaning, but the great growth of our country has made necessary the wise use of all available resources; so that the storehouse concept can no longer be justified.

In 1872, when the Yellowstone National Park was established, as the first unit in our system of national parks, it was not necessary for our country to consider the natural resources in a far western wilderness. At that time, the withdrawal of large areas of the public domain from economic use was of little consequence, but it is doubtful if such actions today could be considered wise. In fact, these discussions, concerning the creation of wilderness areas, might well serve as the occasion to review the laws governing our national parks and similarly restricted lands. It is possible, that certain of the natural resources of the presently restricted lands should now be made available to our people; particularly if they are a natural resource not available elsewhere in our country.

If we use our public lands wisely, we will use them for many purposes. This concept is now known as the principle of multiple use. Perhaps, it does not matter whether the areas under consideration be called wilderness areas, or primitive areas, or scenic areas, or recreation areas, or even national parks. Perhaps, what they are called will only determine the national agency that will administer them. What does matter is that the areas be wisely administered and that the recreational resources of these areas be recognized; however, the recreational resources should not be recognized and used to the complete exclusion of other vital resources, which may some day be found beneath these lands.

The present administration of public lands by the U.S. Forest Service is an example of the application of the principle of multiple use of natural resources. The Forest Service was established dominantly to protect the forest resources of our country. But under their wise guidance, not only is a large and valuable crop of trees harvested each year; which brings revenue to our National Government and supplies lumber to industry; but in addition, we have the use of many of the forest areas for grazing, for recreation, and for mineral production.

During World War I, tungsten was in great demand for special steels. The U.S. production from the few known tungsten deposits was inadequate. Production was mainly the three tungsten minerals: hubnerite, wolframite, and ferberite. In order to obtain adequate supplies to support our war effort, it was necessary to import large quantities of these tungsten minerals from overseas. These oversea shipments were imperiled by the submarine attacks of our enemy. We obtained the necessary minerals at great sacrifice in lives and money.

After World War I new scientific knowledge was applied to the study of minerals. It was learned, that when light of short wave lengths was thrown upon certain minerals, they gave off visible light of long wave lengths. This phenomenon is called fluorescence. One such mineral discovered to fluoresce brilliantly is scheelite—another of the tungsten minerals.

After the discovery that scheelite had a characteristic fluorescence and the manufacturing of an ultraviolet light, that could be transported easily in the

SRP05472

field; prospectors begain to travel the hills at night and to flash their ultraviolet lights on outcrops of rock. They found abundant rock areas that fluoresced, to produce the now well-kown pale bluish-white light. Specimens from these fluorescent outcrops were identified in the laboratories as scheelite.

Throughout World War I, we did not know there were large deposits of scheelite in the United States; for we had no adequate way to explore for them; but with the aid of the ultraviolet light America discovered many scheelite deposits. As a result of this scientific advance, scores of scheelite mines throughout our country were able to pour forth their minerals and supply American industry with the necessary metal to produce those special steels needed to win World War II. Thus, although, in 1917 our production of tungsten was quite inadequate, the advances of science showed the way to new mineral discoveries; so that the United States was almost self-sufficient during a war a generation later.

Had the public lands containing these scheelite deposits been withdrawn from mineral entry, mineral prospecting could not have been done, and even if Congress had changed the laws and permitted prospecting and mineral entry during World War II, it is doubtful if it would have helped; for we do not have time when war is upon us. At such a time we cannot wait those 2 or 3 years that are so necessary to find mineral deposits, and to develop them for production—a process that may take several years.

At Mountain Pass, Calif., 60 miles southwest of Las Vegas, Nev., is a very unusual mineral deposit, containing many rare earths: Among which are; cerium, praseodymium, lanthanum, and neodymium, as well as others in lesser amounts. A decade or so ago, this deposit was discovered on public land. It is the largest deposit of these rare earths in the entire world. As yet, no man knows the full value of this deposit; nor have we yet found any outstandingly important uses for these unusual elements. But what man is wise enough to say these unusual elements will not play an extremely important and vital role in the world a generation from now?

An example of our inability to predict future values of minerals readily comes to mind. A generation ago, titanium was of minor value and many of its mineral deposits, throughout the world, lay idle. Now, it is the common knowledge to every schoolboy that titanium is one of the wonder metals of the modern aviation and space age. The same may be true ultimately of these strange elements in the Mountain Pass rare-earth deposit. The question may well be asked; could this deposit have been discovered and developed, if mineral entry on these public lands had been prohibited?

A few years ago, the U.S. Navy Department proposed to withdraw large areas of land in northern Nevada for military use. A condition of the withdrawal of these lands was to stop mineral entry. Since that time, the Eagle-Picher Co. has discovered and developed a large deposit of diatomite within the area originally requested by the Navy. On the basis of this deposit the company has built a modern industrial plant at Lovelock, Nev.; which now supplies high-grade diatomite filters to the chemical and pharmaceutical industries of America. Please note that this discovery was on land that was to be withdrawn from all future mineral entry.

Our methods and techniques of exploring for mineral deposits are still imperfect. However, they will improve, and as our knowledge of geology, geophysics, geochemistry, and other sciences increases we will improve our ability to search the earth and find its mineral treasures. Until that day, when we can say we have completely explored our country, all public land should be left open to mineral entry. This should surely be done if the mineral for which we search is unique; in the sense that America does not have an adequate supply.

An example of such a unique mineral is tin—for America has no known commercial deposits. It is conceivable that there may be valuable tin deposits some place in America, buried under a few feet of soil or rock. As yet, our sciences have not advanced to the point, nor have we invented instruments, which permit us to discover such buried tin deposits. We cannot turn up the land over the entire country. Even if we could, how deep should we dig? The deposit might be 1 foot below the depth at which we decide to stop. America has no tin deposits. We are dependent upon the rest of the world for tin—so necessary in time of war—yet if tin should be discovered in one of the proposed wilderness areas or even a national park, would it not be the part of wisdom to permit it to be mined under proper supervision?

Perhaps one might say that the forest reserves, the water, the wildlife, and the grazing reserves of the lands proposed for wilderness areas are not unique.

SRP05473

Perhaps resources such as these exist in many other parts of our country, but there may well be minerals that are unique beneath the lands proposed for wilderness areas—minerals that might be strategic and necessary to the safety of America.

Is there a man among us, who is so wise that he can, in 1964, say with assurance, that future advances in our sciences will not produce new and better methods of exploring for minerals? So wise that he can say that our future exploration methods will not discover buried mineral deposits where, today, we do not expect them? So wise that he can say with assurance that minerals of a unique nature, and of strategic value to the United States, do not underlie the lands proposed for the wilderness areas?

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions of the witness?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would just like to say the gentleman's statement is one that I would like to concur in, because I feel that much lipservice is paid to the mining use of this land, or the inventorying of the land, or the exploitation of this land, even in the present reclassified lands, but it is more or less stopped.

Mr. JEROME. Right.

Mr. WHITE. Lipservice saying you can locate, but after you locate what can you do? You cannot develop, you cannot get into the area. I would hate to try to develop a mine today in the Selway-Bitterroot area. I would hate to attempt to do that by pack. To some of the people who are worried that we are going to change the whole wilderness area into a great big pit tomorrow, I would say I do not think their fears are as well founded as they might think.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I commend you for saying you are in favor of the organization that is paying you. That is a commendable attitude. If I were on the board and you would not do it, I would suggest that you be fired. I am delighted to know that you are out fighting for the people that pay your salary. This is a good thing.

I would like to ask you this: Do you think we should exhaust everything we have? Do you think we have become a nation that is so crass we have to put a dollar sign on every acre of land, wherever it is found?

Mr. JEROME. This is not what my statement says. My statement says multiple use of every piece of land for the American public. What you are proposing to do is to isolate a section of this for the use of a small group.

Mr. SAYLOR. This is where I disagree with you. I think what I am representing and what I am trying to fight for is all of the people, not just a small group.

Mr. JEROME. That is what I say, too, in spite of working for the mining organization.

Mr. SAYLOR. Let me ask you this question: You are talking about multiple use, and I would like to know how you would graze, how you would mine, how you would build a reservoir, how you would provide recreation facilities, and how you would cut timber on the same tract of land at the same time. They are some examples of multiple use.

Mr. JEROME. I think it is entirely conceivable to do this on some of the western lands. Obviously, there are some areas where this is not possible. If you take the Rain Forest in the Cascades of Wash-

ington or the Olympic Peninsula, obviously you cannot run cattle in heavy underbrush. This land is more useful for logging. It might be useful for prospecting. We do not know if this is the case. It also has some topnotch value for people who like to go into the Rain Forest and observe the birds, bees, and flowers.

I do not have a dollar sign on every bit of land in the country. I still feel that nature will determine where man will make some of these uses himself. The high country some people are not going to get into. You are not going to graze cattle on barren rock above the timber line. You may on some of the meadows. I think the cattleman has a right to be there, the skier has a right to be there, I think the guy who likes the birds and bees and flowers has a right to be there, and I cannot myself—as one of those kind of people, I do not have a dollar sign on everything. I love the country just as much as you do, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. The important thing is, under the fear of multiple use you want to talk about, you just cannot have all of the uses of all of the tracts of land at the same time. If a scientist wants to go in and study a place where the forest or the area has not been used before, this is a use, is it not?

Mr. JEROME. It is a use, yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. We had people at the hearings in Denver from the University of Colorado and a number of other educational institutions who said they were particularly interested in having these areas set aside because the ecology they might find there was something they had not had an opportunity to study before. Is this not a use?

Mr. JEROME. That is a use. There is no question about it.

Mr. SAYLOR. All right. So, if a man wants to go hunting and fishing, this is a use, is it not?

Mr. JEROME. Right.

Mr. SAYLOR. And if a man wants to go there and wants to walk through it, this is a use, is it not?

Mr. JEROME. You are getting to covering the public now, and this is what I am talking about, too.

Mr. SAYLOR. So you now have an area where you do not want to have a fellow with an oil rig sitting up on top of the mountain because it might change the ecology that is up there. The very fact that we prevent him from being up there, you say, is a bad thing.

Mr. JEROME. I say it is a bad thing, because then you, as a Congressman, are not representing all of the American people. This is what I am objecting to, in my testimony.

Mr. SAYLOR. No; what you are objecting to, you are trying to say that every acre of land is entitled to use by all of the people, and this has never been true. It is not true out here now. In the area where you get a lease from the Federal Government, that is an exclusive lease.

Mr. JEROME. This is in the best interests of the people. That is why the Federal Government gives this lease.

Mr. SAYLOR. And now, you see, you have come around and changed your position completely. Now you say that the use is given to you by the Federal Government and is in the best interest of the people. If Congress decides in their wisdom that it is advisable to set aside some large tracts of land for the use of all of the people, without having

 SRP05475

it being used for grazing or mining or timbering, or any other purpose, this might be in the best interest of the people too.

Mr. JEROME. That is certainly why Representative Aspinall wants to take a look at the public land situation. I certainly do not deny it needs to be taken a look at, but I do think every American citizen should have the right to use a piece of public land, and in the determination—I mean, sure, you are going to have maximum use in a certain case. As I said before, I think nature is going to determine this in some cases.

A guy on horseback wants the trails extended. He is a wilderness advocate, but this is not a true ethereal concept of wilderness, to have extended horse trails.

Mr. SAYLOR. We had a fellow by the name of Mann that was here just a little while ago. He said he thought maybe the best use the cattle had was when people were not around disturbing them. If we are going to leave the cows up there all by themselves, just to talk to one another and the birds and the bees that go by, this, you may say, might be the best use it could be put to.

You see, if a man gets a license, or one of Mr. Mann's clients gets a license to go up there from the Department of Agriculture, and he is told he is allowed to graze so many head of cattle or so many sheep, you as another citizen of the United States cannot go in there.

Mr. JEROME. Is this correct? Do you mean a lease that is given where the man grazing cattle in a wilderness-type area—another man could not go and walk across the country and fish the lakes in the country?

Mr. SAYLOR. You would be surprised at the number of places where the people have put up some fences and say "Stay out." While it may have no effect, you would be surprised what an effect a fence has on some people. They have fenced out a good many people.

Mr. JEROME. I do not think it has fenced out any people who want to use the land.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would hate to try to find somebody going in and prospecting for minerals if they had that kind of a lease, because the first thing you know you would have some representative of the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior coming out and telling you to get off that ground, they had already leased it to somebody else.

Mr. JEROME. If we are going to talk about multiple use, I think we definitely have to take a look at the leases, and the law under which I am talking, multiple use. I would believe exclusive leases of public land probably should not be given. I think this would be a fair statement of my view. It is the only stand I could take if I want everybody to have the use of the last postage stamp, and this is the way I feel about it.

Mr. SAYLOR. I just want to tell you I agree very heartily, and that is why, at the time Mr. Aspinall introduced his bill, I also introduced a bill.

Mr. JEROME. You are to be commended for that.

Mr. SAYLOR. But I would like to make it a little broader, make it broad enough to include the water rights, which I think are of vital importance to every segment of the economy here in the West.

Mr. JEROME. I could not agree with you more.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I have one statement, Mr. Jerome, not a question. But the fact is that Congress has passed legislation known as the multiple-use bill.

Mr. JEROME. Yes.

Mr. WESTLAND. And that the Congress does believe in multiple use.

Mr. JEROME. Yes.

Mr. WESTLAND. It believes in the best use of all the public lands and the best interest of all of the people. I think any legislation that comes out, known as the wilderness bill, must be with that concept in mind. At least that is my opinion.

This particular hearing here, is not, in my opinion, a forum for debate among the Members of the Congress here on their views. We come here to hear witnesses and get their points of view. I may say we are not, all of us, in agreement on every point on legislation that has been introduced or on the previous legislation that has been introduced, and those matters are discussed by the Committee on Interior in executive session, largely, and then the result comes out from there.

Mr. JEROME. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

We will have one more witness before the luncheon recess. Your next witness is Mr. Miles P. Romney, manager, Utah Mining Association. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MILES P. ROMNEY, MANAGER, UTAH MINING ASSOCIATION, AND CHAIRMAN, MINING COMMITTEE, SALT LAKE CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am Miles P. Romney, manager of the Utah Mining Association. The statement which I have prepared is the statement of the Utah Mining Association and the Mining Committee of the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to have the opportunity to present our views on proposed wilderness legislation. The numerous bills before your committee include S. 4 (passed by the Senate in April 1963) and H.R. 9162 (introduced by Mr. Dingell).

H.R. 9162, now before this committee, presents material improvements over S. 4 and, therefore, in the brief time available, we would like to discuss the provisions of that bill which directly affect the mining industry. We strongly oppose the basic provisions of S. 4, as we did S. 174 of the 87th Congress.

We commend the author or authors of H.R. 9162 for the provisions governing the establishment of any wilderness areas beyond those which would be established by passage of the act. The requirement for positive approval by the Congress of any or all lands which might be recommended for wilderness area status, following proper notices, investigations and hearings in the areas in which the affected lands are situated, has been consistently urged by communities and industries in the public land States.

SRP05477

There may be some conflict between the access rights with respect to private lands as stipulated in section 4(d)(2) and in section 5(b). We recommend, therefore, that consideration be given to amending the bill to assure that all owners of lands within the boundaries of wilderness areas, whether such lands are now owned or hereafter acquired, are assured of continuing adequate access to their property.

We particularly object to the provision in section 4(d)(2) of H.R. 9162 which stipulates that:

> Subject to valid rights then existing, effective January 1, 1974, the minerals in lands designated by this act as wilderness areas are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act and all amendments thereto.

That termination date is only 10 years from now. Ten years is a most unrealistically short time. H.R. 776, approved by the full committee in the 87th Congress, provided a 25-year period for such activities. We seriously question the need or advisability of any time limitation on mineral exploration on lands included in a wilderness system, as will be discussed further.

Lands designated by H.R. 9162 as wilderness areas because of their relative inaccessibility, have been subject to less exploration than most other potential mineral-producing areas. Very little topographic or geologic mapping has been done in these lands—again due to inaccessibility. Testimony on S. 174 by James Boyd in May 1962 before this committee, referred to a USGS report which illustrated the fact that of the lands situated in the 11 Western States and subject to S. 174, only 51.9 percent were covered by adequate topographic maps and only 10.0 percent of such lands by adequate geologic maps.

Future needs for minerals and metals now being consumed will greatly expand. History illustrates a material expansion both in the quantity and in the variety of minerals and metals required in our machine-age economy. Both trends can be expected to continue, and at an accelerated pace as we adapt to nuclear and to space developments. Increased production of five basic minerals related to industrialization has been as follows:

Domestic per capita production of steel, aluminum, petroleum, phosphate rock, and salt (1885, 1905, 1962)[1]

	Steel	Aluminum	Petroleum	Phosphate	Salt
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Barrels*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
1885	68	0	0.4	17	35
1905	510	.13	1.6	51	85
1925	850	1.1	6.6	75	128
1962	1,010	23.6	14.4	234	310

[1] Consumption per capita would probably show greater trend increases because of substantial imports of some minerals and their products in 1962.

Any time limitation assumes that a reasonably complete evaluation and development of minerals in wilderness areas can be made within the time stipulated. Such an assumption is not true, for the finding, evaluating, and developing of mineral resources are not determined primarily by time—such activities are initiated and controlled by improved technology in exploration, mining, and processing, by changes in price and production economics, and by the changing nature of de-

SRP05478

mands and uses, including newly created demands for minerals and metals of known presence but of little or no previous use.

The importance of the present and continued availability of metals, minerals, and mineral fuels to our national economy in adequate quantities is emphasized by the simple mental process of evaluating their basic position in our highly mechanized economy and mode of living. Consider further the fact that $20 billion worth of domestically produced metals, minerals, and mineral fuels, plus imports of those materials, was the raw material key to the Nation's gross national production of $584 billion in 1963.

A 10-year limitation imposed 20 years ago in the uranium- and oil-producing areas of Utah would have precluded substantial production of those vitally important minerals. Beryllium and oil shale in Utah are now the subject of much speculative interest for future development. Beryllium deposits were very recently discovered, but oil shale has been known for many decades. It is impossible to predict either the timing or the nature and extent of future demands and uses for minerals and metals either presently known or of future potential. To set a limiting time factor on their development would jeopardize the future availability of mineral resources and restrict the economic potential of the areas in which the lands containing them are located.

The basic provisions in H.R. 9162 for protection of the wilderness character of designated "wilderness areas" would reasonably insure compliance with the basic objectives of the proposed legislation without a time limitation on mineral exploration and development. Mapping and reconnaissance exploration of general areas involve a minimum of disturbance of land surface or ground cover. Localized and intensified exploration would involve very minor portions of any given area and but minor disturbance of nature's environment. Minable deposits found would, as proven by long experience, occupy a very small portion of any given area. Further, the bill provides for practical restoration of the disturbed surface. Thus, in any area designated as "wilderness," the nonrenewable mineral resources could be sought out, developed, and extracted as demands developed, and, thereafter, renewable nature would take over and restore the original primitive characteristics.

This is conservation of the highest order, as well as insurance to succeeding generations that minerals can be searched for, developed, and mined as needed, and that the long-range basic purpose of wilderness preservation can be maintained.

The past two decades have seen both an impressive broadening of Utah's new wealth-producing economy and a substantial population growth. Mining and manufacturing have been the principal factors and they, with related and dependent service industries, have provided the growing population with the needed new jobs and increased tax base. Utah's manufacturing growth in this period has been based largely on minerals available in Utah. The growth was stimulated by the accelerated demand for mineral- and metal-based products needed by the rapidly increasing population in Utah's general marketing area.

The population of Utah and other Western States is growing at a more rapid rate than is the Nation as a whole. Population growth demands new jobs, and new jobs must be created through utilization

SRP05479

of the resources available in the area. Minerals and related processing into salable goods are Utah's principal new wealth resources, and minerals come from the land. The population trend in Western States, which has strongly contributed to industrialized western State economies, is shown below:

Population trend, Western States, 1885, 1905, 1925, 1962

	8 Mountain States	Pacific States	Total, Western States	Total, United States	Western States as percent of United States
1885	(1)	(1)	(1)	56,500,000	
1905	[2] 2,000,000	[2] 3,200,000	[2] 5,200,000	85,820,000	6.1
1925	3,532,000	6,997,000	10,529,000	115,832,000	9.1
1962	7,510,000	22,799,000	30,309,000	185,822,000	16.0
1975 projection [3]	9,582,000	29,439,000	39,021,000	220,794,000	19.4

[1] Not available.
[2] Approximated from 1900 and 1910 census data.
[3] Stanford research, 1955.

Utah is not alone in the situation of having most of its land area owned or controlled by the Federal Government. Nor is Utah alone in the importance of its mineral resources to its new wealth-producing economy. Utah is but an example of the population growth and the growing economic dependence of the western public land States on mineral resources and the processing of those mineral resources.

The policy of the Congress has been to protect and encourage the fullest possible use of the public land—a policy which is compatible with the vital needs of Western States. The public lands have been made available by the Congress through laws giving the citizens rights of use, development, and, in some cases, acquisition of title to the lands developed. The Congress has also passed laws designed to improve the productivity and efficiency of use of the public lands, including use of the same tract by more than one user, wherever practical to do so. This land use recognition has met with wide approval of natural resource users, as well as administrators, and has been demonstrably successful. We respectfully submit that this policy should continue to apply generally as well as specifically to mineral exploration development and production in wilderness areas, and that the proposal to place a time limit on such activities departs from such consistently applied policy.

Furthermore, the time limitation proposal is not consistent with the present vital needs of growing Western State economies, with future needs for presently known and potential mineral resources, or with sound conservation policy of balanced realization of the maximum benefits from all of nature's resources.

Mr. Chairman, I have submitted a communication from Governor Clyde of Utah and a communication from Max Gardner, director of the Utah State Land Board, which they asked me to have included in the record of these hearings.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the letters and the resolution of the State legislatures attached to the Governor's letter will be included at this point in the record.

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

SRP05480

(The material follows:)

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salt Lake City, January 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Hon. Walter S. Baring, Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee of House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Members of the Committees, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Attached hereto are copies of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 of the 35th Utah Legislature.

This measure was passed by both houses of the most recent Utah State Legislature, and signed by the Governor. It therefore presents the official position of the State of Utah on basic wilderness legislation, and I respectfully request that it be made a part of the official hearings on H.R. 9162.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. CLYDE,
Governor of Utah.

PROPOSED WIDERNESS SYSTEM, 1963

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, By Messrs. Bullen, S. J. Taylor, and M. Jenkins

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 35TH LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF UTAH, MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO REDISTRICT THE AREA OF THE PROPOSED WILDERNESS SYSTEM, AND OF OTHER AREAS WITHDRAWN BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM STATE CONTROL AND FROM THE NORMAL DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES BY STATE OR PRIVATE AGENCIES

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein:

Whereas not more than 5 per centum of Utah's land surface area is arable, the remaining 95 per centum compromising mountains and deserts; and

Whereas Utah cannot support its present population, much less support the steadily growing population which is reflected in recent census counts and which the most responsible analysts expect to continue at the present or even at an accelerating rate, on an agricultural economy, but must develop to the fullest possible extent its natural resources, including mineral and grazing resources, in order to maintain a healthy and growing economy; and

Whereas the State of Utah must develop, husband, conserve and put to the fullest and most efficient use its limited supply of usable water 80 per centum of which falls as snow on the 20 per centum of our land area which lies seven thousand feet and higher above sea level, giving the management of this remote, high-mountain area special importance to this State; and

Whereas almost three-fourths of the land area of the State of Utah is in Federal ownership and management, thus severely limiting revenues available for support of public schools and other operations of State government; and

Whereas lands in the public domain and in the national forests do produce at least some revenue to the State and its schools, while lands withdrawn for the purposes of wilderness areas, national parks and monuments, military and Indian reservations and other similarly restrictive purposes produce no revenue whatever to the State; and

Whereas Utah recognizes the esthetic and recreational values inherent in its high mountain fastnesses and its many spectacularly scenic semidesert and desert areas; and

Whereas most of these areas can best be developed on established principles of multiple use, providing for maximum development of both tangible and intangible resources which they may contain; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 35th Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States in its consideration of legislation to establish a wilderness system, to limit the total area to be encompassed in such system to the minimum necessary to achieve the legitimate objectives of the program, and leaving the maximum area open to multiple-use development of both tangible and intangible resources for the support of the basic economy of this and our sister States; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge the Congress and the executive departments of the Federal Government to give all possible consideration to the

SRP05481

principles outlined above in the creation and administration of all national parks and monuments, military reservations, Indian reservations and other Federal withdrawals of lands within the respective States which remove such lands from development of whatever resources they may contain by the States and/or by private enterprise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Congress of the United States; to the executive departments of the Federal Government; to the members, individually, of the congressional delegations of Utah and of all the Western, public-lands States; to the Governors of the Western States and to the legislatures of such Western States as may now be in session; and to the Council of State Governments, as an official expression of the sentiment of the State of Utah on these vital issues.

THE STATE OF UTAH
STATE LAND BOARD
Salt Lake City, Utah, January 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, and Members, Public Lands Subcommittee, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The Utah State Land Board has carefully studied the provisions of H.R. 9162 and is of the opinion that the proposed legislation should be amended by deleting the following words on page 10, line 15 "until midnight December 31, 1973." The effect of this amendment would be to permit the laws of the United States pertaining to mineral leasing and mining to apply to lands designated as wilderness areas.

Mineral leasing and mining on Federal lands in the State of Utah is necessary and vital to our economy. These activities provide substantial direct revenues to the school system, and, in addition, provide untold indirect benefits to our economy.

We are not opposed to the wilderness concept, but we believe that mining operations, and oil and gas operations can be compatible with wilderness areas. We feel that these industries have demonstrated their ability to conduct their operations in such a manner.

We respectfully request that you make the contents of this letter a part of the record of the hearings on H.R. 9162.

Sincerely yours,

MAX C. GARDNER, *Director.*

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions on the part of the committee? The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Romney, for the record, what is your understanding of the right to a man who has a mining claim which he has patented, the right of access to that claim?

Mr. ROMNEY. The right of access to the claim, if it is surrounded by other lands, he would have to acquire a right of way or an easement to get to that claim. So far as his right of movement on the claim itself, it would be unlimited, it is my understanding, because he would have fee title to the property.

Mr. SAYLOR. Your understanding is the same as mine, that, if a man goes in and patents a claim, he must acquire, in addition to that claim, the right of ingress and egress if it is over someone else's property.

Mr. ROMNEY. That is right; with normal legal procedures as with any other holder of property.

Mr. SAYLOR. What you are suggesting in the fourth paragraph of your first page is to make sure that, if he has acquired such rights, those rights be protected?

Mr. ROMNEY. That is right. There seems to be a conflict in the intent between these two sections. I think in the first section the intent is strongly along the lines that you and I have discussed.

SRP05482

In the second section, if it affects ingress and egress on mineral properties and other private lands, there seems to be some question because it relates accessibility to the regulatory approval of the Secretary.

With the other statement, it seems to me the Congress is intending, or would it instead if passed, to prevent fully the right of ingress and egress to private property. This is simply a technical question, Mr. Congressman, that I think should be looked at.

Mr. SAYLOR. This is the same question Mr. Westland and I have discussed with several other witnesses.

Mr. ROMNEY. Yes. I think one other witness touched on this this morning.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any further questions?

Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. ROMNEY. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. We will now recess until 1:30 p.m.

(Whereupon, the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Ernest Browning, Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, Phoenix, Ariz.

You may proceed, Mr. Browning.

STATEMENT OF ERNEST BROWNING, IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT, ARIZONA CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Ernest Browning. I am a rancher near Wilcox in Cochise County, Ariz.; and I am immediate past president of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association. On behalf of the members and board of the association, I wish to express our appreciation for this opportunity to be heard.

Public lands provide the base for the cattle-growing industry in Arizona and many other States. The cattle industry is a vitally important contributor to the economic well-being of our State. Last year in Arizona, income from cattle and calves amounted to $185 million. This is new wealth being pumped into the money stream. It is new wealth created from renewable resources. Through good management practices we have been able to annually produce about this same amount of wealth without depleting the resources from which it comes; and without reliable repeating sources of new wealth our economy would soon stagnate. If we use the generally accepted ratio of new money revolving some seven times, we can see that the cattle industry has the equivalent of $1.5 billion impact on the economy of Arizona.

We take seriously our longtime stewardship of public lands. As you probably know, Arizona has only about 13 percent of our State's area in private ownership, which leaves a very small base for tax purposes in Arizona. We need production and all that we can get, and any time production is taken away from land or excluded from our use, it certainly takes away from our tax base.

SRP05483

The greatest part of the other 87 percent is greatly limited as a source of income except for the revenues from grazing. For many years now we have been developing these lands while using them. We endorse the principle of multiple use. Being public lands, no single person or group should have exclusive use of them.

In terms of wise utilization of renewable resources—resources from which is created new wealth—no other use is as capable of achieving an annual return as cattle. We realize that cattlemen benefit from the use of these lands, but there should also be a realization of the benefit which accrues to the public when these lands are used and improved consistent with good management practices. Because of the economic importance of the cattle industry careful consideration must be given before limiting or withdrawing either present or potential grazing areas for any reason other than dictated by good management practices.

We recognize and appreciate the increasing pressures for public and recreational uses on public lands. However, these pressures are primarily for areas of comparatively easy access, having improvements and conveniences. Under the present multiple-use principle such areas are available. Our increasing population is not creating a greater demand for areas of difficult access. Modern transportation is not geared to wilderness-type recreation. For those who have the finances and stamina a wilderness trek into the present wilderness system offers opportunities practically without limit. Wilderness, wild, and primitive areas are not crowded—it is possible to go for several days even in prime summer months without seeing any other parties.

We have run some surveys in our particular area where we do have recreation, where people are going out hunting, picnicking, and so on, and we find very little use of the areas back in the backwoods country, what we call now the wilderness areas.

The esthetic values of nature-in-the-raw are considerable and we agree that there is a need for them, but our so-called population explosion calls for more than just meeting pressures for additional recreation. Untrammeled arroyos for the few are fine if we don't, in the process, trammel the needs and rights of others. Esthetic desires must be tempered with economic realities. Taxpayers, individually or in groups, may have special or even selfish interests. But in any discussion about the public domain it is the taxpayer as a whole that should receive first consideration. How can this domain be administered or handled to the best immediate and long-range interest of the taxpayer? Is it in his best interest to manage this resource on a single-use nonremunerative basis or on a multiple-use wealth producing basis? When the resource is renewable, as is the case with forage; and when it produces public revenue, as is the case with livestock; then it would be doing the taxpayer a disservice to restrict this continuing source of income in favor of a single-use system for the benefit of a very few persons.

We are not asking for a reduction of present designated areas or for the relaxing of regulations controlling these areas. We are asking for a deliberate and comprehensive review of the actual projected needs and potential uses of the public domain. A review and analysis based on need and logic rather than emotion. We endorse the prin-

ciple of H.R. 8070 which calls for the creation of a commission to study public land laws. We believe this is a necessary step before any congressional action to establish permanent new classifications. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission set a pattern for comprehensive reviews of this nature.

While few, if any, among us can agree on all of the conclusions of the ORRRC, it did establish a base for future recreational needs. We believe the same could be true for public land laws; that is, establish a base for an objective revision if it is found that such is needed.

Our position and recommendation is that no wilderness legislation be adopted until completion of the review called for in H.R. 8070. For the record, however, there are certain points that we feel should be made in regard to wilderness system bills now before this committee. These are:

First, in regard to grazing of livestock, these bills do proclaim that where established it should be allowed to continue. Clarification is needed to insure that this provision pertains to BLM as well as forest lands. Also the vague language about "subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary" should be made more definitive so permittees would be aware of their obligations, responsibilities, and rights; and so that Secretaries in the future would have well defined guidelines in determining "reasonable regulations as deemed necessary."

Second, acquisition of private holdings against the owner's wishes should be done only by action of Congress, and not through the assumption of condemnation authority on the part of any Government agency or bureau.

Third, the same provision as paragraph 2 above should apply for water rights, and full recognition should be provided for State water laws.

Fourth, a definitive clarification as to the status of such things as stock trails, present or future needed watering facilities stock handling equipment, and future repairs and maintenance of existing improvements.

Fifth, make it positive that wilderness legislation will in no way modify or repeal the Taylor Grazing Act as amended.

Sixth, any addition to the wilderness system should be made only by positive affirmative action of the U.S. Congress.

We wish to reiterate, however, that wilderness proposals should be a part of the review called for in H.R. 8070. So the first order of business in regard to public lands should be passage of legislation which embodies the intent of that bill. This would provide the basis for including wilderness proposals in their proper context along with all other public land laws.

I again respectfully express our appreciation at the opportunity to state our position on this subject of such intense current interest.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions on the part of the committee?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The only thing I would like to say, Mr. Browning, is that you were talking about grazing being permitted where it now exists. I believe you are going to see some consideration of a cutoff date

SRP05485

on those grazing permits in those areas as well—a 25-year period, or when those leases expire, or one generation, or something like that. So when you are thinking about this, it does not mean in perpetuity.

Mr. BROWNING. We agree with you wholeheartedly.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I had a somewhat similar question. You cited the language in the bills permitting grazing where it is already established, Mr. Browning. Do you not feel that language is adequate?

Mr. BROWNING. We think it is adequate, but could be improved where it says, "Subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary." If you are operating where the discretion is given, where pressures are brought, we feel it is a hazard to the livestock industry in conflict with the game, and so forth.

Mr. WESTLAND. You are already operating under those conditions now.

Mr. BROWNING. To some extent.

Mr. WESTLAND. Almost completely. Under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service prescribes.

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Do you think we have changed that in any way? Have we made it better or worse or is it about the same?

Mr. BROWNING. I would agree with your point in the matter.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would think the phrase you cattlemen and miners would find in conflict would be the phrase that any operation must be compatible with the wilderness philosophy of any area that is set up as a wilderness.

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

If I might make the statement, we do not operate where there is discretion, and we find it very difficult. We are in a pretty bad situation, and we think under this 8070 these things should be spelled out where these guidelines would be set up as to the proper discretions to be used in these matters.

Mr. WESTLAND. It is pretty hard for the Congress to draw up guidelines in the cattle industry, in the mining industry, in the lumber industry, for the wilderness.

Mr. BROWNING. We would like to help you do that.

Mr. WESTLAND. I am sure you would, Mr. Browning. That is all.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Browning. We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. BROWNING. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. We are trying to accommodate everyone by calling some people out of order in order to permit those who have other commitments to meet them. I am asking some people in Nevada to wait until the out-of-State groups have made their appearance.

The next witness, John C. Dozier, D-o-z-i-e-r, North Fork, Calif., of the American Forest Products Corp. You may proceed, Mr. Dozier.

SRP05486

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. DOZIER, AMERICAN FOREST PRODUCTS CORP., NORTH FORK, CALIF.

Mr. DOZIER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am John C. Dozier, a professional forester. I represent the American Forest Products Corp.

This corporation operates a modern sawmill in eastern Madera County in central California. Our annual production is geared to the allowable cut in our area. We are almost entirely dependent on forest service timber for our raw material. As forester for this operation, I spend most of my time in the woods. I make timber appraisals, cruise timber, and do all the various other tasks an industrial forester is called upon to perform. I mention these facts so that you may evaluate the testimony I am about to give. It comes from an individual who spends the greater part of his time out of doors observing what is going on in our forests.

The name Madera comes from the Spanish word for wood or timber. The city of Madera had its origin as a shipping point for lumber about 1874. Now, 90 years later, Madera County is producing 59 million board feet of lumber annually. This annual production is on a sustained yield basis. Obviously, the lumber industry and Madera County are interwoven historically, economically, and socially. Our organization has operated in Madera County for over 20 years. Our payroll is the largest single payroll in the county. Our employees serve on school boards, county planning commissions, and county advisory boards. They are also active in many service clubs. Much of our product is used locally in both housing and shipping the rich produce of the San Joaquin Valley. We feel that our welfare and the welfare of the county go hand in hand. What affects the county will undoubtedly affect us and vice versa.

Now let us take a look at Madera County. It stretches from the floor of the San Joaquin Valley to the crest of the Sierras. Within its boundaries lie 330,000 acres of the Sierra National Forest, 90,000 acres of Yosemite National Park, and 1,600 acres of the Devils Postpile National Monument. The 50,000 acres of the Forest Service land are within the Minarets wilderness area. Last year the 280,000 acres of multiple-use national forest land in Madera County yielded a revenue of over one-half million dollars to the Federal Government. Of this money, $53,000 was returned to Madera County in lieu of taxes. The 141,600 acres of wilderness and park lands yielded no revenue either to the Federal Government or to Madera County. I mention these figures to indicate why our county is so deeply concerned over any wilderness legislation. It affects our economy and our local tax base.

The boundary of the Minarets wilderness area was established in 1931 and expanded last year. The boundary of Yosemite National Park was established in the early 1900's. From that time to this date there has been no violation of the wilderness principle in these areas.

SRP05487

Under existing regulations these areas have been kept in a wilderness state.

I would like to assure the committee that there has been no intrusion by commercial interests into wilderness areas. Present regulations are adequate to maintain them. Since about one-third of our county is in Federal ownership, we are rightfully concerned about this legislation. Although the county contains over 140,000 acres of wilderness or potential wilderness, from which no revenue is derived, we do have 280,000 acres of multiple-use Forest Service land. This land is paying its way, both to the Federal Government and to the county. This land is also providing jobs, mass recreation, and maintaining an important, useful industry.

All the legislation proposed would lump lands of three Federal agencies into one category. These agencies all have different management objectives. Does this mean we will have still another Government agency to administer the wilderness lands of the Forest Service, Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service? We hope not, because it would be sheer waste.

None of the legislation proposed provides for a review of wilderness areas. Who can say now, that wilderness will still be the highest use of each area so designated 10 or 20 years hence?

We are opposed to the wilderness legislation in its present form. Our county officials and chamber of commerce see no need for wilderness legislation. Their experience has shown such legislation to be unnecessary. We heartily endorse the multiple-use concept. This concept provides the maximum use of our natural resources by the majority of our people. In contrast, wilderness areas, managed for single use, provide enjoyment only to a selective minority.

In conclusion I would like to leave this thought with you. Our forests produce annually an immense store of raw wealth. A portion of this wealth needs to be used each year. Indeed it will be used, if not by man, then by other forms of life. By making intelligent use of this "annual increment," man simply helps nature to do housekeeping chores she would otherwise get done by other means—insects, fungi, and lightning caused fire. Among living creatures man is uniquely endowed to manipulate his environment. How he manipulates it, ignorantly and wastefully, or intelligently and with due husbandry, will in great measure determine his tenure and the fees he must pay.

In the timbered portions of wilderness areas the intelligent use of this annual increment is impossible.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. We appreciate your precise statement, Mr. Dozier.

Are there questions from the committee?

Mr. WHITE. I would just like to ask you one question, Mr. Dozier. In your concept, the multiple use, does this not include some area fully devoted totally to wilderness, wilderness alone?

Mr. DOZIER. Yes, sir; it does. However, we feel that the present legislation is unnecessary in that this is already being handled by the agencies involved to the point it is not necessary to pass national legislation.

The main point I was making is that you have three agencies, all with different management objectives. We do not think you can blanket all of these areas into one.

Mr. WHITE. The present legislation does not provide for any new agency of Government, it just provides for a system that will be under the control of the agencies now controlling these particular areas.

I have listened here to statements, that the words "multiple use" supposedly mean something like exploitation or improper use of our natural resources, and some of the people talk about wilderness as if it has a different meaning from what I think is the true meaning. I think the multiple use means the use of these lands in every area and for every purpose, and not the idea some of our real militant wilderness people advance, that the words "multiple use" do not include any wilderness. I think that this should be brought out for clarification.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WESTLAND. No questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Dozier.

Mr. DOZIER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Stanley P. Calhoun of Phoenix, Ariz. You may proceed, Mr. Calhoun.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY T. CALHOUN, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. CALHOUN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as is obvious, I am here in more than one capacity, as a witness and as a reporter.

I should explain, by way of background, that I am with KPHO-TV and the Evening American newspaper of Phoenix, Ariz., and serve as the outdoor editor for both of those institutions. I am the past executive director of the Arizona Conservation Council. I am one of those militant wilderness lovers and an advocate thereof.

I will not dwell on the merits of wilderness preservation as an idea, or as a program of action proposed in any of the past or present bills before Congress aimed at implementing that idea. I will, however, state again—emphatically and with great pride—that I do concur entirely with the judgments of those minds, present and absent, living and dead, who endorse wilderness preservation legislation. I join them in saying that it is obvious beyond continued ignoring that this country needs, and its people largely seek and demand, legislation creating a National Wilderness Preservation System.

I do wish to dwell somewhat on the conspicuous fact that even in the face of the broad constituency's expressed will favoring wilderness preservation, 7 years and four Congresses have passed and no such system exists to date; or at least no such enabling legislation has been forthcoming. Even in the face of repeated meritorious bills seeking that product and enjoying the consistent support of the major resource management agencies of the Government, there is no wilderness law today. Even considering the progressive placation of an interminable series of objections posed by various interests in and out of Congress (or both), this country's wilderness areas are still exempt from specific statutory protection.

To me the facts of this unproductive record are astounding; astounding in the light of a fundamental maxim of American Government; Congress is intended to be the most direct instrument of Government of, by, and for the people. Yet, in my judgment—with respect to wilderness legislation—the conduct of Congress, more par-

SRP05489

ticularly the House of Representatives, and specifically its Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has largely been reflective of Government of, by, and for the objectors—objectors of vested interest and nominal numbers.

The principal responsibility for this vacillation lies in the House of Representatives. This, the one body most pointedly charged with the direct and responsive representation of the people, has been the culprit to most obdurately ignore the bulk of American citizens favoring legislation guaranteeing wilderness preservation.

Distinguished figures such as former Congresswoman Gracie Pfost, Representative John Saylor, Representative Jeffery Cohelan, Senators Maurine Neuberger, Thomas Kuchel, and Clinton Anderson, and others, all concede that no other single legislative consideration—at least in the field of resource management—has evoked such a massive expression of citizen interest over the 7 years past. And yet, with a wilderness bill twice handed down to this body from the Senate bearing an overwhelming 3-to-1 endorsement, the document and its aims have thus far died while in the care of the House.

Men who in this decade saw the beginning Congressional effort to establish a statutory policy of wilderness preservation have had time to die while their aims withered in an atmosphere of vacillation. The rest of us are still waiting, with an exhausted patience and waning faith.

Nonetheless, today, I again urge the passage of a sound wilderness bill; I again lend my voice to the national call for the creation of a National Wilderness Preservation System. Now, at last, resolve this question with distinction and dispatch. Now, have the representative honesty and courage to execute the public will in this matter. Take the better ingredients from the Dingell and Saylor wilderness bills, as well as the Senate-passed bill, and even others showing real merit, amalgamate those ingredients into the document sought and required and then pass it.

If, as the probability has it, you are still hesitant, I ask one other thing of you. When you return to Capitol Hill, and as you sit deliberating this measure, take a moment to turn and look out the doors through the doors of Congress and visualize standing there a great congregation of all those Americans concerned with wilderness legislation. Then imagine a call being issued to that body—the real body politic—for those opposing the passage of a wilderness bill to so signify by the raising of hands. And then another call to those supporting the bill to make a like sign. And then, gentlemen, with that image in mind, remembering the principles of direct representation and government of the people, by the people, and for the people, turn back to your duty—and do it.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions from the committee?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Calhoun, I am impressed by your use of words. Of course, that is the way you make your living.

I do take exception to your second paragraph on page 2 where you indicate that the Congress has not been direct and responsive in its representation of the people and has been the culprit. I feel that good legislation will carry itself, and I do not think that the original legislation was good legislation. I do not think that because you have

SRP05490

one feeling in one direction that you are necessarily or the people that you are in intimate contact with, representative of the thinking of all of the people of the United States.

Mr. CALHOUN. I did not imply that.

Mr. WHITE. I think these hearings and the work of the Congress and this committee in this area have pointed out that we can come up with legislation in this area, and we will come up with it, and I think it will finally be a resolution and compromise of the needs of all the people. I think just because it does not suit the particular group you represent, or think you represent, that necessarily Congress has been a culprit in this matter.

Mr. CALHOUN. May I respond?

Mr. WHITE. You certainly may.

Mr. CALHOUN. Let me say this, in general, in theory I concur with your view of the function of Congress in terms of the fact it has the responsibility to refine intended legislation so the ultimate product in vital legislation that is adopted is the best possible.

My implication and my meaning, when I say "culprit" and other references of that sort, was that I think a good deal of the drawback, a good deal of the shortcoming of original legislation—and I again remind you there were 7 years to date elapsed, and how many more we do not know—but a good deal of those shortcomings could have been rectified had there been a genuine willing effort on the part of Congress and the part of the opponents I have cited outside Congress to see to it that this issue was resolved more expeditiously than it has been.

Mr. WHITE. I think it may have been a mistake to move with the expedition you are speaking of.

I must say, in defense of the chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that I know of no fairer man, no more able man than Wayne Aspinall, and I know his consideration of this problem has been as totally impartial as a man's position could be. I think he has been maligned by the press, and I think this man is one of the few real devoted men in the Congress that works at it night and day and does it for the good of all of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. CALHOUN. May I respond again?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. CALHOUN. I spoke to Mr. Aspinall regarding this bill in Phoenix some 3 or 4 months past. In general, again, I would concur with your description of his record as a Congressman and representative of his constituency in the broad body politic of the American people. I say, as I told him at that time, that the intent of his move, as I think accurately reported by the press, to call for a wilderness bill brought before the floor of the House without available debate or amendment does not aline itself with his overall record.

Mr. WHITE. I was not in the Congress you are speaking of, but I have a bit of historical information at my command, and knowing what has transpired and the purpose, to get all of the information out and to look at all of our public land laws, and the trend of Government today, I believe it has been conducted in the correct manner. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

SRP05491

Mr. WESTLAND. I have no questions. My only comment is that so far we have had factual and temperate statements. This is the most intemperate statement that we have had before us. It is unfactual, it does not recognize what went on, and sounds mostly like a sour-grape statement.

Mr. BARING. Are you through, Mr. Westland?

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes, I am finished.

Mr. BARING. I would like to comment on your sentence at the botton of page 2—

> And yet, with a wilderness bill twice handed down through this body [House] from the Senate bearing an overwhelming 3-to-1 endorsement, the document and its aims have thus far died while in the care of the House.

I would like to point out that, just because the Senate passes a bill, this is no reason by itself for the House of Representatives to do likewise, and just because the House passes a bill is no reason for the Senate to do likewise.

Mr. CALHOUN. I understand.

Mr. BARING. This is as it should be under our system of government. We have two separate Houses of Congress. And our committtee in the House does not rely on Senate decisions. In fact, we will not even use their testimony at any time. I think this should be made clear to the public. I do not think they are quite aware of it. We have much larger committees. They can turn a bill out in the other body with two men on a subcommittee. As the general rule, we have anywhere from 8 to 15 men on the subcommittee. As you can see, even on field trips, we have more. We have five on this trip.

So the conditions are altogether different, and, as Compton White, the Congressman from Idaho, said, Congressman Wayne Aspinall, the chairman, is one of the fairest men I have ever met, and he is very thorough. He wants to screen his own bills, and he does not rely on testimony that comes from any other committee other than his own. I would like the public to know that I stand 100 percent behind my chairman of the full commmittee.

Mr. CALHOUN. May I say in that regard, not to presume, but if I were in his position, I would do accordingly. I am simply saying in certain aspects of his concern with this legislation I disagree with the manner in which it has been done.

Mr. WHITE. You are certainly entitled to your disagreement.

Mr. CALHOUN. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is John W. Harshbarger, professional geologist and mining engineer of Tucson, Ariz. You may proceed, Mr. Harshbarger.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. HARSHBARGER, PROFESSIONAL GEOLOGIST AND MINING ENGINEER, TUCSON, ARIZ.

Mr. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is John W. Harshbarger, professional geologist and mining engineer, Tucson, Ariz. I have devoted over 20 years to study and examination of the natural resources within Arizona and adjoining States. During these years, I have applied my professional skills as an independent research worker, employee of mineral industry, Federal investigations, director of geological research, university education, and as a private consultant.

SRP05492

I appear before you to ask that any contemplated current legislation concerning our wilderness area maintain the spirit of the mining laws of 1872 while tailoring them to fit the needs of our present time, yet allowing a flexibility for future generations. This will necessitate encompassing the multiple-use principle of our public lands for benefit of our Nation, protecting the ecological environment without hindering mineral development.

During the past 20 years, I have seen and taken part in the development of the mineral resources in Arizona. I am keenly aware of the huge effort, time, and capital that are needed to bring a mineral deposit into production. I have witnessed major change and improvement in techniques and methodologies for prospecting and development of mineral deposits. The modern "ore seeker" is obliged to use mechanized vehicles and aircraft containing sophisticated equipment, developed in recent years, coupled with new advances in laboratories which are an integral part of his field examinations. With modern tools and methods, the professional mineral geologist and geophysicist have discovered and developed remote ore bodies. Modern technological advancement has an important bearing on the proposed legislation in H.R. 9162 and similar bills which will limit mineral entry in wilderness areas after December 31, 1973. Such limited mineral entry is unreasonable and unrealistic for the attraction of the mineral industry to explore and develop potential ore bodies. It will have the same effect as closing the areas from the inception of the act for the following reasons:

First. It will not be possible to fully explore the many mineral occurrences in Arizona within the wilderness areas in 10 years. Maps published by the Arizona Bureau of Mines in 1961 (exhibits A and B and attached) showing the known occurrence of certain minerals clearly demonstrate that they are widely scattered throughout the entire State. Many of these deposits occur in inaccessible areas which would require construction of roads to employ the necessary mechanical equipment.

Second. Detailed geological and geophysical mapping would entail many years of effort to delineate targets for test-hole drilling and subsequent ore body development. The application of such techniques and methods is a continuing process even in established mineral-producing areas.

Third. The full potential of mineral occurrence and ore discovery will have to await the research and development techniques and equipment not now available. Progress has taken place in recent years in scientific instrumentation, but there still is much that is unknown. Continued research to obtain additional knowledge will lead to new methods applicable for future mineral exploitation.

Fourth. It has been demonstrated on numerous occasions that the leadtime which is required for the development and production of mineral occurrences is 5 to 10 years in areas where much geological information is already on hand.

Fifth. I cannot visualize any mineral exploration organization willing to risk the large cost of millions of dollars and hundreds of man-years toward the development of an isolated deposit in the wilderness area when the regulations would prohibit further exploration and development work after December 31, 1973.

SRP05493

In times of national emergency, when importing metals from other countries is difficult, our mineral industry is called upon to marshal its resources and provide minerals necessary for the national defense. If prospecting and exploration have not been previously undertaken, hurried production to meet emergency needs is virtually impossible. Thus, legislation which would inhibit exploration of virgin lands also would tend to inhibit the security of the Nation.

In order to keep abreast with public demand for more items requiring metals, along with increased population, the mineral industry must grow and new deposits must be found and developed for mining. Even if the per capita use of metal were to remain constant, the gross volume would increase substantially to keep pace with technological improvements, automation and mechanization, and high standards of living in an ever-expanding national economy. To accommodate these demands, the mineral industry must step up its exploration activities. Such exploration and production of metals can be undertaken only under a program of multiple use of our public lands. Therefore, the public domain must be kept open to exploration much in the spirit of the mining laws of 1872.

As a large part of our future mineral resources occur in the wilderness areas, I believe it is essential that these resources be available to our future generations. Wilderness legislation which will protect the ecological environment but also allow mineral exploration and development of ore bodies is wholly compatible with the proper use of lands. The mining industry is fully sympathetic to the administration and control of public lands when such policies are realistic in regard to the future sociological and economic growth of the United States. New accesses into these areas constructed by industry in their exploration will also be new accesses available to the public. People who utilize recreational areas seldom move inward more than a few miles from available roads which often causes congestion and forest hazards. Additional accesses would enable people to enjoy more of our wilderness areas.

I firmly believe that if large wilderness areas are withdrawn from mineral entry in the United States, it will place the mineral industry in a very unfortunate position. It will be difficult to discover new deposits that are needed for the domestic market and to remain competitive in the world market. I also believe the preservation of the wilderness area is a splendid idea, but it should not inhibit or stop prospecting and exploration for new deposits. The benefits afforded to the many should not be sacrificed for the few individuals who have the physical stamina and desire to penetrate the inner depths of the wilderness to meditate.

Before any wilderness is withdrawn from commercial entry, detailed scientific geological investigations should be undertaken to marshal natural resources facts on the occurrence of minerals, timber, and water resources as well as having an understanding of the ecological environment. With such information available, it would be possible to make a more realistic appraisal and evaluation on how the area could be managed for optimum benefit for the Nation. We can no longer afford the luxury of management of our virgin lands without adequate knowledge of physical and biological facts. I am confident that Congress would provide prudent legislation when such data and measurements are available.

Future generations should have the right to control natural resources and the right to decide whether or not an area should be included in a wilderness system. To insure this, I believe the Congress of the United States should be the only authorized body to add or create the wilderness system. I am pleased to note that H.R. 9162 provides that the recommendations on wilderness areas by the Federal administration are subject to the approval of Congress. The creation of wilderness areas and managerial procedures by administrative decisions without effective public consultations and congressional approval is not tenable. The results of modern science and its future contributions have much to offer for establishing the most effective methods of land management for the optimum benefit of mankind. The door should not be closed to the public and their congressional representatives to take advantage of such information.

I wish to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before this subcommittee to express my views.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions from the committee?

You have submitted several maps with your testimony. Those maps will be put in the file of the committee rather than the record.

Mr. HARSHBARGER. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Evan Just, of Stanford, Calif.

You may proceed.

EVAN JUST, DEPARTMENT OF MINERAL ENGINEERING, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, STANFORD, CALIF.

Mr. JUST. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, I am professor of mining at Stanford University, appearing here in my own behalf as a private citizen.

Most of us have an innate sympathy toward the idea of preserving islands of untrammeled nature from human depredation, and no one who witnesses the onslaught of the human tide that is engulfing California can be indifferent to the deplorable results. Nevertheless, when the withdrawal of lands on the scale contemplated in the proposed legislation is threatened, it behooves us to weigh the consequences. My own testimony is concerned with the mineral aspects. I am here simply as a private citizen.

It is easy to be an all-out conservationist in the midst of such abundance as we are accustomed to expect. I wonder how much of the enthusiasm for large wilderness areas would wither if we were confronted here and now with poorer living standards as a consequence. Nothing is more imbedded in our national ideals and policies than good living standards for everybody, on both a national and worldwide basis. I need go no further than the President's message of a few days ago to document this statement.

Any concept of good living standards for large numbers of people must inevitably embrace an abundance of mineral raw materials, fuels, and fertilizers. To provide the good life for all our present population will require a very large expansion of present production, and to do it for all the people now on earth would require an expansion which taxes one's imagination. But in the future our country and the world will experience a massive expansion in population. Nobody can quite

comprehend the fantastic increases in mineral supply that will be the implicit in the enjoyment of good living standards by all these people.

Furthermore, mineral resources, except those few available from the ocean, have the unique property of being depletable. This means that our mineral industries must constantly find new deposits to replace those being exhausted. Facing the realities of expanding needs, population growth and depletion, I suggest that it is foolish to establish sanctuaries and traditions which our successors will simply overrun because they cannot afford to do otherwise. It would make more sense to make a reasonable compromise and establish a tradition which has a chance of survival. By this I mean to permit limited, controlled access for important economic purposes and for recreation to an extent that will enlist continued public support.

Beyond the economic aspect, it is questionable if the public will support the preservation of large wilderness areas in a primeval state when it is realized that this virginal condition cannot survive unless access is denied to all but a privileged few. Even the invasion of these sanctuaries by significant numbers of pack-bearing campers will destroy the primeval character. Moreover, who but a well organized, financed, skilled, and conditioned small minority can penetrate into the hearts of large wilderness areas in which vehicular traffic will be prohibited?

As a prototype of practicable alternative, one can find in Germany and France amazingly numerous and accessible woodland areas which are certainly not virginal, but are enjoyed by large numbers of people, are productive of timber, other resources, recreation, game, better water and better air, and are sufficiently natural to provide comfort for battered spirits. Our national forests are intended to operate in the same way.

As footnotes to this position, I offer the following points:

1. Exploratory activities for needed mineral deposits do not have to cause important defacements of nature or upsetting of natural conditions.

2. Mineral production is not likely to require more than a small fraction of broad areas; probably less than 1 percent will suffice.

3. Minerals have to be sought where nature placed them.

4. It is evident that our future population will be sprawled out in great urbanized areas that will add up to an important fraction of the country's total area. Mineral production is inhibited or prevented by urbanization. Between these sprawling urban areas, industrial sites, transportation facilities, power facilities, preferred agricultural areas, and water supplies the mineral industry is in danger of being so hemmed in that it cannot perform its socially basic functions at reasonable cost. The reservation of large, virginal wilderness areas will aggravate this danger.

5. The idea that the mineral potentials of large areas can be resolved in some such period as 10 or 20 years is an illusion. Our mineral-finding techniques are impressive but basically still primitive. The time cannot be foreseen when they will be both completely effective and economically feasible.

6. Any notion that we can afford to depend on imports for more than a fraction of our mineral needs is also an illusion. As the rest of the world achieves better living standards, it will need its own minerals.

I thank the subcommittee for the opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. I would just like to compliment Mr. Just on a very fine statement, and I agree with him in principle. I have had the same thought myself, that I am afraid of some of the thinking of some of the people. As I look at my own areas, I would love to keep it just the way it was when I was a boy, but I know I am going to have to share it with someone else. I would like to go up those streams fishing, but I cannot do it today, and perhaps my children will not be able to do it, but there is still a need for a good limited wilderness area. We are getting down as to what is the correct size and at the same time have the ingress and egress needed. Some of the bills do provide that type of thinking, and I think that is the direction we are going to work in.

Mr. JUST. I agree with your statement.

Mr. BARING. Just for the record, will you furnish us with a résumé of your experience and background?

Mr. JUST. I am a geologist by training. I have had experience in many countries of the world as geologist and mining engineer. I have taught on three occasions in my life.

I was executive secretary of the Tri-State Ore Producers Association for 6 years, editor of Engineering and Mining Journal for 11 years, director of the Strategic Materials Division of ECA for a year and a half. I organized that division. And I was vice president of Cyprus Mines Corp. for 6 years. I have been at Stanford for 4 years.

Mr. BARING. I think your record certainly speaks for itself. I appreciate it.

Are there any other questions?

Thank you very much.

Mr. JUST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Barclay Kamb, K-a-m-b, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF BARCLAY KAMB, PROFESSOR OF GEOLOGY AND GEOPHYSICS, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, PASADENA, CALIF.

Mr. KAMB. Honorable Chairman and members, I testify as an individual citizen who has made use of some of the areas affected by the wilderness bills under discussion. I consider the enactment of effective wilderness legislation one of the most important and lasting contributions that can be made to the health, the sanity, and hence to the strength of the people of our country.

The question of wilderness protection is a question of values. No one denies that the economy would benefit locally from commercial exploitation or development of attractive virgin lands. It is also obvious that if we value our recreational lands only in proportion to the number of people that are squeezed into them, they must be developed commercially. The question of values, then, is whether we appreciate aspects of life that conflict with commercial development and mechanization. It is the question whether we recognize the need for people to get away, not only from crowded cities but also sometimes from holiday crowds, to renew their spirits in wild and beautiful surroundings unblemished by the works of man. It is the

 SRP05497

question whether we value the health and strength that come from true outdoor life. But most of all it is a question of values that are basically spiritual and that no man can fully analyze, though much has been spoken and written in praise of them.

The fact that more and more of our people are speaking out for protection of wilderness shows that these things are valued. The great support the wilderness legislation has already received, and the progress it has made in Congress, demonstrate a national recognition of these values and of the need to conserve them.

The need for effective wilderness legislation is keenly felt in southern California. Experience has shown that the national forest wild areas, and those of the State parks, are too vulnerable to the demands of local commercial interests to long withstand their pressure. Just within the past year, for example, one of our finest remaining wild areas, on Mount San Jacinto, has been opened up to a multi-million-dollar commercial development. Local commercial opportunities are always made to seem more important than a principle of long-term national interest.

The need is well illustrated by the attempt being made at this hearing to exclude from the wilderness system the San Gorgonio wild area, in San Bernardino National Forest. We have here a small but beautiful tract of high mountain country ideal for camping, backpacking, hiking, riding, and climbing. In winter there is skiing: the only cross-country skiing and ski mountaineering available in southern California. Developers want the central part of this area—the most attractive part and the focus of wilderness interest—to build a great lift and resort complex for downhill skiing. It is claimed that the proposed development will not detract from the existing wilderness use, but no one who appreciate the wilderness values can accept this. The attraction of such an area is its isolation, its unspoiled beauty, and the challenge of hiking and climbing and living in the wild outdoors. These values are incompatible with the paraphernalia of a ski resort.

It is also argued that the principle of greatest good for the greatest number compels development, because the downhill skiing facilities would attract so many more people than presently visit the area in its wilderness state. This claim takes us back to the basic question of values at the heart of wilderness preservation. It is like arguing that we should convert our churches to rollerskating rinks because that would get the attendance up. There are human values that cannot be compared in terms of sheer numbers, dollars, or mass appeal. Our country now sees the need to protect the intangible but essential value of our few remaining wilderness lands against just such arguments and pressures as these.

I urge passage of the necessary legislation, which is contained in H.R. 930 and H.R. 9070 but not in the other, weaker measures under consideration.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much for your statement.

Mr. KAMB. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Paul E. Shively, president, California Forest Protective Association. You may proceed.

SRP05498

STATEMENT OF PAUL E. SHIVELY, PRESIDENT, CALIFORNIA FOREST PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. SHIVELY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Paul Shively, chief forester for Fiberboard Paper Products Corp. Our company owns about 85,000 acres of forest land in the High Sierras of California and Nevada near Quincy, Truckee, and Lake Tahoe, as well as timberlands elsewhere in California and in the State of Washington. Much of our ownership in the Sierras is intermingled with that of the Plumas, Tahoe, and Toiyabe National Forests and is being managed for permanent yield of forest products.

At the present time our fiberboard plant at Antioch, Calif., uses as its raw material, mostly chips made from sawmill slabs, edgings, and so forth, which would otherwise be burned. As pulp production rises in California, we anticipate being able to bring our lands into production for pulpwood as well as for the sawlogs, poles, piling, and Christmas trees now produced.

The national forest lands intermingled with ours are heavily used by fishermen, hunters, and campers who, almost as frequently, also use our lands without realizing they have crossed a property boundary.

It is interesting to note that the Tahoe basin and the other areas wherein our lands are situated are considered to be prime outdoor recreation areas, even affording wilderness type experiences in many cases, although much of it was logged in the late 1800's and early 1900's.

A similar story of forest management, of intermingled public and private land and of frequent casual recreation use of private land by the general public could be told by other members of the California Forest Protective Association, of which I am currently president, and for which I speak today. More than 2 million acres of the timberlands owned by members of this association of California timber owners are intermingled with or adjacent to national forests. As this casual use of their lands by the public rapidly increases, these timber owners must consider (and many are considering) means of controlling it, and where consistent with timber management objectives, the development of facilities to properly accommodate such use in a manner profitable to the owner and satisfactory to the user.

The economics of seasonal recreation use being what it is, however, it seems reasonable to expect that much of the demand for outdoor recreation will be of a kind that cannot be profitably provided for in competition with publicly provided facilities and so will have to be handled on public lands. Furthermore, as California's population increases and with it the need for food, water, and fiber as well as for recreation, these needs will increasingly compete for the use of the same land. It will be more than ever necessary for land managers in this State to utilize good judgment and the best professional and technical training and techniques to make the land produce the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run.

For that reason it is imperative that public land use policies be most carefully considered to insure that they do not unnecessarily limit the ability of our land to meet our needs, but do provide adequate guidelines and objectives for public land managers. Economic and other studies now going forward under the guidance of the State office of planning and other governmental agencies will provide much of the data and forecasts necessary for promulgation of such policies.

SRP05499

Meanwhile, under existing policies, 12 percent of California's 49 million acres of Federal land are already in national parks, and monuments or classified as wild, wilderness, or primitive areas of the national forests. These 5.9 million Federal acres are devoted to recreation in California, nearly all of it a wilderness nature. The 4.16 million acres under national park administration are managed principally as wilderness areas. The 1.7 million acres of national forests in wild, wilderness, or primitive classification are in no danger of being significantly reduced—indeed they appear to be increasing in area as they undergo reexamination.

All levels of government in California, faced with a population which doubles every 20 years, are expanding their land-use planning functions. This is a most complex field. Answers are not readily forthcoming, but are essential to our future growth. The public land-use study, which I understand this committe has proposed, is certainly advisable in California where so much of our land resource is in Federal ownership. We would recommend that it be undertaken and completed before additional limited use land classifications are applied on a permanent basis.

We further recommend that for such an important matter as the permanent land classification of such a limited nature as "wilderness," a specific determination for each area by the Congress is desirable.

If there is no intent to set up a separate Wilderness Area Administration (and we do not believe such an agency is needed), it seems unnecessary to create a wilderness system as such.

If, in its wisdom, Congress does find it necessary to create a wilderness system, it should be limited, initially, to areas already classified so. Provision for public hearings on all other wilderness area proposals should be made and provision made for reversion to regular national forest or national park status of areas not accepted as wilderness. We are pleased to see all of these provisions except the latter in H.R. 9162 and H.R. 9070. It does appear that at least 10 years would be needed for a proper examination of all the potential wilderness areas in national parks, forests, and wildlife areas for this is a big and complicated job. Further, since our land-use needs are apt to change as our population grows, provision for periodic review of status is desirable.

However, our principal recommendation is that a thorough examination of the role of our vast public land domain in the culture and economy of the Nation, the States, and the local areas should precede any permanent land classification. Pending that, the status quo could well be maintained, for in the national parks areas suited for wilderness are by policy so maintained, and in the national forests a long-time policy calls for classifying suitable areas as "primitive," "wild," and "wilderness" areas and reserving them from other uses.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WESTLAND. I have one question.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Shively, does your company do any reforestation on these 85,000 acres you own?

Mr. SHIVELY. Yes. Our lands are managed for perpetuity sustained yield. Reforestation is a minor problem with us because of

SRP05500

the lucky nature of our harvesting. We are only taking out overmature trees, and we have a good residual span that provides a seed crop, and primarily our regeneration is by natural means. In case of fire or some catastrophe such as that, we do some seeding and planting.

Mr. WESTLAND. You are not doing any clear cutting?

Mr. SHIVELY. No clear cutting in our area at all.

Incidentally, much of our property is located in Lake Tahoe Basin, which is getting considerable attention at the present time. We are very cautious in how we are managing this program. We have not, at least to our knowledge, had any criticism on destroying the natural background highly recommended for that area.

Mr. WESTLAND. These are on your land?

Mr. SHIVELY. On our private-fee lands; yes, sir.

Mr. WESTLAND. Thank you very much.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Shively.

Mr. SHIVELY. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. Next is a group for the Audubon Society: Mrs. Ann E. Wissler, president, San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society; Dr. James Deacon, Lahontan Audubon Society, Reno, Nev.; Dr. Harold B. Lamb, Utah Audubon Society, Salt Lake City, Utah. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPHINE C. VAUGHN, SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY AUDUBON SOCIETY, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.

Mrs. VAUGHN. Mr. Chairman, I am Mrs. Josephine C. Vaughn, member and editor of the San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society in California. Mrs. Ann Wissler, president of the society, is unable to be here today. Chairman Baring kindly said I might give this letter to the committee and speak for myself.

I retired in June after 35 years of teaching school, due to my almost lifelong interest in conservation.

Several years ago when the wilderness bill was under consideration, as a whim, I asked my class of 45 girls this: How many of you would like to go by yourselves, or with a few friends, camping, picnicking, or horseback riding to a place where there are no people?

Along with many other adults, I have thought our adolescent youngsters definitely wholly gregarious. In answer to my question, I will not say 40 hands were raised, but it looked as if there were that number. I really was overwhelmed.

Now, I will read Mrs. Wissler's letter:

Why spoil the most unique alpine wilderness area in all of southern California for more ski lifts?

One who welcomes a challenge would enjoy skiing in San Gorgonio Wilderness Area. In fact, numerous persons do enjoy wilderness skiing, hiking, studying, and just plain quiet solitude.

Henry David Thoreau wrote in the year 1854: "We need the tonic of wilderness. We can never have enough of nature." How much more these words apply to the year of 1964.

William Wordsworth said in the year 1810: "Certain lands should be deemed a sort of national property in which every man has a right and interest, who has an eye to perceive and a heart to enjoy." Let us keep San Gorgonio Wilderness Area for every man.

SRP05501

From "Paradise Lost" quote: "Accuse not Nature, she has done her part; Do thou but thine, and be not diffident. Of wisdom, she deserts thee not if thou dismiss not her."

We of San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society wish to keep San Gorgonio Wilderness for Nature and all of her admirers. Let us leave one small space on our high mountain where nature's lessons may be taught to all of humanity.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

You may proceed, Mr. Lamb.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD B. LAMB, UTAH AUDUBON SOCIETY, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am Harold B. Lamb, M.D., of 2604 Evergreen Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah. I have the privilege of speaking to you as a representative of the Utah Audubon Society and on behalf of the Utah Wildlife Federation, the Utah Nature Study Society, the Wasatch Mountain Club, and the Alpine Club. I should like to make a verbal statement to the committee and submit separate written statements from each group and other interested individuals. The combined membership of my representations is approximately 12,000.

The conservation groups and individuals I represent have consistently supported the concept of a wilderness preservation system and after 7 years of congressional hearings and debate believe that such legislation can and should be consummated in the 2d session of the 88th Congress. We have strongly supported S. 4 in the past and continue to do so because it provides adequate protection for primitive areas, whereas other recently introduced bills have failed to do so. This protection seems warranted since it is anticipated by most that the majority of primitive areas after completion of study will properly qualify for wilderness status.

However, since recent legislative proposals have perhaps opened the gates to permit some progress on this vital legislation, we are eager to cooperate where sacrifice of principle is not involved. My contacts will be confined principally to H.R. 9162, since it is my understanding that this committee intends to focus its attention primarily on this bill and others like it.

H.R. 9162's statements of policy and definition of wilderness are essentially the same as in S. 4 and prior bills and set the stage for what should be an historically beneficial piece of legislation. We do not object to section 3(b) which requires positive approval of Congress for reclassification of primitive areas as wilderness. We hope, however, that this section will not be used as a political subterfuge by those basically opposing wilderness preservation for further delaying protection of appropriate primitive areas. It would seem feasible to complete adequate studies and make recommendations to Congress on primitive areas within a 5-year period since most of these areas have been administered as such for many years—as a Utahan I specifically refer to the High Uintas Primitive Area. It should also be clearly stated that primitive areas, roadless areas in national parks and monuments, wildlife refuges, et cetera, will continue to be administered in their present state by the respective Secretaries involved until Congress has acted on recommendations by the President or until Congress has determined otherwise.

SRP05502

Both S. 4 and H.R. 9162, as well as other similar bills, specifically state that the establishment of wilderness areas, as defined, is not contrary to the Multiple-Use Act of 1960. In fact, this latter act provides, and I quote, "The establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with the purpose and provisions of this Act." Opponents of wilderness preservation plead this legislation represents single use even though recreation, education, scientific research, wildlife protection, and watershed preservation are just as separate and multiple use as lumbering, grazing, and mining. It would be equally legitimate or ridiculous, depending on your point of view, to label these latter uses as a single commercial use.

Under section 4(d)(2) of "Special Provisions," H.R. 9162 provides for unrestricted mining, including oil and gas production in wilderness areas for a period of 10 years after passage of this bill. Mining of any magnitude in wilderness areas would soon change the character of the involved lands to such an extent that they could not reasonably continue to qualify as wilderness. This very type of destruction has been in the past a significant factor in determining boundaries of presently designated wilderness areas. In addition, the administering Secretary would be faced with an insoluble problem in attempting to permit profitable production and at the same time insure protection of the wilderness character of the land. For these reasons, we cannot accept this portion of H.R. 9162 and recommend the substitution of the provisions of H.R. 9070 which provide for an inventory of mineral resources to be used in case of future emergent or vital need.

Hunting and fishing, if judiciously controlled, can be compatible with wilderness areas of national forests. Such activity in national parks and monuments should be in conformance with the philosophy expressed in the report of the Advisory Board on Wildlife Management, otherwise known as the Leopold Report.

There should be included in all wilderness preservation bills a detailed statement describing in clearly definable language proper public use objectives in both national forest, national monument, and national park wilderness areas.

Management of Federal-State-private land conflicts within wilderness holdings seem to present no great difference of opinion in all the bills submitted. Any acquisition of private property should by all means only be achieved whenever possible with full concurrence by the owner. Value of such property cannot always be equitably determined by its economic resale value.

To summarize: Conservation groups in Utah are wholeheartedly behind the enactment of wilderness preservation legislation. They prefer the present S. 4 version because it protects wilderness principles and areas more stringently than subsequent House introduced bills. In order to satisfy objections of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to the S. 4 type bills, we have accepted some of the new proposals of House sponsored legislation. Of these various bills the Saylor-Quie-Cohelan group seem to represent the best compromise, and we therefore express our support of these bills. Undoubtedly minor changes and recommended amendments may be added to these measures for their improvement.

As a concluding statement, I should like to point out that even if S. 4 or its equivalent were to pass the Congress at this session, the

continued preservation of wilderness will depend on an educated public attitude and concern which assigns the highest priority to wilderness values, not just for recreation, but as representing a profound contribution to human society.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Without objection, the statements submitted by Mr. Lamb will be placed in the record at this point.

(The statements follow:)

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM L. REAVLEY, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

My name is William L. Reavley and I reside at 3125 East 34th South, Salt Lake City. As chairman of an informal group of conservationists that meet every 2 weeks in this city, I've been asked to make a statement in their behalf. These people are practicing natural resource managers from various levels of government, they are university professors, professional men, and just citizens who feel a responsibility for future generations of Americans.

All favor the passage of a strong wilderness bill. President L. B. Johnson stated in his message to the Congress on the 8th of January that whether the bills before Congress fail or pass, the opportunity to vote should not be denied. We hope that deliberations of this committee will result in an early opportunity to place a wilderness bill on the floor of the House, as has already been done twice in the Senate.

Since your committee has not seen fit to go along with S. 4 we would favor a modified form of H.R. 9070 and other related bills. If the Dingell-Reuss-O'Hara-Bennett bill (H.R. 9162 et al.) is to receive most of the attention by the committee, we strongly urge that it be modified to contain the provisions of the Saylor-Quie-Cohelan proposal.

The group I am speaking for believe that the passage of a strong wilderness bill will not plunge the country into an economic depression, nor will it even affect adversely those engaged in mining, lumbering, livestock raising, and related endeavors. They do believe, however, that a bill setting aside a very small portion of this country for man's future inheritance will be a major achievement. Similar actions of Congress in the past has proven this to be a fact. Some of the most glorious chapters in this Nation's history involve the establishment of the National Park System and the national forest reserves. They and the wilderness areas will become even more priceless as our population increases.

STATEMENT OF AUSTIN L. WAHRHAFTIG, CHAIRMAN, CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

The members of the Wasatch Mountain Club, largely Utah residents, know and love the wild mountain areas of Utah and the adjoining States.

For several years we have watched with alarm the decrease in the size and number of the areas which could be considered wilderness. The voices of those interested in the moneymaking potential of these areas are loud. These demands for exploitation are only natural and in keeping with the past development of our country. However, the use of such areas for recreation has multiplied, in some cases, a hundredfold. It is our strong conviction that the increased recreational and inspirational needs of today and tomorrow call for immediate recognition of wilderness areas, as such, as vital national resources.

We hope to see sound wilderness legislation enacted soon. It seems to us that the bills S. 4 and H.R. 9070 come most nearly meeting what we believe to be the public need. We vigorously oppose changes which would extend the periods over which grazing, mining exploration, and other nonconforming uses will be permitted, or which will decrease the areas set aside as wilderness. We want a true Wilderness Preservation Act.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY B. MULAIK, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, UTAH NATURE STUDY SOCIETY

I am Stanley B. Mulaik, executive secretary of the Utah Nature Study Society which has a membership of over 400 scattered in over 30 communities of the State. To them as well as to thousands of others, wilderness areas have deep values. There is a great increase in numbers of those who enter wilderness and those who look into wilderness from its edge. All have a spiritual and psychological experience they never forget. These are lasting values to strengthen the moral fiber of America.

The major area in Utah with which we have a concern beyond such areas as are now in national parks and monuments is the Uinta wilderness area covering about forty-six hundredths of 1 percent of the State. This is about equal to the area dedicated to highway systems which, however, cut through much of the richest farmlands, and in recent years through residential areas of great value, while the wilderness area is at or above timberline far removed from rich farmlands and communities.

Those who have alined themselves against the wilderness bill on the grounds that it would be locking up resources are very unrealistic of the vast potential they have for the recreation of increasing numbers of people. These wilderness areas, with no exception, are important as watersheds which even under some protection by the Forest Service have been severely damaged in many instances by severe overgrazing. Is America so poor that it should heed the cries of that minute but highly vocal minority which seeks to get guarantees for rights to desecrate those last small areas by mining, lumbering, and grazing? I am sure that America is not so poor as to need the last remnants of minerals or the last scrawny timberline trees or the rare blades of grass which might occur in wilderness areas. If it is in such poverty, then we have had some ugly truths kept from us.

To argue that few visit wilderness is fallacious, because even those who might drive to its edge feel a spiritual uplift as they look off into an area where there is no pronounced desecration by commercial interests. The value of keeping some areas in wilderness for scientific studies should not be minimized. To argue against guaranteeing wilderness areas on the grounds that only a few hardy individuals can fully enjoy its blessings is very shallow. Would they argue to abandon gymnasiums, college athletics, tennis tournaments, and the Olympics because only the hardiest may participate?

We strongly support the wilderness bill, H.R. 9070 even though it has some unfortunate compromises with opposing interests. Greatly increased excursions by tourists and vacationers to the out of doors is predicted for the immediate decades ahead, and so it is urgent that our wilderness areas be given congressional guarantees for their future. We urge the passage of H.R. 9070.

STATEMENT OF MARGARET H. PIGGOTT, SECRETARY, UINTA REGIONAL GROUP, SIERRA CLUB

The Uinta Regional Group of the Sierra Club would prefer to see the wilderness bill S. 4 pass to the floor of the House of Representatives without delay. However, since controversy over this bill has caused deadlock, and since the passing of legislation is imperative it is thought that the Saylor bill, H.R. 9070, would form the best alternative, meeting the objections of the opposition halfway.

The thing of prime importance is to get a genuine bill to the floor of the House as soon as possible and if objections can be quashed by the most recent Saylor bill, it should be used to break the stalemate.

Wilderness legislation is imperative to the welfare of the American Nation in the face of an exploding population, and if it is ignored, or held up for too long in committee stage, erosion of what is left will take place. This has already started with the present controversy concerning the San Gorgonio wild area, and from these beginnings anything could happen to bring about the eventual

SRP05505

extinction of the wilderness areas by commercial interests, if they are not afforded congressional protection.

Wilderness is important to the people as a whole, and the areas in question are not of great economic value, except as a tourist possibility. They are important to the physical and mental well-being of millions of Americans, afford protection for wild game which are threatened with extinction, and form an invaluable service to ecological, botanical, and zoological studies in their natural habitat. The importance of commercial interests are small compared with the advantages of wilderness conservation given above, and even if geological surveys show the presence of much needed minerals (the surveys allowed in the latest bill H.R. 9070) they may be tapped with Presidential approval.

The lumber possibilities are small; grazing is permitted in wilderness areas. State water rights are preserved and the areas in question form only 8 percent of the total national forest area. Therefore the establishment of wilderness areas with congressional backing should not pull tightly on the Nation's economic pursestrings, or cause any real hardship; but the loss of these areas to minority interests will be a great loss to the American Nation in terms of scenic works of art, peace and solitude, and a place where "man leaves only footprints and takes only memories."

STATEMENT OF EDWARD G. RICHARDS, PRESIDENT, UTAH WILDLIFE FEDERATION, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Whereas the Utah Wildlife Federation, a nonprofit corporation of the State of Utah, is engaged in the promotion of conservation and recreation, we have a regard for areas that are still wilderness. We are a group composed of sportsmen and conservationists numbering some 12,000.

We, as well as many other citizens, have become concerned with the time it has taken for Congress to establish a national policy for wilderness and establish a proper program for its management. We hope that through the establishment of a wilderness system the American people of present and future generations will be secured an enduring resource preserved in its wilderness character.

We do feel that in all national forest wilderness areas, hunting and fishing should be permitted, and that these outdoor sports are not incompatible with wilderness preservation, provided, however, that the State fish and game departments shall maintain the jurisdiction with respect to the wildlife and fish in these wilderness areas. We feel that this generation must use its foresight to protect some areas from the encroachment of mechanization and urbanization or they will be forever lost.

We of the Utah Wildlife Federation recommend that prompt action be taken by the 88th Congress during its 2d session toward the passage of a sound wilderness bill.

STATEMENT OF WALTER P. COTTAM, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

I, the undersigned, Walter P. Cottam, ecologist, conservationist, and emeritus professor of botany, University of Utah, respectfully request that the following statement be incorporated into the proceedings of the hearings to be held at Las Vegas, Nev., on the several House bills pertaining to the establishment of a wilderness system comprising certain lands in the national forests, national parks, and wildlife refugees and ranges.

At the outset I wish to endorse in its entirety the speech given by the Honorable John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania in the House of Representatives November 7, 1963, and subsequently published in the Congressional Record. It is an excellent statement of the compromises necessary to placate the interests of a small minority of American citizens who continue to oppose the wilderness concept.

It seems abundantly clear that every generation of Americans will and should be judged by its stewardship of the land, a stewardship which implies an inescapable moral and social responsibility. Millions of our citizens who have visited our national parks during the past year and have received spiritual rejuvenation from them must surely bless our immediate forebears, who, through acts of Congress, had the foresight to establish these superb gifts of nature as national shrines for the enjoyment of this and future generations

Yet, Utah citizens, at least, have cause to feel regret and shame, for although over 70 percent of the State area is owned and operated by the Federal Government, not one single stretch of land outside the national parks is initially sched-

uled for inclusion in the proposed wilderness system, despite the fact that approximately one-third of the State comprises humid or subhumid mountainous terrain from which our people receive lifegiving water, the one great western resource that stands to gain most through the protective measures proposed by the Wilderness Act.

Certainly the glaring omission of all Utah watersheds from inclusion in the proposed wilderness system cannot be attributed to creative acts of God that failed to endow these areas with primeval beauty. Millions of dollars have been spent by the Forest Service in the construction of a paved highway from Kansas, Utah, up over the high Uinta Mountains to Evanston, Wyo. Essentially this highway was made not because of the timber it would unlock for industry nor for the new mineral wealth it would make more available, nor to alleviate traffic on established interstate highways or shorten distances between points, but primarily for the recreational opportunities it could afford all America. And the price was not too great, for there are few mountain highway loops in all our land that surpass this in sheer, dramatic beauty as it winds its way over a vast plateau that lifts man up into the clear, rarefied air above 10,000 feet where, on every hand, glacier-sculptured peaks rise majestically above forest-covered valleys studded by hundreds of clear, blue lakes—an apparent ideal wilderness.

In keeping with the Forest Service concepts of wilderness, there are few short roads leading from this major artery of travel into the subalpine valleys, but there are many trails. One soon discovers, however, that for the most part they are not fashioned by shovel and pick, but by the hooves of cows and sheep. During the few short weeks of summer, these animals devour far more of the tender growth of herbs and browse than a subalpine environment can possibly produce in a short growing season. Ecologically the high alpine and subalpine areas are ill adapted to the grazing of domestic livestock, but are excellent for the accommodation of various wild creatures and ideal for the recreational and scientific use as wilderness. It is high time that the people of Utah should demand a publicized cost accounting of this road together with the expenditures for the establishment and maintenance of the many attractive camping grounds that it serves. These figures could then be compared with the dollar returns from grazing, a nonconforming use that has already damaged this area and threatens to destroy it as a prime prospect of wilderness for generations. Hopefully our descendants will be wiser than we are, but certainly they will be poorer if this Congress fails to give the American people proper legislation in the establishment of an effective wilderness system.

The wilderness bills now pending before Congress are admittedly far from perfect. Over the years they have been modified by their sponsors to quiet the vociferous protests of those who oppose the wilderness concept. The compromise that permits the continuance of the nonconforming use of grazing is definitely contradictory to the very definition of "wilderness" as set forth in the bills themselves. Nevertheless I urge the careful consideration of the wilderness bill during the present session for several reasons. In the first place, I believe that this legislation is among the most urgent of any facing the Nation, since the problems involved are bound to worsen each year without congressional action. We as a Nation, like the world in general, are in the midst of a population explosion that is terrifying in its possibilities. We have been so immersed in the national scramble for quantity production that we have gone a long way toward devastating our country. In all our history we have never been so guilty of resource waste. The mad race for industrialization and the rapid increase of population have gone hand in hand with a shrinkage of our once extensive and diversified pristine wild lands. It seems quite certain that no future generation of Americans will have a chance to worry about wilderness areas to preserve because there will be none left, a sobering thought for a Congress concerned with the judgment of history.

That the American people want a favorable wilderness bill enacted into law seems evident from the fact that the bills have had bipartisan support and that the Senate has passed two of them with 85-percent majorities. This morning I was impressed by President Johnson's state of the Union message when he said, "Here in the Congress you can demonstrate effective legislative leadership by discharging the public business with clarity and dispatch, voting each important proposal up or voting it down, but at least bring it to a fair and final voting." He may not have had the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in mind when he made this remark, but he well may have had. Six years is a long time for the American people to wait for action on a bill as important to our country as the wilderness bill. Its delay by one man or by a group of men is no fair demonstration of the democratic process.

SRP05507

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *January 3, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: This letter is to inform you that the University of Utah Ute Alpine Club is unanimously in favor of the Wilderness Act as passed by the Senate and to be passed by the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

Sincerely,

KENNETH C. JESSEN,
Conservation Committee, Ute Alpine Club.

STATEMENT OF B. G. DICK, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

I would like to express my concern, as a citizen, for the fate of the so-called wilderness bill. There is no question in my mind that wilderness protection is in the public interest and that it is urgent. Any wilderness, outside Alaska, that is to be saved for the citizens of the United States will be saved in this generation. It is time, now, to recognize as a legitimate use of public land the preservation of a portion of it in a state as near to the primeval as is possible. This demands the most stringent restrictions on mining, grazing, logging, and other commercial exploitation, as well as vehicular traffic, hunting, and elaborately developed recreational facilities.

It appears, from the many public hearings that have been held in connection with congressional scrutiny of the wilderness bill in its several forms, that opposition to effective wilderness protection comes from those groups who stand to profit from essentially private exploitation of public land. This sort of opposition by its very existence argues in favor of legislative protection of wilderness.

Let us hope that our legislators can rise to this challenge, reflect the great public support for such measures, and pass a wilderness bill which will offer some real protection for wilderness and which will be comprehensive enough to include not just token bits and pieces of land, but a true wilderness system which will be the joy and wonder of generations to come.

Mr. BARING. We have John Davis, representing the Lahontan Audubon Society. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN DAVIS, M.D., PRESIDENT, LAHONTAN AUDUBON SOCIETY, RENO, NEV.

Dr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is John Davis; I am a physician from Reno representing the Lahontan Audubon Society. I consider it a privilege and obligation to speak at this hearing in support of a wilderness system.

Each generation's challenges are framed by the circumstances of the times in which they live. The vision of their leaders determine whether it has been an era of mediocrity or a time of progress.

Those of you that have been involved in consideration of a wilderness system over a number of years have listened to a spate of words on the subject. Most of these reflect thoughts that are based on sound reasoning and deep sincerity both for and against a wilderness concept.

As a father of three sons and admittedly a dreamer, I must add my own personal conviction that every man past, present, and future has a God-given right to his "Walden Pond"—a fount from which he may nourish his soul, cleanse his spirit and clarify his vision. This right has been man's heritage from biblical times when Christ and Moses each found inspiration in the wilderness. Now our generation is charged with the responsibility of assuring this right.

One vital point I would stress for your consideration. We are in the midst of a remarkable explosion in scientific knowledge. In medicine the past 20 years have seen discoveries that have revolution-

SRP05508

ized the treatment of disease. Antibiotics and heart surgery are dramatic examples of these changes. This is so marked that techniques used in the 1930's are now as outdated as the use of leeches in Washington's time. Parallel advances in all the basic sciences are occurring simultaneously. Rockets, electronics, and nuclear fission are altering our individual day-to-day life and the conduct of affairs between nations. Fortunately this gain in scientific knowledge is accelerating in accompaniment to the geometrical increase in world population. Advancement in science and technology in the next 50 years will defy the imagination of a Jules Verne. These will make possible sources of power and the synthesis of building materials that will antiquate and render pointless the exploitation of minerals and forests as we know them today. This is not only possible, it is an absolute necessity in order to support the population of the future since there is a finite end to our natural resources.

Our children and grandchildren will be warmed, lighted, and housed differently because of man's discoveries; but they must be guaranteed now the beauty of nature in its primeval state which is timeless and can only be marred and desecrated by man's efforts for momentary gain.

This year we in Nevada are celebrating the centennial of our statehood. Some of you come from States that have already experienced this honor and others from States that will yet achieve this landmark. It is vital for us here and now to consider Nevada's second centennial in 2064. The national park idea was the legacy of a previous generation for us almost a hundred years ago before the time of the automobile and the tin can. A wilderness system must be our generation's answer for the future.

In this regard I specifically support H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 as the bills most in keeping with the spirit of a wilderness system.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions on the part of the committee?

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would just like to compliment both Mr. Lamb and Dr. Davis on the statements they have presented here in substantiation of their thinking. I think these are very excellent statements.

Dr. Lamb, I only wish we had a little more time. I would like to discuss some matters with you. Perhaps we can privately.

One of them is the use of water, the water resource in the wilderness areas. It is something on which I have some very definite views. I hope to be able to make them coincide with the views of the people who want to preserve a wilderness area. I have a wilderness area in my district, an 800,000 primitive area as well, but the water is the lifeblood of this area I represent. I would hope that we can discuss this a little bit and come to a meeting of the minds.

Mr. LAMB. Very well.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Mr. WHITE. I would just like to join Mr. Westland in his remarks. I thought they were very excellent statements.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Dr. DAVIS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. LAMB. Thank you.

SRP05509

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Joe R. Momyer, M-o-m-y-e-r, president, Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness, San Bernardino, Calif. Robert Marshall will be heard at the same time. You may proceed, Mr. Momyer.

STATEMENT OF JOE R. MOMYER, PRESIDENT, DEFENDERS OF SAN GORGONIO WILDERNESS, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.

Mr. MOMYER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Joe Momyer. My home is in San Bernardino, Calif.; my occupation is that of a supervisor in the U.S. postal service. I am superintendent of window services at the main post office, San Bernardino, Calif.

As the president of the Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness, it is my privilege to present the following statement in support of the wilderness bill.

First, the Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness is an organization with a keen appreciation of the problems of wilderness preservation.

Our organization was formed just 1 year ago, in late January, to provide a focal point around which friends and supporters of the San Gorgonio wild area and of wilderness could rally. This was vitally necessary to meet a formidable attempt to break open the wild area for development of a major ski resort.

In this year our organization has grown rapidly to a membership of nearly 1,000—955 at last count—all concerned with defending wilderness in general and San Gorgonio in particular. Our function is to serve as an information service, a coordination organization, and a communications center for our members, for some 70 other organizations and for the general public.

We are proud to have an advisory board of widely known and respected conservationists, all experienced in, and deeply concerned with, the problems of wise land use.

Second, a good wilderness bill is important to the San Gorgonio wild area. Conversely, the problem of the San Gorgonio wild area is a nationally known example of the need for sound wilderness legislation.

San Gorgonio needs and deserves the stable and enduring protection that only a strongly supported and respected wilderness bill can provide. The threat of breakdown of this fine wild area began in 1938. It resulted in a USFS hearing in the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif., in 1942. It brought about a 2-day USFS hearing in San Bernardino, Calif., in 1947—and it is still a threat today.

The importance of San Gorgonio to the issue of national wilderness legislation lies in the words of the U.S. Senate when it passed the Wilderness Act.

> An increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition.

In southern California we face now the problems which ultimately will face all the rest of the country. As described in a booklet called

"California—Going, Going * * *," published by an organization called California Tomorrow:

> We continue to have 1,500 new neighbors a day, half a million a year; monstrous misplaced freeways; salty ground water supplies; park land scuffed and trampled like a pitcher's mound; a gray stink in the air. And like the great California grizzly, the "slurb" paws its way across the land of gold.

This is the moment of truth for this prime, nationwide example of the wilderness principle. We in southern California and the West should give overwhelming support to good legislation that will protect San Gorgonio now and other areas in the future when the tide of urbanization reaches them.

Third, the proponents of resort development on San Gorgonio claim that this could become the greatest ski resort in the West, and without hurting wilderness values, but we believe they are badly mistaken.

Let it be understood that we know, from personal experience, that San Gorgonio is the best natural area for skiing in southern California. We wish it to be known, also, that many of us enjoy resort skiing and use chair lifts. We know that a fine ski resort could be built on this mountain. However, we also know that San Gorgonio could never compare with a number of other major western ski resorts, such as Mammoth and Aspen, in terms of terrain and consistently adequate snow.

Incidentally, we would also express appreciation for the efforts, of San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc., the principal commercial developers seeking entry, to develop plans that would have an impact on wilderness values.

However, impact there would be—and a major one. This is illustrated by a remark of one of the developers who admitted that San Gorgonio did not have the finest terrain or the best snow season in the West, but who still claimed it would be "the greatest ski resort in the West because of its proximity to tremendous population." The implication is clear. The primary attraction for the promoter is the dazzling financial inducement. Were there no prospect of a financially lucrative development, we doubt that there would be much pressure to develop San Gorgonio.

The potential impact of development on wilderness values is very obvious to those of us who know this area well and are skiers. It is important to point out that many of the most ardent defenders of San Gorgonio are experienced skiers who know the mountain.

My own history perhaps will illustrate this point. I first enjoyed the San Gorgonio country on a fishing trip with my father in 1930. In January of 1934, 30 years ago, I made my first ski tour into Dollar Lake, in the heart of the present wild area. Through the years since, I have ski toured there every year, with the exception of 2 years in the Navy in World War II. With my family I have also enjoyed backpacking, fishing, hiking, ice skating, and camping within the wild area.

There are many other people who know this fine area as well or better than I do. We know that a ski development means at least 6 miles of high-standard access highway; bridges across creeks, parking areas for above 2,500 cars; many chair lifts and rope tows, with necessary engine houses; structures for restaurant, hospital, sanitary facilities,

ski-rental facilities, ski equipment, and clothing shops; public address speakers in the trees to beguile the lift lines with music; and assorted service roads for the maintenance of the facilities. This all would be planted in the heart of the wild area and would be visible from the higher trails, ridges, and peaks.

Four. Important existing values and uses that are compatible with wilderness would be damaged or destroyed.

The San Gorgonio wild area is now well used by horsemen, hunters (in season), ski mountaineers, snowshoers, fishermen, hikers, picnickers, backpackers, photographers, organization campers, Boy and Girl Scouts, school and nature study groups, water users, and many who simply seek beauty and solitude. All of these would be adversely affected by a large commercial development. Organizations representing these varied users have strongly endorsed the continued protection of the wild area. For example, the Bear Valley Mutual Water Co. and its prior right water companies, who have been putting the water from this area to productive use for over 100 years, are alarmed at the idea of development and have publicly expressed the view that "the public interest is best served by keeping the area in its present wild state."

The largest use is from 26 organization camps on the edge of the area. These camps had 284,700 man-days of use in 1962, many of them by underprivileged children from the cities, and contributed much to the 89,200 man-days of use within the wild area in that year.

Five. Development of the Dry Lake basin would block needed future expansion of present uses.

One of the results of the 1947 hearing was a small modification of the southern boundary of the wild area and an extension of the Forest Service road network to a parking area near the top of the steep initial ridge called "Poopout Hill." This was done as a concession to skiers, to make the interior of the wild area more accessible for skiing. It also made the interior of the wild area more easily reached by the general public. Use of South Fork Meadow and Dollar Lake has become so heavy that the Dry Lake area is needed for dispersion of hiking and camping activity to spread the load. Loss of the Dry Lake basin to a very large ski resort would eliminate the best opportunity for easing the pressures on these popular camping spots—a pressure that has been doubling every 5 years.

Six. Skiers themselves would ultimately lose through overcrowding and loss of beautiful ski-touring areas.

Despite the best intentions of the present promoters, we believe that any considerable development would bring further pressures that would finally force development to the very limit of financial, or economic, feasibility. This would create impact even beyond present plans.

Crowds drawn from the other 12 ski resorts in southern California, plus more from the expanding population, would soon swamp the ultimate capacity of the resort. Skiers who had anticipated long, open slopes and freedom from lift lines would find themselves as crowded and frustrated as before. Then they, as well as summer users, would be losers.

Seven. Ski touring, a wonderful sport, is compatible with wilderness and can give lasting enjoyment of the open slopes of San Gorgonio.

Only simple equipment is needed for enjoyment of ski touring. This sport is challenging, exciting, adventuresome, companionable, and requires no resorts, roads, or lifts. If the fine slopes on San Gorgonio are kept under wilderness protection, they will always be open to those who enjoy skiing and beauty enough to walk to them. Surely this is not a great price to pay. Yet, if protected, the area will never be so crowded as to lose its greatest charm, that of uncrowded, unaltered beauty.

More and more people are discovering this great kind of skiing enjoyment. We are glad to see that the growing interest in ski touring and ski mountaineering has caused the Far West Ski Association to start a training program for prospective ski tourers and ski mountaineers.

Eight. Artificial snowmaking offers hope for extending the ski season for existing resorts.

Current news stories offer the surprising information that there is as much depth of custom-made snow at some of our resorts, as of this date, as there is on San Gorgonio. Two independent on-the-spot checks in the past few days tell of 12 to 18 inches of snow above the 8,000-foot level on San Gorgonio. This is being matched by several of our ski resorts, such as Snow Summit and Holiday Hill with artificial snow. This gives hope that the desired longer ski season in southern California can be provided without spoiling San Gorgonio.

Nine. Population forecasts indicate that natural and wild lands will become increasingly scarce and valuable in the future, in the face of soaring population, while commercial recreational facilities, as well as public, will multiply without limit.

The Southern California Research Council estimates that the great metropolitan area of southern California, from Santa Barbara to San Diego, by 1980 will have a population in excess of 16,700,000, against something near 8 million now. Secretary of the Interior Udall, in a recent speech, said that the population of the Pacific Southwest will treble by the year 2000.

With every daily increase of 1,500 people in California, 375 acres of open farmland come under the blade of the bulldozer, to be used for subdivisions, roads, industry, public and private facilities. This amounts to 140,000 acres annually. At this rate, we can expect 3 million acres of bright open land to disapppear by 1980, under the searing program of growth.

With this phenomenal growth, mass recreation will increase. There will be more Disneylands, more Pacific Ocean parks, more San Jacinto tramways, bowling alleys, drive-in theaters, race tracks, sports arenas, and stadiums. If there is any value at all in scarcity, by 1980 our remaining wild lands should be priceless. Mass recreation will be abundant.

Ten. The U.S. Forest Service's 1947 decision was right.

In view of the foregoing, we, the Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness, believe that the 1947 decision of Chief Forester Lyle F. Watts, regarding San Gorgonio, is even more applicable today than it was then. He said:

> I fully appreciate the great public demand and need for additional downhill skiing areas in southern California and I recognize skiing as an appropriate form of forest recreation that should be encouraged by the Forest Service. I also recognize that San Gorgonio is an area well suited for a downhill skiing

SRP05513

development. At the same time, were the area opened as proposed, the loss of other public values such as wilderness skiing, ski touring, summer wilderness use, organized camping, and watershed values combined, would be greater than the public gain through development for downhill skiing.

True, there are more skiers now than in 1947, but that is in part because there are more people. It is interesting to note that the outdoor recreation commission report listed skiing as last among a large number of types of outdoor recreation in terms of recreation activity.

We also question whether the number of "snow hungry" skiers claimed for southern California is as great as represented. Instead of over 200,000, we suspect that there are nearer 50,000.

The basic issues have not changed. Only one new fact has emerged—the development of artificial snowmaking—and this helps to make the attack on the San Gorgonio wild area even more unjustifiable.

Conclusion. We agree with Justice William Douglas, who says:

Some of the unmarked face of America's wilderness must be left as a refuge for man—as a place where he can escape the roar of machines and once more get on understanding terms with the universe.

We ask you, the gentlemen on this committee, for the finest wilderness bill that can possibly be achieved, with the fullest possible agreement from all interested groups.

It appears to us that H.R. 9070 (Saylor), H.R. 9101 (Quie) and H.R. 9520 (Cohelan) constitute a fine group of bills with wide geographic backing and bipartisan political support. Any one of these bills, a combination of them, or H.R. 9162 (Dingell), suitably amended, would be fine.

We ask most earnestly, though, that no provision be considered in any such wilderness bill which would weaken the protection afforded our San Gorgonio wild area by the proposed Wilderness Act. Specifically, there must not be another amendment permitting a ski resort enclave on San Gorgonio.

We plead with you, gentlemen, to take a long look into the future and to secure for your descendants and ours "an enduring resource of wilderness," held in trust to be enjoyed as our Creator left it.

Mr. Chairman, we have submitted 58 statements from organizations and individuals, about 55 of which we screened and feel substantially enough to become a part of the record. We would appreciate that if it is possible.

Mr. BARING. The letters and statements received from Mr. Momyer will be made a part of the record, if they qualify, and placed in the file if they do not.

(The material follows:)

NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM,
San Diego, Calif., January 7, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The San Diego Natural History Society, with a membership in excess of 500, being the oldest society of its kind in southern California, wishes to go on record positively as in favor of maintaining the wilderness character of the San Gorgonio area of California. We consider it of utmost importance to preserve from any further encroachment this last remnant of natural heritage in the southern California mountains, for the sake of generations that will follow us and who will otherwise lack this wilderness place which has enriched our lives.

Sincerely,

E. YALE DAWSON,
Director of the Museum, Secretary to San Diego Natural History Society.

SRP05514

LONG BEACH AREA COUNCIL,
BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA,
Long Beach, Calif., January 8, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: This letter is written by the Long Beach Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, representing 10,653 boys and 4,613 volunteers in the Long Beach, Lakewood, Signal Hill, and Bellflower area of Los Angeles County, and is directed to the field hearings on the wilderness bills, which we understand are to be held by your committee in mid-January at Las Vegas, Nev.

It is the opinion of the Long Beach Area Council that the efforts to open up the San Gorgonio wilderness area for skiing and other commercial recreational purposes would be a tragic loss of the one remaining wilderness area accessible to Scouts and other groups interested in the out-of-doors in its natural state.

When the Mount San Jacinto tramway was constructed, it resulted in the loss of a considerable area of the wilderness of the San Jacinto Mountains, thus leaving practically no other areas in the high mountains of southern California available for hiking and camping in a natural setting other than the San Gorgonio area. The Long Beach Area Council maintains one of the finest high mountain camps in the United States near this area, being 640 acres situated at Barton Flats, only a short distance from Mount San Gorgonio. We have a fine camping site for our Boy Scouts which they are able to explore and camp in the wilderness area surrounding it. Many other youth groups, as well as church groups, have campsites in the general area and to open it up to commercialized, mechanized skiing and uses normally incidental to such operations would result in a great loss to thousands of men, women, and boys who enjoy the out of doors in its primitive condition.

In the opinion of our executive board, which has adopted a resolution opposing the opening of this area, there are ample other areas close by the San Gorgonio area which are available for mechanized skiing and commercial recreation. The San Bernardino Mountains, as well as the Idyllwild-San Jacinto area and Mount Baldy afford sufficient areas for this type of outdoor recreational use.

We feel that opening the San Gorgonio area to these people would be unfair to those who prefer other types of mountain outdoor wilderness activities, and that it would deprive them of the remaining area where it can be enjoyed at a relatively accessible distance from the metropolitan area of southern California. Therefore, we respectfully request that you retain and protect the San Gorgonio wilderness area from change into a commercial skiing area, and we ask that you pass the bills currently being considered by your committee which would establish the National Wilderness Preservation System, including the San Gorgonio wilderness area.

We also request that this letter be made a part of the hearing conducted at Las Vegas, Nev.

Very truly yours,

JAMES G. CRAIG, Jr., *Council President.*

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,
Iowa City, Iowa, January 6, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing you as an individual to encourage you to do whatever is necessary to get a wilderness bill that will adequately protect the designated remaining wilderness onto the floor of the House of Representatives for a long overdue vote and, in addition, I should like to be on record of your committee hearings as opposed to the desecration of the San Gorgonio wild area with the proposed ski resort. My reasons for taking the stand in favor of the wilderness bill and the protection of the San Gorgonio area can be illustrated by the analogy of a fat man at the table. The fat man got that way because he had not fostered the self-discipline to push himself away after eating a healthful quantity. If he wakes up in time, he can learn to control his gluttony and extend the healthy period of his life.

The gluttony of this country with regard to its natural resources is no different than the gluttony of the fat man. The people of this country have ravished the natural resources without regard to the longtime health of the country and the

 SRP05515

people in it. Unless self-discipline of this society sets in, the long decline in the health of the society is inevitable.

The instrument by which the individual controls his gluttony is willpower or self-discipline; the instrument by which society controls its gluttony is law. The time for House action on the wilderness bill is long overdue.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND F. SHEETS, M.D.

STATEMENT OF DUNCAN W. FREW, PLEASANT HILL, CALIF.

My occupation is a research chemist for a large oil company. As a private citizen I would like to express my thoughts concerning the wilderness bill. As you know, the bill was first introduced in the Senate 7 years ago; meanwhile valuable time has been lost. I feel that H.R. 9070 will provide the necessary protection to these areas, particularly those under consideration by Congress until final action is taken.

There are any number of reasons for preserving wilderness areas in their natural state. Unless some positive action is taken by this generation it will be too late for the next generation to save the last vestiges of some of the Nation's most beautiful and untouched lands. Why save these lands? I am sure that I express the feelings of most Americans when I say that I would like to leave these areas for the next generation to admire and enjoy in the same way I have. Are we to be a nation of overcrowded cities with their attendant slum areas, overdeveloped parks, and miles of roads with no place to go? In these times of mounting population it is necessary to escape from the pressures of civilization. Development of these lands by a few who seek financial gain would certainly not be in the best interests of the American people. I strongly urge you to take immediate action on H.R. 9070 since time is of the essence. Each year much valuable land, virgin timber, and wildlife is sacrificed to provide roads and to supply an ever-increasing population.

There are those who seek to "develop" these lands; witness Yellowstone or Yosemite National Park at the height of the summer season. These developed parks are veritable slum areas, a complete perversion of the original intent to preserve the unspoiled wilderness areas. Another area, for example, in which very little conservation has been practiced is Lake Tahoe. Here commercial interests in the absence of any protection have created a blighted area which was once one of the most scenic areas in the United States. The San Gorgonio area may suffer a similar plight due to its proximity to Los Angeles, and all efforts should be made to protect its integrity.

These are a few of my reasons for urging you to support a strong wilderness bill, keeping in mind that development in the wilderness is an irreversible process.

FULLERTON JUNIOR COLLEGE,
LIFE SCIENCES DIVISION,
Fullerton, Calif., January 7, 1964.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We members of the life sciences division staff, Fullerton Junior College, urge that a wilderness bill be passed and that all of the present San Gorgonio Wilderness Area be included in the bill. Being biologists, and living and working in such a densely populated area as this Los Angeles area, we are particularly cognizant of the importance of natural surroundings for all those who need places of peace and quiet and relaxation, and the proximity of the San Gorgonio wilderness to the Los Angeles area makes its preservation particularly vital. Also being biologists, we recognize the importance of preserving natural surroundings as places for biological studies and field trips, and again the San Gorgonio wilderness is vital because of its relatively nearness to many biologists and their students. For these reasons we urge favorable action on the wilderness bill, and that of San Gorgonio Wilderness Area be included. We respectfully request that our position be made a part of the record of the Las Vegas hearings.

(Twenty signatures.)

SRP05516

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
January 6, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing as a private citizen, a resident of California, physicist by profession. I request that this letter be made part of the hearing record of the Las Vegas, Nev., January 13–14 hearing.

I would like to urge support for passage of a strong wilderness bill. I realize that the question of multiple use is a many-sided one, but I believe that there is one argument that must be considered as the most important one: Once the wilderness is destroyed, it cannot be regained. Those who benefit from the wilderness are not well organized as are most of the commercial interests who would like to use the land, and therefore at this time they do not speak very loudly. However, once the land is developed, it will cease to be of use as wilderness recreational land and will not even then be of much use to the developers—and those who wish to find wilderness then will wish that we had had the foresight to set aside land while we still could.

I do not believe that any particular areas should be exempted or be given special status. I refer in particular to San Gorgonio, in southern California. I myself am a skiier and can understand the skiiers' interest in skiing there, but I believe that it is more important to preserve this (and other similar areas) as wilderness than as commercialized ski areas. There are many ski areas and other such developed recreational areas, but few such wilderness areas.

I appreciate this opportunity to express my opinion on the wilderness bill, and hope that you will believe that there are many more like me who feel as I do but who will remain unheard.

Sincerely,

JOHN ARMITAGE.

CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
PALOMAR DISTRICT,
CALIFORNIA GARDEN CLUBS, INC.,
La Mesa, Calif., January 8, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The Palomar District of California Garden Clubs, Inc., is composed of 22 garden clubs in San Diego County, with a combined membership of 1,585 members. After each club was appraised of the upcoming wilderness hearings at their regular meeting Wednesday, January 8, 1964, they voted unanimously to go on record in favor of a wilderness bill without any amendments excluding any part of the San Gorgonio area, and, request that this statement be made a part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearing.

Very truly,

TOM J. CLARK, *Chairman.*

JANUARY 8, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: This letter is directed to you with regard to the forthcoming hearings on the wilderness bill.

In line with my occupation, I have traveled over a good part of the world in the last 18 years and have always been impressed with the ability of some countries to preserve their natural beauty and resources as compared to our national efforts to do so.

As a senior sales representative, international sales, Douglas Aircraft Co., I have spent a great deal of time in Europe and observed in particular that nations such as Switzerland, Austria, Germany, Scandinavian countries, Italy, and Spain have been able to keep large parts of their country in a completely natural state or have, at least, proper zoning that prohibits "junky" commercialism, signs, and billboards in scenic areas where they are incompatible with the environment. Many European cities have retained a feeling of naturalness and orderliness that we have lost even in many parts of our so-called country areas. Most important, this has been accomplished by countries, manifold more populated per square mile than is much of the United States with its vast areas.

SRP05517

It really is unfortunate that a country the size of ours has less than 2 percent of its total areas dedicated to the natural wilderness preservation system. With the space we have and the urgent need to preserve some of our scenic beauty, it is amazing that areas set aside as "wilderness" are not at least twice as large as they are. It should be noted that many areas in need of immediate protection are located near large population centers.

In some primitive areas no adverse effects are created by permitting mining or cattle grazing under controlled conditions. Also in some wilderness areas, dirt roads and certainly more trails would be useful. In the High Sierras of California I have seen old trails deteriorate from lack of maintenance; yet within a few miles a six-lane freeway across the mountains is being proposed.

We must accept the fact that, as citizens and as a nation, we have not yet demonstrated the ability of other people and other countries to save primitive beauty and naturalness.

We will, in time no doubt, develop methods that will permit resort development within primitive scenic areas but, until such time as this can be done without detrimental effects on areas we wish to preserve, a strong wilderness bill, without special concessions for some areas, is a must.

In reviewing our past efforts to save scenic or recreational areas, it becomes apparent that often our better instincts for proper zoning or conservation have too often been overridden by pressure from small groups for selfish reasons.

A perfect example of an area that needed protection but never received it is the Lake Tahoe area on the California-Nevada border.

The type of development there has not only destroyed a great deal of the original beauty but the development of subdivisions now threatens the pollution of the lake by sewage. It may be too late to save this area, but others equally as scenic and representative of many parts of our land as it originally existed, can still be saved by the passage of a strong wilderness bill and one not diluted by powerful, but nevertheless, minority groups.

Now, with reference to the situation at Lake Tahoe, I would like to point out to our good neighbors in Nevada, that no disparaging comments are meant to be directed against nightclubs, gambling, or outgrowths of either. Along with many others, I enjoy both and particularly as they are so well combined in Reno, Las Vegas, and the Nevada State Capital of Carson City. The latter city may lack large nightclubs but it is the "biggest little" State capital in the United States and one of the most interesting.

The point being made here is that people, and those that represent the people, should by now begin to realize that certain areas worth being protected must be protected for those that wish them in their natural state or close to it. This can be done without depriving those that wish the more gaudy nightclubs and crowed ski lifts from having them but they should be approved for areas where they are appropriate. To try to mix the two, at least so far in our country, just does not seem to work out and it is for this reason that we must pass a strong bill to increase the size of our primitive and wilderness areas and protect them. In their natural state, they have a beauty that is unequaled anywhere in this world.

Areas near large population centers, such as Los Angeles, must be given attention. One in particular is the San Gorgonio wilderness area. We need to set aside some true primitive areas near the Los Angeles "asphalt jungle"—locations where people can visit and see truly unequaled natural beauty. Protection of the San Gorgonio area is important and no amendment to the wilderness bill should be passed which would exclude this area.

There are hundreds of others also which should be protected. Parts of the California-Nevada High Sierras and sections in Arizona between Sedona and Cottonwood, where already unattractive structures are being thrust in among some of the most beautiful scenery in the world, are only two examples and there are many more.

I feel what you gentlemen who have the power to act should do is to evaluate the feasibility of including other areas that need to be included in the wilderness bill and not try to find any ways to dilute the strongest bill proposed. The first step is to pass the strongest bill you can and add other areas as soon thereafter as possible.

European friends of mine, who have seen parts of our country such as the Sierra-Nevada Mountains, Oak Creek Canyon, and Monument Valley, have all said: "You people do not seem to realize what you have in your country—when are you going to start taking care of it?"

Our Federal budget for 1964 is now approximately $100 billion and the allocation of this expenditure is certainly being given the attention it deserves. However, it does seem appropriate at this time to plan on spending just a small percentage of our taxes for the purpose of keeping some of "America's front and back yards" as attractive as they were when we were fortunate enough to inherit them.

I respectfully request this letter be made a part of the wilderness bill hearing now scheduled to be held in Las Vegas January 13–14, 1964.

Very truly yours,

R. P. BRUSH,
Los Angeles, Calif.

LEFFINGWELL SCHOOL,
Whittier, Calif., January 6, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: As an educator and conservationist I have been very disturbed by the pressure tactics of certain groups attempting to invade our wilderness areas. Our history has been one of waste and destruction of our natural resources. This approach to our country's riches can no longer be tolerated.

The children we are educating must be left some of the wonders of nature; unspoiled and beautiful. How can we teach the heritage of our Nation to young people who are unable to find it in their daily lives?

I would like to urge passage of a strong wilderness bill and encourage you to not exclude the San Gorgonio wilderness from the bill. I also request that this statement be made part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings.

Sincerely,

BERNARD B. CAMENSON, *Vice Principal.*

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF NORTH ORANGE COUNTY,
Fullerton, Calif., January 7, 1964.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

CHAIRMAN BARING AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: Because of its appropriateness to the bills at issue the Fullerton Saturday Morning Y's Men's Club would like to have the following resolution, passed on June 6, 1963, made a part of the wilderness bill field hearing to be held at Las Vegas, January 13, 1964:

Whereas the youth of America vitally need the strength of body and spirit best promoted by healthful outdoor camping and communication with God and nature, away from the rush and bustle of man's pretentions; and

Whereas rapidly growing southern California is in danger of losing the last remaining major mountaintop wilderness to the same interest groups that have preempted use of and spoiled the wilderness characteristics of the other major peaks of this region; and

Whereas the San Gorgonio wilderness area in question, including Dry Lake (a misleading name) and the surrounding area, serves the program of a score of youth-serving camps in the region, including Camp Osceola, maintained by the YMCA's of Orange County: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Saturday Morning Y's Men's Club of Fullerton urges support for a strong wilderness bill (S. 4 or H.R. 930) not to exclude from its protection portions of the present San Gorgonio wild area.

Respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN G. GRAY,
Program Vice President.

SRP05519

LONG BEACH COUNCIL, CAMP FIRE GIRLS, INC.,
Long Beach, Calif., January 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: In 1962 and again in 1963 the Long Beach Council of Camp Fire Girls voted two resolutions. The first favored the passage of a wilderness bill similar to those enacted by the Senate. The second specifically requested that the entire San Gorgonio wild area be retained in its primitive state and that commercial developments and ski lifts not be permitted there.

As the population explodes in southern California, we have watched one beautiful area after another, on mountains, desert, and seashore, disappear under the bulldozer of the freeways, factories, and suburbs. The trend continues, even though each weekend finds the remaining recreational areas hopelessly overcrowded with persons trying to escape the hectic city life. Inasmuch as local business interests tend to favor increased population and industralization, it appears that the Federal Government must take action to preserve at least some natural areas from commercial exploitation.

Conservation has been defined as wise use. What wiser use could be made of our areas of natural beauty than in the development of the character of our youth? We have been fortunate in our organization to observe the striking improvements which can be effected in the characters of our young people through experiences in camping and hiking. (See p. 2 of this letter.) Our program includes a progression of outdoor skills for the girls, beginning with simple day camping for 7–9-year-olds at our in-town campsite (soon to be swallowed by the Riverside Freeway). The girls progress to our 240-acre mountain camp (one of the three proposed routes for a freeway to Big Bear). Girls 12 and over can take 3-day backpack hikes in the San Gorgonio wild area (threatened by ski lift commercial interests), where they can enjoy the thrill of living away from civilization and of climbing southern California's highest mountain. Then the 16–17-year-old groups can take a week's hike in the high Sierra.

National parks and forests were created for the benefit of all citizens, not only for miners, stockmen, lumbermen, and downhill skiers, although all have some claim.

This council favors the passage of a bill such as H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9101, in order to give maximum protection to at least a portion of our remaining wilderness. And we specifically request the preservation of the entire San Gorgonio wild area.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

MRS. JOHN W. GERHART, *President.*

During each summer groups of girls (age 16–17) who have trained in the San Gorgonio and San Jacinto wild areas plan and take 7-day backpack hikes along parts of the John Muir Trail in the Sierra Nevada wilderness areas and national parks. They are enthusiastic about these hikes and very appreciative of the privilege of viewing such glorious scenery, which, they say, looks more beautiful because they earned it. Accepting the challenge of hiking for a week in the wilderness is thrilling for each girl. But for the leaders, the greatest source of satisfaction is watching the development of esprit de corps, the welding of a dozen girls into a group of fast friends. Included below are excerpts from the reports written by some of the girls who, in July 1963, made the 40-mile hike from Tuolumne Meadows in Yosemite southward via the John Muir Trail to Rainbow Falls below Devil's Postpile.

Patricia Becker (Wilson High School), Long Beach: "The annual Sierra pack trip is one the best activities Camp Fire offers. I seriously feel that it is one of the most rewarding experiences in my life. If I hadn't had this opportunity, I could never have gained the appreciation of nature which this trip gave me. At 17 a girl has a genuine appreciation for her surroundings and beauty. Witnessing the beauty of such awe-inspiring places as Ritter, Banner, the Minarets, Lake Ediza, and Shadow Creek thrilled me. We all reached our destination, Red's Meadow, with a feeling of accomplishment. I can't deny the fact that it was difficult, and at times I felt terribly discouraged, but it was worth ever ache and pain. You have to be put to a test such as this to realize your physical and emotional capacity. This not only strengthened us physically but emotionally and mentally too. We learned to cope with our problems without

complaining * * *. It was an unforgettable experience and one which I'll always cherish."

Carole Lincoln (Long Beach Poly High School), Long Beach: "* * * I learned much more about camping by taking this trip than any other time, and I became more confident in my camping skills * * * I was able to see more variety of nature than in our local mountains. Since I am interested in nature, I enjoyed it very much. The scenery was magnificent. I had never seen scenery like this before. I really enjoyed my trip to the Sierra and will remember it forever * * *."

Lani White (Wilson High School) Long Beach: "I feel that a trip similar to the hike we took would be a rewarding experience for any girl. It brings her even closer to nature than her days at camp. And because the group has to work so closely together, friendships become closer. This trip is a wonderful once-in-a-lifetime experience for girls."

Radene Minyard (Lakewood High School), Lakewood: "The most important thing about our trip was the experience. Gosh, I experienced and learned so much: Such things as different ways of building fires, how to prepare the dehydrated foods, what kind of clothes to take, etc. The trails and campsites were really nice, very clean. The meals were really great, especially the dinners. The scenery was beautiful. I would surely recommend this kind of trip to any girl."

Nancy Carroll (Millikan High School), Long Beach: "The Sierra trip was a very exciting experience for me, a wonderful experience. * * * The spot we chose for our hike was beautiful."

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 7, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The wilderness bill, twice passed by the Senate, is in your hands for recommendation to the House of Representatives. The measure relates only to Federal lands already set aside from commercial use within the wildlife refuges, the National Park System, and specifically designated portions of the national forests. All of the lands possibly affected comprise less than 2 percent of the United States.

All the opposition and attempts at delay come from commercial interests that aim to make a profit from this tiny remainder of original America, no matter what they may do to it.

If we are to have wilderness, we must act now to preserve it where it is. Protecting it harms no one and consumes nothing, for it can be used later if really needed. But if we let it erode away while we haggle over the fine points, there will be little or none left in a few more years.

We ask your help in preserving this last remnant of wilderness, and also in protecting all areas under consideration, just as though they were already in, until a final decision can be made on each one. We urge you to make no exception in the San Gorgonio wild area in southern California.

The Saylor-Quie-Cohelan bills would not interfere with any established uses of the areas in question, and would provide for wilderness protection without added cost or interference with other programs.

We urge you to recommend "do pass" on H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, and H.R. 9520.

Please make this letter a part of the record of the Las Vegas hearing.

Sincerely,

NATHAN C. CLARK,
Registered Engineer and Industrial Manager.

JOAN D. CLARK,
Mrs. N. C. Clark
Homemaker and Mother of Three Children.

EL CAJON, CALIF., *December 30, 1963.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a lover of the wilderness, as a member of the 22,500-member Sierra Club, and as a leader of over 30 high-school-age Explorer Scouts, I am deeply concerned that an adequate wilderness preservation system be established now.

I spend most of my leisure time taking high-school-age boys on wilderness trips where they can learn by experience the character traits that have made the great leaders of the world and that make a successful businessman. Physical fitness to combat modern-day TV-itis, etc., is another important value of this program. Each day another commercial development erases some of the wilderness that affords a training and proving ground for tomorrow's men. It is therefore important to me that the wilderness we have already set aside be preserved permanently.

The wilderness bill as embodied in H.R. 9070 will provide the protection I seek while allowing Congress to review each parcel to determine in detail the way it should be handled.

Living in southern California where the closest real wilderness is the San Gorgonio wild area, I am particularly concerned that no amendments be added to the wilderness bill which would exclude any part of the San Gorgonio wild area from the full provisions of the bill.

We as a nation cannot afford to fiddle away any longer while one of our greatest heritages is dissipated by commercial interests. We must act now to preserve what is left and study systematically the needed use of each specific area.

I urge you to report out H.R. 9070 favorably as it now reads.

Please include this statement in the official records of the January 13–14, 1964, hearings at Las Vegas, Nev.

Sincerely yours,

DON M. DECK.

CAMP FIRE GIRLS,
MT. SAN ANTONIO COUNCIL, INC.,
Pomona, Calif., December 31, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I have had great concern over the possible weakening of the wilderness bill, and am writing to urge the passage of a strong bill without an amendment excluding any part of the San Gorgonio wild area.

Camp Fire Girls, Mount San Antonio Council, with a membership of 7,000 girls and 2,700 adults, owns and operates a camp in the vicinity of the San Gorgonio wild area. Our girls, through the years, have hiked the primitive trails and camped in the virgin forest. The memories they have carried back to the city will never be erased. In our southern California cities where macadam is fast replacing the rural areas of our childhood, it would seem that we must save this place of beauty for the generations of the future.

Commercial ventures such as ski lifts can only bring great traffic to the area with accompanying litter, fire hazards, etc.

On behalf of all those campers of the past and in the future, may I urge you to vote only in favor of a strong bill giving as much protection to the wild areas as possible—no exclusions.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. LENORE SILVEY,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT OF HERLEY GAYMAN, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

I am a securities broker in the Wilshire district of Los Angeles, and am testifying as a private citizen.

The need for a strong wilderness bill has increased like a mathematical progression each of the 5 years we have been campaigning for its passage.

It is the duty of Congress, regardless of the tangle of rules in which it has become enmeshed, to carry out the will of the people. It is their will that a wilderness bill protecting the wilderness from exploitation, protecting its boundaries from political manipulation be enacted now.

It is their will to preserve for present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness that will serve public purposes including recreational, scenic, scientific, educational conservation, and historical uses and enjoyment for all the people.

Southern Californians are especially concerned that there be no amendment excluding the San Gorgonio wild area from the bill.

SRP05522

DESOMOUNT CLUB,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 5, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMITTEE MEMBERS: I am conservation chairman for the Desomount Club, an organization whose membership of 350 includes a large proportion of nature science professors from the colleges and universities in this area, teachers in local schools, and others interested in nature.

For the past 5 years our organization has given a do-pass recommendation on wilderness bills.

We feel strongly that: (1) A national policy for protection of our wilderness areas should be established, (2) that wilderness areas should be set up so that change in status can be brought about only by congressional action, (3) that pending such action areas being considered should be protected as though they were part of the wilderness system.

Much of the greatness of our Nation stems from our heritage from those whose wilderness experience gave them a sense of true values: courage, determination, and an exultation in overcoming hardships.

Our frontiers have pushed westward clear to the Pacific Ocean, leaving only the less exploitable high tops and the ocean depths to challenge our youth.

If our Nation which has utilized 98 percent of our land, in many cases "used up the land," is now so poor it must exploit the remaining 2 percent, there is little hope for the future. That 2 percent cannot last long.

Preservation of the very last 2 percent will be of immeasurable value to society.

San Gorgonio wild area; as southern Californians we are most anxious that our one remaining high mountain wilderness area be preserved for its 11 million people, that there be no amendment excluding any part of the San Gorgonio wild area.

Respectfully yours,

DESOMOUNT CLUB,
MRS. EVELYN GAYMAN,
Conservation Chairman.

RINGWOOD, ILL., *January 8, 1964.*

DEAR MR. BARING: I am writing you to encourage you to pass the bill numbered H.R. 9070. I am a self-employed iron worker and my business keeps me from spending more time in the wilderness. The time spent in the wilderness areas is far too little but every chance we get, we go. The grand pleasure my family and I get (there are eight of us) from thinking and knowing that there are wilderness areas still left for us to enjoy. I am sure there are thousands of people who are not able to get to a wilderness area but still think of the beauty and solitude and plan and dream of going. To let anyone ruin these areas by mining or lumbering or putting in ski areas or any other man-made products. It would destroy the dreams of many. The only other suggestion I could make would be that other so-called marginal land could be made into wilderness areas also.

Yours very truly,

MR. AND MRS. VICTOR A. HOPP AND FAMILY.

JANUARY 8, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing to urge your favorable consideration of a strong wilderness bill which will preserve a portion of our great heritage for ourselves and future generations. I further request that this statement be made a part of the record of your Las Vegas hearings.

Visitation of wilderness areas, getting away from civilization with its smog, noise, litter, etc., and observation of nature has been a source of enjoyment to me and my family for many years. I believe that it is very important to the welfare, health, and education of my children and theirs to preserve portions of this wilderness environment so that they, too, will be able to get away from the rigors of shoulder-to-shoulder civilization.

I think it is especially important to have some of these "preservations" as close as possible to the centers of population so that they are more readily available

to more of the people who have restricted travel time and budgets. Thus, in particular, our local San Gorgonio Wilderness Area now provides this valuable service to civilization for a day, a weekend, a week, or more on a year-round basis. There are certain forces at work now which would develop a ski resort with 14 lifts, restaurants, hotels, 5,000-car parking lot, etc., etc., right in the very heart of the scenic beauty of San Gorgonio. This would destroy the area as a wilderness for all time. Thus the self-interests of a few promoters only interested in the money and a small segment of the population, the skiers, would deprive present and future generations from enjoying this open space. The present generation is manifested by more than 30 camps ("Y," Scouts, church, youth, etc.) in adjacent areas as well as the many individuals and families who can and do go into this beautiful mountain setting.

I feel certain that although the San Gorgonio situation is a small, isolated example, it is probably representative of many situations throughout the country and I believe that stringent protection should be set up for preserving a suitable network of wilderness areas.

In the way of personal background, I am employed by an oil company as a senior research chemist, I am a member of the local YMCA, my wife is a member of the board of directors of the YWCA, my son and I went through the "Y" Indian guide program (which included a number of hikes and campouts at the "Y" camp Osceola bordering the San Gorgonio wilderness) and we have enjoyed many happy hours in some of the more remote mountains and deserts of the entire Southwest.

Very truly yours,

W. W. HOWLAND, *Anaheim, Calif.*

FULLERTON JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Fullerton, Calif., January 8, 1964.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I wish to take this opportunity to express my wholehearted and enthusiastic support for passage of the wilderness bill. Legislation established by the wilderness bill should provide for no exceptions to type of use of officially designated wilderness areas.

Although I have enjoyed excellent conditions for spring skiing on the north face of Mount Sam Gorgonio in past years, I oppose strongly the construction of a ski lift and resort in this area. Although this area is somewhat remote for a 1-day round trip by foot, thus limiting actual available time for skiing, there are many other ski facilities which can be reached by car in southern California. An overnight camp at South Fork Meadows or even at Barton Flats, with an early morning start up the trail, would allow ample time for skiing under the summit ridge of Greyback, for enthusiastic skiers, however.

To invade the last few remaining areas of true wilderness in southern California with the artificial structures of man for the purpose of providing ease of access for even many skiers, seems highly inconsistent with our supposed concept of conservation and proper utilization of wilderness in this country. As the population of southern Califrnia zooms, the pressures produced by tightly packed urban and metropolitan living, intensified by traffic snarls, etc., should produce an even greater proportionate demand for wilderness recreation. If one of the best local areas which now provides this type of recreation, with its cherished spiritual values, is intruded by construction of the proposed ski resort, it can no longer furnish the same peace of mind for those who delight in the beauty of the forest primeval. Wilderness qualities and commercial construction cannot coexist in the same area. Furthermore, if the proposed ski resort is established in the Dry Lake area it is highly unlikely that other nearby choice locations such as Dollar Lake, will remain unaffected for long. Many Boy Scouts have fond memories of an overnight encampment at Dollar Lake or the thrill of ice skating there in the fall.

There is precious little opportunity for real wilderness recreation left in southern California today. Let's preserve what little we have left.

Sincerely,

G. M. BADEN,
Life Science Counselor.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 9, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am pleased to note that hearings are being held on the wilderness bill. Unfortunately, I am unable to testify at the hearings so I would like to request that the following be incorporated in the record of the Las Vegas hearings.

Although I am a member of the Sierra Club, an organization dedicated to the exploration, enjoyment, and preservation of the natural scene, it is perhaps more important to note that I am a citizen who loves the unspoiled natural beauty of the out of doors and the recreational satisfactions and benefits it offers. I wish very much to see portions of it securely set aside in a National Wilderness Preservation System for present and future enjoyment by people of our own and succeeding generations. Today such lands are undergoing ever-increasing use from the ever-growing population of our country and I feel that it is imperative that protection be extended to natural lands, especially near large cities, so that at later times, when population pressures are even more intense than at present, there will be at least as much unspoiled natural countryside as there is now—not less. Lands once removed from wilderness status and changed by development cannot ever (at least in our lifetimes) be returned to it and the enjoyment and recreation possibilities are forever lost.

I personally find hard to understand objections to even the strongest of the proposed wilderness bills. Present use and administration of the lands considered for inclusion would be changed very little and few present users would be affected. Furthermore, the position of wilderness preservation, within the multiple-use concept would be clarified and correct allocation of Federal lands for various uses could proceed with less interference than at present.

Two other points. Within the national forest wild and wilderness areas, all of which would presumably be incorporated into the lands covered by the wilderness bill, one is controversial. That is the San Gorgonio wild area. A portion of this area is being requested for use as a ski resort development. Although I am an extremely enthusiastic skier, I feel that this development should be denied and the natural character of this area be preserved, for the reasons given above. This area's unique position of being an unspoiled wilderness very near to an extremely large metropolitan area makes it doubly imperative that it be given full protection under the wilderness bill.

Also, it would be extremely desirable that at least some of these hearings be scheduled on Saturdays, so that those of us who cannot get time off from our work could still have an opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. JALI.

STATEMENT OF HARRY GILBERT, CHAIRMAN, CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT, LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The San Gorgonio Wilderness Area, though small, includes the finest mountain country in southern California. This area doesn't need to be improved; God did that thousands of years ago.

Extensive road systems for "planned recreation" always mean crowds and crowds always include some campers who are trashy, many day-at-a-time picnickers, and all too often, some who are potential fire hazards. Beer cans line the roads and paper cups follow the streams.

Please help us to keep this one, small area as nearly natural as possible; what it has always been, a wild area. In doing this you will allow literally thousands of summer-camp young people to learn to love real woods and mountains. And, incidentally, you will earn the deep gratitude of the more than 1,200 of us who own (and pay taxes on) cabins in this area; people who have loved this place so much for so long.

 SRP05525

OLYMPIC COLLEGE,
Bremerton, Wash., January 7, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: It has come to my attention that pressure is again being exerted to declassify part of the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area for development as a ski resort. I am an avid skier as well as a hiker and camper. For several years I worked at Camp Yallani and Camp Wassagan, two of the many youth camps which use the wild area extensively for hiking and camping trips. Because of this experience, I realize that commercial development of any wild area would seriously hamper, and in many cases eliminate, the benefit of the area to youth groups. There are many other areas in southern California which are suitable and could be developed for skiing, leaving the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area for the use of the many hundreds of hikers and campers who enjoy it each year.

Speaking as a skier, I would again urge that the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area be protected as a wilderness area. This area is one of the only areas in southern California which is suitable for ski touring (cross-country skiing). Interest in this activity has been increasing steadily.

I would strongly urge that the entire San Gorgonio Wilderness Area be protected by the passage of the wilderness bill, H.R. 930, without amendments which would allow the establishment of ski resorts within the wilderness boundaries. It is my request that this letter be included as a part of the hearing record at the hearing on the wilderness bill.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH JEWELL,
Assistant Director of Outdoor Education.

WHITTIER, CALIF., *January 3, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please make this request a part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings.

I am asking that the national wildlife refuges and ranges, as in parks and monuments and wilderness areas, be kept as they are, since the overall total is less than 2 percent of our Nation's land.

This is a retired schoolteacher writing and a grandmother many times over, and I covet for all the dear children living, and as yet, unborn, the privilege of seeing nature in its original state.

I belong to a very active audubon society here in Whittier. If you could see the eager youngsters who attend our meetings with their parents and who show such avid interest in all aspects of nature, on our field trips, you would do all you possibly could be preserve the loveliness of nature in its pristine condition for the benefit of these and millions of other children.

San Gorgonio, being close to us, is of deep interest to all of us in this area. If San Gorgonio were to be opened up and roads put in, fire hazards would increase. In our dry country, this is a very serious menace.

The natural, primitive atmosphere will disappear, there will be more litter and destruction too.

I know many here who are natives of California, as I am, and those who have adopted our country, who love it just as dearly as we do, who will appreciate anything you can do to keep our wilderness areas in tact, just as they are.

Thank you,

MRS. GRACE GORE JORDAN.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 7, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I would like to state the following concerning the wilderness bill hearing to be held in Las Vegas and have it made a part of the hearing record.

The San Gorgonio area should not be open for a skiing area in my opinion. This would cause the loss of the last mountain wilderness area in this part of the country. Because the proposed ski area is in the very heart of the wilderness area, it would destroy the very thing we are trying to preserve.

Skiing brings in people that litter an area open to them. This result can easily be observed by inspecting any ski slope and any parking area after the snow has melted and, also, to some extent during the ski season. Skiing is a wonderful sport and activity, but let us preserve the wilderness area and those of us who ski can drive to areas already open to skiing.

Why destroy one of the few areas preserved for us and our future citizens to enjoy as an area untouched by the litter and destruction of thoughtless mankind?

Yours truly,

LOIS G. KREBS.

STATEMENT OF REDLANDS FISH & GAME CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, REDLANDS, CALIF.

Wilderness areas cannot be constructed by man; he may only save these areas that have been left in his care to be enjoyed by all for eternity.

The San Gorgonio wilderness is such an area, situated less than 100 miles from the largest and fastest growing population center in California.

As the need for and the use of wilderness areas can only grow with the burgeoning population and as the supply of suitable areas in southern California is limited, we therefore respectfully request—

That those areas presently designated as wild, wilderness, or primitive be maintained as such and that if possible they should be given the added protection of the legislative process of the Congress of the United States.

We further ask that the committee propose no provisions in any prospective legislation which could have the effect of encouraging a ski or any other commercial development within the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 7, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I would like the following to be made part of the hearing record concerning the wilderness bill to be held in Las Vegas.

I strongly oppose the opening of the San Gorgonio area for a skiing enterprise. This is the last mountain wilderness area in this part of the country. To open it for skiing would be to lose it completely. The proposed ski area is located in the very heart of the wild area—thus destroying the very core of the thing that we are trying to preserve.

Skiers are notorious litterbugs. I give as illustration any ski slope after the snow has melted; any parking area during the ski season. The litter is not confined to these areas; view the access roads to the parking areas.

As of this moment, skiing is available on the slopes of Mount San Gorgonio for those interested in the sport as it was originally intended. Why deface a beautiful area with 1 lift, let alone 15?

I can speak with some authority concerning skiing as I am an avid skier. I gladly drive the 300 miles north to enjoy good slopes when necessary.

I can only hope that those making this all important decision on this bill have the foresight to preserve what will be an island of nature in a sea of civilization.

Very truly yours,

E. MARGARET LAWRENCE.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 8, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I would like to state the views of myself and my wife on the wilderness bill and the San Gorgonio wild area.

As a climber and skier I have seen and appreciated deep wilderness for many years. I have also seen park and primitive areas, once popular, deteriorate due to lack of funds and public interest. I despair the modification of existing wilds for transient satisfaction of a small element of the public. I say small because skiing, while popular, as well as climbing and even motor touring does not have the popular appeal warranted by such an irreversible blow to the untouched wilderness.

SRP05527

As an American I take pride in the knowledge that we, as an idealistic people, have the sensitivity and appreciation to recognize the delicate beauty of the untouched earth. This earth must be protected, what is left, since we have long since won our battle against it. If I never see the interior of a wilderness park it is to me a source of pride to know that we cared enough to save this land. It is our private fund of natural heritage becoming the rarest commodity on earth. In 150 years the changes have been incredible. Presumably we intend to be here for several thousand more years. We cannot sacrifice for today's ski fans the natural glory of wilderness for all those to come. The land will all too soon be exploited despite what we do. Let us at least move in the direction of protection. We have already won the natural battle. It will make us little richer to use up all the wilds that are left. In the long run we will inherit only regret.

I have seen the ski fever move into Mount San Jacinto wild area. This area will never be the same. It will be in constant danger of fire and less direct means of "modification." Just knowing this area was at one time protected made me feel proud. Now I feel regret. I cannot easily ski there so the ski area is no source of satisfaction to me. In addition, we have lost another piece of primeval America and America is the worse for it. San Jacinto has lost its meaning to many Americans.

I have never been on Mount San Gorgonio but I would fight to save this area in a wild state though I may never see it in my lifetime.

Protection—we have won the right to protect. We should cherish this right. Prevent the skiing interests from cutting into this area. If this means the public must suffer from want of recreation, think of what our national anguish will be if we lose our pride and if we even lose our capacity to cherish and protect. Some day we may regret that we no longer have anything needful of protection. Sometimes it is priceless to sacrifice.

I don't know the details of the wilderness problem or legislation but I detect a deep discomfort of sense of impending loss. Do your best to save what we have.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD J. LISKA,
CAROL A. LISKA,
Engineer With Boeing Co.

Member: Seattle Mountaineers, about 5,000 members strongly endorsing the wilderness bill.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 8, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing as the conservation chairman of Sierra Hi-Teens Club, a youth group of the Sierra Club. The Sierra Hi-Teens Club favors passage of the wilderness bill.

Our Sierra Hi-Teens Club has been in existence about 2 years. It has 50 members. Most of our activities are hikes, on our own or with the Sierra Club. We also raise money for the Defenders of San Gorgonio and have other conservation projects. At least three other Sierra Hi-Teens Clubs have been formed in California since our original one began.

We enjoy hiking because it is a chance to enjoy wilderness beauty, to know each other better, and to experience the physical activity of hiking. Furthermore, as a person does more hiking, he develops an awareness of God, nature, and himself: it is a wonderful feeling.

We want the wilderness bill passed because we fear that gradually our wild areas will be developed and lose their native charm. We want to keep the wild areas for our children and others to enjoy. A wild area which has been developed in one small part is more vulnerable than a pure wild area simply because of its status; like any wild area, any person weakened by illness is more susceptible to additional illness than a healthy person.

We request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearing.

Sincerely yours,

SIERRA HI-TEENS CLUBS,
MISS BETH WIEMAN,
Conservation Chairman.

SRP05528

STATEMENT OF LUKE FISHBURN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, UNIVERSITY RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE, CAMP DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY CAMPS

University Camps, under the auspices of the University Religious Conference, have been operating camps for underprivileged children in the San Bernardino National Forest for 30 years, and are one of over 30 camps in the Barton Flats area which has the largest concentration of organized camps in a national forest in the United States. Each year, for the past 10 years, we have taken over 600 children from less chance neighborhoods of Los Angeles county to our two campsites.

The most important factor of our location is that it adjoins the San Gorgonio wilderness area. Due to the increased amount of traffic into the national forest because of the increased population we are every year forced to conduct more and more of our program in the San Gorgonio wilderness area.

If camping has any meaning at all, especially for the children that we take from the streets of the city, it comes from its ability to take these children away from civilization and into an area which reflects the beauty and wonder of nature. Much of our effort to be of assistance to these children would be negated without this setting. Without strong protective legislation of the type considered, population pressures would inevitably destroy the last areas in which we could provide for the children the inspiration and understanding that comes from man's ability to be by himself in a natural world.

For this reason, we urge that action be taken to preserve the San Gorgonio wilderness area and similar wilderness areas in the United States.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 9, 1964.*

COMMITTEE OF INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: It is the wish of the undersigned that the views expressed in this letter become a part of the record of the field hearings held by the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in Las Vegas, Nev., on January 13 and 14, 1964, on the wilderness bill.

As technological progress creates more leisure time each year, wilderness areas become increasingly more valuable for recreation to a greater number of people. Why wilderness? Because the renewal of mind and spirit as well as physical well-being derived from living close to nature cannot be obtained any other way.

It is important that Congress take action now to enact a wilderness preservation system for America which will immediately protect all existing wilderness lands from further commercial encroachment and grant full protection to those areas being considered for wilderness status until Congress takes final action on them. This protection should be maintained until the people, through their elected representatives, want to remove it.

Regarding the local San Gorgonio wild area controversy, we are opposed to any amendment that would exclude this area from the Wilderness Preservation System and thereby allow commercial exploitation.

Yours very truly,

DAVID B. MCGLONE,
VERNON K. LINDSAY,
ERIN SPARKMAN.

LA CANADA, CALIF., *January 3, 1964.*

COMMITTEE OF INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The purpose of this letter is to urge favorable consideration of one of the bills to achieve the purposes of the wilderness bill. I hope you will recommend the strongest possible protection for an established National Wilderness Preservation System (S. 4 or one of the similar bills).

Last summer I traveled over 6,000 miles visiting national parks and national forests, and was impressed with the evidence of overcrowding and encroachment on desirable wilderness areas. Here in southern California ever-greater numbers of people are turning to wilderness recreation as a vital need in an evermore urbanized and complex society. For this reason, I particularly urge the inclusion of the San Gorgonio wild area in the wilderness system.

SRP05529

I do not believe it an exaggeration to urge the wilderness preservation system as one of the most critical needs for the future of our national greatness. Please make my letter part of your field hearings on this matter to be held in Las Vegas, January 13.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. MOORE, Jr.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Alhambra, Calif., January 7, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: At its regular board of directors meeting Friday, January 3, 1964 the Alhambra District YMCA board of directors unanimously approved the following resolution:

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Alhambra District YMCA expresses its opposition to any change in the current status of the San Gorgonio wild area which would permit the commercial development of any portion of the area, such as the presently proposed commercial ski resort development.

In addition to its youth and adult program in the Alhambra, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and South San Gabriel area, the Alhambra District YMCA owns and operates a mountain resident camp in the Barton Flats area immediately adjacent o the San Gorgonio wild area.

It is our firm conviction that the preservation of the San Gorgonio wild area, without further road or commercial development, will present the greatest good for the greatest number of our present and future citizens. We believe that any commercial development of the San Gorgonio wild area will greatly reduce the effectiveness and the value of our mountain camping program in teaching the YMCA Christian principles of spirit, mind, and body to the youth of our community.

We therefore wish to register our protest against the currently proposed commercial ski development and request that the San Gorgonio wild area be included in the proposed wilderness preservation system.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. STEED,
Vice President Alhambra District YMCA.

ORANGE Y'S MEN'S CLUB,
Orange, Calif., January 4, 1964.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Congress of the United States of America.

GENTLEMEN:

Whereas hiking, camping, and other recreational uses of our Nation's wilderness areas is constantly increasing; and

Whereas such use of wilderness areas is a major part of the outdoor programs of the YMCA, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America, and many other youth groups; and

Whereas the individual's contact with the natural world is constantly diminishing in this technological age: *It is hereby*

Resolved by the Y's Men's Club of Orange, Calif., That the Congress of the United States of America, and all the appropriate committees thereof, be urged to expedite the passage of one of the several forms of a wilderness bill now in Congress, preferably S. 4 or H.R. 930. It is also earnestly recommended that no areas be excluded from the protection of the final law. In our geographical area, we are particularly anxious that the San Gorgonio wild area be preserved in its present state for the general welfare of the rapidly increasing southern California population, and particularly for the benefit of the many fine youth camps in the Barton Flats area of the San Bernardino mountains.

The Orange Y's Men's Club currently has an active membership of 33. It is a chartered club of the International Association of Y's Men's Clubs.

Sincerely,

JOHN VALENTINE, *President.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Thirty years ago the south shore of Lake Tahoe was a beautiful retreat. Today it is a tawdry amusement zone. Such maltreatment of unique spots is going on apace as California's population soars.[1] The same process in less exaggerated form is evident all over the country. The 11th hour is certainly here.

The wilderness bill (if passed without crippling amendments) will save for future generations at least a little of America's heritage of beauty.

I request that if possible this letter be made a part of the Las Vegas hearing on the wilderness bill.

Very truly yours,

MISS GRACE LEADINGHAM.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *December 29, 1963.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: When one lives in the Los Angeles area, as in any large metropolitan area, he often feels the need to get away from the stale city to the fresh outdoors. But how often he finds an area once wild is now littered with cans and paper or trampled by many feet, or perhaps is the site of a tramway, skating rink, or a ski resort.

Never has America so needed to guard the precious remainder of her primitive areas lest those who wish to make themselves grow rich make us all poorer. They tempt many by offering delicious excitement and often a certain exclusiveness—promising sports facilities, restaurants, and cabin homes. They cheat those who want to see America grow stronger by reporting their cutting of forests for buildings we need, and then showing their growing of trees in tree farms, tiny plots among acres of wasteland, as near the Mount Shasta area in northern California.

What do these men really offer to us? A moment of pleasure for something lost forever? Our delight at a ride up a tramway in trade for a lovely meadow campsite frequented by Boy Scouts and other nature lovers? This has happened at Round Valley in the San Jacinto State Park; we have lost a place of wild beauty to men who wanted to line their pockets. It can happen again.

You, our lawmakers, must decide now whether all America's wilderness areas will be protected for the common man, or if you will listen to the hired voices of moneyed interests. They can be persuasive, powerful, and can claim to represent the people, but please see the real meaning behind their words—money.

I hope special consideration will be given to the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area, widely used by Boy Scouts, families, hikers, and campers, but there will be many San Gorgonios in the future—many more attempts at exploitation.

I request that this letter be made part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings since I am not able to attend. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. EDWARD L. PANKOW,
Teacher at Abraham Lincoln High School in Los Angeles.

WHITTIER AUDUBON SOCIETY,
Whittier, Calif., January 2, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AND INTERIOR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: With the request that the following be made a part of the hearing record at Las Vegas, January 13–14, the Whittier Audubon Society, branch of the National Audubon Society, with a membership of 150 members, submits the following:

Wilderness areas free of the possibilities of exploitation or change of any kind are necessary to the welfare of our Nation for many reasons.

---

[1] U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 13, 1964, p. 82 ff. California to have 25 percent increase and United States 10 percent increase by 1970, only 6 years hence.

 SRP05531

1. It is important for our survival that we renew ourselves in the environment of a wilderness character.

2. As custodians of our natural heritage for future generations, it is our responsibility today to secure wilderness areas and keep them untrammeled and unspoiled.

3. The bills now offered are the result of long careful study and represent the profound interest of thousands dedicated to the protection of wilderness areas as such and should be considered in good faith.

4. The San Gorgonio area is now established as a wild area. It is the only remaining place in southern California at mountain elevation where alpine flora still flourishes, and where true wilderness character prevails. It should be preserved as it now exists and not be excluded from the wilderness bill by amendment or any other means.

We urge your favorable report on the wilderness bill.

Respectfully submitted.

(Mrs. J. H.) ELLEN M. CONEBY,
Conservation Chairman.

SMITH, POWELL & MORGRIDGE,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 2, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing in regard to the wilderness bill which is coming before your committee for consideration. For many years I have belonged to the Sierra Club, and have enjoyed taking my family up into the High Sierras; following the John Muir Trail, enjoying the tremendous benefits that California mountain backcountry has to give. With the recent great expansion here in California, I have noticed a tendency to whittle away these beautiful wild areas, by driving roads through, commercializing the section, and in other ways destroying an area of great beauty, which once destroyed can never be returned to its original condition. I feel that we Americans of today owe it to those who will follow us in the future to preserve as much as we can these irreparable, irreplaceable portions of our country. In addition to the High Sierras, I have many times taken my boys up into the San Gorgonio country, where we climbed Grayback on numerous occasions. This beautiful piece of wilderness should be left for others to enjoy, and not commercialized as so often happens when it is "opened up," with its accompanying collection of tin cans, rubbish, papers, and other evidences of civilization that destroy completely the feeling of primitive wilderness area.

I would strongly urge that this bill be given favorable recommendation so that when it appears before the House for passage, that it doesn't get lost or amended all out of value.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT J. POWELL.

SYRACUSE, N.Y., *January 5, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am submitting this statement in support of the wilderness bill, passed in the Senate, in April 1963, and request that the statement be made part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas field hearings.

I believe that the passage of this bill is vitally significant to the welfare of all Americans, both present and future generations.

Nearly 100 years ago—long before any of my family came to this country, the citizens of New York State voted to create the forest preserve. Today I am one among millions of U.S. citizens who is privileged to enjoy this unique wilderness.

It is close to our home, and my family and I visit it often. But all of us—I, my husband, and three daughters—have also camped in and are irresistibly drawn by our national parks and forests in the West. These, too, were set aside by past generations.

I feel I have inherited this wilderness tradition. I believe the wilderness bill, so long delayed, can best protect all our wild areas.

I am for it. I hope it can soon be passed into law.

Sincerely yours,

ROSE PULLARA
Mrs. Santo Pullara.

JANUARY 8, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEAR SIR: Our club of the Nature Friends, Local Los Angeles, supports the wilderness bills, H.R. 9070 introduced by Representative John P. Saylor, and the similar one introduced by Representative Jeffery Cohelan of California. We ask that you report these bills soon and favorably to the House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, so that for the first time in three Congresses the Members of the House may have a chance to vote on this most important matter of the preservation of 2 percent of our national area in its natural state. This will serve the interests of recreation, science, history, and the preservation of some of our native plants and animals which are fast being destroyed.

We are a hiking, skiing, and camping club of some 125 members living in Los Angeles County. In the past 3 years our members have sent several hundred letters and cards in support of the wilderness bill to their Representatives and Senators. In addition, they have sent to their local and the metropolitan papers about 25 "Letters to the Editor" in support of the preservation of wilderness.

We are also active supporters of the defenders of San Gorgonio wilderness, and do not want to see any part of the San Gorgonio wild area opened to commercial ski lifts. People are pouring into southern California by the thousands, and the San Gorgonio wild area is the only spot of wilderness nearby where people can restore their physical strength and mental perspective by becoming a part of nature for a little while. We believe this area should be protected for us and for future generations.

Our stand is clearly shown in the following resolution, passed in April of 1961 and reaffirmed each succeeding year:

Whereas wilderness areas, with their native plants and animals are a necessary part of the recreation and inspiration of cultured human beings; and

Whereas the growing pressure of population in our country, with the accompanying houses, factories, and highways, is threatening to destroy all of our wilderness areas; and

Whereas Senator Clinton P. Anderson, the new chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, has personally introduced the new wilderness bill, S. 87, which is satisfactory to the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, and to conservationists who have long been working for a National Wilderness Preservation System: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nature Friends, Local Los Angeles, endorse the wilderness bill, S. 87, and request our Senators and Congressmen to work to bring the bill out of committee and to vote for its passage; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Chairman Clinton P. Anderson, to our two Senators, Clair Engle and Thomas Kuchel (who is one of the sponsors), and to Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as to Representatives Judge D. S. Saund, Harold T. Johnson, and Craig Hosmer, who are members[1] on his committee. Copies also to be sent to the press, the Wilderness Society, the Western Federation of Outdoor Clubs, Trustees for Conservation, and to any other groups which the executive board may recommend.

Respectfully yours,

AARON BRAUDE,
President.
VIOLET ORR,
Chairman, Conservation Committee.

---

[1] From California.

SRP05533

MILL VALLEY, CALIF., *January 6, 1964.*

Representative WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Wilderness bill hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: Since the first efforts toward a wilderness bill were begun in 1956, I have appeared in person at two hearings and written for the record at others when it was not possible to be there.

This is once more, a written request that a wilderness bill with legislation to preserve what remains in a national wilderness system that will be protected against unwise use. When the first bill was introduced there was still about 2½ percent of our original wilderness left. Since time has passed, this has been cut and cut again. I do not know the present figures but would be generous and say we have possibly 1 percent left.

In passing such legislation I would urge that no amendments be made which would exclude our southern California San Gorgonio area. There has been increasing pressure from ski and commercial interests to open up this last remaining section of land near the densely populated Los Angeles environs.

I had occasion in the past 6 months to drive across the United States one route and returning another. The creeping inroads of progress was all too evident everywhere. Once past the Rocky Mountain area and into the Kansas flatlands I found no wilderness of any kind. That which I once knew and saw again as I left California, was much changed.

It is important we have something of the past left for the future. The late John Fitzgerald Kennedy in the foreword to "The Quiet Crisis," by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, wrote:

"Our economic standard of living rises, but our environmental standard of living—our access to nature and respect for it—deteriorates."

Wilderness legislation enacted now will prevent that deterioration of which our late President wrote.

Sincerely yours,

LUELLA K. SAWYER,
Writer and Editor, Conservation Publications.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. SEARLE, PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, SANTA SUSANA, CALIF.

Passage of effective legislation for the establishment of a wilderness preservation system is vital to the development of a fair and impartial national policy for management of our remaining wildland resources.

Population pressure is rapidly increasing in our country and as a result wildlands are rapidly disappearing. Because of this I believe we must regulate wildland development for the same reasons as apply for planned urban development. Enactment of a national policy for zoning is essential for this purpose. Two wilderness bills presently under consideration, H.R. 930 or H.R. 9070, best provide appropriate machinery for classification of public wilderness lands according to their best use for national interests as well as protection from unregulated exploitation.

It is essential that any legislation which is passed provide protection for all areas which are being considered for inclusion in the wilderness system as if they were a part of the wilderness system until final action is taken on their status. Such a requirement will permit thorough consideration of each area without placing the status of other areas still to be considered in jeopardy because of delay in taking final action.

Amendments which would exclude specific areas already classified as wilderness are unwise and unnecessary. A case in point is that of San Gorgonio. This area has been reviewed and evaluated many times over for its best use with the same conclusion being reached, that it should retain its present status. The present agitation for development of mechanized ski facilities in the area does not represent a majority opinion nor is it in our best interest nationally. However, such attempts to "grab" free public lands for private gain regardless of the overall community and national need are typical of the problems we presently face in national land management. Legislation establishing realistic control of wilderness land use on a national basis can help to solve these problems.

Some commercial and mining interests are opposed to protective legislation typified by the two referenced bills. I do not believe these interests have a valid

basis for objection in terms of overall national interest. They say the legislation will "lock up" our national resources. This is not true. Public land with known mineral resources of economic value will remain open to mining. There is no timber production on any of the lands involved. Under the pending legislation less than 2 percent of our land would attain a classification excluding mining and other commercial development. Are the natural resources of 98 percent of our country now so depleted that we must depend on the last 2 percent? If this becomes so in the future, the legislation contains procedures by which land can be reclassified for mineral or other uses if it is determined to be in the national interest.

With due consideration for the above thoughts I urge you to favorably report a strong and effective wilderness bill such as H.R. 930 or H.R. 9070, for action by the House.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 6, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I have been on and around San Gorgonio many times in summer and winter during the past 21 years. Though an enthusiastic skier myself, I am against any developments in this area.

The seemingly small portion intended for the ski area is really the heart of the region. It is the most accessible and most desirable portion for those who cherish it now.

A road will bring in masses of people who will neither in summer nor in winter experience what the present visitors are particularly enjoying on their trips because the wilderness aspect will have been lost. To those who come with easy access by car, it will be just another area, not basically different from any others in southern California accessible to them now.

The commercial interests which push for the developments will, of course, gain from any increase of traffic and people and they have hardly anything to lose because the taxpayers would provide the access roads. I am quite sure the lift promoters would back out if they would have to pay for the access roads themselves.

Also, if the financial return of the lifts should not be as expected, there will be requests for relaxing of initial Forest Service restriction and, judging from precedents, those will be granted to help protect the investment.

Eventually trees, brush, rocks, and boulders will be removed, configuration of slopes may be changed in order to make the place more useful for skiing under poor conditions and extend the season. More buildings (shelter, service, etc.) will be put up to make it more attractive to the crowd so they will spend their money to pay for the investment. More and more of the other values of this area will be lost. This is what happened in other places. Look, in summer, at what has been done to the lower slopes of Mammoth. Look at Mount Baldy and others. What an ugly, depressing site.

That leads to the part of the argument which centers around winter use only which disregards the fact that what is being done for winter cannot be undone when snow disappears. Quite to the contrary, every summer for years to come, the area will be greatly disturbed by first the initial building activity and then maintenance and improvements will necessitate noisy and disquieting work.

Many of those of the general public who are aroused through the publicity campaign in favor of the development do not really know what is at stake. They may never have been in the area. As a matter of fact, they may not even care. All they are after is another amusement park-type ski area made safe with traffic and warning signs, protected by ski patrol, loudspeakers all over the place, piped in music which can be heard way beyond the ski area, etc., etc., and, of course, the promise of snow, but more about this later.

Right now San Gorgonio is the last place in southern California where one can go for adventurous type skiing, ski touring or ski mountaineering or whatever you may want to call it, where one has to match ones own resources, planning, skill, and endurance against the obstacles of nature, the elements and where one has to exercise ones judgment and is not babied and protected.

All this would radically change, as it must, when the big crowds come.

Without a doubt there is more snow on San Gorgonio than in the other southern California areas of lower altitude. But to imply (issue of Nov.

22, 1963 of Far Western Skier) there will be snow conditions resembling those of Mammoth Mountain because of the equivalent altitude is sheer nonsense. This is not so at all for reason of latitude, climate, and other peculiar features of Mammoth.

For example, right now there is not enough snow around San Gorgonio to provide skiing. I made it a point to check on January 5. There is a snow depth of about 18 inches in higher regions above 8,000 feet on slopes with favorable exposure. This is not anywhere enough for the terrain as it is. The 18 inches does not have a high water content and this seems to indicate that the reports and measurements earlier in the season, which reached a figure of 5 feet, were taken with magnifying glasses. But no matter how much fell, it was and is not enough. Even in the most favorable bowels of the big and little draws, the rocks are showing in great numbers all over, not to speak of the manzanite farther down which is not covered at all.

In lean years it may not be until February that the snowpack in the area in question on Gorgonio is substantial enough to make for good skiing. The so much heralded extension of the ski season is not at the beginning but at the end of the season, that is in spring. Anybody who goes out regularly to the ski areas knows that once March comes around, the ski crowd thins out, no matter how good the conditions are. The greater number of skiers just lose interest. Therefore the extension of the ski season in spring will not benefit the multitude when they want it.

Not every sport can be pursued anywhere in the world and skiing in southern California is marginal. The opening of San Gorgonio will not materially change this. Onion Valley, near Independence, would be a better supplement. Lets save San Gorgonio for the "Wilderness People" for now and the years to come.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD SCHAAR.

STATEMENT OF PETER J. VLASVELD, BELLEVUE, WASH.

This is a statement concerning the enactment of the wilderness bill and as such I herewith request that this statement will be made part of the hearing record of the Las Vegas, Nev., hearing as scheduled by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I make this statement for myself and the members of my family. My name is Peter J. Vlasveld, my occupation is electronic computer programer. I am a member of the 4,500-member organization the Mountaineers, of Seattle, Wash., and an active mountain climber and skier.

It is my strong feeling that where only around 2 percent of our country is still in its wild status, this wilderness should be protected in the strongest possible sense, thus preserving a sample of what our country looked like for our descendants and providing a psychological, if not physical, outlet for all of us from the pressures of an overpopulated, overorganized, and time-conscious society.

It is further my feeling that allowing any type of commercial use will destroy its essential value as a wilderness, thus in fact consuming public property in favor of a relatively small profiting group.

In my opinion this protection would be given best by the bill S. 4 as passed by the Senate April 9, 1963, or by H.R. 930. These bills have been pending at your committee for a long time and I herewith urge you gentlemen to take action on these bills, enabling them to be submitted to the House vote.

If, and only if, however, these bills cannot be sent to the House I would favor the House bills as introduced by Representatives Saylor, Quie, and Cohelan (H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, and H.R. 9520) which in my opinion would provide the second best possibility of protection of our wilderness areas, as would H.R. 9558 (Udall) if, and only if, a subsection would be stricken which provides for continuation of mining for 10 years where it is now allowed; in my opinion it is not justified to virtually destroy wilderness (an unavoidable complement of mining) in favor of mining activity which is in practically all cases economically marginal anyway.

If, however, affirmative action on proposals H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, and H.R. 9520, or H.R. 9558 with above-mentioned amendment does not seem feasible, I would favor the proposals H.R. 9162, H.R. 9163, H.R. 9164, and H.R. 9165 if and only if the following amendments would be made:

(1) At the end of section 4(a) add: "All accommodations and installations within any park or monument shall, furthermore, be incident to the conserva-

tion and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition."

(2) At the end of section 4(b) add: "Except as otherwise provided in this Act, wilderness areas shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation."

(3) At the end of section 5(e) add: "Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein."

(4) Authority to accept gifts or bequests of lands, to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purpose of this act, and to acquire inholdings of lands within areas of wilderness should be applicable to park and refuge as well as national forest areas, and accordingly the sections 5 (c), (d), (e) of H.R. 9162 should name the Secretary of the Interior as well as the Secretary of Agriculture in granting this authority.

(5) The words "national forests" should be inserted in sections 5(b), 4(d), and 7 in order to limit permitted hunting and mining ingress and egress to national forest areas.

(6) The phrase "by this Act" in sections 4 (c), (d) (1), (3), and (5), 5 (c) and (d) should be corrected to read "by or in accordance with this Act."

(7) At the end of section 3(b) should be added: "each such primitive area shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as on the date of this Act until Congress has acted on a recommendation of the President regarding the area, as provided in this subsection, or until Congress has determined otherwise."

(8) At the end of section 3(c) should be added: "each such portion shall continue to be administered as roadless until Congress has acted on a recommendation of the President regarding that area, as provided in this subsection, or until Congress has determined otherwise."

(9) The provisions regarding mining of the bills H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, H.R. 9520 should substitute section 4(d)(2).

In brief, I favor bills S. 4, or H.R. 930, H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, and H.R. 9520; H.R. 9558 with amended mining provisions as stated; H.R. 9162, H.R. 9163, H.R. 9164, and H.R. 9165 with above amendments, in this order.

In all cases moreover I would be strongly opposed to an amendment to any of the above-mentioned proposals which would exclude any part of the San Gorgonio wild area or which would specifically exclude any part of any other primitive area, wild area, or the proposed North Cascades National Park area. I would also be strongly opposed to any amendment of any of the above-mentioned proposals which would generally or specifically allow ski resorts in the areas involved.

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL D. AND ELIZABETH S. SHEELINE, WOODLAND HILLS, CALIF.

How fortunate we are to be able to help in any way such a wise act for the future of our people as the wilderness bill. This enduring program for the conservation of wilderness is a gift we give our children as surely as the father who works and saves for his sons. Once the wilderness is disturbed, it is gone forever, just like squandered money.

We urge you to support the wilderness bill including the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area. San Gorgonio is so close to our second largest city (Los Angeles, population 7 million) that it offers wilderness escape for our people which is as inexpensive to indulge in as walking. Jazzy, smoggy Los Angeles needs and will need the beauty, sanity, and peace of accessible San Gorgonio Wilderness Area.

We look forward with eagerness and deep satisfaction to the passage of an excellent wilderness bill.

STATEMENT OF ALBERT SPENCER, ANGELUS OAKS, CALIF.

My name is Albert Spencer. Address: Post Office Box No. 6, Angelus Oaks, Calif. (Angelus Oaks is at the edge of San Gorgonio wild area.) I am now

 SRP05537

retired and have come to live in the mountains that have meant so much to me ever since I attended youth camps in this area as a small boy.

I strongly recommend approval of the wilderness bills as added protection for a part of our national heritage which seems to be eaten away by many selfish and commercial interests from time to time. As the bills now stand, they do afford greater protection, but the real danger is in the exclusions that may be tacked on as amendments.

I am concerned, in particular, with the strenuous efforts of commercial interests to exclude the heart of the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area so that it can be commercialized with ski resorts. The 30-odd youth camps and the hundreds of residents located near the wild area are located here because of the quiet, unspoiled, natural beauty of the country. I'm sure that all this would be changed with the influx of thousands of cars and many more thousands of people drawn by the commercial resorts. This area would become just another resort trap so repugnant to people who really enjoy true, natural surroundings.

As I understand it, the wilderness bills are designed to prevent the commercialization of beautiful areas such as the San Gorgonio wild area, so I do respectfully request that no wild or wilderness area be excluded from the bills under consideration. Please help us keep all of the national heritage that we have left to us.

Thank you very much for your time and your interest in this plea.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CARL WALSTEN, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.

First of all I am a housewife. I am representing the feelings of my own immediate family. My 13-year-old daughter derives her greatest pleasure of the year when she attends Girl Scout camp in the San Gorgonio area and climbs to the top of that mountain. This area abounds with camps for children. There is really only one argument about an issue like this. Are the monied interests to win or can it remain a lovely refuge for the animals and the people? It just cannot serve both satisfactorily as they would have you believe. That dollar is trying to speak louder than the people who love the woods for beauty's sake. Please don't allow a ski development to spoil this last remaining natural refuge. It would be hard to climb San Gorgonio as the Scouts and others do and feel you were on a great adventure with a ski lift (and later more of them) beside you. A ski lift means more roads, places to eat and sleep. Entertainment places to attract the multitude when they are not skiing. Here we have a builtup area—a far cry from the lovely wilderness it now is.

If the Congress does not preserve these wilderness areas right now, it will be too late for our grandchildren to know what the deep woods are really like. There will be nothing left to preserve, at least within reach of the ordinary person with limited means. These people may not have the money to buy needed ski equipment and the costs of riding lifts, but they can go to the woods on picnics, camping, hiking, and the like. They can really enjoy a vacation they can afford and be away from commercialism. We owe them a wilderness area like San Gorgonio and others.

Please consider a bill that will preserve San Gorgonio and other wilderness areas throughout the good old U.S.A. for now and future generations. Please allow our children to have a place to run to for freedom and relaxation. A place where they can be taught the true love of nature. A place where they can learn to respect nature and learn to live with her. I want this for my child and her children.

I trust each of you know what is trying to be done. Perhaps more money is being spent to try to prove to you that the ski group need this last fort more than we nature lovers do, but I know you will be fair and see our point of view, too—and how I hope you'll decide to make them leave some areas of our mountains unscarred.

SRP05538

VICTORVILLE, CALIF., *January 6, 1964.*

Subject: Wilderness bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to add my voice to many urging the passage of the wilderness bill without changes that will alter or amend it to the detriment of those who will come after us.

As a resident in southern California where we are faced with a tremendous growth in population, where we have a fast shrinking mountain wilderness area, I urge you to keep San Gorgonio Wilderness Area intact and within the present classification within the bill. San Gorgonio is our tallest peak. It is within reach of our youth from the fast-growing metropolitan areas. It should remain as natural as possible for them and for the many who will soon follow.

I am a teacher. We teach our young people conservation within our schools. We try, also, to encourage their enjoyment of the wonderful country that is their heritage. Let us all be sure that they have a heritage to enjoy in the years to come.

Sincerely,

HAZEL F. WEAVER.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *January 7, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In reference to the wilderness bill in general, and the opening of the San Gorgonio Wild Area specifically, I would like to make the following statement.

As a longtime and ardent skier I am greatly opposed to opening the abovementioned wild area for skiers. As this is the only remaining wild area of its type in this part of the country I believe that it should be preserved for cross-country hiking.

Through lack of foresight and strong financial backing, we have already lost the Mount Baldy and San Jacinto areas to commercial interests. I sincerely hope that some type of foresight will be shown and this area is saved.

Very truly yours,

BETTY WYSS.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *January 3, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am in the seventh grade here in Long Beach. I am also in the Boy Scouts.

I have been camping and hiking in the San Gorgonio wilderness area several times and found it more beautiful than any other place I have ever been to. It is a true monument to nature and beauty.

If, for instance, ski slopes are established on San Gorgonio, the whole area will be commercialized, thus taking away one of our fastly disappearing wilderness areas.

Please make my letter part of the hearings in Las Vegas.

Sincerely,

PETE TRUSKIER.

SRP05539

STATEMENT OF DANA L. THOMPSON, HAYWARD, CALIF.

My name is Dana L. Thompson, and I live at 292 Langley Way, Hayward, Calif. I am a mother and a housewife. I am concerned about the passage of the wilderness bill (H.R. 930) and (H.R. 9070) now being considered by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. As one who has enjoyed wilderness areas in California, I wish to see a bill passed without concessions to those who would seek to destroy these areas by developing them. I realize the threat that these and other land areas face from an expanding population, especially here in California, and I feel that this wilderness bill would preserve the best for the enjoyment of future generations.

But this is only one reason for passing a strong wilderness bill to preserve such areas. Another reason was given by Dr. Karl Menninger, speaking on environment at the International Design Conference in Aspen, Colo., in 1962. He said that "for reasons of mental health we should preserve wilderness areas." I feel that, in a society that is fast becoming more technical and mechanized and in a State and country that is becoming increasingly developed with freeways and housing tracts, city merging into city, the need for wilderness areas is even greater.

Since land use is one of the key controversies of this bill, I'd like to comment further on this problem. One of the main uses of these wilderness areas is camping and hiking. This has become more popular, and the need for more camping areas, primitive and otherwise, in increasing with the population. In California, anyone who has waited in line on a summer weekend to get a campsite in a State or National park is keenly aware of this need. Those who don't like to camp elbow to elbow use the wilderness areas in ever-increasing numbers. Unless the wilderness bill is passed the wilderness areas in this State and others will be under increasing pressure to be developed for other uses and their use as wilderness camping and hiking areas diminished and destroyed.

This is the situation now facing the San Gorgonio Wild Area in southern California, and it clearly shows what could happen to other areas as well. The U.S. Forest Service is under pressure to allow a portion of the San Gorgonio Wild Area to be developed as a ski resort. Plans vary from a modest lodge, parking for 5,000 cars, and 14 lifts to the $10 to $15 million dollar development envisioned by Ben Weingart. But what would this use of the land replace and destroy?

The San Gorgonio Wild Area is a natural watershed at the headwaters of the Santa Ana River, and is the last of the three major mountain wilderness areas in southern California to remain uncommercialized by ski lift facilities. But most important is the use of this area by campers and hikers. Adjacent to the wild area, in Barton Flats, is the second largest community of organizational camps in the United States. These 26 camps are owned and operated by organizations such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, churches, and YMCA's. In 1962 these camps provided a program for over 75,500 youngsters. A major part of the programs of these camps are hikes and camping trips into the wild areas and to San Gorgonio Peak. As a counselor in one of these camps, I participated in many trips into the area. The proposed ski facilities would include portions of the wild area that are used by the camps and other campers. This development and the close proximity of the camps to commercial activities would force many camps to curtail their program and some of them to close down. Much money and work was donated by many volunteers to build these camps, and there is no other place to move to. The need today, especially in big cities like Los Angeles, is for more summer camps for children, not less. I sincerely hope that no amendment will be proposed to exclude this valuable San Gorgonio Wild Area from the protection of the wilderness bill.

These wilderness areas need protection from public as well as private agencies who seek to develop them for dubious needs, and mainly for their own profit and prestige. In November I saw for the first and last time the beautiful canyons of the former Glen Canyon of the Colorado River which are now being covered by the water of Lake Powell. The sadness at the thought of their destruction was with me throughout the trip. That things like this can happen is an indication of our lack of concern for others and those who come after us. A wilderness area can be destroyed by man quickly, but it can never be returned to a wilderness area once destroyed. For this reason I urge action on the wilderness bill now. Either H.R. 930 or H.R. 9070 will provide the protection needed.

SRP05540

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have one question.

Mr. Momyer, you say that the largest use is from 26 organization camps on the edge of the area and these camps had 285,000 man-days of use in 1962.

Would that not indicate then the greatest use is by people who more easily find the area accessible? I suppose you can drive right up to the area?

Mr. MOMYER. That is right.

Mr. WESTLAND. And this is where you get the greatest use, is it not?

Mr. MOMYER. These organization camps are right on the edge of the area. The figure stated was used in organization camping through the year. The area is very accessible, in that you can drive right to the edge of it, but the camps use this area as a resort and are located where they are because it was such beautiful natural country.

Mr. WESTLAND. And you object to making the rest of the area equally accessible?

Mr. MOMYER. What we specifically object to is the establishment of a full commercial resort, with lifts, parking areas, and the like within the present area.

Mr. WESTLAND. Are there roads up to where these camps are now?

Mr. MOMYER. There are roads up to the area, but not within the wild area.

Mr. WESTLAND. And that is where the greatest use occurs?

Mr. MOMYER. The greatest use—well, this is the area of use on the edge of the wild area, but again these people who use the wild area do make great use of the interior of this country for organization camping trips.

Mr. WESTLAND. You said there were only 89,000 man-days used within the area?

Mr. MOMYER. That is right.

Mr. WESTLAND. As compared to 285,000 man-days on the edge of the area. You indicated in your statement that is because of the accessibility.

Mr. MOMYER. I think perhaps one of the best ways to handle this would be that some of the people from the organization camps will testify for themselves as to the uses the organization camps make.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is all.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Several people have indicated they would support 9070 or the Quie-Cohelan bill, but they could support the Dingell bill with amendments. You mean to amend it so it is like 9070?

Mr. MOMYER. That is right.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

You may proceed, Mr. Marshall.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT R. MARSHALL, TREASURER, DEFENDERS OF SAN GORGONIO WILDERNESS, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am treasurer of the Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness and I also function as its editor. I would like to inject a few quick facts into this hearing for the sake of information and perhaps for the sake of a more lively hearing.

SRP05541

The Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness is an unaffiliated nonprofit association formed in February of 1963. Our mail address is Post Office Box 777, San Bernardino, Calif.

The association has but one object, the integrity of the San Gorgonio Wild Area on the San Bernardino National Forest in southern California. We solicit as members any persons who feel that there should be no reduction of the San Gorgonio Wild Area or alterations in its use. We offer no social events, no organized trips, and no other incentives to join other than to assist in the defense of this wild area which has quietly acquired a vital place in the pattern of southern California life. Our current membership is over 950.

Those of us who have been active in the association have been strongly impressed not only by the sincerity of the motivation of our members, but also by the enormous public sentiment outside of our membership which agrees with our objects. Our files contain supporting resolutions from some 3 dozen other organizations, some of which have representatives here today to testify before this committee.

San Gorgonio and the wilderness bill: The San Gorgonio Wild Area represents about one-twentieth of 1 percent of the public lands being considered under these bills, but it has an importance which is very much out of proportion to its size. For example, California provides about one-quarter of the wilderness recreation for the Nation, and the use of San Gorgonio is about seven times more intense than that of other such areas in the State. The usage is getting in the range of 100,000 man-days a year.

We are sure that the members of this committee are well aware of the high degree of public interest in the controversy over this relatively small tract, and during the preceding Congress this committee acknowledged the controversy by recommending an amendment on the subject introduced by Mr. Kyl. It was unfortunate that the committee had held its field hearings before the integrity of this wild area was challenged. Because of this, the committee had the opportunity to hear only the presentations of those who have the means to travel across this Nation freely. In an issue such as San Gorgonio, presentations under these conditions could be nothing other than lopsided.

But the importance of this controversy with regard to the entire question of a National Wilderness Preservation System goes a great deal beyond the public enthusiasm. In a very real sense, San Gorgonio is the future here today. More so than any other presently dedicated area, San Gorgonio is exposed to what is vaguely referred to as "population pressure." This increases not only the number of conflicting uses which could be installed here but also the importance of keeping it free from these damages. The nature of the pressure being applied to this area, including the large sums of money available to one side only, illustrate clearly why additional protection is needed for such areas. To put this another way, what is happening at San Gorgonio can and will happen again and again at an increasing rate at other places in our country unless a National Wilderness Preservation System is established which is substantial and effective.

Impact of development on San Gorgonio: It is universally agreed that you cannot establish, say, a 1-acre wilderness area. Just how big such an area needs to be is a very indefinite quantity which has been set arbitrarily by various agencies, but there is no disagreement on the fact that such areas cannot be small. This is the same thing as saying that, in a general way, the quality of a wilderness experience depends upon how far you can go away from the boundaries within an area. The Forest Service recognizes this, as we do, when they make a distinction by size between so-called wild and wilderness areas. This fact is also acknowledged by most of the bills being considered by this committee, since they specify that wilderness tracts can be no less than 5,000 acres.

Because of this "distance-from-boundaries" consideration, the impact of a 3,500-acre exclusion from the 34,718-acre San Gorgonio Wild Area should not be judged merely by the ratio of these two numbers.

Although the enclave most strongly proposed would remove but 10½ percent of the total wild area, because of its central location it would result in a 58.8-percent reduction of lands 1 mile or more away from a boundary. In addition, of the 21 designated campsites within the wild area, 8 are located either within the proposed enclave or within one-half mile of it. These eight include all of the major campsites and the overwhelming majority of the overall camping capacity of the wild area. Also, the enclave would engulf a scenic feature completely unique in southern California and considered to be the finest portion of the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

We are aware that other locations within the wild area for such an enclave have been proposed, but we have noticed that even those who propose them admit that they would be inferior to the Dry Lake basin. Even though it would be somewhat less, the damage resulting from some of these other proposals would still be substantial, and would not give the downhill skiing fraternity all that it hopes for. It should be clear, then, that development of any part of the wild area other than the Dry Lake basin wouldn't make anyone happy. To allow such an alternate plan could have no result other than to provide a precedent and to whet appetites for another attack on the Dry Lake basin in the near future.

Recreation needs to be met: The downhill skiing fraternity is perfectly correct when it argues that its size is increasing and that it needs more slopes. They are also correct when they say that snow conditions on Mount San Gorgonio are superior to natural snow conditions anyplace else in southern California. But the situation is clearly one where it is not possible to leave everyone satisfied. Any decision will be painful. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider this southern California recreation problem as a whole. Several surprises result from this.

The first surprise is that the downhill skiing fraternity is not very large. Using the best available information and adjusting uncertainties in favor of a larger figure, the number of downhill skiers in all of

southern California is no more than 61,000—two-thirds of 1 percent of the population. This figure represents the situation for 1963, and is based on information taken from the California public outdoor recreation plan and the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The full derivation of this number is contained in a documented appendix attached to this statement.

From the same two sources just mentioned, it is also possible to determine the annual rate of increase for several forms of outdoor recreation in California. These are camping (about half of which is organized camping), 9.8 percent increase per year; riding and hiking, 8.6 percent; wilderness recreation, 8.5 percent; and downhill skiing, 7.7 percent.

It is significant that all but one of these forms of recreation is suffering from a steady, irreversible decrease of places where it can be enjoyed. Because of this, one would expect that use of a given area would increase even faster than the figures above as more and more people are forced to crowd into less and less space. San Gorgonio shows this effect. Between 1960 and 1962, usage of this wild area increased by 11.7 percent per year. But downhill skiing, which has the slowest increase rate of the forms of outdoor recreation listed above, is actually enjoying an increase of available facilities.

But until recently, ski resort operators have had to gamble with the weather, as do many farmers. And just to make matters worse, southern California weather usually keeps everyone guessing, including the Weather Bureau. But an interesting development, paralleling irrigation, is making its appearance on the southern California ski scene. Because of this development, the restraint on skiing ambitions which would result from continued preservation of San Gorgonio has all but disappeared.

Artificial snowmaking in southern California: There are a large number of existing ski resorts in southern California, and sites have already been reserved to double their number. The primary complaint against these sites is that they are all at elevations lower than those available on Mount San Gorgonio, and therefore subjected to faster thawing. Yet during the 1962–63 season, Rebel Ridge, a local snowmaking pioneer, operated for 4½ months. By even the most optimistic estimates of San Gorgonio snow, this is at least 1 month longer than San Gorgonio would have been able to operate on natural snow. A similar situation is shaping up this season.

The success of artificial snow is illustrated by the fact that last season one resort was making it, and by next season at least six will. This season unusually early storms came to southern California during October and November, with the result that all of the existing areas were operating by November 21. Since then there has been nothing but excellent thawing conditions and, however, good snowmaking conditions as well. As of Friday, January 10, at least four southern California ski resorts were reporting very good to excellent skiing on depths frequently as great as 2 feet of what they like to call "custom powder." The quality of this snow is surprisingly good. On the 10th, the snow reporting service of the Southern California Lift and Tow Operators' Association, referring to the artificial snow areas, said, "Skiers returning from these areas report that it is hard to believe they are not skiing on natural snow."

Conclusions: The principle of the greatest good for the greatest number cannot be applied blindly on an acre-by-acre basis. The San Gorgonio controversy must be viewed in an overall manner objectively to determine and, we are convinced, verify the highest use for the San Gorgonio wild area. Other witnesses here today will provide you with additional information for this overall view, but we trust that in reaching an objective decision you will not fail to give full consideration to the subjective aspects. For just as surely as with discussions of freedom and love, for example, you cannot discuss wilderness without attaching significance to intangibles.

We hope that this committee will not only agree with us that no portion of the San Gorgonio wild area should be excluded from the protection of any potential wilderness legislation, but that you will also consider this controversy to be what it is—a classic example of the need for a National Wilderness Preservation System, protected with fairness but also with determination, and adequate in size not only for the present generation but also for future generations as far as we can possibly provide for them.

(The appendix to Mr. Marshall's statement follows:)

APPENDIX

THE NUMBER OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SKIERS AS OF 1963

SUMMARY

Based on the most authoritative statistics available, the number of individual skiers in southern California as of 1963 is estimated as 61,000. The estimate is based on an extrapolation from comprehensive statistics describing the amount of ski recreation during the 1958 season.

SOURCES

Most statistics on winter sports are not broken down in a manner which would help answer the question, "How many skiers are there in southern California?" Forest Service statistics, for example, are kept in terms of winter visitor-days, and do not distinguish how many days the average visitor stays, nor why he came. The latter is especially important because most people who use southern California forests during the winter merely want to throw snowballs, for example, and a good statistical analysis must be able to separate this use from actual skiing.

To the writer's knowledge, the only study where this was done is the California public outdoor recreation plan, prepared by an ad hoc committee and staff under the mandate of the California Legislature. The completed study was published in two parts during 1960, and represents the work of several years. In addition to compiling use statistics, the study staff conducted several surveys, thus gathering a great deal of important information about the habits of individual winter sports enthusiasts.

Unfortunately, the committee and staff disbanded after the report was published, and so definitive statistics on ski use are available only for the year 1958. To obtain estimates for 1963, an extrapolation will be made based on a prediction in the Study Report No. 3, Wilderness and Recreation, of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. This commission, created by Congress under Public Law 85-470, made its report in 1962. The prediction of increase in winter sports can be compared to similar predictions in the California plan, and are in good agreement.

But the validity of such an extrapolation depends heavily on the amount of snow during the 1958 ski season, since, if the snowpack were poor and skiing opportunities curtailed, the apparent number of skiers in the base year could be less than the actual number. Happily, the winter of 1957-58 was an unusually good one; precipitation was 160 percent of normal, and the snowpack during

April, for example, was 140 percent of normal.[1] Therefore, it should be safe to say that 1958 was an excellent year on which to base extrapolations.

1958 SKI USE

In the nomenclature of the California public outdoor recreation plan, region 4 includes all of southern California and region 3 is that part of the Sierra Nevada south of Yosemite. (Regions 1 and 2 do not provide significant recreation for southern California.) For 1958, ski resorts in region 4 provided 232,828 visitor-days of skiing, while resorts in region 3 provided 184,597 visitor-days (almost entirely at Mammoth Mountain).[2] All use in region 4 originates in southern California, as does all in region 3 except for about 5 percent from the Fresno area.[3] Therefore, the number of visitor-days of skiing enjoyed by people living in southern California during 1958 is:

Region 4: 100 percent of 232,828	232,828
Region 3: 95 percent of 184,597	175,367
Total	408,195

Unless each skier skis only 1 day each year, which, of course, he does not, this number is not the number of actual skiers. The average skier makes 7.6 trips each season.[4] Unfortunately, no statistics are available as to how many days the average skiing trip includes, and an assumption is necessary. The assumption used is that each trip to region 4 (local) is for 1 day, and each trip to region 3 (Mammoth) is for 2 days. This assumption is conservative as it is almost surely somewhat low, and this error has the effect of increasing the eventual estimate of the number of skiers.

Based on this assumption and the visitor-day statistics, the number of skiing trips during 1958 was:

Number of trips to region 4	232,828
Number of trips to region 3	87,684
Total	320,512

The average number of visitor-days per trip, then, is:

$$\text{Average visitor-days per trip}=\frac{408,195}{320,512}=1.27$$

The average number of visitor-days per skier is the product of the average number of visitor-days per trip and the average number of trips per season per skier:

$$\text{Average visitor-days per skier}=1.27\text{x}7.6=9.68$$

The number of southern California skiers during 1958, then, is the quotient of the total number of visitor-days of skiing divided by the average number of visitor-days per skier:

$$\text{Number of southern California skiers in 1958}=\frac{408,195}{9.68}=42,172$$

EXTRAPOLATION TO 1963

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission predicts that winter sports recreation in California will increase 3.51 times from 1959 to 1976, a period of 17 years.[5] For comparison, the California public outdoor recreation plan prediction for increase of skiing over a 20-year period is 4 times as a maximum and 2.2 times as a minimum.[6] These estimates take into account the promotional effect of the 1960 Winter Olympics at Squaw Valley. On the basis of this comparison, it seems unlikely that an increase of 3.51 in 17 years is a low estimate.

---

[1] U.S. Weather Bureau, Los Angeles. Response to a question.
[2] State of California, "California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan, Pt. I," 1960, p. 64.
[3] Ibid., p. 65. The information is taken from the map. Because of a printing error, captions for the maps on pp. 64 and 65 were reversed.
[4] Ibid., p. 64.
[5] Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, "ORRRC Study Report No. 3, Wilderness and Recreation—A Report on Resources, Values, and Problems," 1962, p. 236. This report has been republished as "Wilderness and Recreation," Sierra Club, 1963.
[6] State of California, "California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan, Pt. II," 1960, p. 66. Compare to the table on p. 64 of pt. I for increase ratios.

SRP05546

If the number of skiers follows the formula:

$$\frac{n}{n_o}=e^{ky}$$

where n is the number of skiers y years after the year when the number of skiers was n_o, and if—

$$\frac{n}{n_o}=3.51 \text{ when } y=17$$

then

$$k=.07386$$

Therefore, when y=5:

$$\frac{n}{n_o}=e^{5\times.07386}=1.4467$$

So the number of southern California skiers should have increased by 44.67 percent between 1958 and 1963. The actual number, then, is estimated as:

$$42{,}172\times1.4467=61{,}010$$

Mr. BARING. I am curious. In your appendix you have an over "N" zero equals 3.51 when "Y" equals 17. I have heard of formulas in atomic energy and everything else, but this formula you use here, is it for when they hit the sump or what?

Mr. MARSHALL. This is purely the easier way of expressing a constant incremental change.

Mr. BARING. I was a little bit curious because I had never seen that formula before.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. No questions.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. No questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentleman.

The next witness is Howard Liggett, L-i-g-g-e-t-t, of Orange, Calif., representing Camp Osceola, Orange County YMCA Camp, Inc., and Camp Arbolado, Whittier YMCA Camp. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD D. LIGGETT, ORANGE, CALIF.

Mr. LIGGETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am Howard D. Liggett, 425 North Pine, Orange, Calif., executive camp manager of Orange County YMCA–YWCA Camp Osceola and Whittier YMCA Camp Arbolado. Both camps are located in the Barton Flats area of the San Bernardino Mountains of California.

These two camps are affiliated nationally with 1,819 YMCA camps and are members of the American Camping Association which represents various camping groups located throughout our country. Therefore, we are vitally concerned that a wilderness bill be enacted by Congress which will adequately protect and preserve wilderness areas for hiking, primitive camping, and nature study, which are free of roads, structures, and commercialism.

Camping is an out-of-doors living experience for youth and adults which provides recreational, educational, and inspirational benefits. The camp setting lends itself to citizenship training in keeping with the principles and traditions of our American democracy. For boys and girls, going to camp is the highlight of the year-around pro-

SRP05547

gram of agencies such as the YMCA. As population increases in urban areas, it is increasingly more important to provide the opportunity to youngsters and adults to get away from the hustle and bustle of city life into the refreshing setting of the great out-of-doors.

Since the two camps that I represent are located in the vicinity of the San Gorgonio Wild Area of the San Bernardino Mountains of California, we have a special interest that this area in its present natural state be included in the wilderness bill.

For over 40 years camping has been conducted in this area for youth and adults of Orange County at Camp Osceola and for the Whittier area of Los Angeles County at Camp Arbolado. Over these years thousands of campers and their counselors have attended these two camps. Among them is the Honorable Senator Thomas H. Kuchel who attended Camp Osceola as a camper and served as a camp counselor some years ago.

Last year 6,596 individuals camped at these two camps for a total of 33,978 camper man-days. We operate 12 weeks during the summer and on weekends and vacations during the school year. A large percent of the campers utilized the primitive areas of the San Gorgonio Wild Area. Both camps are located on national forest land leased through the U.S. Forest Service and were selected for their beautiful natural scenery and their proximity to the vast wilderness area. Over $4 million has been invested in facilities through voluntary contributions and countless hours of voluntary labor have been given by citizens because they believe in the valuable experience that these camps make in the lives of youth.

Youngsters of various religious denominations and national origin attend these camps. In 1963 foreign students from Argentina, Japan, Sweden, and Uganda served on the staff or visited camp to observe our program. Nature is used as a common denominator through which we interpret the recognition of God's existence and the appreciation of His gifts to man. City youngsters thrill to the excitement that comes from experiencing the sights and sounds of nature, even the taste, smell, and feel of it. A deeper respect for all living things is gained, and good outdoor manners and skills are taught.

Camp program is designed for developing a lifelong interest in the out-of-doors, for character development, for wholesome use of leisure time, and for appreciation the value and need of conservation.

The San Gorgonio Ranger District of the U.S. Forest Service is one of the largest ranger districts in the Nation and has done an outstanding job in recent years in the devolopment of recreational use of the Barton Flats area and in forest fire prevention. Further development could be accomplished if additional funds were provided through the U.S. Forest Service budget.

Exclusion of any portion of the San Gorgonio Wild Area from the wilderness bill which would permit commercial development of that portion would greatly increase the fire hazard in this remote area. This would eventually necessitate a network of fire roads which would be expensive for the Government to construct and maintain, and greatly detract from the scenic beauty of the area. Annual U.S. Forest Service administrative costs would also be increased. Federal funds could better be used to complete the maximum development of the surrounding national forest recreational area.

SRP05548

We have a responsibility to future generations to leave for them to enjoy portions of our country undisturbed by man. We strongly recommend H.R. 9070, or a bill similar to it, without an amendment excluding any part of the San Gorgonio Wild Area will best serve the needs of this section of the United States.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. How close is your camp to the proposed area of San Gorgonio?

Mr. LIGGETT. I would say about 400 yards from the boundary line.

Mr. WHITE. So you would be immediately affected?

Mr. LIGGETT. We would definitely be affected if roads and ski lifts and that type of thing were installed in our area.

Mr. WHITE. What adjacent camps are there other than yours?

Mr. LIGGETT. Mr. Amend will testify——

Mr. WHITE. Just give a number roughly.

Mr. LIGGETT. Twenty-six.

Mr. WHITE. Other camps?

Mr. LIGGETT. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. In the area exclusive of your camp?

Mr. LIGGETT. Including our camp.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would like to say a favorable word for the work you fellows are doing, Mr. Liggett, with the Boy Scouts. I happen to be a director of the Evergreen Council of the State of Washington, and in my view, it is the finest organization of them all. I have camped with them many times, and would like to go again.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Mr. LIGGETT. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Howard E. Amend, representing the Barton Flats Camping Association. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD E. AMEND, ALTADENA, CALIF., REPRESENTING THE BARTON FLATS CAMPING ASSOCIATION

Mr. AMEND. I am Howard Amend, representing the Barton Flats Camping Association, which is made up of the 26 camps surrounding and near the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

All are in the vicinity of the San Gorgonio Wild Area. This is the second largest community of organizational camps in the United States. These camps are sponsored by Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA's, YWCA's, Boys' Clubs of America, Camp Fire Girls, and church affiliated groups.

The first of these camps, established by a U.S. Forest Service special use permit in 1917, and most of the other 25 camps had been established by 1925. Last year these camps provided an inspirational, living experience in God's great out of doors for 75,676 children, for approximately an 8-day period, into this area. The many years of planning and building with donated money and volunteer labor has given these camps a capital worth of over $7 million. They spend over a million dollars each year for camping operations in Barton Flats area.

SRP05549

We, the Barton Flats Camping Association, are strongly in favor of the passing of a wilderness bill that will preserve and protect wilderness lands in their natural state for our generation and all of the future generations of our Nation.

We feel that we have an obligation to the millions of children yet unborn to preserve for them a place where they can enjoy a true wilderness as God created it, a place for them to learn to love the simple things and feel at home with themselves and nature, and not watching out for cars as they whisk by on the roads or watching the ski lift pass over their heads.

We are more familiar with the problems of southern California than other portions of our Nation. We have seen how quickly the bulldozer turns virgin land into bustling cities. This bulldozer cares not for the needs of children to explore, to find high adventure, to dig under a rotting log, to drink from a fresh cold spring, or to climb high on a mountain. They must also learn that these experiences are rightfully theirs but also must be conserved.

We of the Barton Flats Camping Association know of the importance of wilderness for our campers. This is the main reason for the large number of camps located near the boundaries of the San Gorgonio Wild Area. Any change in the wilderness values of this land would directly hamper the value of the outdoor living experience offered by these camps.

The trails in this wild area are used by hikers and campers to a greater extent than any other similar area in the country. Over 53,500 persons visited San Gorgonio in the past year. An increase of over 30 percent over the previous year. More than 3,800 of these climbed to the summit, at an elevation of 11,502 feet. For many, this was their first wilderness experience, their first chance to know nature by its taste, smell, and feel.

(The Barton Flats Camp Association membership list follows:)

BARTON FLATS CAMP ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP LIST NOVEMBER 1963

Camp Arbolado, Whittier YMCA, 218 West Hadley, Whittier. Executive director, Charles W. Holloway.

Camp Cedar Falls, Southern California Conference of Seventh Day Adventists, Post Office Box 969, Glendale. Executive director, E. S. Reile.

Camp DeBeneville Pines, Universalist Church of America, 300 South Los Robles Avenue, Pasadena.

Camp Evangel, Camp Evangel, Inc., 955 West Fifth Street, Azusa. Executive director, John W. Birch.

Camp La Verne, Church of the Brethren, in care of Royce A. Stutzman, 334 South Annapolis Drive, Claremont.

Camp Nawakwa, Mount San Antonio Camp Fire Girls, 330 East Center Street, Pomona. Executive director, Mrs. Lenore Silvey.

Camp Osceola, Orange County YMCA and YWCA, 146 North Grand, Orange. Camp secretary, Howard Liggett.

Camp Cedar Canyon, San Gabriel Valley Council, Boy Scouts of America, 540 North Rosemead, Pasadena.

Camp Conrad, Centinela Valley YMCA, 319 East Kelso, Inglewood. Camp executive secretary, J. C. Risner.

Camp Edwards, YMCA Redlands, 500 East Citrus Redlands. Executive director, L. R. Coble.

Camp JCA, Jewish Center Association of Los Angeles, 5870 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles. Executive director, Bertram Gold.

Mile High Pines, California District Pilgrim Young People, 10717 East Klingerman, El Monte. Executive director, Dan Chamberlain.

Camp Norris, Boys' Club of Pasadena, 363 East Villa Street, Pasadena. Executive director, John R. Ya Senka.

Camp River Glen, Glendale Girl Scouts, 325 North Orange, Glendale. Executive director, Marion L. Donergan.
Camp Rokili, Orange Empire Council, Boy Scouts of America, 1032 West Eighth, Santa Ana. Executive director, Ross J. Taylor.
Camp Sky Meadows, First Methodist Church, 500 East Colorado Street, Pasadena. Minister of camping, Rev. Kenneth J. Mitchell.
Camp Tahquitz, Will J. Reid Scout Reservation, Boy Scouts of America, 401 East 37th Street, Long Beach. Executive director, Harold W. Arnold.
Camp Tulakes, Grayback Council, Boy Scouts of America, 115 East Central, Redlands. Executive director, O. Dayton Sharpe.
Camp Wasewagon, San Gabriel Valley Council, Camp Fire Girls, 391 South Madison, Pasadena. Executive director, Mrs. Florence Martin.
YMCA Round Meadow, Los Angeles YMCA, 715 South Hope Street, Los Angeles. Executive director, Robert G. Felder.
Ta Ta Pochon, Alhambra District, YMCA, 10 North Almansor, Alhambra. Camp executive, John T. Mott.
Camp Tautona, Tautona Girl Scout Council, 1931 E Street, San Bernardino. Executive director, Helen M. Mahler.
University Camp, University Religious Conference, 900 Hilgard, Los Angeles. Executive director, Luke Fishburn.
Camp Yallani, Camp Fire Girls, 725 South Figueroa, Los Angeles. Camping director, Miss Esther Bristol.

FREE USE

Kilkare Community Center Association Clubhouse, Route 1, Box 324, Mentone, Calif.
Camp Radford, Los Angeles Board of Recreation and Parks, 430 South Fuller, Los Angeles.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes, I have a question.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. First of all, let me say this: I am not excited one way or the other on this San Gorgonio proposition. We have had it up before us in Congress, as I am sure you know.

Mr. AMEND. Yes, sir.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is it not a fact that the use of this skiing area would, of course, be in the wintertime?

Mr. AMEND. Yes, it would be, plus tours during the summer.

Mr. WESTLAND. You would have tours anyway.

Mr. AMEND. Using the ski lift.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is there 3 or 4 months of skiing in that area?

Mr. AMEND. Approximately. I have some photographs of the area taken just less than 3 days ago showing no snow. [A chorus of boos.]

Mr. WESTLAND. Wait a minute now. I am in charge here.

Most of your camping is done in the summertime by the boys and girls, is it not?

Mr. AMEND. The largest percentage; although we do year-round camping on our particular site.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is it your position that a ski lift would so impede the view or the use of the wilderness area that it would be incompatible with camping for these youngsters?

Mr. AMEND. I believe it would be very detrimental. The 26 camps are mostly established where they are because of the wilderness area and our access to it. Nothing I think is more disheartening to a child making a valid effort in climbing a steep and rugged peak and meeting somebody in a coffee shop on top.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is why I asked originally if this was going to be principally used in the wintertime.

Mr. AMEND. I believe year-round use is intended of the ski lift.

Mr. WESTLAND. Certainly not for skiing.

SRP05551

Mr. AMEND. Not for skiing, but for sightseers during the summer months. I am not sure what the ski lift operators would intend to do, but with the investment they would have to make year-round use would almost be imperative. And we do use the area during the winter months also.

Mr. WESTLAND. All right.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Amend.

Mr. AMEND. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The photographs submitted will be made a part of the committee file.

The next group of witnesses is for San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc.: Morgan Adams, Jr., president; A. Andrew Hauk and Howard V. More.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Hauk will speak first.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF A. ANDREW HAUK, SAN GORGONIO SKI LIFTS, INC., UNION OIL CENTER, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. HAUK. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, counsel and staff, my name is A. Andrew Hauk. My office address is Union Oil Center, Los Angeles, Calif., telephone Huntley 2-7600. I am an attorney at law, specializing in trial and appellate practice, and I appear before your subcommittee as an individual vitally interested in the sport of skiing in southern California, as well as on behalf of San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc., and other groups seeking modification of the San Gorgonio wild area to permit limited entry for skiing and outdoor recreation development.

A short biographical sketch is attached. First of all, with respect to the testimony of the last witness, may I say we have had a survey team that went up there December 27 and found snow from 2½ to 3½ to 4 feet in the little draw and the big draw, and even in the lower portion of the big and little draws, which you see in the pictures on the various easels.

The snow is there. They did not go up high enough to the area we are talking about, 9,000 feet.

Secondly, these camps are not within 400 yards of the skiing area. The skiing area is more than 3 miles from the edge of the wild area. The ski area is above the 9,000-foot level and the camps are down below the 7,000-foot level. So they are more than 3 miles away from the proposed ski area. We believe the children should be able to use this area about 9,000 feet during the wintertime, and the way it is now they cannot use it because no man in his right mind would take his children up there, and attempt to get in and out in a day, and see the area and hopefully have them come back not having died of exposure or being caught in an avalanche. This is the point I think sometimes the camps overlook.

We will have some testimony later of an operator at Mount Baldy who at first got some static, if you will, from the Boy Scout camps, but they now use it more in winter than in summer. This fantastic change was because of summer school and so forth. They cannot get up in the summer but they can go in the winter.

My interest in skiing goes back to my youth in high school and college in Colorado, my native State, which is, of course, today the

prime skiing area in the country, interlaced with a tremendous network of uphill skiing facilities, including cable cars, chair lifts, T-bars and other uphill transportation.

More recently my interest since 1946 stems from my past service as committee chairman for ski area development and former vice president of the Far West Ski Association, 1947–49; my committee work with the United States Ski Association; my racing experience—I hold a national championship, Veterans II Giant Slalom 1953; membership in the National Ski Patrol System; former president and director of Southern Skis, a local ski club; and other such activities.

I was chairman of the speakers bureau and was a member of the committee which prepared and directed the presentation of the case on behalf of the skiers at the Forest Service hearing on San Gorgonio in 1947.

In 1960 and during the preparatory years prior thereto, I served as vice chairman of the California Olympic Commission on appointment by the Governor for the VIII Olympic winter games in Squaw Valley, and I plan to attend the IX Olympic winter games in Innsbruck, Austria, as a representative of the Governor.

I have traveled extensively throughout the United States and Europe, studying various winter recreation areas, and assisted on the organization of three local areas, Snow Valley, Kratka Ridge, and Mount Baldy, the last named of which I am vice president and general counsel.

The general position and viewpoint of my testimony will be in favor of including in the wilderness legislation a provision permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to designate a limited portion of the San Gorgonio Wild Area for limited entry to permit the development of facilities for skiing and for outdoor recreation. In this connection, I suggest for consideration of the committee the following language, which was included in the 1962 House version of the wilderness bill, H.R. 776, 87th Congress, 2d session, section 206 (j):

> (j) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture may designate approximately 3,500 acres in the San Gorgonio Area, California, for the purpose of skiing and developing facilities necessary therefor: *Provided*, That the Secretary finds that said use is the highest and best use to be made of this area.

We feel most strongly that the public welfare and the expanding recreational needs of the 12 million people in southern California demand the development of skiing and outdoor recreation in the 3,500 acres—less than 10 percent—of San Gorgonio above 9,000 feet—the unique and ideal skiing and snow play portion of San Gorgonio Wild Area.

However, we also feel strongly that this development should be recognized as a necessary and essential exception to general wilderness policy in the San Gorgonio area and throughout the United States as developed and carried out so well by the Forest Service and embodies in some of the wilderness bills before your subcommittee.

Further, we feel just as strongly that this exception does not and should not create any precedent to be used to cut down or redraw wilderness protected areas throughout the United States.

And we agree with the Sierra Club and other wilderness groups, and we emphasize, that this development of skiing and winter recreation should and must be carried out under strict regulations of the For-

SRP05553

est Service so as to protect the beauties of nature for a widening segment of the population, and so as to preserve the present recreational uses by hikers and overnight camping groups in the lower region of San Gorgonio below 9,000 feet, that is, in the South Fork Valley of the Santa Ana River, South Fork Meadow (Thousand Springs Meadow or Slushy Meadow, as it is sometimes called), Christmas Tree Hill and Dollar Lake, along with the lower part of Charlton Peak adjoining Dollar Lake.

In this connection, and, in line with our continuing and wholehearted support for the concept of adequate protection and preservation of the wilderness, we suggest to the subcommittee and to the committee that the Secretary of Agriculture should be given continuing authority to manage primitive areas without any time limitation, such as the 10 years set forth in H.R. 9162, the Dingell bill, section 3(b), page 5.

I am submitting a document entitled "Statement of Facts and Arguments in Support of Modification on San Gorgonio Wild Area To Permit Limited Entry on 3,500 Acres for Development of Skiing and Outdoor Recreation," being a detailed summary of material developed and prepared up to November 13, 1963, and submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Forest Service on that date in connection with our appeal for the public hearing on modification of San Gorgonio as we are urging your subcommittee today.

This statement of facts and arguments has nine enclosures as follows:

1. Snow survey report.
2. Elevation-accessibility chart of ski areas in southern California.
3. Report of Economic Research Associates, "The Need and Potential for Expanded Utilization of Mount San Gorgonio," March 29, 1963, ERA folder.
4. Ski dollars going out of State and to Europe.
5. Excerpts from hearings and reports of Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on wilderness bill S. 4.
6. Copies of letters from existing southern California areas: (*a*) Clem C. Glass; (*b*) Mount Baldy Ski Lifts, Inc.; (*c*) Snow Valley, Inc.; (*d*) Table Mountain.
7. Sutherland's articles in the Los Angeles Times, March 24–27, 1963.
8. Resolution of Far West Ski Association.
9. Press clippings: (*a*) San Bernardino Evening Telegram editorial, January 24, 1963; (*b*) San Bernardino Sun Telegram, Sunday, August 4, 1963; (*c*) Redlands Daily Facts editorial re amendment, August 3, 1963; (*d*) Riverside Daily Enterprise, August 5, 1963; (*e*) San Bernardino Evening Telegram, September 20, 1963; (*f*) Los Angeles Times, November 18, 1963; (*h*) Herald-Examiner, November 14, 1963; (*i*) Sports Illustrated, November 18, 1963.

The enclosures are also submitted to you for your study.

(Committee note: Exhibits considered appropriate for inclusion in the record are set forth below. The remainder are in the committee files.)

SNOW SURVEY, 1962–63 SEASON

Perhaps one could summarize this past season as being, for southern California, a typical season in many respects; and yet it was actually more critical, the snow coming unusually late, even Mammoth Mountain to the north not becoming operational until the beginning of February.

Locally, operations ranged in length from 22 days (maximum) to 1 operator who did not have a single day of ski activity. February 15, which was actually the midpoint of the local ski season, was favored with snow depths ranging from 0 to 18 inches at elevations basically between 7,000 to 8,000 feet. Mount Baldy, at its top level (8,600 feet), recorded the maximum reading.

San Gorgonio received the following snowfall at altitudes listed.

Date	Snow depth	Snow quality	Altitude
	Inches		*Feet*
1963—Jan. 27 [1]	0–24	Poor to fair	9,000
Feb. 15	40–60	Powder	9,000–10,000
Mar. 3	30–35	Wet-crusty	9,000
Mar. 10	24–36	Dry powder	9,010–10,000
Apr. 21	26–60	Dry granular	9,000–10,000
May 5	20–48	Wet-good	9,000–10,000

[1] Snow samplings taken on listed dates by Ski Patrolmen Jack Page and Bob Hale.

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF MODIFICATION OF SAN GORGONIO WILD AREA TO PERMIT ENTRY ON 3,500 ACRES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SKIING AND OUTDOOR RECREATION

A detailed summary of material developed and prepared up to the present moment for submittal with letters to Secretary of Agriculture and Chief of Forest Service dated November 13, 1963, re San Gorgonio Wild Area, Forest Service letter of October 16, 1963, Forest Service File 2320:

A. Request for reconsideration by Chief of the Forest Service.

B. Appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture.

C. Petition to the Secretary of Agriculture to order public hearing re modification.

D. Request for extension of time to April 1, 1964.

Submitted by San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc.:

By MORGAN ADAMS, Jr., *President.*
By A. ANDREW HAUK,
Vice President and General Counsel.

Recently our group made a detailed presentation to U.S. Congressman Harry R. Sheppard and to the Board of Supervisors of San Bernardino County, setting forth the facts about the proposed limited entry in San Gorgonio for skiing and outdoor recreation development of the 3,500 acres above 9,000 feet.

We sincerely believe that you have an open mind on the matter. We further believe that if sufficient demand were shown, and if San Gorgonio area could be opened to the development of skiing and outdoor recreation in a careful manner so as to protect wilderness values and present use by the hiking and overnight camping groups, you would be in favor of a hearing by the Forest Service to determine the best method of accomplishing this limited entry.

During the past year we have made considerable progress in assembling the facts, in evaluating public opinion, in determining the impact socially upon the general public, as well as economically upon business in San Bernardino County, and in ascertaining the economic feasibility of developing skiing and outdoor recreation facilities in the 3,500 acres of San Gorgonio above 9,000 feet—the unique and ideal skiing portion of the San Gorgonio Wild Area. We believe that from what we have accomplished to date we can, within the next 5 to 6 months, demonstrate conclusively to you that the public welfare and the expanding recreational demands of the people in San Bernardino County and southern California require the development of skiing and outdoor recreation in San Gorgonio.

With the able assistance of Dr. George A. Selke, the special assistant to Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, we met several times with representatives of the Sierra Club in an endeavor to narrow the gap between skiers and wilderness groups. We believe that considerable progress has been made in this direction but more can be and should be done. It is our understanding that Dr. Selke has kept you and the secretary fully informed of our progress in this direction. However, it is rather apparent that, at least for the moment the Sierra Club does not believe that any sort of compromise is possible.

 SRP05555

Their stand is still completely and adamantly against any kind of skiing and outdoor recreation development anywhere in the San Gorgonio Wild Area. On the other hand, we believe that the development could be so regulated that it would not in any way impair any of the wilderness values. So there remains a basic disagreement between the Sierra Club and ourselves despite our every effort to effect a compromise.

However, we agree with the Sierra Club and other wilderness groups and we emphasize, that such development must be carried out under strict regulations of the Forest Service so as to protect the beauties of nature for a widening segment of the population, and so as to preserve the present recreational uses by hikers and overnight camping groups in the lower region of San Gorgonio, that is, in the South Fork Valley of the Santa Ana River, South Fork Meadows (Thousand Springs Meadows or Slushy Meadows, as it is sometimes called), Christmas Tree Hill and Dollar Lake, along with the lower part of Charlton Peak adjoining Dollar Lake.

Specifically directed toward these objectives we have amended our application to the Forest Service (originally filed July 11, 1962), eliminating any suggestion of ski-lift development or construction of facilities anywhere in this lower region that is used most heavily by the youth camps, the hikers, and the overnight campers.

On July 30, 1963, in the same amendment to our application to the Forest Service, we definitely limited our proposed entry into San Gorgonio by excluding overnight lodging within the area, except for employees and operating personnel. The Big Bear Lake resorts and lodges, having over 10,000 available accommodations within half an hour's drive over the new high-gear road from Barton Flats, would be the logical base for after-ski fun in the mountains for those enjoying San Gorgonio in the daytime, and would benefit greatly from the lengthening of the ski season which its development would entail.

Therefore, we are particularly pleased that you continue to have an open mind on this question and we should like to bring to your attention some of the facts that have been developed by us in the past year.

We are, of course, continuing our work and more facts will be forthcoming as our work progresses.

We understand some persons in the Big Bear area are ostensibly concerned about possible lose of business in the Big Bear area that might result from the limited entry in the San Gorgonio area for skiing development.

Apparently the alleged complaints from the Big Bear area can be summarized in three points, each of which is unfounded in fact:

(1) There is ample skiing and there are sufficient ski areas to take care of the demand in southern California without San Gorgonio.

(2) Present commercial ski areas would be injured by possible loss of business to San Gorgonio and are therefore opposed to its opening.

(3) The development of skiing facilities in San Gorgonio is not economically feasible.

We believe we can conclusively demonstrate to you, and to the Forest Service, that there is no factual basis for these points; that they are not, in fact, true; that they are myths based upon misunderstanding of the facts; and that any contentions based on them simply do not hold water.

THE FIRST MYTH

There are already enough ski areas in southern California to take care of the demand

This, as any skier in southern California can readily testify, is absolutely unfounded and completely untrue. The highest ski area in southern California is Mount Baldy where the top ski lift ends at 8,600 feet. Of course, the higher the elevation, the more snow, but over the past 5 years the number of skiing days at Mount Baldy have been as follows:

Season:	*Days*
1958–59	20
1959–60	57
1960–61	0
1961–62	99
1962–63	22

The longest season was 99 days; 1 year had no skiing; and another year had only 20 days. During this last season of 1962–63, while Mount Baldy had 22 marginal days of skiing, the snow in the San Gorgonio skiing area above 9,000 feet could have provided a season of 90 days with average to good skiing. (See snow survey reports enclosed.)

The fact of the matter is that the 3,500 acres in San Gorgonio above 9,000 feet offer the only dependable and reliable skiing in southern California. The altitude alone guarantees this. But in addition, the configuration of the bowls which nature has formed in San Gorgonio above 9,000 feet in the Big Draw, Little Draw, and North Face is unique in southern California. It is an ideal ski area and the only one in southern California with the necessary altitude and, therefore, adequate snow.

Lack of snow at all of the existing ski areas in southern California in the last 5 years has forced skiers to travel to out-of-State ski areas like Sun Valley, Aspen, and Alta, or to Europe, or at least as far north as Mammoth Mountain in Mono County, a 700-mile round trip drive requiring more than 12 hours of high-speed concentration in auto driving by weary skiing groups and families over weekends.

It is inconceivable that this ideal area of San Gorgonio should be locked up and barred from limited entry for skiing which is not only adequate but superb, while the existing ski areas in southern California have snow and skiing that are often marginal and sometimes nonexistent. As a matter of fact, the San Gorgonio area is at virtually the same elevation as Mammoth Mountain area. (See "Elevation, Accessibility Chart of Ski Areas," enclosed.)

It is equally inconceivable that the skiers should be forced to spend time and effort, as well as dollars, in driving and skiing 300 or more miles outside of San Bernardino County and southern California when this ideal ski area potential is right here in their backyard.

It is conservatively estimated that approximately 100,000 skier days are generated annually by southern California in the ski areas in the High Sierras alone, resulting in a flow of funds to these areas of between $2 and $2½ million annually, with most of these expenditures "off mountain"; that is, accruing to the many merchants, hotel keepers, and restaurant operators in neighboring localities of the High Sierras. (See Economic Research Associates report, enclosed p. 18, "The Need and Potential for Expanded Utilization of Mount San Gorgonio.")

The financial impact of winter recreation in San Gorgonio would, by conservative estimate, be $2½ million annually in the early years of operation and $5 million or more in later years. This economic input would be shared by all of the neighboring communities to San Gorgonio, and particularly the Big Bear area, Redlands, and the city of San Bernardino, all within the county of San Bernardino in southern California.

Summing it up, the existing ski areas in southern California are inadequate, they do not meet the demand, they do not have reliable snow, and as a result the economic benefit—skiing dollars to the tune of at least $10 million annually—are going north, out of State, and to Europe, instead of staying in San Bernardino and southern California. (See "Ski Dollars Going Out of State and to Europe," enclosed.)

THE SECOND MYTH

The existing ski areas might be injured by loss of business competition from a developed San Gorgonio ski area

Again, we have an assumption that is simply not based on fact. Any reputable ski area operator in California will tell you, and those of us who are connected with the existing ski areas in southern California know this to be true, that the development of an adequate and ideal ski area in San Gorgonio will not hurt the business of existing areas but will, in fact, increase that business. This has been the history of ski areas—each new ski area developed in California with adequate snow has resulted in increasing the number of skiers and the demand for skiing dramatically throughout the State. This in turn has resulted in more business for each of the ski areas throughout the State.

As a matter of fact, the principals in our organization are right now connected with three existing ski areas in the county of San Bernardino, which happen to be the largest in southern California—Mount Baldy at the west end of the county near Ontario; Snow Valley in the center of the county near Arrowhead; and Snow Summit at the east end of the county at Big Bear. We also have a director who runs a ski area known as Table Mountain near Big Pines in Los Angeles County, and another who developed Alpine Meadows in northern California near Tahoe.

 SRP05557

We are unanimous and emphatic in affirming to you, and we would so testify, that none of these existing areas would suffer by a development in San Gorgonio, but, in fact, would receive increased business if the San Gorgonio area were opened to limited entry for skiing development. We might add, too, that the manager of the Snow Summit ski area in Big Bear, the only ski operator from southern California called to testify on this San Gorgonio issue at the hearings before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the wilderness bill, S. 4, went on record favoring the development of San Gorgonio for skiing, recognizing the need but apparently willing to wait until the Forest Service is ready. (See pp. 121–124 of hearings, Feb. 28, 1963, enclosed.)

We are in the process of obtaining letters from the various existing ski areas in southern California as well as throughout the State which will confirm this to you, and we enclose those we have already obtained from persons connected with Mount Baldy, Snow Valley, Snow Summit, and Table Mountain.

Moreover, consider the economic impact of the $2 to $5 million which would be spent in San Bernardino, Redlands, Big Bear, and Barton Flats for transportation, lodging, and food, as well as for skiing equipment and ski lifts. This impact would also add to the income and economic potential of all existing ski areas in San Bernardino County, the communities supplying the services to the people skiing in San Gorgonio, and all of the people throughout San Bernardino County and southern California.

THE THIRD MYTH

The skiing development in San Gorgonio would not be economically feasible

This is absolutely false. The fact of the matter is that the demand by the public for skiing facilities in southern California; the ideal snow conditions, altitude and configuration of the 3,500 acres in San Gorgonio above 9,000 feet; the mountain recreational needs of the exploring population of southern California; the inadequacy of the existing ski areas in southern California which do not have dependable and reliable snow because they do not have the necessary altitude; the economic potential of a carefully planned skiing development in San Gorgonio—all of these conclusively demonstrate the economic feasibility of a major skiing development in San Gorgonio.

These are not conclusions drawn out of a hat. They are the careful judgments made by outstanding and independent economists of national repute, Economic Research Associates, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif., in their report dated March 29, 1963, titled "The Need and Potential for Expanded Utilization of Mount San Gorgonio." We are enclosing a copy of this report from which you can ascertain directly the economic feasibility of limited entry in San Gorgonio for skiing and winter recreational development. (See ERA report, enclosed.)

This very reputable economic research group headed by Harrison A. Price, has made economic studies for the largest recreational developments in the country, including Disneyland and other Disney enterprises; Marineland; Century 21 Exposition at Seattle; the new California State Fair and Exposition at Sacramento; Interama (an $80 million recreational development) at Miami, Fla.; numerous exhibitors at the coming New York World's Fair in 1964; recent State of California development in Squaw Valley, and the 1960 Olympic winter games prior thereto; and the California World's Fair 1966–67 at Long Beach. (See ERA folder, enclosed.)

Perhaps even more significant in demonstrating the economic feasibility of a major skiing and outdoor recreation development in San Gorgonio is the combined investment, financial, management, and skiing development experience and judgment of our group of principals in San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc. Each of us, in his own right, is a man of substance and proven ability in the business and professional communities of southern California. Each of us, except for John Reily, who developed the new northern California area of Alpine Meadows adjoining Squaw Valley, at Lake Tahoe, actively participated in the development and is presently an investor or executive in existing ski areas here in southern California, and in the three largest ones which, incidentally, are located in the county of San Bernardino—Snow Summit at Big Bear Lake, Snow Valley near Lake Arrowhead, and Mount Baldy near Ontario.

Convinced as we are of the economic feasibility of ski development in San Gorgonio, we have gone on record with the Forest Service in a formal application filed in July last year and a recent amendment filed July 30 this year. We are willing to commit a financial investment of $2½ million to this project in the

initial phases with an ultimate investment of up to $5 million. This is not idle talk. This is the considered conclusion of our group who represent the largest existing ski areas in southern California and in the county of San Bernardino, and who are in the best position to judge economic feasibility. We are willing to make this investment commitment because we believe that a reasonable program for the development of San Gorgonio for skiing and outdoor recreation, and yet preserving all the wilderness values, can be undertaken and carried through successfully on the basis of an initial expenditure of $2½ million and an ultimate investment in excess of $5 million. Individually and collectively we are willing to make this commitment because we are convinced it is economically feasible.

As we pointed out at the beginning of this letter, we have been making considerable progress, but we are continuing and intensifying the efforts of public education and development of facts. We will send you the results of these efforts from time to time.

We urge that you continue to keep an open mind on this question of opening San Gorgonio, because we believe that you will want to support the limited entry we propose in San Gorgonio.

There has been a tremendous swing of public opinion in favor of limited entry in San Gorgonio for a skiing and outdoor recreation development that will take care of the expanding demand and need for skiing and winter recreation in a way that will protect and preserve the wilderness values. This swing is being recorded in the petitions, resolutions, letters, and newspaper stories which will be forwarded to you.

We know that you will give these facts your careful consideration. We are confident that we can convince you, that we can convince the San Bernardino Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade, that we can convince all of the merchants, businessmen, opinion leaders, and general public of this great county that the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run, which after all is the motto of the Forest Service, demands this limited entry in San Gorgonio for skiing and outdoor recreational development.

The enclosures we are sending for your information and in support of the true facts on this issue are as follows:

1. Snow survey reports.
2. Elevation—accessibility chart of ski areas in southern California.
3. Report of Economic Research Associates, "The Need and Potential for Expanded Utilization of Mount San Gorgonio." March 20, 1963; ERA folder.
4. Ski dollars going out-of-State and to Europe.
5. Excerpts from hearings and reports of Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on wilderness bill, S. 4.
6. Copies of letters from existing southern California ski areas—Mount Baldy, Snow Valley, Snow Summit, Table Mountain.
7. Sutherland's articles in the Los Angeles Times, March 24–27, 1963.
8. Resolution of Far West Ski Association.
9. Newspaper articles:
   - (*a*) San Bernardino Evening Telegram editorial, January 24, 1963.
   - (*b*) San Bernardino Sun Telegram, Sunday, August 4, 1963.
   - (*c*) Redlands Daily Facts editorial re amendment, August 3, 1963.
   - (*d*) Riverside Daily Enterprise, August 5, 1963.
   - (*e*) San Bernardino Evening Telegram, September 20, 1963.
   - (*f*) Los Angeles Times special supplement "Ski World," part 6, page 111.
   - (*g*) Los Angeles Times special supplement "Ski World," November 8, 1963.

---

4. Ski Dollars Going Out of State and to Europe

OUT OF STATE

Sun Valley, Idaho, states that 40 percent of their customers in the winter come from southern California.

Alta, Utah, claims that almost 50 percent of its revenue is from southern California skiers.

Aspen and Vail Pass in Colorado have somewhat smaller percentages because of their distance from California and closeness to Texas, Chicago, New York, and the eastern seaboard. But they are, nevertheless, dependent for good numbers of skiers from southern California.

 SRP05559

EUROPE

One thousand and fifty Far West Ski Association members flew to Europe in February and March 1963, in 8 chartered planes arranged by this one organization. They spent approximately:

	Per member	Group of 1,050, total
Round trip air fare to Europe	$340	$357,000
They averaged 28 days there at $25 per day	700	735,000
Total	1,040	1,092,000

NOTE.—70 percent of these people were from southern California.

6a. CLEM GLASS

SEPTEMBER 19, 1963.

Re proposed San Gorgonio ski area.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHEPPARD: This letter is being written to advise you that it is my sincere belief that the development of the San Gorgonio Mountain area above 9,000 feet for recreational skiing would not be harmful to the existing ski lift areas in southern California.

At the present time I am an officer of the San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc., and have been working with them to secure the development of the San Gorgonio area in the proper manner. It is the sincere feeling of our group that if the development is done properly it will not destroy the wilderness area.

I am also an officer (and have been active since its inception) of one of the largest ski areas in southern California, which is located at Big Bear; namely Snow Summit. It is my feeling, as indicated above, that when it has snow—either artificial or real—Snow Summit will prosper whether or not San Gorgonio is or is not ever developed. As a matter of fact, it might even be argued that if we had a San Gorgonio facility, business may improve at Snow Summit. One of the difficulties at the present time is our short season due to the low elevation of existing ski areas. I believe that the more good ski areas that we have available in southern California, the more skiers will be "created" and in the long run all areas should secure more business through this process of developing more skiers.

If you were to travel to the ski areas surrounding Los Angeles on a good weekend when there was adequate snow, you would find that at the present time all areas would be overcrowded. With San Gorgonio obviously not being able to take care of the requirements of all skiers in southern California, it is obvious that when there is good snow at the surrounding areas business will continue to be tremendous. At the present time when the local areas are out of snow it is necessary to travel many miles to the ski areas. With the development of San Gorgonio, San Gorgonio should still be running for many additional weeks when the local areas are out of snow.

Incidentally, I am also a stockholder in one of the other large areas in the San Bernardino Mountains, Snow Valley. Johnny Elvrum, the founder and head of this corporation, I believe, will be writing you to give his viewpoints on the matter. But, as a stockholder, here again I feel that Snow Valley will not suffer from the development of San Gorgonio.

Yours very truly,

W. ROSS CAMPBELL CO.,
CLEM C. GLASS, *Vice President.*

6b. MOUNT BALDY SKI LIFTS, INC.

MOUNT BALDY SKI LIFTS, INC.,
Mount Baldy, Calif., September 16, 1963.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHEPPARD: We would like to state to you our position and convictions with respect to the opening of the San Gorgonio Wild Area for limited entry on the 3,500 acres for skiing and outdoor recreational development above 9,000 feet in this area.

As president and general manager of Mount Baldy Ski Lifts, Inc., which is located in the western end of San Bernardino County near Upland and Ontario, I firmly believe that the proposed skiing and outdoor recreational development in San Gorgonio would not adversely affect the operations of our Mount Baldy ski area in any way. As a matter of fact, all of our shareholders, officers, and directors agree on this; we are convinced and we know from past experience that such a development in San Gorgonio would benefit our ski area and every other ski area in southern California, because it would make available for the skiing public the only dependable snow area in southern California.

This would provide guaranteed ski seasons every year resulting in expanded ski opportunities and increasing the number of skiers using the presently existing areas when we do have snow.

This has been the history of all ski areas in the United States—every good new ski area brings greater business to the existing areas because it increases the usage, excitement, and the skiing population.

Our Mount Baldy, with its investment of $1½ million, is the largest existing ski area in southern California, and along with the next two largest, Snow Valley near Arrowhead and Snow Summit at Big Bear, are all located in San Bernardino County. These other areas, I am sure, will report the same facts. They will not be hurt by the skiing expansion generated by the proposed development of San Gorgonio. They will, and particularly anyone offering accommodations, in fact, benefit from it.

For these reasons we do not oppose the San Gorgonio development. On the contrary, we welcome it, we support it, and we urge that you support it because it will not only help us, but bring tremendous economic and social benefits to the entire county of San Bernardino. We ask you to join us in urging the Forest Service to conduct a public hearing on this issue so that the proposed development can get underway.

Sincerely,

HERB C. LEFFLER,
President and General Manager.

6c. SNOW VALLEY, INC.

SNOW VALLEY, INC.,
Running Springs Post Office, Calif., September 16, 1963.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHEPPARD: We have been at Snow Valley, a ski resort located in the San Bernardino Mountains, for over 23 years. Over this period of time we have seen the number of skiers increase with each year.

In regard to the opening of San Gorgonio for skiers, we would like to mention that many skiers are leaving this county to go to the High Sierras for their skiing weekend or holiday. Having San Gorgonio opened with the longer ski season and more dependable snow should not hurt our area or for that matter, any other ski area in southern California but actually promote more enthusiasm and participation for this part of the State and also bring in skiers from out of State.

Yours very truly,

JOHN ELVRUM, *President.*

SRP05561

6D. TABLE MOUNTAIN

TABLE MOUNTAIN,
Wrightwood, Calif., September 27, 1963.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It has recently been brought to the writer's attention that you have raised some questions concerning the feelings of ski lift operators in southern California in regard to the development of southern California's only first-class ski area—the approximately 3,500-acre basin under the summit of San Gorgonio.

The writer is sure that the predominant majority of southern California ski areas faces the development of San Gorgonio just as I do. Attached you will find a copy of a letter which I addressed to the Hon. Gracie Bowers Pfost more than a year ago on this subject, which I think is still completely valid.

I sincerely hope that you will support the development of skiing in San Gorgonio. It will not only mean a great deal to the skiers in San Bernardino County but in all southern California and would give a great commercial boost to hotels, motels, restaurants, and recreation business in the San Bernardino and Big Bear areas. This can be accomplished without interference with the presently developed Barton Flats camps or the South Fork Valley and Thousand Springs Meadow which are used so heavily by them.

Sincerely,

HOWARD V. MORE.

TABLE MOUNTAIN,
Wrightwood, Calif., May 2, 1962.

Re wilderness bill S-174.

Hon. GRACIE BOWERS PFOST,
Chairwoman, The Public Lands Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. PFOST: The writer is the lessee and operator of the captioned ski area which is located approximately 85 miles from downtown Los Angeles in the Angeles National Forest. The writer has run this area for more than 18 years. I have been skiing for more than 35 years and have watched this sport grow from a "toe strap" and "barrel stave" operation for the neighborhood kids into a national recreational pastime. The writer has been involved in skiing in Colorado, New England, Pennsylvania, as well as the west coast.

Los Angeles has currently more than a dozen ski areas and undoubtedly has more ski lifts and tows within 100 miles than any city in the United States. On the other hand, as the writer knows from sad personal experience, skiing on currently available areas in southern California is a very undependable proposition. It is dryland farming in reverse. Some years we have no skiing at all—some years it is reasonably good, but we can never be sure that we are not going to be rained out of business in the next storm. All of the presently developed areas in southern California are in an elevation between 7,000 and perhaps 8,500 feet as a top. This just is not high enough for dependable snow conditions. There is terrain in southern California at higher elevations but unhappily Mother Nature has not provided this terrain with an area which is practicable for major skiing development—that is, with the exception of one large basin on the slopes of San Gorgonio.

This basin is remarkable. It is safe to say that it contains as much good skiable terrain as all of the presently developed southern California ski areas put together. What is more important, the skiing begins in this area at about 8,800 feet and extends up to almost 11,000 feet—a critical difference in elevation. This elevation makes the difference between rain and snow. What is more important there seems to be a peculiar set of climatic conditions which favor this basin on San Gorgonio with more precipitation and thermal conditions which cause the snow to hold in quantity and far longer than any other southern California area.

The area in question is well known. It is bounded roughly by Dry Lake, a defile known as the Big Draw, another valley known as the Little Draw, Charlton Mountain, Dollar Lake, and Christmas Tree Hill. It consists, all told, of perhaps 3,000 or 4,000 acres, or about 10 percent of the present San Gorgonio wilderness. It is set off by natural ridges, etc., from the rest of the wilderness.

It is worth mentioning that this acreage could easily be replaced with present unused Government land not included in the San Gorgonio wilderness because it

SRP05562

lies below the 7,000-foot elevation; which elevation was the original determining criteria describing which land would constitute the wilderness area. Much of the land not included in the present primitive area is at least as rugged, remote, and beautiful as the land which is needed for ski development.

In some ways the San Gorgonio ski terrain mentioned above is similar to Tuckerman's Ravine on the side of Mount Washington in New England. The difference, however, is that there is alternate good ski terrain nearby in New England. This is not the case in southern California.

To get conditions like those on San Gorgonio one must travel 250 miles each way to the high Sierras which is far beyond a 1-day practicable recreation range. San Gorgonio is less than 100 miles from 5 million people and not over 150 miles from more than 10 million people. The basin in question could easily accommodate 10,000 people on any given day if there was an adequate access road. One of the beauties of this area is that there is plenty of terrain for parking. What is more, there is skiing for all classes from beginner to expert, and plenty of room left over for people who simply want to play in the snow, or otherwise enjoy wonderful winter recreation.

In spite of an unusually good skiing season in southern California this year, all southern California ski areas were out of business by April 10. The writer has hiked to San Gorgonio twice since April 10 and as of May 1 there is still many feet of snow on hundreds of acres of wonderful ski terrain on San Gorgonio.

I have been to San Gorgonio many times in years past for there is good skiing there when there is none elsewhere in southern California. For instance, on January 1, 1961, the writer and his son visited San Gorgonio and had very good skiing. As a matter of fact, we skied a couple of miles on one downhill course at a time when there was no skiing anywhere else in southern California. We spent the weekend in the area and saw only two other people.

It is virtually impossible to overemphasize the difference between presently available ski terrain in southern California and the terrain on San Gorgonio. San Gorgonio is more like Mammoth Mountain, Squaw Valley, or one of the major dependable ski areas and it is positively the only such area in southern California.

Because there are getting to be so many more skiers and people interested in winter recreation, the development of San Gorgonio is currently the subject of widespread interest here. However, many have been interested in the development of this remarkable area for 20 years or more—for the area in question is unique and is a "one and only" situation so far as winter recreation in southern California is concerned.

San Gorgonio has a long and dependable season as compared to an unpredictable and undependable season at any area presently developed or capable of development on a major basis in southern California.

There will be no question of adequate available private financing for San Gorgonio. For instance, the writer is currently involved with a group which can come up with the first million on virtually an overnight basis.

San Gorgonio could cause a problem to existing ski areas in southern California during the first year or two. On the other hand, with the number of people in southern California and the growing demand for ski recreation, it could only help our business in the long run, for it would give us one dependable area. When the present areas have snow there is no particular problem drawing customers and this would undoubtedly continue to be the case. I am willing to risk the several hundred thousand dollars I have invested in Table Mountain on my judgment in this matter.

The writer sincerely hopes that appropriate governmental action, either via the Forest Service, the Department of Agriculture, or by Congress, if necessary, can be taken to make this area available for winter recreation.

Sincerely,

HOWARD V. MORE, *Lessee.*

---

8. RESOLUTION OF FAR WEST SKI ASSOCIATION

Whereas the tremendous and explosive growth of southern California since the 1947 public hearing by the Forest Service on the San Gorgonio Wild Area has increased the population of southern California 111 percent; from 5 million then to 11 million now, with all estimates indicating that there will be 20 million residents by 1973; and

SRP05563

Whereas this population explosion and increased personal income and leisure time, as well as increased emphasis on participating recreation, have created overwhelming public demand for the use of a small portion of the San Gorgonio Wild Area above 9,000 feet for skiing and outdoor recreation; and

Whereas the construction and development of ski lifts and attendant facilities, including parking, can be confined to an area of 3,500 acres, which is only 10 percent of the total of 35,000 acres in the San Gorgonio Wild Area, without any entry or invasion of the South Fork Valley, including South Fork Meadows (also known as Thousand Springs Meadows and Slushy Meadows), and the Christmas Tree Hill area, thereby preserving and protecting the great wilderness values of San Gorgonio for future generations, and preserving the present usage by hikers, campers, and youth groups; and

Whereas the skiing and winter recreation area which would be serviced by such facilities; that is, the area of the Big Draw, the Little Draw, and Northeast Face between Dry Lake at 9,000 feet and San Gorgonio, Jepson, and Charlton Peaks up to the 11,300-foot level, is an ideal and unique skiing and winter recreation area whose use for skiing and winter recreation will in no way interfere with or harm the rest of the San Gorgonio Wild Area as a primitive wilderness preserve; and

Whereas the winter season which is just coming to a close in southern California has demonstrated beyond all possible doubt that the San Gorgonio Wild Area between 9,000 and 11,300 feet is the only area in southern California with dependable snow conditions, since it has had sufficient snow to support a minimum of 90 days skiing between December 15 and April 15, while all of the presently developed ski areas in southern California have had either no snow at all suitable for skiing or only enough for extremely poor seasons of 20 days or less; and

Whereas there is overwhelming evidence that the general public interest requires the recognition that highest and best use of the San Gorgonio Wild Area above 9,000 feet in the region of the Big and Little Draws between Dry Lake and San Gorgonio Peak is for skiing and winter recreation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Far West Ski Association in its 31st annual convention assembled April 27 to 28, Yosemite, Calif., as follows:

1. The U.S. Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture should make available for the development of skiing and outdoor recreation facilities an area of 3,500 acres out of the 35,000 acreas in the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

2. These facilities should be so located upon the 3,500 acres as to protect and preserve the great wilderness values of the San Gorgonio Wild Area for future generations. More specifically, they should be constructed under strict Forest Service control and without intruding in any way upon the South Fork, Thousand Springs, Meadows, or Christmas Tree Hill areas.

3. These facilities should be so located as to service the area of the Big Draw and Little Draw, Northeast Face, and the slopes generally lying between Dry Lake at 9,000 feet and San Gorgonio Peak, Jepson Peak, and Charlton Peak up to the 11,300-foot level. This is an area of approximately 3,500 acres, 10 percent of the total of 35,000 acres in the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

4. This action by the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture will meet the tremendous public demand in southern California for winter outdoor recreation and skiing which arises from the explosive population increase to the present 11 million people (20 million in 1973) in southern California. At the same time it will preserve and protect all of the great wilderness values in the San Gorgonio Wild Area for future generations.

5. The Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture should call a public hearing in the immediate future to hear testimony and receive evidence from all interested sources in order to determine the appropriate action to be taken in making this area available for skiing and outdoor recreation in a way that will preserve and protect the wilderness values.

Mr. HAUK. Personally and on behalf of those whom I represent I desire to thank the committee, its counsel, and staff, for your kindness and consideration in permitting us to present to you and for the record the facts and arguments in support of modification of San Gorgonio Wild Area to permit limited entry for skiing and winter recreation development.

There is no reason why southern California should not be able to enjoy skiing on the 3 feet and more of snow now in San Gorgonio. Here are the latest figures from our on-the-spot survey made by our executive secretary, Gene Hallstrand, and party on December 27, just 2 weeks ago: Dry Lake and vicinity, 11 to 14 inches; Big Draw, 2½ to 3 feet.

As a matter of fact, San Gorgonio has had skiable snow since October 15, when no area in southern California had any snow, and even the famous areas of the West, such as Aspen, Vail, Sun Valley, Squaw Valley, and Mammoth, had no skiable snow.

More astounding and almost unbelievable, yet verified by on-the-spot snow surveys made by Bob Hale of the National Ski Patrol and his group on the weekend of November 23–24, there was as much snow there, 3 feet and more, as had fallen at Mammoth Mountain where the U.S. Olympic Ski Team was training because there wasn't enough snow in Colorado.

It's a tragic absurdity to keep this area locked up and see the skiing money leave southern California for Aspen, Sun Valley, and Europe.

But even more important for the great majority of the citizens of southern California is the tremendous potential of San Gorgonio's snow area above 9,000 feet, the 3,500 acres I've been discussing, for winter outdoor recreation that goes by such truly descriptive names as snow play, snow fun—the chance for all the 12 million people of southern California to enjoy the Alpine wonder of this unique land of consistent snow lying in the heart of sun, sea, and desert.

My brother is in the Forest Service and I have a great regard for it, but I say thank God for legislative committees, gentlemen, like yours, who look at things with unjaundiced eyes and taking a full view make a decision on behalf of the entire public.

What we ask is compatible use, compatible with the wilderness values which we all cherish. Most of us are members of the Sierra Club or the Defenders of the San Gorgonio Wild Area. We love it as much as they, and we hope we can preserve it too and make it available to the people.

We have a statistic of compilation of existing wilderness areas in California and in southern California, which I am submitting.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the biographical sketch and the exhibit will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The statements follow:)

EXISTING WILDERNESS AREAS IN CALIFORNIA AND IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Never publicized by the opponents of limited entry on 3,500 acres of San Gorgonio for skiing and outdoor recreation development is a very important fact—and that is the tremendous number of acres at this very moment locked up in wilderness classification by the Forest Service throughout California and available solely and exclusively for wilderness uses only.

As set forth in the U.S. Forest Service Handbook, latest edition June 1962, over 1½ million acres are in the wilderness categories of wild areas (5,000 to 100,000 acres), wilderness areas (over 100,000 acres), and primitive areas (no acreage limitation but administered in the same manner as wilderness areas).

For skiing and outdoor recreation development those who believe in the multiple-use principle seek, as an exception to general wilderness policy and not as a precedent, limited entry on only 3,500 acres of unique snow area above the 9,000-foot level on San Gorgonio—just two-tenths of 1 percent (0.21 percent) of the total wilderness acreage of 1½ million acres in California.

SRP05565

Let's look only at the southern California picture. Here we find over a quarter of a million wilderness acres in the national forests of which the 3,500 acres in San Gorgonio sought for limited entry to skiing and outdoor recreation development is less than 1½ percent (1.4 percent).

Finally the 3,500 acres is only 10 percent of the total acreage in the San Gorgonio Wild Area itself.

Is it asking too much to except these few acres of the unique snow area of San Gorgonio above 9,000 feet—the only reliable snow area in southern California—from rigid application of a lockout policy against all skiing and outdoor recreation development throughout this vast wilderness acreage in California and southern California? Of course not. And this does not take into account the State wilderness areas such as the recently created Mount San Jacinto Wilderness State Park, where 12,000 acres containing five peaks over 10,000 feet high have been set aside exclusively for camping and wilderness uses.

Here are the actual figures:

Wilderness acreage

Area	Gross acreage [1]	Net acreage [2]
Total, California	1,633,603	1,557,822
Southern California (4 forests)	257,569	251,036
Cleveland: Agua Tibia Primitive Area	26,760	25,995
Angeles: Devil Canyon-Bear, Canyon Primitive Area	35,267	35,267
San Bernardino: Cucamonga Wild Area	9,022	9,022

[1] Gross includes private lands.
[2] Net excludes private lands.

Area	Acreage	
	Gross	Net
Southern California—Continued		
San Bernardino—Continued		
San Gorgonio Wild Area	34,718	33,898
San Jacinto Wild Area	21,955	20,565
Los Padres:		
San Rafael Primitive Area	74,990	74,160
Ventana Primitive Area	54,859	52,129
Northern California (10 forests)	1,376,034	1,306,786
Lassen: Caribou Wild Area	19,080	19,080
El Dorado: Desolation Valley Primitive Area	41,383	41,343
Stanislaus: Immigrant Basin Primitive Area	98,043	97,020
Inyo, Sierra, Sequoia: High Sierra Primitive Area	393,945	393,899
Inyo: Hoover Wild Area	9,000	9,000
Klamath: Marble Mountain Wilderness Area	214,543	213,283
Inyo, Sierra: Mount Dana-Minerets Primitive Area	82,376	82,181
Klamath, Shasta-Trinity: Salmon-Trinity Alps Primitive Area	285,756	223,300
Modoc: South Warner Primitive Area	70,682	68,870
Lassen: Thousand Lakes Wild Area	16,335	15,695
Mendocino, Shasta-Trinity: Yollabolly-Middle Eel Wilderness Area	111,091	109,315

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF A. ANDREW HAUK, UNION OIL CENTER, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Home address: 1408 Ridge Way, Pasadena, Calif.

Married: One daughter.

Attorney at law specializing in trial and appellate practice. Formerly special assistant to the attorney general and assistant U.S. attorney, Los Angeles.

Lecturer in law, University of Southern California Law School, 1947–56; vice chairman, California Olympic Commission.

Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States; California Supreme Court, State Bar of California; American Bar Association; chairman of the Pleading and Practice Committee, Los Angeles Bar Association; Lawyers

SRP05566

Club of Los Angeles; American Judicature Society; Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce State and Local Government Committee; World Affairs Council; American Legion; Navy League; past president, Yale Law School Association of Southern California.

Member, Jonathan Club, Valley Hunt Club, Shadow Mountain Club.

Graduate Regis College, A.B., Denver; Catholic University of America, LL.B; Yale Law School, J.S.D. (doctor of science of law).

Lieutenant commander naval intelligence, World War II. Official in ski associations and at 1960 Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed, Mr. Adams.

STATEMENT OF MORGAN ADAMS, JR., SAN GORGONIO SKI LIFTS, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. ADAMS. Chairman Baring and members of the committee, I am Morgan Adams, Jr., 1541 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles; president of San Gorgonio Ski Lifts which is applying to the U.S. Forest Service for a permit to construct ski lifts and warming facilities mostly above the 9,000-foot elevation. I have five children, all of whom ski, and would like to see this only reliable ski area in southern California opened up for the youth and families of Metropolitan Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and San Diego.

I have here with me a number of photographic enlargements taken of the north facing bowl of San Gorgonio from a number of angles. Although you will note there are a few trees at the 9,000-foot level, they soon thin out to craggy, treeless escarpments which afford unique skiing such as can be found nowhere else in southern California.

In this regard I have prepared a chart showing the existing ski areas within a hundred miles of Los Angeles, of which there are 13, grouped by distances from the city hall, as well as their elevations above sea level, as compared with Mount San Gorgonio, which is shown here in the middle. You will note that all existing local ski areas commence approximately at the 6,500-foot elevation; also that none of them go above the 8,600-foot mark. Take Mount Baldy, for example; although it towers to over 10,000 feet at its peak, the terrain is such that no suitable ski area can be found for public use above 8,600 feet. As a sidelight upon this matter of terrain, 11,000-foot San Jacinto guards the south side of the pass into Palm Springs, as San Gorgonio guards the north side. But there is practically no suitable ski terrain there, although the new tramway affords a tremendous opportunity for people to reach the 8,500-foot elevation from the heat of the desert. This combination of elevation and terrain seems as yet to be little understood in its effect upon skiing in a semiarid region such as we enjoy in southern California. Weather people have discovered that for each thousand feet of vertical rise in elevation, there is a drop of temperature of approximately 3°. In other words, if you can base a ski or snow play area at 9,000 feet instead of 6,500 feet, the temperature will be 7° or 8° lower through the whole year, which greatly enhances the prospect of entrapping the occasional precipitation as snow. If a storm comes in with a temperature of 38° at 6,500 feet, it will be raining at the bottom of most of the existing ski areas and snowing at the top, but a skier will not ski halfway down, take off his skis, walk to the bottom and ride up again. Toward the end of the storm, in the present local areas, the temperature usu-

SRP05567

ally lowers for a few hours and although we may get snow, it will not be heavy or last very long because of the warmth in the ground.

Many of the members of our group which hopes to put in the ski lifts at San Gorgonio have previously built ski areas at these lower elevations. We have had ski seasons which have varied from as many as a hundred days to other seasons where there was no skiing. I would, therefore, call snow conditions at the present elevations marginal. Although the local skiing at times can be as good as that found in Sun Valley, Idaho, as Aspen, Colo., last year, for instance, when all of these local areas enjoyed from 2 to 20 days of rather poor skiing, we had a survey crew go into San Gorgonio every 2 weeks. Although the season did not commence until the last week of January, a season of over 100 days was clearly possible. This season San Gorgonio has already had skiable snow for 50 days, whereas Mount Baldy has had only 3 days. The reason we, the owners of existing local areas, are not afraid of competition from this new mountain, San Gorgonio, is that there can be only one such super area in southern California. When we have snow at the low elevations, people will come in droves to our present lifts. About 2 years ago when I was first interested by my friendly competitor, Mr. Howard More, who runs the Table Mountain Ski Area in Wrightwood, and we were putting together a group to make a proposal to the Forest Service in regard to San Gorgonio, I was approached by my friend, Mr. Tommi Tyndall of the Snow Summit area, to form a group with him, and he used exactly this same line of reasoning with me. Today he is using another line of reasoning which I believe will be aired at these hearings.

My next exhibit is a distance comparison between San Gorgonio and the closest major ski resort in California, Mammoth Mountain. You will find a copy of this map as figure 1 in the ERA—Economic Research Associates—report on "The Need and Potential for Expanded Utilization of Mount San Gorgonio," prepared for San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc., and submitted in evidence by A. Andrew Hauk. In this regard the Forest Service and Mr. Tyndall have suggested other potential areas, such as Mineral King, Robinson Basin, and so forth, which would be fine for skiing. But this aspect will be covered by Howard More. You will note that San Gorgonio is less than a hundred miles from the coastline all the way from Santa Monica to San Diego, whereas Mammoth is about 320 miles from the Los Angeles City Hall by road and 400 miles from San Diego.

My next exhibit is a comparison of Mammoth, the best ski area in California, with San Gorgonio from a physical, economic, and population aspect. There are a great number of similarities between these two mountains; they are both approximately 11,500 feet high; they both have excellent northerly terrain with gentle slopes at the bottom. These gradually increase in steepness and in difficulty, as you have seen in my first pictures, with really challenging and spectacular skiing at the upper heights. This is in contradistinction to Mount Baldy, Holiday Hill, and the Angeles Crest areas, which are very steep at the bottom and gently rounded at the top. These areas are difficult for either a beginning skier or a sightseer to enjoy without going to the top. San Gorgonio and Mammoth with wide, open, gentle slopes adjacent to the parking allow anyone to see or enjoy winter fun without the cost of going up a lift.

Mammoth has five chair lifts now and will probably double its capacity within the next 5 to 10 years. San Gorgonio should start with four or five such lifts and it is planned that within 5 to 10 years these facilities will also be doubled or even tripled without in any way overcrowding the slopes or increasing the needed 3,500 acres.

The main problem with Mammoth, as you will see, is its distance from the metropolis which makes it really a fine place for a week's vacation or a long weekend but a little strenuous drivingwise for a 2-day weekend and impossible for a single day's outing. As a busy man on the wrong side of 40, I find it difficult to make more than one or two short weekends a year to Mammoth because of the 13-hour round-trip driving time. Equal skiing opportunity would be afforded, as I have said, by Mount San Gorgonio with only a 4-hour round-trip drive. Many people are unable to enjoy their favorite sport, or don't take up skiing at all, because of the expense of driving to Mammoth, which, at 10 cents a mile, figures $17 extra per trip. Even if this is divided among four or five people in a car, this costs $10 or $12 extra for each one, whether they realize it or not. Please also note the number of people within a hundred miles of San Gorgonio: 11 million now, with a forecast of another 6 million within 10 years; also a quarter million skiers and prospects for four times that number, if they are given the opportunity to ski close by. I use this last figure advisedly, based upon the experience in Seattle which has close-by skiing and a ski population of 10 percent. But in Los Angeles these time and distance factors coupled with the short, unreliable season locally has kept thousands who might otherwise enjoy taking up this sport from doing so.

Dave McCoy who has built up the Mammoth ski area over the past 18 years realizes this fully and has endorsed the opening of San Gorgonio in the secure knowledge that its opening would double, triple, and even quadruple the number of active skiers in the Los Angeles metropolitan area from which he draws his customers. He knows further that skiers like to travel around and try different areas, that he will have more skiers coming for longer stays, and that he will not have so much of his present problem of too many skiers on a weekend and not enough during the middle of the week.

My last exhibit is one which is also contained in our ERA report (fig. 4). This shows most of the first and second stages of our proposed development wherein the first facilities would be established at the west of the great cirque of mountains north of San Gorgonio Peak concentrating on the Big Draw, Little Draw, and Charlton Peak. Although only 9 lifts are shown here, the area is so vast that 12 or 15 can eventually go into this area backed up by adequate parking in strips between the trees for thousands of cars, as well as warming, eating, and sanitary facilities for all comers under the supervision of the county authorities, as well as the Forest Service. Our project is backed by years of experience with day ski areas throughout southern California and will not be started on a shoestring. It will be properly financed.

In closing I'd like to point out that I, and most skiers, are outdoorsmen and conservationists who love the mountain. In September I hiked with three 10- to 12-year-old boys from Baldy Notch where the ski lift ends to the top of Mount Baldy. Returning by a different

SRP05569

route, we flushed a band of six mountain sheep, then a little doe, and lower down, of course, numerous squirrels. Other wildlife like fox, badgers, and racoons can be seen there if one knows how to go about it. All this is within less than 50 miles of the Los Angeles City Hall and in close proximity to the ski lifts which are certainly compatible with riding, hiking, and wildlife. The opposition we are facing here is that impostor, fear. Fear that we will put up neon signs, fear that we will not pick up beer cans, fear for the trees, fear for the wildlife. It is hard to fight those who, fearing new ideas, would hang onto the status quo because they cannot picture anyone with the courage or integrity to go forward with a forthright plan to solve some of the new outdoor needs of the millions from the metropolis.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed now, Mr. More.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD V. MORE, PASADENA, CALIF.

Mr. MORE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, counsel and staff, my name is Howard V. More. I reside at 3077 East California Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif.

In my testimony I propose to deal briefly, but I hope conclusively, with areas which have been proposed by the U.S. Forest Service, region 5 headquarters, as alternates for development to San Gorgonio. For convenience, a chart summarizing the results of this preliminary study has been prepared. I trust that each of you have a copy of this chart in hand, together with a map which indicates the general location in relation to Los Angeles of each of the seven alternate U.S. Forest Service suggested areas. Topographic maps and more detailed location data, is of course, available from the Forest Service if you desire it; however, it is safe to say these areas are the only alternatives which can be found less than 275 miles from Los Angeles. It is also safe to say there are no alternate sites on private land.

I believe that a review of this data will show how inadequate or impractical the suggested areas are as alternatives, especially for day use, for southern Californians. Distance alone rules them out in every case except for Mount Pinos. At Mount Pinos, inadequate elevation and terrain makes the area poorer than a number of areas already developed within 100 miles of Los Angeles.

Except for Cottonwood Basin and Mineral King, elevations are not adequate for good skiing at southern California's latitude. Both of these areas require fantastic road investments unless supported by something more than ski potential. In every other case these alternate areas are really in the 7,500 to 9,250 feet class. In a word, they just don't compete favorably elevationwise, and thus are not in the same class snowwise, with the basin on San Gorgonio where lift skiing would start at 9,000 feet and extend upward to almost 11,000 feet elevation.

It is almost certain that any of the areas except Mount Pinos would offer more dependable skiing than anything we have or can develop in southern California except San Gorgonio. On balance, however, none of the areas suggested begin to offer a practical substitute for San Gorgonio, which for quality, proximity or both stands, by an order of magnitude, above and superior to the alternatives.

SRP05570

This chart takes the great north facing basin of San Gorgonio as the standard to which the alternate areas are compared. San Gorgonio is the first area listed. The alternate areas are compared on the following basis:

(1) Distance from Los Angeles.
(2) Estimated driving time from Los Angeles.
(3) Elevation of area and usable vertical rise.
(4) Estimated access road cost and elevation new road must gain.
(5) Parking potential at area.
(6) Type of terrain, including exposure and weather snow play can be provided for.
(7) Expected length of season.
(8) An overall rating as compared to San Gorgonio.

To demonstrate that the conclusions are based on facts, one column is devoted to describing the source of data or method of observation.

I am a mechanical engineer. I also have a master's degree in business from Harvard, but I doubt if this is pertinent. However, it is pertinent that I have lived in southern California for 24 years and have hiked and traveled much of the area in question, including probably 60 trips, mostly in winter, to San Gorgonio. It is pertinent that for the past 20 years I have been lessee and operator of Table Mountain, a major southern California ski area. I am also a director of a group dedicated to the opening of a portion of San Gorgonio for skiing called, San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, Inc. Incidentally, principals from four of the largest southern California ski areas are members of this group.

Luckily operating a ski area is an avocation, for I have a family to support. Believe me, operating present southern California ski areas is dry land farming in reverse. Eventually, we may get a little help from manufactured snow, but what can be done is a pittance when compared to the incomparable forces of nature. Unlike irrigation, very large equipment and power costs make snow manufacturing practical on only a very limited basis, especially in our comparatively warm present southern California ski areas.

But back to the data: In conclusion, one can find no justification for consideration of these Forest Service suggestions as alternatives for for the great, north facing, San Gorgonio basin for day-trip winter recreation for southern Californians. The San Gorgonio basin is a God-given gift to southern California skiers (but not without facilities), ideal as Mother Nature can be in providing terrain, exposure, precipitation, and climate suitable for a truly magnificent winter recreation area less than 100 miles from almost 12 million people today and more tomorrow.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the data and maps submitted by Mr. Hauk, Mr. Adams, and Mr. More will be placed in the committee files.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions of any one of the three witnesses?

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that, of course, time does not permit here for us to debate this matter with the proponents and opponents to this San Gorgonio proposition. I assure you that the matters you have presented before us will be studied, and I am sure we will be hearing more about it in coming sessions of

SRP05571

Congress. We could go into this at great depth, as I am sure you know, but with as many witnesses to be heard, it simply is impossible to question you gentlemen, both the pro and the con. I hope you appreciate that fact.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I have no questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The next witness is for the Far West Ski Association, Len Speicher, president; Chandler P. North; and Karl H. Unger. Mr. Speicher, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF LEN SPEICHER, HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., REPRESENTING FAR WEST SKI ASSOCIATION

Mr. SPEICHER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as an association, and as individuals, skiers have appealed to the Forest Service and other governmental agencies for assistance and direction in finding a way to permit the development of winter recreation areas on land which is under Government jurisdiction. Notable among these areas is the San Gorgonio Range of mountains.

In southern California there are two existing mountain ranges where winter recreation areas now exist. One is the San Gabriel Range extending east and west over about a 30-mile range. The six areas in this range are from 1 to 1½ hours driving time from Los Angeles. The other range, is the San Bernardino Range which is developed primarily in the vicinity of Big Bear Lake. The seven developed areas herein are from 2 to 2½ hours from Los Angeles.

The only area with dependable snow conditions within weekend driving distance from the Los Angeles area is Mammoth Mountain in the High Sierra, some 300 miles or 6 hours' drive. The elevation and much of the terrain at San Gorgonio is similar to the Mammoth area, and is only about 90 miles from Los Angeles.

This year there has been sufficient snow at San Gorgonio for winter sports continuously since the end of October. The same conditions hold true in the High Sierra, as evidenced by the U.S. Olympic ski team training at Mammoth Mountain in November. By contrast, the areas in the San Gabriel Range have operated 2 weeks' maximum and those in San Bernardino, about 3 to 4 weeks thus far this season.

The photograph which is included as a part of this testimony illustrates why the San Gorgonio Range of mountains is unique when considered as potential winter recreation area. The photograph was taken on May 5, 1963, from an airplane flying above the village of Big Bear Lake. In the foreground, at a peak elevation of about 8,000 feet, the ground is dry and devoid of any snow. This is the Moonridge ski area at Big Bear Lake. In the background, and about 15 air-miles due south of this area is the San Gorgonio Range, some 6 to 7 miles in length, some 35,000 acres total with 5 miles of ridge above 10,200 feet and seven peaks above 10,600 feet, covered with snow down to about the 9,000-foot level.

The point that is illustrated is that an altitude above 8,500 feet is necessary to provide dependable snow in southern California. The highest existing area for skiing is 8,600 feet at its peak. All but one

of the other existing 11 areas have peaks below 8,500 feet and, of course, the base of operations well below 8,000 feet.

This is the fundamental reason that skiers, and outdoor recreationists have long desired to see a ski development in this area. This is the reason why delegates representing some 12,500 members of the Far West Ski Association adopted a resolution at their 1963 convention, to support the opening of approximately 3,500 acres above the 9,100-foot level on Mount San Gorgonio, providing that development planning consider that none of the major camping or hiking areas are disrupted; no lodging facilities be provided, except for operations personnel and that access roads to the ski area be clearly defined and limited.

Attempts have been made since World War II by the Far West Ski Association, representing the skiers of southern California, to have the Forest Service hold public hearings to ascertain the demand for and feasibility of a winter recreation area in this range of mountains. A hearing in 1947 brought about no change and the entire mountain range is still classified as wild area, precluding the possibility of any recreational development.

Two new areas have been established in the High Sierra Range some 300 miles north of Los Angeles metropolitan area, during the past 5 years, under Forest Service jurisdiction. These are China Peak and June Mountain. These also have marginal elevations and reportedly have not been financially successful; whereas, the one other ski area with a base elevation about 1,200 feet above the other two, is probably one of the most successful ski resorts in the country. Its base elevation is 8,842 feet and its peak is 11,034 feet. This is Mammoth Mountain.

It appears that these areas are permitted to develop in locations far removed from any population centers, merely because there is no opposition to them.

Attempts have been made to reconcile any differences with the Sierra Club, one group specifically opposed to any change in the San Gorgonio Range. They are apparently unalterably opposed to a specified proposal submitted by San Gorgonio Lifts, Inc., and would be opposed to proposals for winter recreation development by anyone.

They do agree that the continued population growth will necessitate increased recreational facilities, but contend that setting aside some 10 percent of San Gorgonio will ruin the wilderness value of the entire range. At most existing ski areas in California, one need only ski or hike a short distance from the chair lifts and be completely surrounded by wilderness. Such developments actually enable many individuals to visit wilderness areas, who otherwise would be unable because of age or physical infirmities.

Artificial snow-making equipment, because of the limited area which can economically be covered and because of limited availability of water, is not the answer. The answer for southern California skiers is San Gorgonio, with its natural environment.

We are conservationists; we are active outdoorsmen; we believe that skiing as a recreational pursuit and as a sport, is one of the best, most exhilarating forms of physical fitness.

Our request is that you do not, by a legislative act, close the door to the development of a winter recreation area at San Gorgonio.

SRP05573

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Speicher.

Without objection, the photograph presented by Mr. Speicher will be made a part of the committee files.

You may proceed, Mr. Unger.

STATEMENT OF KARL H. UNGER, PRESIDENT, SOUTHERN COUNCIL, FAR WEST SKI ASSOCIATION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. UNGER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to preface my testimony with a short story, a little humor. I hope you can detect the area of seriousness that is intended.

In addition to being president of Southern Council, Far West Ski Association, a guild of 70 ski clubs and representing about 7,000 member skiers, I also belong to one of those member ski clubs in the Los Angeles area with about 200 active members and applicants, the Single Ski Club of Los Angeles, Inc. This club has been in operation about 3½ years. Its program in that period of time has been about the same from year to year, about 12 ski trips to Mammoth Mountain, 350 miles one way, and these trips have not been out of choice, but rather out of necessity—there have only been about five opportunities in that period to actually plan local outings.

To continue, this year was no exception. That is, the necessity of planning of bus trips with food and lodging included for the purpose of saving as much money as possible, as well as conserving the physical for the skiing. For the record, a weekend trip for 40 people would consist of boarding a bus at about 7 p.m. Friday evening after a day's work and packing, riding that bus until about 2 a.m. Saturday, unloading and bedding down until about 7 a.m., when breakfast is served and the bus departing for the hill about an hour later to get in that day of skiing. Dinner Saturday, breakfast Sunday morning, load the bus for the return trip to expedite departure time that afternoon, a day of skiing Sunday, and depart for Los Angeles 4:30 p.m. Arrive Los Angeles midnight, unload, drive home, unpack, sleep, work Monday a.m.—comment—you have to love it.

Anyway, to return to the story, the Single Ski Club board of directors was reviewing this year's schedule before presenting it to the general membership. The vice president of the club, a nurse, upon reviewing in her mind the schedule and its expense, threw up her hands in despair and one of the other members of the board laughed it off and casually suggested that she could take in laundry.

This story was being told at the next week's regular club meeting, when three of us got the same idea at the same time and we, in jest, approached the speaker's table unbuttoning and handing over our outer shirts. A week later we received our laundered and neatly pressed shirts with a sales slip headed, "Ooh-La-La French Laundry" and the charges at the rate of 25 cents per shirt. This nurse, with a regular job, continued to take in shirts until she had paid for her season of skiing.

One might argue that no one should pursue an interest to this extent, and that argument is valid under existing conditions, or rather should be. Skiing is certainly one of the most healthful interests I can think of, and when you realize that it could be available to anyone

so inclined at hardly any expense, it must seem a shameful waste that it remains a sport of southern Californians that can afford it or are willing to go to unnecessary extremes. Enjoying a sport and the out of doors should not be a challenge to one's perservance or ambition or ability to pay the price. God placed a seashore as our summer backdoor, and we recognize the millions that use and appreciate it. By the same token, He has given us our mountains for our year-round pleasure. Is there any earthly reason why we can't employ them to equal advantage? We have been listening for years to arguments for and against the accepting of the San Gorgonio area in wilderness legislation. Today you have or will hear facts and statistics concerning such things as increased demand for recreational facilities based upon population increases, average yearly snowfall and snow holding capacities, et cetera, et cetera, these the arguments of the specialists, cold, hard, impersonal, indisputable figures. And in rebuttal, as in the record of the hearings last year in the Senate on bill S. 4 I find the contentions of two basic countering groups. First, the naturalists, trying to preserve our natural beauties and animal life. What, in this case, has the skier asked for that could be construed as destructive to these things, not in compromise but to actually satisfy his need? He has asked for the use of one-tenth of a mountain, almost all of which area is above timberline, and at a time of the year when it cannot support wildlife and fauna and when and where natural weather conditions exclude accessibility on anything but skis and all of this during less than 6 months of the year. Now, take the common denominator of all this, and you end up with less than 5 percent of an area's yearly use. This is to say that the recreationalists who, mind you, are conservationalists as well, are not asking for one-half of something, or three-quarters of something, or all of something, as are the so-called defenders, but, rather, for one-twentieth of something that they wish to share with their fellows of other interests.

Let us now look at the arguments of the other group. I name them as the independent enterprise interests who are fearful for their present investments or for their efforts to promote other areas elsewhere. What of this group? We know it now to be divided; one segment recognizing the inevitability of having to someday open the San Gorgonio area, and, thus, rationalizing, standing at the side of the skier recognizing that to advance and promote the opening of San Gorgonio can only benefit their present business situations. In line with this reasoning, I respectfully refer you to page 33 of the November 18, 1963, issue of Sports Illustrated, attached herein, where a small ski area operator of Vermont states that the opening of a colossus such as Mount Snow didn't hurt him financially, but, instead, benefited him. How very simple, added interest, added participation, some of it rubbed off on everyone. And of the 13 present area operators in southern California, 10 to 11 have declared that they are in favor of the opening of San Gorgonio.

But, on the other hand stand that very small segment who have the gift of making themselves heard very loudly that selfishly try to promote their existing areas with the advent of snowmaking facilities as a partial answer and/or the opening of new areas under less rigid wilderness classifications. What of existing areas, assuming that they could be blanketed in toto with natural fallen or artificially produced

SRP05575

snow. I listened last week to the boasting of an employee of one of these local areas describing a situation 2 years ago after a substantial snowfall of the sale of 4,700 lift tickets on one Saturday, and a wait that day in lift lines of 65 minutes—a record. Something to be proud of? Imagine paying $5 for a lift ticket so you could stand in line for over 1 hour to ski a hill which requires, at best, 10 minutes to ski from skiable summit to base. Or, the rest of their argument, opening those other undeveloped areas again in the Sierras, east or west, requiring overnight lodging, 500 miles or more round-trip travel to reach. How can this be offered as a solution; it is more accurately a duplication of the existing alternative to staying home or finding something else to do.

Gentlemen, for those of you who have skied and enjoyed it, I need not go into detail describing its benefits to body and soul. And if you have not skied or been exposed to skiers, listen to them sometime and to their enthusiasm and count their growing numbers, an explosion. And, at the same time, take heed of the frustrations they encounter in pursuing their sport. Why look for acceptable compromises to the solution of this problem of facilities, when a glaringly, all-encompassing answer lies staring us full in the face? Can we afford to ignore this inevitability any longer?

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Unger.

Mr. North, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF CHANDLER P. NORTH, SOUTHERN COUNCIL, FAR WEST SKI ASSOCIATION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. NORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give oral testimony and present my other testimony later when it is duplicated. It is being duplicated now.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed.

Mr. NORTH. I am Chandler P. North, sponsor of the Student Ski Club at the University of California at Los Angeles, area development chairman of the Southern Council of the Far West Ski Association, a member of the National Ski Patrol System, and a very enthusiastic outdoorsman, with a background of college training in ornithology, entomology, ecology, and botany.

On this national park business, the national parks, State parks, and national forests have steadily increased since 1950, according to the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission of 1960. There are four forests extending about 300 miles in length from north of Santa Barbara down from Los Padres through Angeles through San Bernardino, down to Cleveland National Park east of San Diego. Each of these national forests has at least one wild area in it, some of them two. There are two or three really in the San Bernardino National Forest—Cucamonga Wild Area, San Gorgonio Wild Area, and now the new wild area in the California State Park, which includes the peak of San Jacinto. One of the wild areas in Angeles National Forest is larger than San Gorgonio.

It would seem, with all of this recreation area available, we should be able to come to a compromise and get some for the skiers. The plants and animals do not recognize boundaries, and they go on existing right up to the edge of the wildlife boundary.

SRP05576

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions.

Mr. WHITE. I have no questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much. Without objection, Mr. North's written statement will be printed in full in the record.

(The statement follows:)

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I am Chandler P. North, sponsor of the student ski club at the University of California at Los Angeles, chairman, Area Development Committee of the Southern Council of the Far West Ski Association, member of the National Ski Patrol System, and an enthusiastic outdoorsman with a background of college training in ornithology, mammalogy, botany, ecology, and entomology.

STUDENTS' SKI CLUBS

The student ski club at UCLA has over 200 members and would have many more if we were able to conduct regular 1-day trips and overnight trips to dependable local snow. We have not had dependable local snow for many years in southern California. Group ski trips involve several weeks or even months of planning whether the transportation is by bus or by private cars. We use private cars at UCLA because it is cheaper by several dollars per person per day and gives much more flexibility to the varied interest within the group. Planning a trip to a local ski area only to find that a hot spell or rain has made skiing impossible or impractical soon breaks the morale of a club so trips to more distant snow areas are necessary.

From Los Angeles, dependable snow is over 300 miles or 6 to 7 hours' driving time. The trip may start at 5 to 7 p.m. Friday or at 1 to 2 a.m. Saturday, the latter to avoid housing rent on Friday night but still get a full day of skiing on Saturday. Sunday the return trip starts between 3 to 6 p.m. for over 300 miles of high speed driving after skiing all day. The sponsor of such a group of 30 to 60 students does not stop worrying until he is sure all the students are home and safe. The cost of a student ski trip is $10 to $12 per day plus $8 each for transportation, for distant ski trips. In contrast, local ski trips take 2 to 3 hours' driving, each way, and cost $6 to $8 per day. Most of the driving is on freeways.

COLLEGE SKI TEAMS

Intercollegiate ski teams no longer exist in southern California although they did exist in the past at the University of California at Los Angeles and at the University of Southern California. UCLA has the trophies to show for their past teams. However, improved skiing techniques have outgrown the present local ski areas. Formerly the slopes of the local areas were long and steep enough to train junior skiers and college teams but this is no longer true. Therefore any serious, competitive skiers must use 13 to 14 hours of travel time plus living expenses, each weekend, of the ski season to get alpine competition training. Nordic training (jumping and cross country) is not available. All of the Olympic skiers come from towns with good, challenging ski slopes easily available to them so that they may ski from an early age and at a minimum cost.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WINTER SPORTS PROGRAM

I am not a member of the Los Angeles public school system, but I have worked with them and know their problems and desires for the future. The Los Angeles school system has a winter sports program that was started in 1953 for junior high and high school students of ages roughly 12 to 18 years old. These students are taken in school buses (12,500 students in 1960–61) for carefully supervised tobogganing, snow play, and skiing on gentle to moderate slopes. This program is not unique with the Los Angeles schools, but is practiced in many schools adjacent to good ski areas in California, Idaho, Utah and probably in many other States. Dry land ski school is conducted each year to introduce the students to exercises that will condition them for skiing and to give them the fundamentals of ski etiquette, safety, setting of bindings, and how to choose their ski equipment.

SRP05577

A site for the public schools winter program must be within 2½ to 3 hours driving by bus over all weather roads. There must be a minimum distance of curving mountain roads for safety and to prevent "car sickness." Parking for school buses adjacent to the area is very desirable.

Youth groups such as some chapters of the YMCA have similar problems with their winter sports programs.

DEPENDABLE SNOW

Dependable snow in California, Utah, and parts of Colorado exist only above 8,500 feet altitude. For example, the lower slopes at Mammoth Mountain, Calif., are at 8,900 feet and Alta, Utah, are 8,600 feet. The lower slopes (below 8,500 feet) around Lake Tahoe, Calif., are often not skiable and the lower slopes at Aspen and Vale, Colo. (below 8,500 feet), are sometimes icy or partially bare while the upper slopes, above 8,500 feet, have good snow. In contrast, the high point on any existing southern California ski area is 8,600 feet, on Thunder Mountain, at the Mountain Baldy area.

CUSTOM OR ARTIFICIAL SNOW

Artificial snow, made by spraying water and high pressure air through nozzles into the air, near freezing does produce a small amount of skiable snow but the area that it is practical to cover is very small, on the order of a few hundred yards long and a hundred yards wide. This is compared to runs of at least a mile long at the average ski resort. The total area and terrain covered by "snow machines" are good for the beginner and intermediate skier. Even the advanced skier will ski it for a day if no other snow is available, but after a day it is very boring. I have been 1 of the 4 ski patrolmen on duty on a day when over 500 skiers converged on the artificial snow covering roughly the area of 2 football fields. The confusion and danger were awesome to behold and we were very fortunate to have had only three serious injuries, one of them to a mother's back. A few days later that same area had 800 skiers on it and I am very glad that I was not there to see it. On this hill it took approximately 60 seconds to go up the hill by rope tow and 15 seconds to come down. Compare this time to a chair lift that takes 10 to 20 minutes to go up the hill and the skiing time down the hill will take 3 to 30 minutes, depending on the skiers' skill.

DEPENDABLE SNOW IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

There is only one mountain range in southern California that is high enough to produce dependable snow and also has the skiable northern exposure of the slopes above 8,500 feet to keep the snow from melting. This mountain range is 7 miles long, in the San Gorgonio Wild Area, and extends from San Gorgonio Peak at the east end to San Bernardino Peak at the western end above Camp Angeles. There are seven peaks above 10,600 feet and at least 5 miles of mountain ridge above 10,400 feet. There is more than one site that appears to be suitable for lift skiing. One or two sites appear better than others. However, only one of these sites has been skied and none of them has been adequately surveyed in winter. I have been refused permission by the U.S. Forest Service, to use a helicopter to adequately survey any part of the mountain range in winter. Snow depths make any other type of winter survey impossible. The terrain on this mountain range can offer skiing to all classes of skiers including Olympic competitors.

WILDERNESS RECREATION IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Southern California has an unusually large amount of wilderness-type recreation land easily available to it extending in an almost unbroken line from north of Santa Barbara, in the Los Padres National Forest, south through Angeles National Forest, and San Bernardino National Forest to Cleveland National Forest east of San Diego. Each of these national forests contains one or more wild areas in it. In my opinion, much of these national forests that is not classified as wild or wilderness does indeed offer this type of recreation even though it is not labeled as such. Each person has his own definition of wilderness. It may be an association of plants, trees, and wildlife, it may be a mountain trout stream, a mountain meadow, or a mountain peak. For others wilderness may be a valley

SRP05578

river bottom with herons, bullfrogs, wild ducks, bass, catfish, willow and cottonwood trees. In the Deep South, wilderness is a swamp and some ornithologists want ivory-billed woodpeckers there. Wilderness is where you find it and what you want it to be.

Angeles National Forest has been described (Los Angeles Times of July 1, 1962) as a "vast primeval playpen. Park the size of Rhode Island abounds in wildlife and giant, ageless trees." Devils Canyon-Bear Canyon Wild Area of 35,270 acres occupies a very small part of Angeles National Forest but it is larger than the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

The Cucamonga Wild Area in the San Bernardino National Forest abuts against the Mount Baldy ski area without any apparent damage to the wild area. Plants, trees, birds, and animals are not aware of an artificial boundary line go right on existing to the edge of a ski clearing. The birds and animals may even take advantage of the open space during their night and day activities in summer. The U.S. Forest Service has stated that lift skiing is not compatible with wild or wilderness areas. It would appear that the phrase should be "not permissible" in regard to Forest Service regulations.

SUMMER RECREATION IN THE SAN GORGONIO WILD AREA

Summer use of the Poopout Hill-Slushy Meadows-Dollar Lake, part of the San Gorgonio Wild Area is intense because a road exists to within 1½ miles of Slushy Meadows with a parking lot to accommodate approximately 50 cars at 7,800 feet. The altitude rise to Slushy Meadows is 400 feet. From Slushy Meadows to Dollar Lake the rise is from 8,200 to 9,100 feet. There is always running water at Slushy Meadows and usually water at Dollar Lake. These two sites are used as staging camps for youth groups camping out or going on to San Gorgonio Peak.

Dry Lake has relatively light use because water must be carried up 900 feet from Slushy Meadows. There is a small spring (Lodgepole Spring) east of Dry Lake but this spring does not have much volume and has many young toads (genus *Bufo*) in it by May. These toads come from Dry Lake which has myriads of pollywogs in April, May, and June if there is any water in it. There have been unsuccessful attempts to seal the bottom of Dry Lake with bentonite. Trees around and above Dry Lake (9,100 ft.) are predominantly lodgepole pines with an occasional limber pine and white fir. The Forest Service has constructed trails to Dry Lake, around it and above it and have indicated plans to lay out 1- to 3-day trips above Dry Lake on the north face of San Gorgonio Peak. These plans do not appear realistic in view of the fact that water must be carried from Slushy Meadows 900 feet below Dry Lake.

WINTER RECREATION IN THE SAN GORGONIO WILD AREA

Winter use of the wild area depends on whether the access road is blocked by snow or not. In warm winters when the snow is only at higher altitudes (above 8,000 feet) many persons walk in as far as Slushy Meadows because they can drive their cars to within 1½ miles of the meadows. In more normal seasons and during the middle of the winter the road is blocked by deep snow, the 6- or 7-mile walk through deep snow is too strenuous for those not in too good physical condition. It is dangerous to go into San Gorgonio at any time because of snow surface conditions. The great majority of recreation skiers can ski safely only on the compacted, skied surfaces of a prepared ski slope. In springtime the unskied snow at San Gorgonio may have breakable crust or have an icy surface in the morning. I helped carry an injured skier out after he fell on icy snow. There is no safety patrol to help injured persons.

HIGH WILDERNESS PEAKS NOT LOST TO RECREATION

In a newspaper interview, a Forest Service official stated that two of the three high wilderness peaks, San Antonio, San Jacinto, and San Gorgonio, have already been lost to skiing. This statement is not correct. San Antonio, one of the lost peaks, is over 2 air miles from the Mount Baldy ski area and access to Mount San Antonio is by a Forest Service trail. San Jacinto is also said to be lost because an aerial tram has its top terminal 5 miles from the peak and it is assumed that a ski area will now be developed there. The manager of the company told a reporter that they have no access to the peak since it is now a State park wilderness. An eminent ski area specialist, Willie Schaeffler, from Denver,

SRP05579

Colo., has examined the area above the tram terminal and declared it not practical for downhill skiing. Southern California skiers have concurred in this opinion for many years.

No ski lift would ever be placed at the top of San Gorgonio because of the technical problems keeping and maintaining it there and because it should always remain a foot climb to reach the top.

REPLACE WILD AREA BY ADDING ON TO IT ON SOUTH SIDE

Land lost from wild status could be replaced on the south side of San Gorgonio Peak along the south and east forks of the Whitewater River at 8,000 feet altitude.

CONCLUSION

The sport of skiing is probably the most rapidly growing in the world. It allows persons of almost any age to take part in a sport as an athlete and this does much for the general outlook of persons who thought themselves beyond all sport participation.

Dependable snow occurs only at higher altitudes. Since this may be in wild or wilderness lands provisions should be made to accommodate this recreational activity in the same manner that other recreations are made available to the public in the mountain regions.

The wilderness bill should contain provisions to permit development of lift skiing with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and at the recommendation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, if they shall deem this to be the highest and best use of the land.

(Subsequently, Mr. North submitted the following additional comments:)

SOUTHERN COUNCIL OF THE FAR WEST SKI ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 18, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Please add these comments to my statement filed with your committee in Las Vegas on January 13, 1964.

My interests regarding wilderness legislation are not limited to winter sports. I definitely want wilderness legislation but with moderation and consideration for the rights of persons other than those who want all wilderness-type land set aside for hiking, camping, hunting, and fishing.

I respectfully suggest that it is not possible to provide or preserve every person's idea of wilderness because of cyclic climatic changes that can induce widespread changes of flora and fauna and because of increased needs for water storage and flood control.

I believe that controlled lumbering can take place without permanent damage to a forest. In fact, it can even be beneficial in that it may open a close stand of timber and make possible more varied flora and fauna. I have observed an area that was being selectively cut for lumber above the Kern River near Quaking Aspen, Calif. Ten years later it was virtually impossible to tell that lumbering operations had taken place. The original flora and fauna had come back completely. I repeat, flora and fauna do not respect artificial boundary lines and they continue to exist, regardless of man, if food shelter and water remain available in an adjacent area.

I believe that limited mining and prospecting, as in a shaft or tunnel, do not upset an appreciable amount of forest land providing it is not beside a like or stream used for summer recreation. I am opposed to mining operations that pollute streams or lakes.

Cattle and sheep grazing must be regulated to preserve some of the lower forest area for summer recreation. Livestock do harvest a natural and replaceable food crop that otherwise would be wasted. However, excessive grazing, particularly by sheep, may destroy that natural crop and spoil the area for summer recreation.

I suggest that there be a 5-year review of the present wild and wilderness lands before they are locked up. Future changes in classification from primitive to wild or wilderness should be given wider publicity and reviewed by a group of persons such as the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

I want to see all species of wildlife, game and predators alike, kept alive and available in their natural state as long as possible. This may mean more game and even predator refuges. This last is in opposition to the desires of rod and gun clubs.

May it please the Congress and the Senate to give us a wilderness bill with some moderation that will preserve some land for use on foot or horseback only. On the other hand recognize the needs for water conservation and flood control.

In my experience on the farm and in the city, plants, birds, and animals will occur in the middle of cities or farm areas if water is available such as around a reservoir, pond, or lake and if bushes, trees, and rocks be present for shelter and living space. I have never lacked for solitude recreation space if I was willing to walk a mile or two to get it."

Respectfully yours,

CHANDLER P. NORTH,
Chairman, Area Development Committee, sponsor, University of California Student Ski Club.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Herb C. Leffler, president and general manager of the Mount Baldy Ski Lifts, Inc. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HERB C. LEFFLER, PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, MOUNT BALDY SKI LIFTS, INC., MOUNT BALDY, CALIF.

Mr. LEFFLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Herb C. Leffler, general manager and president of the Mount Baldy Ski Lifts, Inc.

I would like to state to you our position and convictions with respect to the opening of the San Gorgonio Wild Area for limited entry on the 3,500 acres for skiing and outdoor recreational development above 9,000 feet in this area.

As president and general manager of Mount Baldy Ski Lifts, Inc., which is located in the western end of San Bernardino County near Upland and Ontario, I firmly believe that the proposed skiing and outdoor recreational development in San Gorgonio would not adversely affect the operations of our Mount Baldy ski area in any way. As a matter of fact, all of our shareholders, officers, and directors agree on this; we are convinced and we know from past experience that such a development in San Gorgonio would benefit our ski area and every other ski area in southern California, because it would make available for the skiing public the only dependable snow area in southern California.

This would provide guaranteed ski seasons every year resulting in expanded ski opportunities and increasing the number of skiers using the presently existing areas than we do have now. Because of being a marginal snow belt area due to our elevation, we lack a continuity of snow in our area.

This has been the history of all ski areas in the United States—every good new ski area brings greater business to the existing areas because it increases the usage, excitement, and the skiing population.

Our Mount Baldy, with its investment of $1½ million, is the largest existing ski area in southern California. We will not be hurt by the skiing expansion generated by the proposed development of San Gorgonio. We will, and particularly anyone offering accommodations, in fact, benefit from it.

SRP05581

For these reasons we do not oppose the San Gorgonio development. On the contrary, we welcome a limited entry, we support it, and we urge that you consider an exception to this wilderness area because it will not only help us, but bring tremendous economic and social benefits to the entire county of San Bernardino.

I also would like to say that our recreational area lives in complete harmony with all other uses in the canyon, the individual canyon owners, the Sierra Club, organizational camps, et cetera.

Our Boy Scouts' camp, when they went in there 19 years ago, fought the putting up of ski lifts and developing a recreational area. They now use it as part of their activities in their camp and now have a higher use in the wintertime than they did in the summertime.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. The point you are making is that this would be compatible with the camp uses now established, which could utilize and gain from the lift to expand operations?

Mr. LEFFLER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. That is the experience in the Mount Baldy area?

Mr. LEFFLER. Yes.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Mr. LEFFLER. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Robert Freeman.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT FREEMAN, BIG BEAR LAKE, CALIF.

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will give an oral statement. I am substituting for the gentleman who was supposed to appear regarding this San Gorgonio situation.

I am engaged in publishing in Big Bear. I am opposed to the development of San Gorgonio.

Big Bear is a town with but one industry—recreation. Its income is almost totally derived from vacation-spent dollars of the recreation-seeking public from San Diego and Los Angeles.

Summer activities are centered around big Bear Lake, the largest fresh water lake in southern California. When winter comes the focus of attention turns from the lake and does about-face toward the four major ski areas situated on the valley's slopes.

In years past, we waited for snow and sweated through marginal winters. Today we manufacture snow at all four areas. This winter industry has developed proportionately to the demand for skiing in the southland.

Big Bear can accommodate more than 30,000 people overnight and many more who just stay for the day. Big Bear is just 100 miles from Los Angeles.

Big Bear has, by no means, reached its saturation point in resort accommodations and facilities. We can expand to handle 10 times our present load. Present building and developmental trends clearly show Big Bear's ability to cope with this swell.

Why then open San Gorgonio, a few miles distant, to commercial development when this Big Bear summer and winter resort already exists.

SRP05582

The San Gorgonio wild area is a needed asset to our well-rounded resort activities and the development of San Gorgonio would obliterate the last vestige of recreationally suitable Wild Area in southern California.

Personally, I moved from Los Angeles to Big Bear so that I could avail myself and my family of the benefits of nature so near by.

Eventually it may be necessary to open the San Gorgonio wilderness for commercial development—if and when the skiers of southern California reach enormous numbers, and when the summertime outdoorsmen completely disappear from the scene.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. This is getting more complex all the time. I am confused and amused.

Did you ever try getting around the table and settling this by yourselves?

Mr. FREEMAN. I think one of the problems that has arisen is the fact the snowmaking is a relatively new situation. It was pioneered in Big Bear but became a tremendous development. I believe we can make more snow in a season than will fall on San Gorgonio.

Mr. WHITE. That is a lot of snow.

Mr. FREEMAN. It is.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Mr. WESTLAND. I have no questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. CINA. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. What is your name?

STATEMENT OF JOHN CINA, PRESIDENT, BIG BEAR ASSOCIATES, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. CINA. John Cina. Mr. Freeman has spoken on my subject. I was not going to get involved in this roundtable discussion, as you said, but previous speakers have talked about going to Mammoth. At present, Big Bear Associates, who are mostly lodge owners and other businesses, sponsor a snow report. I was not going to bring this up because this is kind of out of the way here.

This is a snow report that tells the people in Los Angeles how to ski and where to ski. This is free to all of the ski areas. It will cost us this year approximately a thousand dollars for this report. Our report can be had by calling Madison 27285. Dial this number and come to Big Bear. The skiing is terrific. I am not a skier, I am not a hunter, I am not a fisherman, but the skiing has been terrific for the last 6 weeks, with the snowmaking.

We have a four-season resort at Big Bear, not a one-season. Let's leave San Gorgonio for the fishermen, hikers, campers, sightseers, bird watchers, the people that come to our lodges all year around. From the figures I have here, only two-thirds of 1 percent, I would say to those who want to make the entire wilderness a ski area, are skiers. Let's give our other guests a chance.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much. We got our cattlemen and sheep growers together in our State, and I do not see why you cannot get the skiers together.

Mr. TYNDALL. Mr. Chairman, may I say something?

SRP05583

Mr. BARING. What is your name for the record?
Mr. TYNDALL. My name is Tommi Tyndall.
Mr. BARING. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF TOMMI TYNDALL

Mr. TYNDALL. I have no address.

I have no prepared statement. I have fought for skiing and against the strictly exclusive use of wilderness for a few, for a minority all my life. I have a record of 7 years of battle with the U.S. Forest Service for the opening of Robinson Basin in Inyo County, 90 miles closer than the area mentioned.

I have learned in these fights that we truly are in the minority, and while we are greatly interested in making as many ski areas available as possible to the skiing public, especially in southern California where it is so needed, we have, with bowed head, listened to the demands of the Government-appointed administrators who would prefer if nonclassified lands would be developed first, and not new technological advances, which by others may be called pittances because they have not investigated the extent to which these areas are successful today, only after these specific improvements which we are trying to fulfill for the people.

I assure you, gentlemen of the committee, we are not trying to compete with the Lord. We do not ever make as much snow as can come from the heavens, but we make a considerable amount of snow, more so than is known to the people in this room.

I have two exhibits showing the president of the Far West Ski Association skiing on our hill on good snow, and we are only 1 mile from Moon Ridge, the picture which he mentioned to be such a miserable place where there was no snow.

Mr. BARING. Is that artificial or real?

Mr. TYNDALL. Real snow and artificial. Artificial snow is being produced at the bottom and the real snow is on top, and we have gone to great extent and great financial sacrifice to prove the point. I believe we would not have obtained Government cooperation on this if the Government also had not thought this approach was feasible, and we would like to have a chance to prove that these investments which we have made and which we have tried to sustain will be worthwhile.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions on behalf of the committee?
Mr. WESTLAND. I have no questions.
Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.
Is Dr. Gherman here?
Mr. TYNDALL. He will not appear today. He will be here tomorrow.
Mr. BARING. Without objection, Dr. Gherman's statement will be made a part of the record.
(Statement follows.)

STATEMENT OF DR. M. E. GHERMAN, BIG BEAR LAKE, CALIF.

Inadequate and misleading testimony by both proponents and opponents to lift skiing in the heart of the San Gorgonio Wild Area given at Las Vegas January 13, 1964, causes us to respectfully request a thorough investigation by members of your committee or appointees of the existing snowmaking installations now operational in southern California. They already have and will con-

SRP05584

tinue to revolutionalize this industry on a major scale. No judgment should be rendered on snow summit's ability to serve the needs of the skiing public, when this largest manmade snow system in the Western United States became operational only 48 hours before misleading testimony was given at the January 13 hearing. Furthermore, no testimony was given pertaining to other above 9,000 feet natural snow areas considered by the U.S. Forest Service hours closer to Los Angeles than Mammoth Mountain in the High Sierras.

Mr. BARING. And Charles Frederick?

Mr. TYNDALL. He will not appear.

Mr. BARING. Dr. Edward Woodhouse, of La Crescenta, Calif., representing the Division of Camping of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles. You may proceed, Doctor.

STATEMENT OF EDWIN D. WOODHOUSE, LA CRESCENTA, CALIF., DIVISION OF CAMPING, EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

Mr. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I am Dr. Edwin D. Woodhouse, professor emeritus, Los Angeles City College, today representing the Division of Camping, Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles.

In the summer of 1921, I camped at Radford in the San Bernardino Mountains with the Boy Scouts of the Los Angeles Council as assistant to the then director, E. B. de Groot. We took the entire group on a 2-day hike to the summit of Mount San Gorgonio; camping overnight at the dry lake at the base of the mountain and starting early the next morning in order to reach the summit in time for sunrise. Though tired of body, every one of those boys got a thrill and a spiritual uplift out of that experience, including the sunrise and the view into the Palm of God's Hand, as the Spanish called the Imperial Valley. With ski lifts proposed for that area, the thrill would be gone for all of those boys and all of these other children from the 26 camps that are now developed in that area.

In the nearly half a century since then, the number of youth camps on the fringes of the San Bernardino Wilderness Area has increased greatly. Today there are over 2 dozen, accommodating about 75,000 southern California children every year. The wilderness bill (preferably H.R. 9070, Saylor, or H.R. 9520, Cohelan) is necessary to protect this area against violation by commercial interests whose developments would ruin the area for the use to which it has been put through the years.

It is not true that ski development would not change the area. It would completely alter it. It would cease to be a wilderness area. It would cut across the trail of natural migration of animals, such as the puma, which range widely in this area. It would be completely altered. After all, the one-tenth of 1 percent they are asking for is the heart of the San Gorgonio area, and the San Gorgonio area would cease to exist as a wilderness area if this ski development were put in the center.

The Episcopal Church asks for the perpetuation of this area and every similar wilderness area in their entirety, by the wilderness bill, for the use, protection, and inspiration of all of the young people of southern California and of the United States. In southern California, the area which would be included under the wilderness bill is a fraction of 1 percent of the total land area. Therefore, I repeat that these areas should be preserved in their entirety; Shylock in the "Mer-

SRP05585

chant of Venice" wanted only "a pound of flesh, to be cut off nearest the merchant's heart." The skiers' demand is the pound of flesh from the heart of the San Gorgonio wilderness.

To this end we offer the attached resolution.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Without objection, the resolution submitted will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The resolution follows:)

RESOLUTION OF THE DIVISION OF CAMPING OF THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF LOS ANGEES RE WILDERNESS

Resolved, That the Division of Camping of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles record its 100-percent endorsement of the basic policy of preserving such wilderness areas remaining in our country, whose preservation as wilderness is essential to give to future generations the opportunity to see and enjoy their natural heritage.

Further, in view of the enormous population increase which has already taken place in southern California, and which will continue for some time to come, it is our conviction that it is more imperative than ever that those few wilderness areas within southern California be maintained and protected; be it further

Resolved, That the Division of Camping of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles supports the general policy of maintaining the San Gorgonio Wild Area in its present status and that it be included in the wilderness bill.

The above resolution was approved unanimously by the Executive Council of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. I have no questions.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Dane Winkelman, representing the Explorer Squadron 101, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Pacific Mountaineering Association.

STATEMENT OF DANE WINKELMAN, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.

Mr. WINKELMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit my prepared statement for the record and make an oral statement.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed.

Mr. WINKELMAN. Gentlemen, I feel that the problem we have here is far more than just the idea of land use of the area. A mountain is much more than a mere pile of rock and timber; it is a valuable channel for the development of self-reliance.

In our country we have a general principle of education, but education is much more than a mere acquaintance with technology and history. We have to develop the full man. Even in the few numbers of years of my life I have had an opportunity to see the real character-developing effect of the wilderness on the young men.

There are a few points I would like to make.

Where the people from the Far West Ski Corp. said they would only want to develop approximately one-tenth of the mountain, it seems to me this is not quite true. We have had three wilderness areas in the past in San Gorgonio. Two of them already have a tramway or ski lift. This is two-thirds of the area. They do not want a monopoly, but just this one-tenth of the mountain would be situated near the center of the San Gorgonio and would have much greater effect.

It was also stated that plants and animals do not recognize boundaries and they would grow out over the rest of the area that was not

used for a ski tow. But they do recognize people, and when thousands of people are carried to the top of the mountain, we have thousands of people who are going to go downhill. This ski tow would not only open up this one-tenth, but would open up the entire area to downhill hikers. It would open the area on the south side of the mountain as well as the north. It would open it up to downhill hikers and people who would not just be using the ski area. Actually then, this would affect nearly 60 or 70 percent of the area that is readily accessible from the peak.

Both in natural beauty and in wealth our Nation has been blessed more than all of the lands in this world. We have inherited a responsibility to protect at least a small part of this for the future. I wonder what is really going to be more important 40 years from now when there are twice as many people in the West as we have now—whether there is a small increase in commercial recreation or an enclave of the area that would be the same as it has been for thousands of years.

Another thing mentioned by the Far West and other ski corporations—not put on some of these maps—is the fact within the period of about 10 years they expect to put a ski tow over the area of the lake trail and open the entire area to use by skiers. When they say they are only using 10 percent of the area, this may be true geographically, but nearly 80 percent of the use in the area is concentrated where the ski tow would cross these trails that are used by the organized camps at the base of San Gorgonio. So really, in effect, the entire area would be opened up, rather than just 10 percent of the enclave as they would be expecting.

The same idea is applicable to the other wilderness areas in the entire wilderness system. A precedent could be set in San Gorgonio that would affect the wilderness areas over the entire country and the entire concept.

Let me say this: Thousands of people across the country, because of some breakdown in their education, not necessarily in school, but possibly in home and other places, disregard their self-evident responsibilities, but a wilderness experience can really make a difference in a person's life. A wilderness area has something to be found nowhere else. In wilderness there is a supreme feeling of peace and beauty, there is a clear and refreshing view of life. What is most important, there is an irreputable obligation to believe in oneself. Of course, self-reliance can be developed anyplace, but there are certain places where the opportunity is greater, and in San Gorgonio particularly, and in the area near the organization camps where this great concentration of youth is held, there is a terrific opportunity for this development. If a ski tow were put across the great concentration of uses in the wild area for our young people, this would disrupt the entire purpose that the organization camps are set there for.

Thank you, gentlemen.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Winkelman follows:)

Most everyone has seen a mountain at one time or another. They are as different from one another as are those who view them. Some are greedy and allow their favorite trees to crowd out the smaller life. Some are so deluded by their own majesty that no beauty or lasting good can grow on their slopes. Others, though, are generous and understanding of all the living things about them. They capture the brightness of the sun and the lifeblood of water to make

nourishment for all and provide security for harder times. They foster beauty and happiness in all those who visit them. These are the Mahatma Ghandi's and the Albert Switzer's of America. They have reverence for all life. They have looked beyond the present and have provided for the future.

We are told that the future of America depends on the education of her young people. This idea of education goes much further than a mere knowledge of history or technology. There is no single thing of greater importance in life than the development of self-reliance in young men.

A mountain is much more than a pile of rock and timber. It is a valuable channel in developing self-reliance. Thousands of young people across the country are given to disregard their self-evident responsibilities. Do we dare let this feeling grow up with them? If we do, we are all guilty of corrupting our own future. A wilderness experience can make the difference in their lives. There is something in wilderness that is to be found nowhere else. In wilderness there is a supreme feeling of peace and beauty, a clear and refreshing view of life, and an irrefutable obligation to believe in one's self. Even as young as I am, I have had opportunities to really see the positive character-developing influence of the wilderness. It has brought purpose and self-reliance into the lives of young men who might not otherwise have developed this part of their character. Wilderness can make the difference between a life of self-respect and honor and one of base corruption.

Both in natural beauty and in wealth, this land has been blessed above all other nations on the earth. We have now inherited the responsibility to protect it for our posterity. The vast wilderness of a century ago has been destroyed. Our Congressmen are now being asked to determine the destiny of our final outposts of solitude and tranquility. These men represent a far greater number of people than just these who are living today. The decision they make may have little effect on their own lives, yet these decisions will reach out into the future and have a great influence on the lives of millions yet unborn. Tell me, gentlemen, what will be more important in 40 years when there are twice as many people in the West as there are now: a small increase in commercial recreation and lumber interests or an enclave of eternity, the same then as it had been for thousands of years—a natural area of peace and solitude for the edification of millions.

The thoughts I have expressed represent the general feelings of thousands of Scouts and Explorers. We are adamantly in favor of the passage of a strong wilderness bill such as H.R. 9070 (Sayler), without any amendment excluding the San Gorgonio Wild Area from its protection. I am president of the Pacific Mountaineering Association, president of Explorer Squadron 101 of Arrowhead Area Council, of the Boy Scouts of America; and service chairman of the Order of the Arrow.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. That is the longest summation I have heard in quite awhile.

Are you in Congressman Johnson's district?

Mr. WINKLEMAN. I am in Mr. Sheppard's district.

Mr. WHITE. I will inform him about you being out there, and he can start worrying.

Mr. WINKELMAN. He is a great guy.

Mr. WHITE. You made an excellent presentation. I thought your mind was most nimble in developing your points, not from a prepared piece of paper, but from the testimony that has been given.

Mr. WINKELMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. No questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Winkelman.

The next witness is Sidney Cornwall of Los Angeles. You may proceed, Miss Cornwall.

You may proceed.

SRP05588

STATEMENT OF SIDNEY CORNWALL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Miss CORNWALL. My name is Sidney Cornwall. I am an underpaid secretary in an advertising agency, and have been skiing since 1951. The first year I skied, I had the opportunity to ski locally during the Thanksgiving holidays on through April. Not since that time have I, and have been forced to go many miles away to do a majority of my skiing. Since this is very time consuming and very expensive, it has not been easy to do the amount of skiing I wish to do.

I have long admired the view of snow-capped San Gorgonio, towering above the snowless mountains below, and have many times felt it was unfair that we were not able to easily ski that gorgeous area.

Three seasons ago there was more skiable snow than the usual southern California season, about 2½ months of pretty good conditions. In talking to ski shop operators and others in the business, I understand that 20,000 new skiers were created in that one season. As a result, the dollar volume was raised considerably in the related ski businesses in the surrounding area.

Every 57 seconds a new person comes to Los Angeles, or surrounding area, to live. Many of these people have never seen snow and have no desire or funds to drive great distances to get in some snow play with their families, for a day at a time. By obtaining good access and facilities in the San Gorgonio area, these people could go to the area and find an outlet for a winter outdoor family activity in snow play.

I have not done much hiking because of an asthmatic condition, so have not gone through all of the San Gorgonio Area. However, I have seen many pictures, read studies of snow depths, and have had a small taste of the potential or the area. It is truly frustrating not to be able to go up there and be able to get on a chair lift and to be able to ski down that beautiful terrain.

In talking to the present Alpine Olympic Coach, Bob Beattie, who comes from Colorado, he mentioned that he had heard about our great area out here and he himself wondered why we could not develop reasonable facilities there for skiing and ski training. He said he thought it would be a great Olympic training ground for our young people in the West, and since we are especially Olympic-minded out here, having a good share of the team this year in Innsbruck coming from the West, it's a shame this area isn't available for training. He stated that he had heard that it would be the best challenging terrain here for that purpose.

I am basically all for wilderness, as most skiers are, as I, too, like "to get away from it all." However, I would truly like to see a provision in the wilderness bill that would allow for a good, sensible, well-managed development in the San Gorgonio Area.

Mr. BARING. Mrs. Hudson, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF SALLY NEIDLINGER HUDSON, SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Mrs. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, my name is Sally Neidlinger Hudson. I'm a former Olympic skier who now lives in Santa Monica, Calif. I appear before you as the mother of two young skiers who are anxious

SRP05589

for the opportunity to learn to ski themselves. The reasons I would like to see skiing made available to the children of southern California stem from the wonderful life the sport has given me. Skiing is a great way to enjoy our mountains.

To make an exception to the general wilderness policy by opening a small portion of San Gorgonio would be of great benefit to my boys and all future Olympic champions in the West. San Gorgonio is the only mountain within easy driving distance from Los Angeles that has the altitude and northern exposure necessary to assure adequate training grounds.

When I grew up in New Hampshire, children began skiing in their back yards at the age of 4, and my boys have skied since the age of 4. I realize we can't bring snow to Los Angeles, but southern California has the perfect winter playground close by in San Gorgonio. Our only alternative to develop junior skiers is a long drive to the Sierras. There are not many parents willing to drive 16 hours to Mammoth or spend the $100 a weekend required for a family trip to the snow.

My one boy has a record of having 74 runs down the hill in one afternoon. I know it takes him an hour to get down Mammoth. I would compare this to running around a track the size of a football field as compared to taking a walk in the wilderness.

There are hundreds of southern California youngsters who need the opportunity to get away to the mountains and enjoy an invigorating sport like skiing. To train toward a goal of athletic perfection makes for better citizens. I feel a ski area closer to the thousands of potential junior skiers in our city would benefit many more citizens than leaving it buried in inaccessible snow all winter.

Other cities have wonderful programs through their schools or youth organizations where youngsters are introduced to the snow. Seattle has a city-sponsored project where 8,000 teenagers take weekly trips to enjoy skiing. The Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce organized 4,000 local children for a learn-to-ski program only to have the whole thing fall through for lack of snow.

By opening San Gorgonio to skiing, we might find some southern California children having a chance to make the next Olympic ski team instead of staying home to watch it on TV.

I strongly urge you to consider limited entry to the San Gorgonio Wild Area for the benefit of the growing number of skiing families.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much, Mrs. Hudson.

Mrs. HUDSON. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Dr. Mervyn G. Hardinge, of Loma Linda, Calif.

STATEMENT OF MERVYN G. HARDINGE, LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY, LOMA LINDA, CALIF.

Dr. HARDINGE. Gentlemen, I, Mervyn G. Hardinge, M.D., Ph. D., of the School of Medicine, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, Calif., wish to make the following statement regarding the wilderness bill, and especially concerning the San Gorgonio National Forest Wild Area, San Bernardino County, Calif.

SRP05590

As a resident of this county for the past 25 years, I have watched the rapid population growth of southern California, and the gradual encroachment of commercial organizations into our primitive areas. Within recent years, San Antonio Mountain area has permitted the building of ski tows, a lodge, and restaurant. San Jacinto Mountain area has just allowed the building of an aerial tramway from Palm Springs to the 8,500-foot level with a restaurant now located in the heart of what was a primitive area. Efforts are underway to build roadways and lodges for skiing facilities in the heart of the San Gorgonio National Forest Area.

I personally enjoy skiing but oppose the opening up of the San Gorgonio National Forest Wild Area for such commercial purposes because this would destroy the hiking and camping area for thousands of youngsters and adults who for reasons of time and distance and finance cannot afford to travel long distances for such outdoor activities. The numerous youth camps in the vicinity are evidence for the preservation of the area as natural a state as possible. Because of the rapidly growing population this will probably become the most used primitive area in the country. Numerous skiing facilities already exist in the southern California mountains, and the limited number of skiers could better afford to travel into the Sierras than thousands of youngsters, many of whom come from underprivileged homes.

The lack of snow for many winters at a time in the San Gorgonio Mountains, such as we are now experiencing, further emphasizes the impracticality of destroying a wilderness area for an uncertain and relatively short seasonal use.

Although I am speaking as an individual, as organizer and leader of the University Hiking Club some years ago, my sentiments are those of many others in this area.

I urge a strong wilderness bill which will protect the San Gorgonio Forest area and other such areas across the country from commercial exploitation, and preserve for this and future generations some natural areas for the youth of today and tomorrow.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Hardinge.

The next witness is Mrs. Marjorie Jones of San Bernardino, Calif. You may proceed, Mrs. Jones.

STATEMENT OF MARJORIE JONES, SAN BERNADINO, CALIF.

Mrs. JONES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am Marjorie Jones, housewife, of 3340 Mayfield Avenue, San Bernardino, Calif., which is 60 miles east of Los Angeles. I would like to express my views as to why I believe it important that a wilderness preservation system be established.

Secretary Stewart Udall, in his recently published book, "The Quiet Crisis," states:

> One of the paradoxes of American society is that while our economic standard of living has become the envy of the world, our environmental standard has steadily declined. We are better housed, better nourished, and better entertained, but we are not better prepared to inherit the earth or to carry on the pursuit of happiness.

SRP05591

The late President Kennedy in a speech on March 3, 1961, said that:

> It is our task in our time and in our generation to hand down undiminished to those who come after us what was handed down to us by those who went before, the natural wealth and beauty which is ours,

also noting that—

> to do this will require constant attention and vigilance, sustained vigor and imagination.

President Johnson, early in 1963 when he was Vice President, expressed similar sentiment when he said:

> We must never neglect the future of nature's rich endowment for our country. We must constantly be vigilant and on the alert to keep our air clean, to keep our water pure, to keep our forests green, to keep our birdlife abundant, and our wildlife plentiful or else we will lose a vital essential of what we love to call America.

It has been my good fortune in the last 10 years to visit and enjoy many of our national parks and monuments and primitive, wild, and wilderness areas. This has included the entire 217 miles of the John Muir Trail in the California Sierra Nevada, and many more miles than that in approaches and side trails, not in one summer, but five, knapsacking all the trip. I carry my share of food and other supplies for a 14-day trip. The longest continuous time I've lived on the trail without return to to civilization has been 24 days. This was with one cache. I emphasize these things because it is so often said that only the sturdy, hardy few can enjoy such activities. I weigh 100 pounds and did not even start hiking until I was past 35. I've been rained on, snowed on, hailed on.

Other areas in which I have knapsacked include the North Cascades in the State of Washington, the Three Sisters and the Wallowas in Oregon, the Bitterroots in Montana, the Sawtooths in Idaho, the Appalachian Trail in Vermont. I've also enjoyed one 10-day canoe trip in the Quetico-Superior Wilderness in Minnesota and Canada, and 13 days on the Salmon River and its Middle Fork in Idaho. I've also camped and hiked in many other places too numerous to mention here.

The closer one is to large areas of population the harder it is to find what more and more people are looking for, solitude and breathing space. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in southern California. There aren't many places where one doesn't hear the whine of traffic, even on mountaintops, and I've been on the top of 218 over 5,000 feet high in southern California alone. Our largest wild area, San Gorgonio, less than 40,000 acres, is threatened by proposals to build a road so mechanical aids to skiing can be installed. This is also the only area in southern California where boys and girls can hike to and camp on a natural lake in summer, and indeed find enough water in springs and streams to knapsack for a few days. A good wilderness bill without crippling amendments will preserve areas such as this for all boys and girls in the future. But this is only one example of what will come unless you help to preserve now the segments we still have.

I am indeed fortunate to have the health and the time to enjoy some of America's natural assets, but I want them not for myself alone. While I have no children of my own to enjoy them, I think all children in the future have a right to visit, know and enjoy them. Once

SRP05592

destroyed, it will take hundreds, and in some cases thousands of years for nature to restore what we already have.

I have (or to be more exact, my husband has) the knowledge and ability to search out the places we enjoy, but it gets harder year by year. Before it is too late, we need to preserve the smaller areas close to large numbers of our young people where they can learn what they need to know before going into larger, more distant ones. Any error we make in preserving too much can be easily rectified in the years to come, but any errors we make in not preserving enough will take many years to change, if, indeed it can ever be done. If man must have all our land now for his economic health, what chance has man tomorrow?

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions from the committee?

Mr. WHITE. I would like to compliment the lady. Anyone who has gone through the Sawtooth in Idaho and down the "River of No Return"—I do not know whether you did it afoot or by rubber boat, but either way you had quite a stimulating trip.

Mrs. JONES. They were beautiful and quite enjoyable.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would just like to say, for a lady who only started hiking when she was 35, you have done an awful lot of hiking in a very short time. [Applause.]

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Mrs. Harry J. Krueper. We welcome you before the committee, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HARRY J. KRUEPER, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.

Mrs. KRUEPER. Mr. Chairman and members of the comimttee, I am Mrs. Harry J. Krueper, resident of the city of San Bernardino; my occupation is a public health nurse, although I am currently a homemaker and much involved in raising four sons.

My husband and I have enjoyed the pleasures of wilderness camping for many years and, with each one of our sons, have introduced them to camping, starting them at about 6 weeks of age.

This perhaps sounds complicated, but ingenuity allowed us to go into the back country again with small children. The Indians had a good idea with their papoose board which we adapted and used very effectively. After the youngest son got to be about 11 months old we switched him to an old rucksack in which we had devised a seat supported by straps. Well, that wore out recently so this past year we attached a little seat to a packframe, with room for a sleeping bag underneath. Incidentally, the sleeping bag was covered with plastic sheeting, just in case.

We have back-packed many times on overnight trips into the wilderness with all of the boys, the youngest one starting at 6 months of age. Our two older boys are developing feelings of self-assurance, courage, and accomplishment through their wilderness experiences. There are very few other ways of total family enjoyment in which this can be obtained. We feel a very tightly knit family association in wilderness that is otherwise difficult to obtain in our busy everyday lives.

It is essential for our family's equilibrium to get into wilderness country about twice a month. We then are ready, willing, and able

SRP05593

to tackle the complexities of our present way of life. We need wilderness close to us for these reasons.

The areas concerned here are public lands which we, and many others like us, enjoy so much. Note, I say "public lands." This means, in my way of thinking, that the dollar-minded individual should be thwarted in their continual attempt to grab something for nothing.

A good example of this is our nearby San Gorgonio Wild Area where certain Los Angeles businessmen are desirous of taking the best part of the area for a huge downhill ski development. There is no doubt that the very reasons the thousands of people who go there now is because it is undeveloped. We need areas of refuge away from sight and sound of manmade structures.

I have no personal objections to downhill skiing, as my husband and I have been actively skiing since 1951. Our two older boys, now seven and a half and five, will be taking ski lessons this season. We are in a unique position to do this in that there are already 12 major ski developments within one and a half hour's drive of our house in San Bernardino.

Therefore, we need wilderness legislation to protect these areas from just such proposals now and in the future. I most sincerely urge you to consider a strong wilderness bill with no amendments excluding any area involved from the protection of the bill.

We personally favor something similar to S. 4 or Mr. Saylor's 9070, but due to the apparent stalemate in the Interior Committee, my husband and I would not be opposed to Mr. Dingell's 9162, provided some omissions be corrected, such as listed in Mr. Cohelan's 9520.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much, Mrs. Krueper.

The next witness is Mrs. Gwen Rector of Rolling Hills Estates, Calif.

You may proceed, Mrs. Rector.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GWEN RECTOR, ROLLING HILLS ESTATES, CALIF.

Mrs. RECTOR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as a parent, a high school teacher, a Far West Ski Instructors Association certified ski instructor, and a national ski patrolwoman, my testimony will be in favor of making an exception to the proposed wilderness bill to include a portion of San Gorgonio for development as winter recreation area.

In the past 17 years that I have been skiing, the popularity of skiing has brought thousands more of our Los Angeles area families to the mountains in winter. San Gorgonio is the only local area which can accommodate the increasing participation in winter activities. Skiing appeals to all ages—by the way I taught my mother to ski when she was 52—and provides opportunity for families to vacation together in the wintertime in a physically healthy environment.

As a physical education teacher and as a parent, I am most interested in what activities appeal to children. The thrills of winter sports are especially appealing to junior and senior high boys and girls. This is noteworthy for several reasons. Firstly, the beauty of mountains in the winter can be so awe inspiring that there is an

SRP05594

immediate awareness of an almost spiritual feeling. For those of us who attend church regularly or not, this is true. This can be really most appreciated from the top of a mountain, and it is mostly inaccessible to people not able to hike it. Secondly, we, in the physical education field, are most concerned that our students continue to enjoy sports after leaving school. Year-round recreational activities are readily available in southern California, but few can compare to skiing when we measure the degree of acquired physical fitness involved.

And so our thrill-seeking junior and senior high school boys and girls flock to the local mountains at the first snowfall throwing snowballs at passing cars, creating traffic hazards, and sliding down slopes on anything they can find from cardboard cartons to toboggans. The unsupervised areas where you see this are not safe, the slopes are heavily timbered and usually rocky due to the sparce snow coverage. While working on the ski patrol one weekend, I personally provided first aid to as many as 12 young people suffering from compression fractures of the vertebrae, all resulting from sliding down hills in a sitting position on toboggans or ash can lids. Why does this continue to happen? Because the act of sliding at exhilarating speeds appeals to our young people. Compare for a moment the sport of surfing to skiing—the initial output of purchasing a surfboard is considerable, but this is the only major expense—transportation costs are incidental and surfing beaches are being made more available for surfers only.

Most boys and girls in our area, regard the opportunity to learn to ski as some vague wonderful, but unobtainable dream. This need not be true; as a ski instructor I have been teaching dryland ski classes in Los Angeles County for several years. The cost is very nominal, but very few teenagers take advantage of the lessons. Too many ski clubs in our schools have been initiated with enthusiastic plans for winter activities only to be denied the opportunity. Why? Because, one, the only available good snow is hundreds of miles away. The result: added expense and travel time; two, the local skiing season is far too short to warrant the expense of buying boots and skis for growing feet.

Thousands of families will continue to seek winter recreation in our local mountains. Those who can afford the added expense will travel north or out of the State. Skiing interest will not diminish for those who can afford it. Why not place winter recreation within the financial realm of the average economic income? Why not benefit our local economy by keeping our skiers in the State? Why not provide safe, open, and controlled areas for winter play where families can vacation together? All of these need not be an obscure dream. San Gorgonio can satisfy the need, and the vast population of this area need not be denied the recreational benefits that are almost within reach.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. I am wondering about that age of 52. I am 52. Do you think I would be able to learn?

Mrs. RECTOR. Welcome. You come to Mount Baldy and be my guest.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I think you have made an excellent statement, and I congratulate you on the work you are doing with these youngsters, in the physical eduaction program.

Mrs. RECTOR. Thank you.

Mr. WESTLAND. I think this is one of the things the country can have more of.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Mrs. Carol J. Wright, of San Pedro, Calif.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CAROL WRIGHT, SAN PEDRO, CALIF.

Mrs. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, my testimony is that I want to see a provision included in the wilderness legislation that will permit 3,500 acres to be opened for skiing development in the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area. I am speaking as a skier and past president of Ski Club Alpine, and as an interested parent of two skiing children.

San Gorgonio is one of the greatest potential winter sports areas in the United States. It has a very long season, and the terrain is suitable for beginners, as well as advanced skiers. I am one of thousands of frustrated skiers who is aware that San Gorgonio is covered with snow, while local developed areas are barren. Even with some resorts turning to manmade snow, the expense involved in producing it is such that only very limited areas are covered. These areas can't possibly handle the increasing thousands of skiers.

I have hiked into San Gorgonio almost every spring, for the last 11 years with 2 years out for children—either in April or May, to participate in Ski Club Alpine's annual San Gorgonio downhill race. Hiking 4, 5, or 6 miles into the area carrying skis, boats, poles, sleeping bags, and food is rather exhausting. Only the diehard skiers and racers are willing to undertake the long hike for two or three downhill runs. Most of the day or weekend is spent having to climb the mountain, for a small amount of skiing.

There are many parents like my husband and myself who would like to be able to enjoy skiing as a family in the San Gorgonio area. As it is now, to plan a family ski trip means thinking in terms of driving 750 miles roundtrip on a weekend to Mammoth Mountain. This is a long and expensive trip. If San Gorgonio were developed for skiing, many families would be able to enjoy a day's outing only 100 miles from Los Angeles.

As a parent I feel active participation in sports such as skiing is important for children, both physically and mentally. If more children were able to take advantage of an area like San Gorgonio to ski in the winter months, I am sure that the delinquency rate would decline in direct ratio to the number of individuals participating. Our club, Ski Club Alpine, has a very active junior program. Every year we hold a ski race training camp during Christmas week and during Easter vacation. To conduct these camps we have to take the juniors 325 miles north to Mammoth or June Mountain, or east 500 miles to Flagstaff. How much better it would be to utilize San Gorgonio, which this year had more snow than Flagstaff at Christmastime.

Let's encourage healthful winter sports activities by opening fabulous San Gorgonio for the enjoyment of many.

Thank you.

SRP05596

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mrs. Wright.

Mrs. WRIGHT. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is John M. Blatt of Indio, Calif. You may proceed, Mr. Blatt.

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. BLATT, INDIO, CALIF.

Mr. BLATT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am John M. Blatt, contractor with offices in Indio, Calif. I am speaking in favor of limited entry in the San Gorgonio area, San Bernardino County, Calif., for skiing and winter recreation development. I am appearing on behalf of the many unorganized skiers and winter sports enthusiasts of the desert areas of California, and for the Junior Skiers of Southern California, Inc., a nonprofit organization devoted solely to the training of junior ski racers.

I am a member of the Mount Baldy and Alpine Ski Clubs, and of the Far West Ski Association, and a member of the board of directors of the Far West Ski Instructors Association. I was a member of the 1948 U.S. Olympic ski team at St. Moritz, Switzerland, and am currently active as a coach of junior racers of southern California, as well as the adult senior racers of the Alpine Ski Club.

There is a need for accessible skiing facilities within reasonable distance of California's lower desert areas—Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley, and Palo Verde Valley. Surprising as it may seem, there are a great number of skiers and winter sports enthusiasts in these areas; there are several hundred active skiers in the Coachella Valley alone. Many others are inactive, having moved there from other areas where ski facilities are more readily reached, and forced to give up this healthy activity because of the long distances involved in reaching a ski area. (San Gorgonio is a mere 40 air miles from Indio, the center of the Coachella Valley.) During the infrequent periods of satisfactory snow conditions at the present lower elevation southern California ski developments, our neighbors must drive 2 to 3 hours to reach them. For the dependable, winter-long areas, such as San Gorgonio represents, the drive is now 8 to 10 hours, which is impossible for the average family weekend outing. From the standpoint of training of our southern California junior racers, it is absolutely essential to have a long season with dependable snow conditions on suitable terrain. These are the boys and girls who can represent the United States in future Olympic and world championship competition, if they are given the opportunity to avail themselves of the natural training ground which lies right in their backyard. We have in the Alpine Ski Club alone nearly 50 youngsters who take part in our junior race training program each year. They now have to travel the hundreds of miles to Mammoth Mountains, June Lake, or Arizona Snow Bowl at Flagstaff, during their holiday vacation period for their annual training camp. Needless to say, it is impossible to develop top competitors from such a situation. Only through constant, regular, rigorous sessions on long, steep terrain, can these youngsters rise to the levels of their counterparts who have real ski mountains available to them. Were there no such mountain in south-

SRP05597

ern California, we would abandon the idea of providing our Nation with its top racers from this inexhaustible supply of potential talent that is southern California's youth. But with San Gorgonio less than 150 miles away, with its rugged vertical rise at an altitude and exposure that assures skiable snow conditions from October through May, we could afford the hundreds of enthusiastic racing aspirants with every opportunity to become world champions, that is available to the youngsters in northern California, the Northwest, the Rockies, New England, Scandinavia, and the Alps. San Gorgonio is the only area in all of southern California where this natural combination of terrain, exposure, and elevation occurs.

It can only become available for the enjoyment of our desert residents and for the development of our young competitive skiers, if it is made accessible to them by relaxing the strict wilderness area concept.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Blatt.

Mr. BLATT. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. For orderliness in the record, we have included at this point all of the testimony on the San Gorgonio Wild Area, and I would like to know whether there are any other witnesses who want to address themselves primarily to the San Gorgonio Area.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JOHN D. GOODMAN, MAHALI JUANI, MENTONE, CALIF.

Mrs. GOODMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am Mrs. John D. Goodman. I am representing my husband, Dr. John D. Goodman, professor of biology, University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif., and chairman-elect of the Desert Bighorn Council.

First, I would like to say that we have all heard that only mad dogs and Englishmen go out in the noonday sun. Then I am a mad dog, and I know it is like me, because I find myself on the summit of San Gorgonio in the wintertime, with snow on the ground, where I have to fight through the rotten snow up to my waist, and take my children up. I would remind you the Sherpa guides and their families live the year through in the Himalayas at a considerable higher elevation than San Gorgonio Peak.

I will now read my husband's statement:

Southern California—unlike parts to the north—has little real wilderness left. Excluding the deserts, most of this is in the high country of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains, in San Bernardino County, and is known as the San Gorgonio and Cucamonga Wild Areas. Furthermore, southern California is experiencing one of the greatest population increments in history; thus, there is a heavy demand for recreation outside the metropolitan areas, with a weekly exodus to desert and mountain. Here, such varied activities are engaged in as camping, hiking, boating, waterskiing, and, in season, hunting, fishing, and winter sports such as skiing, sledding, and ski moutaineering.

Multiple-use recreational facilities place a great strain on the habitat, especially in the mountains where the total available space is extremely limited. This is particularly evident in the Big Bear Lake district of the San Bernardino Mountains and in the Mount Baldy area of the San Gabriel Mountains. Both have numerous ski lifts which double as aerial trams.

There are good roads to the lifts and shopping and other facilities are close at hand. Emphasis here is on a group recreation, so that it is very important and, in fact, necessary for commercial enterpirses to be encouraged.

Quite a different situation exists, however, in the higher portions of the mountains, in those parts which have been designated wild areas. These lie within the San Bernardino National Forest, like most of the preceding, but at elevations exceeding 8,000 feet for the most part. These are the only places that the serious hiker or climber, hiker-camper, naturalist-photographer, hunter, fisherman, or ski-tourer can find conditions approximating that found in other natural, undisturbed habitats.

The total extent of the area so designated as wild is scarcely 44,000 acres—the larger of the two, the San Gorgonio Wild Area being only in the neighborhood of 50 square miles in size. Thus, if one attempts to hike even 7 or 8 miles into the center of the San Gorgonio Wild Area, he has already penetrated past that point and is coming out the other side. Thus, the feeling of wilderness is preserved only by strict adherence to a policy of keeping conditions as primitive as possible within the wild area. Even so, one is scarcely ever more than 6 miles from a graded or paved road, or a parking lot, while within the wild area.

It may come as a surprise to many that, despite this tremendous human use, there exists, in very limited numbers, a few wild mountain sheep of the Nelson bighorn variety, *Ovis canadensis nelsoni*, in some of the wilder, more inaccessible portions of the San Gorgonio and Cucamonga Wild Areas.

Finally, to strike a more personal note, it is my opinion that to allow any kind of recreational activity, other than that now described as compatible with the continued preservation of wild areas, to be established within the boundaries of the region now known as the San Gorgonio Wild Area, no matter how contained or modified, is totally wrong.

It is impossible to have any sort of organized commercial operation of any kind or description within an area designated as "wild"—which means an area not inhabited by man or his installations—and expect to retain any more than a semblance of its wild character. To even suggest that recreation involving man-made installations, noise, vigorous activity, smells, and all the other evidences of man's permanent occupancy, need not alter—let alone destroy—its wild character, is so utterly preposterous as to be, in my opinion, unworthy of further comment.

Probably every wild area or area possibly designated as wilderness is coveted by someone or some group for its own personal gain. It has become abundantly evident in the past few months, and for that matter going back to hearings conducted on this same situation a good many years ago, that the San Gorgonio Wild Area is no exception to this pattern that brings into such sharp focus man's greed and always-ready hand for exploitation.

One of the surest evidences that this kind of thinking is in operation is when these same individuals or groups profess to have considerable concern and even love for wild country. They may even assume titles that seem to indicate this love. But the sad fact is, these wild areas that they pretend to love are always somewhere else, totally ignoring the fact that someone else just as earnestly desires these areas for their own peculiar form of exploitation, and, by right, should therefore be allowed to have these areas.

What is needed—and what has been so wonderfully demonstrated by the very bills now up for consideration—is a real, honest concern for wilderness and the wildlife occupying these wild areas. Nations everywhere are facing similar problems with their own rapidly dwindling natural resources at the same time as they are experiencing the most rapid rate of human increase in history. We in America have the chance to lead the way in demonstrating what a large and

SRP05599

powerful and often-judged materialistically minded Nation does in the face of this problem. Whatever we do, it is almost certain that much of the rest of the world will sooner or later follow. In what direction do we want them to go?

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much, Mrs. Goodman.

Mrs. GOODMAN. Thank you.

(The following letter subsequently was received from Mr. Goodman:)

JANUARY 16, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please append this statement to the testimony of John D. Goodman, made at the Las Vegas hearings, on Monday, January 13, 1964.

The Desert Bighorn Council endorses wilderness bill H.R. 9070, et al. (9101 and 9520). It could endorse H.R. 9162 (as well as 9163, 9164, and 9165) were they amended to approximate 9070. It could not endorse any amendment permitting commercial development in the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

Thank you.

JOHN D. GOODMAN,
Department Biology, University Redlands, Redlands, Calif. (Chairman Elect, Desert Bighorn Council, Las Vegas, Nev.).

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Bradley Graham Whyte, La Habra, Calif. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF BRADLEY GRAHAM WHYTE, REPRESENTING NORTH ORANGE COUNTY YMCA AND AFFILIATED GROUP ORGANIZATIONS, LA HABRA, CALIF.

Mr. WHYTE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Bradley Graham Whyte, age 17, 211 East Highland Court, La Habra, Calif., representing youth who are active in the North Orange County YMCA.

In a way, I represent a great number of young people who are interested in the enjoyment of unspoiled nature. We are concerned that the areas we visit may become spoiled unless protected by law. Instead of talking about many experiences of many youth, I will talk about my experiences.

I have been in the YMCA for 10 years, and one important thing the YMCA does is teach a boy how to enjoy himself in the mountainous areas.

I first went to a day camp, then to overnight camp, then regular week camps and finally caravans through a State camping area.

Being in the outdoors has no equal upon this earth. I got a chance to get away from the everyday noises and smog of our modern society. I not only learned of nature, I also became closer to God, and more spiritually enriched, being in these unpopulated areas.

Last summer our "Y" took 30 boys down the Salmon River in Idaho shooting the rapids. At practically all times, we were at least 100 miles away from any other human being. If this area had been commercialized in any way, this fabulous experience, which I will never forget, would have been ruined.

I once hiked to the top of Gray Back Mountain, which is in San Gorgonio Wilderness Area. It was like a miniature Mount Everest. This hike was not done by my dad or my money, but was a chal-

SRP05600

lenge to me alone. I had no help. This whole challenge would be ruined if I could ride almost to the top on a ski lift. I saw many deer on the trail. If roads went up there it would be so easy for hunters to drive up there that in a few years there would be few, if any, deer.

I have had many wonderful experiences of being in the wilderness which every child needs. But if these areas, whether in Idaho or California, are allowed to be exploited for monetary gain, my children and my grandchildren will never know the wilderness as it should be known, free, clear, clean, and uninhabited.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I have one question of the young man. How did you go down the Salmon River? In what equipment?

Mr. WHYTE. With the Great Western River Expedition Co. in rubber rafts.

Mr. WHITE. This is paid-for service?

Mr. WYTHE. Yes; our "Y" paid.

Mr. WHITE. It was a noncommercialized area?

Mr. WHYTE. It was an uninhabited area.

Mr. WHITE. I know all about the area and I know about the commercialization along the Salmon River. I have several constituents that run rafts and boats up and down the river. I just wanted to make the point it is commercialized.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Mr. WHYTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Cecil Charles, of Santa Monica, Calif.

STATEMENT OF CECIL CHARLES, SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Mr. CHARLES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to see San Gorgonio opened for skiing, because it is the only area close to Los Angeles where we can be assured of snow. In the past, local ski resorts had only a few days of skiing. We could have been skiing at San Gorgonio for several months. I cannot afford to take my family for a weekend of skiing at Mammoth. It is too costly. We enjoy hiking at San Gorgonio in the summer. I can't see how a ski development will in anyway affect the enjoyment of hiking in San Gorgonio.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. Is there anyone else?

Mr. HAUK. Mr. Chairman, there is one person who could not come here, the youth director of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood, who takes 200 youngsters from time to time skiing. He asked me to present this letter to the committee.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask Mr. Hauk one question. Is it pro or con?

Mr. HAUK. In favor of.

Mr. WHITE. I would assume so.

Mr. HAUK. I cannot tell a lie.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the letter will be made a part of the record at this point.

SRP05601

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement follows:)

JANUARY 11, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing this letter to register my feelings and concern with regard to the proposed San Gorgonio Mountain Ski area in southern California.

As one who has been involved on a full-time basis in youth work in Los Angeles for the past 12 years, I firmly believe that the proposed San Gorgonio Mountain project would be of definite advantage to a large number of youth organizations in southern California.

For a number of years the staff which I direct has recognized the positive aspects of skiing in connection with a youth program, and accordingly, for a number of years, in our youth program, we have been taking large numbers of teenage youth on ski trips. Unfortunately, snow conditions at existing southern California ski areas are unpredictable and for the most part totally unsatisfactory for most of the winter months. As a result, we have been taking busloads of our youth to the Mammoth Mountain area in order to engage in ski activity. The negative features involved in the latter include: a 700-mile round trip; financial inability of many to participate; the necessity for locating lodgings for as many as 200 persons, and other hazards caused by operating with large numbers of youth so far from home base.

A ski area as close as the proposed San Gorgonio Mountain area would make it possible for our groups and many others to participate on a 1-day basis, and of course, we could do this more often.

I can definitely state without fear of exaggeration, that such a facility as the proposed San Gorgonio Mountain ski area, would be of tremendous value to local youth endeavors such as the one I am presently directing, and we are hopefully awaiting the time when it will become a reality.

For the past 12 years I have been youth director at the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood. However, due to the nature of this matter I am writing this letter unofficially.

Sincerely,

JAMES FERGUSON.

Mr. BARING. I believe that concludes the San Gorgonio witnesses.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, would I be out of order in requesting the opportunity to make a few remarks based on observing this fight for the last 16 or 17 years as a newspaperman in southern California.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF BERT SIMS, LOS ANGELES HERALD-EXAMINER, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. SIMS. My name is Bert Sims. I am employed by the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner and the Hearst papers. I have been associated with skiing and winter sports for a number of years.

The chairman asked why it was not possible for all of these people to get together around a table and settle this argument. There was an attempt to do this in 1947 and it failed. There have been attempts in the last couple of years.

Mr. Freeman sent a representative into this area, Mr. Sculky, who is a renowned conservationist. He attempted to get the wilderness people and skiers to arrive at the highest level of compromise, and he had to report that the wilderness people would not budge an inch from their position and no compromise.

The skiers have been trying for many years to find an acceptable level where they could take some part of this area above 9,000 feet, and, gentlemen, there are 7 miles along that mountain, along those

SRP05602

ridges, 7 miles of skiable terrain, the Big Draw and the Little Draw having the best possibilities. But there are other areas in there that could be skied. I am sure the wilderness people realize they do not have a monopoly on enjoyment of this region. The skiers like to enjoy it, and the young people do in the summer. The use of this area would provide a year-round recreation for young people, not just limited to use in the summer.

Mr. BARING. You mentioned 1947. That is some 17 years ago?

Mr. SIMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARING. And Congress has been in the hot seat here today for not turning the bill out in 7 years. So I do not think it is all our fault.

Mr. SIMS. The skiers would have liked to have the legislation passed in 1947.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Mr. FLOURNOY. Mr. Chairman, I am scheduled to talk tomorrow for the California Wildlife Federation. Our testimony does touch upon San Gorgonio also. Do you wish me to present this part on San Gorgonio now?

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Of course, this debate on San Gorgonio is interesting to us, but I think we are here to consider wilderness legislation primarily. We have listened to a good many witnesses, both pro and con on San Gorgonio, and I think most of the members here are pretty well aware of the differences of opinion and the merits of both sides.

Speaking for myself, I would like to get on with the wilderness hearings.

Mr. BARING. You are going to testify tomorrow anyhow, Mr. Flournoy?

Mr. FLOURNOY. That is correct.

Mr. BARING. I believe we will keep the regular order on the witnesses then.

The next witness, or group of witnesses is for the Southwest Pine Association. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP E. FRANKFORT, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, SOUTHWEST FOREST INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mr. FRANKFORT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Philip E. Frankfort. I am executive vice president of Southwest Forest Industries, Inc., and a director of the Southwest Pine Association. I am appearing today as a representative of the Southwest Pine Association which is a nonprofit organization composed of lumber mills in Arizona and New Mexico who manufacture most of the lumber produced in these two States. I am also authorized to say that the Lumber & Sawmill Workers' Unions in Arizona and New Mexico, while not affiliated with our association, are in agreement with the views expressed in this statement.

Except for 4 years of wartime service, my entire business life has been spent in the lumber industry managing woodlands and directing the harvesting of timber and pulpwood in Virginia and

SRP05603

Arizona. I have been president of the Southern Pine Association, I am a director of the Western Pine Association, a member of the Tonto National Forest Advisory Committee on Multiple-Use and I am serving on a committee of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association. However, since my company is largely based in Arizona, I will confine my statement as much as possible to the effects of the various wilderness legislation proposals on the economy of that State in which the forest industries are the dominant economic factor, especially in the northern area where most of the forest land, and virtually all the commercial timberland, is located.

In Arizona, more than 4,000 persons are employed in the forest industries, earning about $16 million annually in wages and salaries while producing more than 300 million board feet of lumber and 140,000 tons of kraft paper and newsprint. These employees, a majority of whom live and work in the forest-dependent communities of northern Arizona, depend for their livelihood on the 3 million acres of commercial forest which produces such timber crops as sawlogs, pulpwood, fuelwood, posts, and poles. Better than 9½ out of every 10 acres of commercial forest land in Arizona is owned or controlled by the Federal Government.

The Southwest Pine Association and we, in Arizona, do not oppose the concept of wilderness preservation. We have, in fact, consistently favored setting aside a portion of public lands so that their natural and scenic beauties might be retained undisturbed. We are opposed to establishing a wilderness system which would require the administration of another land agency on top of the existing agencies who are responsible for administering public lands, and we are opposed to the inclusion of vast areas of commercial forest land just for the sake of attaining maximum acreage.

I might add that we in the forest industry are encouraged by the depth of insight and understanding the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has demonstrated in its consideration of the 20 wilderness legislative bills which have come before it, and we are confident that the committee's ultimate action will be based on sound reasoning with due regard to the problems any withdrawal of timberlands will create.

Let me briefly review these problems from the standpoint of Arizona.

I have already touched on the importance of the forest industry to the economy of northern Arizona. Withdrawal of what is for us the sizable commercial forest acreage now designated as wilderness, wild, or primitive would have a serious effect on the 4,000 families in the forest-dependent communities area. It should also be considered that the Navajo and White Mountain Apache Indian reservations maintain three sawmills which are important contributors to the State's production of lumber.

Withdrawal of commercial forest land into a wilderness system would have a serious effect on the State's water supply. Arizona is one of the driest States in the Nation with only 329 square miles of water in a land mass of 113,909 square miles. By contrast Wisconsin has a land mass of 56,154 square miles and 1,439 square miles of water. Commercial forests cover the watersheds of the State. About a third of Arizona's total water supply is produced by surface runoff from

SRP05604

these forested watersheds. The water flows into major streams and rivers and is piped to agricultural, industrial, and municipal users primarily located in the dry southern half of the State. Since the forests are renewable, the water supply is too. But if 674,000 acres—82,000 of which are forested—are taken out of forest management and allowed to revert to overmature stands and dense thickets, water runoff will be substantially reduced. Timber harvesting and deliverable water—a precious commodity in arid Arizona—go hand in hand as important elements of the multiple-use concept or forest management.

Withdrawal of the commercial forest land, as well as noncommercial forest land, into a wilderness system would create a dangerous fire hazard. Nine out of ten Arizona forest fires are caused by lightning. Only a fraction of the numbers and acreage involved are man-caused. If fires occur in areas purposely made inaccessible, their suppression will be impossible and their danger of spreading into a holocaust greatly enhanced.

Withdrawal of commercial forest land into a wilderness system would pose serious problems in the control of insects and disease. Insects are a serious problem to forest managers in Arizona. Periodically some insects, particularly bark beetles, appear in epidemic proportions and kill sawtimber and growing stock almost overnight. The delicate balance between insects and forests in Arizona, entomologists have said, can be attributed to three factors: One, extensive areas of timber stands of a single species of tree; two, overmaturity and poor vigor of some trees and some stands—a situation certain to result in wilderness areas—and, three, frequent droughts. Insect control and salvage logging in stricken areas are important in the pine, fir, and spruce forests. Using highly mobile equipment, loggers move in quickly when outbreaks are reported, hoping that the insect population can be confined to relatively small areas by hauling infested trees to a sawmill as rapidly as possible. I leave to your conjecture the havoc an insect epidemic breaking out in a wilderness area and spreading unchecked and uncontrolled to multiple-use areas would create for timber, livestock, and recreationists. Diseases in the forests of Arizona and the Southwest are killing trees at an alarming rate. Two principal diseases that afflict our forests—dwarf-mistletoe and heart rot—take an average annual toll of nearly 215 million board feet in the Southwest. This is about two-fifths of the volume harvested each year for man's use. Again, the appalling havoc which could result from the unchecked and uncontrolled spread of these diseases is terrible to consider.

Gentlemen, I earnestly hope that in your consideration of H.R. 9162, or any of the companion bills seeking to establish a wilderness system, you will keep in mind the grave risks to which our forest economy and the forests themselves will be exposed.

Mr. Chairman, we wish to commend the committee for the serious thought and consideration that they have given to this problem over a period of years. We have followed it with great interest, and I assure the committee of our continuing interest in this problem.

We are not, and have not been, opposed to the establishment of wilderness areas. Our position on this has not been changed. We believe the magnitude of the wilderness areas is a matter of serious concern.

SRP05605

Under the Dingell bill we have some question in our mind, administratively, if the setting up of a definite system would in the future lead to the establishment of another governmental regulatory body to administer this system. I know the bill does not call for it at the present time and hope this would not develop in the future.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed, Mr. Whiting.

STATEMENT OF A. MILTON WHITING, KAIBAB LUMBER CO., FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ.

Mr. WHITING. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is A. Milton Whiting. I am president of the Kaibab Lumber Co., and a director of Southwest Pine Association. I am appearing in behalf of my company and the Southwest Pine Association, which is a nonprofit organization of lumber mills in Arizona and New Mexico.

I have been engaged in the lumber business during my entire business life. My company is employed in the manufacturer of lumber from the harvesting of trees to the manufacture and sale of finished lumber; and, likewise, we are engaged through a subsidiary company in the remanufacture of molding, cut stock, and other finished remanufactured lumber products.

I would like to state parenthetically that I am a member of a family which has been in Arizona and engaged in the lumber industry in Arizona for four generations. We have seen Arizona develop from its very beginning and I feel that I can speak not only as a person engaged in the lumber industry and, therefore, directly and vitally interested in the welfare of the forests of Arizona, but also as an individual and member of a family that has an extremely deep interest of long standing in the entire State of Arizona. I sincerely want the State to be developed in a fashion consistent with the interests of the communities that are now dependent upon the forest for livelihood, and also in a fashion which is consistent with its best use for future generations, my own family included.

The idea of wilderness areas is not new in Arizona. At the present time a great amount of land is devoted to this purpose. Wilderness areas have been established through the presently existing State and Federal agencies throughout Arizona in the places which hold a natural interest. These wilderness areas have been carefully protected. They are not being invaded and there is no danger of any of them disappearing. On the other hand, there is a great deal of Arizona forest land which is better devoted to the multiple-use concept than to a wilderness area. For example, the harvesting of timber by my company from the Kaibab Forest—just north of the Grand Canyon, one of the largest wilderness areas in the United States—has been of great benefit to the public in that it has enabled game conservationists, the hunters, tourists, and visitors of many varying interests to reach many areas near and in the Grand Canyon which were not accessible a few years ago except by the most difficult means.

We feel that the industries which have a valid interest in the forest of Arizona and the communities which are dependent upon it for a livelihood have an excellent record in preserving true and natural

SRP05606

wilderness areas, while at the same time, under the multiple-use concept, they have developed other areas which are properly devoted, in part, to commercial purposes.

My company has watched with great interest the work that this committee has done on wilderness legislation and we are most encouraged by the approach that it has taken. We endorse the work of this committee and would like to go on record stating that we agree with the proposal that action by Congress must be taken before any Federal lands can be set aside for wilderness preservation. We would like to have this policy retroactive so that wilderness areas thus far established would be reviewed by Congress before being made permanent.

We feel that Congress should decide what portion of Federal lands are best suited for wilderness preservation and those best devoted to multiple use. Everyone has a stake in these decisions and they can best be made by our highest legislative body.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed, Mr. Weber.

STATEMENT OF PAUL WEBER, BERNALILLO LOG & LUMBER CORP., BERNALILLO, N. MEX.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Paul Weber. I am representing Bernalillo Log & Lumber Corp., whose lumber manufacturing facilities are located in Bernalillo, Sandoval County, N. Mex. We are members of Southwest Pine Association and Western Pine Association.

My company employs regularly 200 people, with an annual payroll in excess of half a million dollars. Any reduction in the amount of timber available for harvest to these people, or any people making their livelihood in the timber industry in New Mexico, also reduces their chances for continuing their livelihood in an industry which is the only one they know and understand.

Our employees are represented by two locals of the New Mexico and Southern Colorado District Council of Lumber & Allied Products, Lumber & Sawmill Workers Unions, AFL-CIO, Nos. 2887 and 2864. I have been asked by their principals to voice their objections to the wilderness system, on the grounds that it threatens their jobs in an industry which is already faced with a shortage of available commercial timber.

We feel that the establishment of any wilderness area, local or national perpetrates and perpetuates a waste which our State or the Nation as a whole, can ill afford. Timber has a definite use in our economy. It is a growing thing, reaches maturity and eventually dies. If it is not harvested, it rots, it decays, and is forever lost. It is highly susceptible to insect invasion in its unattended state. Dead trees make it highly susceptible to devastating forest fires caused by lightning. In a wilderness area in its unattended state, diseases, insect invasion, forest fires, and the like, can and will inflict millions of dollars worth of damage before they can be noticed, corrected, or controlled.

True wilderness preservation must, therefore, include a means to harvest mature, merchantable timber, which in turn will provide the necessary funds to maintain, perpetuate, and preserve this great re-

SRP05607

source. This is already provided for by the system of multiple-use land management, which was instituted some years ago, and which we heartily endorse as the better method of wilderness preservation.

The State of New Mexico has roughly a total of slightly over 21 million acres of national forest. Of this 21 million acres, 1,014,000 are already in the wilderness systems, and an additional 14,580,000 acres are classed as nonproductive for commercial use, chiefly because they consist of open, brushy type areas, bald spots at high elevations, and the like. Of the 1,014,000 acres already in the wilderness system, 202,300 acres are reserved for redetermination as to their end use; that is, either wilderness or commercial use. This then leaves out of the 21 million acres only about 5,500,000 acres of commercial forest land in the State. We submit, therefore, that there are presently available adequate areas for the end use as proposed be advocates of the wilderness system.

We would propose to this committee that, rather than include additional lands in this State into wilderness areas, these present areas be reexamined for the potential, and put under the multiple-use plan. Modern logging techniques have been developed which now make these areas accessible, rather than inaccessible. These techniques are not destructive; their proper use makes it possible to intelligently remove merchantable timber without destroying natural beauty, wildlife cover, or use as recreational areas.

H.R. 9162, page 15, line 6, subparagraph C, arbitrarily authorizes the acquisition by Congress of private lands lying within the perimeter of areas so designated by this act. Since we harvest timber from private lands lying within the boundaries of the national forest, as well as timber from the national forest, we most strenuously object to any acquisition of private land so defined, without the concurrence of the owner.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Are there questions?

The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I made this point the other day and I will do it here also.

Mr. Whiting, you appeared before our committee in Washington, D.C., before, did you not?

Mr. WHITING. Yes, sir; I have.

Mr. WHITE. And your purpose was to attempt to get a small piece of land for a site for mill operation, was it not—public land?

Mr. WHITING. That is correct. The bill is still active.

Mr. WHITE. You hope it is still active.

How long have you been in the process of attempting to acquire this small piece of land?

Mr. WHITING. We attempted to acquire it through exchange for between 2 and 3 years. As far as congressional action, it started at the beginning of 1963.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, you have been 4 years trying to get a small piece of public land for a mill operation?

Mr. WHITING. That is right.

Mr. WHITE. The reason I bring this out at this time is that some of the people think this land is going to be parceled out quickly and easily, and I want them to know it is not done in that manner. I want

SRP05608

them to know the amount of time and effort and money that you have expended to try to do this, and you are not to a successful conclusion yet.

Mr. WHITING. That is correct.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I want to address my question to Mr. Frankfort.

You say you are authorized to speak for the Lumber & Sawmill Workers' Unions in Arizona and New Mexico. Do you have any evidence of that authorziation, Mr. Frankfort?

Mr. FRANKFORT. No, I do not. I can secure it for you.

Mr. WESTLAND. I think for the record it would be a good idea for you to do so.

Mr. FRANKFORT. I will do so.

Mr. WESTLAND. I do not doubt your word, but I think as a matter of record it would be good to have that.

Mr. FRANKFORT. Right.

(The information follows:)

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ., *January 27, 1964.*

Hon. WALTER BARING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At the public hearing of your committee in Las Vegas on January 13, Mr. P. E. Frankfort of Southwest Forest Industries submitted a statement on behalf of the Southwest Pine Association. His statement contained a sentence indicating that the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Unions in Arizona and New Mexico, while not affiliated with the Southwest Pine Association, were in agreement with the views expressed as regards to wilderness legislation. In questioning this statement, the Congressman from Washington, Mr. Westland, asked if there was any substantiation for the statement that we, the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, did actually concur in this statement.

We ask, therefore, that this letter be made a part of the record of the hearing to indicate that our union has talked this matter over with representatives of the Southwest Pine Association and we are in concurrence with the position expressed by Mr. Frankfort and the other members on behalf of the Southwest Pine Association.

Very truly yours,

W. A. NAZER,
General Representative, Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union,
International Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners.

Mr. WESTLAND. On page 2 of your statement you said:

Withdrawal of what is for us the sizable commercial forest acreage now designated as wilderness, wild or primitive would have a serious effect on the 4,000 families in the forest-dependent communities area.

Is it not a fact this has already been withdrawn?

Mr. FRANKFORT. The primitive area we are speaking of primarily. What I am saying is that any withdrawal of large acreage of commercial forest land in northern Arizona would have a serious impact on the northern part of the State which is highly dependent on timber for the livelihood of the people. This is the biggest industry in the northern part of the State.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is it presently designated as primitive area?

Mr. FRANKFORT. There is in Arizona now, I believe 670,000 acres in total designated either as a wilderness or primitive. The great bulk of this is not in commercial timberland. Our concern is that we do not put at a later date more in, withdrawing substantial acreages from the commercial currently available.

SRP05609

Mr. WESTLAND. Additional acres?

Mr. FRANKFORT. That is right.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is what I thought you had in mind, Mr. Frankfort.

Mr. FRANKFORT. Yes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Because, as a practical matter, the primitive wild, wilderness, and canoe areas for all intents and purposes are withdrawn from commercial operations now.

Mr. FRANKFORT. That is true.

Mr. WESTLAND. I have one question of Mr. Weber. In the next to last sentence of your statement you said you strenuously object to any acquisition of private land so defined without the concurrence of the owner.

H.R. 9162 specifically states that. Are you aware of that?

Mr. WEBER. I am aware of the conversation that took place this morning, and I read the bill, but I am not an attorney and I am not sure that is what the wording means because it says "or the acquisition by Congress."

Mr. WESTLAND. We tried to make that just about as specific as we could. I will think that one over.

Mr. WEBER. That is the only point I was trying to raise—the wording may be a little bit ambiguous.

Mr. WESTLAND. Many people have testified before us, Mr. Weber, that they want the same phraseology in that part of the bill providing for exchange of private land as well as is already provided in the bill for the exchange of lands with States. Are you in agreement with that?

Mr. WEBER. Basically, yes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Thank you; that is all.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. WEBER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITING. Thank you.

Mr. FRANKFORT. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is John Carpenter, president of the Nevada Woolgrowers Association, accompanied by Mr. Cummings of the Utah Woolgrowers Association, and Mr. Broadbent of Wyoming.

Mr. Carpenter, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN CARPENTER, PRESIDENT, NEVADA WOOLGROWERS ASSOCIATION, ELKO, NEV.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is John Carpenter. I reside at Elko, Nev., and I am president of the Nevada Woolgrowers Association.

The Nevada Woolgrowers Association welcomes this opportunity to comment upon wilderness and wilderness legislation.

The first two points that I would like to make are:

In view of the fact that legislation in regard to establishment of a public land and public land law review commission is apparently assured of passage, it seems logical that all wilderness legislation be tabled until such time as the review commission submits its findings.

In all wilderness legislation it is absolutely necessary that all wilderness areas be established by positive action of Congress.

SRP05610

The Nevada Woolgrowers Association believes that livestock can and are being grazed in wilderness areas without detracting from the esthetic values of the area. In fact, livestock can actually add to the beauty and enchantment of the surroundings.

In any case, livestock must be permitted to graze wilderness areas where now allowed, subject only to the same rules and regulations of management as are necessary in any other Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management grazing allotments and are now in effect.

We urge that such language be inserted in any wilderness legislation. We also urge that multiple-use principle be a requirement of all wilderness areas.

With your permission, I would like to discuss the general area of wilderness and cite a few figures on the use of Forest Service lands in Nevada.

In Nevada we have one designated primitive area of some 66,674 acres. This area is part of the Humboldt National Forest. You might be interested in some of the recreational use of this area during 1962. The total number of recreational visits to the Humboldt National Forest was 365,900. These people spent 465,300 man-days in the area. In one area, Lamolle Canyon, where there are excellent camping and picnicking facilities as well as adequate access roads, there were 93,000 visits and 143,000 man-days of use.

In the Jarbidge Ranger District, where the primitive area is located, there are only two improved camping and picnic areas. The entire ranger district was visited by 12,200 people who stayed for 24,400 days of man-use. The improved areas received 1,790 visits and 5,930 days of man-use.

The interesting part of these visits is the number who entered the primitive area. There were 710 visits to this area and 1,080 days of man-use. The ranger stated that most of these visitors were hunters and that only—please notice this—80 people visited this area to enjoy it for its pure wilderness values. The 80 visits represent only 0.00021 of 1 percent of the visits to the Humbold National Forest.

These figures represent to me the need of improved recreational facilities for the public, such as campgrounds and picnic areas, and not wilderness areas. The ranger of this district frankly stated to me that the only way large numbers of people could or would use this area was if access roads were built and facilities provided. The vast, vast majority of our citizens cannot afford the means that are required to visit these areas. He also stated that grazing is compatible with the wilderness use of the area.

Another interesting set of comparisons: Kennecott Copper Corp., during 1962, had 40,000 visitors at its vast open pit mine at Ruth, Nev., and 1,500 people took advantage of their guided tours at the reduction plant in McGill, Nev. Compare this to the 80 people who visited our primitive area.

The Nevada Woolgrowers Association believes that local communities can best assess the requirements for wilderness areas both as to demand of the local citizen and people from outside the communities.

Local citizens in cooperation with Federal land administrators could evaluate these demands and act accordingly.

In conclusion, we bring these to your attention:

Are wilderness areas the great recreational need of our citizenry?

SRP05611

Grazing is compatible with and compliments wilderness areas.

Multiple use is only logical way to manage our lands.

Local people are best informed as to what is the best use of land and should be given authority to regulate the use of lands around their communities.

Thank you for your consideration and time.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

You may proceed, Mr. Cummings.

STATEMENT OF VEIGH CUMMINGS, VICE PRESIDENT, UTAH WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Veigh Cummings, rancher and vice president of the Utah Wool Growers Association. I have lived for 14 years closest to the primitive areas in the Uintah Mountains of Utah, said area consisting of 241,000 acres in the Ashley and Wasatch National Forests. It is my feeling that there has been, and will be, less than one-half of 1 percent of the public who will benefit or use the primitive areas.

I believe that less than 1,000 persons use the Hi-Utah primitive areas each year. Many of these people have to travel through my private land to have access to the primitive area; therefore, I have some idea as to the amount of use.

There should be less regulation prohibiting use of primitive areas. We must remember that the more restrictive the administration the less beneficial the lands will be to all. We citizens own this ground, and it should not be set aside for a minority group one-half of 1 percent.

S. 4 requests an area too large, for too few, to be justified or right for the Nation's well-being. God provided us with the wonders of the land, and restricting its use for other than sightseeing on foot or horseback is unjust. The natural resources should be harvested in a way which would not deface the area, and be beneficial to all. Multiple use is the only realistic administrative policy.

As one having personal contact for 14 years with the users of a primitive area presently existing, I testify that this romantic idea favors too few. These lands should be available to not only the rugged individuals but also to those who might have personal handicaps.

It is costly in the sense that the day will come in the not too distant future when additional production of red meat and associate products shall be necessary for the feeding and clothing of our Nation.

If S. 4 is passed, multiple use is a must.

In closing, let me place on the record the resolution passed by the Utah Wool Growers 1964 Convention, having a membership of approximately 3,500 and representing the sheep industry of Utah:

WILDERNESS

The Utah Wool Growers Association is opposed to wilderness legislation as presently proposed. We feel that there is sufficient legislation on the books, and that any additional regulations would be more detrimental than helpful.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Cummings.

You may proceed, Mr. Broadbent.

STATEMENT OF J. R. BROADBENT

Mr. BROADBENT. Chairman Baring and members of the Public Lands Subcommittee, my name is J. R. Broadbent, a livestock operator, on private lands, BLM lands, and forest lands in Wyoming and Utah, and appreciate very much the privilege of appearing before this committee. I am vitally concerned about the proposed wilderness legislation. In view of the rapid population growth in the United States, it is vital that the productive potential and economic stability of western lands should not be impaired. There should be no legislation enacted which would restrict or discourage the production of meat and fiber vitally needed for future generations. There are thousands of cattle and sheep currently using ranges that a minority special interest group under the guise of conservation and wilderness preservation would eliminate from economic use in western lands.

If these lands are locked up or their present use restricted, there would be this resultant effect on the livestock industry:

(1) Productive facilities would be curtailed by any reduction or elimination of grazing on the lands included and communities dependent on these grazing facilities would suffer a loss of tax base, and loss of income for their citizens.

(2) Productive capacity of the contiguous lands would be impaired by providing breeding ground for predatory animals now barely held under control through cooperation of livestock operators and State and National agencies. We have had much experience in Utah with predator buildup in Government withdrawals, and you who have never had sheep, lambs, and calves slaughtered and torn apart by coyotes, mountain lion, and cats will have difficulty understanding this problem.

(3) Private lands adjoining would have to bear the impact of game herds that would infiltrate such adjacent contiguous land, and would burden domestic livestock production.

There are, at present, approximately 14 million acres set up as wild, wilderness, primitive, and canoe areas under the control of Federal agencies, and present areas now designated as wilderness type are, in my opinion, sufficient to perpetuate the so-called continuity of the primitive, and additional areas should not be considered. Present areas should be administered with certainly no more restrictions than at present (probably less). Otherwise, it will be restrictive to use by a very small minority of special interest groups with no provision for proper economic use. I doubt very much if more than 1 percent of the people in the United States can ride a horse, and certainly not all of them would use the wilderness areas. From my experience handling livestock in a primitive area, I have observed very few people with either the physical stamina or the desire to penetrate on foot very far into the present designated primitive areas.

Certainly any withdrawals for wilderness-type use should have the approval of the various States affected.

Any legislation that is passed by the Congress concerning wilderness areas should provide for the multiple-use concept and should provide adequate protection for adjacent landowners and adjacent permitees on Federal land. It should provide for the protection of the area itself and provision for its economic as well as esthetic use.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen. Living in an area that has these many uses, I know exactly what you mean.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Cummings, you say, "If S. 4 is passed, multiple use is a must, m-u-s-t." What do you mean by that statement? Have you read S. 4? Do you know what the present legislation provides?

Mr. CUMMINGS. In substance.

Mr. WHITE. Really the wilderness legislation we have before us precludes multiple use in certain areas. If S. 4 is passed, you will not have multiple use. You are saying, then, we should——

Mr. CUMMINGS. Amend.

Mr. WHITE. Amend the legislation so there is the multiple-use feature?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. All right. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I want to address a question first to Mr. Cummings. You say the resolution passed the Utah Wool Growers' Association at the 1964 convention?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WESTLAND. You have had the convention this year?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes, sir; last week. It just ended Saturday.

Mr. WESTLAND. My next question is: Are you opposed to 9162 and 9070? Did you consider either of those bills?

Mr. CUMMINGS. This resolution that I was referring to came out of the committee that handles those. I am not aware of that bill, sir.

Mr. WESTLAND. In all honesty, your statement is largely directed toward S. 4. As I said previously here, there is quite a bit of difference between 9162—you might jot these numbers down—and 9070. I suggest you take a look at them and see whether or not that resolution you passed still holds up. You might ask your legislative committee, if you have got one, as I presume you have, whether or not they considered those two bills, for your own information, because it is quite a bit of difference.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I will.

Mr. WESTLAND. Another question I want to direct to Mr. Carpenter, and I thoroughly approve, Mr. Carpenter, of your statement where you say the need is for improved recreational facilities for the public such as campgrounds and picnic areas.

I think you might find it interesting to know we had a bill before us called land and water conservation fund bill, which is presently pending before the Congress, and this bill, as it arrived before our committee, provided about a $2 billion fund over a 10-year period, largely for the Secretary of Interior for the acquisition of additional land, and had not one word in there about any improvement or development. It was only because of the work of this committee that the word "development" was included.

I quite agree with your statement. I have had many complaints from constituents of mine about the lack of adequate facilities in our national parks and forests, but I have never had any complaints about a lack of adequate area.

Mr. CARPENTER. I believe that is entirely true, not only from my standpoint as a rancher, but I believe the public needs more concen-

SRP05614

trated campgrounds and picnicking areas, if the way were are going to solve our recreational need is through these facilities.

Mr. WESTLAND. Thank you. That is all.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask one other question, Mr. Carpenter. The figures you have as to the number of visitations, did you acquire them from the ranger in the district?

Mr. CARPENTER. I have right here where I obtained them. This is a publication put out by the Forest Service called, "Recreational Uses for 1963 in the Jarbidge Ranger District, Humboldt National Forest." The Jarbidge Wild Area constitutes a part of this ranger district. These are Forest Service figures.

Mr. WHITE. I was very much interested in your figures, because I made a similar check on the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area below Glacier National Park, and the visitations there fall into about the same division that your figures fall into here. Two years ago, 37 people went into the heart of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

Mr. CARPENTER. I tried to figure this out, and it came out that 21/10,000ths of 1 percent who visited the Humboldt National Forest went into the primitive area for purely wilderness scenery you might say.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. CARPENTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. Next we have the Nevada Farm Bureau. Robert F. Thomas, first vice president; Norman D. Glaser, assemblyman, Elko County and speaker pro tempore of the Nevada Legislature. You may proceed, Mr. Thomas.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT F. THOMAS, FIRST VICE PRESIDENT, NEVADA FARM BUREAU, RENO, NEV.

Mr. THOMAS. Congressman Baring and members of the subcommittee, my name is Robert Thomas. I am the first vice president of the Nevada Farm Bureau. I am representing this organization.

Congressman Baring, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to present the views of the farmers and ranchers that are members of the organization that I am representing.

We in Nevada have a direct interest in the future of the public lands. Eighty-six percent of the land in Nevada is State and federally owned. This places us in a precarious position, second only to Alaska. The residents of our State are presently enjoying the benefits of multiple use. The bulk of our agriculture's economy is tied to these lands in the form of grazing permits. The livestock operators in this State have been backed into a corner by the drastic adjustments that have been made in grazing on Federal lands administered by the BLM and Forest Service.

At a time when we are fighting to preserve our very existence, we are confronted with still another problem, the setting aside of vast amounts of public lands for wilderness areas.

It is true, multiple use will still be permitted in these areas, but it will be permitted only to the extent deemed feasible by one person, the Secretary of the Department involved. We question whether it is wise to give one man such broad power.

 SRP05615

If this is the course that must be followed, then we suggest that a clear-cut set of rules and regulations governing grazing be made a part of any wilderness bill that is considered by Congress.

Our livestock operators are well aware of the terminology: the greatest good for the greatest number. We realize that we must share the public lands on which we graze livestock with other interest, and we are more than willing to cooperate in the multiple-use concept in the management of these lands, but there is always a question in our minds, what is the livestock operator's role when Federal lands have been designated to a use that would serve the greatest good for the greatest number. This point needs clarifying. We need to know if the production of food is a service to the people that could be classified as serving the greatest good to the greatest number.

We question if it is in the best public interest to designate extensive areas of Federal land as wilderness areas in which normal development for other purposes would be precluded.

Forest officials have observed that for every person that enjoys the benefits of wilderness areas 99 are deprived of benefits because of their very nature, their inaccessibility. Can it be that there is not a need for additional wilderness areas at this time? This point, in our opinion, should be given careful consideration.

All previous rights enjoyed by property owners on private lands within a wilderness area must be respected. Ingress and egress to said land must be recognized along with all water rights. Private lands must not be condemned without approval of property owners or specific authorization from Congress.

Congress should give their approval to all lands that are placed in a wilderness, wild, or canoe area. Terminology in any bill assuming Congress inaction as an affirmative vote on any recommendation by a Government department to designate certain areas as wilderness, wild, or canoe, is unacceptable.

The Nevada Farm Bureau's present position is that the entire subject of wilderness legislation should be considered by the proposed Public Land Law Review Commission before action is taken on any of the proposed wilderness bills.

This briefly summarizes our views. Irregardless which course of action Congress decides to follow, we are depending on this body to protect the interest of the users on the public lands.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Thomas.

You may proceed, Mr. Glaser.

STATEMENT OF NORMAN D. GLASER, PRESIDENT, NEVADA FARM BUREAU, RENO, NEV.

Mr. GLASER. Mr. Chairman and members of the House Subcommittee on Public Lands, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee and I would like to present testimony as a State legislator, concerned about the future of Nevada, and the economic impact which results from the Federal Government's ownership of 87 percent of the land in Nevada. The economy of the State has historically been based upon agriculture and mining. With the decline in mining, agriculture has assumed a more important role as a stabilizing factor in our tax base. In recent years, the tourism industry has become a

SRP05616

prime factor in our economy. This segment of our State income is derived by attracting large numbers of people into the State for gaming, recreation, and sightseeing.

Last year an estimated 21 million people visited our State. This transit population contributes to the sales tax, cigarette tax, liquor tax, gaming tax, and gasoline tax. The State legislature has made every effort to open the State to tourism, and to enhance limited economy. I would oppose any national legislation that would: One, reduce the already narrow property tax base; or, two, reduce the influx of tourists, hunters, and recreationists.

There is some merit in preserving a small amount of Americana in its original state for posterity, although most Americans will never see or explore these wild or wildernes areas. The actual joy and enthrallment of exploration will accrue to those few hardy nature lovers—that pack into the hinterland of such areas. The vast majority of Americans are satisfied with our present accessible park system and recreational areas with automobile access. The Governor and the State legislature are presently exploring the possibility of acquiring 26,000 acres on the Nevada shore of Lake Tahoe. A special session is being called with this proposed State park one of the prime topics for consideration. We are interested in nature preservation.

As a legislator, it would seem to me that a proper balance must be struck between the land resources necessary to maintain our growing, dynamic economy, and our need for recreation areas, parks and wilderness areas. A deep freeze of perpetuity upon our minerals, grazing, and other natural resources over vast acreages would not be in the State or National interest. It should be recognized that these islands of wilderness are also isles of infestation for predatory animals, tree blight, fungus, and insects, plus a potential fire danger that will require a reasonable amount of management and supervision, such as already exist on our national forests.

We have thousands of acres in Nevada that have never been trod by the foot of man. Millions of acres that will forever remain a desert panorama. In Elko County we have 64,667 acres of our finest and most beautiful land locked up in a wild area. Nationally we have 14,318,575 acres now classified as wilderness, wild, and canoe areas. This should be enough to satisfy the yen of those few who want to pack into the trackless wilderness.

Federal withdrawals or designations of land for a specific purpose should require clear individual congressional authorization. The power of eminent domain should not be used for national parks, wilderness areas, or other recreational projects. Multiple use of the Federal lands is in the highest public interest.

I would like to suggest that action on any wilderness legislation be deferred until the Public Land Law Review Commission is authorized, and reports its findings. This would bring into focus the general application of the public land laws—including their relationship to wilderness values. It would provide an orderly approach to properly protecting such values, consist with other public land use, and without damage to presently protected wilderness areas.

We in the State of Nevada are celebrating our centennial year of statehood. We hope our contribution to the strength of the union will in the future be even greater than our transfusion of gold and silver

SRP05617

and other natural resources into the life stream of a dynamic young nation during the past 100 years.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. I want to commend both of you gentlemen on your presentation here.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. Are there questions by the committee?

The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to comment that Mr. Glaser's background and his interest in the State of Nevada points up the need for real good legislation in this field that will make possible the expansion of the economy in the western part of the United States.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I have no questions. I would like to compliment both of these gentlemen on their statements setting forth their point of view.

Senator, I can certainly understand your concern in this area. I am glad to hear that the State of Nevada is planning on picking up some land for State park purposes. I think it is good. As a matter of fact, in the land and water conservation fund, part of that is for the purpose of assisting States in doing just that for recreational purposes, which I think is all to the good. I think this is one area where the Federal Government should enter into the picture.

Mr. Thomas, perhaps you heard my discussion earlier with another gentleman concerning the ground rules for this livestock operation. Frankly, I certainly would not be competent to tell the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior any ground rules for this business. I think I had better suggest that you work with your Congressman as much as possible—perhaps you already have—to get him to assist you in working with those departments and bureaus in getting these ground rules set up. But for the Congress as a whole to do it, I think would be almost impossible.

Mr. THOMAS. It appears this is a point that needs clarification in some manner. I do not know how it is going to be done.

Mr. WESTLAND. I gathered that from some of the hearings we have had in Washington, D.C., but it is a specialized form of regulation. If you got into lumber, I would be competent to talk about that, but in the livestock operation, I could not help you a bit. I think you ought to find the right avenue to those people.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The next witness or group of witnesses is for the Nevada State Cattle Association. You may proceed, Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF ROGER SMITH, VICE PRESIDENT, NEVADA STATE CATTLE ASSOCIATION, RUBY VALLEY, NEV.

Mr. SMITH. Congressman Baring and gentlemen of the committee, I am Roger Smith, vice president of the Nevada Cattle Association. My initial point is that the subject of wilderness legislation should be considered by the proposed Public Land Review Commission, as proposed by H.R. 8070, and that this Commission should be given the chance to function prior to the passage of legislation affecting the use and classification of public lands.

We, in the livestock industry, want continuing and full control of the public lands to be reserved to Congress, with a minimum of executive discretion as to future wilderness withdrawals.

Assured tenure of grazing permits ranks first in the thoughts of the livestock industry, and we want to be assured that grazing will be permanent. We are concerned that grazing and wilderness areas may eventually be placed on a basis which would eliminate the permits after the life of the present operator, or 25 years. This principle has been adopted with reference to national parks and it is possible that it will be advanced in the future in wilderness areas, even though the present law purports to protect existing grazing use. If in the future, grazing should be withdrawn or prohibited from such areas, the tax structure, plus the value of our present base properties, would be jeopardized and new hardships would be imposed on range operators that have paid valuable money for their properties. Any business operation requires stability and security in order to finance itself, and laws which threaten the security of that industry make it very difficult for us to raise money, to plan for the future, and to meet our obligations due our local communities.

I actually believe that considering the history and personality of Nevada, that many visitors to our State enjoy seeing groups of cattle or sheep grazing under present conditions, and that this factor may attract them to the State as much as the opportunity to observe plain mountain scenery.

I wish to assure the committee that we in the cattle industry endorse the multiple-use concept and the right of others to enjoy the scenery and resources of Nevada. We, likewise, want to continue this basic industry which has been so historically important to Nevada, so that our children and the visitors to the State will know Nevada as a land of wide open spaces where the cowboy may continue to thrive.

I would like to ask that a note may be added to the end of this statement later on.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith.

You may proceed, Mr. Marvel.

STATEMENT OF JOHN MARVEL, BATTLE MOUNTAIN, NEV., NEVADA STATE CATTLE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MARVEL. Mr. Chairman and members of the House Interior Committee, I am John Marvel of Battle Mountain, Nev., chairman of the Public Land Committee of the Nevada State Cattle Association and also a member of the executive committee of the National Public Lands Coordinating Committee. Our association welcomes you to Nevada.

The Nevada State Cattle Association does not oppose passage of legislation establishing a wilderness preservation system for the sake of opposition because we are aware of the earnest efforts by members of this committee to introduce legislation palatable to grazing interests and other resource users of the Federal lands. The provisions in H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162, as related to grazing, are favored by our association to the extent they have gone, though we find a want for further development. Subsequently, I shall mention some features which we ask to be considered if amendments are in order.

SRP05619

Our objection to any wilderness legislation in the near future is based upon lack of synchronization with other legislation that appears to be of a greater immediate need. We feel any legislation pertaining to the Federal lands, except emergency measures, would only confuse and hinder the whole study area which will be circumscribed by the Public Land Law Review Commission as set forth in H.R. 8070. Our association supports H.R. 8070, as reported, and until this act is disposed of, we believe wilderness legislation would not lend itself for exclusive treatment until the whole public land sphere has been studied and reported. Wilderness cannot be classed as emergency legislation with present land laws, such as the Multiple Use Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 215), Forest Reservation Act 1891, and General Withdrawal Act 1910, which provide adequate latitude for the establishment of wilderness, wild, canoe, and primitive areas by administrative authority as has been done.

However, if deemed a need does exist for wilderness preservation, we in due respect ask for congressional review and public hearings to ascertain the suitability for inclusion into a wilderness system all areas that are now classified as wilderness, wild, canoe, and primitive prior to the effective date of any wilderness preservation act. The several million acres already placed into these respective classifications have been administrative decisions—not the express designation by the Congress.

Other provisions we feel necessary to protect the multiple users of the public lands and those possessing private property and water rights in respective wilderness areas are concisely these:

1. We ask for a clear definition and prescript of authority to guide all the administrators of wilderness areas to be set forth by the Congress rather than, for example, the present nebulous language, "permitting grazing to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture." Further importance is attached to the request motivated by the various agencies which will administer the wilderness system; i.e., BLM, Park Service, Wildlife, Forest Service, et cetera. Each administrative agency may have different standards as to what determines the uses that are "compatible to wilderness."

2. We urge precise provisions be considered to prohibit eminent domain proceedings for the acquisition of private lands within or adjacent to wilderness or akin areas. Acquisitions should be by the express consent of the owner with the final authorization by the Congress.

3. Nevadans strongly defend State ownership and control of both surface and subsurface waters originating or found within the confines of the State's perimeter. Our State water law provides for the enjoyment of water rights as any other form of real property provided the acquired right is put to beneficial use. By being denied use of the land dependent upon the water, in effect allows a Federal agency to usurp a State prerogative and property right of the individual. A specific provision is again requested to protect these rights by prohibiting administrative authority from precluding enjoyment of these rights in any manner without the consent of the possessor, the State, and the Congress.

SRP05620

4. Any land reservation, withdrawal, or change in classification has a definite effect on the State and local economies and patterns of multiple use. We recommend consideration be given to providing for greater responsibility by State and local officials in classifying, recommending use, and in the management of areas placed into a wilderness system in the respective States.

5. We strongly advocate the development of any of the natural resources in these areas through the efforts, research, and investment of private enterprise to take precedence over the development of these resources by any Federal agency, if and when the Congress declares development beneficial to the public.

Thank you for this privilege to appear before your committee.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Marvel.

You may proceed, Mr. Dalton.

STATEMENT OF VERNON DALTON, CATTLE ADVISORY BOARD, HUMBOLDT DIVISION AND RUBY DIVISION, HUMBOLDT NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. DALTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Vernon Dalton and I speak for the Cattle Advisory Board, Humboldt Division and Ruby Division of the Humboldt National Forest, which represents approximately 200 cattle permittees who use grazing lands on the Humboldt National Forest.

The position of this board concerning wilderness legislation is that this legislation is not necessary, as the Forest Service has done a satisfactory job, in our opinion, in managing the 14 million acres of wilderness, wild, canoe, and primitive areas.

We are aware, however, that there have been changes in the wilderness provisions since they were first introduced and are pleased that some of the wilderness legislation reflects more realistic policies for the western areas where wilderness predominates. If Congress believes this legislation must be passed, we suggest these changes: That provisions be made to insure landowners, whose land might be landlocked by a wilderness area, a satisfactory access to this land not less than what existed before the wilderness area was established. Also that acquisition of private land could be made only if the owner agreed.

It is encouraging to see that livestock grazing privileges are incorporated in the versions being considered by the committee. However, we feel the reasonable regulation regulating this grazing should be made part of the wilderness legislation along with a reasonable appeal procedure, which does not exist in the Forest Service grazing regulations at this time, and a provision for an advisory board, composed of grazing permittees, with which forest administrators must consult regarding grazing in wilderness areas.

We want Congress to retain authority of affirmative approval of any wilderness areas to be established under wilderness legislation as in Congressman Saylor's bill.

We approve the House version of wilderness legislation that include recommendations by the Governor of the State in which areas are established.

SRP05621

We ask that this legislation will not modify in any way the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 as amended.

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing before this committee and expressing the views of the cattle permittees of the Humboldt National Forest.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen. I want to compliment all three of you, like the group that preceded you, for a very well-written presentation.

The gentleman from Washington mentioned your troubles and the need of guidelines in legislation, and to work through your Congressman. I know your group in particular knows I have done that, being the Congressman from Nevada. I have gone through those channels already. We are having a time for ourselves back there in Washington, and it is going to be a long fight with the Trade Commission.

Just about 3 weeks ago I did go before the Trade Commission to see what we could do about the beef being imported into this country.

This is a little off wilderness, but this is my first opportunity to be back in the State to tell you individually.

I do not know why it is. The cattle industry is one of the greatest of our economies and it is treated the worst. It has never asked for a cent of subsidy, and yet the free trade is bringing in the imported beef and lambs to the extent it is going to kill off one of the greatest economies this country has.

My heartfelt sympathy is with you, and I am going to do all I can to get the guidelines on the public lands. When the wilderness bill goes to committee and we write it up I am going to see that you get all of the protection you need, or there is not going to be a wilderness bill.

Mr. SMITH. We certainly appreciate that.

Mr. BARING. Are there any other questions?

Mr. WHITE. I have no questions.

Mr. WESTLAND. No questions.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, there will be included in the record at this point a statement by Fred H. Dressler, Gardnerville, Nev., past president of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF FRED H. DRESSLER, PAST PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, GARDNERVILLE, NEV.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Fred H. Dressler. I am a ranch operator from Gardnerville, Nev., and a past president of the American National Cattlemen's Association. That organization has gone on record in the past on wilderness legislation, and so have I.

The opportunity to again get on record is appreciated. It has been kind of popular in the past, it sometimes seems, to try to find friends for wilderness by making cattlemen and sheepmen out to be the enemies of wilderness. I have some thoughts on that.

If those who think that the westerner generally, and the western stockmen and other resource users particularly are opposed to wise resource use, looking and listening instead of talking that way might prove educational.

If they will do so, they'll learn there is much more agreement than disagreement.

My people before me and those I will leave behind have, in just about four generations, raised many generations of livestock. But our private lands and privately developed water and those of other ranchers have been responsible

SRP05622

for production and survival of thousands of big game animals, countless game birds, wonderful hunting and fishing recreation.

We think a number of self-styled "outdoor lovers" could learn some old-fashioned outdoor "table manners" from the common cowboy. This would make for a lot broader working base on common resource interests.

It is not the stockman who is demanding more and more access roads and trails in country which has remained virtually unchanged for years. Nor is it the man who must make a living outdoors who shoots up signs, clutters the forest with beer cans, scatters trash, and contaminates springs and waterholes. When you have to depend on nature being kind to you for a livelihood, you are kind to nature or you just don't survive.

Those of us in the livestock business want to help preserve wilderness, when and where it should be preserved on the Federal lands. While our operations are not substantially dependent upon use of Federal grazing resources, we also want to help preserve the cowboy and sheepman who is so dependent.

I would like to urge the subcommittee to retain the H.R. 9162 and related bill provisions permitting livestock operations to continue, but urge that both Departments, Agriculture and Interior, be required to write the regulations and rules to be placed in effect before and not after a wilderness bill becomes law.

We stand ready to work with wilderness proponents. We hope they want to work with us.

Thank you for the opportunity to get on record in these hearings.

Mr. ABBOTT. Thank you for that inclusion, Mr. Chairman. There was added to the statement a plea from Mr. Dressler, while you are preserving, you preserve here and there someplace one cowboy and one sheepman, if you will.

Mr. WESTLAND. I might say, Mr. Chairman, we will always have "Bonanza."

Mr. ABBOTT. If I may comment on Mr. Westland's thought, we have 1,047 ranching operators in the State of Nevada. One thousand forty-three of them are unhappy, and the other four, all of whom ride the Ponderosa, are happy. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The President of the Elko County Sportsmen's Association, Inc., who is listed as a witness, cannot be here, but he has forwarded a copy of a resolution adopted by the association on January 11, 1964. Without objection, the resolution will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The resolution follows:)

RESOLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF A WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Whereas lands already under jurisdiction of the Federal Government possess wilderness characteristics of great recreational, scientific, and educational values to the general public; and

Whereas competing and conflicting forms of land uses threaten to impair or destroy these wilderness areas unless adequately protected by law; and

Whereas wildlife is recognized as a product of these lands and should be given its proper place and the utmost consideration; and

Whereas recreational uses including fish and wildlife must be adequately provided for in all future land uses; and

Whereas there is great need to preserve some of these areas for future generations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Elko County Sportsmen's Association, Inc., hereby supports the principle of wilderness preservation provided:

1. Conversion of these lands is specifically limited.
2. Due respect given range usage by present permittees including wildlife.
3. Widlife harvest practices in the areas are not subjected to any type of Federal control.

Be it further resolved, That the Elko County Sportsmen's Association, Inc., hereby supports the Cattlemen's Association, Nevada Woolgrowers Association,

SRP05623

and the Elko County Farm Bureau in the belief our views and aims are similar.

Adopted this date January 11, 1964.

Attest:

CARL J. LINO, *President.*

Mr. BARING. The last witness before we recess is Roy Thornton, Elko, Nev., representing the Sheep Advisory Board of the Humboldt National Forest. Is he here?

(No response.)

Mr. BARING. With that then, we will conclude our hearing for today and adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Before we adjourn, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people of Las Vegas and the people of Nevada for the hospitality I have been shown here in this area. I would also like to compliment the many witnesses that we have had before us for the very expert manner in which they have made their presentations. I honestly believe this is the kind of hearing which gives the best information to the members of not only this committee but to the other 430 Members of the House of Representatives. I think I can assure all of you the knowledge we have acquired here during these hearings will be made available to other members of the committee and the other Members of the Congress.

I certainly want to express my appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for the way in which you have conducted these hearings. You have been fair; all sides have been heard. I, for one, think you have done a splendid job.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to join the gentleman from Washington in his remarks and thank the people of the State of Nevada, particularly here in Las Vegas, for the wonderful reception we have had. Thanks to you also, Mr. Chairman, for your able conducting of these hearings.

One other comment. I had a pile of statements like this in Denver. I left it and one person took exception to this.

"You mean we went to all of the trouble to prepare all of this material and you left it?"

I told them the copy of the hearings would be indexed and ready for my immediate reference.

Mr. BARING. These copies, of course, were just for the use of the members during the hearing. The regular hearings are printed and that will be in book form.

Again I say I appreciate the way the people are cooperating. It is rough when you have had as many witnesses as we have had in the last week in Olympia, Denver, and here, and we will not be through here until tomorrow. This has to be done in an orderly way, and I want to say thank you for cooperating and keeping the fight good and clean.

Thank you very much.

This committee will stand adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 9:30 Tuesday, January 14, 1964.)

SRP05624

WILDERNESS PRESENTATION SYSTEM

TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1964

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Las Vegas, Nev.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment at 9:40 a.m. in the Las Vegas convention center, Hon. Walter S. Baring (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. BARING. The meeting of the Public Lands Subcommittee will now come to order.

The first witness this morning will be Loyd Sorensen of Elko, Nev., representing the Sheep Advisory Board of the Humboldt National Forest.

I understand he has gone.

Then the first witness will be Robert Alkire of McGill, Nev., representing the White Pine County Chamber of Commerce and Mines. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT ALKIRE, WHITE PINE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND MINES, McGILL, NEV.

Mr. ALKIRE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Robert Alkire. I am here speaking on behalf of the White Pine County Chamber of Commerce and Mines.

I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude for the opportunity to present the chamber's views on the proposed wilderness legislation now pending before your committee, and being the subject matter of this hearing.

The Chamber of Commerce and Mines of White Pine County opposes Senate bill 4 and bills of similar language for the reason that under these bills, the wilderness system would embrace extensive and extremely large areas of land in the Western States which have either been prospected or explored to the point of demonstrating that such areas are devoid of potential mineral production. S. 4 and those bills of like language actually create a special use incompatible with, if not wholly antagonistic to, the general principles of multiple use. This chamber believes that the multiple-use concept is necessary and should be applied to the use of public lands in view of the increase of our population, the increased demand for more metals to support the national defense and economy, our standard of living, and to provide employment for our exploding population.

We understand that there are two bills, H.R. 9070, introduced by Representative Saylor, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and H.R. 9101,

SRP05625

introduced by Representative Quie, Republican, of Minnesota, which, to some extent, modify S. 4 and the some 13 House bills of like nature, but none of which are acceptable to the chamber for the reason that the concept of multiple use is again ignored.

There are four bills, recently introduced, namely, H.R. 9162, H.R. 9163, H.R. 9164, and H.R. 9165, which are the principal bills being considered at this hearing.

Our chamber of commerce and mines are not opposed to wilderness legislation per se. Our position is that the public lands should be left open for uses of the highest character, uses which will support a community, a county, and a State by producing taxable wealth, thereby, in turn, providing for the support and maintenance of better government, better schools, and such other governmental activities as are in the national interest and for the public welfare.

If there is to be a wilderness bill, that is, a bill creating a wilderness system within which there can be built no roads, no trails, the use of which is limited solely to those affluent enough to provide themselves with special pack trains and who are willing to undergo the rigors of a sojourn in wilderness areas, then the last group of bills, 9162, 9163, 9164, and 9165, are by far the more acceptable. We subscribe to the proposition that the rights of timbermen, cattlemen, and other users of the public domain should be protected, and believe that section 4(d)(2) should be amended so as to provide that the mineral leasing and mining laws should continue in full force and effect in wilderness areas.

We would prefer that there be no time limitation on the general applicability of the mining laws in wilderness areas.

We believe that the provision of H.R. 9162 and similar bills requiring a positive act of Congress before the wilderness system can be enlarged is much superior to the plan provided for in S. 4, which would permit the increase of the size of the wilderness area, and the modification of its boundaries by executive recommendation unless the executive recommendation was repudiated by a motion of either House. The plan set up in H.R. 9162 in this particular is consonant with our historical, traditional, and constitutional concept of legislation.

While we consider H.R. 9162 to be a significant improvement as compared to S. 4, we would suggest that amendments be studied which would guarantee continuing access to owners of all land contained in wilderness areas, irrespective of whether such lands are owned now, or are acquired at a later date.

We believe that the primitive areas should not be taken into the wilderness system until such time as there has been made a comprehensive and exhaustive study to determine mineral potentials in these areas.

In conclusion, it is the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce and Mines of White Pine County, Nev., that if wilderness legislation there must be, then H.R. 9162 with the suggested amendments, or bills of similar import are the more acceptable.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your committee for the opportunity of presenting this statement.

Mr. BARING. I appreciate your testimony, Bob. I do not have any particular questions because I know just about how you folks feel

over there in White Pine County. Your attitude to wilderness is the same as with regard to the Great Basin National Park; is it not?

Mr. ALKIRE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARING. This has caused quite a commotion here in the State because uninformed people have tried to make it a political football. The White Pine County Chamber of Commerce and Mines met with a group of the mining people and the cattle people and the fish and game people, and the bill that went to Congress was a compromise bill, was it not, the combined thoughts of all of the fractions?

Mr. ALKIRE. Yes, Mr. Chairman; it was.

Mr. BARING. I wanted to bring out that the chairman of this subcommittee was not dragging his feet or holding up that bill or any bill. It was a matter of not accepting the Senate bill, which contained 2½ times more acreage, and locking up for all time very important mineral development, as well as hurting the cattle people. And the people of White Pine County met and they themselves decided that the park would be limited in size and sent me the bill prescribing some 53,000 acres, which I introduced in your behalf. I just wanted to put that in the record to clear up, once and for all, these stories running almost monthly now in the newspapers. While it has no reference to wilderness, it is a little wilderness bill itself.

Mr. ALKIRE. It certainly is.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much, Bob.

The next witness is Ray Lincoln of the Idaho Wool Growers Association.

(No response.)

Mr. BARING. The next witness is John W. Spencer, a national director of the Izaak Walton League of America. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. SPENCER, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, SANTA ROSA, CALIF.

Mr. SPENCER. Honorable chairman of the committee and gentlemen, my name is John W. Spencer, 1353 Sonoma Avenue, Santa Rosa, Calif. I am one of the national directors of the Izaak Walton League of America, and am speaking at this hearing for the league membership in the northern half of California. I am former regional forester of the U.S. Forest Service from Denver, Colo., region 2 of the Service, now retired.

At the outset, I wish to state for the record that the Izaak Walton League of America, as a national body, has already supported Senator Anderson's wilderness bill S. 4, which passed the Senate last April. Our local group endorses the principles of S. 4, although we realize full well that identical House legislation is unlikely.

Your honorable committee has struggled long and patiently with a mass of proposed wilderness legislation in the House. You have now narrowed the field down for all practical purposes to two major proposals represented by the new Dingell bill, H.R. 9162, and the Saylor bill, H.R. 9070—and associated companion bills.

Our people like both of these bills in that they offer desirable compromises designed to fairly and equitably work out a reasonable adjustment between the conflicting interests involved in wilderness

SRP05627

use. These conflicts occur almost entirely within the national forest wilderness proposals. The national forests, as your committee knows, are legitimately open to any number of different types of uses. The national parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges, and some other public lands are definitely set up by law for some specific type of limited use or uses. Consequently, the proposed legislation is especially important in establishing statutory guidelines for national forest administration.

Both the Dingell and Saylor groups of bills are excellent in our opinion. They are identical in some respects, similar in others, and in general both follow down the same road to the same destination.

They have one important thing in common in that they retain control by the Congress of the administrative policies to be followed in the management of established wildernesses. Further, the creation of additional wilderness classifications out of national forest primitive areas would likewise be subject to specific congressional approval. The passage of either bill would, in our opinion, meet the major considerations of wilderness preservation advocated by Waltonians.

However, our local group, if given its choice, prefers the current provisions of the Saylor bill, H.R. 9070.

It is only fair to say that since the statement was prepared we have had copies of the Cohelan bill, H.R. 9520, and that has not yet passed all of our groups, but I am satisfied it will have the same endorsement.

H.R. 9070 provides for the prompt review within 5 years of all national forest primitive areas leading either to their final wilderness designation or to their declassification and return to general forest management. Further, such primitive areas pending formal action by the Congress will continue to be handled as roadless by the Forest Service. Under the Dingell bill, such areas will lose their primitive status if not acted upon by Congress within 10 years, and during the interim period of consideration will not be kept roadless. These provisions of the Dingell bill are considered undesirable by the Izaak Walton League.

Prospecting and mining involve an unavoidable conflict with undisturbed natural wilderness. The Saylor bill, H.R. 9070, apparently affords sufficient latitude for prospecting and exploratory mineral development in primitive areas, but is somewhat more limited than the provisions of H.R. 9162 which, in our opinion, impose virtually no restrictions at all beyond those of the current mining laws. We realize, of course, that no primitive area classification can stand against the demonstrable presence of mineral deposits of substantial commercial value. We realize also that no human being can say with certainty that commercial mineral values are not present even in many areas that have been thoroughly prospected over the past 100 years. Nevertheless, whenever these primitive areas have been fully studied and considered for wilderness classification within the period provided by H.R. 9070 and no substantial showing of commercial minerals found, then we can reasonably recognize the public's paramount interest in the wilderness features of the areas and give this interest legal protection.

SRP05628

Unfortunately, but also understandably, any efforts to give wilderness areas a firm and generally accepted land use classification are faced with the necessity of meeting all other competitive uses of the same areas on the basis of demonstrable public values.

We are not impressed by the arguments of those who allege that wilderness designations on national forest lands mean locking up commercial resources of tremendous value. Much of the wilderness is steep, rugged country, usually at high elevations and often including many areas above timber line.

The forage resources now used by wild game and heavily grazed by domestic livestock under paid Forest Service grazing permit will still continue to be so used.

Commercial timber included within wilderness withdrawals is relatively small in comparison to the total stands of merchantable timber in the forests. Much of the wilderness area timber resources are of a sub-alpine type, scrubby in character and really only protection forest. Such timber though largely unmerchantable, does have exceedingly high values for watershed protection. Under the more complete protection afforded in wilderness status, the timber and brush cover prevents much erosion and maintains a loose permeable forest soil which collects and stores maximum amounts of water.

The point to all this is that usable fresh water is already in critically short supply in the United States. Your own Science Committee in the House predicts that by 1980 we will be using all the fresh water available. The superior water-collecting ability of wilderness watersheds may well be a contribution to our national economy, more than compensating for any resources withdrawn from commercial use.

Your committee is dealing with public lands, public property, if you please, that belongs not only to everyone of us today, but also belongs equally to the people of all future generations.

In classifying any of these lands for their highest public use, you cannot fairly establish their permanent all-time value on a dollar basis. There is no way of comparing the solid, easily visualized values of water, timber, forage, minerals, and the like, with the aesthetic and spiritual values to humans of the wilderness. Even the time-honored device of appraising outdoor recreation by what people are willing to pay for its enjoyment falls flat.

The amount of potential wilderness in public lands will never be greater than it is today, but the actual value of wilderness to our people of 15, 30, or 50 years from now may well be immeasurable.

We urge that you place the protection of a firm statutory foundation under this great wilderness resource.

We urge that you approve one of these pending bills and enact it into law without delay.

Even though there may be some imperfections in any measure passed now that will fall short of meeting all future conditions, this is not serious. The people of the future and their representatives in Congress at that time, can if necessary enact amendatory legislation to suit that generation's needs. Those people, thanks to your foresight, will at least have some natural and unspoiled wilderness to enjoy and, in turn, to hand down to their own children.

Thank you.

SRP05629

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Spencer. We appreciate your statement.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I gather you feel that either the Saylor bill or the Cohelan bill now would be acceptable. From this, I gather you mean some mining activity as far as location, development, and extraction is compatible with the wilderness in the mining area.

Mr. SPENCER. Well, yes. We know, and might as well admit, there is no way of determining definitely the presence or absence of mineral values back up in this high country. We have to make the best classification we can, and that is one of the reasons why we think that each new wilderness area proposal should stand on its own feet and be subject to congressional approval before it is made law.

Mr. WHITE. You indicate, then, that a mineral classification is one of the most difficult to make because of the very nature of a mineral deposit?

Mr. SPENCER. Definitely, sure.

Mr. WHITE. And you appreciate, too, that access and the right to properly develop this deposit is the only way it can be properly exploited?

Mr. SPENCER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I am very happy to hear you say this and concur with you in your ideas. I think you made a fine statement.

Mr. SPENCER. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Spencer.

The next witness is Robert Hayes, secretary, Southern Idaho Forestry Association.

(No response.)

Mr. BARING. The Nevada Academy of Sciences, Southern Chapter, James E. Deacon, president and Edward J. Austin, vice president. You may proceed, Mr. Deacon.

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. DEACON, PH. D., PRESIDENT, SOUTHERN CHAPTER, NEVADA ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. DEACON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Southern Chapter of the Nevada Academy of Sciences, representing about 70 southern Nevadans who are interested in scientific pursuits, feels obligated to present to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs certain information which we feel is pertinent to any consideration of wilderness legislation. As our areas of wilderness diminish, the preservation of those remaining areas becomes increasingly critical.

No matter how unique man may be from the standpoint of intellect, esthetics, or metaphysics, he has the same overall biological demands as any other animal. Despite the apparent complexity, self-sufficience, and independence of human civilization, the laws governing population growth and maintenance of plans and animals are very similar to those governing population growth and maintenance of man.

CRP05630

Civilization, especially in recent history, has brought about geological changes on earth equivalent in magnitude with the forces of rain and frost. These geological changes have occurred as a result of mining, drilling, lumbering, and other commercial activities carried on by man in creating our modern constructions.

The biological changes effected by man are usually less obvious yet unquestionably more profound and extensive in their effect on man's future. The elimination of large mammals, certain birds, and fish in parts of or all of their ranges has been well documented. Less publicized is the decimation of countless plants and animals because they share parasites with man or man's creatures. Transportation has lowered the barriers to distribution for countless organisms. The immigration of these organisms cause radical changes to occur in the nonhuman world wherever mankind passes. As these disturbances continue at an ever-increasing rate, the human population as well as man's per capita consumption of his environment is also on the increase. Thus, the possibility of the biological world being as stable as it was in prehuman times becomes more and more remote.

At the present time many of the elements on the surface of the earth are being used and reused. A constant cycle of food production by plants, feeding by animals, and plant and animal decomposition occurs. The fact that plant and animal remains do not accumulate, but rather are decomposed as rapidly as they are formed, implies that the overall picture of nature is one of a balance between plant production and decomposition of organic material. Raw materials are produced as rapidly as organisms die and in turn are used as rapidly as they are produced. The extent to which we disrupt this balance can only be broadly judged.

As the human population, rate of per capita consumption of man's environment, and standard of living increases, the margin for error in judgment diminishes. The primary problem is to insure, so far as possible, that the disturbance produced by man is reversible. By continually assessing the effect of man's activities it may be possible to detect disturbances while we can still change our activities. If, as is quite likely, vital aspects of man's ecology are dependent on undomesticated species, the wilderness is not only of esthetic, intellectual, metaphysical and recreational value, but is an indispensable reserve of biological raw material which could be used for the retracing of our ecological steps. We strongly feel that the wealthiest Nation on earth cannot afford to take the chance of losing this irreplaceable raw material.

I have stressed the ecological importance of wilderness to man's future success. The additional value of wilderness to man's educational, scientific, historic, esthetic, metaphysical, recreational, scenic and conservation endeavors overwhelmingly dictates the necessity of its protection.

The Nevada Academy of Sciences feels that the enactment of the Cohelan bill would best serve the purposes discussed above. One modification which seems desirable would be to extend the time period for reclassification of primitive areas and roadless areas of 5,000 or more acres in the national parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, and game ranges to 10 or even 15 years, or until Congress has acted.

SRP05631

It is extremely important, however, to extend wliderness protection to these areas during the reclassification period.

In addition, other points which bear upon the need to have areas for ecological studies involve such things as space exploration, effective atomic radiation, and so forth, from the standpoint of attempting to assess what kind of relationship exists in a natural environment in an attempt to set up an artificial environment in space, in attempts to assess what goes on in a completely natural environment from the standpoint of finding out what effect radiation is now having on man's environment. That is the part of it that is more highly exploited.

A third rather important point, which I think deserves a considerable amount of consideration is, we have heard a lot of discussion recently of the importance of using wilderness because of the population explosion. I submit that it is important to maintain wilderness because of the population explosion and submit the concept, recently beginning to be investigated by some of the behavioral psychologists. This is simply an interesting study carried out in mice which indicates that even mice, when subjected to overcrowded conditions, begin to show increased mental strain, mental anxiety, arteriosclerosis, heart diseases, and so forth.

Therefore, the conclusion that I draw is that when man proceeds himself to be overcrowded, as he apparently is now doing, we will also, in fact are now seeing increases in these same diseases of man.

Mr. BARING. I am very interested in your testimony, Mr. Deacon. This is about the first time we have had any biological evidence before the committee with regard to this bill. We will certainly review your statement.

Are there any questions?

The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN. The only thing that bothers me, Mr. Deacon, is that maybe we are upsetting major ecological plans, destroying the survival of the fittest type operation, if we create wilderness areas, and are upsetting this perfect cycle nature has created. Are we?

Mr. DEACON. Absolutely not.

Mr. DUNCAN. I did not really want you to answer that question.

Mr. DEACON. This is the kind of question we could go on for days answering, but in summary, no.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed, Mr. Austin.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD J. AUSTIN, VICE PRESIDENT, SOUTHERN CHAPTER, NEVADA ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Southern chapter of the Nevada Academy of Sciences, of which I am vice president and which it is my privilege to represent, consists of some 70 members, both among the professions and lay persons, whose interest covers the broad spectrum of science. It is affiliated with the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

I am sure that if every citizen could have the opportunity to visit some of the areas which lie within our national parks and monuments and was then able to spend a few weeks exploring one or more of the wilderness and primitive areas which it is the purpose of the

SRP05632

wilderness bill to preserve, there would be no question of which way the popular vote would go.

Anyone who has been exposed to the wonders of this country, who has seen the magnificence of our mountains and forests and rivers and lakes in their natural, undisturbed state, who has breathed the pure air of our mountaintops, drunk from a spring, knelt in a glade to view a wildflower, smelled the good odors of the forest, stood awed and inspired by any one of the thousands of natural phenomena that make up this great creation we call America, cannot help but believe that these few remaining areas must be preserved as nature has provided them.

Nature has taken unbelievable millenia to create these things in the shapes and sizes and varieties which are still here. They are becoming pitifully few with the inroads of man. No where has man improved upon these handiworks. Where man touches, he destroys or irrevocably alters. Man's tremendous ability to destroy is everywhere evident. At no time and in no place has he recreated except marginally. It has taken the force of laws that he brought on himself to restrain him in the exploitation and waste of our resources, a restraint that came much too late, and which is still inadequate.

Except for selfish gain, it has nowhere been demonstrated that it is desirable to exploit those areas which will fall within the anticipated protection of wilderness and primitive areas. There is no foreseeable national emergency which demands further mining or other development. There are only the desires of those who see the opportunity for personal gain which would dictate any exploitation whatever. These are such an infinitesimal minority of our people that, on any conceivable basis, they deserve no consideration in their desires to perpetrate further travesties on this small remnant of primitive America.

It is the consensus of the Nevada Academy of Sciences to favor the Saylor, Quie, Cohelan bills.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Deacon's statement has a great deal to be said for it. I am a little bit concerned about the third paragraph on the first page. I realize we have had some earthshaking effects on the surface of this planet, human beings, but I wonder when you say that this is in equivalent magnitude with the forces of rain and frost.

Mr. DEACON. And wind.

Mr. WHITE. And wind?

Mr. DEACON. What wind we have in addition, and wave action. I feel this statement can be substantiated and, for that matter, can refer you to a publication, with a 1963 date on it, if you are interested.

Yes, these geological changes—possibly it requires a little additional explanation. My definition of geological changes includes not only the holes we dig in mining, drilling, and other activities in the lumbering that takes place, it also includes farming, and, significantly, construction of buildings.

Mr. WHITE. Man has to house himself.

SRP05633

Mr. DEACON. Absolutely. I am not contesting this. I am simply pointing out that these changes are equal in magnitude with the rain and frost.

Mr. WHITE. All right. I will go along with it, in one particular era perhaps. In the short space of time that man has been on the face of this earth he has had quite an effect. However, if you take the erosion strips of the earth and look at them over the last 2 million years, there have been big changes—continents have risen and fallen, 40,000 feet of sediment eroded away.

Mr. DEACON. Yes. This statement is on the basis of the fact that man has not been around for 2 million years, a much shorter space of time, and in that space of time has equaled geological forces.

Mr. WHITE. For the few seconds of geological time man has been here.

Mr. DEACON. Absolutely, and in that space of time has equaled rain and frost in his effect on the earth.

Mr. WHITE. I agree with you, however.

Mr. Austin, I always take exception to statements such as yours because I feel that, if the human being has taken the attitude you are taking, we would have none of the benefits which we feel are so necessary and so bountiful on the face of the earth today, that man's activity in every area has not been to spoil, to waste; there have been a good many wonderful things come out of his activity. The fact that you are here today, the way you got here, where you sit right now, the air conditioning of this room, are all based on man's use of his natural resources. I do not say there have not been improper uses of these resources in the past, and I certainly would not want to see them perpetrated in the future, but I do not think you can just categorically go down the line and say every use of our natural resources has been totally for personal gain, has been totally to exploit, totally to destroy the great God-given things we have.

I think you have made your point that this has occurred in the past, but I think it is the minority activity that you are talking about, not the majority of the activity of man.

Would you like to comment?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. I was born and raised in Wisconsin just at the end of the White Pine area there. That, of course, has never been replaced, and in the West we did not commit reforestation except under the force of law. Fortunately, this is being carried out today.

I think the point I want to make, more than any other, is that eventually we have to come to a stopping point on this encroachment on these primitive remnants or else eventually we creep into a point where we meet on either side and there is not anything left.

Mr. WHITE. I do not agree that there is nothing left. I think the people of Wisconsin will take exception to your statement, that they have a few things left in Wisconsin. And the primeval White Pine Forest, no matter how desirable it may be to have it, many things were gained in the State of Wisconsin through the harvest of that forest. Perhaps all of the land was not put to some other use, but the majority was perhaps more productive to society than standing as a White Pine Forest unscarred by man.

Mr. AUSTIN. A great deal of it is submarginal land today, beginning about south of Eau Claire, the Black River area.

SRP05634

Mr. WHITE. I know there is a great deal of submarginal land. I would not say it was true of the entire area. I will not argue.

Mr. DEACON. The thing that continues to bother me about this same idea—apparently many people, including yourself, Mr. White, seem to have the opinion that we can continue to do as we have done in the past and continue to be successful. My statement is geared to the concept that we cannot continue to do so. Of course, we must go beyond this. Involved in it is also the idea of, can we continue population growth as we have in the past and continue to be successful.

I maintain it is absolutely incompatible with man's future success to continue not only population gain, but to continue exploitation of natural resources in wilderness areas and have success in the future. We are being extremely narrowminded and biologically unsound to assume we can continue to be a successful people by complete exploitation of natural resources.

Mr. WHITE. I agree with you we are going to have to retain some vestment of wilderness. I do not want you to get the idea I do not feel this and Congress is not going to take a real good look at all of the problems encompassed in this.

There is only one thing I will say: It seems like every little bee wants to have more little bees and every little bird wants to have more little birds, and it seems like the human beings are pushing this to the limit too.

Mr. DEACON. And this is a further point, you see, that is extremely important, that human beings are pushing this to the limit. We must maintain enough little bees so that some of the human beings are able to go out and see them.

Mr. WHITE. That is all.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. DEACON. Thank you.

Mr. AUSTIN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Dr. Nelson N. Williams, of the Paradise Valley Improvement Association, Las Vegas, Nev. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF NELSON N. WILLIAMS, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to thank you for the privilege of entering this testimony. I wish to testify as a professional plant ecologist and assistant professor of biology, and also as vice president of the Paradise Valley Improvement Association, Las Vegas, Nev. In this way I am presenting to you the wishes of the approximately 100 members of the association as well as my own thoughts on a wilderness preservation system.

In the 7 years that have elapsed since a wilderness bill was first presented in the U.S. Congress, most of the arguments for and against such a bill must have been presented. Therefore, the most significant contribution I can make today is not the addition of more data in support of a wilderness bill, but simply to state that I represent some 100 American citizens who favor a bill protecting the few wilderness areas which are in existence today—tomorrow, or another 7 years from tomorrow may be too late.

SRP05635

Of the many bills presented for consideration, the Saylor bill (H.R. 9070) seems to approach an adequate solution. There are, however, several dangers inherent in this bill. One of these dangers is that adequate time is not allotted for survey of wilderness areas with the attendant possibilities of needlessly including an undesirable area as a wilderness area or excluding an irreplaceable natural habitat due to hasty action caused by lack of time to complete a survey which might need as long as 10 to 15 years. Another danger apparent in the Saylor bill is inadequate control of mining operations. Those operations in progress have already made their imprint on the natural landscape and could be left alone, the biological damage cannot be repaired. The Saylor bill does not provide adequate insurance that, once an area is under consideration, the initiation of new mining operations will not take place. It is easy to visualize disruption of an area in the spirit of, "Let's start now while it is still legal," even though the operation might not be profitable.

In closing, I would like to leave the committee with two thoughts. One, as an ecologist I know it is a fact that once a natural area has been disrupted or changed it can never be restored. The natural processes leading to the development of a particular part of the living landscape can never again in the history of the earth be duplicated exactly; two, I have inferred from my contacts with the Paradise Valley Improvement Association and as a teacher and biologist that it is the will of the majority of the people with whom I am acquainted—ranging from ranchers, mining engineers, land developers and speculators to students, sportsmen, and conservationists—that a wilderness bill such as H.R. 9070 should be enacted. If I did not believe these people to be in the majority, I would not be presenting this testimony.

If I may add, Mr. Chairman, I think you gentlemen of the committee have really two problems you are investigating on this tour of the West. One of them is the will of the people—this is the way our country runs—and what the majority of the people want. You people have to determine this.

The other thing is that our country, being a republic rather than a democracy, you also have to determine what is the good of the people. Sometimes these two things are opposed to each other. Sometimes the will of the majority cannot be done for the good of future generations. I do not envy you gentlemen your job of working out this problem.

I would like to emphasize, as a professional plant ecologist that a natural area undisturbed as much as possible at least by man is the most important tool the ecologist has to work with. If it were not for small remnant areas of natural plants and animals, it would be an almost impossible task for any ecologist to make order out of the complex relationships between living organisms. And since man is a living organism, we cannot exclude him from the rules of ecology.

I would like to ask then, in one way or another, some natural areas be preserved for scientific studies if for no other reason. I realize this is a single use of an area, but in my experience I have seen this is an extremely important use. I might illustrate by an example that my entire concept of one whole unit of vegetation that at one time occurred around the Great Lakes region is based on 27 acres left in

SRP05636

Pennsylvania by a lumbering company as a monument to the other 27,000 acres that they cut off. I think this is really fine because I have learned quite a few things in this one small area. Information of this type has wide application in many of man's endeavors such as forestry, ranching, mining, and the like.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. No questions.

Mr. WESTLAND. No questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Doctor.

The next witness is Robert G. Bear, of Beaumont, Calif., representing the Trailfinders.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT G. BEAR, BANNING, CALIF., REPRESENTING THE TRAILFINDERS

Mr. BEAR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Robert G. Bear. My home is Beaumont, Calif., where I am self-employed as a public accountant.

I appear today as representative of the Trailfinders, a nonprofit California corporation with the purpose of promoting in boys an understanding of and appreciation for the outdoors through camping and related educational activities. For the past 50 years the Trailfinders has been making available to boys a variety of wilderness experiences, not only in the mountain and desert regions of the Southwest, but also in Canada, Mexico, and Europe.

The founder and president of the Trailfinders, Harry C. James, is a member of the Advisory Committee to the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. He has come to appreciate that wilderness recreation offers a wholesome outlet for youthful aggressiveness. Of the thousands of youngsters who have participated in the various activities of the organization—mountain climbing, cross-country skiing, desert exploration, and wilderness camping—not one boy has ever become a juvenile delinquent.

The Trailfinders, therefore, urges passage of a strong wilderness bill modeled after H.R. 9070, Saylor, and H.R. 9520, Cohelan. As our mushrooming population and energetic industry rapidly consume the undeveloped lands of our country, it is obvious that we had better soon pick out what wilderness is to be preserved and then set up effective protection. Our Federal wilderness areas must not be subject to the stroke of an administrator's pen.

When we refer to a strong wilderness bill, we mean one with reasonable concessions to conflicting uses, whether economic or recreational. We feel that 10 years is too long to permit mining to continue in areas converted to wilderness status. An inventory of mineral resources is sufficient protection of the national interest. It is essential that areas considered for permanent wilderness status be protected in their wild condition pending disposition.

Critics of wilderness legislation have long complained of locking up resources. But banking is a fairer term to apply to the status of such resources. Instead of permitting premature exhaustion from wasteful competition between producers of nonrenewable resources like petroleum, wilderness areas would conserve such resources against emergency need.

SRP05637

At the same time a National Wilderness System is banking nonrenewable resources, it is providing intangible resources of the spirit to the members of our crowded society. It provides a serene haven to which you and I can retreat from the insane pressures of our complex environment. It is a place where we can find healthful recreation during our increasing leisure time. Many seek out its healing silence to reassure themselves that all is well in God's world where His handiwork is left untouched by man.

It is no exaggeration to say that the wilderness bill is one of the most important pieces of conservation legislation in a generation. Our descendants will long applaud our foresight and restraint in saving for their use and enjoyment the relatively insignificant areas remaining from our once vast wilderness. In a few decades we could consume the nonrenewable resources in the areas sought for a National Wilderness System. Otherwise these areas could serve as a permanent source of beauty and inspiration for countless future Americans.

We Americans are indeed fortunate to live in a land of such vast resources, both economic and intangible. As our population and technology reach the point where we must be concerned over the exhaustion of many of these resources, we can be very thankful for farsighted national leaders who plan carefully for resource and land use today and tomorrow.

As a youth I was awed and speechless at my first visit to wilderness. It was a pitiful one-eighth section remnant of the primeval forest which used to cover my home country in the Midwest. I felt a great sadness when told there were no other remains of our sublime natural heritage within hundreds of miles, and inwardly vowed to always do what I could to save wilderness wherever I might find it the rest of my life. This resolve was confirmed by what I learned in England when I served there in the Air Force in World War II. The English had developed practically all their national beauty spots, leaving practically no scenic treasures for a national park system.

As an adult my recreation—including that of my family—has been directed toward wild and scenic spots. Such areas provided much needed healthful relaxation from a stressful desk job. I feel that our many visits to the wilderness contributed greatly to a happy family life and two healthy, alert youngsters.

Thus, it is only natural that I am an ardent advocate of wilderness legislation. I firmly believe I should try to save for my heirs a well-protected wilderness system where in a setting of pure air and water they can find the physical and mental health so many before them have found. Such wild areas should always be large enough so that one can escape the sight, sound, and even smell of the civilization we all need to escape from now and then.

Won't you legislators please present the American people with a strong wilderness system, one which recognizes that man does not live by bread alone, one which prescribes for a small fraction of our Federal land uses in which spiritual values take priority over material.

One additional point: Please consult the national Forest Service and other impartial sources before accepting information about the San Gorgonio Wild Area. My home in Beaumont was purposely selected for the warm, dry climate, and lies at the south base of San Gorgonio Peak. From 5 years' residence I know that, for all its eleva-

tion, the San Gorgonio Wild Area suffers from the same dry climate and southern latitude only slightly less than the other ski areas of southern California.

Mr. BARING. I think in the last day and a half you have gathered that most of the committee well recognize the fact we must have some wilderness. On the other hand, there has to be some give and take on the part of the wilderness people, too, or it will be another 7 years before it goes through the Congress. I wanted to make the statement to that effect because there has to be some give and take.

There has to be some locking up, it is true, but we cannot figure on locking up some 64 million acres as would be in the Senate bill. It is preposterous to think here in the West we can just throw all of the miners and cattle people and lumber people out of business, for it has been our strongest economy, and in most cases where they have removed trees, the lumbering people have replanted. They are constantly taking care of these areas they are using.

I think there has to be some wilderness area in the higher elevations, too, but I do not think we can be steamrollered by the fact there are more wilderness people than there are cattle people. They are going to get somewhere, of course, with this bill, but I do not think that they should be able to outlaw the legitimate requirements of the other economies.

Mr. BEAR. We realize it is a matter of compromise, Mr. Baring, and I think we just both have the feeling that we are being squeezed out, and naturally we are very concerned.

Mr. BARING. As I brought up here earlier with the witness from White Pine County, the same thing happened on a smaller scale over there. There were a few businessmen over there that wanted the Great Basin National Park to bring in tourists There were also many miners and cattle people all through White Pine County and western counties in this State that did not want the park because they wanted it to continue as it did before, to make a living off the ground and what the area offered. They got together and had a dinner, which I attended, and a week later they had a commission appointed out of the different groups which came up with a compromise bill.

Mr. BEAR. Mr. Baring, I hope you folks will do the same thing we folks from California should do—when you have something worthwhile in Nevada like that Great Basin area, we hope you will be willing to sacrifice just a little so that people from out of State can come in and enjoy that wonderful wilderness area there, like we know we ought to do in sharing places in the Sierras, rather than developing them for all the lumber and the last dollar and minerals.

Mr. BARING. There was a known deposit of beryllium, a very important element at this time in spacecraft. It withstands heat better than any other known element we have. Excluding the beryllium deposit, they still had the essence of the park, the Lehman Caves. The higher elevations, the glaciers and the pines, those old trees up there, that are still in the park area. We were able to confine it to 53,000 acres instead of the 126,000 which the wilderness people wanted.

Mr. BEAR. I am tickled to hear you say that because I organized a bus tour back in 1958 in California to take people over there.

Mr. BARING. The rest of the acreage from 53,000 to 126,000 was nothing more than cattle country, something we have 100 million acres of here in Nevada alone. To lock that up into a park is ridiculous.

SRP05639

Mr. BEAR. Us birdwatchers, you would be surprised what we think is pretty good country to get out in camping and hiking.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. I would just like to comment on the last paragraph on your first page about banking. We have to do a little banking in this area, you say.

I also happen to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee, and I am concerned about our banking business today in the United States. I would like to see a little more real money in our account rather than just credit.

Mr. BEAR. You sound like a conservative.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Dr. Henry M. Weber of the California Garden Clubs, Inc., was unable to be here and has submitted a statement for the record. Without objection, Dr. Weber's statement will be included in the record at this point and the article from Engineering attached to the statement will be made a part of the committee files.

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HENRY M. WEBER, M.D., CONSERVATION CHAIRMAN, CALIFORNIA GARDEN CLUBS, INC., INDIO, CALIF.

The 17,000 members of the California Garden Clubs, Inc., in 400 clubs urge the passage of H.R. 9070 by Mr. John P. Saylor, to provide for a wilderness system for the health and welfare of the people of America, today, tomorrow, and tomorrow.

The proposal introduced by Mr. Saylor, however, is faulty in two important categories, which shall be emphasized here.

First, the proposal is named "The Wilderness Bill," which truly enough indicates its purpose, but fails to convey to the "man in the street" the many and associated and interdependent natural resources for which wilderness is the foundation. This treasure chest of resources, dependent upon wilderness, contains the most essential and indispensable resource of all, without which no life could exist upon the earth and for which there is not substitute. This resource is pure water. For every other resource of our forest-covered lands, there is a substitute, but there is no substitute for pure water. Consequently H.R. 9070 fails to indicate by its name, that it is indeed a legislative proposal, that could more truthfully be called "The Wilderness and Water Conservation" bill, of especial significance to intelligent citizens of the Western States.

Second, Mr. Saylor has prepared H.R. 9070, having one eye on the political feasibility of its enactment into law. In such preparation, and we are sure for the reason above stated, he has failed to propose wilderness of sufficient size to meet the expanding needs of Americans in the years to come. We would do well to recall, that since the pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, 500 million acres of virgin forests have gone. This is an area five times as large as the entire State of California. In addition, 1,100 million acres of the United States is in cropland, while 100 million acres are now covered by asphalt and concrete, forming concrete jungles—poor substitutes for wilderness. This loss of vegetative cover of the land is directly implicated in the severity of the increasing number of drought periods. (See attached item "What Causes a Drought.")

This wilderness legislation urgently needs to become law. Our late President John F. Kennedy strongly urged the passage of legislation to provide for the security of a wilderness system. It would be fitting, under such circumstances, that the recognition for such interest would be to establish the American wilderness as a fitting and ever living monument to his memory.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Chancie L. Snyder of Silver City, N. Mex. You may proceed.

SRP05640

STATEMENT OF CHANCIE L. SNYDER, DIRECTOR, SPORTSMEN ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHWEST NEW MEXICO, SILVER CITY, N. MEX.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Chancie L. Snyder of Silver City, N. Mex. I am a director of the Sportsmen's Association of Southwest New Mexico. I also am representing the Central Mining District Game Protective Association of Grant County, N. Mex. The above sportsmen's association was organized in Silver City, N. Mex., back in 1913, and had as one of its charter members a young forest ranger, Aldo Leopold. As many of you know, he had much to do in setting up the Gila Wilderness in southwest New Mexico back in 1924. His philosophy of wilderness preservation is the ideal, and we wish to go on record as favoring legislation that will approach this idea.

We urge, Mr. Chairman, that your committee report out a true wilderness preservation bill. Not one in name only, which will have so many amendments and reservations that one looking at it would not know if it were protecting the "Strip" here in Las Vegas, Nev., or the Gila Wilderness in southwest New Mexico, but one that will be truly a wilderness. That through this legislation Congress will set up a wilderness policy that can only be changed by Congress.

The proponents of this wilderness legislation are not a greedy group for they are asking, percentagewise, a very small portion of all forest lands to be designated as wilderness. Surely, this Nation with its vast resources can put aside a small percent for wilderness, so that scientists, naturalists, hikers, trail riders, sportsmen, and others can, from generation to generation, use and enjoy the unspoiled wilderness. I remember a poem Hamlin Garland wrote some 50 years ago, and it ended something like this:

"All the rest of my life these joys will remain, I have touched the primitive wilderness again."

Let us hope, Mr. Chairman, that poets 50 years hence will have the opportunity to express themselves in the same manner, because of a favorable action of this Congress.

I want to emphasize, after hearing much of the testimony here, I feel there are many types of people in this great country of ours. Some will enjoy wilderness experiences and some will not. This the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recognized in their report. They recommended "wide variety of activities and values," for outdoor activities. Six broad classes are recommended, and one of these six is "primitive or wilderness areas," and they describe these areas, "with natural wild conditions undisturbed by roads and managed solely to preserve their primitive characteristics."

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we urge your early favorable reporting out of committee a sound and as near ideal wilderness preservation bill as possible, and help it through Congress this year of 1964. We pray that this legislation will perpetuate wilderness values, values that will inspire people to have enriched experiences through wilderness opportunities.

You gentlemen in Congress deal with minorities all the time and you know how they sometimes can interfere and block things that are going on. But minorities must be considered, and we feel they should be. A scientist has the right to have a place where he can study the

SRP05641

natural science as well as the individual who wants to run cattle or cut timber.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to testify for the wilderness preservation bill. Also, over 300 members of the clubs I represent here today thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I am very interested in your statement, Mr. Snyder. You represent one kind of a group of people?

Mr. SNYDER. I represent the sportsmen, hunters, fishermen, conservationists.

Mr. WHITE. Hunters, fishermen, and conservationists. Your statement indicates to me your real interest. You said you want a wilderness bill that approaches the ideal, the wilderness as it was years ago. Is that correct?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. I would feel that we should get a wilderness as near to the concept of complete natural conditions as it is possible to have, so that it will be added to and kept from generation to generation.

Mr. WHITE. I agree with you very much, sir. Now I would like to ask you a further question.

Do you feel that a game animal standing in this wilderness area—you say you would like to observe and so forth. To have him struck down by a hunter's bullet, do you feel that is compatible with this concept of wilderness?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, sir. For instance, we consider wilderness going back as far possibly as prehistoric Indians. The prehistoric Indians ate and were able to take the deer. Our early Indians were able to do so. Then, even going back further than that, we have our predators that attack a deer, dispose of it. And of course, man with a gun is just a predator. He helps to keep the wilderness or any place in balance. So therefore, I feel that the hunter is just a type of predator, because, if you should not have predators, you would need something to keep it in balance.

Mr. WHITE. I disagree with you quite extensively. I think you really put man in his true context when you talk about him being a predator. With his 30.06 rifle out in a game area that you want to have remaining in its natural state, he is a predator with his huge advantage over the game. The American Indian you refer to, looking for food and sustenance, I can see, and I can see it with the wildcat or the puma or the other predators, whether it be the botfly or the worms that infect deer. But I cannot see that man out there to kill an animal for the sake of killing it alone is as you say. And the majority of our hunters are in this category. And I love to hunt. But at the same time I cannot see that hunting is compatible with wilderness, and you want to preserve wilderness. If you want to provide a private hunting area for a certain group of people, let's call it a hunting area, let's not call it wilderness, let's not fly that flag.

Mr. SNYDER. Just remember now, it is not only the hunters that go into the wilderness. There are others.

But also, Mr. White, the people out around the wilderness, and the Government is guilty of this also, have controlled the predators, even used 10-60 or 10-80.

SRP05642

Mr. WHITE. I know.

Mr. SNYDER. They have done it around the wilderness which has caused the predators not to be able to go into the wilderness.

Mr. WHITE. We are talking about establishing our wilderness which is supposed to establish a natural balance with predators and so forth. If we are going to have a true wilderness, I do not believe man is going to figure in this system.

Mr. SNYDER. We each have the right to our opinion, do we not, sir?

Mr. WHITE. We certainly do.

Mr. BARING. Are there further questions?

Thank you very much.

Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the statements of Dawson A. Campbell, Byron Miller, and Francis B. Parsons, all of Silver City, N. Mex., will be included in the record at this point.

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statements follow:)

STATEMENT OF BYRON MILLER, SILVER CITY, N. MEX.

As an ecologist and conservationist deeply interested in the establishment, protection, and preservation of suitable natural areas, I feel it essential that our Nation have adequate wilderness areas set aside to be administered in accordance with the wilderness concept in order to conserve such areas, to retain various vanishing esthetic values and to serve recreational, educational, scientific, and historical uses for ourselves and future generations.

To accomplish this objective, our Congress should now enact a comprehensive form of wilderness legislation whereby adequate wilderness will be established and at the same time giving suitable protection and stability to all such areas. This is not satisfactorily accomplished under the present system as wilderness areas now extant are in continuous jeopardy. For, with the pressures of increasing population and limited land frontiers, there are ever self-seeking individuals and groups having commercial interests which incessantly produce seemingly logical arguments to encroach, invade, or reduce wilderness areas under one pretext or another.

It is notable that the great majority of the thinking public has for some time favored passage of suitable wilderness legislation in principle, while only a comparative few who have commercial interests or who seek personal advantage or monetary gain are in opposition to the legislation. Thus, for the past several years all attempts at passage of suitable wilderness legislation have been stymied by this minority having commercial interests, who seek to ravage any last vestige of wilderness in order to achieve their immediate financial gain.

There is a great need for the preservation of wilderness areas (and natural areas) in all diverse plant and animal habitats and life zones throughout our Nation, wherein the ecological balance of nature may prevail undisturbed. With the rapid encroachments of civilization, all wilderness areas (and other natural areas) set aside will be of increasing value and importance in the future.

I therefore urge that a suitable wilderness bill, giving adequate protection to all existing wilderness areas and all other wilderness areas which may be established in the future, be passed by Congress and enacted into law.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS B. PARSONS, PRESIDENT, GRANT COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, SILVER CITY, N. MEX.

This statement by the Grant County Archaeological Society reflects its keen interest in securing from Congress a wilderness bill that most fully protects and conserves the interest of the whole people of our country.

At present the national forest system, comprising over some 15 million acres, is so set up that the Secretary of Agriculture has undue authority over this area. As the law now stands he might institute regulations that could be very

detrimental to our vast primitive heritage. This is a situation that we believe will be remedied by the enactment of H.R. 9520. We urge full consideration of this important matter by your committee.

Most of the unique wonders of our land, preserved as national parks and monuments, are bounded by areas of national forest. Many of them are reached only by traversing wilderness and primitive preserves. With the rapidly increasing number of people finding relaxation and recreation in the rapidly dwindling forests of our counrty, every effort should be made both to protect and, if possible, increase the number of true wildernes areas.

The Grant County Archaeological Society was organized in 1925, chartered in 1938, and is one of the oldest societies of its kind in the State of New Mexico. It has always supported conservation measures that reflect the best interests of all the people of our country.

STATEMENT OF DAWSON A. CAMPBELL, GILA HOTSPRINGS RANCH, SILVER CITY, N. MEX.

The present wilderness areas and any area that might be designated "wilderness" should be directly protected by the U.S. Congress. Changes of any kind should be passed on by the legislature.

The bureaus have demonstrated that they are both unwilling and unable to protect the wilderness areas entrusted to their care.

I have lived in and adjacent to the Gila Wilderness Area for over 34 years. During this time, the Gila wilderness has suffered three boundary changes. Other drastic changes initiated by the Forest Service have been averted by local conservationists.

The Forest Service has consistently tried to gather local support for a road to connect the Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument to Beaverhead, N. Mex. This would bisect the Gila Primitive Area.

The Forest Service has failed to prosecute anyone for violating the wilderness by driving four-wheel-drive vehicles into the area.

The Forest Service has encouraged the introduction of elk into this great wilderness area; then by regulations discourages the packing and outfitting business. The Forest Service used the excuse that an overpopulation of deer need be harvested to build the Copperas Canyon Road in 1930. This road penetrated the Gila wilderness for 9 miles and permitted hunters to drive over many more miles of mesa country. The same excuse will be used to violate McKenna Park—a road to harvest surplus elk.

The Forest Service built an airstrip on McKenna Park, the very heart of the wilderness. This clearing of virgin timber to make the runway is visible for many miles. This strip was cleared over the objections of all conservation groups.

The attitude of the Forest Service here has been that the Service can be anything under the guise of "administrative use."

In closing, the greatest danger to our wilderness area system is not the private interests, but by the various bureaus that administer the areas. They use public money to influence public opinion toward the bureaucratic line. These bureaus are now so powerful that they can ignore all except the U.S. Congress. The people's representatives in Congress should keep a tight control on our wilderness and not delegate authority to any bureau of the Government.

Mr. BARING. Next is Larry S. Wisehart, president, Sportsmen's Club of New Mexico. Is he here?

[No response.]

Mr. BARING. Next is Elliott S. Barker of Santa Fe, N. Mex. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ELLIOTT S. BARKER, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Chairman, I am Elliott S. Barker, of 343 Palace Avenue, Santa Fe, N. Mex., often referred to as the "Old Man of the Mountains."

This is my own personal statement. However, I am a member of a dozen or more organizations which, I am sure, fully endorse my posi-

SRP05644

tion. Also, I guarantee that my plea for wilderness preservation represents the sentiments of a thousand men and women from practically every State in the Union with whom I have ridden, hiked, camped, hunted, and fished in wilderness areas.

In order to give my statement proper perspective and so that it can be evaluated, it seems necessary to present a bit of background material.

I came to New Mexico with my parents, overland in covered wagons, at the age of 3 in 1889. I was ranch-raised adjacent to what is now the Pecos Wilderness Area. I was a professional hunter, trapper, and guide; a U.S. forest ranger and a forest supervisor; I operated a sawmill; ranched for 10 years and grazed cattle on a wilderness area; had charge of wildlife and predator control on a 360,000-acre ranch and game preserve; I was head of the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish for 22 years, and am now retired, but have a half dozen jobs mainly related to recreation, wildlife, and conservation.

I have been on twenty-two 11-day wilderness trail rides sponsored by the American Forestry Association and have been its representative in charge of 16 of them in 5 different States.

With the broad experience provided by that background I feel that I am qualified to look at wilderness preservation and the legislation proposed to establish and maintain a wilderness system from multiple points of view.

My twenty-two 11-day wilderness trail rides with 20 to 30 guest riders on each trip brought me in prolonged contact with over 500 average American men and women from all walks and stations in life and from practically every State in the Union. These people sought their recreation on wilderness trails and around wilderness campfires to get away from the stresses and tensions of modern urban life. Not one of them but what was enthusiastic about wilderness preservation for present and future needs. They want to see these areas kept free of commercialization of any kind so that they may be handed over to our successors in the majestic condition in which God loaned them to us.

I have been using wilderness areas ever since I was a little kid. Fifty-two years ago I took my young wife on a week-long, wilderness camping trip. We went again last year and in between we have gone scores of times. We will go again come spring and take along some greatgrandchildren. I have ridden wilderness trails with many hundreds of others through the years on camping, picture taking, hunting, and fishing trips.

As a result my honest appraisal is that such trips into the unspoiled pristine back country are not only enjoyable but are most beneficial for recreation and relaxation of both mind and body. I know of no one with whom I have ridden who would disagree with that. There is nothing that provides better training for Boy and Girl Scouts and other young folks than wilderness trips. They are a powerful antidote for juvenile delinquency.

It is amazing how rapidly the use of wilderness is increasing. As one example, I cite the situation on the 165,000-acre Pecos Wilderness Area in New Mexico. When I was forest ranger there in 1909–12 it was estimated that there were 200 visitors to the area each year. When I became State game warden of New Mexico in 1931 the num-

 SRP05645

ber of annual visitors had increased to 800 (it had not yet been designated as wilderness). Last year according to estimates of the Forest Service and State game department, there were over 10,000 persons who spent from 1 day to 2 weeks in that 1 area. That is an increase of 5,000 percent in a 50-year period. Or to put it another way, there are 50 users of the area for recreation now where there was one 50 years ago.

On my trip through the Bridger wilderness on a single trail a few years ago, we met many other pack-in parties, a number of backpackers and 1 group of 101 hikers, with horse-transported camp equipment, on an 8-day trip.

To say that wilderness areas are too little used to be justified is the utmost folly, and that the use of and demand for wilderness won't increase at a rapid pace is extremely shortsighted.

Those who claim that only the robust and hardy people are able physically to take wilderness trips simply do not know whereof they speak. The average American man, woman, boy, or girl, can and do make wilderness trips. I know for I have ridden and camped with over a thousand of them from 7 to 70, and they have been just average city and country folks. They don't have to be expert riders either. In fact, many are not currently accustomed to riding—regularly I take some who have never been on a horse before, or not since they were youngsters. They make it all right, too.

At other wilderness hearings where I have testified some opponents of wilderness preservation have said that wilderness would be for the rich only, since, they claimed, only the rich could afford a wilderness trip. That, of course, is pure poppycock. The people who I take on the American Forestry Association's deluxe trips are, for the most part, not rich people. They are doctors, lawyers, businessmen, nurses, secretaries, stenographers, school teachers, farmers, chemists, technicians, college students, and a big percent who list themselves by the glorified title of "housewife." They are not rich men's wives either.

Those deluxe trips cost only $22 per day—about what it costs to stay at a good hotel in the city. But there are many other ways of enjoying a wilderness camping experience at much less cost. The backpacker (and there are many of them) goes for as long as a week for $1.25 per day. Three or four hikers in a group taking a packhorse to carry equipment and food go for $2.50 to $3 a day. Similar groups who ride and do their own work must add $5 per day for a saddle horse which brings the cost up to $8 per person per day. You can't stay at a tourist court and eat for that. If a party of four or more want a wrangler-chore man to go along, it will cost about $2 to $3 more per day.

Actually a wilderness trip is about the cheapest vacation one can go on. It is silly to talk about it being available for the rich only.

Now, as to the objections of the livestock organizations to wilderness preservation and current proposed legislation. I have many good friends who summer graze their cattle on wilderness areas and I hear no complaints from them. They are content to continue to get the best of summer grazing for half what it would cost on private lands.

The fact is that the livestock people are not affected by wilderness areas or the proposed legislation. They have no valid reason to op-

pose this legislation because every bill that has been introduced contains the specific provision that, and I quote:

> The grazing of livestock where established prior to the effective date of this act shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Of course, all grazing on national forests is subject to regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The lumbermen and the miners and oil and gas people object to wilderness preservation and to the proposed legislation to accomplish that end in the democratic American way. We should be governed by laws and not be subject to arbitrary whims of a public official as it could be as the situation now stands. The Secretary of Agriculture could, if he were so minded, abolish any existing area within the national forests or the whole system for that matter. That's the way the opponents want it, but the way it should be is to enact a proper law to insure preservation of an adequate system of wilderness areas for the future.

Adequate provision is made in S. 4, H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 for prospecting by modern scientific methods to take care of the overall interests of the American people. Likewise, there are provisions for mining, dam and road building and, in fact, for any commercial development where the President shall determine that to authorize such activity and development will better serve the interests of the American people than would its denial.

To ask more than that is not to ask it for the best interests of the American people, but instead for private gain.

The wilderness areas within the national park system and within the national wildlife refuges are now protected by law against all such commercial encroachment. So it is with the national forest wilderness system, comprising 8 percent of the total national forest area, that we are primarily concerned in this regard.

The proponents of sound wilderness preservation legislation have often been called selfish by miners, lumbermen, and other commercial interests for wanting to save for wilderness purposes 8 percent of the national forest area. Mr. Chairman, I ask who is being selfish. Those who simply want to preserve a meager 8 percent in its natural state for the benefit of present and future generations, or those who now have 92 percent of the national forests for regulated commercialization and exploitation and demand the other 8 percent also?

Then the charge is made that wilderness is a single use and, therefore, is inconsistent with the forest service's venerable multiple-use policy of administration. No one section of land can be devoted to all land uses. The highest use of one may be timber production, another grazing, another developed campsites or summer homes, still another may be watershed, or wildlife, with a certain amount of overlapping throughout.

But wilderness is not a single use. Instead wilderness areas provide many important uses. Wilderness areas are unique in that they serve at one and the same time a variety of highly important purposes without diminishing or damaging the natural resources in any way. Most wilderness, wild, and primitive areas have a very high value for watershed purposes, and wilderness preservation provides the highest type of watershed protection. Water is the lifeblood of the West.

 SRP05647

Then wilderness serves highly important scientific and educational purposes. It provides the opportunity, found nowhere else, for some of the highest types of recreation and relaxation sorely needed in a turbulent world—riding, hiking, camping, mountain climbing—in spiritually stimulating, pristine settings.

Wilderness provides unspoiled habitat for wildlife and fish where sportsmen can enjoy their sport and recreation in uncrowded scenic, natural environments. The majestic peaks, verdant, flower-spangled meadows, alpine forests, tumbling streams and lucid lakes provide the photographer, professional and amateur, with unexcelled artistic subjects.

These multiple uses neither consume, damage, or diminish the resources, but the areas if preserved as wilderness will serve posterity was well as they do us. I may add that posterity will surely hold us in utter contempt if we fail, before it is too late, to save enough of these magnificent, God-given outdoor natural history museums in their pristine condition for its benefit and enjoyment.

There are those who assert that a bit of lumbering here, some mining there, and all that goes with such operations will not impair the wilderness character of the area nor prevent its enjoyment by wilderness riders, hikers, campers, and other visitors. Those who make such claims have either never had a wilderness experience or their souls are too dead to appreciate it. A wilderness trip with such operations going on would be like trying to enjoy grand opera surrounded by jackhammers and blow torches.

It was my privilege to attend several of these wilderness bill hearings where the opponents of wilderness argued that we should wait for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, authorized by Congress, to submit its report, and that to act on wilderness legislation before that would be premature and ill advised. The report is now out, as you know. On page 7 of the general report it sets up six categories for classifying outdoor recreation resources. It is most gratifying to note that primitive areas, synonymous with wilderness, is listed as the fifth class. Then the report in several places recommends wilderness legislation. Wilderness was considered by the ORRRC so important that it devoted a 350-page 8- by 10-inch volume on it. Are not those who said wait going to accept the report now? Is this committee not going to accept its guidance?

It seems to me that the will of the people for wilderness preservation is expressed in the ORRRC report and emphasized by the 10 to 1 vote of the Senate in passage of S. 174 and 6 to 1 in passage of of S. 4. President Kennedy strongly favored good wilderness preservation legislation. We could erect no greater monument to his memory than to provide for an adequate system of wilderness for benefit of present and future generations.

It is hoped that these hearings will result in getting a bill out of committee so that the House of Representatives as a whole may vote upon it.

Now, as to which bill is the best. I endorsed S. 174 of the 87th Congress, and S. 4 of this Congress, as did hundreds of organizations and thousands of individuals throughout the country. I believe they are good bills and that the provision for dealing with primitive areas would save Congress a lot of precious time without taking

away its prerogative of rejecting any area it might find unsuited for wilderness purposes.

But since this committee objected to that procedure, I think Mr. Saylor's bill, H.R. 9070, and Mr. Cohelan's bill, H.R. 9520 are fair and provide a reasonable compromise on procedure. They are acceptable so long as primitive areas continue to be administered as such until the Congress has acted upon recommendation of the President for their inclusion in the wilderness system. I can endorse those two bills, that is, 9070 and 9520.

When I received a copy of Mr. Dingell's bill, H.R. 9162, I was alarmed and dismayed at some of the omissions and deficiencies. But particularly the provision granting miners and prospectors 10 years to exploit the entire national forest wilderness system seemed to me to be entirely unjustified and utterly inconsistent with wilderness preservation. To me it just does not make sense. Wilderness characteristics of any area could be permanently impaired or even destroyed in that time with no assurance that any operation would be in the overall public interest. Then if such concessions are given one group other commercial interests will consider it justification for demanding concessions also.

It seems to me that the mining people are emphasizing too much the taking away, as they call it, of this wilderness system. They do not have access to the wilderness system in the national parks or the national wildlife reserves as it is now. So they are only affected by taking away, as they put it, the privilege of mining and prospecting in the national forest wilderness area. Actually, that is only 3 percent of the total public lands that they do have access to to continue their operations.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I, and the hundreds of wilderness users and proponents with whom I associate, cannot accept H.R. 9162 in its present form. But since it is on the same base as the others mentioned, it might be drastically amended to be made a good bill.

Since Hon. Jeffrey Cohelan has made and widely published such a complete and sound analysis of H.R. 9162, it would seem to be entirely unnecessary for me to go into it further. I fully endorse Mr. Cohelan's analysis and recommendations for correcting 9162 to make it an acceptable bill, but I would recommend H.R. 9520 instead.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very deeply the opportunity of presenting my testimony on wilderness preservation here today. In closing, I would like to add a little poem of mine titled, "Outdoors Heritage":

The outdoors deeply lies in American hearts,
In America's cherished traditions;
In its history, heritage, likewise its arts,
To preserve it should head our ambitions.
When Americans search for the meaning of life,
Or a means for escape from life's stress,
They won't find it in cities midst turmoil and strife
But, instead, in some lone wilderness.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there questions?

The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN. As the uses of the so-called wilderness areas increase over the years, as you prophetize, what is going to happen to the wilderness concept?

SRP05649

Mr. BARKER. It is going to be somewhat of a difficult problem to maintain, well, as you might call it, a purist conception of the wilderness area. But you can preserve a place where people can go and be free of all of the reminders of civilization, such as your motorized transportation and all that sort of thing. You can get away from that permanently.

Mr. DUNCAN. It is going to have to be a relative concept, is it not, depending on the quantity of people that want to use it and the land we have left at that time?

Mr. BARKER. Yes, sir. As I say, I do not believe there are many areas that you can keep in the truly purist notion of a wilderness, but you can certainly keep a place that is free from the mechanized civilization that exerts such stresses and tensions on the public.

Mr. DUNCAN. As that time approaches would you advocate rationing the use of the wilderness and keeping people out of it so as to stay as close to this relative concept as possible?

Mr. BARKER. The time might come when you would have to do that. It would be a most regrettable situation if you had to do it, but I can conceive that in some areas there might come a time.

I can cite you the Pecos Wilderness Area. When I was forest ranger down there in 1909–12 we estimated 200 visitors into what is now the Pecos Wilderness Area each year. By 1931, when I became State game warden of New Mexico, head of the game department, it was estimated there were 800 visitors to the same area. It still had not been made a wilderness, it was primitive. Last year the Forest Service and the game department combined, who have a great interest in the area because it is a fine recreation and wildlife area, estimated over 10,000 users. That is a 5,000-percent increase in 60 years.

Mr. DUNCAN. I am going to abandon this line of questioning, but I think it is an interesting one, and I think it is an important concept to keep in mind as we make our plans. The national parks right now in many areas are so crowded I have already heard talk of rationing admissions to the national parks. This disturbs me considerably.

The only other thing I want to ask you, sir, is this: As you have utilized these wilderness areas, particularly with your horseback trips, do you run into conflict with people who do not want horses in the wilderness area.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think in all of my rides that I have ever run onto but two people who thought that if we were going to have wild areas we should go to the purist idea.

Mr. DUNCAN. Are there any trails in your immediate area that you are familiar with that are restricted to backpacking and no horses allowed?

Mr. BARKER. No, sir; as far as I know there are not. In fact, I am sure there are not.

Mr. DUNCAN. I assume the use of horses fits into your concept of a properly managed wilderness area?

Mr. BARKER. The use of horses certainly does, but at the same time I have the greatest admiration for use by the hikers and the backpackers.

Mr. DUNCAN. Certainly. I do, too. The only reason I mention it is I am engaged in such a controversy right now.

We have a trail along the Rogue River in southern Oregon that has been tentatively, at least, closed to any utilization at all by horses. And this is at the instance of the people who want to backpack. This is one of the constant conflicts that we have, not only a dispute between miners and timbermen on the one hand and wilderness proponents on the other, but between groups of wilderness users.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. While we hear frequently in these hearings that the majority of the people want wilderness, no one really knows that yet, and no one really knows the precise concept of wilderness that this legislation should embody. There was a fellow named Dewey one time who went to bed thinking the majority of the United States wanted him to be President. He woke up the next morning, and it just wasn't so.

Mr. BARING. If the gentleman will yield, do you think there are a few differences of opinion among the skiers, too?

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. No questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—The following supplemental statement subsequently was received.)

SUPPLEMENT TO STATEMENT FILED AT WILDERNESS BILLS HEARINGS, LAS VEGAS, NEV., BY ELLIOTT S. BARKER

A stockman testifying on the proposed wilderness preservation legislation at Las Vegas, Nev., hearings stated in effect that a wilderness system was unnecessary and the proposed legislation undesirable because, he said, only about half of 1 percent of the people of the United States use such areas. However, he thought they were quite important for grazing of livestock. This witness, as all stockmen that I have heard testify on the subject, gingerly overlooked the fact that only three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the cattle of the United States graze on wilderness, wild, and primitive areas. In other words, there are 17 times as many people using the wilderness areas as there are cattle.

By opposing the wilderness system it would seem that a greater value is being placed on grazing for 1 cow than on the spiritual, mental, and physical recreational benefits derived from wilderness experience by 17 humans. Actually there are only 583 stockmen who hold permits to graze livestock on wilderness and primitive areas, which is about three ten-thousands of 1 percent of the people of the United States.

There are 97 million cattle and 33 million sheep in the United States for a total of 130 million head of livestock. Of these only 33,000 cattle and 175,000 sheep graze on the wilderness, wild, and primitive areas and that only for short summer periods. Stockmen convey the impression that grazing will be prohibited contrary to a special provision in all the bills. But even if it were prohibited can it be argued that use by one cow or sheep would outweigh the use by three human beings? That's not reasonable.

Likewise, the miners, oil and gas people greatly exaggerate any possible setback that could occur to those industries by passage of H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9520. in exploitation of natural resources that belong to all the people and not to them. The national park system is now closed to their operations, and the national forest wilderness system embraces only about 3 percent of the total public lands available to them for exploitation. If or when they shall have exhausted the mineral resources of the 97 percent of public lands open to them will be time to consider the necessity of development of those resources, if any there be, on the wilderness areas.

One member of the committee at the hearings at Las Vegas seemed to be disturbed about hunting in wilderness areas not being consistent with wilderness concepts. It seems to me that hunting has always been an inherent part of wilderness. Four hundred years ago this continent was wilderness from coast

SRP05651

to coast. Hunting was the way of life. I have personally found evidence of primeval hunting in the form of arrow and spear points in wilderness areas in five different States.

Hunting provides sportsmen an opportunity found nowhere else to enjoy their sports in primeval environments. Their activities interfere little, if at all, with other wilderness users because the hunting seasons come late in the season after the summer and early fall recreation visitors have had their wilderness vacations.

Then it would be impossible to let big game increase and overstock the ranges without doing irreparable damage to the natural vegetative growth, running into unreasonable competition with livestock in the use of the forage, damaging the watershed and, eventually, destruction of the game herds themselves by destruction of their food supply. That has happened in more than one instance on other ranges.

Game herds must be reduced each year to keep them within the carrying capacity of the range, just the same as livestock must be kept down to a level compatible with the available forage resources. We can no longer maintain the larger predators in numbers sufficient to keep game in balance with its food supply. To attempt to do so would result in intolerable damage to livestock both on the wilderness areas and on adjacent ranges.

Hunters must on wilderness areas, as elsewhere, assume the role of the major predators under strict management regulations of the respective States. Wilderness areas are in no case anything like large enough to provide a complete ecological unit insofar as game and predatory animals are concerned. They respect no boundaries.

Then, too, it must be remembered that Indian hunters and the large predators shared with each other in the taking of game when this whole continent was a wilderness. Hunting is not only necessary but it seems to me a most desirable use of wilderness areas to supply hardy nimrods with the very highest type of sport in natural environments.

A few days ago a businessman of Santa Fe was offered an all-expense paid, 5-day trip to the New York World's Fair next June by his supply firm. He turned it down, saying, "I'd much prefer to go again on a camping and fishing trip into the Pecos wilderness and pay my own expenses."

We keep hearing the remark that only the rich can afford a wilderness trip. Two years ago, a 16-year-old girl from Albuquerque went on an 11-day wilderness trip in the Pecos wilderness. Cost was $240 with everything furnished but her bedroll. Last summer she said to me, "Mr. Barker, I'm going on the wilderness trip again this fall. I've saved my babysitting money and am going to pay for it myself." Unfortunately school activities prevented her going.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Chairman, I have here quite a number of statements addressed to this honorable committee, properly signed and sent to me for filing for the record. They come from over the country, from Alaska to Rhode Island and from Wisconsin to Texas. I would like to have permission to file these.

Mr. BARING. We will accept them subject to the scrutiny of the staff of the committee.

Mr. BARKER. That would be assumed, of course. I would like to submit them here.

You might wonder why I would have so many. As I say, I have ridden with over a thousand people in the wild areas. I have many, many other friends throughout the width and breadth of this country who would send them to me because they know of my interest in this.

Mr. BARING. You know it is not a popularity contest to see how many you can get. There is such a thing as a mimeograph machine, and we want to avoid repetition.

Mr. BARKER. But the most of these are individual letters.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The material follows:)

STATEMENT OF ERNEST H. HART, PRESIDENT OF THE GRANTS, N. MEX., CHAPTER OF THE NEW MEXICO WILDLIFE AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, GRANTS, N. MEX.

As president of the Grants, N. Mex., chapter of the New Mexico Wildlife and Conservation Association, I wish to represent the 65 members of this organization in voting for wilderness bill H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9162 with the following amendments: The Dingell bill, H.R. 9162, should be amended to conform to H.R. 9070. H.R. 9162 leaves out the last sentence of section 2(b)(4) of H.R. 9070 which provides "For the purpose of this Act, wilderness shall include the areas provided for in this Act and such other areas as shall be designated in accordance with its provisions." This should be restored.

Also, the last sentence of section 3(b) of H.R. 9162 should be amended to conform to H.R. 9070 that 10 years should be allowed as the time limit to include all wilderness areas and/or primitive areas, and that the wilderness should continue to be administered as such until Congress acts on the recommendation one way or the other.

Section 3(c) of 9070 provides for reviewing roadless portions of the national park systems of 5,000 or more contiguous acres and similar units of wildlife refuges and game ranges. H.R. 9162 sets no minimum size limit, and should be amended to conform to H.R. 9070 in this respect.

Bill H.R. 9162 omits end of section 4(a)(3) H.R. 9070, "All accommodations and installations within any national park or monument shall, furthermore, be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition." This should be included in H.R. 9162.

The last two sentences of section 4(b) of 9070 dealing with the above section only including the maintenance of the wilderness environment and its preservation to be kept in harmony for public purposes should also be included in H.R. 9162.

We, also, would like to see section 4(a)(2) kept in as a section of H.R. 9070 where the President determines the needs pertaining to prospecting, mining, and certain other activities. H.R. 9162 sets a 10-year limit which is not good as in 10 years the areas could be wrecked for wilderness areas.

We would, also, like to see sections 5(c) and 6 (a) and (b) kept in H.R. 9070. H.R. 9162 omits the Secretary of Interior who should be included with the Secretary of Agriculture.

STATEMENT OF BELEN GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, BELEN, N. MEX.

On behalf of the Belen Game Protective Association, representing the organized sportsmen of this area, this statement is presented for the record endorsing wilderness preservation and urging early passage of a good law to guarantee an adequate system of wilderness and primitive areas for the future.

We heartily endorsed S. 174 of the 87th Congress which passed the Senate by a big majority. We regretted to see it die in your committee. We then approved and endorsed S. 4 of the 88th Congress and were greatly disappointed that it too was held up in your committee. We felt and still feel very strongly that everything has been said for and against wilderness preservation that can be said at the dozen or more hearings that have been held, and that positive action by your committee is long overdue.

Now that some compromise bills have been introduced to meet one of the biggest objections that the committee chairmen have had to the bills mentioned, in regard to admission of primitive areas into the national forest wilderness system, we sincerely hope that your committee will very soon report one of these bills out for consideration by the whole House of Representatives.

We can endorse H. R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 as good bills and urge the committee to act favorably on one of them, and to do that at the present session of Congress. We are sorry that we cannot approve of H.R. 1962 because it leaves out a lot of necessary items and principally because it would give prospectors and miners a free hand to spoil wilderness characteristics of any area for a period of 10 years. We think that the time to protect wilderness, wild and primitive areas is now, and not 10 years from now. We do not believe it is consistent with wilderness protection to permit any commercial activity or development within the

SRP05653

areas. H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 provide for such as may be required in the future for emergencies or overriding national needs.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission studied the situation thoroughly and came up with strong recommendation for wilderness preservation legislation. President Kennedy strongly recommended it along the lines of S. 174 and S. 4. Every conservation organization in the Nation has endorsed it. President Johnson is for it. The vast majority of the American people are for it. It will mean so much for the welfare and training of our young folks now and in the future. So we can see no reason why the committee should not act favorably at a very early date, and we urge it to do so.

BORDER GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Deming, N. Mex., January 7, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: The Border Game Protective Association of Deming, N. Mex., is vitally interested in the introduction and passage of one of the wilderness bills to be presented during the current legislative session.

We feel that a wilderness bill is necessary to preserve some of our forested area in its natural state so that future generations may observe and enjoy these areas as they were originally created.

We recognize that there is a greater need now for developed recreation areas than ever before and this need will be increasing as time goes on and the leisure time of the people expanded. In addition to expanding our recreation areas we also feel a need for areas that have not been subjected to commercial use and development and where the natural beauty will be maintained. Such areas can only exist where roads are forbidden, concessionaires excluded, and where the natural resources are not exploited by persons who are interested in their own personal gain.

Now, as never before, we must realize that our forests are being commercialized and depleted, and our game is diminishing in direct proportion and this trend must be arrested now or we may reach the point of no recovery.

Of the three bills offered—S. 4, H.R. 9070, and H.R. 9162—we feel that S. 4 is the most acceptable and the bill that we feel should be given favorable consideration. However H.R. 9070 would not be unacceptable to our association. We do not feel that H.R. 9162 is acceptable in its present form since it throws the wilderness areas open to mining till December 31, 1973. Such a provision will act to put a deadline for providing access to these areas, which will, in turn, stimulate immediate encroachment by mining interests and by the time the bill becomes effective these areas will be so commercialized that their preservation as such will become futile. It will also mean that even though minerals of commercial quantities do not exist that persons may take advantage of mineral laws for erection of cabins, fenced areas and other uses incompatible with the purposes of a wilderness area.

The Border Game Protective Association, a sportsmen's organization of over 200 members, does therefore urge the favorable consideration and passage of either S. 4 or H.R. 9070.

Yours very truly,

CHAS. F. MCGRAW, *President.*

STATEMENT OF F. LOUIS HERNANDEZ, PRESIDENT, NEW MEXICO CONSERVATION EDUCATION COUNCIL

I am F. Louis Hernandez, 449 Ash NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex., and am an elementary school principal in the Albuquerque public school system. I am speaking for the New Mexico Conservation Educational Council, of which I am president.

We believe that the wilderness bill, in some form similar to H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9520, should be passed during the current year. Too much time has already been lost, and any attempts to further alter the bill will probably do more harm than good.

Our exploding population increase dictates that something be done quickly to preserve areas of wilderness for future generations before real estate and

SRP05654

commercial uses dominate so much territory that there will be little wilderness left to preserve.

Educational interests need areas of wilderness as a laboratory in which to study our natural resources and ways to better manage them for the greatest good to the greatest number over a long period of time.

These areas are also important for the study of all the natural sciences, for the training of our youth in camping and related activities, and for the appreciation of our national outdoor heritage.

Wilderness areas will have an increasingly important place in activities contributing to the improvement of physical fitness among our citizens.

Esthetic values offered by wilderness areas will be lost if they are not preserved. By this we mean that people need to get away from the pressures and tensions of city life. They need places where some degree of solitude can be attained—even in the rugged Bridger Wilderness Area of Wyoming my son and I, in 1962, met at least 3, and up to 15, people every day at distances of up to 16 miles from a road.

Natural resources preserved now in wilderness areas may well turn out to be of undreamed of value at some time in the future as new technological discoveries are made, then they could, by act of Congress, be put to emergency use.

FOUNDATION RESERVE INSURANCE CO., INC.,
Las Vegas, N. Mex., January 9, 1964.

Re wilderness bill hearings, January 13 and 14, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the record being made here today, I appeal to you to prepare for the Congress such legislation as will preserve a nonrenewable, natural national resource, our wilderness areas.

It is difficult to discern the logic of the disputant group or groups to the conservation principle under discussion. In fact, aside from pure materialism, there seems no credible reason for controversy.

The public can and will enjoy the aesthetic and recreative values of the wilderness for years on end. If at any time during the years it becomes a necessity for national emergency or defense to use the wilderness products, they will still be intact. We all use forest and mineral products every day, however, to take them from wilderness areas is to spoil those areas without hope of restoration. The products to be taken are presently available elsewhere than in the 1 or 2 percent of our land area under discussion and can be taken with minimal spoilage of one of our natural resources.

For emphasis I repeat the request that you gentlemen prepare legislation for the vote of Congress that will preserve our wilderness areas.

Sincerely,

R. C. MOORE,
First Vice President.

SAN MIGUEL COUNTY GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
January 9, 1964.

Re wilderness bill hearing, January 13 and 14, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the record evolving before this committee the San Miguel County Game Protective Association of Las Vegas, N. Mex., expresses the desire that your committee report favorably on H.R. 9070, H.R. 9520, or H.R. 9162 if amended consistent with the wilderness concept.

Our position is rather simple in that we feel the public interest will be better served by preservation of a nonrenewable natural resource than by acquiescence in its desecration by commercial exploitation on a one-time basis.

Our local organization is 190 strong and all of us urged that you please assist in the enactment of such legislation as will preserve wilderness areas in their natural state.

Sincerely,

R. C. MOORE, *Secretary*

SRP05655

STATEMENT OF CAP PARKINSON, PRESIDENT, SAN MIGUEL COUNTY AREA DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.

The San Miguel County Area Development Committee passed a resolution at a meeting on January 2, 1964, urging passage of legislation now before Congress to preserve wilderness areas in the United States. The committee specifically approved the provisions of H.R. 9070 or similar legislation that will protect wilderness areas from depredation by the exploitation of natural resources in these areas.

This committee has been in existence since adoption of the ARA legislation in 1960. One of our primary interests has been the orderly development of recreational opportunities in northern New Mexico in an effort to improve the economy of this area. We believe the wilderness areas now in existence are valuable assets to this area, as they offer unique opportunities for people to enjoy the forests and unspoiled scenery which are the only remaining evidence of the natural state of the land our forefathers settled. These wilderness areas cannot be restored once they are destroyed. These are irreplaceable parts of our heritage, and we urge Congress to adopt legislation at this time to preserve permanently the few remaining wilderness areas.

STATEMENT OF J. H. HANNAH, PRESIDENT, LAS VEGAS RIFLE AND REVOLVER CLUB, INC., LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.

It is my pleasure to submit for the record on behalf of the Los Vegas Rifle & Revolver Club, and the Las Vegas Junior Rifle Club members.

We, both junior and senior club members, numbering 40 senior members and 16 junior members, have discussed at our regular club meetings the proposed wilderness preservation legislation. We wholeheartedly endorse and urge passage of H.R. 9070, or equally effective wilderness legislation that will preserve for our future generations enjoyment of unspoiled areas in their primitive state. We are of the opinion that it is our heritage and the heritage of our future generations to have and enjoy these areas as they were and have remained since before our forefathers settled the North American Continent. H.R. 9162 would be acceptable only if certain portions were amended. We do not believe that the mining activities provisions are in concurrence with the concept of wilderness areas.

We recognize the importance to our Nation's economy and that of the individual States of the lumbering, livestock, and mining industries. We also respect the rights of those engaged in these industries to defend their interests. We feel with great concern that unless something is done in the immediate future by our Legislature to permanently preserve these wilderness and primitive areas that they will become forever lost to us and our future offspring.

The rapid growth and expansion in all fields within our Nation prompted the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to point out in its January 1962 report and recommend that "Congress should enact legislation providing for the establishment and management of certain primitive areas as wilderness areas."

It is essential that prompt and effective action be taken to preserve them for their cultural, scientific, recreational, and inspirational values. Once destroyed, restoration can never be made to their original state.

We of the Las Vegas Rifle & Revolver Club wholeheartedly endorse and respectfully request passage of H.R. 9070 or similarly purposeful and effective wilderness preservation legislation at the earliest possible date.

NEW MEXICO PACKING CO., INC.,
Carlsbad, N. Mex., January 8, 1964.

Re wilderness bills, hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: Would like to make this statement in regard to the preservation of the wilderness.

I personally feel that bill H.R. 9520 is adequate in all respects and certainly due your sincere consideration.

R. N. BRADLEY,
President and General Manager.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Truth or Consequences, N. Mex., January 8, 1964.

Re wilderness bills, hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, January 13 and 14, 1964
Las Vegas, Nev.

The Sierra County Wildlife and Conservation Association strongly urge the passage of H.R. 9520.

Sincerely,

L. C. "PAT" OWEN, *President.*

STATEMENT OF CURRY COUNTY GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, CLOVIS, N. MEX.

The Curry County Game Protective Association on behalf of its 300 members strongly endorses a national policy of maintaining an adequate system of wilderness areas for the benefit of present and future generations. Especially should we think of the welfare of our children and their children after them by preserving for them these unspoiled areas of scenic beauty and grandeur. It is necessary that there be preserved areas of this kind where it is possible to escape from the stresses and tensions of modern life. They cannot long survive without good, sound legislation to protect them from commercialization.

We have no mountains in our plains country, and therefore, we doubly appreciate the privilege of an occassional trip into wilderness country in unspoiled primeval environment. Such areas provide habitat for wildlife and fish in natural condition where sportsmen can enjoy their recreation and sport in untrammelled environments as no where else. For youngsters there is no greater preventative for juvenile delinquency than regular trips to the God-given wilderness country.

The Curry County Game Protective Association strongly urges early and favorable consideration of H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9520. Action by your committee seems to us to be long overdue.

STATEMENT OF STATE GAME COMMISSION OF NEW MEXICO

The New Mexico State Game Commission has long favored the establishment and preservation of a system of wilderness and wild areas adequate to serve the present and future needs of the American people.

With the expanding population in urban areas, the demand for recreation in the back country away from roads, blaring noises, glaring lights, and to escape the tensions and stresses of modern civilization is increasing rapidly. It seems to the commission that we should save enough such areas in time, rather than save too little too late.

Naturally, we are much interested in providing various types of hunting and fishing for the public. We find that there are a great many sportsmen who like best to hunt and fish in the back country; and that wilderness areas serve that purpose to the optimum degree. There is an extra thrill, pleasure, and satisfaction in hunting and fishing in uncrowded, pristine conditions. We feel that we are obligated to provide this opportunity.

We feel that the primitive areas of the National Forest Wilderness System are highly important. Therefore, we hope legislation that will permit their admission to the system as wilderness areas will be most liberal.

In considering the several bills before the committee, we strongly favor H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520; and sincerely trust that they may be given favorable consideration. We regret that we cannot support H.R. 9162 because of several omissions, but particularly because of the provisions giving prospectors and miners free run of the whole wilderness system for 10 years. That we feel is not justified nor is it consistent with wilderness preservation.

We appreciate the opportunity this committee has given us of presenting this statement of our views on this important subject.

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Los Alamos, N. Mex., December 30, 1963.

Re wilderness bills hearings.

CHAIRMAN, INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Los Alamos chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America is very much in favor of bills S. 4 and H.R. 9070 and strongly urges that positive action be taken by the Congress in 1964.

Sincerely,

JESSE G. WHITE, Jr.,
President, Los Alamos Chapter.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *December 31, 1963.*

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We sincerely request permission to have a representative from our organization to testify for the passage of a wilderness bill at the wilderness bills hearings to be held in Las Vegas, Nev., in January 1964. And if our organization is unable to send a representative, we should appreciate having our comments filed for the record.

We strongly recommend that consideration be given to the passage of a wilderness bill as soon as possible in order that the areas under consideration may be protected from the destructive elements of mining and its related facilities such as exploration, drilling, smelting or processing operations, or the building of transmission lines, waterlines and telephone lines. (We support H.R. 9070.) And further, we feel that wilderness areas should be devoted to the public multiple uses such as recreational, scientific, educational, historical, scenic, watershed protection, wildlife, and recreation.

Your earnest consideration of our interest in our wilderness areas will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CARLSBAD SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
J. G. SHULDA, *Secretary.*

STATEMENT OF WESLEY ADAMS, MOUNTAIN VIEW RANCH, COWLES, N. MEX.

I am Wesley Adams, of Cowles, N. Mex. I am the lessee and operator of the Mountain View Guest Ranch which is situated at the end of the road at the principal entrance to the Pecos Wilderness Area. This ranch is the largest of the several resorts and outfitters for horseback riding and pack-in trips into the adjacent wilderness area.

I keep about 100 saddle and pack horses, and the several other outfitters in this immediate vicinity together have about the same number. All summer long there are strings of people going back into the wilderness areas to ride, hike, climb the peaks, camp, take pictures and fish. On weekends every available horse will be taken. Many go for longer periods from a few days to 10 days. Some backpack, or hike with pack horse to carry camp equipment.

Besides the many other trips that I outfit for, each year I am the outfitter for an 11-day trip with from 20 to 30 guests from all over the country and all walks of life on the famous trip sponsored by the American Forestry Association. During deer season and the two or three elk seasons there will be from 200 to 400 hunters at a time back in the wilderness. It is a most popular area and being a wilderness is what makes it so.

The very fact that it is there makes the nearby developed campgrounds, guest ranches, and summer homes all the more attractive, popular, and much more valuable. There are perhaps a dozen other trail entrances into the wilderness area, but Cowles on the Pecos River is by far the most popular.

The value of the area to the American public for outdoor recreation—horseback riding, hiking, pack-in and backpack trips, camping, picture taking, youth training, scientific and educational purposes, and hunting and fishing would be difficult to estimate in dollars. But the fact that over 10,000 persons annually use this one wilderness area alone for one or more of the above stated purposes, well establishes the fact that its value as a wilderness area is, indeed, very high.

These established facts conclusively refute the claims of some wilderness opponents that only a few people are able financially or physically to use wilderness areas. My observation over a period of years right on the job is that any person between 7 and 70 who is in average physical condition can and, in fact, do use the wilderness areas. The cost is so low that anyone who can afford to go on a vacation anywhere can go on a wilderness trip.

Besides the abovementioned uses this wilderness, as is the case with most others also, has a very high value for watershed purposes. It yields an acre-foot of water for every acre of land within its boundaries for beneficial use in the valleys below. The fact that it is a wilderness insures the very best watershed protection and guarantees a steady flow of clear, clean water of highest quality for fishing, municipal, and irrigation uses.

Many small rancher-farmers around the perimeter of the forest summer graze modest numbers of cattle, and a few sheep, in this wilderness area, as is done in others also, to supplement their low income from the outside properties. In fact I personally have an interest in a nice bunch of cattle that graze there. I have no complaint about the grazing situation nor do I hear any from others.

I have given the foregoing facts to show that wilderness areas involve and provide many uses, and to show that wilderness is not a single use as many have claimed. Also I have presented facts to show that wilderness is not for just a few rich and hardy people as is often charged by opponents of wilderness preservation. It is, to my personal knowledge, for the average American citizen. In fact we have had several foreigners on wilderness trips. One, a famous doctor from Zurich, Switzerland, came just to make the 11-day trail ride.

It is my considered conclusion that wilderness areas are indispensable to the welfare of the American people. That is true now and will be even more so in the future. As the metropolitan and other urban areas become more crowded day by day the need for a place to go to get away from the stress and tension of those surroundings will grow proportionately. There is no escaping that fact, so let's use a little foresight and save an adequate system of wilderness, wild and primitive areas now before it is forever too late.

The Forest Service, or should I say the national forest wilderness, wild and primitive area system is in dire need of complete protection right now against all commercialization that would affect their wilderness quality and character in any way. All lumbering, mining, developed camp grounds, roads and the like should be prohibited from today on. We cannot afford to wait 10 years or even a year to stop it all. Those are not my sentiments alone, but represent the sentiments of just about every one of the thousands of people I have come in contact with in my operations just outside a wilderness area, and miriads of trips within it.

Your committee has before it numerous wilderness preservation bills, and I am not familiar with all of them. Senate bill 4, which was passed by the U.S. Senate is a good bill and would serve the purpose very well I think. The principal objection of your committee to it has been changed as a compromise in H.R. 9070 and 9520 to meet your objections. I see nothing wrong with these two measures and sincerely urge that this honorable committee report them out of committee at this session of Congress for consideration by the whole House of Representatives. In my humble opinion that is only right and fair to give all the elected Representatives of the people a chance to debate, amend if desired, and vote on this or any other bill that is so obviously in the public interest.

I regret to say that H.R. 9162 in its present form is entirely inconsistent with wilderness preservation. To give prospectors and miners a free hand to do as they please in wilderness, wild and primitive areas for 10 years could do irreparable damage. It is deficient in other respects also and leaves out some important items.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
Wilderness Bill Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: I am an electrical engineer and Boy Scoutmaster.

Scouting is an organization for doing outdoor living for real. Once a month all year round I see that boys go out for 2 days and longer trips using wilderness areas. These trips are mostly with back packs.

Once a year we make a trip across the Pecos wilderness with back packs on a trip of over 65 miles. Approximately 35 boys make these back pack trips with age range from 11 to 15 years old. The cost for each boy is $10 each. I hope

to see this program expanded to 500 boys per summer and more. The purpose of these trips is to have boys become confident by doing real wilderness living with their own two hands and feet and very primitive equipment. They cannot gain this real self confidence from the forest when they have a logging road to walk on. The trip now has the security of a road and is no longer a real wilderness trip.

This is one of the hundreds of reasons the wilderness must be preserved in a primitive state.

Your support of H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 is most respectfully and urgently solicited.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. PHILLIPS,
Scoutmaster, Troop 23, Santa Fe.

P.S.—Enclosed are two booklets on "Scouting in Santa Fe," covering our program of scouting in the wilderness.

STATEMENT OF UNION COUNTY WILDLIFE & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, CLAYTON, N. MEX.

This statement is made on behalf of the Union County Wildlife & Conservation Association of Clayton, N. Mex., leading conservation organization in the northern part of the State. One of the objectives of this organization is to harmonize interests of sportsmen and conservationists with those of the ranchers and farmers. It is a give-and-take program, and we are proud of the progress we have made.

At our annual wild meat banquet each member brings a farmer or rancher as his guest. We get acquainted there, talk over mutual problems, and renew friendships when we go hunting on their properties.

This organization is much interested in preservation of an ample wilderness system to meet the needs of ourselves and our children after us. While wild, wilderness and primitive areas in the national park system and in national wildlife refuges are important, we are particularly interested in the national forest wilderness areas. They are in greatest need of protection against ruinous commercialization, and are available for recreational use in primitive environments.

As stated, we try to work out our problems and projects on a give-and-take basis, and we can see no reasonable obstacle to settling the wilderness controversies on the same basis. We are willing to give up 92 percent of the national forest area for commercialization for oil, lumbering, mining, developed recreation facilities, summer homes, water and power projects, roads, and livestock grazing, all under appropriate regulation, of course, while asking to take only 8 percent of the forest area for wilderness purposes. Can any fair-minded person consider that proposition unreasonable?

We believe to ask that only 8 pecent of the national forest area be reserved for wilderness purposes is not at all unreasonable. How can it be when we consider the fact that wilderness includes a variety of uses and serves multiple purposes? All important watershed protection and wilderness go hand in hand. Wilderness areas serve admirably as grand, outdoor, natural history museums for scenic, scientific, and educational purposes. They provide the highest type of beneficial and enjoyable recreation consisting of trial riding, mountain hiking, backpacking, pack-in trips, camping, and picture taking, all in inspiring and refreshing primeval environment. Wilderness provides wildlife and fish habitat where, as nowhere else, hunters and fishermen can enjoy their chosen sport in pristine, uncrowded surroundings, unspoiled by man.

No, indeed, wilderness is not a single use but serves many important purposes. One of these is the grazing of livestock. We cannot understand why livestock organizations continue to oppose the proposed wilderness legislation. Their use of the areas is specifically protected in every bill. We know that the great majority of individual stockmen in our country do not oppose the wilderness preservation proposals.

Our organization and the State organization, with which it is affiliated, since 1958 has consistently supported proposed wilderness legislation because it is necessary that the system established by executive order of the Secretary of Agriculture be given a firm foundation in law. Otherwise these areas will be nibbled and whittled away by commercial interests and their primeval wilderness condition destroyed. That would be disastrous for future generations. We owe it to our children to leave for their benefit some of God's country as He created it.

We felt that S. 174 of the 87th Congress was a fair and reasonable bill. The Senate agreed with us by a vote of 78 to 8. We were keenly disappointed when it died in your committee. We endorsed S. 4 of the 88th Congress, and felt we could not be far wrong when the Senate passed it 72 to 12. We believe that S. 4 is reasonable and fair and that its provisions for dealing with primitive areas would save Congress a lot of precious time while still giving Congress full opportunity to reject any area it might consider undesirable for wilderness purpose.

It is our understanding that your committee objected to that procedure, and that H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 and others were introduced as a compromise to provide for affirmative action by Congress upon each primitive area recommended by the President for wilderness status.

Consistent with Union County Wildlife and Conservation Association's give-and-take policy we are agreeable to this affirmative procedure and we do endorse both H.H. 9070 and H.R. 9520 as a reasonable and adequate measure to provide and protect a good wilderness system.

But in H.R. 9162 there are deficiencies and omissions that render it unacceptable to us. In addition section 4(d)(2) giving prospectors and miners a free run in all wilderness areas for 10 years is completely inconsistent with wilderness preservation. The wilderness characteristics of these areas could be ruined under that provision. If miners are given this special privilege other commercial interests will demand it also. H.R. 9070 and 9520 make ample provision for prospecting, mining and other uses where the Nation will be better served by permitting them than it would by their denial.

Wilderness needs protection of law and needs it now, not 10 years from now, is our firm belief. We respectfuly urge that this committee report out of committee either H.R. 9070 or 9520 or amend 9162 to correct its deficiencies and omissions, particularly the 10-year mining provision, and give the whole House of Representatives an opportunity to debate, amend and vote upon a wilderness preservation bill.

We appreciate the opportunity this committee has given us to appear and convey to it the sentiments of our people on this important issue.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND FISH,
Santa Fe, January 10, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Land Subcommittee,
Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Las Vegas, Nev.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Personnel of the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish highly endorse the establishment and preservation of a system of wilderness and wild areas to serve the present and future recreation needs of the American people.

There is much that we could say concerning the highly desirable aesthetic and recreational aspects of certain remote areas which should be preserved in as nearly as possible their original primitive state.

We, as game and fish managers, are primarily interested in serving the sporting public with desirable hunting and fishing conditions. We find an increasingly large number of sportsmen who particularly enjoy the opportunity of hunting or fishing in wilderness-type areas under wilderness conditions.

We have studied quite closely the several bills before the committee. For several reasons we strongly favor H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520.

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity of presenting this statement on this important matter to this committee. We very much hope that the two abovementioned bills may be given favorable consideration.

LADD S. GORDON, *Director.*

TIANO SPORTING GOODS CO.,
Santa Fe, N. Mex., January 7, 1964.

Re Wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.:

The wilderness bills are of particular interest to us who live near one. Controversies that have occurred have been argued pro and con. Hardly without exception our customers are in favor of wilderness bills S. 4, H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520. They do not want H.R. 9162 unless amended.

To us the wilderness is a way of life; our ancestors knew it and loved it. With life and the world becoming more and more complicated, a greater than ever need is created. Knowing the love for the great outdoors of the American people, our open lands are rapidly being commercialized to the point where the average man has nowhere he can go.

The wilderness is one place where one can think and breathe and behold God's work. We must preserve these lands for our future generations. We respectfully submit it.

Yours very truly,

JOHN E. TIANO, *President.*

Re wilderness hearing.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
Interior and Insular Committee,
Las Vegas, Nev.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We , who live in this arid region—where most of the timber has long disappeared and erosion taken over—keenly appreciate the work being done to preserve, in its natural state, the areas still untouched by commercial enterprises. Water is a most precious article in this part of the West and it is extremely vital that we protect the watersheds.

The wilderness areas are the most economical use which can be made of those lands, while preserving for future generations the heritage which is ours.

Our young people need these wilderness areas. Only there can they find wildlife in its truly natural setting. They can learn to respect and love the wild animals. They can discover the simple pleasures of the things they see, hear, and smell as they walk through the forests and develop a reverence for all growing things. The lad whose big thrill is a jaunt in the woods with his gun and dog, isn't the kind of boy who comes before the juvenile court.

Our adult people need the wilderness areas away from the tensions of modern life. They can breathe the fresh air of the high altitudes and virgin timberlands. It provides a pleasant means of keeping physically fit. It offers a richer, fuller, more healthful way of living to anyone who wants to take advantage of these recreational areas.

Our wildlife is vanishing because of the loss of the wildland habitat and the ever-increasing encroachment of private and commercial interests. We must plan now to preserve these areas for future generations.

It is wrong to assume that preservation of our natural resources should be the concern of the few. It is important to every American. In the past, the persons who represent special-interest groups and provide intensive lobbying have prevented the Congress from voting on this legislation. Now is the time for action.

Respectfully submitted.

MCKINLEY COUNTY WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION.

STATEMENT OF A. W. "BUD" BODDY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALASKA SPORTSMEN'S COUNCIL, JUNEAU, ALASKA

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is A. W. "Bud" Boddy, my address is 939 W. 10th Street, Juneau, Alaska. My occupation is superintendent of the Alaska Laundry & Cleaners, Juneau, Alaska. I am executive director of the Alaska Sportsmen's Council, Alaska's only statewide conservation organization. Alaska Sportsmen's Council is an affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation.

I appreciate this opportunity to comment further on the proposed wilderness legislation. The Alaska Sportsmen's Council has consistently supported the proposed wilderness legislation such as S. 4 and H.R. 9070 and other similar bills before the Congress of the United States. It is our firm belief that there is a pressing need for immediate passage of legislation which would establish a National Wilderness Preservation System in order to assure present and future generations of an opportunity to enjoy wilderness surroundings and a wilderness experience and to derive benefits from such an experience not only physically but morally and spiritually. Since the founding of our Nation until quite recently most of us have had the opportunity to enjoy a wilderness experience almost continually. With an expanding population and a rapidly developing

nation, this opportunity has rapidly disappeared and to many is no longer a possibility except in areas far removed from their place of residence. It has often been said, and truly so, that the American people were originally confronted with the problem of turning a raw land or wilderness into a productive and prosperous nation and in this endeavor we have certainly been successful. It would appear now that our next real responsibility is that of setting aside or preserving some of the true wilderness areas still existent primarily in the western and northern regions of our Nation.

In reviewing many statements made both pro and con in the Senate and House of Representatives, it would appear that the majority of the Members are in accord with the philosophy of wilderness preservation. The method by which this can be accomplished seems to be the one remaining step to be taken. Various members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee have contended that proposed legislation such as S. 4 and H.R. 9070 did not give proper recognition to the responsibility placed upon the Congress of the United States for the management and protection of the public lands. Certainly no one would argue with those who contend that the Congress has this responsibility. The disagreements or arguments seem to center around the establishment of wilderness areas around certain areas presently set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior. Primarily the disagreements would seem to center around primitive areas and other areas within the national forests. It would seem that the logical approach or solution to this would be passage of wilderness legislation with provisions which would assure temporary protection or recognition for the areas presently encompassed within these disputed areas with the asurance that immediate and positive action would be taken by the Congress to review the various areas and to take early action in establishing them or bringing them under the wilderness system if it was deemed to be in the broad public interest and within the intent to establish a wilderness preservation system. H.R. 9070 recently introduced by the Honorable John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, seems to offer a reasonable and workable solution to the settlement of the differences which have been existent to date and which have prevented final action on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in behalf of the Alaska Sportsmen's Council, I urge you to give early and favorable consideration to the enactment of the proposed wilderness legislation in order that we may fufill our obligations as present custodians of this national heritage.

Mr. Chairman, since it was impossible for me to be in attendance at the time hearings were held, I have asked Mr. Elliott Barker to present this statement in my behalf. I sincerely request that it be made a part of the official record.

DENVER, COLO., *January 3, 1964.*

Re wilderness bills hearings.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: We feel that wilderness areas and primitive areas must be preserved for present and future generations. We protest the encroachment of commercial interests and developments on our fast-dwindling open space.

We strongly urge that H.R. 9070 be brought out of committee and favorably acted upon. We believe the Saylor and Dingle bills are in the interests of the people of this Nation.

Very truly yours,

Miss EVELYN RUNNETTE.

P.S.—Member: American Alpine Club, Colorado Mountain Club, Southern Rocky Mountain Ski Association.

STATEMENT OF M. E. CLARK, SECRETARY, IOWA WILDLIFE FEDERATION, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

For the past several years the Iowa Wildlife Federation has gone on record through adopted resolutions as supporting sound legislation and the passage thereof in favor of the preservation of our wilderness. We also want strong safeguards against greedy minorities who can see only the "dollar sign" and not the esthetic and recreational values.

It is the contention of the Iowa Wildlife Federation that now is the time to press passage of this sound legislation so the generation not yet born may have the experience of enjoying what is left of our fast evaporating open spaces.

When a person who lives in a "have not" State travels to these most wonderful areas he fully realizes the full measure of God's work. It gives him a reverence obtainable nowhere else in creation, not even in a house of worship. I know, for I have had that experience.

It is the contention of the Iowa federation that no minority group is in such dire need for mineral resources, petroleum resources, timber resources or grazing areas that the God-given heritage of the vast population of this great country must be handed over to them at their expense.

Please be assured that this federation will do all in its power to prevent the theft and rape of the heritage of the people of the United States.

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. CRAIGHEAD, PRESIDENT, MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION

I am John Craighead from Missoula, Mont. I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Montana Wilderness Association.

The Montana Wilderness Association has consistently supported bills to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. Our organization testified in favor of the Senate-passed act, S. 4, with House bills like it. We recognize the many complexities and the conflicts of interest inherent in establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System. We further recognize that the revised bills introduced this fall by House sponsors were designed to meet objections raised by the House Interior Committee members to the measure (S. 4) passed by the Senate.

We want and will support a wilderness bill that realizes the essential objectives in wilderness preseravtion based on a national policy and a program to put the policy into effect. The revised measure, H.R. 9070, introduced by the Interior Committee member, John P. Saylor, November 7, 1963, best meets these objectives. We wish to go on record in support of H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9520 if this later bill more nearly meets objections raised by the House Interior Committee members concerning earlier wilderness bills.

I wish this to be made a part of the official records.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. WEISEL, MISSOULA, MONT.

I am George F. Weisel, of Missoula, Mont., and desire to make the following statement on behalf of the Western Montana Fish & Game Association:

The Western Montana Fish & Game Association has strongly urged the passage of S. 4 to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. We are located close to two of the largest areas that would be affected by passage of such legislation—the Bob Marshall and the Selway-Bitterroot. We believe that these and other areas are endangered and must be protected for our present and future welfare.

This association supports other wilderness bills that meet the prime objectives for wilderness preservation. We consider the revised measure H.R. 9070 introduced by Interior Committee member, John P. Saylor, to be a favorable bill.

We wish to go on record in support of H.R. 9070.

We wish this to be made a part of the official record.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. BORZEA, ROCK SPRINGS, WYO.

My name is John C. Borzea, 1306 Kimberly, Rock Springs, Wyo. I am the president of the Wyoming Conservation Association, a statewide organization composed of affiliated conservation clubs throughout the State of Wyoming. Our prime interest is the conservation and wise use of our natural resources.

Our organization has submitted statements for the record to all of the many hearings held in recent years pertaining to the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System.

The Wyoming Conservation Association highly favors Senate bill 4 and H.R. 8070. We believe that these bills have been watered down to the point where they meet the approval of most of the special interest groups previously opposed to wilderness legislation.

We solicit the support of the Members of the House of Representatives to act favorably on legislation to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a statement to your fine committee, in behalf of the Wyoming Conservation Association.

STATEMENT OF G. M. COTTREL, PRESIDENT, RHODE ISLAND WILDLIFE FEDERATION

The Rhode Island Wildlife Federation emphatically urges immediate and favorable consideration of wilderness bill H.R. 9520 because it considers this the most timely and significant consideration act now before Congress.

JANUARY 9, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
Wilderness Bill Hearings, Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: About 15 years ago, immediately following my retirement from the U.S. Navy, I settled on a small ranch in New Mexico. Over these years I have observed many changes in the towns and countryside local to my residence, changes resulting from the population growth and the increasing mechanization of society. Such changes are perhaps inevitable. We may regret the fact that the area in which we have elected to live cannot retain all those aspects which weighted our choice, but we tend to accept.

There is, however, another face to the impingement of population pressure and mechanization on our country which I believe should not be accepted except under conditions of extreme emergency. That is the encroachment into a portion of our wilderness areas of influence tending to erode their pristine qualities and aspects.

Passage of a good wilderness bill seems to be essential to preserve for us, and more especially for those who follow, a fundamental and necessary part of our human heritage which, once lost, can never be recovered.

Your support of H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 is most respectively and urgently solicited.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. VAN METER,
Commander, U.S. Navy (Retired).

JANUARY 9, 1964.

Re wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: We, the undersigned members of the Albuquerque Chapter of the New Mexico Wildlife & Conservation Association, sincerely believe that of all proposed wilderness legislation, H.R. 9520 offers the best method of preserving the all too few remnants of our great outdoors. A sound program for wilderness preservation is a must if we are to insure the enjoyment of roaming an unspoiled forest for our coming generations. We sincerely urge that you not be swayed by the cries of those who would sacrifice the heritage of our children for personal gain and that H.R. 9520 be given a favorable report by the committee.

Respectfully submitted.

(There were 15 signatures.)

 SRP05665

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *January 9, 1964.*

Re wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: All citizens of our land who have observed the unspoiled, uncommercialized, and natural beauty of our national parks and wilderness areas realize the importance of preserving these areas in their natural state.

The pressure of increasing population plus pressures exterted by vested-interest groups will result in rapid depletion of these wilderness area resources if adequate legislation is not promptly enacted to prevent this from happening.

We hereby affirm our strong support of adequate legislation introduced to protect wilderness areas and the wildlife, water, and forests lying therein. Senate bill 4 and House bill 9520 are good examples of necessary legislation. We stand in favor of preservation of wilderness areas for all future Americans.

JAMES H. HINES.

JANUARY 8, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearings.
Las Vegas, Nev.:

I should like to go on record in favor of adequate legislation to establish and maintain the wilderness system. There are many reasons why I favor a permanent wilderness system, and I will briefly mention a few of the most important.

(1) Primarily, I consider the wilderness areas to be a natural resource which is fast disappearing from the country. They are the last vestige of the original continent, and I feel that future generations should have the privilege of sharing the pleasures to be obtained by maintaining the wilderness in its original condition.

(2) I am a frequent and regular visitor to the Pecos wilderness and find it to be a haven and a refuge from the everyday pressures of business and social activities and everyday worries of earning a living. This area, to me, is a sanctuary where I may relax and enjoy nature to the fullest.

(3) Even though opponents to the wilderness system minimize damage to the area, even a small encroachment such as a road or mining and timbering permits will ultimately lead to destruction of the area. These areas must be maintained in their original untouched condition for present use as well as for future generations.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES R. WHERRITT,
Santa Fe, N. Mex.

STATEMENT OF E. E. FISH, TAIBAN, N. MEX.

I am E. E. Fish, of Taiban, N. Mex. I am a farmer and rancher in the high plains country. I am strongly in favor of wilderness preservation, and I am sure that the great majority around here are also.

I regret to note that many of the livestock organizations are opposing the proposed wilderness legislation. Why they should do so is hard to understand because the bills all provide that grazing on wilderness areas shall be permitted to continue wherever it has been established on the effective date of the legislation. I am sure that most of us ranchers are not opposed to wilderness preservation.

I feel very strongly that we should save enough of these unspoiled areas now before it is too late. Once destroyed the wilderness characteristics cannot be restored. Let's save enough in time rather than too little too late. It should be borne in mind that the national forest wilderness system includes only 8 percent of the total forest area, and that these areas are the last of wilderness-type country. We must save them.

I endorsed S. 174 and S. 4 as good bills. But I can compromise on H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9520 and hereby do so.

SRP05666

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 9, 1964.*

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIRS: Just a few short years ago public recreational areas accessible by roads provided necessary relaxation for those desiring it. These same now thoroughly overcrowded facilities are far from relaxing.

The increasing need for mental relaxation and physical strength will increase use of wilderness areas. Professionals, scientists, businessmen, etc., are learning the necessity and satisfaction of crossing from civilization over a ridge to areas completely at peace with nature.

Unless we make every effort to protect such areas, soon they will become overcrowded and cease to exist.

Sincerely yours,

FOSTER H. HYATT, AIA.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 8, 1964.*

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I am Theodore R. Gordan, Jr., of Santa Fe, N. Mex., an engineer in private practice.

This letter is written in support of wilderness and wild area legislation. Any legislation leaving the wilderness and wild areas open to commercial development, that is, any form of exploitation that requires the installation of roads, powerlines, airstrips, or destruction of watersheds either through erosion, diversion, or pollution, is unacceptable to this voter.

Sincerely,

THEODORE R. GORDAN, Jr.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MAURICE TRIMMER, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

This is one small voice crying for the wilderness. If I never again have the opportunity to ride the wilderness trails I will always feel grateful for past trail rides and thankful that the wilderness areas were heretofore preserved. It would be a great loss to the United States and all its citizens if the wilderness bill is not passed. Aside from reasons of personal enjoyment—temporary escape from the mechanized world, the vastness of the land and sky pleasing eye and mind and spirit, not to mention the less esthetic pleasures of hunting and fishing—is the larger, more farsighted objective of preserving one place in this country that is inviolable; one area of virgin country that cannot be defaced by machines and structures, roads and careless picnickers.

Once the bars are let down, the strict laws guarding the sanctity of the wilderness revoked it would be devoured piece by piece by selfish interests till nothing is left but denuded forest land, slag heaps and tin cans. Our grandchildren—or maybe even our children—will have been denied the privilege of seeing some part of their country untouched, unspoiled.

I would like to see H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 passed but cannot go along with H.R. 9162 as it reads now for all those reasons stated above. It took eons for nature to form the wilderness. The damage done by 10 years of mining could be irreparable.

One small voice among many.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD S. BIBO, STATE PERSONNEL DIRECTOR, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

This is to establish my personal vital interest in favor of the wilderness system, and particularly bills H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520.

In our present rapid growth and population explosion, the wilderness areas are of vital importance to preserve for posterity the several wilderness areas throughout our country which can provide the many campers, hunters, and outdoor sportsmen with an everlasting opportunity to enjoy the forests' flora and fauna as God made them.

SRP05667

Furthermore, these areas provide Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts with much-needed campsites and opportunities to study the many important and interesting marvels of nature.

In view of the fact that my home is located in close proximity to the Gila Wilderness Area and has provided for me and many others the privilege of experiencing the pleasures of camping and hunting in an area which, without a wilderness system, would fast disappear from the face of our great country, I wholeheartedly support these bills.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LINDA LEE BURNSIDE, CAMINO CORRALES, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

This is to establish my vital personal interest in favor of the wilderness system, and particularly bills H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520.

I grew up on a ranch of some 30,000 acres and the innumerable accounts of my everyday adventures could fill several books. The freedom I enjoyed was so valuable and precious to me that I feel I have been very fortunate indeed to have had the privilege of growing up so very free.

After marrying, I moved to California and my children were born there. They were not as fortunate as I had been as a child—to have the wonderful freedom and fun of living in the country. However, my husband and I have made every effort to bring them in contact with the wonders of nature and the smell of clean mountain air, as found in the forests, campsites, etc., of both California and New Mexico.

To rob my two boys, and the millions of children like them throughout our Nation, of the sheer pleasure of our wilderness areas is much worse than a crime—it is a national disaster. Our juvenile delinquency rate in this Nation is alarming; millions of dollars are spent each year to try and help these young people—get them into the country, mountains—out of the crowded, dirty cities, with only overcrowded dingy parks to go to to rid themselves of the natural energy of youth.

Is it not the responsibility of every mother and father and citizen in the entire United States to support, preserve, and maintain our few remaining wilderness areas?

Can we allow anyone to exploit this precious possession which belongs to all of the American people?

It is not ours to exploit in this century but to preserve for all the future generations of Americans who will live in our land.

As we become more heavily populated, these wilderness areas will remain the only refuge left to "we the people" to enjoy and to use as God intended—to bring us closer to the wonders He has created for us.

If we, the American people, the parents, do not protect these wilderness areas now, our children and our children's children shall suffer irreparable damage—that cannot be undone.

I support these bills as a good American, a mother and a believer in the glory of our Lord and the wonderful gift of nature He gave to all of us.

BELEN, N. MEX., *January 6, 1964.*

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Wilderness Bills Hearings, Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: My name is Charles E. Seery and I am a salesman, selling sporting goods throughout New Mexico.

In the last 25 years I have seen many encroachments made on our recreation and primitive areas. Farsighted men were responsible for saving our Yellowstone National Park. Imagine what the park would like like today if selfish interests had taken over years ago. Millions have enjoyed the beauty and grandeur and millions yet to come.

So I urge you gentleman to preserve our national forest wilderness system for posterity. I urge the passage of bills S. 4 or H.R. 9162.

CHARLES E. SEERY.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *January 8, 1964.*

Re H.R. 9070.

PUBLIC LAND SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS.

GENTLEMEN: Recognizing the tremendous population explosion in the coming years, and the good heritage which has been handed down to this generation, which, in turn, must be handed down to future generations, I heartily urge and endorse the passage of the necessary legislation to preserve the wilderness areas.

Experience gained from other parts of the world where preservation of the wilderness areas has not been safeguarded should help to teach us the necessity of preserving for all times a portion of our wilderness areas.

Thanking you for your consideration of this highly important matter.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR L. WELSH.

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIRS: The undersigned hereby acknowledges approves, and supports Senate bill S. 4 and House bills H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520.

Also the undersigned does not approve or endorse in any manner House bill H.R. 9162.

Respectfully,

H. R. CAMPBELL, Jr.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
January 8, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Las Vegas Convention Center,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I certainly hope you are going to represent the overwhelming majority of the people of this country and come out promptly and decisively in favor of H.R. 9070 or some similar type of legislation to save the pitifully small portion of our country that still remains in its natural condition.

Please do not let yourselves be misled by any strongly financed and well organized commercial groups which might try to persuade you to prevent this

Sincerely,

L. A. WILLIAMSON.

SANTE FE, N. MEX., *January 7, 1964.*

Re wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I, James W. Surber, 209 Spruce Street, Santa Fe, N. Mex., wish to submit my statement for the record as opposing any legislation that would deprive all citizenry, present and future, of any portion of our wilderness areas (which represent only 8 percent of the total national forest area) and feel that legislation is necessary now to prevent these areas from being commercialized and to guarantee their preservation for our present and future generations.

I am alarmed that these scenic areas which provide such pleasures as hiking, horseback riding, camping, and picture taking, as well as habitat for fish and wildlife, and hunting and fishing, could be abolished and become despoiled of their inherent primitive environment. I cannot conceive that it is in the interest of our welfare to do anything to take away this comparatively small acreage which now remains in our great country.

I strongly urge that this committee report out of committee either of the pending bills, H.R. 9070 or 9520, which I feel provide adequate provisions for protection of our wilderness system, or amend H.R. 9162 to correct certain deficiencies such as the 10-year mining provision which I oppose, and enable the House of Representatives to debate, amend, and vote upon a wilderness preservation bill.

I deplore the fact that there are interests and opinions that make this letter necessary. I only hope that they will be defeated soundly and that you will find a way to establish these precious areas on a basis to guarantee perpetuation

SRP05669

of the existing wilderness system for the benefit of our present and future generations.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES W. SURBER.

JANUARY 9, 1964.

Re wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: All citizens of our land who have observed the unspoiled, uncommercialized and natural beauty of our national parks and wilderness areas realize the importance of preserving these areas in their natural state.

The pressure of increasing population plus pressures exerted by vested interest groups will result in rapid depletion of these wilderness area resources if adequate legislation is not promptly enacted to prevent this from happening.

We hereby affirm our strong support of adequate legislation introduced to protect wilderness areas and the wildlife, water, and foresis lying therein. Senate bill 4 and House bill 9520 are good examples of necessary legislation. We stand in favor of preservation of wilderness areas for all future Americans.

DAVID FROW.

STATEMENT OF LINDA ELMORE

My name is Linda Elmore. I live at 10428 Bellamak in Albuquerque, N. Mex. I am a further resident of El Paso, Tex. I am in my fifth year of Girl Scouts. I am glad we moved because now we are closer to the mountains and wilderness areas.

In 1958 my family took my sister and me on a trip deep into the Pecos wilderness. I can hardly wait to go again this summer.

I think these areas should be protected from miners, roadbuilders and lumbermen.

These areas are set aside for people who love the mountains and want to get away from it all. A law is needed to keep them forever untouched by civilization. They are more valuable for that than for anything else and so more people can enjoy them as I do.

STATEMENT OF TOMMY BARKER, UNIVERSITY PARK, N. MEX.

I am Tommy Barker, a student at the New Mexico State University where I am taking courses in forestry and wildlife management. That fact, quite naturally, focuses my attention on wilderness preservation for it affects both forestry and wildlife. I have been a user of wilderness areas just about ever since I got out of swaddling clothes, and I have given this subject a lot of thought.

I have noted that some make objections to wilderness because, they allege, it is a single use and there inconsistent with the multiple use administration policy of the U.S. Forest Service. Such allegations are either false propaganda or they are made in ignorance and a complete lack of information on what wilderness areas actually are.

Certainly not every acre or every square mile of national forest lands can be devoted to all the major uses. Each unit has its primary value—timber here, grazing there, wildlife, mining, summer homesites, developed recreation and watershed. There is usually a certain degree of overlapping of other uses with the primary use.

Wilderness is definitely not a single use, but instead serves many important purposes. Wilderness is unique in that it serves several highly important purposes to the highest degree at the same time without depletion of the resources. Watershed is the most important use of the great majority of wilderness and primitive areas. In fact water is the most important product of most of the nationl forests, and wilderness and primitive areas are the prime water-producing areas.

Wilderness preservaion is synonymous with good watershed management. At the same time it provides the very highest type of outdoor recreation—trail riding, mountain climbing, hiking, camping, backpacking and pack-in trips, hunting, fishing, picturetaking, etc., all in spiritually stimulating pristine environments found nowhere else.

Not everyone likes to use wilderness for recreation but, believe me, a great many people of all ages and all walks of life do. The mere fact that the wilderness is there makes nearby developed campsites, resorts, summer homes and the like all the more attractive and valuable.

We simply must save our few remaining unspoiled wilderness and primitive areas now, not next year or 10 years from now. We must have a balanced outdoor recreation program. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission lists wilderness or primitive areas as one of six major outdoor recreation resources. That's in the general report. Then that highly competent Commission devotes a 350-page 8 by 10 volume to the subject. It's that important.

Wilderness provides fish and wildlife habitat in a natural condition where nimrods and anglers have the rare opportunity to enjoy their sport, uncrowded, in a refreshing primeval environment. That appeals to many and I know from experience with companions of all ages that it is a most inspiring and satisfying recreational activity. One old man, a former State official, that I have ridden and camped with says there is nothing like it to get the cobwebs out of one's brain and rancor out of one's soul.

I have used wilderness areas within the national forests ever since I was a very little kid. My father and my grandparents took me on many unforgetable pack-in camping, hunting, and fishing trips. My Boy Scout and Explorer Scout companions and I have backpacked on many trips of from 2 days to a week. They were always most enjoyable but they would not have been had there been roads in the area. Another thing that appeals to me is that the cost of such trips is only about a dollar a day for food, and cost of the little equipment required would be amortized at about 25 cents a day.

Sometimes we hiked and led a packhorse with our equipment and food (one horse or mule for four boys), and the cost was only $2.50 per day each for horse and food. Then when we ride horseback and pack in we add $5 a day for the saddle horse. That brings the cost up to $7.50 or $8 per person per day. One cannot stay at a tourist court and eat two meals a day for that. Those who claim that only the rich can afford a wilderness trip simply do not know what they are talking about. They don't have to be hardy to do it either. Just the average Americans can and do enjoy recreation in the wilderness. I know grandmothers who regularly take their grandchildren on horseback and camping trips away back in the remote wilderness areas.

I must state also that none of the many boys I have hiked and backpacked with in the wilderness turned out to be juvenile delinquents nor ever got in trouble. Wilderness does things for young and old that makes them better citizens. We need more wilderness, not less.

Now as to the several bills pending before this committee. I thought Senate bills 174 and 4 were all right and hoped the House would pass them. But since it wasn't given a chance to vote on them I hope it will be given a chance to vote on either H.R. 9070 or one of the other very similar bills more recently introduced. But I can't go along with H.R. 9162 because it is not complete and particularly because of the provision giving miners a free hand to ruin the areas for a 10-year period. That just is not right.

We must save these wilderness and primitive areas for both our use and the use of those who come after us. The whole wilderness system needs protection against all kinds of commercialization, and it needs it now, not 10 years from now. Ten years' free run for miners and prospectors is simply unthinkable. There would then be, in many cases, nothing worth while left to protect.

I know how the young folks with whom I associate at college feel about it. They want wilderness preserved for use down through the ages for the many essential purposes, for the welfare of mankind, to which such areas alone are adapted. Please give us a law to preserve wilderness.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *January 8, 1964.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Las Vegas Convention Center, Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: In the summer of 1961, I went on a horse pack trip into the Pecos wilderness and had a wonderful time.

I hope you will preserve the wilderness areas of our country so that other people may have the opportunity of a trip like this. The only way to preserve the

SRP05671

wilderness areas is to keep them as they are now and not let them be put to commercial use.

Very truly yours,

JANE WILLIAMSON.

JANUARY 9, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearings, Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: All citizens of our land who have observed the unspoiled, uncommercialized and natural beauty of our national parks and wilderness areas realize the importance of preserving these areas in their natural state.

The pressure of increasing population plus pressures exerted by vested-interest groups will result in rapid depletion of these wilderness area resources if adequate legislation is not promptly enacted to prevent this from happening.

We hereby affirm our strong support of adequate legislation introduced to protect wilderness areas and the wildlife, water, and forests lying therein. Senate bill 4 and House bill 9520 are good examples of necessary legislation. We stand in favor of preservation of wilderness areas for all future Americans.

MARIE C. NEIDHAM.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *January 6, 1964.*

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I am president of the Carlsbad Sportsman's Club of Carlsbad, N. Mex., an affiliate of the Wildlife Conservation Association; however, I am expressing my views as an individual.

I am opposed to H.R. 9162 and in favor of H.R. 9520 for the following reasons:

For the past 15 years I have observed the quest for oil in this county. Thousands upon thousands of exploration units consisting of very heavy equipment, have made a spider web of the entire county, in the mountains and in the valleys, going anyplace they desired regardless of whether a road existed or not. This entire area has been churned and dynamited in the search for oil.

Every new rut made by this equipment is inviting disaster from a soil conservation standpoint and the pitiful fees paid for this privilege can never pay for the damage has been done.

Many of you have seen the "red death" that follows strip pit coal mining and I am sure you have observed the horrible scars left on the face of the earth when the metal miners were through.

Gentlemen, if H.R. 9162 is passed with its provisions for mining until December 1973, the areas in question wouldn't be worth converting to a wilderness.

The passage of H.R. 9520 will bequeath to our children and coming generations something that we all enjoyed in our youth, something unspoiled, something very wonderful.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD J. TRINDER,
President, Carlsbad Sportsman's Club.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *January 8, 1964.*

DEAR SIRS: I went on a horse pack trip into the Pecos wilderness in the summer of 1961, and I certainly enjoyed the trip.

I hope you plan to keep some wilderness areas like this open to the public for such trips and not let them be put into commercial use.

Truly,

BETTY WILLIAMSON.

WHEATLEY PHOTO,
Clayton, N. Mex., January 6, 1964.

Re House of Representatives wilderness bills hearing.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: If our public lands continue to shrink in area as they have in the past 100 years, our future generations will have only a strip of concrete, a plowed field, a desert or a badly eroded piece of land where they may enjoy the serenity and loveliness of God's great outdoors.

We today accept this privilege as a part of our inheritance.

Now, let us through legislation enact laws that will make permanent a small portion of our great forest in order that our posterity may enjoy some of this great national resource, our wilderness.

Very truly yours,

JOHN WHEATLEY.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 6, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON WILDERNESS AREAS.

Gentlemen: I wish to express my views concerning the existing and proposed wilderness areas. I feel quite strongly that they must be maintained, and if possible, enlarged. Aside from my private concern for adequate wild game areas, I feel that my children should be allowed to know areas where wheeled vehicles may not go, without the desolation caused by mine rubbble piles, the erosion and needless flooding caused by wood slashings, the stream pollution caused by careless dumping of factory refuse.

CLEMENT J. BURKE.

JANUARY 9, 1964.

Re House of Representatives wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: All citizens of our land who have observed the unspoiled, uncommercialized, and natural beauty of our national parks and wilderness areas realize the importance of preserving these areas in their natural state.

The pressure of increasing population plus pressures exerted by vested-interest groups will result in rapid depletion of these wilderness area resources if adequate legislation is not promptly enacted to prevent this from happening.

We hereby affirm our strong support of adequate legislation introduced to protect wilderness areas and the wildlife, water, and forests lying therein. Senate bill 4 and House bill 9520 are good examples of necessary legislation. We stand in favor of preservation of wilderness areas for all future Americans.

RODNEY MAXWELL, *Albuquerque, N. Mex.*

P.S.—My greatest pleasures have been the time I've spent in our great wilderness.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 8, 1964.*

Re House of Representatives wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIRS: I believe the establishment of an adequate wilderness system for the protection of the 8 percent of the national forest now reserved for wilderness, to be of the upmost importance. It is disturbing to me to realize that this area is at present set up by, and can be abolished by order of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is at all times subject to pressure from those who wish to commercialize these last few unspoiled areas for personal gain.

In an age when all too many of the ancient and honorable heritages have been rejected by man, it is not surprising that this one too might be lost without those responsible knowing what we were losing.

My first experience away from the trappings of civilization was to a high mountain lake soon after I came to New Mexico in 1946. My husband and I followed, on horseback, a guide who unloaded the packhorse and took all the

SRP05673

horses back to the ranch. For three wonderful and incomparable days we were on our own, as our pioneers were, with nature, except for one breakfast which we shared with another on his way out, and an enormous dog who found us on our first night. At this time this was a truly primitive and isolated area, and for me was an experience beyond description. I have returned to this lake with a larger party, and my husband and sons and friends have been there many times, but it is different now. It has become overcrowded.

I have also backpacked into about the same area for 3 days in the 1950's and experienced similar feelings. I have also been on innumerable camping and hiking trips to fairly isolated areas. In recent years, however, they have become accessible by car, and much of the beauty has been spoiled.

My most recent and impressive experience was a pack trip when my husband and I and two other couples spent 8 glorious days in completely primitive and spectacularly beautiful mountain country. For 8 days we saw only beauty at close range, heard only the birds, wind in the pines, the ripple of the water in the streams—pure enough that we could drink it—the crackle of the campfire, and our own voices as we conversed around it. No one who has ever stood on a high divide and seen incomparable beauty in all directions, including a herd of elk in a meadow far below, can ever be quite the same again.

This trip ended with a spectacular sunset as we exchanged our horses for our cars—a short stay in an isolated mountain village, a beautiful drive down the mountain road in the moonlight—and dinner in a restaurant in the valley. The food was enjoyable, but never before had I seen so clearly the "ugliness around us."

I believe our generation and those to come need the opportunity for this sort of comparison as it has never before been known within the history of civilization.

I believe in the establishment of an adequate wilderness system.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. FOSTER H. HYATT.

JANUARY 7, 1964.

Re House of Representatives wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I am very much in favor of legislation for the preservation of our wilderness areas.

I have recently moved to New Mexico from the State of Texas and one of the main reasons for moving is the wonderful outdoors and wilderness areas which were not to be found in the area of Texas from which I moved.

I have two sons, both of which are Boy Scouts, and as you know scouting is an outdoor organization. If for no other reason I would like to see our wilderness areas preserved for the use of the Scouts. I have been on campouts in Texas with my son and it is very hard to teach a boy woodsmanship where there are beer cans and trash instead of trees, and this is exactly what you will find if the wilderness areas are made too accessible by building roads, etc.

SANTA FE, N. MEX. G. H. DUNBAR.

SANTA FE., N. MEX.,
January 7, 1964.

Re House of Representatives wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I am an architect and engineer who has lived in New Mexico for 15 years and have been in private practice for 11 years. My main diversion, when I can find some time away from the office, is to travel into the lovely, primitive areas of this country in order to regain my perspective of life and to revitalize my body and spirit. It's a wonderful, satisfying experience and one that I hope will be preserved so that my children and yours may share it.

Please don't be swayed by the nakedly commercial pressures which I'm sure the roadbuilders, dambuilders, miners, and lumbermen will apply. They naturally want to make money by exploiting as much land as possible.

What good are we if we can't preserve at least 8 percent of our total national forest area in its natural state?

I hope and trust that you will strongly favor H.R. 9520.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

EARL P. WOOD.

SRP05674

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 3, 1964.*

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Wilderness Bills Hearings, Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I am strongly in favor of laws to protect and preserve our national wilderness, wild, and primitive areas. Our wilderness areas are being used more by more people all the time. Everyone has more leisure time and all Government records show increasing use of outdoor campgrounds, parks, and lakes. We should not have one hand building new facilities for outdoor recreation and the other hand removing like facilities. Once such recreation facilities are allowed to go into private ownership or private exploitation, it is much more expensive to regain them for the public ownership. And a wilderness area cannot be built back in a year or 10 years or 20 years. Only nature and many years can grow the tall trees and erase the roads and signs of commercialization.

I feel that a wilderness area is in the same class as a museum. It is the last example of our country as it was before the days of the jet, the rocket, and the gasoline engine. It is a museum in which anyone can relax, play, hunt, fish, and learn about the outdoors.

I am told that the wilderness areas comprise only 8 percent of the national forest area. This 8 percent could be used by 100 percent of the people of the United States. Why isn't the remaining 92 percent of the forests enough for this group of people who would gain financial benefits? It looks like greed to me. Here is a group, maybe 5 percent of the population, having access to 92 percent of the forests for their personal gain, but they want the whole pie. Can't the other 95 percent of us have just 8 percent?

I am personally acquainted with the Pecos Wilderness Area, and would hate to see it full of roads, mines, and lumbering operations. I have enjoyed many hunting trips and pack trips into the area. Will our children and their children be able to know the wonderful feeling of riding or walking for hours and hours without encountering speeding cars, cities, and the hustle and bustle of everyday life? Please protect the wilderness for future generations to enjoy.

Very truly yours,

K. D. DELAPP, Jr.

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIRS: The undersigned hereby acknowledges, approves, and supports Senate bill S. 4 and House bills H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520.

Also the undersigned does not approve or endorse in any manner House bill H.R. 9162.

Respectfully,

BEN J. BRAFF, D.D.S.

STATEMENT OF F. LOUIS HERNANDEZ, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

I am F. Louis Hernandez, elementary school principal in the Albuquerque public schools. I live at 449 Ash NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex. I wish to speak as an individual in favor of some form of wilderness bill, preferably H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9520.

For most of my 59 years I have loved outdoor recreation and participated in hiking, mountain climbing, camping, hunting, fishing, and photography in national forests, wilderness areas, etc. I have camped, fished, and hunted in the Pecos, Gila, and Bridger Wilderness Areas, and the San Pedro Wild Area, as well as the Wheeler Peak region in New Mexico. I have visited and camped in a dozen national parks and a like number of national monuments. I have been active in Boy Scouts. I am advisory board member of the Bureau of Land Management at district and State levels, representing wildlife, and member of the National Advisory Board Council of the BLM.

Wilderness areas must be preserved lest they fall someday into private hands and have to be bought back at a price such as the State of New York is now paying for land being purchased for much needed public recreation use. The movement of people from rural to urban areas will continue. Wild areas will not likely be needed for people to live in.

However, it is important that these areas be preserved in somewhat of a natural state. If they are to serve as laboratories for the study of natural sciences and outdoor activities. They will also assure us of a place where some of

SRP05675

resources can be preserved for future generations to use, as technological discoveries reveal new and important uses for resources.

The greatest values in wilderness areas, however, are in the realm of esthetic experiences that may be had where nature rules supreme and unchanged by man's activities, where complete solitude may be enjoyed, for a time, by urban-dwelling people worn out by the pressures and tensions of modern living.

If we preserve a little of America as God created it, there will still be plenty left for man to try to improve, if it is felt that God didn't do a good enough job, in the beginning. If we do not preserve some land as God first made it, future generations may never know what the original looked like.

UNION COUNTY WILDLIFE & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Clayton, N. Mex., January 7, 1964.

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Wilderness Bills Hearing,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: If our public lands continue to shrink in area as they have in the past several years, our future generations will have only a strip of paved roads and plowed fields, a desert or a badly eroded piece of land where they may enjoy the serenity and loveliness of God's great outdoors. We today accept this privilege as a part of our inheritance.

Now, let us through legislation enact laws that will make permanent a small portion of our great forest in order that our posterity may enjoy some of this great national resource, our wilderness.

Respectfully submitted,

OTIS WETSEL, *Secretary and Treasurer.*

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR G. HARDING, ANTHONY, N. MEX.

It seems that the commercial interests of this country will never take no for an answer to their desire to spoil and destroy the few remaining wilderness areas of this country. I as a lover of the outdoors and a personal user of the wilderness areas deplore such destruction and do not want to see either myself or my descendants deprived of the possibility of relaxing and enjoying the beneficial uplift that one gets from either long or short trips into these areas. These areas deserve the greatest protection possible because once we allow them to be desecrated they will forever be gone and no more will the unspoiled nature that we know be available to those who want and need the morale building effect that one can acquire by communing therein.

I beseech you to take all possible steps to rigidly preserve the wilderness areas by insuring the passage of H.R. 9070 so that it may join with Senate bill No. 4 in preserving this national asset,

Preserve the wilderness areas.

STATEMENT OF ETHEL M. BARKER, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement for the record in support of wilderness preservation and stabilization by law.

I am Ethel M. Barker, of Santa Fe, N. Mex. I shall not tell my age, but I do wish to state that I have 3 children, 10 grandchildren, and 4 great-grandchildren. I packed into the wilderness with my husband to camp, ride, climb peaks, and fish 52 years ago. We have gone scores of times since then, and derived incomparable enjoyment and recreational benefits from them. We will go again come June.

I want my great-grandchildren and their children after them to be able to have the same pleasures and thrills out of wilderness trips that I have had through the years. In fact for many years now it has been an extra pleasure to take our grandchildren, one or two at a time, with us on these wilderness trips. By the time they are 7 or 8 years old we begin taking them on horseback packin trips for a week's training and enjoyment in the solitude and inspiring scenic beauty of God's unspoiled country.

It is impossible for me to understand why your committee has so far declined to report favorably on a good wilderness bill that will, from the start, protect the existing wilderness system from the ravages of certain selfish commercial interests. The system within the national forests is fine in many respects but it needs a good wilderness preservation law to insure its stability and to prevent commercial interests from nibbling and whittling it away for their private gain.

It seems to me that your committee should report out a reasonable bill, such as Senate bill 4, or H.R. 9070, and give the whole House membership a chance to debate, amend, and vote on it. After all they are the elected representatives of the whole people. I am only a homemaker but any further delay in positive action that will give the people's elected representatives a chance to vote on this highly important matter seems to me to be in effect a wholly unjustified filibuster apparently promoted by private commercial interests.

The Congress authorized a 4-year, multimillion-dollar study of the Nation's outdoor recreation resources. That report of the ORRRC strongly recommends wilderness preservation and legislation to insure establishment and protection of an adequate wilderness system for the benefit of present and future generations. Why spend all those millions of our dollars for the study if you are not going to pay heed to it?

At previous hearings some have testified that only the rich and the very strong, hardy people can go on wilderness trips. The committee should know that that is utterly silly. We go for $6 or $7 a day. My friends and I and my under teenage grandchildren are not rich nor hardly above average. My grandsons backpack for a dollar a day and enjoy a week's vacation. They are not juvenile delinquents.

In closing I just want to again say that it is my considered opinion that the time is long overdue for positive and favorable action on the proposed wilderness legislation. It is in the interests of all the people but especially important for posterity. My husband and I may not be around many more years to enjoy the incomparable delights of a vacation in the roadless wilderness areas, but we want very much to see sound legislation enacted to give the wilderness, wild, and primitive areas immediate and complete protection from commercialization in any form before we say goodby.

I would like to insert here a poem my husband wrote on August 17, 1961, titled "Tomorrow We Will Go Again."

"Just 50 years ago today, as I recall,
I took my bride where wild flowers bloom and trees grow tall,
In mountains on a week-long, horseback, packin trip:
In wilderness we basked in love's companionship.

"We camped beneath a spreading spruce (we had no tent)
Where moonbeams peeked into our pristine tenement.
Air mattress was unheard of then and so, instead,
On mat of springy spruce bough tips we made our bed.

"We reveled in flower-spangled parks, and climbed high peaks,
And fished for gamey, cutthroat trout in rippling creeks;
Explored the wildlife haunts and stalked a doe and fawn;
And thrilled at weird coyotes' yelps at dusk and dawn.

"Although three times great grandma now that girl, today,
Said, 'Dad, now that our time of year is here, what say
We pack into the wilderness to camp again?'
Tomorrow we will go and camp as we did then."

LOS ALAMOS, *N. Mex., December 29, 1963.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to speak in favor of wilderness preservation legislation. For over 6 years now this legislation has been kicked about in committees in Congress. Hearings have been held numerous times throughout the Western States on the subject with the same results. The proponents of the wilderness preservation legislation far outnumber the opponents.

Continual hearings and wrangling in committee seem to be making a mockery of our democratic form of government. Our Congressmen are elected by the people to represent the wishes of the people and those people have shown time and again that they are for this legislation. It is time that Congress reacts to the wishes of the people and listens to them rather than to the words of the pressure groups. Continual hearings are not going to change the minds of the people.

With the population explosion we are experiencing all of our land will be "developed" and exploited by real estate promoters, lumbermen, ranchers, or miners if something isn't done now to prevent it. We need to set aside some of our untrammeled land to remain undeveloped and I personally feel the small percentage of our total land proposed to be put in wilderness areas is not too much and may be too little.

I hereby urge support for Senate bill S. 4 and House bill H.R. 9070.

I respectfully urge that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, pass this legislation on to the House of Representatives for their prompt action and vote.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN D. VAN VESSEM.

STATEMENT OF HARRISON MACDONALD, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

It seems to me perfectly obvious that nothing that can be advanced by the opposition to this bill transcends the importance of preserving for our people the wilderness areas which are part of their heritage.

The broad vision of those who set apart our national parks for the enjoyment of millions has been amply justified. And now, while there still is opportunity to keep these last remaining areas inviolate, vision, and not selfishness, should prevail.

Shall these areas become deserts of concrete and asphalt pavements, despoiled of forests and wildlife, or shall they continue to delight and ennoble our people?

The Gila wilderness, Pecos wilderness, Wheeler Peak, and other smaller areas, should particularly be preserved. And I am sure that the people in other States will have similar feelings about their own areas.

Let us not say: "After us the deluge." Let us, rather, say: "This we have done because we know it is right."

STATEMENT OF PAUL E. ELMORE, JR., ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

My name is Paul E. Elmore, Jr., appliance sales representative for a major manufacturer, residing at 10428 Bellamah NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex. I am addressing this committee as an individual who has enjoyed the God-given recreational facilities of wilderness areas for many years. Commencing with "back pack" camping trips as a Boy Scout into very wild and remote areas now criss crossed with roads and other desecrations of our modern civilization, it is very clear to me that the few remaining natural areas of our great nation are in urgent need of immediate protection against infringement and eventual destruction by selfish private interests.

Today, at the age of 44, I live from one horseback trip to the next into the unspoiled magnificent upper Pecos Wilderness Area in anticipation of the excellent fishing, camping, and big game hunting that I have enjoyed on numerous pack trips with family and friends. The inspiration and sense of values that an individual can attain in communion with unspoiled nature are priceless and must be preserved for future generations.

Surely less than 10 percent of our national forests isn't asking too much, especially in view of the grazing and watershed usages that are granted within these areas.

Of the several wilderness bills now pending, I feel that S. 4 or H.R. 9070 would be satisfactory. H.R. 9162 with several important amendments, could be modified into a satisfactory bill.

I recall numerous hearings that have been conducted in previous years and I wish to state that it is time for positive action. Action in favor or wilderness protection and preservation is urgently needed and the time to act is now.

GLORIETA, N. MEX.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Wilderness Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.:

There are no new continents to be discovered, probably no paradise islands either.

To keep the spirit of exploration strong in every lover of nature, there must be areas of almost uncharted country. There the young and active adults can feel the possibility of getting lost in a friendly hilly living space. The hills make it feel compact; a different view from every hilltop.

TV can give us nothing to compare with being—first person singular—in the place where joy of living is real.

CYRIL H. FRY.

STATEMENT OF LEE C. HYDE, D.D.S., ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

I am a dentist and this statement is in my own behalf.

Hasn't it all been said and set down in the records, the pros and cons on the various wilderness bills proposed in the past, in the many past hearings?

I suppose that it is possible to bring forth new arguments for or against wilderness preservation, however, it is very improbable that there will be any new arguments presented at this hearing.

Therefore, I challenge this committee to let the entire House of Representatives vote on either wilderness bill S. 4, H.R. 9070, or H.R. 9520 and let the people through their representatives decide on whether the wilderness, wild and primitive areas should be preserved forever.

I feel that this route would be a much more democratic procedure than the past procedure of one or two individuals preventing any sound wilderness bill from getting out of committee for a vote in the House of Representatives.

The commercial interests that stand to profit in a material way from exploiting the wilderness areas will not tire or run short on funds in their efforts to prevent a vote in the House of Representatives on a sound wilderness bill. The philosophy seems to be that if they can keep having hearings long enough that the people who do not stand to profit by doing away with wilderness areas will give up the fight for the wilderness bill. That these people in favor of wilderness will go away or just give up and never be heard from again.

The people favoring wilderness areas may not be in attendance today in as great numbers as those people opposing the wilderness bills that will really protect and give us a permanent wilderness system, however, they represent a far, far greater number of the general public than the people paid to be here by the opposing commercial interests.

The people favoring wilderness areas may run short on funds and may become discouraged and may not attend hearing after hearing, however, they will not give up, they will not go away and they will be heard through their representatives if the representatives are given a chance to vote on one of the wilderness bills; such as S. 4, H.R. 9070, or H.R. 9520; on the House floor.

Please give the people a chance to decide on whether they want a permanent wilderness system or not.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *January 9, 1964.*

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Wilderness Bills Hearing,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I, Robert B. Griffith, U.S. Army Security Agency enlistee, would at this time like to state my opinion on the wilderness bill and proposed amendments now before the Congress of the United States.

After reading several publications on the matter and studying them carefully, I feel that the Wilderness Society proposed amendment to H.R. 9162 would be in the best interest for all campers, sportsmen, hikers, and so forth, if the proposed amendment were not added the bill would tend to degrade our wilderness areas by mining, trucking, and the lot.

I strongly urge that our vanishing wilderness areas should be preserved by any and all possible means.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. GRIFFITH III.

SRP05679

JANUARY 9, 1964.

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.:

I hereby state that my husband and I wish to preserve our national forest wilderness system which comprises 15 million acres in 84 units set up by executive order of the Secretary of Agriculture, and therefore we oppose H.R. 9162 but favor H.R. 9520.

(MRS.) SUSAN C. ROGERS.
SAMUEL C. ROGERS.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.:

I oppose bill H.R. 9162, and support bill H.R. 9520.

I think we should preserve our national forests for our children and their children.

E. L. NIX.

JANUARY 9, 1964.

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: As supporters of the National Wildlife Federation, and other conservation organizations, we are deeply interested in the wilderness bills under discussion.

We urge you to unalterably oppose H.R. 9162. Please lend your full support to H.R. 9520.

Sincerely yours,

BETTE PIANIN SASMOR, R.W.
DANIEL J. SASMOR, Ph. D.

BELEN GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Belen, N. Mex., January 6, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: We heartily endorse House bill No. S. 4, or H.R. S. 4 which also embodies H.R. 9070. We feel that either, or both, of these bills are necessary for the maintenance of the national forest wilderness system, and that there should be no special privilege existing other than that of livestock grazing. Therefore, the livestock people should not be involved.

Since President Kennedy, and now President Johnson, have promoted recreational activities through our national forest and other governmental agencies, it seems proper that the Congress of the United States should, at this time, consider these important wilderness bills, and that they should be considered from the general public standpoint rather than any group of individuals who would use them for their own personal gain.

Please feel free to use this endorsement in any way that you see fit at this meeting.

Sincerely,

J. A. SEERY, *Secretary.*

STATEMENT OF DAVID S. SHAFFER, PRESIDENT, NEW MEXICO DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, as I recall, this is the third statement made to a congressional committee on a wilderness bill. The past proponents for this legislation have outnumbered opponents 20 or 30 to 1, which indicates that the average American desires a portion of forest land to be set aside as a permanent wilderness area in which generations of the future will be able to enjoy a portion of this Nation as seen by the early American Indian and settlers.

The opponents to this legislation appear as and are selfish interest groups, thinking only of personal gain.

SRP05680

It is the sincere hope of the members of the New Mexico Division of the Izaak Walton League of America that the Congress will see fit to make into law S. 4 and H.R. 9070, so that in years to come our descendants will be able to enjoy the national parks and monuments, which at the time of their conception, were as bitterly opposed by some of the same groups that are in current opposition to the Wilderness Act.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *January 8, 1964.*

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: Because we feel strongly that stabilizing laws are needed to keep intact our national forest wilderness system, we oppose the bill H.R. 9162.

We favor H.R. 9520.

Thank you.

EDWARD C. HIRT.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIRS: The undersigned hereby acknowledges, approves, and supports Senate bill S. 4 and House bills H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520.

Also the undersigned does not approve or endorse in any manner House bill H.R. 9162.

Respectfully,

CELIA B. JOSEPH.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *January 9, 1964.*

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearings.

DEAR SIR: One of New Mexico's greatest assets is its wilderness system and having game and wildlife already extinct in other sections of the country. In addition to having abundant wildlife, we are going to add game native only to Africa. We are proud of our wilderness.

Because of this I very definitely oppose H.R. 9162.

I am a physician at the Lovelace Clinic. As a subscriber to New Mexico Wildlife, I am aware of developments to preserve our national resources.

FREEMAN P. FOUNTAIN, M.D.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND FISH,
State Capitol, Santa Fe, January 10, 1964.

Mr. ELLIOTT S. BARKER,
Sante Fe, N. Mex.

DEAR MR. BARKER: As I understand it, you are going to appear before the committee on further hearings on the wilderness bill which has now been languishing for the past several years and has not yet passed.

Speaking entirely as a private individual and as a citizen of this State, I wish that you would include my small voice to this committee urging them to pass this. To anyone who has ever been in our two largest wilderness areas, the Gila and Upper Pecos, the very thought of them being thrown over to commercialization is a shattering one. I have two small children and I hope that when they are grown, that they, too, will be able to visit these remote and marvelous places as I have been privileged to do.

Very truly yours,

LADD S. GORDON,
Director.

By LEVON LEE,
Chief of Game Management.

SRP05681

SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Wilderness Bill Hearing,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: For the past 18 years I have been active with the Girl Scout program. The wilderness areas are used, loved, and appreciated by the Scouts. I believe the youth of our country will benefit for generations, if we will preserve these areas for their education and enjoyment.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA HOFFMAN.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *January 11, 1964.*

Re wilderness bill hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: As a member of the New Mexico Wildlife & Conservation Association, registered voter of McKinley County, Gallup, N. Mex., I urge strong support of H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520, and I urge strong opposition to H.R. 9162, believing that now and in the future there is a great demand for protection and establishment of an adequate wilderness system.

To allow any commercial individual or organization to exploit the wilderness areas will lead to eventual loss of present recreational areas for ourselves and our future children.

Serious consideration should be given toward the preservation of these areas as the demand for recreational areas alone grows larger each year.

Very truly yours,

HARRY H. MENDOZA.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *January 11, 1964.*

Re wilderness bill hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: As a member of the New Mexico Wildlife & Conservation Association, registered voter of McKinley County, Gallup, N. Mex., I urge strong support of H.R. 8070 and H.R. 9520, and I urge strong opposition to H.R. 9162, believing that now and in the future there is a great demand for protection and establishment of an adequate wilderness system.

To allow any commercial individual or organization to exploit the wilderness areas will lead to eventual loss of present recreational areas for ourselves and our future children.

Serious consideration should be given toward the preservation of these areas as the demand for recreational areas alone grows larger each year.

JOE YURCIC.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *January 9, 1964.*

Re wilderness bill hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I am Richard Wilson, 830 Country Club Drive, Gallup, N. Mex., employed as manager of a small loan company. I desire to go on record as favoring legislation for the establishment and protection of a wilderness system. I sincerely ask your consideration of H.R. 9520 in this connection.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD WILSON.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *January 9, 1964.*

Re wilderness bill hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I am Charles Vidal, 528 La Cima Road, Gallup, N. Mex., employed in real estate, investment and financing. I ask your support of H.R. 9520 on the wilderness system. I don't think it is asking too much to set aside a small percentage of our national forest area for this purpose. I sincerely ask that you recommend adequate legislation now.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES VIDAL.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Santa Fe, January 11, 1964.

Re hearing on wilderness bill.

INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I am advised that you will hold hearings in Las Vegas, Nev., on the 13th day of January 1964, pertaining to the Federal wilderness bill.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would consider this letter as part of your deliberation. Our feelings here in McKinley County is that such a bill would not only be beneficial to this area, but have a lasting benefit to the country as a whole.

Yours very truly,

ALBERT O. LEBECK, Jr.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *January 3, 1964.*

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing this in regard to the wilderness bill—to persons that are supposedly representing the majority of the people of this country, their welfare and well-being, now and for the future. I am quite sure if this is so, there is no question of needing a wilderness bill.

The opposing forces to this bill are only thinking of their pocketbooks, not the needs of the country and the good for the people in it.

What God has put on this earth will be here for centuries unless it is destroyed by man. What man can restore that which has been destroyed? Costly tries, weak results. When the time comes that our country needs these resources for survival, I'm sure, with our form of government, through President, Senator, and Representative, it will be available, thanks to farsighted people who made it possible to be here instead of past history.

Mr. Chairman, I remain "small fish in big ocean."

Sincerely,

PETE B. CRESTO,
Director of New Mexico WCA, NW.

RICO MOTOR CO.,
Gallup, N. Mex., January 8, 1964.

Re wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I love to fish, hunt, camp, hike and just enjoy the out-of-doors. The way I like it best is the way God made it. Not with roads, trailer courts, stumps, and overgrazed land. We are losing too much of this every day. Act now while there is still a portion of our national forest wilderness to protect. Pass H.R. 9520.

Our children and their children might like to know what the country did look like before we destroyed it.

ROBERT E. MENAPACE.

P.S.—Member of McKinley County Wildlife Conservation Association.

STATEMENT OF JOHN P. MCCAULEY, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

I am John P. McCauley, a merchant in Santa Fe, N. Mex.; I along with many of my friends regularly used established wilderness areas in New Mexico for recreation including camping, riding, hunting, and fishing. In our opinion, there is no other recreation that can compare with these wilderness experiences.

We strongly urge your committee to act favorably at an early date upon legislation that will guarantee preservation of the national forest wilderness system as it is now set up.

We feel that these areas comprising only 8 percent of the total national forest areas should by all means be insured of preservation for the benefit of present and future generations.

Of the bills now pending before your committee we wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520.

We regret that we cannot accept H.R. 9162 because of the many omissions of necessary items and particularly because of the provision that would allow miners and prospectors for a period of 10 years a free hand to operate in and spoil the wilderness area, that simply is not consistent with wilderness preservation.

Thank you for the priviledge of submitting this statement of our strong convictions.

STATEMENT OF LEONARD C. HANSEN, SECRETARY, FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMITTEE, FORT WINGATE ARMY DEPOT, GALLUP, N. MEX.

The Fish and Wildlife Committee at Fort Wingate Army Depot urge support of H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520. We urge strong opposition to H.R. 9162, believing that to allow unhampered access of any commercial individuals or groups to these wilderness areas tends to invite and encourage their exploitation and eventual loss to the American people as recreational areas.

This committee favors the enactment of such legislation that will establish and protect an adequate wilderness system.

We believe legislation should be such as to place strict control through stabilizing measures, on all national forest wilderness, refuge, and wild areas throughout our Nation. We oppose all measures that will give individuals such powers that they may, under pressure, reduce or abolish any portion of this necessary and rightful part of our American heritage.

Any phase of modern planning today places heavy emphasis on future or long range plans. This is true in the defense of our country, in contemplating future taxes and future income for the preparation of budgets and in every other phase of progressive programing. So it must be with our wilderness and forest areas. The exploding demand and use of these areas during the past 20 years, for recreational purposes alone, indicates an immediate need for serious and intelligent consideration aimed toward the preservation of these areas.

Many of us do not fulfill our individual obligation to participate in an aggressive physical fitness program on the golf course or football field or the tennis court. Many of us prefer to meet this obligation in the out-of-doors amid God's tall trees, clean air, and pure waters. Therefore it is reasonable to believe that through an aggresive physical fitness program alone the need for these areas grows each year. The demand on these areas during the next 20 years for our needs and during the hundreds of years in the future for our children and their children's needs, demands immediate, sound and aggressive action now.

STATEMENT OF ROGER SIMMS, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

My name is Roger Simms, and I am a student at Santa Fe High School. I have been an active member of Boy Scouts here in Santa Fe for the last 4 years, and I am now one of the charter members of the new Explorer Post No. 30, which has as its theme conservation and use of our wilderness areas. We are sponsored in part by the Santa Fe Wildlife & Conservation Association.

I feel that I am not only speaking for myself in this letter, but rather I am speaking for all my fellow Boy Scouts, students, and friends in expressing my opposition to any reduction in or elimination of the wilderness areas of the United States. Many people I know use our Pecos Wilderness Area here by

such activities as hiking, camping, skiing, snowshoeing, etc. The wilderness areas of our great land are the last strongholds of real peace and serenity. They are the only places in most of our country where one can walk amid the beauty and splendor of nature, with no cars screeching at stop signs, no horns blowing, no people screaming and yelling. When in the wilderness, the cares and troubles of the modern world are left behind; you can sit on top of a majestic peak and look into the civilized world below, and you can wonder what today's news is.

Our Scout Troop No. 23, under the excellent guidance of Mr. James G. Phillips, aroused my interest in the wilderness by taking hikes and camps into it at least once a month, all year around. Membership in this troop, and in others that use the wilderness, has been rising constantly ever since I was a new member. This fact illustrates the point that more people (not only young people but also adults) are becoming interested in using the wilderness areas. For this reason, among others, I feel it the obligation of every American citizen, especially you, the lawmakers of our country, to preserve wilderness lands for the benefit of the whole of the American people, for our generations and for generations to come. It is my sincere desire that you accept your responsibility, and prove yourselves worthy of the titles you hold.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT BOSHEN, D.D., SANTA FE, N. MEX.

I am Rev. Robert Boshen, 1561 Camino Amado, Santa Fe, N. Mex., age 56, and minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Santa Fe.

One of the first and real joys which I found on moving into the Santa Fe area was the nearby preservation of the natural world in the wilderness areas. The conservation of some of this beautiful country as the Lord created it has been a source of continual satisfaction to myself and my family, but much more importantly, to the people who live in this part of the country and the multitude of visitors who come here all during the year to discover and enjoy living in the world of real nature.

I personally feel that it would be a tragedy for the wilderness areas, few as they are, to ever be changed and become as any other portion of our lived-in country. Man needs the refreshment and renewal that true wilderness living can give to him.

May I express a hope that is not alone mine but that of most of the people of this mountain country that the wilderness be protected by adequate laws and that everything possible be done to pass S. 4 and H.R. 9070, which as explained to me will do the most to adequately preserve the natural world for the best use of our citizens.

STATEMENT OF REV. CHESTER E. WHITTIER, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

As one who enjoys the trails and wide-open spaces of our land, who does considerable camping out, I want to add my word approving the wilderness preservation system—providing real enjoyment and refuge for human beings of our day.

As one who does seek refuge from our crowded cities, urban centers, and even rural highways, we find it more and more difficult to find a place to even park a car and stop a night in our National and State parks—for the crowds of the cities are already there.

Where can we go but farther out on the trails into more primitive areas?

I understand nothing will be lost to future generations in preserving these areas. The water will still be there, the forests, and the grazing areas. And these will be available through lawful processes by our representatives in Congress in case of any emergency.

I urge the consideration of these measures to preserve wilderness areas as they are, to bring the bills concerned with this out of committee—in order that from these areas, untouched by man's commerializing programs, we make take from them solely in our spirits and memories, the inspiration, the beauty, and the grandeur of God's creation.

 SRP05685

JANUARY 8, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness bills hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev., January 13 and 14, 1964.

GENTLEMEN: My name is Arthur Newfield, 1024 Don Cubero, Santa Fe, N. Mex. I am a counselor in the Santa Fe public schools.

It is my opinion that it is vital to the future welfare of this country, that steps be taken to preserve our wilderness country in its present state as far as possible. This area has suffered continual encroachment of various interests, and unless the Congress takes positive steps to preserve that small portion which the present investigation is considering, our wilderness areas will be despoiled.

S. 4 and H.R. 9070 are in my opinion the best bills being considered, and it is my hope that the provisions contained in this bill become law.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR F. NEWFIELD.

STATEMENT OF HUGH M. MILLER, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

My name is Hugh M. Miller, of 1021 Governor Dempsey Drive, Santa Fe, N. Mex. I am a retired employee of the Federal Government. For myself as an individual I wish to make the following statement for the record.

I am strongly in favor of comprehensive and effective legislation to perpetuate and stabilize, in effect, to guarantee continuance of, the Nation's wilderness system.

The urgency of such legislation has become more acute in the years during which it has been discussed and adjusted to correct all important weaknesses. Our rapidly growing population and concomitant urban congestion make it progressively more important to secure for this and succeeding generations assurance that there will always be wild places to which they can go for the therapy only such places can give to nerves and spirits overwrought by the tensions of modern living. Moreover, these remaining wild places are a part of this country's greatness. They are, I truly believe, an important element in understanding and preserving the American spirit.

The lands which would be affected constitute, as is, of course, known to your committee, an extremely small fraction of the total of all public lands in the country. I regard the new Senate Wilderness Act, S. 4, as most acceptable. It was passed in April 1963, if I am correct. House bills H.R. 9070, 9101, and 9520 are fully acceptable as introduced. So would be any other bill with all their essential provisions and without weakening clauses.

I urge passage of one of these bills at an early date, speedy action in conference, and early enactment of a final wilderness bill to end the delays which have plagued this worthy project. I think, also, that I am correct in believing that a very great majority of citizens, most of whom are not vocal, are of the same mind.

STATEMENT OF MATT NOYES DODGE, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

My name is Matt Noyes Dodge. I am employed by the Kiwanis Club of Santa Fe, N. Mex., as secretary, and I live at 465 Camino Manzano, Santa Fe, N. Mex. I feel that the wilderness bill should be enacted into law for the following reasons:

"Man against the wilderness" was the battle cry of pioneers in the colonial days of America. Progress of civilization depended upon man's control over nature and the most productive, if wasteful, utilization of natural resources. Slowly but inexorably man beat back the wilderness. The battle became a conquest, a rout, then a massacre. Today only hard-to-reach vestiges remain of that once glorious expanse of primitive America. Commercial interests desire to exploit them too. If they do, the slaughter may be complete; there will be no wilderness left.

Among the first innocent victims of this conflict of man against wilderness was the passenger pigeon. The heath hen held out longer, and the ivory-billed woodpecker is a recent sacrifice. Those lovely creatures are gone; we can never get them back. In their places are second-growth woodlands, polluted

streams, smog, overpopulations of rodents, eroded hillsides, and damaging floods. This is the price that our generation is paying for the smashing victory over the wilderness that our forefathers achieved.

Only the vigorous action of conservation-minded leaders saved from extinction the bison, the beaver, and the pronghorn antelope. Does anyone now regret that last-ditch rescue? Today wildlife inhabitants of the remaining areas of wilderness include the timber wolf, the grizzly bear, the fisher, the wolverine, the mountain goat, the otter, and a few others who inhabit virgin forests, free-running streams, roadless meadows, and mountain fastnesses. These are wilderness creatures whose way of life are incompatible with the environment of civilized man. Dilute or detroy this natural habitat and these animals, too, will be gone forever.

We are now at the last crossroads. Do we take the path that perpetuates for the appreciation, stimulation, and inspiration of future generations of Americans the best that remains of our primitive wilderness? Or do we open the road to commercial interests so that they may wring from it a few million dollars worth of oil, or minerals, and of timber then to toss it aside with its scenic, wildlife, and inspirational values lost forever?

Patriotism is defined as "zealous support of one's country." Certainly the support of the wilderness bill, designed to save by legislation the outstanding wilderness areas remaining in our Nation, is a modern example of patriotism just as worthy as protecting our shores from the attacks of a foreign invader.

Thank you for giving the foregoing your careful consideration.

NEW MEXICO SYNOD, UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
January 8, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearing, Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: We have lived in Santa Fe for 24 years. Sixteen of those years I was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, and for the past 8 years the office of the Synod of New Mexico of the United Presbyterian Church has been located here, of which I am the executive.

During this period of time we have come to know the Pecos wilderness of northern New Mexico quite well. We have a summer cabin near the wilderness and have enjoyed a great deal of time there for many years. We have come to appreciate the beauties of a recreational tract that has been untrammeled and unscarred by humans. Such places are difficult to find in America these days. I strongly believe that they should be so preserved by the best possible means at our disposal through Federal legislation, or else these beauties will be lost forever.

It has been my privilege to organize and conduct for the past 4 years, trailride conferences of older high school and college age young people from coast to coast, who have come into the Pecos wilderness to ride horseback, study, and worship. Without exception these young people have enthusiastically expressed gratitude and appreciation for being able to find such unspoiled expanses of nature to inspire better living on their part. We have conducted these conferences at the minimum cost of $62.50 per conferee for a total of 5 days.

We in America desperately need your most careful consideration of legislation that will preserve and protect the wilderness system. Thank you for your thoughtful attention to this portion of our national resources.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. KEELER,
Synod Executive.

STATEMENT OF RONALD W. COSS, SANTA FE., N. MEX.

I am Ronald W. Coss. I live at 903 Rio Vista, Santa Fe, N. Mex. I am a teacher at Santa Fe High School, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

I am for passage of a law whereby wilderness preservation is assured. I am not sure which proposed bill would do this best but I understand that Senate bill 4 or House bill 9070 are favored. I strongly urge that one of these bills be passed into law—soon.

SRP05687

My reasons for this request are simple. Though I seldom have the time to make use of such areas I want to make sure that my sons have wilderness areas to enjoy—now and when they are grown. Such a law would insure this, not only for them but for their sons and grandsons, etc.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 10, 1964.*

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Wilderness Bills Hearing,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIRS: I am now a resident of Santa Fe, N. Mex., and formerly resided in Colorado. I am very much interested in the preservation of the remaining wilderness areas of this country. I have seen, over the years, much of the natural beauty of formerly isolated areas, destroyed or preverted by irresponsible industrialism or by other private use, and permanently lost to the use of the American public. There is now much less of these wild areas left, and what does remain may soon be gone unless steps are taken at once for their preservation.

I am, therefore, interested in the proposals being considered by your committee, which, if enacted by the Congress, would go a long way toward preservation of these remaining wild areas. I have been particularly impressed by H.R. 9520 introduced by Mr. Cohelan as a modification of H.R. 9070, and believe that a bill along this line is urgently needed. I urge that your committee, after such study as may be needed, take the steps necessary to further legislation along these lines.

Sincerely,

ADIN P. BROOKS.

LA POSADA INN,
Santa Fe, N. Mex., January 11, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearings.

To Whom It May Concern:

It is my opinion that the sooner the laws affecting the wilderness operation are put into action in such a manner that areas now available are protected for this generation and those to come, the more benefit will be derived. Let's forget the profit angle, moneywise, on a few of God's great gifts to His children—there are so few left.

MARY C. KEELER,
Mrs. Kenneth M. Jones.

LA POSADA INN,
Santa Fe, N. Mex., January 10, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearings, Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: I, Harvey S. Durand, president and manager of La Posada de Santa Fe, Santa Fe, and La Posada de San Carlos, Guaymas, Mexico, would like to have my name go on record as being wholeheartedly in favor of wilderness preservation and passage of a law, or laws, to establish and protect an adequate wilderness system while it is still possible to do so. A member of the wilderness society, it is my hope this may be accomplished.

HARVEY S. DURAND.

JACKSON, MISS., *December 31, 1963.*

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Committee,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas Convention Center, Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR MR. BARING: May I urge you to do all possible to preserve our wilderness areas by implementing the passage of laws guaranteeing perpetuation of the existing wilderness areas.

SRP05688

I have had the immense pleasure of traveling and camping in the wilderness areas with my oldest son and we must perpetuate this heritage for the future generations of Americans.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. PARKES, D.D.S.

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILL., *January 7, 1964.*

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas Convention Center, Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR MR. BARING: As one who has enjoyed five pack trips into wilderness and primitive areas in the West, I understand the importance of preserving them intact for future generations to enjoy. Not only do wilderness areas have a rehabilitating effect on the individual, but they give one a sense of history—of what the country was originally like and what the early fur traders and settlers went through in order to survive.

The importance of preserving wilderness areas in their natural state is greater now than ever because of how fast the U.S. population is growing.

I sincerely hope that Congress will pass the wilderness bills.

Yours very truly,

MRS. MARGIE FLANDERS.

CANOGA PARK, CALIF.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Wilderness Bills Hearings, Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIRS: I, Jack A. Hammond, a cement contractor of Canoga Park, Calif., in October 1963 drove 1,000 miles straight through to hunt deer and camp in the Pecos Wilderness for 5 days. This was an experience I could never duplicate though I plan to visit this particular area again for a trip with my wife and three children in the spring of 1964.

For anyone, for any reason to tamper with God's natural wilderness would or should be a crime, for it far surpasses any manmade recreational facilities. I have seen them all for I live in the city.

Sincerely,

JACK A. HAMMOND.

APPLETON, WIS., *January 6, 1964.*

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas Convention Center, Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: I depend on the wilderness areas for rejuvenating myself at regular intervals. The quiet remote magnificent areas are very dear to me.

If these lands are not kept inviolate our progeny may have refuse piles, devastated hills, or concrete everywhere. Generations to come are entitled to the beauty of nature I can now experience.

Yours truly,

SMITH MCLANDRESS.

STATEMENT OF BESSYE CROWDER WARD, ODESSA, TEX.

I have been on six of the American forestry 11-day wilderness trail rides in four different States, besides a ride in the Texas Big Bend country. These rides as a vacation in the wonderful unspoiled country away from roads and all commercial activities are the most satisfying and enjoyable vacations one can imagine.

I understand there is always danger of selfish pressure groups encroaching on the national forest wilderness and primitive areas for mining, timber operations, roads, and other commercial development.

SRP05689

If anyone who takes that attitude toward these wonderful primitive and wilderness areas only realized how very greatly thousands of people enjoy the scenic beauty and solitude of God's unspoiled country they would surely stop their efforts to destroy them. There is for many of us a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction in getting out and "roughing it" in a natural setting away from anything made by man.

I hope you will understand why I, and so many others are so much interested in having the insurance of a good law that these areas will be preserved in their natural condition with no development permitted. Think also of the wonderful habitat wilderness areas provide for wildlife in a natural state. We trust that you will see to it that wilderness and primitive areas are left as they are, so that our children and their children after them may have the God-given opportunity to enjoy them as I and so many others have. We can leave them no greater legacy.

I appreciate the opportunity of making this statement in behalf of wilderness preservation.

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 31, 1963.*

Re wilderness bills hearings.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Las Vegas Convention Center,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that hearings on the pending wilderness preservation legislation (H.R. 9070) are scheduled for January at three locations in the West. I have written many letters in an attempt to gain support for this bill and am writing again, telling you of my desire for passage of this bill. Only when the wilderness bill is passed will we have a guarantee that the existing wilderness system will be perpetuated for the benefit of present and future generations.

Last summer, instead of taking a trip west as I have done for many years, I went to Europe. Despite the fact that I was especially impressed by the beauty of the Alps, I felt that something was missing. Seeing the special July issue (I think) of Life magazine devoted entirely to Western United States brought tears to my eyes, because suddenly I realized that what I had missed in Europe was wilderness as we know it in our West—miles and miles with no habitation or industrialization, an abundance of pure air and streams and wildlife, to be enjoyed by every citizen according to his capacity to appreciate it.

Please spare no effort to see that the wilderness bill is enacted as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

(Miss) MARION B. STIENS.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To write a statement in support of bills preserving America's wilderness areas can be done with enthusiasm by anyone who has been introduced to the joys of camping in one of these areas, who has rested their body and soul by a spruce campfire, who has seen the Milky Way and millions of stars undimmed by city smoke, who has ridden through a wet forest enjoying the diamonds of water hanging from leaves and ferns where the only noise was the clop, clop, clop of the horses on the trail, who has watched the fearsome grandeur of a storm moving up a valley toward your mountain top, who has sat atop a mountain in the warm sun and gazed for miles and miles and miles at the unspoiled forests, valleys, and lakes.

It seems inconceivable to me that anyone would consider anything but preserving unspoiled these relatively small areas left to us rather than exploiting them commercially when one considers the following facts:

(1) The rate of our population increase.

(2) The increasing amount of leisure time (for example, the steel industry with its new 13-week vacations).

(3) The increasing amount of travel in our country since World War II as evident in the tremendous increase in use of the national parks.

(4) The increased emphasis on keeping fit and the necessity of the active life in prevention of such prevalent, modern ills as coronary heart disease.

(5) The increasing need for places to "escape" or "retreat" in the ever-increasing pace of modern industry and life in general.

(6) The increased publicity given to camping as evident in the massive advertising for such items as tents, sleeping bags, hunting and fishing equipment, etc.

(7) The increased publicity given specifically to wilderness trips (for example, the Cleveland Plain Dealer will soon have a feature on its travel page of the Pecos wilderness trip sponsored by the American Forestry Association and the Cleveland Press recently had a full page feature on a wilderness trip in Montana sponsored by the Wilderness Society).

This statement speaks only for one use—recreation—while there are, of course, multiple uses planned and carried out in these areas. My concern is in the prevention of such earth scarring activities as mining and lumbering when these commercial uses are already available in over 90 percent of the national forests now.

To any committee member who is unconvinced, I would issue an invitation to spend a week in the wilderness—hunt, fish, ride, hike, gather wild flowers, be a bird watcher, or just sit in the sun—but try it. It is available to all, rich and poor, young and old. Let's save it. Let's advertise it.

Respectfully,

JEANNE E. ANDREWS, M.D.

CORONADO, CALIF., *December 31, 1963.*

Re Wilderness bills hearings.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: I am Paul E. Giers, D.D.S., and reside in Coronado, Calif. It has been my good fortune and pleasure to utilize the Pecos wilderness area of New Mexico on two recent occasions. In 1960 my wife, who had never ridden before, another California couple, and myself packed in by horse for 4 days of fishing. This past fall I returned to the Pecos area to hunt. To say these areas are too remote and are only for a rugged few has not been borne out in either of these instances and I look forward to many more trips with my family.

Presently before Congress are two bills, S. 4 (passed by the Senate) and H.R. 9070, which will insure fairly to all the preservation of these areas by law. I believe it is in the best national interest to maintain these areas as they are for future generations to enjoy as I have.

Sincerely,

PAUL E. GIERS, D.D.S.

BRONXVILLE, N.Y.

Re wilderness bill.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Las Vegas Convention Center,
Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: Even though my age is only 13, I have had probably the most exciting and enjoyable trip that I will ever encounter in my life.

It was the Pecos wilderness trail ride. For 10 days we saw the majestic beauty that America still and I hope will always have in its possession.

Without it America would just be another country of the times, with no remembrance of the struggle for settlement and freedom.

We have to fight and work for preservation of our beautiful country.

I have seen many national forests, such as: Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, Grand Teton, and more. They all give you a feeling of satisfaction for coming.

If we do not preserve the land America will become a country of skyscrapers and no satisfaction for living.

I hope we can attain as much wildlife lands and national forests as the people want and need.

Yours truly,

FRANK PUZIO, Jr.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Don Clauser of Santa Fe, N. Mex. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF DON CLAUSER, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Mr. CLAUSER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Don Clauser. My home is in Santa Fe, N. Mex. At present I am superintendent of a retirement home, owned and operated by the Board of Pensions, United Presbyterian Church, United States of America.

I feel I am qualified to make this statement because in the past 15 years I have organized more than 50 pack trips into 9 different wilderness and primitive areas from Wyoming to California. We have had from 7 to 25 riders on each one of these trips, all were from 10 to 14 days' duration. I rode as the director on most of these trips. Previous to this, I made numerous trips into the back country with hunting and fishing parties. A fair estimate of my experience would be over 75 separate trips into wilderness areas of the West, no trip under 3 days' duration.

Wilderness must be protected by every means known to man. This committee can and must provide an adequate wilderness preservation law. The people who use the wilderness must educate themselves and others in the care and preservation of the areas. The Government agencies in whose trust these areas are placed must administer them to the best of their abilities.

If we are to preserve any wilderness the first, and by far the most important, step for this committee, is to present a bill to the Congress for passage. The committee has numerous bills to be considered. After going over most of these, I feel the best ones are: S. 4, H.R. 9070, and, with some amendments, H.R. 9162 would be acceptable.

May I urge you without further delay to bring out of your committee a good wilderness bill with a "do pass" recommendation. We need to protect what wilderness that is still in existence and you gentlemen are the ones who must make the next move. Your action in the next few months may determine the fate of a "heritage" once lost we never can replace.

I would like to add a few observations that I have made during this hearing.

First, I would like to point out that the wilderness areas are one of the greatest areas producing quantity and quality water. Water is the lifeblood of the western farms. So I feel that all farmers and users of water should protect wilderness in the same attitude that we who are considered wilderness advocates feel toward it.

Another observation I have made is that grazing is protected here in the wilderness bill by law. It is one of the few statements in our law of the United States which protects grazing interests. Most of the grazing is regulated by the Secretary of Agriculture. The grazing interests will receive protection now in the national forests.

There has been a great deal of development which has destroyed grass, by dam building, by roads, and by recreation areas. Cattle do much better when they are not disturbed. Consequently, your grazing interests should back the wilderness bill 100 percent because their interests are protected, more so than in the present status.

As for the miners, I think they should police their own industry before asking, and clean up some of the mess they have left before requesting any more public lands to be destroyed. By the, "mess that they have left," I mean their abandoned towns, their abandoned mine dumps, the pollution they have done on streams. And when they police their own industry, they will receive the wishes and the good will of other industries much more than they do today.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Mr. DUNCAN. Just a comment that your water concept is a good one. It has been mentioned, but mentioned infrequently. And you join a very fine old gentleman of Olympia who called this matter to our attention. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I agree with you; the mining industry has a responsibility to police its own operations, and in my immediate area the industry really needs to take a good look at what they are doing in the pollution area. I know of one stream in my area where I fish, and before it gets to the mining district it is crystal clear and full of fish, and when it leaves this area it is full of tailings, and I believe you could almost walk across it with the amount of material that it carried. I know that this can be done because I did operate a mine and I did control tailings, and if you really want to do the job it can be done.

Mr. CLAUSER. One more statement. It has been reported there has been no tailings dumped into the Animas River in Colorado for many years, but it is still carrying only 14 percent of the trout that it would carry had there been no pollutions some 25 or 30 years ago.

Mr. BARING. Does the headwater of that river consist of a lake?

Mr. CLAUSER. In the mining district around Silverton on the western slope above Durango, and it was one of the very highly mineralized areas of western Colorado. The mountain is, you might say, virtually a mine dump today. And the rain still washes mine tailings down, which probably cannot be controlled without terrific expense today.

Mr. BARING. Is it a source for drinking water?

Mr. CLAUSER. Durango uses the water. It is part of the Colorado River drainage. From the Animas it goes into the San Juan into the Colorado. In places it is too thin to plow and too thick to drink.

Mr. WHITE. I have one last comment, and I think it is germane to the hearings. All of a sudden certain groups of people are beginning to take a new look at pollution, air and water pollution, and I believe that this is all for the good. Some people say they do not want Federal control, they do not want the U.S. Government mixed up in air and water pollution. But at the same time, like in every other area, if the local area does not take care of air and water pollution problems, they will become the problem of the Congress and all of the people of the United States.

I will say that I believe, because of this particular situation, that industries today are beginning to reevaluate their position in this area, with the idea of controlling and cleaning up streams and cleaning up the air pollution. I think it is a good move and I think it is probably as important as the wilderness concept.

Do you agree?

Mr. CLAUSER. I beg your pardon.

Mr. DUNCAN. Please do not ask him again.

Mr. WHITE. All right.

Mr. CLAUSER. I have a statement which was prepared by Troop 30, an Explorer Scout troop in Santa Fe, N. Mex., on their own volition, without guidance, and it is signed by some 365 teachers and students, primarily students. They have asked me to offer it for the record here. It is because of their own interest in outdoors. We have a very active troop there in Santa Fe of Explorer Scouts.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Clauser, without objection, the resolution on which there are 365 signers will go into the record and the signers' names will go into the file.

Mr. CLAUSER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The document follows:)

RESOLUTION

We, the undersigned, wish to express our opposition to any reduction in or elimination of the wilderness areas in the United States. We hereby affirm our belief that the wilderness areas make a most worthwhile contribution to the citizens of our country in regard to conservation of wildlife and natural resources and provide unequaled opportunity for hiking, camping, and recreation in addition to the financial contributions made through grazing and administration of these areas on a multiple use basis.

We further request the preservation by continuation of the wilderness areas in the United States for the benefit of ourselves and our posterity.

(365 signatures.)

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Mr. V. I. Corbell, president of the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am appearing on behalf of Mr. V. I. Corbell, and it is his statement which is now before this committee.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF V. I. CORBELL, PRESIDENT, SALT RIVER VALLEY WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION, PHOENIX, ARIZ., AS READ BY ROBERT P. MOORE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Salt River project represents and serves a large segment of the area and population of central Arizona. These services, electricity and water, apply to approximately 75 percent of Maricopa County's 800,000 people.

We are opposed to H.R. 9162 specifically, and wilderness legislation in general, as it may affect our ability to provide water and power to the people in the Salt River Valley. In Arizona, as in other of the Western States, our population depends upon the renewable natural resources issuing from Federal lands; namely, water, wood, and forage for the sustenance of life and the established and growing economy. Yet this bill sets up such uses as "special." This hardly seems consistent with the endorsement of the multiple-use concept.

The watershed which sustains the Salt River Valley consists of approximately 13,000 square miles, 90 percent of which is Federal land (65 percent national forests, 25 percent Indian reservations). Our water supply from this area has, over the last 40 years, declined some 45 percent. This reduction is primarily attributed to the lack of

watershed management on these lands and has resulted in a tremendous overdraft of the underground water supply in central Arizona to meet the demand. We are, in cooperation with the Forest Service, livestock industry, mining industry, and others, attempting to reverse this downward trend in the surface water supply through watershed research. This research is just reaching fruition. An example would be the 3-Bar Cooperative (Forest Service, research and administration; Arizona Game and Fish Department, Salt River project) study in the chaparral vegetative type of central Arizona. This study was designed to give us the results from managed areas similar in type to the Mazatal Wilderness Area. The changes in water yield, forage production, game use, and erosion have been measured over the last 8 years. Generally, foreage production has increased at least tenfold, game use has increased, and erosion has all but vanished on the treated area. Most important from the project's point of view, the annual water yield has increased by about 300 percent.

We are, in cooperation with others, now readying programs which are designed to implement these research findings so that we can improve our native water yields. These programs include plans for carrying out good forestry practices which will reduce the fire danger, limit the possibilities for insect and disease damage, and provide much more enjoyable recreational opportunities to the individual, and his family. Add to this the fact that the production of the other renewable resources, forage and wood, will be enhanced and perpetuated. This program is an absolute necessity since the underground water supply has definite physical limits, and the influx of new people is creating a more and more inflexible demand upon the supply of water. This problem, more people making demands on a limited supply of water, is not confined just to Arizona, or even the Southwest. Water, clean water, suitable for meeting today's domestic, industrial, and agricultural uses is becoming a nationwide problem.

Therefore, we believe that any designation of watershed lands, in Arizona or elsewhere, for a single purpose, wilderness, is not in the best interest of the people served by the project, nor of any people dependent upon a surface source for their water supply. Further, this would be an added limitation on land use in a State already faced with 85 percent of its area under Federal control.

There are already some 413,000 acres of wilderness-type areas on our watershed. There are adequate measures now in effect for the creation of such additional, individual, wilderness areas as may be required for that single purpose. We believe that such individual needs and requests can be processed through the existing procedures. For these reasons we can see no need for a wilderness preservation system.

In summary, this legislation should be defeated for the following reasons:

1. It is contrary to the multiple-use principle which is so vital to the operations of the public lands comprising the watershed of the Salt River project.

2. It prevents the maximum use of forest areas for recreational purposes and limits such wilderness areas to a small minority.

3. It would be detrimental to the State of Arizona by interfering with the lumber industry, the cattle industry, the mining industry,

 SRP05695

the agricultural industry, and, last but not least, the domestic water supply of the city of Phoenix and other valley towns.

4. These existing areas impose use limitations regarding management, and the addition of more wilderness acres would further reduce the productive area for meeting the needs for all the renewable natural resources.

Thank you for allowing us the time to make this statement presenting our views.

Mr. BARING. You are entirely opposed to wilderness then?

Mr. MOORE. To all of the present bills.

Mr. BARING. To all present bills?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions on the part of the committee?

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes; do you have a bill of your own or any suggestion of language of your own that you think you could support, Mr. Moore?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir; we have not.

Mr. DUNCAN. Your objections, I assume, are primarily from the standpoint of utilization for water and power projects?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir; I referred to the existing watershed management work. We think that this work can go on, that water yields can be increased, that the grazing and timber interests can be satisfied, and that the wilderness expanse can still be had.

Mr. DUNCAN. Have you read these bills that are presently before the committee?

Mr. MOORE. Specifically and only 9162 and the Senate bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. There is a provision in there, is there not, that looks to this very situation that you are objecting to? Do you conceive that these bills exclude, under any circumstance, any water development, any reservoir development at all?

Mr. MOORE. Our objection here, Mr. Duncan, is that these uses which happen to sustain life and the economy in the West are classified as "special." We think the wilderness use is a special use, not the use that sustains us day to day.

Mr. DUNCAN. That does not quite answer my question. Do you conceive that these bills prohibit any reservoir development or water resource development in the wilderness areas?

Mr. MOORE. The language of 9162, I believe, does not prohibit, but it involves certain approval which we believe is a limitation.

Mr. DUNCAN. All of these have to be approved. Any Federal project has to be approved, not only by the Executive Construction Agency, the Corps of Engineers, or the Bureau of Reclamation, but by all other Government agencies that are involved, be it Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture, all the rest of them, and then the local units of government have to put their stamp of approval on it, and then they have to go to Congress for a bill authorizing them, and then another bill appropriating the money. So it is a long, hard, tedious task anyway.

As far as I know, I think all of these bills include provisions that permit the President to designate within specific areas where power projects and water projects and powerlines and everything else may be put in in the public interest.

SRP05696

Mr. MOORE. I agree with your summary of the procedures that now exist, but you made my point for me when you said it was a long, hard, tedious process. Why add one more limitation? We have plenty already.

Mr. DUNCAN. In the first place, I do not think you are adding one more because one of the agencies that has to put its stamp of approval on it right now is the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget is the President's right arm.

Let me ask just one other question. You heard the gentleman that just preceded you, I assume?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. In regard to the withdrawal of wilderness areas from the standpoint of the water conservation and preserving the watersheds on which we depend for potable water, would you comment?

Mr. MOORE. I also heard the reference that this had come up before in one of the earlier hearings.

I am not qualified to comment on the production of water in any other State except Arizona, and my qualifications may be a little shaky there.

But let me say this: The experience that we have in Arizona with this research that is going on, shows us this is simply not true for our area.

Mr. DUNCAN. This gentleman, I am sure, was talking about the preservation of the vegetation, trees, grasses, and brush and so on, and the maintenance of the soil as a kind of a sponge which will soak up the water and permit the water table to maintain itself, as opposed to those areas where, for one reason or another, man's activities have denuded it and erosion is the result. You certainly cannot argue with this concept, can you?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir; I will, because this simply does not apply on the watershed area we are concerned about.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is this because you have no vegetation?

Mr. MOORE. This is because we have an overpopulation of vegetation at this particular time. This is what we are aiming our treatments at, thinning out of the vegetation.

Mr. DUNCAN. The aspiration of moisture through such things as sagebrush and things of that sort?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir; we are not at all concerned with the sagebrush area. We do not have sagebrush such as exists here in Nevada and Utah. We are talking about mixed conifers at our highest elevation, talking about ponderosa pine between 6,000 and 9,000 feet elevation, talking about juniper from 3,000 to 5,000 feet elevation, and the chaparral type below the juniper. We are not getting into the sagebrush at all because we, in fact, have none.

Mr. DUNCAN. Your theory is what—that these plants should be stripped from the soil?

Mr. MOORE. That the population of plants existing on our watershed today should be thinned, not removed, thinned just as the cotton farmer thins the cotton and the fruit and vegetable people do the same. This watershed supports a crop of natural resources and they should be managed.

Mr. DUNCAN. I would be interested in pursuing this further, particularly with reference to the impact on supply and the quality of

 SRP05697

water. I do not want to take more time now. If you have additional information on it, I wish you would send it to me. Will you?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask one thing, Mr. Moore. You are talking about trees. I am wondering if the thought ever occurred to anyone that ultimately we are going to have to take some of the people where the water is instead of the water where the people are.

Mr. MOORE. I admit this has not crossed our mind, because our people like the Salt River Valley area and we have the water margin.

Mr. WHITE. Do you not think this is going to be the ultimate problem, that the population cannot go on expanding forever in areas where there is not sufficient water to sustain that expansion?

Mr. MOORE. I am not enough of a philosopher to answer that question directly, but I would point out that transmountain diversions are existent now to move the water where the people are in California, Arizona, and Colorado. This may be the thing of the future, but right now the situation is that water is being moved where the people are.

Mr. WHITE. It is of concern in my State. My State is worried about water being moved out of our State into California.

Mr. BARING. Will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BARING. Does the gentleman have any concern we might turn the Snake into Nevada?

Mr. WHITE. That is just what I mean.

Mr. BARING. We consulted the other day on the possibility of getting a little Snake River water to come down through Nevada. We have a 2,000-foot drop and could cultivate about a hundred million acres if we had the water.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Moore.

The next witness is W. R. Schofield, consulting engineer, San Francisco, Calif. You may proceed, Mr. Schofield.

W. R. SCHOFIELD, CONSULTING ENGINEER, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. SCHOFIELD. Honorable Committee Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee Chairman, and committee members, I wish to thank the committee for granting me the privilege of appearing here before you and to express my personal views and those of a number of private timberowner clients in California.

I am a consultant in engineering and forestry subject matter and have for over 30 years represented engineering, forestry, and water clients on legislative measures before the California State Legislature and on occasion have appeared on behalf of these clients before congressional committees, on matters of land use and ownership.

My personal concern as well as the concern of those whom I represent, is the management of all our natural resources—forests, water, forage, soil, and wildlife—not in the emphasizing of any single use program but an economic and balanced use so applied as to produce the greatest good to the greatest number within the bounds of sound management.

SRP05698

Wilderness legislation deals with only one of the many facets of outdoor recreation which has become of extreme importance in the life of the citizens of our Nation and is of concern and a problem yet to be solved by Congress.

I have observed that I am sure within your legislative experience you have found that too often ideas incorporated in legislation are based solely on emotional and selfish interest, with little or no thought given to the need for such legislation. Often, as is the case of the pending wilderness legislation, there is a dearth of information upon which sound, practical and satisfactory legislation can be designed. All too often you, as lawmakers, are asked to draft and pass a law upon a subject that has many obscure and unknown factors and concerning which no established Federal policy has been enacted which could be used as a guide to the drafting and setting up the administration of such a law.

With due respect to the authors of the pending wilderness legislation, it is my judgment that all of the bills now under consideration contain undesirable, ambiguous, and unnecessary provisions. Some examples: The establishment of a wilderness system, the bypassing of full congressional control by the creation of wilderness areas through administrative fiat, the direction of action in matters not fully explored or known and other clauses and phrases concerning administration by separate agencies yet inferring an ultimate single agency.

It is encouraging to note that your House committee has approved a bill which would establish a Public Land Law Review Commission. If enacted into law this would eventuate in the recommendation concerning the retention and management or disposal of public lands of the United States, which could become the basis for specific legislation to establish a national public lands policy, within which would be incorporated sound administration procedure which in turn would resolve equitably and properly the question and problem of wilderness.

The question and resolving of wilderness administration and management can well be held in abeyance until a commission such as proposed has been able to report its findings and recommendations leading to the establishment of a national public lands policy by action of Congress.

Congress should not be pressured into abdicating its determination of public land policy and administration of public lands by special or piecemeal legislation enactments.

Again, I wish to thank the committee for its courtesy and consideration.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

The gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. WHITE. You refer to the people you represent. Do you represent any specific group?

Mr. SCHOFIELD. I have clients who are in the lumber business primarily in the redwood region in California.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, as well as representing yourself today, you are representing the lumbering industry in a certain area of California?

Mr. SCHOFIELD. Speaking in their behalf; yes.

 SRP05699

Mr. BARING. What is the nature of the water clients you have? Is it in regard to source or from the standpoint of cleanliness?

Mr. SCHOFIELD. Source and service to the people. I represent the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland.

Mr. BARING. As far as the drinking water is concerned?

Mr. SCHOFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARING. That is interesting. I do not know about the East Bay, but San Francisco has fluoridated the drinking water there. Would you care to express yourself as to the question whether these waters should be medicated or kept pure the way God gave them to us?

Mr. SCHOFIELD. Most certainly the East Bay water has, of record, the purest water that is served to the public in the United States at the present time. They are much concerned with the purity of our water and are trying to maintain it at its highest level. They are, however, interested in the use of their watershed plans compatible with the production of pure water, and have so designated the use of their lands for fishing and recreation that are not harmful to the potability of water.

Mr. BARING. The potability of water, though, in San Francisco is entirely different from nature. There they have fluoridated the water.

Mr. SCHOFIELD. Right.

Mr. BARING. And there is a difference between chlorine and fluoridation. One is a purifier——

Mr. SCHOFIELD. That is right.

Mr. BARING. And the other is a menace. I am very interested in getting your testimony on this point. I think where a government bureau sticks its nose into the supplying of drinking water in America and deliberately puts in a medicine, they are just as guilty of destroying the wilderness as any part of our people.

Mr. SCHOFIELD. I think the people in the water business realize that, too.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much. I appreciate getting that statement from you.

Mr. SCHOFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Mr. Richard Gordon Miller, Washoe Pines Ranch, Carson City, Nev. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD GORDON MILLER, WASHOE VALLEY, CARSON CITY, NEV.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Dr. Richard Gordon Miller. I represent Washoe Pines Ranch, a private summer school for high-ability children situated in Washoe Valley, Route 1, Box 621, Carson City, Nev. I wish to testify in favor of the wilderness bill, H.R. 9070, known as the Saylor bill, because I believe it best meets objections and serves to protect my business. My business is a school for the instruction of capable grade school and high school children in the studies of history, natural history, and the environmental sciences. To show why the wilderness system is important, I must explain that our program is an intensified field, laboratory, and classroom study of earth and life. In order to know the highest and best domestic uses of the habitable places of the land, our students study the effects of weather, climate, latitude,

SRP05700

and altitude upon the native plants and animals which have evolved and adapted in the situations that we can visit. In a 6-week session these children, many of them from distant cities, study the cultivated fields, pastures, and orchards, the desert rangeland, the forest and mountains and compare their ecology with aquatic life situations. Our travels are by foot, horseback, truck, and bus. During each 6-week session we examine the public domain, a national forest, Federal and State wildlife refuges and a national park as examples of land management. In 6 weeks we travel some 2,000 miles going to these places.

These children from families established in business, ranching, mining, and diplomatic and political careers come to us because we can provide this wilderness experience as part of the lesson of resource use.

The crux of my testimony is this: the future of my school as a business and as a success in science education depends in a very obvious way upon consistency in the government for a continuing system of wilderness.

Therefore I request your committee to pass to the House of Representatives H.R. 9070 without further amendment for early passage this session of Congress.

I would like to add, as a professor and as an ecologist, the wilderness in the future is going to be our own yardstick to what life is and was intended to be. We are a long way, evidently, from knowing as scientists at this time this yardstick.

I appreciate your attention to the Academy of Science's testimony, because as president of the northern chapter of the Nevada Academy of Science, I would like to say we feel we need these yardsticks in the future.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Miller.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. I would just like to thank the gentleman for a very forthright and honest statement. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The magazine Nevada Highways we will put in the file.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. There are plenty more available but are not mine to distribute.

Mr. BARING. Together with the brochure of the Washoe Pines Ranch. They will be made a part of the file.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Arthur B. Johnson, treasurer of the Desert Protective Council. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR B. JOHNSON, TREASURER, DESERT PROTECTIVE COUNCIL, WEST COVINA, CALIF.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the Public Land Subcommittee, I am Arthur B. Johnson, West Covina, Calif.

The Desert Protective Council for which I speak as a member of its board of directors and its treasurer is a nonprofit organization which, as its name implies, was organized for the protection of the natural and native features of "the deserts and the mountain ranges within

SRP05701

and/or bordering them which are ecologically bound to them." It might appear at firsthand that an organization interested in desert protection would have little interest in a wilderness protection bill. On the contrary, many large desert tracts will be included in the wilderness system as envisioned by wilderness legislation before this committee. Also, the mountain ranges within and which border the deserts also contain large tracts of wild or wilderness areas under the management of the U.S. Forest Service which would or could become units of a wilderness system.

The Desert Protective Council and its many hundreds of members, spread throughout California, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico, endorse and strongly support legislation designed to assure adequate future protection for these wild and wilderness areas. The concept of wilderness protection is not new. The U.S. Forest Service, as early as 1932, set aside areas to be managed in their primitive or natural state. Twice the Senate of the United States has seen fit to overwhelmingly pass wilderness protective legislation, the most recent of which was S. 4 of the current Congress. Wilderness protection has also been recognized on the State level.

Mr. Edward Dolder, chief of California's division of beaches and parks, at a meeting of the Society of American Foresters, December 13, 1963, said:

> Wilderness has always been a major challenge to mankind. In this country, up to the recent past, wilderness has been something to conquer, something to exploit, something to overcome and to modify for the immediate material and economic needs of mankind. Now, however, the picture has changed. We have reached the point where our remaining wilderness areas must be protected and preserved if the challenge of wilderness is to exist in any form for the generations of the future.
>
> If adequate samples of wilderness can be retained, the challenge of the wilderness * * * and the enjoyment of its rare beauties * * * will remain as a stimulating force in America, one which wil contribute materially through the years to the strength and fiber of the people of our Nation.
>
> There is a real urgency for preserving what little wilderness remains in the southern California area. With the tremendous population pressures that will be on these remaining areas, their management will be a critical problem in the future. If these areas are not provided with an adequate framework for protection and management, they may actually be found to be in the position of being preserved in principle but being destroyed in fact.

Mr Dolder's remarks were made the evening of the day that the California State Park Commission had established a 13,000-acre area in their park system as Mount San Jacinto Wilderness State Park and had directed that special regulations be prepared to preserve its wilderness integrity for the future.

As Chief Dolder so truthfully said, the time of exploitation of our wilderness is past. Attached and made a part of this statement are the remarks made a few years ago by Prof. James Bonner, of the California Institute of Technology. Professor Bonner's remarks are entitled "The Ultimate Limit of Our Resources." I quote his closing remarks to further emphasize their irrefutability and because they so eloquently answer the pleas of those advocating "use now or suffer later."

> We are in the midst of a transition from an economy based upon the exploitation of the highest grades of materials to one based upon the utilization of the lowest grades of materials. In the long-range future our industrial civilization will obtain its materials entirely from the lowest grade and most abundant of

ores. The time must inevitably come when high-grade resources, rich deposits of this or that, magnificent stands of timber, water flowing in the streams of our mountains, will no longer suffice for the requirements of an expanding industrial civilization. We have to learn how to get along without these high-grade resources, and to use low grade ones instead. We know that we can in principle get along with low-grade resources for an essentially infinite time into the future.

The pressure today for the despoilation and utilization of our natural areas in order to obtain from them material resources such as ores, trees, or fuel is immense. As high-grade resources become even more scarce the pressure to exploit and utilize the last little remnants will become ever more intense. There is, however, no logical reason why our society should yield to these pressures. If the preservation of a natural area has aesthetic, scientific, or other important value, then society is quite justified in such preservation. The amount of any material resource obtainable by the despoilation of a natural area today is insignificant in comparison with the future requirements of our Nation or of the world as a whole. To maintain a natural area in its native state will at the most delay but a second in time the moment when we must depend upon the lowest grades of materials anyway. Let us, therefore, resist these pressures for the despoilation of natural areas, pressures based upon the argument that the material resources which they contain are essential to the welfare of our culture. Let us maintain a portion of the surface of our earth in its original state. By doing so we do not cheat mankind of anything which is essential to his well-being, we merely hasten very slightly the day which must inevitably come anyway, the day when industrial civilization must live upon rock, sea water, and air.

Mr. Chairman, I can add nothing to the eloquent pleas of Chief Dolder and Professor Bonner, other than to plead in behalf of the Desert Protective Council and our widespread membership that the Congress of the United States in its wisdom, provides legislative protection for an adequate wilderness system. The Desert Protective Council and its membership recommend the enactment of the legislation embodied in the Senate bill, S. 4, which the Senate of the current Congress has already passed, as the most effective means in that no timely delays would be required to compromise the Senate and the House versions. If, however, in its wisdom, the House of Representatives should wish to write their own legislation, the Desert Protective Council and its membership recommend the enactment of H.R. 9070, introduced by your member, the Honorable John P. Saylor, or Mr. Cohelan's bill, 9520. We feel the Dingell bill, H.R. 9162, which is before you, has many deficiencies and should be amended to bring it into conformity with H.R. 9520.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BARING. The pamphlet, "The Ultimate Limit of Our Resources," attached to Mr. Johnson's statement, will be made a part of the committee file.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Virlis L. Fischer, Las Vegas, Nev.

STATEMENT OF VIRLIS L. FISCHER, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. FISCHER. Honorable chairman and members of the committee, I am Virlis L. Fischer, a wilderness recreationist with broad experience throughout the West. I live in Las Vegas where we have more than 10 million visitors a year, as contrasted with the 100 visitors to our one wilderness area in Nevada. Nevertheless, I am grateful for this one area. I am a member of most of the nationally known con-

SRP05703

servation organizations, and serve as a recreation member of the Western Land Use Committee of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association. It will be readily recognized that the subject of this hearing involves a major western land-use problem. Whatever final solution is made to this problem of wilderness legislation, I hope it will be one that westerners can live with—and I mean all westerners, not just those with a special interest in maximizing wilderness acreage.

In 1958 at a public hearing in Bend, Oreg., conducted by my friend, the late U.S. Senator Dick Neuberger, I first questioned the need for wilderness legislation. I still do. The record of the Forest Service in the field of wilderness preservation is noteworthy. It should dispel the irresponsible charge that the wilderness will disappear unless this bill is enacted. With congressional sanction of wilderness establishment in the Multiple Use Act of 1960, I fail to see the need for further legislation unless and until there is a breakdown in the moral fiber of either the Forest Service or the Secretary of Agriculture. If this should ever occur, Congress has the power to intervene. So far, there has been every indication of being able to cope with the pressures which develop from time to time, and I am convinced that future threats to the integrity of wilderness boundaries will come, not from commercial interests, but from conflicts with other forms of recreation.

If the Forest Service has erred at all, it has been on the side of generosity in wilderness dedications, as I know of no outdoor recreation group who has been more lavishly treated than the wilderness recreationists. I, therefore, look upon the wilderness bill as an artificially stimulated promotion, and as a prime example of the blessings of tax exemption.

If, however, in the democratic process, there is to be additional wilderness legislation, then I would give my endorsement to the Dingell bill, H.R. 9162, if changes along the following lines were adopted:

Suggestion No. 1: Eliminate the national parks and monuments from the bill, as well as the wildlife refuges and game rangers, so that the legislation will apply only to the Forest Service wilderness system.

It is still my belief that the national parks and monuments already have sufficient congressional directive for their protection, and that in practice the Park Service is doing a magnificent job. Further, I think the inclusion of the parks in a wilderness system will tend to guarantee the perpetuation of the underdevelopment which cause the ORRRC to state in its classic report:

> Opening up unused parts of present sites is just as imperative; indeed, without this kind of development, the United States could spend billions on new parks and still not keep up with the demand.

Also, I am still of the opinion the wildlife refuges do not belong in a wilderness bill. These are managed areas where development and control of the water, and manipulation of the vegetative cover are management tools. Roads facilitate management. I was tempted to make an exception of certain refuges in Alaska, but even here the airplane is a management tool.

Suggestion No. 2: Allow 15 years instead of 10 for the reclassification of the existing primitive areas and their enactment as wilderness by positive congressional action.

Ten years seems too short a time to allow for detailed studies of nearly 40 of these primitive areas and the necessary congressional action to follow. I have grave fears that some real choice areas, for one reason or another, might fail of enactment within the time limit imposed, and it isn't sufficiently clear what happens to them in that case.

Suggestion No. 3: Perhaps it should be spelled out in the bill that eliminations of unsuitable portions of the primitive areas, in the study and reclassification process, should revert to ordinary, unclassified national forest land; in addition to spelling out similar disposition for those lands which fail of wilderness enactment by Congress.

Suggestion No. 4: In the event the committee sees fit to make the change from 10 to 15 years, perhaps the date for the mining and mineral leasing should coincide accordingly. There is very little mineralization in the existing wild, wilderness, and canoe areas and the highly mineralized portions of the primitive areas likely will be eliminated in the reclassification process, so that I see no great harm to get excited about if this change were to be made.

In conclusion then, with the foregoing suggestions, I wish to go on record as favoring H.R. 9162 in the event the committe, in its wisdom, proceeds with a compromise wilderness bill. I thank the committee for this opportunity to make my views known, and wish to express my appreciation to the individual members for their continuing support of sound conservation measures, and to Chairman Aspinall, in particular, whose record as a conservationist and whose grasp of western land use problems are, to me, outstanding.

In closing, I would just like to say you gentlemen have my sympathy if you have to agree on a concept of the wilderness, because I recall that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission could not agree.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Fischer, your testimony is interesting and I am sure the committee appreciates it.

I know of your background in the wilderness and as a recreationist for a long time. You would rather not see a bill enacted at all at this time, but if any is to come out of the committee, the Dingell bill comes closest to fitting your idea?

Mr. FISCHER. I still fail to see the actual need for additional wilderness legislation at this time, but I have no objection to going ahead with a compromise bill like the Dingell bill.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Fischer.

The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN. I would guess you would differ rather strikingly with my friend Senator Neuberger if he were here today on this particular issue; would you not?

Mr. FISCHER. I gave substantially the same testimony before my friend Dick in 1958.

Mr. DUNCAN. Senator Dick Neuberger was a very highly esteemed Member of the U.S. Senate from my State.

Mr. FISCHER. I know. I am formerly from Portland and I know all about your hassle down on Rogue River.

Mr. DUNCAN. I am pleased to have a chance to greet a friend of Dick Neuberger.

Mr. FISCHER. Thank you.

SRP05705

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would just like to say this: I believe your analysis probably comes closer to what will actually happen in the compilation of this legislation. I think if wilderness legislation is passed it will be very close to that that you recommend.

Mr. FISCHER. Thank you very much.

Mr. WHITE. I do not mean that this is exactly what I want, but what I foresee.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Art Lynn on behalf of the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. You may proceed, Mr. Lynn.

STATEMENT OF ART LYNN, INLAND EMPIRE MULTIPLE USE COMMITTEE, COEUR d'ALENE, IDAHO

Mr. LYNN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Art Lynn, forest engineer for Western Pine Association from Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. I am a member of the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee, a group composed of forest resource users and owners in Idaho, Montana, and Washington. The membership, objectives, and reports of our committee are summarized in the attached sheet, "Facts About the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee."

The Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee appreciates the opportunity to express the viewpoints of our group at this meeting.

From the beginning I wish to point out our committee accepts wilderness as a valid use under the multiple-use concept which became law in 1960.

Our committee was greatly impressed by the performance of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 87th Congress. The thorough work and considered judgment of the Public Land Subcommittee resulted in an amended H.R. 776 and officially titled as Report No. 2521. We regret that circumstances prevented this bill from being enacted. If agreeable to this committee, I would like to include as part of the record our committee's September 11, 1962, analysis of H.R. 776 which discusses the major provisions of Report No. 2521 and gives our reasons for supporting it.

In past testimony to your committee, the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee set forth some basic premises which are desirable in any wilderness legislation. These are reviewed briefly, as follows:

One, positive congressional control of lands to be included as wilderness in the national forests, national parks, and wildlife refuges.

Two, to specifically exclude national forest primitive areas as wilderness until thorough inventory and analysis has been conducted to determine its proper classification as wilderness of multiple use in whole or in part.

Three, to specifically provide for future periodic evaluation of all resources in wilderness areas to establish the proper and wisest use.

Four, to permit sale or exchange of private lands inside the boundaries of wilderness areas by consent of the landowner.

The above provisions are a sound basis for reasonable wilderness areas and would sacrifice a minimum of multiple-use benefits for all citizens. We recommend these basic provisions be included in any proposed wilderness legislation.

SRP05706

A basic concern of a great many western citizens and particularly those of us whose livelihood is directly dependent on the wise use and management of our natural resource—whether it be wood, water, minerals, forage, or recreation—is that proper consideration be given to local dependent communities and our basic industries of agriculture, mineral, and forest products to permit them to grow and continue to provide our social and economic way of life.

An additional concern is wasted resources set aside in wilderness areas which are best suited for multiple use; for example, in the case of a forest crop which, if not utilized, becomes a loss to the economy as well as a hazard to manage. Careful examination of each area before classification as wilderness to determine its suitability as wilderness or multiple use could limit this waste.

Our committee believes H.R. 9162 introduced by Representative Dingell on November 19, 1963, would be acceptable with the following suggested amendments:

One, the one major amendment our committee feels is necessary to make H.R. 9162 acceptable is a provision which requires periodic reviews of all resources in all wilderness areas to determine their suitability for continued classification as wilderness.

Two, section 5(b) affecting a private owner's right of access needs clarification and, in the particular, the phrase, "which have been or are being customarily enjoyed with respect to other such areas similarly situated."

Three, section 5(a) provides that State-owned lands within wilderness areas may be exchanged for comparable Federal lands. This principle should be extended to private landowners within wilderness areas.

In conclusion, the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee commends this committee for holding western hearings to develop a record upon which to base sound legislation.

Thank you.

(The documents attached to Mr. Lynn's statement follow:)

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *January 8, 1964.*

FACTS ABOUT THE INLAND EMPIRE MULTIPLE USE COMMITTEE

The committee is composed of members of six forest conservation and development organizations representing a large number of private natural resource owners, operators, and users in Idaho, western Montana, and eastern Washington.

The objective of the committee is to promote sound, integrated, multiple-use management of the many natural resources on both public and private forest lands.

In all of its studies the committee has followed the premise that while the multiple-use concept includes wilderness as a valid use, the areas preserved as wilderness must be balanced against local and national needs for other essential natural resources.

All committee members are employed in private forest-land resource conservation and management. Their work includes the protection, development, and wise use of timber, minerals, grazing, water, wildlife, and recreation.

The committee was formed in December 1960, to study the Forest Service proposal for the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area in Idaho and Montana. Since then, the committee has studied and reported on other phases of the wilderness issue.

At its first organizational meeting the committee elected Royce Cox of Lewiston, Idaho, as its chairman. Cox is managing forester for Potlatch Forests, Inc.

SRP05707

E. C. Rettig, recently retired vice president and general manager, P.F.I. is presently committee chairman.

Other members of the committee and the organizations they represent are:

Mr. Burton Schmidt, president, North Idaho Forestry Association, Schmidt Bros., Inc., Weippe, Idaho.

Mr. Theodore Hoff, president, South Idaho Forestry Association, Hoff Lumber Co., Horseshoe Bend, Idaho.

Mr. Mark Schoknecht, chairman, Montana Forest Practices Committee, J. Neils Division, St. Regis Paper Co., Libby, Mont.

Mr. George Rauch, chairman, Idaho Forest Practices Committee, Potlatch Forests, Inc., Lewiston, Idaho.

Mr. Arthur Lynn, forester, Western Pine Association, Post Office Box 222, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

To date, several reports have been published by the committee:

1. Proposal for the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area, February 1961.
2. Recommendations on the wilderness bill as amended and passed by the Senate, October 1961.
3. Proposed Anaconda-Pintlar Wilderness Area, January 1962.
4. Analysis of the new wilderness bill, H.R. 776, as amended by House Interior Committee, September 1962.
5. Proposed Sawtooth Wilderness Area, June 1963.
6. Proposed Cabinet Mountains Wild Area, July 1963.

In the first report the committee expresses support for preserving a reasonable acreage of wilderness on Federal lands, but objects to the Forest Service-proposed Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area (in Idaho and Montana) as being too large and containing too many resources having higher values for nonwilderness uses. The committee recommends the wilderness area be reduced in size by 301,440 acres (from 1,163,550 to 862,110). More roads and camp grounds are suggested for the multiple-use area to be excluded from wilderness. The committee contends these changes would improve forest protection, make more resources available for local needs, and provide more recreation accessible to the average family. The committee points out that the net size of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area it recommends is 862,110 acres, which is twice as large as the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area in the Washington Cascades. The committee's proposed wilderness contains 182,110 acres of commercial forest area with some extensive mature stands of representative species. The committee presented statements at the three Forest Service hearings in March 1961. (NOTE.—After receiving many pro and con statements, the regional forester sent an undisclosed recommendation to the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service in Washington, D.C. On January 11, 1963, the Secretary of Agriculture announced the classification of a 1,239,840-acre Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area, including 28,400 acres not previously classified as primitive; 216,870 acres were left in primitive status and 441,000 acres reclassified for multiple use.)

The committee's second report analyzes the wilderness bill, S. 174, as amended and passed by the Senate and recommends opposition to the bill because it is unnecessary and damaging legislation. The committee reaffirms its support for a reasonable, carefully planned program of wilderness preservation balanced with the other needs of the Nation's citizens, but points out that adequate wilderness areas on national forests are already provided for under the Multiple Use Act of 1960, and that the wilderness bill, if passed, would too severely restrict the use of too large an area of public land. Recommendations for amendments to S. 174 are made.

The committee's third report gives general endorsement to the Forest Service proposal for reclassifying the 164,408-acre Anaconda-Pintlar Primitive Area in Montana to a 159,000-acre wilderness area. The committee says the proposed Anaconda-Pintlar wilderness is reasonable in size and is well qualified for wilderness classification with a minimum of conflict with other uses. Recommendations are made for periodic reevaluation of mineral resources with future adjustments of wilderness area boundaries to be made when justified by the discovery or development of needed nonwilderness resources.

The committee's fourth report gives full support to H.R. 776 as amended, feeling it provided the most reasonable and workable solution to the wilderness controversy. This bill would give reasonable assurance that all resources of the large area of public lands involved would be protected and made available under sound management, if and when needed for the benefit of all U.S. citizens.

SRP05708

In the fifth report the committee generally endorses the Forest Service proposal for reclassifying the 200,942-acre Sawtooth Primitive Area in Idaho as a 192,402-acre wilderness area. The committee said the area was ideally suited for wilderness use and that areas containing other known values had been excluded by the Forest Service. The committee recommended on boundary change to exclude about 21,000 acres considered to be more valuable for other resources; development of this excluded area would also improve access to the high mountain wilderness.

The committee's sixth report endorses the Forest Service proposal for reclassifying the 89,900-acre Cabinet Mountains Primitive Area in Montana to a 94,314-acre wild area, pointing out that the area was reasonable in size and contains good examples of commercial timber but not in quantity sufficient to harm the economy of the State.

Several newsletters have been circulated by the committee and statements presented to congressional hearings on wilderness legislation.

Limited copies of reports are available on request. Address: Post Office Box 600, Lewiston, Idaho.

[Report No. 4]

INLAND EMPIRE MULTIPLE USE COMMITTEE,
Lewiston, Idaho, September 11, 1962.

ANALYSIS OF THE NEW WILDERNESS BILL H.R. 776

As amended and approved on August 9 by the House Public Lands Subcommittee and as further amended and approved on August 30 by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee

The additional changes made by the full House Committee on Interior Affairs are:

A. The period during which mineral prospecting and mining is permitted on the 7 million acres of national forest land initially designated as wilderness is increased from 10 to 25 years. (See item 10.a, p. 6.)

B. Provision is made for constructing temporary roads for transporting otherwise inaccessible national forest timber across wilderness areas. (See item 10.b, p. 6.)

C. Special permission is given to develop skiing facilities on 3,500 acres of the 34,000-acre San Gorgonio Wild Area in California. (See item 10.d, p. 6.)

D. Other technical and minor changes of no great concern.

Following is an analysis of the essential features of the new bill. Comments on the bill in comparison with S. 174 which passed the Senate last fall appear in parentheses.

The title of the bill is amended to read "A bill to provide for the preservation of wilderness areas, for the management of public lands, and for other purposes."

1. Section 101 clearly sets forth the intent and purpose of the bill as follows: "In order to assure that—

(1) there are no unnecessary or unjustifiably extensive withdrawals, reservations, restrictions, or changes in use designations or classifications of the public lands and shelf lands of the United States; and that

(2) such withdrawals, reservations, restrictions, and use designations or classifications as are made provide for the use of each area in the national interest; and that

(3) the acquisition, occupancy, use, and exploration of lands and the development and exploitation of the resources thereof in accordance with the public land laws of the United States are not unduly limited; and that

(4) the public lands of the United States are managed generally in accordance with the principles of multiple use unless otherwise specifically authorized by law; and that

(5) an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas within the United States, its territories, and possessions leaving no lands reserved and protected in their natural condition,

It is hereby declared to be the national policy that Congress shall provide more precise guidelines for and supervision over the use and disposition of the public lands and resources of the United States, thereby securing for the American people of present and future generations maximum beneficial use of such lands and resources including an enduring resource of wilderness."

(Comment: This is a vast improvement over S. 174 which does not give adequate consideration to resource values other than wilderness. The new bill, H.R. 776, still stresses wilderness preservation but places it in proper perspective with overall multiple use resource management.)

2. Uniform procedures are established for all major changes in use designations of public lands including classifications for wilderness.

(Comment: A big step forward. S. 174 does not do this.)

3. Wilderness is defined by section 202(a) as follows:

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

(Comment: This is almost identically the same as in the Senate-passed S. 174. The only change is the requirement that wilderness areas must have at least 5,000 areas of lands. In S. 174 the 5,000-acre requirement was limited to national park areas.)

4. Positive acts of Congress are required for all "withdrawals, reservations, restrictions, designations, or classifications" of public lands over 5,000 acres in size, with certain exceptions noted later.

(Comment: One of the most significant improvements over S. 174. This is an extension of the "Engle Act" passed by Congress several years ago which requires positive acts of Congress for all withdrawals of public lands for military and defense uses. The Engle Act was primarily sponsored by wildlife and outdoor organizations who feared military withdrawals were becoming excessive. It will be interesting to learn the position of these groups regarding the extension of the protective features of the Engle Act to all land withdrawals for special uses—including wilderness designation.

(This positive act requirement assures adequate debate in Congress of vitally important public land management proposals involving large areas of public lands. It also assures the selection of outstanding high-quality wilderness—the kind which will endure in competition with other uses. Under the negative or "veto" provisions of S. 174 unreasonable (and untenable) wilderness classifications could be enacted into law by default, simply through inability of Congress to take action within a specific period of time.)

5. The bill initially designates as "wilderness" 6,822,400 acres of wilderness, wild, and canoe areas in national forests, with additions, subtractions, or changes of over 5,000 acres only upon specific, positive approval of Congress.

(Comment: S. 174 would also have included these areas initially. H.R. 776, however, more specifically provides for justifiable changes later. Some opponents of Senate-passed S. 174 will no doubt still object to the automatic inclusion of such a large area of national forest lands. However, it must be remembered these areas were given at least some—if inadequate—study by the Forest Service before being placed in their present restricted classification. Some highly valuable minerals, timber, or other resources will no doubt be placed in wilderness by this new House bill; however, the specific provisions for prospecting and mining (see item 10a, p. ——) and periodic review (see item 7, p. ——) give reasonable assurance that boundary changes can be made later to exclude from wilderness those areas having higher values for nonwilderness uses.)

6. The bill provides for the additional classification as wilderness within a 10-year period of qualifying parts of (*a*) the 7,852,958 acres of national forest primitive areas; (*b*) the 20,100,000 acres of roadless portions of the national park systems; and (*c*) the 24 million acres of national wildlife refuges and game ranges—but only after a thorough review and evaluation of all resource values and only upon positive action of Congress.

(Comment: S. 174 would automatically place the national forest primitive areas into a "wilderness system" upon enactment of the bill with the remote possibility of withdrawing nonqualifying areas later. The new bill does not

SRP05710

create a "wilderness system" desired by promoters of S. 174. Such a wilderness system is actually unnecessary because all the areas classified as wilderness are already under the jurisdiction of and will continue to be managed by competent Federal agencies. Therefore, the House bill still gives assurance of including an additional reasonable acreage of wilderness from existing primitive areas, national parks, and wildlife areas, but it also gives much stronger assurance that these vast unstudied areas of public lands will be much more thoroughly inventoried before any part is officially classified as wilderness.)

7. The new bill requires review, by the appropriate department Secretary, of wilderness areas established by this act and analysis of resource values therein at least once every 25 years. Reports are to be presented to the President and Congress. These reports are to include the opinions of the Governor of each State and the governing county boards involved, as well as the opinions and recommendations of 11 Federal agencies having jurisdiction over public land. These are the U.S. Forest Service, the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Mines, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission. The reviews and reports are to specifically consider all resource values, including wilderness, and possible alternate uses of the areas for the highest public benefit.

(Comment: This too is a great improvement over S. 174, which does not require review of all areas prior to inclusion in a "wilderness system" or periodic review thereafter. The requirements for review under the new bill assure that the natural resources on the vast area of public lands involved will be protected, wisely managed, and developed for full multiple use benefits for all U.S. citizens. In other words, wilderness preservation will be balanced with the Nation's need for other resources.

(Some sponsors of S. 174 will object to this review requirement of the new bill because they fear it will gradually diminish the total area designated as wilderness. While some areas will no doubt lose their wilderness classification upon the discovery of greater values—such as presently unknown minerals—nothing in the bill prevents the addition of other areas determined to then have a higher value for wilderness than for other purposes.

(There are many thousands of acres of Federal land, lying outside areas presently proposed for wilderness which could be classified in the future as wilderness upon determination that this is their "highest and best" use. Much of our high, scenic, western mountain country will remain essentially wilderness for a long time to come. Even though these high elevation areas contain many beautiful stands of commercial-quality timber, in many cases the growth rate is so slow and the problems of harvesting so great that it is unlikely they will ever become commercially operable, at least in the foreseeable future. Also, it is difficult to visualize all of this high country being developed for minerals. The greatest pressure for development will come from demands of the general public for more campgrounds and accessible recreation areas; this can be effectively controlled under H.R. 776 to provide a continuing and adequate resource of wilderness for the special use of those who enjoy this type of recreation.)

8. The new bill requires that the appropriate Secretary shall hold public hearings at "locations convenient to the area affected" prior to submitting his report to Congress for proposed reclassifications as wilderness any part of existing primitive, national park, and wildlife refuges and game ranges. No requirement is made for local hearings at the time of the review period made once every 25 years; however, such review and subsequent positive action of Congress is to be based on the purpose of the bill previously described under title I and also is to consider the opinions and recommendations of the local and national agencies involved.

(Comment: Again this is an improvement over S. 174 which does not require any hearings prior to the automatic inclusion in a "wilderness system" of all existing national forest primitive areas or prior to the later inclusion of parts of national parks and wildlife ranges and game refuges. The omission in the new bill of requirement for local hearings concerning recommended reclassifications at the time of the 25-year review is disappointing. The importance of local hearings should not be overlooked. For example, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs refused to hold western hearings on S. 174 prior to its going to the floor of the Senate for a vote. Had such hearings been held to obtain the views of local citizens most affected by the legislation, many more Senators might have voted against S. 174.)

SRP05711

9. The new bill places general restrictions on use of the wilderness areas under section 206(b) as follows:

"Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within wilderness areas designated by section 203(a) of this Act, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required, for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such area."

(Comment: These restrictions are identically the same as in S. 174 except for the substitution of the word "areas" for "system" in line 3.)

10. Specal uses or exceptions to section 206(b) are provided as follows:

(*a*) Provision is made for the continuation of mineral prospecting and mining—during a 25-year period following enactment of the bill—on national forest wilderness, wild, and canoe areas initially included as wilderness under the act. Such use is subject to the mineral laws of the United States and "to such reasonable regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture." The bill also permits "where essential the use of mechanized ground or air equipment" for prospecting and mining together with the requirement for "restoration as near as practicable of the surface of the land disturbed."

(*b*) Section 206(i) of the bill provides for crossing wilderness areas with temporary roads necessary to harvest otherwise inaccessible timber as follows: "In connection with sales of timber outside of wilderness areas, the Secretary of Agriculture may, if in his discretion no practicable alternate route is available, authorize construction of temporary roads necessary to permit transportation of the cut timber across any area designated as wilderness by this act: *Provided*, That such temporary roads shall be used for no other purpose: *And provided further*, That restoration of the surface, as near as practicable, shall be accomplished as soon as the temporary road has served its purpose."

(*c*) Timber cutting is permitted on wilderness areas but only in three specific situations:

(1) In connection with mining operations described under 10(*a*) above and then only in amounts needed for the mineral extraction, and

(2) For the removal of trees in the construction of access roads described under 10(*b*), and

(3) In the boundary waters canoe area of Minnesota where specific provision is made for "maintaining without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber, the primitive character of the area * * *." (NOTE.—Does not otherwise permit commercial timber operations on public lands in any primitive or wilderness area.)

(*d*) Special designation of a 3,500-acre ski area in a 34,000-acre wild area in California is provided by section 206(j) of the bill as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture may designate approximately 3,500 acres in the San Gorgonio area, California, for the purposes of skiing and developing facilities necessary therefor: *Provided*, That the Secretary finds that said use is the highest and best use to be made of this area.

(*e*) The use of aircraft and motorboats "may" be permitted to continue where already established.

(*f*) "Such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and disease subject to such conditions as the appropriate Secretary deems desirable."

(*g*) Commercial services "may" be performed for recreational purposes. (Apparently includes commercial packing and guide service although not specifically named.)

(*h*) Hunting and fishing is permitted "to the extent it is not incompatible with wilderness preservation." Jurisdiction over fish and wildlife is left with the States involved.

(*i*) The Secretary of Agriculture "may" authorize water storage projects, transmission lines and other facilities needed in the public interest.

(*j*) The grazing of livestock "shall" be permitted to continue where already established.

(Comment: These special uses are similar to those in S. 174 with the important exceptions of items (*a*), (*b*), and (*d*) and the change from "well established" to "established" with respect to continuance of grazing and the use of aircraft and motorboats.

(One of the most significant improvements in the new bill is the specific permission of prospecting and mining for a period of 25 years after enactment on the 6,822,400 acres of wilderness, wild, and canoe areas initially designated as wilderness. This will provide an opportunity for a much-needed inventory of the mineral potential of these areas—something which would have been virtually impossible under S. 174. Undoubtedly, this will be one of the most controversial features of the bill. Some sponsors of S. 174 will strongly object to this on the ground that it "violates" the purist wilderness concept and that it may "despoil" too much of the wilderness. However, as a nation we simply cannot afford to let such a large area of public lands lie unsurveyed for minerals and other resources which may be urgently needed to sustain local economies, for national defense, or for successful competition in the space race. The biggest job in surveying these vast, roadless, unexplored areas is the determination of subsurface and deep-lying minerals. This process should be greatly speeded by the use of powered core drills transported by helicopters to check areas determined by modern geophysical and geochemical examination to have mineral potential. Such exploration should not greatly disturb the land surface.

(More intensive prospecting or mining activities resulting from discovery of valuable or critically needed ore deposits would no doubt disturb the land surface to a greater extent than would core drilling. However, mining operations ordinarily occupy relatively small portions of the earth's surface and hence it is unlikely that these activities will materially reduce the total potential area of wilderness. The new bills does specifically require reasonable regulation of prospecting and mining activities as well as restoration of the surface of lands disturbed to a near-natural conditions. Thus, upon completion of prospecting and mining operations the natural character of the area should be restored through the regrowth of trees and other vegetation. While such restored areas might not be as "pristine" as desired by the purist wilderness concept, nevertheless this procedure will assure the continuing designation of large areas for the limited use of wilderness-type recreation—without sacrificing the use of other critically needed resources.

(The provision for temporary roads described in item (*b*) above is also an improvement over S. 174. While this provision will probably not be used to any great extent, it does make possible the harvest of highly valuable timber outside wilderness areas which might be needed in the future and which might otherwise be completely blocked off. It should be noted that no timber cutting is permitted in wilderness areas adjacent to these roads. The specific requirements for restoration of the road surface and prohibition of any other uses will preserve the long-range wilderness characteristics of the area.

One perpetual and especially difficult problem with wilderness-type areas is that of protection of the forests from fire, insects, and disease. H.R. 776 does provide (as did S. 174) that "such measures may be taken as may be necessary" to control these enemies of the forest. However, because of the absence of roads, these areas are extremely difficult to get into quickly enough with adequate men and equipment to stop fires while they are small. While improvements have been made in the use of smoke jumping and helicopters for transporting men and the use of aircraft for dropping fire retardants, these methods are much more costly and usually less effective than the use of modern ground-based equipment and manpower. Thus, we can expect continued heavy losses of timber from fire in many of the larger wilderness areas.

(As trees become overage and lose their vigor, insects and disease increase their toll. Because of the general inaccessibility of wilderness areas, control measures are either impractical or excessively expensive.

(The problem of maintaining trails for wilderness users and fire-protection access becomes increasingly difficult and costly as the dead trees rot at the base and fall to the ground. The resulting jungle of dead snags and fallen timber not only adds to the costs of fire protection but also increases hazards to the people who penetrate the wilderness. (NOTE.—Those who may think this is an exaggerated picture should visit parts of the 1,875,000 Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area where such conditions have existed for many years.)

(These vast areas of snags and dying trees may add to the esthetic enjoyment of a few people who regard them as part of "Nature's balance." But to most people such areas are anything but scenes of "pristine beauty." And to the trained conservationist, who is responsible for the protection and wise use of our public lands, these dead and dying forests are examples of waste and poor management.

 SRP05713

(Since wilderness restrictions prohibit the cutting or salvage of timber (even under H.R. 776 as we read it), these dead and unsightly forests must simply be regarded as part of the price we must pay for preserving wilderness areas. The best solution of this problem, of course, is to exclude from wilderness classification those areas of timberland which are presently or potentially suited for commercial management. H.R. 776 makes this possible by its requirement for review of existing national forest primitive areas and game ranges prior to wilderness classification. The requirement for periodic review once every 25 years also makes possible future boundary adjustments as justified by changing conditions.)

11. Under the new bill States are granted either the right of access to State-owned land entirely surrounded by lands designated as wilderness or the right to trade for unsurveyed Federal lands of equal value in the same State. States are specifically required to relinquish mineral rights on surrounded lands traded for the unreserved lands.

(Comment: This is the same as under S. 174 except for the requirement for States to relinquish mineral rights.)

12. Access to private lands is permitted under sections 207(b) and (c) of the new bill as follows:

"In any case where privately owned lands, valid mining claims, or other valid occupancies are wholly within a designated wilderness area, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, by reasonable regulations consistent with the preservation of the area as wilderness, permit ingress and egress to such surrounded areas.

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

(Comment: The language of the bill here indicates that mechanized access to private lands would still be limited to locations where the use of aircraft and motorboats are already "established." Section 206(b) does make the restriction on use "subject to existing private rights" but whether this would include the use of motorized vehicles for transport from an airfield on Federal land to a hunting and fishing cabin or other legitimate operation on private land is not clear. This section of the new House bill does have one big improvement over S. 174 in that it requires a positive act of Congress to condemn the land of a private owner who is unwilling to sell. However, no specific authorization for trade is given for the private owner. The same rights for trade as provided for States should be extended to private lands.)

13. A specific provision is made under section 102 that "nothing herein contained shall change the status of any public lands or the uses permitted or prohibited by Executive proclamation, public land order, or administrative regulation in effect on the effective date of this act."

(Comment: This may somewhat clarify action on the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area in Idaho and Montana. Following public hearings in March of 1961 the Forest Service prepared a final recommendation on this area which it has never made public. On May 15, 1962, the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee wrote to the Chief of the Forest Service asking what had happened to the Selway-Bitterroot proposal. The Forest Service replied that the regional forester's recommendations had been received by the Chief but that no recommendation had yet been made to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Forest Service also said that the Secretary of Agriculture had agreed—on the request of Mr. Aspinall, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—to take no action on the Selway-Bitterroot proposal until after adjournment of the 87th Congress. If this action is followed, reclassification of the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area as a wilderness area would be delayed until after Congress has had a chance to vote on a wilderness bill. Therefore, if the new bill is enacted, the Selway-Bitterroot would not be automatically classed as wilderness as would have been the case if S. 174 had been enacted. This means that under the new bill the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Areas would be given further careful consideration before being reclassified as a wilderness.)

14. Section 102 provides a number of special exemptions to the requirement for positive act of Congress for all changes in land classification over 5,000 acres. The most important of these are:

(*a*) For defense purposes in time of war or national emergencies.

(*b*) For certain other limited military purposes.

(*o*) Under section 102(4)(A) where "the withdrawal, reservation or restriction, or a change in designation or classification is desired by the agency having primary jurisdiction of the land, for purposes related to its administration of the land and an Act of Congress is not specifically required by this or any other Act."

(Comment: No criticism has been heard relative to items (*a*) and (*b*). However, some objection has been directed at section 102(4)(A) described under item (*o*) above on the grounds that it gives the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management blanket authority to make large land withdrawals for "administrative purposes." This criticism may have some justification. While section 102(4) does provide for review of such proposed withdrawals by Congress and the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the Senate and House, it does not specifically state that any form of approval must be received from Congress or the Interior Committees before such withdrawals can be made. This may be a weakness which should be corrected. The intent of such strengthening should be, of course, not to block or delay administrative withdrawals essential for efficient operation of the departments.)

15. Section 104 ("segregative effect") provides that the filing of an application by department or agency of the Federal Government for any withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of Federal lands shall "have the effect of segregating such land from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other form of disposal under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws." Such segregation is to terminate at the end of 2 years or earlier upon the concurrence of the head of the department administering the lands with the agency making application. Provision is made for renewal of the segregation for an additional 2-year period subject to the earlier termination of the application by Congress.

(Comment: Some criticism has also been directed against this section of the bill since nearly all action of the agencies could be construed to be for "administrative purposes." The same provision was contained in S. 174. Such provision is deemed necessary to permit the Federal agencies to make essential withdrawals for administrative purposes. It is unlikely that this section would be used for making unjustifiably large withdrawals. At the most such withdrawals could tie up land for no longer than a 4-year period.)

SUMMARY

The benefits to be achieved under this bill can be best summarized by quoting from Colorado's Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Idaho's Gracie Pfost, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands. Both of these dedicated persons deserve high commendation for their hard work in developing such a reasonable compromise bill.

Mr. Aspinall, who sponsored the amendment in the form of a substitution for H.R. 776, said: "After an analysis of all data and testimony received by the committee, the staff drafted the basic substitute to accomplish my objectives of fair and equitable treatment for all: those who enjoy isolated wilderness as well as those whose livelihoods depend on such areas, while safeguarding the overall national interest. I think that, as perfected with some very fine amendments adopted by the subcommittee, the substitute is a logical piece of legislation and a true conservation measure."

Mrs. Pfost, who has probably spent more time than anyone else listening to both sides, said: "While the measure may not meet all objectives of both proponents and opponents, it was the best measure we could approve after long hearings both in the field and in Washington. More hours of deliberation were spent in executive sessions going over points raised by witnesses than on any measure which has come before my subcommittee in the 8 years I have been chairman."

"I think we have a good bill," Congresswoman Pfost stated, continuing: "We have, on the one hand, guaranteed preservation of large wilderness areas in their natural status while at the same time assuring limited use for other purposes including protection for the discovery and development of any minerals that may be present in those araes. By having the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines survey the lands, we will be assured that the most modern techniques will be available to provide current information at all times as to the mineral potential of each area. Likewise, the 25-year periodic review will permit Congress to take whatever action is in the national interest by either expanding or restricting areas designated as wilderness."

SRP05715

DISCUSSION

From the beginning of the wilderness debate, the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee has recognized the values of wilderness for specialized recreation and spiritual stimulation. We have pointed out, however, that the opportunity for "refreshment of soul and body" is not confined to wilderness areas—that a much greater number of people enjoy this "rejuvenation of spirit" in the more accessible areas of national forests and private tree farms. Nevertheless, we have strongly supported the preservation of a reasonable acreage of wilderness on Federal lands as part of an overall program of multiple-use management. At the same time we have insisted that classification of wilderness areas must be based on extremely careful study and evaluation of all of the many resources contained in the vast areas being proposed for this limited and specialized use for a relatively small segment of the Nation's citizens.

We have strongly opposed S. 174 and all preceding bills to establish a national wilderness preservation "system" because we were convinced these bills were unnecessary and too restrictive of too large an area of public lands. Sponsors of these bills have recommended a total potential wilderness "system" comprising from 59 to 65 million acres, or an area considerably larger than the State of Idaho or larger than the six New England States plus Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey. We have felt this is too large an area, unless it can be proven to contain no resources having a higher value to the Nation than wilderness. Proponents of S. 174 have said that this is an unfair comparison, pointing out that their proposed wilderness system is only a small percentage of the total land area of the United States. We have contended, however, that this proposed wilderness system could contain a very high percentage of the Nation's supply of scarce, strategic minerals, and minerals not yet known to exist. Because of their remote location, rugged topography, and absence of roads, these areas have never been adequately explored and inventoried.

While we have opposed a bill to create a national wilderness "system" as being unnecessary, we have said we would support a wilderness bill if it contained adequate provisions for evaluation of all existing resources, through periodic review, and for future boundary adjustments proven to be in the Nation's interest. Consequently, we offered a number of amendments at the Public Lands Subcommittee hearing in Washington in May. (See our newsletter dated June 1, 1962.) The new bill, H.R. 776, meets most of our objections to earlier bills.

At this time it is impossible to predict the total area of wilderness which would eventually be designated and preserved under H.R. 776. This is a question Congress would decide after all potential areas are reviewed. Initially, 6.8 million acres of existing national forest wilderness, wild and canoe areas, would be designated as wilderness upon passage of the act. Then during a 10-year review period, additional wilderness would be designated from qualifying parts of the 7.9 million acres of national forest primitive areas, the 20.1 million roadless acres of national parks, and the 24 million acres of national wildlife refuges and game ranges. This gives a total potential of 58.8 million acres, although it is highly unlikely that all these areas would be given wilderness designation. In fact, resources of higher value than wilderness are already known to exist on parts of these areas. Nevertheless, a substantial amount—perhaps over 50 percent—of the 58.8 million acres will retain its wilderness characteristics for a long time to come.

CONCLUSION

In the opinion of the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee the bill, H.R. 776 as amended, provides the most reasonable and workable solution to the wilderness controversy that is likely to be achieved. It is a bill, which, if enacted, will give reasonable assurance that the many resources of the large area of public lands involved will be protected and made available under sound management, if and when needed, for the benefit of the majority of our citizens. At the same time it will provide for the preservation of an adequate and enduring resource of wilderness for the enjoyment of the minority group which demands this type of specialized recreation.

Therefore, we give this bill our full support and urge other conservation groups and individuals to do the same.

As we have said several times before in our newsletters, we feel this bill is a reasonable compromise of the wilderness issue. Exhaustive hearings—with

a high cost in time and money—have been held, both in the West and in Washington, D.C., to receive opinions and recommendations from all interests. A sensible bill has been drafted which, while not giving either side all they ask for, does consider all viewpoints and does provide safeguards for all resources—including wilderness. To prolong the debate further or to hold additional hearings on this particular bill would be a waste of time and energy. (Of course, if the bill is materially changed, then additional hearings would be in order.)

In view of these facts, we recommend that, if for any reason H.R. 776, as amended, fails to be enacted during this session of Congress, it be reintroduced without major changes at the beginning of the next session. The important thing now is to resolve this issue—as H.R. 776 does—so that those who have other pressing responsibilities in natural resource management can devote more of their efforts to getting the basic work accomplished. There are many complex on-the-ground problems involved in natural resource protection, development, and use. Under H.R. 776 we can continue progress in developing a sound program of integrated multiple-use management of all these basic resources for the benefit of society.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions on the part of the committee? The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I want to welcome Mr. Lynn here to these hearings and Las Vegas. He has come a long way, and he happens to be a constituent of mine, so I will have to treat him as well as I can under the circumstances.

I would like to ask you, Mr. Lynn, to comment just a little bit on our particular area. I think perhaps we do not have the pressures in the north of Idaho that other areas have, but at the same time, we have set aside already in the State of Idaho a great extent of wilderness area, one of the largest in the United States. I think Mr. Lynn has pointed out what would be best for the development of that area.

Mr. Lynn, do you not feel that the multiple-use concept fits into not only the provision of wilderness as provided, but the proper utilization of the resource in that part of the State?

Mr. LYNN. Yes, we do, Mr. White. We have a much more thorough understanding, I believe, than a good segment of the public may feel, in that we are close to the problem. We are also very closely dependent upon our basic resources.

We do have a great deal of sympathy for preserving certain portions of the land that fit the wilderness concept, but we do not feel it is proper that communities dependent upon these resources should sacrifice jobs and payrolls to a great extent just to set aside massive areas of wilderness just for the fact of having wilderness. This has been a great concern in our area, as you point out, because in a radius of a hundred miles, we have a tremendous amount of wilderness acreage that may fall under a bill which would be at stake.

Mr. WHITE. In listening to the testimony here and considering the areas and acreages we are talking about in some of these other States, when you stop to think the State of Idaho already has over a million acres that fits into a wilderness classification, to put another 2 million acres in puts quite a load on the State of Idaho, does it not?

Mr. LYNN. Yes; it does. It is a tremendous load, not only on the economics, but it limits a lot of our future development.

Mr. WHITE. And this is where we have to develop, this is our resources that will—water being the main one—be the ultimate salvation of a State like Idaho.

Mr. LYNN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you.

SRP05717

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Mr. LYNN. May I introduce for the record a statement of Mark Schoknecht of Libby, Mont.?

Mr. BARING. Without objection, it is ordered.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF MARK SCHOKNECHT ON BEHALF OF THE MONTANA FOREST PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and committee members, I am Mark Schoknecht, manager of lands and logging, St. Regis Paper Co., Libby, Mont. I am chairman of the Montana Forest Practices Committee, which represents 25 Western Pine Association member companies in Montana, on whose behalf I speak today.

We welcome the House Interior Committee wilderness hearings in the West where the issues are most vital.

I wish to stress in the beginning, our industry has long favored the establishment of reasonable wilderness areas long before it became the focus of public attention. Our industry supported the recent Forest Service reclassification of the Cabinet Mountains Primitive Area composed of 90,000 acres. This is an example of an area reasonable in size which is well suited for limited multiple use. Our industry recognizes recreation as one phase of multiple use. We support this belief by the construction and maintenance of many public camping and picnic areas, as well as allowing free access for hunting and fishing to our private lands within the limits of public safety and fire protection.

It should be thoroughly understood that wilderness-type recreation, by its very nature, is only to be enjoyed by a limited few persons at any one time or place. A crowded wilderness area quickly loses its qualities of peace and solitude.

Therefore, wilderness-type recreation should be put in its proper perspective in the total multiple use of our lands. It is suggested reasonable wild areas (areas 5,000 to 100,000 acres) better serve our Nation's needs than massive areas of wilderness which sacrifice the wise use of such areas for mass recreation, minerals, wood, grass, water, and wildlife.

If Congress, in its wisdom, determines wilderness legislation is needed, we would respectfully suggest any wilderness legislation embody the following principles:

1. That Congress have positive control of lands to be included as a wilderness area through affirmative procedure.

2. That national forest primitive areas be specifically excluded as wilderness until a thorough inventory and complete economic analysis of all values and resources have been completed to determine the areas' value as multiple use or wilderness.

3. That a periodic inventory and assessment of values and resources of all wilderness areas be conducted by qualified persons. For example, the U.S. Geological Survey could employ the latest techniques of mineral exploration to determine any potentially valuable or strategic mineral deposits. In event of discovery of strategic or valuable minerals or mass recreation or water storage needs, the wilderness value of the area affected should be reappraised for justifiable boundary changes.

Our industry is deeply concerned by the lack of thorough inventory of resources and economic analysis of values included in wilderness areas being established. The natural resources which sustain the basic industries of our communities must be protected and developed. Agriculture, mining, and forest products are the lifeblood of our region; they form the foundation upon which rests all other social and economic development.

4. That the Secretary of the Interior be required to submit for positive action of Congress a total long-range plan for development and use of the national park system and national wildlife refuges before recommending any area for wilderness classification.

5. That provisions specifically provide for the choice of sale or exchange of private lands or State lands within a wilderness area for Federal lands of equal value outside the wilderness area.

In conclusion, the Montana Forest Practices Committee believes the House Interior Committee's approach to the wilderness matter is sound and will develop factual information upon which to base their considered judgment.

SRP05718

Mr. BARING. The next witness is representing the North Idaho Forestry Association, Mr. Royce G. Cox of Lewiston, Idaho, You may proceed, Mr. Cox.

STATEMENT OF ROYCE G. COX, NORTH IDAHO FORESTRY ASSOCIATION, LEWISTON, IDAHO

Mr. COX. Honorable Chairman, gentlemen of the Public Lands Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement on behalf of the North Idaho Forestry Association, a conservation group composed of private timberland owners and operators in Idaho north of the Salmon River. Our membership represents at least 75 percent of the forest products production in north Idaho. This association, since its formation on October 10, 1908, has actively supported and worked for sound protection, development, and wise use of natural resources—a record which gives it the distinction of being one of the oldest and most progressive conservation groups in the Nation.

Your committee deserves high commendation for the patient and thorough manner in which you have approached the many-faceted problems involved in the wilderness controversy. You deserve further praise for taking the time to hold these western hearings close to the people most affected by wilderness legislation. This is democracy in action.

Our association is gratified that you have had the wisdom and courage to resist the pressures for rushing through incompletely through out emergency bills sponsored by well-meaning groups who claimed such legislation was needed to "save the vanishing wilderness."

Everyone should realize by now that your restraint has been fully justified by the fact that since the first wilderness bill was unsuccessfully proposed in 1957, there has been a substantial net increase in the acreage of legally protected wilderness and primitive-type areas in national forests, national parks, and national wildlife refuges and game ranges. During the interim, the hearings held by the Senate and House Interior Committees have served the extremely useful function of compiling a large volume of pro and con wilderness testimony. Certainly, as a result of these numerous hearings, Congress is in a much more fully informed position than it was in 1957 with respect to the resource values and problems involved in the 54 million acres originally proposed for wilderness classification.

PAST AND PRESENT POSITION

Support reasonable wilderness: The North Idaho Forestry Association has gone on record at congressional and Forest Service hearings as being generally in accord with the preservation of wilderness areas reasonably consistent with the actual need for such areas. Since the beginning of the wilderness debate, we have held the position that significant areas of the Nation's true wilderness-type country can be maintained in a predominantly primitive condition without unduly jeopardizing the general economy and industry—provided adequate assurances are made for developing and utilizing the minerals, water, timber, and other natural resources of these areas when required by exceptional value, extreme local need, or national emergency. We still hold this position.

SRP05719

More congressional control needed: In the past we have contended that additional wilderness legislation was unnecessary because we believed existing laws were adequate to give the various Federal administrative agencies the authority and procedures necessary for balancing wilderness preservation with the Nation's need for other recreational and material resources from public lands.

Also, we have felt that the Federal agencies, being staffed with competent, technically trained professional resource managers, were well qualified to make land-use decisions rather than asking an overworked Congress to make such decisions.

However, after experiencing the congressional hearings previously mentioned and the results of some Forest Service hearings we have come to the conclusion that perhaps a properly designed Federal law specifically dealing with wilderness may provide the best long-range solution to the problem. The wilderness issue is so charged with emotions and pressures that the administrative agencies are being placed in an increasingly difficult position in attempting to arrive at decisions based on sound evaluation of the complex problems of natural resource management. The sincere and dedicated efforts of the responsible men in Federal agencies notwithstanding, we feel that our elected congressional delegates, by their very nature, are much more responsive to the needs of our local people, and therefore, are in a better position to resist the well-intentioned but sometimes harmful pressures of nonlocal groups. We are aware, of course, of the dangers to a lightly populated State such as Idaho (with only two Members in the House of Representatives) when more administrative authority over our State's public natural resources is placed in a Congress which is heavily overbalanced in favor of more populous States. Nevertheless, we are confident that our congressional delegation will work vigorously for our needs, and we are hopeful that Congress, through careful study, will develop the depth of knowledge and understanding necessary to balance fairly the resource needs of local people with the overall national interest.

Review prerequisite to wilderness classification: In the past, we have contended that before any specific wilderness bill is enacted, there should be a thorough study of all present and potential multiple-use values of existing and proposed primitive and wilderness areas. We still hold this position because such a study has not been completed even on many lands already administratively classified as wilderness.

In this respect the findings of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission have been helpful in determining the Nation's recreational desires and needs and in developing guidelines for meeting the actual needs. We are greatly disappointed and concerned, however, by the overemphasis being placed on land acquisition by the Federal Government rather than development of camping and picnic facilities on the 234 million acres of recreation lands already publicly owned nationwide.

Comprehensive resource study needed: Experience has shown that once an area of public land is set aside for any form of recreational use, it is extremely difficult to utilize any of the timber or mineral resources of such lands, regardless of the urgency of the need. This is equally true of private lands acquired or condemned for recreation.

SRP05720

Therefore, extremely careful consideration must be given before any additional lands are designated by law for any single or restricted use.

Our association believes the time has arrived when a comprehensive inventory and evaluation of the supply and demand situation with respect to all our Nation's natural resources on all lands should be undertaken. The Timber Resource Review has provided excellent information for an intelligent evaluation of our Nation's forest resources. Perhaps similar information exists for other resources which could be combined with TRR data for an overall appraisal; if not, an inventory should be made. Such a comprehensive study would provide the basis for developing a proper balance between outdoor recreation (including wilderness) and national and local needs for other resources.

Public Land Law Review Commission: A prerequisite to such a comprehensive natural resource study would seem to be Congressman Aspinall's proposed Public Land Law Review Commission (H.R. 8070). While our association has not studied this bill in detail nor presented a statement pertaining to it, we would probably support the bill provided the six public members would be representatives of the various resource fields, and, provided also such a commission would not result in the eventual creation of another Federal bureau.

"System" unnecessary: In the past, we have opposed the idea of a wilderness "system," believing that the creation of a system could lead to administrative overlapping and confusion and perhaps eventually to the creation of another Federal agency. Further, we have believed a "system" is unnecessary for adequate wildernes preservation. While we still hold this view, the retention of the term "system" in the eventual wilderness bill would not necessarily preclude our support, provided the bill specifically leaves administrative responsibilities with existing agencies.

COMMENTS ON PRESENT BILLS

Our association is gratified to see the progress which has been made toward compromise in the wilderness controversy. We wish to compliment Mr. Saylor for his broadened viewpoint. Mr. Dingell's bill and companion bills also have good features.

We have consistently supported the provisions in the Dingell and Saylor bills requiring positive acts of Congress for classification of wilderness and review of national forest primitive areas before inclusion of qualifying parts in the wilderness system. We recommend, however, that the provision for review of primitive areas be made retroactive to January 1, 1963, so that the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area could be given the thorough study it deserves.

One area of confusion in existing bills is lack of specific provision for reclassification of those parts of primitive and wilderness areas which, after review, are found to have a higher value for nonwilderness uses. Any final bill should specifically require that such areas be returned to regular national forest status so as to be available for full multiple-use management.

With respect to the acquisition of private lands surrounded by wilderness lands, the Dingell and Saylor bills both are an improvement over Senate bills in that owner concurrence is required. How-

SRP05721

ever, in our opinion, the private owner should be given the same right as the States to trade for lands of equal value if he so desires.

A key provision still not adequately covered in current bills is that for mandatory periodic review of all natural resource values in classified wilderness areas. Mr. Saylor's bill provides for periodic review of mineral resources; this is a step in the right direction. However, our association feels that this provision should be extended to include the resources of timber, water, grazing, wildlife, scenic, and recreational resources. Such review should be made by appropriate Federal and State agencies and the information made avaliable to Congress and private individuals. Guidelines should be written into the bill for making justifiable changes in wilderness area boundaries to provide for future unforeseen changes in society's needs. We are confident this can be done so as to not only assure the availability of natural resources for urgent local and national requirements, but also to assure the preservation of adequate areas in an essentially primitive condition.

SUMMARY

In summary, our association reaffirms its support for preservation of a reasonable area of Federal public lands in wilderness status, provided adequate safeguards are taken to assure the availability of other natural resources when needed for a more important requirement of local or national society.

We still feel that adequate areas of wilderness would be preserved under present laws, and further that large areas of our scenic western mountain country will remain in an essentially primitive condition simply because of their rugged terrain, remoteness, and lack of access.

However, if in its final judgment, Congress determines that a wilderness bill is necessary, we urge that you continue to give extremely careful consideration to the many complex problems of protecting and managing the wilderness itself, and of developing other essential resources. Of utmost importance is the need to achieve a proper balance between the desire of a small segment of society for pristine wilderness and the absolute dependence of total society on other natural resources.

CONCLUSION

All of the present wilderness bills contain some desirable features, particularly the Dingell and Saylor bills. However, in our opinion, none of these bills are adequate as now written. Either Mr. Saylor's bill (H.R. 9070) or Mr. Dingell's bill (H.R. 9162) could be easily modified to include the necessary safeguards. If the essential principles and objectives of the amended wilderness bill reported by your full Interior Committee in the 87th Congress could be worked into either of these two current bills, we are confident there would be broad support in north Idaho.

Thank you, members of the committee, for providing this opportunity to express our views.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions on the part of the committee?

The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN. I would just like to say that I think your statement is very helpful. You not only point out the areas that you think

need some more work, but you make concrete suggestions as to what should be done.

I am concerned where, on page 3 of your statement, you suggest the dangers to a lightly populated States such as Idaho with only two Members of the House of Representatives. I just want to tell you, and I am sure you are aware of it, that in spite of the fact there are only two of them, the State of Idaho is very well represented by highly respected Members of Congress, one of whom sits here on my left. And even if there is only two of them, they pack a lot of weight. And if you do not believe it, look at him.

Mr. Cox. We are happy to know that, and we share your confidence in the Representatives from Idaho.

Mr. White. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Duncan. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. White. What I do not make up in quality, I guess I can make up in quantity. I assure you that Mr. Duncan ably represents his area, and I believe we have a concert of ideas in these fields and that we will work for good wilderness legislation.

Mr. Cox. Thank you.

Mr. Baring. Thank you very much, Mr. Cox.

Mr. Cox. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. Baring. The next witness is Grant B. Potter, Dinuba, Calif. You may proceed, Mr. Potter.

STATEMENT OF GRANT B. POTTER, CALIFORNIA FOREST PRACTICE COMMITTEE, WESTERN PINE ASSOCIATION, DINUBA, CALIF.

Mr. Potter. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Grant B. Potter. I am president and general manager of Sequoia Forest Industries, Inc., at Dinuba, Calif., and also chairman of the California Forest Practice Committee of the Western Pine Association. This committee is one of long standing, made up of forest industry men from all areas of the California pine country. It is part of the forest conservation function of the Western Pine Association trade group of the 12-State pine region lumber industry. While this committee limits its work to California forest resource matters, it serves in harmony with similar committees in other pine States, whose forest affairs and problems are in many respects similar to California.

Our committee has always been concerned with Federal land management policy as it affects the management and use of commercial timberlands, because in California the Federal Government controls 60 percent of the total commercial forest in the State. The Government controls 73 percent of the commercial forest land in our 12-State western pine region.

Economic and social benefits accruing from forest management and forest-based industry are the very foundation for existence of hundreds of western communities, including many in California.

Products manufactured from forest crops are intrinsically important, too, at home and elsewhere. As an example, consider the Dinuba operation of my company, with which I am most familiar. With raw material supplied mostly from the national forests, we employ about 200 men while producing each year enough lumber to build at least 4,000 houses, plus thousands of tons of byproducts such as pulp chips,

SRP05723

baled shavings, wood flour, sawdust, and ground bark. In developing a byproducts partnership with San Joaquin Valley agriculture, and other chemical, paper, and plastic manufacturers, we have achieved nearly 100-percent utilization of the log. Mature Government timber which we buy at auction, and harvest the way the Government wants it done, to insure prompt regrowth of succeeding crops, makes all this possible, while at the same time opening up new areas with roads for other forest uses, including recreation.

The Dinuba mill is only one of some 225 forest industry plants in the California pine region which afford direct employment to about 25,000 men.

This productive industry, supported by a constantly renewing resource, has every reason to look ahead to continuous operation and further growth, providing the resource from which it draws its raw material, the commercial forest land, is not decimated, or locked up by unwise land withdrawals.

Obviously, since Government controls 60 percent of our State's commercial forest, public land policies have the power of life (health or ruin) or death over most of our industry and communities. There is not a single lumber manufacturing operation in the California pine region that, so far as I know, is not dependent to some degree on Government timber sales to stay in business. Mr. Chairman, the Government has a monopoly on the timber in our area.

While we see no jobs in wilderness, we do believe wilderness can be perpetuated, and even expanded, without undermining the bread-and-butter necessities of forest-borne communities, if it is done wisely.

Commercial forest lands are those forested lands best suited to the endless production of forest crops, which can be harvested, regrown and harvested again. Trees are like men—they mature, they reproduce, grow old, and die. Careful timber harvest insures both full use and perpetration of the resource. This use need not interfere with the wilderness program if wilderness is restricted to carefully chosen, appropriate areas.

We favor the reservation of well-chosen, appropriate wilderness areas, always keeping in mind, however, that it should not be a question of how much wilderness area we can boast, but how much we can afford.

In California we already have nearly 6 million acres, or 6 percent of our total State area, reserved in the various national park, national monument, and national forest wilderness categories. This reserved area already includes 1.2 million acres of the total available merchantable timber area in California (by U.S. Forest Survey calculation—1953).

Since your committee is considering many wilderness bills, providing numerous approaches to wilderness preservation, I can best transmit our thoughts on wilderness legislation by the following statements:

1. We find no demonstrated need for new wilderness legislation. Existing provisions for wilderness preservation are entirely adequate. Wilderness resources have not been threatened or reduced. They have, in fact, been expanded under existing procedures. In 1961 there were 18 wilderness, wild, and primitive areas reserved in California national forests totaling 1,555,000 acres. Since that time the Mokelumne Wild Area, the Minarets Wilderness Area, and the Dome Lands Wild

SRP05724

Area have been added with a total additional area of 140,000 acres. Even now the enlargement by 122,000 acres of the High Sierra Primitive Area, with change in classification to wilderness area, is being advertised. There will be hearings on the proposal in Fresno next month, and if approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, this will add 502,978 acres to the list of wilderness areas. As a sidelight to this new proposal, our company must oppose the addition of a portion of the area because it is commercial forest land.

2. We are definitely opposed to arbitrary blanketing in of all wilderness categories under a new system for wilderness.

3. We favor the implementation of a Public Land Law Review Commission, as recommended by your committee, before any new legislation is enacted for special withdrawals.

4. If new wilderness legislation is inevitable before a commission can review the public land laws, then we strongly recommend that new reserves be created only after positive congressional determination for each area, following detailed study of its suitability, and need, and of the values involved.

In summary, I will leave you with this thought. It is possible that we will ever have enough land area in these United States to satisfy the demands of a mushrooming population? If wilderness areas are established and heavily used, we have a land-management problem—if they are established and not used, we have set aside too much acreage for this specialized use.

I wish to thank the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for taking time to come out here and hear our views first-hand on this vital matter.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN. When you talk about well-chosen appropriate wilderness areas which you favor being preserved, what do you have in mind, those on which there are no trees?

Mr. POTTER. Not necessarily, because we do have areas that are forested that contain what we consider commercial stands of timber.

Mr. DUNCAN. Commercial or noncommercial?

Mr. POTTER. Already there are areas with commercial stands or timber.

Mr. DUNCAN. And you do not object to those and are not advocating they be removed from the wilderness?

Mr. POTTER. No, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. As I recall, we are talking in these bills before us about 8.6 million acres, and I think of that there is somewhere around three, more or less, of timber classified commercial grade. I think much of that is probably of a fairly low commercial grade. So that, as far as the bills and the areas that they encompass as of now, you do not have any particular objection to continuing that wilderness concept?

Mr. POTTER. No, sir. I think I can best summarize that——

Mr. DUNCAN. Let me ask you another question. As far as any of the other areas which are to be further studied, then you would prefer to exclude any commercial timber that might be involved in any designated primitive areas?

 SRP05725

Mr. POTTER. I think many of the primitive areas should be studied before they are designated, before they are designated, before a land-management use designation is placed on them.

Mr. DUNCAN. I think that is the concept of these bills. That is all. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I would merely like to comment about one thing. In the classification of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area, I believe there was a sincere effort made by the Forest Service to try to take a look at the commercial timber areas and the possible highest use even within this wilderness system. One thing that bothers me very much is that, when this ultimate classification was enacted, there was a deletion of about 400,000 acres, part of it left out because it had a higher use as timber, part of it left out because it had a possible use as a packer starting point on the Lochsa River.

The thing that bothered me was, when this had been given all this consideration—I felt it should have had perhaps more consideration. But assuming it was correct, the people that were the real all-out wilderness people said this was a horrible mistake and we had not properly evaluated it. So it all gets back to one question: If you are going to be militant and hold for everything, you are going to be dissatisfied whether you are on one side or the other.

Mr. POTTER. Maybe I could leave you with this thought: After listening to these hearings, I wonder if it will ever be possible we will have enough land area in the United States to satisfy all of these demands. I think what will happen is, if you establish a wilderness area and it is heavily used, you have got an immediate land management problem. If you put in too much land, then you have made a mistake the other way. I do not envy you at all.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Mr. COX. Thank you gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is George A. Craig, secretary and manager of Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE A. CRAIG, WESTERN LUMBER MANUFACTURERS, INC., SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc., is an association of lumber producers who are dependent on national forest timber. Most of the membership is in California which has more national forest areas designated as wilderness, wild, or primitive than any other State.

In the past, this organization has opposed wilderness legislation in general because it is not needed. We have noted that properly classified areas in this State are under no threat of declassification.

The validity of this position is shown by the fact that there are now more national forest units and greater acreage designated as wild or wilderness in California than ever before. A February 1961 report of the Forest Service listed 18 units with 1,555,000 acres classified as wilderness, wild, or primitive areas in California national forests. At the first of this year there were 20 such classified units totaling 1,695,000 acres. This 140,000-acre increase obviously has taken place without new legislation. (The Multiple-Use Act of 1960 authorizes the classification of areas for wilderness use.)

Unneeded legislation is undesirable legislation. Further, all of the bills now under consideration have other shortcomings. They would establish a "system" for no indicated purpose. Some would include uninventoried primitive areas in the "system" prior to a review to properly establish the portions of such areas for which wilderness is the greatest value. We oppose the idea that areas shall be included or excluded by law on the proposal of the administrators limited only by disapproval through a specific act of Congress.

Congress has the duty to determine management objectives for the public lands. We favor the principle of requiring an act of Congress for withdrawals, reservations, restrictions, designations, or classifications of all public land units of more than 5,000 acres each. This is an issue of broader concern than the classification of wilderness.

In summary, let us restate the position of this organization on the legislation as given to the subcommittee's hearing at Sacramento on November 6, 1961. In varying degrees, the following applies to all of the bills now under consideration:

We are opposed to the wilderness bill. We are opposed because there has been no demonstrated need for it. We are opposed because it is a piecemeal approach to public land policy. We are opposed to the inclusion of primitive areas in the system. We are opposed to the administrative rather than congressional determination of policy for these areas; and, we are especially opposed because there has not been proper consideration of the values involved.

Thank you for the opportunity to express these views.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Philip R. Bradley, president, California Mine Operator's Association, Berkeley, Calif. We are very happy to welcome you before the committee today. I have known you over the past years, and I know you will give solid thinking here in your statement.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP R. BRADLEY, CALIFORNIA MINE OPERATORS ASSOCIATION, BERKELEY, CALIF.

Mr. BRADLEY. I hope I have. I have tried to.

My name is Philip R. Bradley. I am a mining engineer by trade, at present a resident of California. My mining experience has been wide and I have lived long in remote and sparsely populated places that most would call wilderness. I am president of the California Mine Operator's Association. I am presenting (appended) a formal resolution in behalf of that association opposing centralization in Washington of authority over areas of the Nation that at present already are being managed as wilderness (in name or in effect) by various Federal agencies, and opposing also any further restriction, over that already existing, of the search for and the production of minerals from the earth, such as is proposed in the various wilderness bills before Congress.

I do not reject the concept of preservation of wilderness. I strongly question the procedures proposed to gain this end. I question whether the proposed legislation would achieve its stated aim any better than does present Federal management of the wilderness lands of the Nation. In fact, I judge that on balance, its weaknesses outweight its gains. True conservation, in the form of wisest use of resources and land for greatest good of mankind, is the loser. A specific victim of

SRP05727

wilderness legislation is a part of the national supply of certain very basic and vital raw materials. At this and other cost the legislation appears to provide no greater protection of the wilderness areas it defines than they now enjoy under their present form of Federal management.

The typical western metal mine operator may be considered a wilderness authority. Except for a very few acres immediately around him, much of his environment remains wilderness (in the common conception) in spite of anything he may do toward civilizing it; and most often these few acres revert to the wild when he is through. Time even reforests them if below timberline. He deals primarily with forces of nature, or with their results, and so learns to view life perhaps much less in the minute terms of personalities and frailties of man than does the city dweller. And, much more than the city dweller, is he conscious of the special importance to the Nation of the products of his mines and of the problem of continuously supplying these products.

From their position at the receiving end of the supply line most other citizens seem to take these products for granted, much as they do water, unaware of the real problems of mineral production and of the unique problem of constant replacement of supply sources. This uninformed view of the majority, when reflected in legislation such as is here proposed, aggravates difficulties of minerals production considerably.

Because of close and frequent association with many branches of government—for example, through almost constant involvement with one or the other of the great land agencies, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management; through dependence on some of the very helpful technical agencies such as the Geologic Survey and the Bureau of Mines; through contact at times with SEC; through influence on markets for products of mines of tariff, import control, and stockpiling policies of the Government; and, through contacts with such committee as yours—the mining industry is one most conscious of both the workings and the problems of the Federal government.

In short, on problems of mineral supply, on what will encourage and what will hamper supply, on wilderness, on government, and on the interrelations of all these, the miner knows whereof he speaks.

My own views on wilderness legislation have been put previously before the congressional committee. I have heard, and have read in volume, testimony of others. I am convinced from what I have so read and heard that the country as a whole, and unfortunately, most of Congress as well, has an appallingly deficient knowledge of the vital importance to present civilization and daily life of the products of mines. This importance promises to be much greater to civilizations of even the near future. Indeed, it is my belief that the future—need picture demands that even today, legislators should at all times have before them measures that will be helpful to, rather than a hindrance to, mineral production. The fact seems to be that instead, much current legislative policy in its longrun effect clearly hampers production of minerals.

The 20 to 30 million acres that would fall into the proposed centralized wilderness system, under definitions expressed in H.R. 9162,

and others, have been made, in previous hearings on wilderness legislation, the subject of much competent testimony that concerned the geologic and other evidence of the importance of just those millions of acres to future mineral discovery and production. No doubt similar testimony will be put before this committee, but in any event I urge the committee to include any such previous testimony in its records. I also urge the committee to heed it as authoritative, as coming from individuals expert in their field, by their calling broadened and fairminded in outlook, not opposed to the concept of wilderness but to the legislation proposed, and testifying in search, in their way, of the greatest longrun good for their country.

These 20 to 30 million acres are, as yet, owing to their relative inaccessibility, the least explored for minerals. They may thus well be the most likely scene of future mineral discovery if exploration is allowed to continue. They are largely mountainous, which further supports the probability of mineral discovery, since a definite assocation exists between the geologic forces that result in formation of mountains and those that result in formation of mineral deposits. Exploration for minerals, and mining, today is permitted by law in most of these millions of acres. If terminated as proposed by the legislation it may well cost the country considerably in material welfare—for example, in its capacity for defense.

Simply to suggest dependence of civilization on products of mines I ask that you reflect but a moment on how large a part metals, for example, have played in the lives of all of us only since this day began. Practically all inanimate objects around us today—walls, ceiling, lights, switches, plumbing, carpets, clothes, tableware, automobiles, briefcases, decks, chairs, public address systems, et cetera, either are largely metal or were made with largely metallic machines or tools. Concrete in roadways we cross and plaster in walls are processed products of mines, and even the wooden objects and parts of furniture and rooms were cut and shaped by metallic products of mines.

All saw transportation to present location by devices made largely of or by metal or mined material. All food supplies of the Nation depend on use of great quantities of fertilizer which again is largely the processed product of mines.

Abundance of products of mines available for use by a people, at one time, or their scarcity at another, has strongly influenced the course of history or man and of nations. Nearly always the advance of man across the globe was led by seekers of precious metals. The more prosaic metals found use in implements of war, the advantage to him who had most and used it best. Superior abundance on our side contributed heavily to victory in World Wars I and II.

More recently and more subtly a drastic change of course by Russia seems forced (if news is reliable) by agricultural shortages and sees vital military and scientific development subordinated to intensive production of fertilizer—a commodity again requiring, amongst its basic ingredients, the products of mines. All this amply suggests the potentially high impact on national welfare that can be caused by neglect of incentives for mineral production.

The degree of civilization of a people throughout history has borne a close connection to availability and use of metals and other products of mines. Interesting statistics are available that show the high con-

 SRP05729

sumption today of products of mines in the highly developed nations of the so-called free world, in contrast to the low consumption of the backward peoples. The population ratio of these segments of the world is more than 4 to 1, the backward numbering about 2,500 million against about 550 million in the advanced segment. The 2,500 million includes most of the population of Asia, Africa, and Central and South America. For each pound of the basic metals consumed, on the average, by the individual residents of these countries, the individual resident of the advanced countries consumes about 40 pounds.

Perhaps this question shows the real significance of the 40:1 ratio of consumption—what of availability of mineral supplies for the world, or for only this Nation of ours, once the backward people advance themselves? If their four times as heavy population would come to use but 20 pounds of metal, per capita (compared to our 40), it would see their consumption increased eightyfold. If this were to occur as soon as the year 2000, world consumption might well increase about fivefold, given a supply that would permit it.

It is fair to say that world reserves of unmined metal, as we now conceive of such reserves, would be unable to meet such an increase in demand. Furthermore, even today no one nation mines a supply sufficient to its own needs of all metals, and for many, none of its needs of some of the metals is mined. With increased demand, the inevitable growth of competition between nations, or perhaps races, for these materials so basic to a high standard of living may be a factor offering the most vicious of all time bombs silently threatening peace in the world. The inherent danger in governmental policies that hamper rather than encourage domestic minerals exploration is obvious.

The United States depends today on foreign lands for about 25 percent of our total supply of metal, much of which we import over the ocean. (The public seems quite unaware of the position in which we found ourselves in World War II in respect to basic raw materials—again, largely the products of mines—owing to tremendous loss of shipping to submarine warfare.)

U.S. consumption of metals at present rates promises to double itself about every half generation. On past record, rates seem more likely to increase than decrease. It also is likely that the imported fraction of our supplies must also increase. This, then, means that if our political ties with source countries deteriorate, or if improving standards of living in these same source countries requires more metal be kept at home, or if anything else interferes with flow of metal to this country, then our own living standards must suffer. I leave it to the committee to judge for themselves the degree of likelihood that any such forces will act to interfere with importation of metals. Some certain insurance against their effects lies in domestic Federal policy more favorable than at present, rather than less, for those seeking mineral sources in our own lands.

In view of current national needs for products of mines and of probability of much increased need in even the next generation, it seems absurd to propose, as wilderness legislation commonly does, that present rights to explore for and possess mineral deposits in wilderness areas ever be withdrawn. If, for some reason that I am incompetent to imagine, such rights properly should be withdrawn, in the future, the 10-year stay of execution proposed by H.R. 9162 is much too short

SRP05730

in view of the typical history of modern mineral exploration. Twenty-five years appears to be the practical minimum.

What must be emphasized is the time element in a typically modern program of mineral exploration leading to discovery of substantial, buried deposits. From the birth of a favorable attitude on the part of some geologist toward a certain geologic expression until the end of surface mapping sufficiently complete to establish a workable degree of economic promise in the locality may be 5 years. From that stage to the ore body of established value may well be from 3 to 10 more. I am sure other witnesses will be giving concrete examples. My purpose is merely to cite the inadequacy of the 10-year period offered in the bill.

Funds applied at the beginning of a campaign of exploration go up at extreme risk. While such risk decreases progressively if exploration continues to be successful in each step, some remains for the miner even after his production operation begins. Risk characterizes any underground operation; when mining finally opens the ground, it may prove unpredictably hard to hold; values may pinch; the deposit fault off, and so forth. Risk exists in the marketplace; outlets may be lost to competition of lower priced importations, to competition by substitutes, to declining use of the product, or to effects of general depression in all commodities. Truly enough, along the route beginning at discovery of first clues and then running on to beginning of production operations the risk does decline markedly. Original odds were against, on the order of several hundred to one. They improved, but seldom offer certainty of good pay. If Congress recognized the real importance to the Nation of a reliable, continued supply of minerals (and recognized also the problems this involves) it is inconceivable to me it ever would act to worsen the odds against the miner.

Mining history in the West has proven over and over again the rule that the most powerful of all incentives for exploration for minerals is the chance to come into full possession both of a mineral discovery and of sufficient surface to be able to work it. The usual form of such possession, fee simple possession under U.S. patent, is specifically withdrawn by the Dingell bill, and no substitute form is even suggested. Lack of assurance of possession even during exploration, let alone after discovery, is about as powerful a deterrent to risking of private funds in mineral exploration as can be invented. Most certainly the legislation must guarantee appropriate possession if it is to expect exploration to be done.

The provision in this or any other bill that patent extends only to the deposit and not to the land of a mining claim is too absurd in its practical effect to justify comment.

Though it is not altogether germane to the wilderness bills introduced, it is germane to the problem of exploration people generally and to your committee that possession of claims on public domain during the first 2 or 3 years of such a program as is described above is a difficult enough problem as it is, and I call it to the attention of the subcommittee on lands that this problem justifies at another time their attention to the present Federal policies toward mining claimants on public lands.

It is supposed by some proponents of wilderness legislation, patently uninformed in regard to mining, that those provisions usually included that concern Federal permission to explore for minerals in mineral

SRP05731

areas are adequate to insure such exploration. Of course the miner, more knowingly, must ask how an area is to be determined sufficiently mineral in character to justify mineral exploration without first exploring it?

With management of most wilderness areas (whether these are wilderness officially or are only managed as such) now under more or less local authority—such as regional foresters, or, so far as I know, in the hands of various superintendents of the national park system, or of the wildlife refuge system—a fear is often expressed by proponents of wilderness legislation that this is a form of management dangerously vulnerable to outside pressures for reduction in extent of individual areas, or for relaxation of restrictions against nonwilderness use, or for special exceptions. It is said by the proponents that security lies only in centralization of authority in Washington.

To this I reply that a mistake made in Washington will be much more disastrous to the proposed system than will be a mistake made by an individual field authority. I also say that Washington has been known to be the scene of really powerful pressures, and that pressure in Washington characteristically will be invisible to users of wilderness and to the public at large until results are in and the battle over. The record of almost 40 years of Federal wilderness management under local authority does not justify the fear that this is a weak management, endangering preservation of the areas. In these 40 years, adjustments of wilderness boundaries indeed have been made from time to time, but, so far as I can learn, have been minor in acreage as compared to the whole number under wilderness management; and, apparently, in no case have they been made without good cause, without extensive hearings, and without conscientious weighing by the local officials responsible of all factors involved.

It seems to me that for all the bill purports to accomplish, the degree of wilderness preservation to be achieved presents little or no improvement over existing measures and procedures, now in operation; with its authority centralized, it appears less adaptable to varying needs and changing conditions in the widely different and dispersed individual areas, yet may well be too susceptible in toto to special interest pressures. Still, if the positive achievements of the prospective legislation are doubtful, in its negative effects it clearly singles out two victims and disposes of them: one is the present authority of local Federal administrators to make adjustments and the other is a numerically indeterminate but nevertheless tangible, and potentially most important, part of our future mineral supply.

As to some of its other nonmining aspects, H.R. 9162 makes no attempt to appropriate or authorize funds for expenses of administration of the system it creates, or others, and might seem thus to infer that expenses thereof will be nominal. It appears to me, however, that volumes, if not libraries, of data are to be written under the procedures called for and that this, together with the repeated sifting and reviews required, is likely to generate considerable expense. First the data must be sifted, reviewed, and judged at the Secretarial level, with conclusions by the two Secretaries forwarded with supporting data to the Presidential level. Coordinated somewhere along the line, the forwarded data is there reviewed and judged for conversion into recommendations to Congress as to exact boundaries of areas to be brought into the system. These areas are actually to be included in

SRP05732

the wilderness system only after affirmative action by Congress, after their review of these and possibly other recommendations, and supporting data. Considerable review of massive data by different committees of Congress is possible at this stage, coupled perhaps with further committee hearings.

Such flow of data will originate obviously in the hands of field officers of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture acting for Secretaries, under their requests that probably some 30 to 40 million acres of land be reviewed for suitability for inclusion in the proposed system. It will originate also in hearings to be called in each affected State, to which the public and officials of affected States and counties will be invited, to give views. On sheer numbers of witnesses that can be expected the volume of testimony can be enormous; but it is here, also, that county and State specialists in local water resources, fish and wildlife control, timber and mineral and other natural resources, recreation, and the many others, will file their specialized data.

The volume of data thus generated, the potential paper monster, if you will, certainly will be unwieldy if not almost impossible to deal with. In any event it will be costly and slow to process if given due regard as it goes from station to station along the route to Congress, even though pruned at each stop. If nothing else, surely the cost of all this, in terms of diversion of attention of the President and Congress from more fundamental problems of the Nation, can be extremely high in relation to the gain offered by the bill over existing wilderness control.

As to another nonmining aspect of the bill, I note that it begins with a definition of wilderness corresponding more or less to the usual public conception. This generally imagines a remote, rugged, somewhat inaccessible area of a certain natural grandeur, mountainous, forested, altogether beautiful to the eyes of man yet without man to disturb its solitude. (Nature is thought of as that part of nature not including its unique child, man.) The usual concept includes a total absence of buildings, roads, machinery, automotive vehicles, planes, commercial enterprises, dams, powerlines, mines, and the like, and includes a markedly low content of people. The forces of nature are to operate as nature intended.

The bill, nevertheless, provides primarily for management by man of these natural areas. Nature is not to be left alone. Obviously, damage to forests by fire must be prevented, and damage by insect pests and diseases of trees. One must presume that certain flood control facilities must be undertaken, at least where effect of natural runoff after freak storms could be extreme if not controlled. Emergencies resulting from accident or sickness befalling visitors and need for rescue of the lost must be anticipated and facilities provided. Some enforcement personnel must exist and operate to control the destructive tendencies of man.

For such reasons the bill does recognize the need for, and with only slight obscurity provides for, actual existence in the wilderness of roads, mechanized transportation, buildings, and whatever may be necessary to prevention of or restoration after, the various possible hazards to nature and to man in the area, and other forms of land management. It is most likely that in time further roads, buildings, facilities, and forward camps for the convenience of visitors will

 SRP05733

appear in the wilderness as a result of the management contemplated in the bill. This already is the case in certain wilderness areas under the Bureau of Land Management.

Wise provision is made also in the bill for the building of dams, reservoirs, waterworks, power projects, transmission lines, and the like, within the wilderness areas, and for the building of roadways and for ingress and egress of heavy construction equipment, and for all works and housing and auxiliaries necessary to all such construction. It makes, by inference, provision for all the extensive cutting away of timber and other flora that goes with the construction of dams and reservoirs. One need only reflect on the continuing current publicity given water shortages in the West and to Interior Department plans for regional pooling of water resources to know that such construction is inevitable.

Furthermore, provision is made in the bill for the continuation of such commercial enterprises, roads, mechanized transportation facilities, use of motorboats and airplanes, grazing, mining, power and water projects, and the like, as have already become established in the wilderness areas contemplated. All this seems to me to point up the impossibility today of establishing any really large areas of wilderness solitude that do not intrude on real material needs of the Nation.

One further thought concerning necessary use of the contemplated areas: The values of the more central and well-developed portions of the various national parks are beginning definitely to show the erosive effects of a rapidly burgeoning stream of summer visitors. If only to preserve these well-known parts of the parks, it appears certain to me that a program opening up and developing the back country of these parks must be pushed. In any event, it cannot forever be postponed. I speak of country that today is roadless, and if not formally and officially a wilderness, it still is one by definitions in H.R. 9162 and by its present treatment by park management. The alternative to such development is to suffer an intolerable concentration of vacationers in the more central facilities of the parks—on the floor of Yosemite Valley, for instance.

One needs no statistical proof to know that the combination of upswing in population, record sales of cars, increased prosperity, and increased leisure time we now see throughout the Nation promises, if not this next summer, then in a very few, to swamp present park facilities all over the West. I understand most of the eastern national parks already are overloaded, at least from the standpoint of those who seek real solitude. All this creates an immediate necessity for continuing road and facility development of the marginal or wilderness-type areas of our parks, in spite of what desire proponents of wilderness legislation may have to the contrary. Intensive development of Forest Service recreational areas, whether or not now slated for roadless and carless uses only, can be but little further down the list of necessaries. As remarked above, BLM is pushing roads into its wilderness-type areas and setting up camping facilities and the like with considerable drive.

The hard fact of life here is that however hopeful a certain part of the public may be of preserving large, pristine areas in solitude (solitude for the millions?), nature alone predominant, the present wilderness area of the country is bound, in a few short years, to be a very

busy wilderness indeed, virtually teeming with humans engaged in all sorts of civilized, modern, mechanical activity, whether it be under provisions of existing law or provisions as set out in the proposed legislation. No practical law exists or can be made that will prevent in time an invasion of most of the wilderness area now contemplated by man engaged either in recreation, service of the recreationists, or in service to the more fundamental needs of his fellow man, or in protection of the natural values of the area. It seems to me that the promise from now on is for a situation changing rapidly in every respect. It appears to be one requiring the most flexible form of control. Present Federal management of wilderness areas by regions, by forests, or by individual areas, seems to me very well suited to existing problems of wilderness preservation and to the ever-increasing need for recreation in the same areas, to say nothing of ever-increasing material needs. Centralization of authority in Washington simply will not provide the flexibility the times require.

Again, as one familiar with real wilderness, I say I am for preservation of all especially outstanding wilderness and scenic values; I say as one familiar with mining that mining and preservation of the wilderness are not incompatible; I say as an observer of Government that no wilderness bill centralizing wilderness control in the National Capital should be passed, but that perhaps the present forms of localized control might be strengthened; I say as one familiar with the need of the Nation for mineral products and also with its capacity to supply them that mineral exploration and mining should not be hampered but instead must be helped by Federal legislation from now on.

Congress might well consider legislation that would define wilderness about as defined in H.R. 9162, and that would authorize Park Service and Bureau of Land Management to set aside, as they see fit, appropriate areas and manage the same as wilderness, all in a way quite parallel to present selection and management of wilderness and wild areas by the Forest Service. If so, this legislation should provide for the exceptions that will make it possible for each agency to develop its own particular areas as local differences and considerations may dictate; and, in view of the certain material needs of the Nation, not exclude the building of dams for water projects, not exclude roads and facilities for necessary material services, and, above all, not exclude exploration for minerals or mining.

Thank you.

(The appended material is as follows:)

CALIFORNIA STATE MINING BOARD, JANUARY 17, 1964

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Actions completed:

1. Approved minutes of meetings of September 15 and November 5, 1963. Confirmed actions of meeting of committee of two held on November 15 and approved minutes of that meeting (item 3, p. 2).
2. Approved resolution in opposition to and requesting public hearing on the proposed addition to the pending Death Valley withdrawal (item 4, p. 6).
3. Approved as official business the attendance by any board member at the hearings to be held January 23 and 24 in San Francisco by the Senate Natural Resources Committee (item 9, p. 8).

Actions to be taken:

1. Resolutions (action 2 above) to be forwarded with a cover letter by the chairman to the Secretary of the Interior (item 4, p. 6).

SRP05735

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present:

Mining board:

Philip R. Bradley, chairman.
Edmond F. Brovelli:
L. L. Huelsdonk, secretary.
Thomas H. Rodgers.

Department of conservation:

DeWitt Nelson, director.
Robert D. Calkins, deputy director.

Division of mines and geology:

Ian Campbell, chief.
Gordon B. Oakeshott, deputy chief.
Charles W. Chesterman.
Thomas E. Gay, Jr.
Richard M. Stewart.

Guests:

Representing U.S. Geological Survey:
Donald C. Ross.
Parke D. Snavely, Jr.
James F. McAllister.
Fred H. Dakin and Mrs. Mayme Arkelian of Dakin County.
Malcolm B. Gould, H. W. Gould & Co.
William T. Griswold, manager, Minerals Department, Kern County Land Co.
L. E. Mannion, chief geologist, Stauffer Chemical Co.
Seigfried Muessig, chief geologist, U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp.
F. T. Waite, retired.
Floyd Wilmoth, instructor (mining and geology) at Sierra College; contractor; member Western Governors Mining Advisory Council.
Kenneth Wilson, consulting geologist.
Lawrence B. Wright, consulting geologist.

1. The meeting was called to order in the San Francisco Port Authority Board room in the World Trade Center, Ferry Building, at 9:30 a.m.

2. Richard M. Stewart was appointed recorder.

3. Minutes of previous meetings were approved as follows: September 15 and November 5, 1963. The actions of the committee of two that met on November 15, 1963, were confirmed and the minutes of that committee meeting approved.

4. The chairman placed before the board the problem posed by the proposed addition to the pending Death Valley withdrawal. As a preface to opening the discussion on this problem, the chairman read the resolution that was passed by the board at the November 5 meeting:

"Whereas for a period of many years mining has been permitted in Death Valley National Monument and has been a source of interest to visitors to the monument; and

"Whereas for a period of many years California has supplied about 90 percent of the borate minerals used by industry throughout the world; and

"Whereas the latest proposed withdrawal would encompass lands that probably contain important reserves of borate minerals: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the mining board opposes withdrawal of lands within Death Valley without public hearings and without sufficient investigation of the effects of such withdrawals on the future production of minerals, especially borates."

The chairman also read into the record correspondence, relating to this resolution, between him and the Bureau of Land Management, as follows: A letter dated December 2, 1963, from the chairman to Mr. Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, transmitting the resolution noted above; a reply dated December 5 from Mr. James F. Doyle, Assistant Director, Bureau of Land Management: and the reply dated December 23 from the chairman to Mr. Doyle. These letters are made a part of this record and are attached as appendixes.

The chairman then stated that because of this background, it seemed appropriate for the board to hold a forum to hear testimony from some of those best informed regarding the area proposed for withdrawal, for the purpose of deriving a statement to be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior.

SRP05736

At the request of the chairman, Dr. Campbell introduced Dr. James F. McAllister of the U.S. Geological Survey. He noted that Dr. McAllister had been engaged in geologic mapping in the Death Valley area for several years and that the Division had an interest in his work, as it was part of the cooperative program with the U.S. Geological Survey. Mr. Bradley and Dr. Campbell both commented that the board was anxious to develop all the facts that might bear on the situation, in order that, where necessary to extrapolate data, the most reasonable inferences could be drawn.

Mr. McAllister showed an index map on which was outlined the area covered by his geologic mapping, his geologic map of the area and a number of slides, to bring out geologic features that were pertinent to the discussion. The area in general slopes gently upward from the Black Mountains on the southwest side to the Funeral Mountains on the northeast side. He prefaced his geologic discussion with general background information concerning the area and some of the mining history. He pointed out that the Ryan area, which was the principal source of borax production prior to the discovery of the boron district, was most active during the 1920's, and that this lies outside the Death Valley Monument area. Additionally, a borate-bearing zone extends generally from the Ryan area along the Black Mountains on the southwestern side of the area that he has mapped, in a northwesterly direction to the east Coleman Hills north and east of Furnace Creek Inn and the public campground at Texas Spring.

In his general discussion of the geology of this particular area, he indicated that the formations principally involved are, from oldest to youngest, the Artist Drive formation, the Furnace Creek formation, and the Funeral Fanglomerate, all overlain by more recent surficial gravels. Paleozoic rocks are exposed in the higher portions of the Funeral Mountains. The borate deposits are all within the fine-grained facies of the Furnace Creek formation. Gravelly portions of the Furnace Creek formation, probably representing alluvial fans, interfinger with the finer sediments, thus adding to the difficulty of predicting the location of borate-bearing beds under the subsequent cover.

Mr. Griswold of Kern County Land Co. indicated that the geologic discussion showed that the area proposed for withdrawal would cover the down-dip extension of these rocks. Dr. Muessig of U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp. stated that in his opinion the borate-bearing zones do go under the area proposed for withdrawal. Following some discussion as to what constituted the original basin of deposition for these rocks, Dr. McAllister agreed that the rocks do extend under the area proposed for withdrawal but pointed out that the exact location of the fine-grained sediments cannot be predicted accurately because of the relationship between them and the gravelly portions.

Dr. Mannion of Stauffer Chemical asked if the source of the gravelly portions of the Furnace Creek formation was known. Dr. McAllister stated the source was principally from the southwest, although fans also came from the northeast. Adding to the problem of predicting the relationship between the fine-grained and gravelly facies of the Furnace Creek formation is the situation that exists in some places where the Funeral Fanglomerate lies directly on the gravel of the Furnace Creek formation. Also, volcanic rocks interfinger with the fine-grained lakebed sediments to the southeast.

Dr. McAllister pointed out that the general structural picture under the area of interest is that of a syncline, the axis trending in a northwesterly direction. The syncline, however, is complicated by faulting at the southeast end. There followed a discussion of the possible depths to the finer grained portions of the Furnace Creek formation in the center of this synclinal area. Based upon the sections that Dr. McAllister had drawn, these could be as deep as 3,000 to 4,000 feet.

The question arose as to the exact relationship between the area proposed for withdrawal and the area mapped by Dr. McAllister. Dr. Muessig furnished a map of the proposed withdrawal showing the general relationship. Further discussion brought out the fact that the maximum thickness of the known borate-bearing beds is 1,500 to 2,000 feet.

There was some discussion as to purpose of the withdrawal, whereupon Dr. Muessig read from page 11083 of the Federal Register of Wednesday, October 16, 1963, as follows:

"The applicant desires the exclusion of mining activity to permit proper administration of scenic, historic, and scientific areas of the national monument that could be modified or destroyed if entry under the mining laws were

 SRP05737

permitted. Applicant, also desires to safeguard the public interest and to protect the water rights and valuable water resources in the monument's Furnace Creek area."

With respect to the water, Dr. Muessig felt that his company had evidence that most of the withdrawal area does not act as a recharge for the springs near Furnace Creek Inn. In a discussion that followed on the problem of water, Dr. McAllister made reference to an open file report that had been prepared at the request of the National Park Service and completed in 1958, "A brief geologic and hydrologic reconnaissance of the Furnace Creek Wash area, Death Valley National Monument, Calif.," by M. A. Pistang and Fred Kunkel. The manner in which mining might act to disturb the water was discussed. Dr. Snavely of the U.S. Geological Survey suggested a ground-water specialist would be needed to clarify the entire water problem.

Mr. Bradley asked anyone representing a mining company to point out what might be the most favorable area for further exploitation in the mapped area. Dr. Muessig stated that, in his opinion, the Furnace Creek Wash area was probably the best area in the United States for further exploration for borate deposits. Mr. Griswold made reference to the operations of his company which lie outside of the area proposed for withdrawal, but indicated that portions within the withdrawal may be of equal importance. The borate-bearing beds apparently are shallow at the southeast end of the withdrawal area and may represent extensive reserves. His company has developed at least 20 million tons of ore, some of which is as thick as 300 feet, averaging 15 to 20 percent calcium borate). Dr. Muessig pointed out that the borate-bearing zone that extends along the southwest portion of the area to be withdrawn, but immediately outside of it, constitutes about 20 percent of the linear extension of the Furnace Creek exposures (one ore body 300 feet thick, 3 million tons). This zone dips under the withdrawn area.

There followed a general discussion of how and on what basis the Mining Board could request a hearing, who should present testimony, etc. Both Mr. Bradley and Mr. Nelson felt the Division of Mines and Geology should be involved. Some of the arguments for a hearing include:

(*a*) The value of the borates:

(1) 85 percent of the world's borates come from California.

(2) The 1963 value of the crude borates produced in California was about $50 million and the value added by manufacturing was tremendous.

(*b*) The mining companies, in general, did not object to the first version of the proposed withdrawal, therefore a hearing might be necessary to make a selection of those lands acceptable to the mineral industry for withdrawal.

(*c*) There is a need to express the great public diversity of opinion; a need to provide good answers on the water problem.

(*d*) It is difficult to evaluate written material and both sides benefit from the give-and-take of oral discussion.

Mr. Wilmoth pointed out that mines are and can be points of interest and that the naturalist program conducted in the monument could actually assist the cause of mining in that it extols the value and interest of mining activities.

Mr. Nelson emphasized that there would have to be strong testimony on the part of mining companies. Mr. Griswold remarked that his company would be willing to release drill data, etc. Dr. Oakeshott stated that the map prepared by Dr. McAllister had not been released and that any testimony by the Survey would be up to the Director; the division would not be in a position to provide original data. Dr. Snavely suggested that the map could be placed upon open file upon request.

Mr. Nelson stated that the request for a hearing should be brought before the Bureau of Land Management by means of a resolution transmitted by a letter from the chairman to the Secretary of the Interior. Dr. Campbell said that the board should consider two aspects of the problem: (*a*) It should request a hearing and, regardless of whether or not a hearing was granted, (*b*) the board also should state its opposition to the proposed withdrawal.

It was moved, seconded, and voted that the chairman of the board would forward, by means of an appropriate cover letter, the following resolution:

Whereas the State mining board, having previously considered the most recently proposed additional withdrawal in Death Valley National Monument as provided in an amendment, as published on page 11083 of the Federal Register for Wednesday, October 16, 1963, to the pending withdrawal applica-

tion serial No. Los Angeles 0153533, bringing the total area under proposal of withdrawal to 47,902.21 acres; and

Whereas the State mining board, having previously stated its position that the proposed withdrawal in Death Valley National Monument is not in the best interests of the State of California or of the United States, nor is the proposed withdrawal consistent with the spirit or with the text of the enactment that created Death Valley National Monument; and

Whereas the State mining board has obtained additional evidence on the mineral potential of portions of the area under consideration; and

Whereas the State mining board has had a negative reply from a representative of the Washington office of Bureau of Land Management to its request that a hearing be held on the matter of the proposed withdrawal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State mining board, in the knowledge now available to it, strongly opposes the proposed withdrawal, but nevertheless respectfully urges the Bureau of Land Management to arrange for and conduct a public hearing at some time and place convenient to interested citizens in order to provide opportunity for all interested persons to make known pertinent facts and opinions on this important matter.

A statement by the Kern County Land Co. was submitted for the record, and is made a part of the appendixes to these minutes.

5. The next item on the agenda was a brief report by Mr. Bradley relative to the hearings he attended in Las Vegas on January 13 and 14, 1964, on items of wilderness legislation. Mr. Bradley submitted to the board his statement given at the hearing. In response to a question from Director Nelson, Mr. Bradley stated that two-thirds of those present and testifying were "Audubon type" and one-third were "resource type." Several bills were discussed. Mr. Bradley stated that he favored the present system of management of wilderness.

6. Mr. Brovelli asked for a brief report on the hearings held on the zoning problem in the rock, sand, and gravel industry. Dr. Campbell provided a brief summary of the three hearings and the fact that, in response to a question asked of every witness, there apparently were no recommendations for legislation. Subsequent to the hearings held in San Francisco, it has been announced that another hearing will be held in Los Angeles on January 30. Whether any legislation develops or not, the indirect effect of the hearings will be good for the industry as city planners, etc., are more aware of the problems.

7. The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 12:30 p.m.

8. The meeting was reconvened at 3:20 p.m. following an early afternoon meeting of the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council, participated in by the board members and chaired by Mr. Nelson.

9. Dr. Campbell reviewed the situation relative to the Senate interim committee hearing on Senate Resolution 190. There will be 2 days of hearings in San Francisco, January 23 and 24 (additional hearings will be held if necessary). At the request of Ford B. Ford (the executive secretary of the Senate Committee on Natural Resources), he and any interested Senators would be taken on a tour of the division's operations on January 22.

Mr. Nelson reminded the group that, in recent years, the only increase in the division's program was brought about by a budget augmentation for the research program, put through largely by the efforts of Senator Collier. Therefore, he and Dr. Campbell had prepared the resolution and requested its passage in subsequent hearings. There is a need to educate the legislators as to what is being done, what should be done, and what the economic results may be. There is a need to develop 250,000 new jobs each year in California.

The Senators will want to know if there is any legislation needed with respect to commodity studies, etc. Dr. Oakeshott and others pointed out that we really need additional staff to assist in our present activities. There was some discussion of the progress of geologic mapping, as an example. The rate at which the State is mapped depends upon the number of man-years that can be put into this portion of the division's program.

The chairman called upon Kenneth Wilson, as being the only nongovernment person present at the time, in the audience, to explain what he thought should be done. Mr. Wilson commented that in efforts to conduct certain economies, paralleling the example presumed to be set by the Federal Government, there might be a threat of a cutback in State programs. He would urge that instead of being cut back, the programs of the division of mines and geology should be increased. He pointed out that not only do individual geologists make

SRP05739

considerable use of the division's facilities, but corporations and planning boards of cities and counties need our information. The needs for geological information extend beyond the mineral industry, as most of the economy depends to some extent upon knowledge of geologic conditions. Small communities need geological advice, and the division perhaps is in a better position to reach them than consultants.

Mr. Nelson raised the question as to what part industry should play in augmenting the division's program and what part, if any, it should finance. Dr. Campbell pointed out that—

(*a*) The mineral industry is extremely important to California's economy.

(*b*) In general the mining industry has had a hard time (metals especially).

(*c*) Government should provide incentive and assistance.

(*d*) Geologic maps (as examples of division's program) should be provided as an incentive.

Dr. Snavely commented that industry does provide assistance to State and Government agencies, in that they provide much basic data that is incorporated into compiling geologic maps.

A brief discussion followed as to the procedures, order of speakers, etc., for the hearings. Dr. Oakeshott asked if this committee could not pass a resolution directing the division to expand and speed up its work. Mr. Nelson stated that they could set up a legislative policy statement defining the scope of the division's activities, and that this might help obtain subsequent program augmentation. Mr. Nelson commented that he was looking forward to the hearings, hoping that they would be 2 productive days.

Mr. Wilson suggested that Mr. Bradley could raise the question of wilderness, getting into the record that the mining board has taken a position in opposition to any Federal action that takes lands away from mineral development. Following a discussion, it was agreed that an effort should be made to inform the committee that it should not ignore wilderness when it is examining other land problems.

It was moved, seconded, and voted, following Mr. Nelson's suggestion, that attendance by board members at the hearings would be recognized as official business in order that travel expenditures could be reimbursed.

10. The next regular meeting of the board was scheduled to be held in the Los Angeles area on February 27, subject to the call of the Chair.

11. Mr. Bradley commented that at some meeting in the future the board should make arrangements to visit the bay model at Sausalito, and the offices of the U.S. Geological Survey in Menlo Park.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

RICHARD M. STEWART, *Recorder.*

APPENDIX TO MINUTES OF MINING BOARD MEETING OF JANUARY 17, 1964

A. Correspondence between chairman, State mining board, and Bureau of Land Management relative to resolution and request for public hearing on proposed Death Valley withdrawal (three items).

B. Statement from Kern County Land Co. regarding proposed Death Valley withdrawal.

C. Statement presented by Mr. Bradley at the hearings in Las Vegas January 13 and 14 on wilderness legislation.

Appendix A-1

DECEMBER 2, 1963.

CHARLES H. STODDARD,
Director, U.S. Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STODDARD: At the order of the State mining board I transmit herewith a resolution passed at the last meeting of the mining board:

"Whereas for a period of many years mining has been permitted in Death Valley National Monument and has been a source of interest to visitors to the monument; and

"Whereas for a period of many years California has supplied about 90 percent of the borate minerals used by industry throughout the world; and

"Whereas the latest proposed withdrawal would encompass lands that probably contain important reserves of borate minerals: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the mining board opposes withdrawals of lands within Death Valley without public hearings and without sufficient investigation of the effects of such withdrawals on the future production of minerals, especially borates."

This resolution represents a careful consideration of all the facts that the mining board could obtain from our well-informed State division of mines, and represents the unanimous opinion of the board. Please note that in effect it asks for public hearings on the proposed withdrawals.

Yours very truly,

PHILIP R. BRADLEY, *Chairman.*

Appendix A-2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C., December 5, 1963.

PHILIP R. BRADLEY,
State Mining Board,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: Thank you for your letter of December 2, advising us of the sentiments of the State mining board toward the proposed Death Valley National Monument withdrawal, as expressed in the resolution it passed at a recent meeting.

Public hearings in withdrawal matters are conducted at very considerable expense to the Government and, of course, to participants who sometimes must travel long distances to state their views. Accordingly, we prefer to avoid them unless there is a reasonable likelihood that only through such methods can evidence be adduced which would have an important bearing upon the question whether, and to what extent the withdrawal should be made.

It has been our experience that most, if not all evidentiary material bearing upon the issue may be submitted by interested patries by written communication, which is carefully reviewed by the Secretary of the Interior in this convenient form, even though offered long after the time limit specified in the published notice of proposed withdrawal.

It will be appreciated if you will advise us if you wish at this time to submit a written statement of reasons why the board feels the withdrawal is contraindicated, or reasons why the board's case can best be presented only at open hearings. The board's position will be brought to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior, who will make a decision in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. DOYLE, *Assistant Director.*

Appendix A-3

DECEMBER 23, 1963.

JAMES F. DOYLE,
Assistant Director, U.S. Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Your letter of the 5th answering mine of the 2d arrived here while I was on a trip in Federal service, from which I have only just returned; hence the delay in this answer to you.

I expect, in the near future, between this board and the most competent division of mines and geology of this State, to provide the Bureau of Land Management with a statement that in effect will present reasons why it will be more in the public interest for Bureau of Land Management to preserve the right of the public to make valid mining locations on the area that is proposed to be withdrawn, than will such withdrawal itself. No formal statement in respect to this, however, can be ready much before mid-January, if then.

Meanwhile, we want to urge your most serious consideration of the benefits of a public hearing on the subject, in contrast to review of submitted statements in a bureau or departmental office, particularly so if such office review be in Washington. Hearings most certainly inform the interested public con-

SRP05741

cerning all the various viewpoints that are likely to be expressed, far better than any other mode of communication that can be applied in these cases.

It has been our observation and belief that a hearing frequently can generate, on the spot, a crossfire of testimony that is most informative—much more so, of course, than written statements, often sterile—to witnesses as well as hearings officers. This has the double advantage of supplying a maximum of information to officers, and at the same time actually educating witnesses, with the effect that their viewpoint henceforth is likely to be more collective and is likely to manifest understanding of the broad problem, and to less represent only their own narrow interests.

By its tendency to develop ideas in the course of the testimony the hearing tends to guarantee that a maximum of information important to the case will be entered, and in addition it offers opportunity for correction of misinterpretation of information that exists in no other means of presentation.

However, probably most important, the hearing has the distinct advantage of offering an infinitely better opportunity to the interested public to experss itself—and this is especially true of much of the mining public—than does an invitation to hand in written material to some Washington office. The Bureau of Land Management should not, in our opinion, risk the criticism that the interested public has not had proper opportunity to express itself. Instead, it must do all it can actually to manifest its good faith in a public way. We think also it should go far to manifest its continuing regard for the rights of the public at large that are set out in the general mining laws; and to display also its awareness of the important relation between land and the tremendous need of the public for the product of mines.

What is involved in this withdrawal appear to be major known or inferred reserves of boron compounds in mineral forms. Public need for trese is so great that any threat of impairment of the Nation's capacity to produce from these reserves must be most carefully approached by responsible agencies, whether these are private, State, or Federal.

Yours very truly,

(S) Philip R. Bradley,
PHILIP R. BRADLEY,
Chairman.

Appendix B

KERN COUNTY LAND CO.,
San Francisco, January 16, 1964.

Mr. PHILIP R. BRADLEY,
Chairman, Resources Agency of California, Department of Conservation, State Mining Board, Ferry Building, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: The Death Valley National Monument is a unique natural asset that should be preserved for its scenic and historic value and, with appropriate safeguards, developed for its economic mineral value. Kern County Land Co. believes these objectives to be completely compatible.

At the present time a substantial portion of the Death Valley National Monument appears to have economic mineral potential. The area the National Park Service proposes to withdraw from mining entry, however, encompasses one of the very few locations in the United States considered favorable for borate exploration.

The company believes that the best interests of the Nation are served when the concepts outlined in the Multiple Mineral Development Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 708) are applied to public lands.

We recognize that it is desirable to withdraw certain lands from multiple use when such withdrawal is not detrimental to the best long-term interests of the national economy, but rarely should this be necessary. While the company does not object to having lands withdrawn from multiple use when it appears that such lands have no economic potential, it feels some means should be developed to reopen such lands if future circumstances should warrant.

The company recommends that withdrawals of public lands should be made only after joint Government-industry evaluation of the lands are completed. After evaluation, lands with potential mineral value could be designated to multiple use under appropriate regulation; the remainder could be withdrawn

subject to possible future reclassification. The company believes further that public hearings should precede any withdrawal from any public lands so that all segments of the public, as well as industry, may be represented.

Very truly yours,

(S) William T. Griswold,
WILLIAM T. GRISWOLD,
Manager, Minerals Department.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Phil. That is fine.

Are there any questions?

Mr. DUNCAN. It is a very comprehensive statement. I am sure it will be very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I think Mr. Bradley's comment about the growing field for minerals all over the world is something we are going to have to face up to. It was not but a few years ago that zinc was considered a metal that had an oversupply situation and zinc areas were shut down. Today one of the metals in worldwide shortage is zinc. We are faced now with what we are going to do to maintain a zinc industry in the world zinc market.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may add, I believe feasible legislation would involve the following:

One, Congress set up common standards for all agencies involved in wilderness, given definition and management, much like the present Forest Service standards;

Two, let the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the Park Service manage independently, locally, and flexibly;

Three, maybe set up an Agriculture-Interior Coordinating Committee;

Four, in policy, anticipate the ultimate invasion by recreationists of all but the choicest wilderness and anticipate water resource development for off-wilderness needs; and

Five, above all these days, permit mineral exploration and mining under the ordinary, it not extended, rights of mineral entry.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

I would like to congratulate you on your new appointment as chairman of the State mining board. Mr. Bradley has also accepted appointment to the National Advisory Committee on Multiple Use of the National Forests, the appointment coming from Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BRADLEY. I have an advisory job with the Bureau of Land Management, too, and the problems they have in this recreational development of what they call wilderness is just unbelieveable.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is John Tyler, vice chairman, Southern California chapter of the Nature Conservancy. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN TYLER, VICE CHAIRMAN, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CHAPTER, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY, SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Mr. TYLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I appear here today specifically representing two national conservation organizations as well as my own views on the wilderness bill; the southern California chapter of the Nature Conservancy of which I am vice chairman, and the Committee for the Preservation of the Tule

 SRP05743

Elk, with international membership of which I am a member of the board of trustees.

We are here to plead for the strongest possible wilderness bill, one which will assure the maximum possible area of jurisdiction under the strongest protective means at our command. Of the bills under consideration, S. 4 appears to be this bill, with the Saylor bill next in order. Lest our attitude appear "grabby" may I remind the committee that the total area remaining that could be under consideration was only 2 percent in 1956 at the time of the Senate hearings. It is much less in these few scant years. The other 98 percent has long fallen to the opponents of this bill who wail that if this last 2 percent is not surrendered to them, we are in dire straits as a Nation. If this is so, what will our situation be in 20 years when they have used it up? They cannot create wilderness, only destroy it.

Let us exclude the aesthetic values espoused by "nature lovers" as they call us and consider the practical values of wilderness—like water. Water is a resource every city dweller is becoming aware of more each day. Only in the untouched areas is rain truly recovered, allowed to percolate in clean underground reservoirs or run in controlled flow streams. Elsewhere it scours the topsoil which took centuries to make, sends it muddy, roaring uncontrolled floods damaging to land and life in the great valleys cleared of protective vegetation which has lost much of its rich topsoil and now requires chemical fertilizers to stimulate the original fertility.

How can the old policy which has already destroyed so much conceivably be the right path today? Instead of destroying wilderness, we must protect it, and quickly, or all it lost. Originally it had to be hack and cut to clear. It was easier to cut more than it was to protect the cleared land from erosion. Today it is easier to cut virgin timber than to plant new trees. Both methods have about run their course, we are about to run out of virgin land to clear or harvest, and this could be fatal to the Nation.

Most of what we do is for the economics of the problem—it may be easier, quicker, or cheaper. This is certainly the reasons back of present lumbering and mining industries. Why plant trees while there are plently all ready for the cutting; who wants to wait 50 years for a crop when there is already some prime 350-year old trees at hand? Why work low grade ores when richer ores are yet to be discovered in the wilderness areas? Why selectively cut trees when taxes are cheaper if you slashcut everything at once.

Years ago, working for Douglas Aircraft, I learned that perfectly good parts were destroyed because it was cheaper to make new ones than to hold over on the inventory at tax time. The real waste was economically practical under existing tax laws.

The correct answer to both the spare parts problem and our current mining and lumbering practice is to change the laws that govern the economics of the situation. Make some concession to make it economical to mine lower grade ores, make it worthwhile to replant and care for timber-cut areas. This is the methods which should be persued by these industries, not go blindly ahead until there is no reserve whatever.

The lumber industry speaks of our forests as a renewable resource which should be continually harvested. Theoretically this is correct,

but there is as yet no practical means of doing so economically in the botanical sense. The damage to the other trees is extensive in getting out the mature specimen. This will be a problem for future generations, if we leave them any forests over which to ponder. Mention is often made of a 50-year crop. A tree may be mature enough for most purposes at 50 years, but the forests they wish to cut into are much older, certainly more like a 350-year average. It won't return in any 50 years to its present condition. If these low 20- to 50-year figures are correct, why hasn't the industry gone all out in planting trees? Recently I flew over much of the Northwest by light plane, which is the only way to really see and understand the problem. The great patches of cutover area are easy to see, and so is the erosion.

There seems to be a vast amount of trees, until you see statistics, and then you realize how quickly these cut patches could erase everything. Much of what you can see is already in private hands, but this is the lumberman's "reserve." He seems to be doing exactly what he accuses the conservationist of doing—hoarding. What is wrong with "we the people" having a little nest egg for the future generations?

There seems to be great concern over what should and what should not be included under this act. The line must be drawn somewhere, of course, but let us hope that the line of true wilderness is not as clearly marked by the lumberman's ax as are some of our present national parks. Perhaps we should also indicate buffer strips around these areas lest the high plateau of wilderness be eroded away at the edges if we leave steep cliffs instead of stable slopes for its protection. Every suggestion seems to want to limit the wilderness area more and more. Let us rather save all we can, plus a buffer zone whose exact status could be decided by future generations who can judge better than we its true value. But if we don't save it now, they will have nothing to decide, but can only condemn us for our stupidity in destroying our heritage.

Many oppose the wilderness bill on the grounds that the Federal Government already owns large sections of the State. The wilderness bill should not be made the whipping boy of our economic shortcomings. Wilderness is where you find it—exploit its advantages to the area, but keep it intact. Develop the surrounding areas in harmony with it. Tourism is still in its infancy despite its present great importance. As more leisure time is available, more use will be made of wilderness and associated areas. Economic adjustment could and perhaps should be made to some areas, but that is outside the scope of this bill.

More important than the actual areas being preserved at this time is the establishment of a policy, a philosophy, that wilderness does have value and merit, that it should and will be saved for ours and future generations. We need this mostly for ourselves, but it will also enhance our international image if we show that we appreciate more than the material things with a dollar sign. In deed, it may be opportune for the many emerging nations who look to us as examples to see this new philosophy now rather than follow our most destructive past example.

I do not mean that wilderness does not have dollar value, but rather that we can understand dollar value in those less tangible elements

 SRP05745

of which wilderness is composed. As a case in point, it is currently being advocated that Americans see America first as a means of reducing the gold outflow from this country. The beauty of wilderness, wild, and primitive areas is the unique feature that can cause Americans to do just that. It should be exploited for just that. The income to the surrounding areas will continue to increase over the years. The income is there. We need only to set up the rules by which we operate so that it is not spoiled by the "get rich quick" types. The wilderness bill is the essential element.

The Mount San Gorgonio Wilderness Area in southern California is a case in point. Commercial interests want to invade this area, want it excluded from this act. We feel it most unwise for this commercial development to spoil this area. Wilderness is where you find it, and it is rare in southern California; so is snow for skiing in some years. It is not a lacking element, and snow in the wilderness is still there to be enjoyed. Most of the skiing persons I have talked to don't see the need for ski lifts everywhere. If we allow an exclusion of this area, then we must also allow it in other areas, and soon there is no wilderness. We allow them full rein in 98 percent of the United States. Just leave us the 2 percent as we think it should be—to be enjoyed by all without the "improvements by man."

It doesn't make sense to destroy our wilderness for a few dollars; therefore, we ask our opponents to join us in preserving a greater America.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Are there any questions?

The gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. WHITE. I have no questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Tyler.

Mr. TYLER. Thank you, gentlemen.

(The following supplmental statement was received from Mr. Tyler:)

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY,
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CHAPTER,
January 20, 1964.

Re establishment of national wilderness preservation system.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I request that the following remarks be added to my written and oral remarks made at the Las Vegas hearings on January 14, 1964, and all be made a part of the record of this hearing on the wilderness bill:

At this Las Vegas hearing, as in previous hearings over the years, the vocal opponents of the wilderness concept continue with the same cliche arguments, somewhat out of context with the facts, usually selfishly, economically oriented.

"Multiple use is of paramount importance" but it first must include their particular use to be multiple or primary. "Wilderness would remove areas from the tax rolls" yet no area now under consideration is now on the tax rolls. "The Government owns too much land already" but wilderness areas are a small fraction of this total. The military services hold the big areas, and entry to these is verboten whereas wilderness is open to all to enjoy. "The areas are off the tax rolls," but they don't draw from the tax treasury.

This tax concept brings up the fact that actually the users of the Federal lands are being subsidized by the low charges they actually pay for their use. Were they required to pay the going rate of private holdings, there would not be such a clamor to use these lands.

"The wilderness bill is unnecessary, there are enough laws now" while actually there are no laws but regulations under constant pressure at the local levels.

Many indicate expectations of the closed areas being opened to commercial interests soon. Local administrators need wise, strong, policy to back up protective attitudes or more and more will go on the one-way trail to oblivion.

The San Gorgonio skiing situation illustrated the commercial attitudes. Those prepared to exploit it say it is essential to the skiing minority. Those with investments nearby who have done something about the unreliability of snow are opposed to development (it would hurt their investments) and favor wilderness. The wilderness bill won't eliminate skiing, just make getting to the start of the run more rugged—won't this build stamina into our Olympic athletes?

The grazers opposed, yet there are strong protective clauses in all versions of the bill. These clauses could easily impair the watershed unless watershed protection overshadows grazing rights. But economics may force a change for the better. Feedlot methods are cheaper than open range, also Du Pont just announced a true leather substitute.

A great deal has been said about protection of inholdings and the rights of ingress and egress. First we make a tight, theoretical definition of wilderness, then we proceed to eliminate as much of the area meeting the standard as possible by these rights. In this situation, the longest road is the most feasible—it cuts more trees. In light-plane flights over the Northwest recently, I noticed the technique. A highway cut a wide swath through the forest, and paralleling it a hundred yards away was another wide swath barren of trees—the powerline, partly paid for by the lumber produced from the trees in the way.

We are accused of locking up vast areas which should be exploited for their resources. At least they concede that there is a key for the lock. Let us hope also that this key only fits the front door, where all can see when the storehouse is emptied, not the black market back door. The area sounds vast, expressed in acres, trivial, in percent. Fifty years ago, had we asked for the current 2 percent of the United States now being considered, we might have gotten it without an argument, but few conservationists expected it to disappear so quickly; we are realizing it a little late. Having already divided the land 50 to 1 by default, we are now expected to share what is left in the same ratio, and the same destructive terms. Not all of the areas considered wilderness are wanted by lumbering or mining or grazing, there are some uneconomic areas, although there are few acres in our vast country that someone hasn't some private ideas about. Still they count these uneconomic areas in the vast lockup of resources.

Why should those living closest to wilderness oppose the wilderness bill? Having it in abundance all their lives, they have never needed it nor do they expect ever to be without it, but mainly, on the frontier, they oppose regulation of any sort. They are much too close to the lumber to see the forest. They oppose it on principle of no regulation for them.

We are a minority, it is true, who value wilderness and are concerned about its destruction, but a quickly growing one. Even if we were not on the increase, when you repeat just a few generations, we greatly outnumber the single generation that would otherwise benefit from its use. In the next generation we will have increased manifold, but it will be futile, wilderness will have practically disappeared.

Wilderness has been rather sharply defined, but unnaturally. It doesn't stop and start at a line on the map. Actually, it requires a buffer zone for its protection, and which it in turn enriches. Also, this buffer zone will have to satisfy many who want wilderness, because there is not enough for all of us even now. As this buffer zone is not spelled out, or provided for, and it is vital to wilderness; the least we can do is be generous in our boundaries and overclassify in favor of wilderness, include a few ordinary acres with the choice—we may want to trade off with some choice acres we missed the first time. Let us hope that we don't emulate present practice in some areas—log up to the boundary—as has happened with our national parks.

If the situation will be as bad as they indicate when wilderness is locked up, think how tragic it will be if they use it up and still have not adjusted to the change. Isn't it far better to adapt now, while there is the emergency reserve? They haven't responded to this warning, we must take stronger action if we are to remain economically strong and this land continues to be free.

Most conservationists think of the wilderness values as saving of biological habitat, and consequently of species other than man. Witnessing the interplay of nature without the altering hand of man is uplifting, a continual new experience. From this, and the solitude comes renewal of spirit and physical rejuvination of ourselves as individuals. Still another broader concept is expressed

SRP05747

by Raymond F. Dasmann in the introduction to his book "The Last Horizon," from which I quote a few lines:

"Fifty years ago it was still possible to push out into areas on the map that were blank. Thirty years ago the geographical magazines were still full of accounts of travelers to strange places who brought back stories of new countries and different ways of life. But now it has mostly gone, although in our actions we behave as though the 19th-century concept of the world were still valid. We retain the frontier outlook in a world from which all the old land frontiers have vanished.

"This book is about the wild country that still remains; the places where people are still few and their works little in evidence. In the broad spectrum of land use, the emphasis here will be on the rangelands that feed the livestock, the forests that grow the timber; the desert, the mountains, the arctic barrens; and the wildlife that still is to be found there. They are no longer remote, and they are all on the map, but they are still wild. They are a dimension of life that has been present throughout history. They have provided a refuge for those grown weary of the presence of too many people. When tyranny reigned in the tamer lands, they have sheltered the rebels, the Resistance, the Partisans, the Maquis. They have helped to guarantee a measure of freedom, an opportunity for change that might otherwise have vanished. So long as they remain, such freedom and opportunity will stay with us.

"Wild country is not looked upon favorably by those who would control others. It is an undisciplined element—a waste. It must be organized and arranged, if the lives of people are to be disciplined and managed. It must be fenced, policed, patrolled, and made to disappear. It must be brought into production, into the plan, or the world cannot support the teeming billions of the future. In an anthill, there is no room for rebels. Wilderness must be eliminated, therefore, in man and in nature."

There are some of us who believe that people are not worth preserving unless the remain human. If to provide for the future we must compress people into molds that distort their nature and force them to manageable patterns, then the future is not worth having. We have been moving in this direction: we have already limited our freedom of choice, but it is not too late to change. We can still work to maintain the space, the flexibility, necessary for the preservation of people as individuals, free to grow and choose, to select the ways of life to their tastes. To do this we must have land, in particularly the wild country where man can get away from the pressures of his society, and give some thought to its meaning.

Sincerely,

JOHN TYLER, *Vice Chairman.*

Mr. BARING. The next witness is J. D. Flournoy, president of the California Wildlife Federation. You may proceed, Mr. Flournoy.

STATEMENT OF J. D. FLOURNOY, PRESIDENT OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDLIFE FEDERATION, NEW CUYAMA, CALIF.

Mr. FLOURNOY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is J. D. Flournoy, president of the California Wildlife Federation, and my comments reflect the views of over 100,000 dues-paying members of this statewide conservation organization.

It is our view that a wilderness bill is necessary and we do support the Senate bill S. 4, and the companion bills that have been submitted in the House of Representatives. However, in order that our basic philosophy is not misinterpreted, S. 4 is the bill that we advocate adoption of. We believe that wilderness is a valuable natural resource that belong to the people, and that the preservation and educational, scientific, and recreational use is part of a balanced conservation program essential in the survival of our civilized culture.

This crusade is not new to organized sportsmen. We have played a leading role in the American conservation scene ever since the disappearance of the passenger pigeon and the decimation of our buffalo.

In fact, organizations of sportsmen to protect wildlife and other natural resources were formed long before the word conservation was added to our vocabulary. For example, the New York Association for the Protection of Game was organized in 1844, and the well-known Boone & Crockett Club began its effective preservation efforts in 1887. Today, over 50 million hunters and fishermen are indebted to our forefathers who banded together to fiight the political and economical forces that otherwise could have wiped out the entire natural resources of this country.

Today, we are faced with the question: What part of our public lands shall be set aside and dedicated to a wilderness concept? Wilderness is a physical condition. Wilderness is also a state of mind. Both concepts are important, the former in matters of protection and management, the latter in evaluating the benefits of wilderness. Both play a vital role in planning for the intelligent and beneficial use of this important cultural and recreational heritage. There is much merit in setting aside and preserving less than 2 percent of our national area, a place where nature still resides, and where future generations of this Nation may return for inspiration. We feel that the small areas of this Nation that would be set aside by this legislation as advocated by S. 4, will have more economic and spiritual values for the common good than any multiple-use concept that can be applied to these public lands.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Saylor's bill, 9070 and 9520 are good bills and seem to provide adequate legislation for the establishment of wilderness and recently meet the objection to S. 4. However, we hope in seeking unity the concept of true wilderness is not lost. The California Wildlife Federation will await the action of this committee anxiously.

I have one other comment to make, and that is, we do support the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area and request this committee to oppose any building of roads into the area.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much, Mr. Flournoy.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. No questions.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is a group from the Biology Club, University of Nevada. I understand they are not here, and their statement will be made a part of the record at this point. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF BIOLOGY CLUB, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, SOUTHERN REGIONAL DIVISION

Many of the members of the Biology Club at Nevada Southern have visited and studied in areas which have been little disturbed by the activities of man. We have learned the value and in many cases the necessity of conducting ecological studies in areas which are as natural as possible. Each year the Government as well as private organizations and individuals spend millions of dollars in the support of biological research. A significant portion of this effort is directed toward ecological studies. These studies are destined to become increasingly significant and extensive as the time for the attempted establishment of an artificial ecological system in space draws nearer. Many basic questions can best be answered in an area which most closely approaches a completely natural environment undisturbed by man.

SRP05749

The Nevada test site provides us with another important reason to preserve a portion of natural America. Ecological studies there are directed toward assessing the effects of atomic detonation on natural communities. These studies involve examination of both radiation and blast effects. The effects of sublethal doses of radiation on ecological systems are impossible to measure except over long periods of time and will probably involve rather subtle changes. The studies at the test site unfortunately began after several years of testing had taken place. Therefore measurements of change, while valuable, cannot hope to show what changes have occurred from the natural situation.

A third important reason to preserve wilderness involves the psychological well-being of at least some of us. Recent studies on mice have shown that when subjected to overcrowded conditions these animals develop such conditions as arteriosclerosis and heart disease and what the investigators described as mental disturbances. The fact that these conditions are on the increase in man indicate that a similar situation may exist for man. We may, therefore, see the day when areas of undisturbed, unoccupied country become essential to the maintenance of the health of many of our Nation's people.

We strongly urge the enactment of the bills listed by the committee in group 2. This legislation we feel will provide the kind of wilderness protection necessary to preserve these areas long enough to give us the opportunity to attempt to answer some of the ecological questions outlined above. It may also allow us to inherit from you a country of greater beauty, value, and opportunity for scientific advancement (as well as personal sanity) than if these areas are allowed to be desecrated by mining, lumbering, and certain highly commercialized recreational interests.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Tom Yoho, Las Vegas, Nev., representing the Lincoln Back-Country Protective Association, Lincoln, Mont. Is he here?

(No response.)

Mr. BARING. Robert C. Gardiner, of Sierra Madre, Calif. Is he here?

(No response.)

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Mrs. Arthur N. Hull, of Las Vegas. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ARTHUR N. HULL, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mrs. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I am Dawn Hull. I live here in Las Vegas. My husband is a meteorologist with the Atomic Energy and 2 weeks a year we are happy campers.

I feel we should regard with alarm that in our brief history as a Nation we have reduced our original wilderness to about 2 percent. At this destructive rate there will not be a wild area left in its natural state for the future unless we now draw up an ironbound contract to preserve what little is left. My young daughter is not yet old enough to defend her own natural heritage, so I speak for her, as well as myself. And I should like to feel I represent my own future descendants, too.

When we create such monsters as the city of Los Angeles (where I grew up) and ruin the beauty of the Monterey Peninsula (to which I moved) we must recognize the fact that we cannot intelligently coexist with nature. We must simply keep our hands off of it and not allow our increasing population to spill over into these last primitive areas which have become small enough to be considered in a museum status, and may well serve as therapy some day for a society that is showing symptoms of needing relief from our own artificial surroundings within cities.

SRP05750

Our wilderness is in desperate need of protection against 20th century progress, and a protection that will survive forever after our century is history. Therefore, I favor the Saylor-Quie-Cohelan bills and their provisions which I feel best protect America's original beauty.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Mrs. Hull, you have also furnished us with a statement from your daughter who is in the sixth grade.

Mrs. HULL. Yes. She could not come as she is in school. I do not know if it qualifies for the record, of course, because she is not a voter.

Mr. BARING. How old is she?

Mrs. HULL. Eleven.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, we will print the daughter's letter in the record at this point.

Mrs. HULL. Thank you.

(The letter follows:)

JANUARY 13, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I feel greatly shocked to think the greedy contractors wish to overrun our last bit of wilderness.

America is greatly marveled for its scenic mountains, quiet forests, and pools (which we now have very few).

If we let these contractors seize our remaining wilderness, soon there will be crowded tracts, bars, supermarkets, gas stations, markets, trash, and filthy beer cans, and lost forever will be the towering trees and snow-topped mountains against the blue sky. The clean, sparkling rivers, falls, and pools will all be in the past unless America's wilderness is saved.

KATHLEEN P. HULL,
Las Vegas, Nev.

Mr. BARING. I might comment on your characterization of Los Angeles as a monster. Do you refer to the concrete jungle of freeways?

Mrs. HULL. I can say it with conviction because I was born and grew up in downtown Los Angeles. It is a pretty poisonous area.

Mr. BARING. I might say that I got on the freeway at Redondo Beach the other day and I tried to get off downtown and finally wound up in Hollywood. I just could not get off.

The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mrs. Hull, I have overheard a couple of your comments. I will not take issue with you on your Los Angeles characterization, but you indicated, I think, as you conversed with our counsel up here that you were not at all certain a little old housewife would be listed as a witness, and you also expressed some doubt as to whether your daughter's statement would be included because she is not a voter.

One of the things I wanted to do in this series of hearings we have held in Olympia, Denver, and Nevada is to find out how many of the people that are coming to these hearings are voters. I have not asked them, although I have wanted to, because I suspect that many of them have not exercised their right of franchise, and to many people the only way they ever get a chance to participate in the government these days is to register and vote, and not nearly enough of them are doing it.

Another way you can participate in your Government and make this system of ours work better is to do what you have done today—come down here to a congressional committee and give us the benefit

 SRP05751

of your views. And one, not the least, of the advantages of having hearings of this sort is not only to give us the benefit of your thinking but to give you, here in Las Vegas and this area, an opportunity to come into direct contact with your Government and to know, as you leave this room—and I hope everybody does—that this Government is responsive to the wishes of the people. That does not mean everybody gets everything they want in each bill, but it does mean that the views of every citizen in this country, if he will make them known, either by testimony or at the ballot box, is going to be taken into consideration by the Government.

I want you people to know this, too: Not only is your Congress directly responsive to the people, they have to be because they have to go before the electorate every 2 years or every 6 years, but also it has been my experience during my short time in Washington that the members of the executive branch in Government want to do a good job, they want to govern this country the way the country wants to be governed. I just want to disabuse you, if there is remaining any doubt in your mind about not only our willingness to listen to you, but, indeed our anxiety to have you come and appear.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. HULL. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Mrs. Robert T. Ives of Claremont, Calif. You may proceed, Mrs. Ives.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ROBERT T. IVES, CLAREMONT, CALIF.

Mrs. IVES. Gentlemen, I am Mrs. Robert T. Ives, another housewife in southern California, and I am proud of it.

I live at 1022 Harvard Avenue, Claremont, Calif. I would like to testify today before this committee as an individual in favor of a bill to preserve our last bit of wilderness.

Everyone is aware that this country is very different today than it was a century ago, 50 years ago, or even a generation ago. In addition to sweeping changes in technology, one can observe many changes in communities and the countryside. Especially in Los Angeles one notices many, many more people and air that wilts vegetation, chokes the lungs, smarts the eyes, and obscures the horizon. All over the country, landscapes that were open before are today clogged with housing tracts and overloaded highways. In some places, one finds raw gullies where there were once fertile fields. In other places, tangles of stumps and underbrush have replaced living forests. The coal that lay beneath the surface of the Appalachians has been torn out in temporary strip mining operations, leaving a great scar on the land. Our rivers run polluted to the sea, sterile and offensive.

We find these things today because at the time they were happening, either nobody noticed their significance, or because there were not enough people who cared. It seemed at the time that our forests were inexhaustible and the land limitless. Our rivers seemed more than adequate to wash away our filth. No one thought to ask if we had enough air. We know better today, but remedies at this advanced stage are expensive; they would require great changes in existing society; in some cases, they are impossible.

Today, we are considering legislation to leave intact for our children a small portion of the wild country that once covered this con-

tinent. A bill to save a few forests from destruction; a bill to leave undisturbed a few remnant natural communities of soil, water, fungi, insects, birds, fish, mammals, herbs, shrubs, and trees. A bill that will permit the possibility of solitude at a time when it will be even rarer than it is today.

I cannot understand why this bill has not already been passed in Congress by unanimous acclamation. The lands in question are already owned by our Government, so no appropriations would be necessary to acquire them. The utilitarian contribution to the economy that would result even from their complete exploitation, would be insignificant in comparison to our total needs. We will insure timber for the future, not by the destruction of our last virgin forests, but rather by reforestation and careful management of existing timberlands. Established privileges will not be taken away since the lands in question already are dedicated to the future. The chief effect of the proposed laws would be to confirm and protect that dedication. It would leave for coming generations the same chances for wilderness experiences that have been so important to me in my life.

I hope the bill will become law early this year, with no damaging amendments that would take land out of wilderness. In particular, I hope that the San Gorgonio Wild Area will be left intact. It means a great deal to me to have this wilderness so close to the crowded region in which I live.

I personally feel that my husband and I need wilderness. Maybe we have sufficient wilderness today in 1964, but what is going to happen 10 years from now? What chance do our children have if we do not put in effective legislation?

I have packed through the Cascades and the California mountains primarily, and we would like to very strongly urge the passage of the Cohelan bill, which meets many of the objections to the other bills, and the adequate H.R. 9070.

I might add one thing: My husband is on the faculty of the Claremont College in Claremont, and we have a group of faculty wives, the campus wives, and there are in the campus wives, about 20 of us that go hiking together as a hiking club, stodgy old housewives like myself. We have used extensively the San Gorgonio Wild Area, which is near to us, the Cucamonga. And this is very important to the private citizens. We have taken our children up. I do not have children myself yet, but I am hoping, and I hope very much they will have the chance to have these same experiences that mean so much to us in our lives.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mrs. Ives, I have six youngsters, and I am hoping, too.

I would like to underscore the comment I made a minute or two ago. I see you have some doubt and cannot understand why the bill has not already passed by unanimous acclamation.

Mrs. IVES. I am beginning to understand more. This is my first hearing.

Mr. DUNCAN. I have often thought that I could get things done a lot faster down there, too, if it were not for the other 434 men there.

Mrs. IVES. Thank you.

Mr. BARING. The next witness is Anthony Payne, Mackay School of Mines, University of Nevada.

SRP05753

Mr SILL. Mr. Chairman, I understand that Dr. Payne is not able to be here. I do not know whether he has submitted testimony or not. It could be quite interesting since I am testifying on the other side of the fence.

Mr. BARING. What is your name?

Mr. SILL. Dr. Sill.

Mr. BARING. You are the next witness.

Mr. SILL. I shall not attempt to represent Dr. Payne.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD C. SILL, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, NEV.

Mr. SILL. I am Dr. Richard C. Sill, associate professor of physics at the University of Nevada. My home is at 720 Brookfield Drive in Reno. My interest in this legislation is an an out-of-doors man, a conservationist, and as chairman of the board of control of the Whittell Forest and Wildlife Research Area although I am representing no organization. I do, however, represent myself, my wife, and about 30 colleagues in this testimony. These colleagues are professors in physics, mathematics, chemistry, psychology, foreign languages, physical education, and biology. A few graduate students are also included. I submit a note from the 15 biologists, and append the names of the others.

I speak in favor of the Saylor bill, H.R. 9070, and the several which are similar to it such as H.R. 9520 and in opposition to H.R. 9162 through 9165.

To shorten and simplify my oral testimony I append a short analysis of the several wilderness bills. This is my own, by the way.

My basic point of view can be summarized as follows:

1. It is essential for the welfare of the United States and for its citizens that some wilderness be preserved for study and enjoyment.
2. The currently designated wilderness areas and de facto wilderness represent close to a bare minimum of the necessary wilderness.
3. Some wilderness areas must exist that are large enough so that what I call deep wilderness is available for use and study. Areas of at least a million contiguous acres approximately are necessary for this purpose.
4. Wilderness should include not only ragged barren country, sharp peaks, and nonmineralized mountains, but also the gentle forested land exemplified by the Kern Plateau in the southern Sierra and the Chamberlain Basin in the Idaho Primitive Area.
5. It is proper that nondestructive prospecting be permitted within the wilderness areas because the minerals therein should be available in case of a real national emergency, not wasted through indiscriminate mining at other periods.
6. I believe that the lumberman's designs on the wilderness areas should be diverted to other areas so that the timber and its streams and wildlife can be held in reserve in wilderness. A tax reduction to those firms that tree farm rather than cutting on public lands should accomplish the purpose of providing adequate supplies of wood and pulp for the country and still preserve our wilderness forests.

In regard to the current legislation, I prefer the definition of wilderness as given in H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9520 to that of H.R. 9162 so that

other wilderness, when decided upon by Congress upon the recommendation of the President, can be the most simply and expeditiously administered. In section 2(b)(3), the deletion of the "therefore" to which Mr. Cohelan refers would seem to be essential.

I object to the hurried reclassification period of 3 plus 2 years appearing in sections 3 (b) and (c) in 9070 and 9520, provided full protection is accorded all land in limbo. If such protection is not envisioned, I agree with the short reclassification period. H.R. 9070 is ambiguous when it says, "and each such primitive area shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (or Interior) * * *." I recommend the passage should read "* * * be administered as a primitive area (or other appropriate term) by the Secretary of Agriculture (or Interior) * * *."

It is in regard to the mining provisions of H.R. 9162, section 4(d)(2) that I take greatest issue. Mining, except in case of a national emergency shortage of strategic materials, has no place in a wilderness area. If the 53 million acres which might conceivably be designated wilderness (out of the Nation's 2,350 million acres) is too much land to "lock up" (as the opponents wish to call it) in wilderness, then I wish to protest the 37.7 million acres (an area equal to that of the State of Georgia) which is said to have been removed from agriculture under pavement and most certainly "locked up." If the 10-year "phasing out" of mining from the wilderness areas, as included in H.R. 9162 (or 25 years of "phasing out" as reported in the Denver Post for December 1, 1963) is allowed to stand in the bill which is reported out, the effect would be a rampaging tide of hopeful miners racing in before the deadline, and anything that survived the onslaught would fit Webster's definition of a wilderness as "desolation and waste" quite well. Such a provision would warrant a change in the titles of the various bills which now read, "A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people and for other purposes." Ninety-eight percent of the country should be enough for those who would be free to mine anywhere.

We are asking very little—and probably entirely too little—for recreational and scientific purposes. The areas in State, municipal, and county parks is almost identical with that in designated wilderness areas at this time (about 8 million acres) and there is currently available only another 45 million acres left to consider for possible inclusion as wilderness. Under protective wilderness legislation, the land would be available to all for recreation. (The Forest Service itself, as reported at the Western Farm Economics Association meeting held in Reno in the summer of 1962, recognizes that the recreational dollar in the national forests is rapidly overhauling the value of all other uses combined including lumber.) In my home State of Nebraska there is almost no place to walk that is not trespassing except on the city sidewalks or the county roads. In that situation we find "real locking up," not the kind that protects the wilderness for each of us to enjoy according to his needs and wishes as long as he does not destroy it.

One final necessity for wilderness—which is seldom mentioned—is in the study of ecology both as it pertains to the interrelationships between living plants and animals and their environments and in the lessons and perspective that can be learned and applied to man in his relations to civilization and to his environment in general. Only in

SRP05755

the deep wilderness can certain crucial aspects of these studies be made.

While man's success as an animal is through his individual intelligence and communication abilities, his course as a species is almost a classic example of a species that is mindlessly ravaging its environment. (Harrison Brown points out that of all the nonrenewable natural resources consumed by man in his entire history on earth over half has been consumed since 1920.) Man's ability to understand complex relations and to foretell the probable future and to act so as to achieve some control over that future is almost as totally lacking in man's actions as a species as it is for penicillin mold.

Wilderness, in addition to the surcease it gives the individual from civilization's insistent demands, provides the opportunity for ecological research and study which may make Thoreau's "In wildness is the preservation of the world," a precise and literal statement of man's hope for survival. This is because man sees himself as above nature and only grudgingly subject to its laws. Through study of eco systems, it is beginning to be clear that, rather than man's being separate from nature, man is so close to himself that he cannot see how much he fits into the standard ecological castastrophic patterns. Ecology has and can develop dramatic examples that can leave no doubt that, despite man's ability to manipulate things and other animals, he is still subject to ecological laws and processes. This perspective can save us. I know of nothing else, not even anthropology, that has the potentiality of giving man the platform from which to view himself that the developing science of ecology promises. And ecology needs wilderness, including areas of deep wilderness.

In addition to the biologists identified below, I represent myself, my wife, and the following University of Nevada faculty members in this testimony: Philip L. Altick, Ph. D.; George Barnes, Ph. D.; Edwin X. Berry, M.S.; Philip C. Bettler, Ph. D.; George A. Broten, Ph. D.; Willard F. Day, Ph. D.; Thomas V. Frazier, Ph. D.; Sigmund W. Leifson, Ph. D.; David J. MacDonald, Ph. D.; David P. Marsh, Ph. D.; William T. Scott, Ph. D.; Robert N. Thompson, Ph. D.; Charles V. Wells, Ph. D.; R. Edwin Worley, Ph. D.; making 31 individuals all told.

Thank you.

(The documents submitted by Mr. Sill follow:)

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY,
Reno, Nev., January 10, 1964.

Hon. WALTER BARING,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARING: We, the undersigned, are strongly in favor of getting a wilderness bill out of committee and passed by the Congress. We believe that passage of such a bill is a moral obligation owed by our generation to future generations. We are residents of the State of Nevada; Dr. Richard Sill will speak for us.

Sincerely yours,

F. Donald Tibbitts, Ph. D.; David Nyquist, B.S., M.S., R.S.; Fred R. Ryser, Jr., Ph. D.; Dave Salter; Donald G. Cooney, Ph. D.; Lois Austin; Hugh N. Mozingo, Ph. D.; Stephen R. Kozloff, B.A.; Eugene C. Steeb, B.S.; Andrew Anderson, B.S.; William L. Haskell. B.S., M.S.; Jack Knoll, Ph. D.; Ella Knoll; Lowell L. Jones, Ph. D.; Richard W. Warner, B.S.

SRP05756

ANALYSIS OF WILDERNESS BILLS

The following is a short analysis of H.R. 9070 (Saylor) and H.R. 9162 (Dingell) which points out the differences between the two bills. (Note that H.R. 9101 is reported to be and H.R. 9520 is virtually identical to 9070 and that H.R. 9163-5 are reported to be identical to 9162. Copies of 9101 and 9163-5 were not available for examination.)

Both 9070 and 9162 are bills to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. The language up to section 2(b) is the same. In 2(b) 9070 omits "therefore" found in 9162 and changes the meaning to imply that 5,000 acres is a minimum for a wilderness area. H.R. 9070 also adds the sentence, "For the purposes of this Act wilderness shall include the areas provided for in this Act and such other areas as shall be designated in accordance with its provisions;" 9162 does not contain this sentence. In section 3(b) of each bill the Secretary of Agriculture shall review all primitive areas and report findings to the President. The President shall then advise the Senate and House of his recommendations as to classification. The President's recommendation shall become effective only by act of Congress. Each primitive area shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture until Congress acts. H.R. 9070 specifies that all primitive areas be reclassified within 5 years; 9162 specifies 10 years. Section 3(c) of each bill states that the Secretary of the Interior shall review all roadless portions of 5,000 or more acres in national parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, and game refuges and report his findings to the President. The President shall then advise the Senate and House of his recommendations, and each recommendation shall become effective only with an act of Congress. The areas shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as roadless until Congress acts. H.R. 9070 again requires a 5-year period for such action and 9162 a 10-year period. There is some difference in wording in section 4(a)(3) between the two bills but no essential difference in thought. The principal difference between the two bills is contained in section 4(d)(2). H.R. 9070 states:

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

H.R. 9162, on the other hand states:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight December 31, 1973, laws of the United States pertaining to mineral leasing and mining shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extend to those lands designated by this Act as "wilderness areas"; subject, however, to such reasonable regulations governing ingress and egress as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture consistent with the use of the land for mineral location and development and exploration, drilling, and production, and use of land for transmission lines, waterlines, telephone lines, or facilities necessary in exploring, drilling, producing, mining, and processing operations, including where essential the use of mechanized ground or air equipment, and restoration as near as practicable of the surface of the land disturbed in performing, prospecting, location, and, in oil and gas leasing, discovery work, exploration, drilling, and production, as soon as they have served their purpose. Mining locations and patents to mining claims lying within the boundaries of said wilderness areas shall be held and used solely for mining or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto; and hereafter all patents issued under the mining laws of the United States affecting lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas shall convey title to the mineral deposits with the claim, together with the right to cut and use so much of the mature timber therefrom as may be needed in the extraction, removal, and beneficiation of the mineral deposits, if needed timber, is not otherwise reasonably available, and if the timber is cut under sound principles of forest management as defind by the national forest rules and regulations, but each such patent shall reserve

SRP05757

to the United States all title in or to the surface of the lands and products thereof, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be allowed except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act: *Provided*, That unless hereafter specifically authorized no patent within wilderness areas designated by this Act shall issue after December 31, 1973, except for valid claims filed on or before December 31, 1973. Mineral leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act covering lands within wilderness areas designated by this Act shall contain such reasonable stipulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the protection of the wilderness character of the land consistent with the use of the land for the purposes for which they are leased. Subject to valid rights then existing, effective January 1, 1974, the minerals in lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act and all amendments thereto."

Thus prospecting and patenting of mining claims is permitted until 1974 in 1962 but not in 9070. Both bills authorize prospecting for water resources, establishing reservoirs, power projects, transmission lines, etc., and road construction essential to this use. Both bills permit grazing of livestock established prior to the effective date of the Act to continue, subject to reasonable regulation by the Secretary of Agriculture. One final difference is in regard to the acceptance of gifts from private sources. Section 6 of 9070 states:

"The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act. Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein."

H.R. 9162 merely authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to accept contributions and gifts to further the act. In the sections not cited specifically the two bills are approximately the same.

The material provided by the Wilderness Society in volume 78, autumn-winter, 1961–1962, of the Living Wilderness devoted to the wilderness bill of the 87th Congress, S. 174, is almost identical with S. 4 of the current 88th Congress, except that S. 4 in section 3(i)(1) (B) and (C) requires public hearings for changes of status either into or out of the wilderness system. The critique provided in that issue can be referred to for S. 4 as noted. Other bills technically under consideration which are identical to S. 4 are H.R. 930 and H.R. 991 and 11 others. There are 21 bills in all, with the serious contenders being 9070, 9520, and the 9162 sequence.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much. Your testimony is very interesting. Are there any questions?

Mr. DUNCAN. I have no questions.

Mr. BARING. Thank you, Mr. Sill.

Mr. SILL. Thank you.

(Subsequently the following supplementary statement was received from Dr. Sill:)

In the hearings much discussion occurred about multiple use. Some gave evidence that they thought multiple use might result in grazing sheep and cattle, explorer scouts, and a family of picknickers dodging each other and trying to escape falling trees, while occasional blasts of dynamite in the near vicinity marked the progress of a mining endeavor—lumber and mining trucks can be pictured jackknifed trying to avoid the cars of the hikers or screeching to a halt to avoid running over an oblivious birdwatcher standing in the road, eyes glued to binoculars, while rising waters behind an earth-filled dam imperil hiker and trucks. Such chaos and pandemonium is, of course, preposterous but serve to point out that rational multiple use may necessitate some areas primarily reserved (zoned as it were) for particular uses. One such use that has been little mentioned that also in its pure form is partially preemptive, as are mining and logging, is the use of wilderness areas for scientific purposes. As one cannot camp or picnic when forest giants are felled across your tent or picnic table, neither can you study the natural interrelationships of plants and animals when

the natural predators are eliminated, the vegetative cover is stripped or destroyed, the streams choked or impounded, and more animals are hit or run over by cars than are shot by hunters (a startling statistic but one strongly hinted at by data of the American Rifleman's Association).

Since this use is an important one and has been little discussed in these hearings, I wish to add to my oral and prepared testimony these following considerations that, consistent with the broad meaning of multiple use, speak strongly for an adequate national wilderness preservation system and partially justify the importance and significance to man of the studies that are needed which in turn need deep wilderness as well as lesser kinds.

Although I spoke at the Las Vegas hearings as a private citizen and represented myself, my wife and about 30 colleagues, many of the aspects of my testimony are related to the general problems of ecological research with which I am attempting to deal as chairman of the board of control of the Whittell Forest and Wildlife Research Area of the University of Nevada. This forest is a 2,500-plus-acre tract in and adjacent to Little Valley in the Carson Range. While there is much significant microecology that can be studied in this Whittell Forest and while techniques and results developed there have wider application than to just areas of this size in this specific region, ultimately the significance of the research for application to any practical or fundamental purposes depends on studies that can only be carried on in wilderness areas of substantial size (of 50,000 acres and larger). In addition, there must ultimately be reference areas in the climatic zones of agricultural and biological interest that are large enough to minimize man's influence. Such areas are what I have termed "deep wilderness" in my Las Vegas testimony and in the rest of this supplemental information.

Ecology is the technical and accepted name for the comprehensive studies of plant and animal populations in relation to each other and their environment. It includes static (or equilibrium) limits and dynamic situations. Ultimately the so-called balance of nature which would represent the true static (or equilibrium) condition is an illusion, all ecosystems drifting though perhaps but slowly. In general, the more contact man has with ecosystems the less static they become and the less suitable for the reference needed for evaluation of control efforts man may be making in economically significant areas.

Ecology as a formal separate science is very young although it can draw on many other established disciplines for background and facts. Yet the application to man's affairs is very new indeed. Enough can be seen even now to make us realize that here is the science, not only of plants and animals, but also of man as a species in his relation to his environment.

Like other animals, man eats, reproduces, interacts with other species and his environment and finds he must dispose of his waste products. The fact that he is a builder and a tool user, that he uses other animals and has command of energy beyond that in his own body and that his waste includes unusual materials and forms such as old beer cans confuses, but does not alter, the fact that a real ecology will apply to him and not solely applicable to the nonhuman species from which he has notably departed in most ways.

Though the pace of man's possible evolutionary changes and growth in numbers seems slow to us (in the two human generations that have passed since the study of agencies really got underway, fruitflies have gone through as many generations as mankind has since 57,770 B.C.) yet man's pattern, viewed from the perspective we can bring to bear is shockingly similar to that of a young new species in a food-rich environment that has developed no significant enemies. Simple examples of this are virus or mold cultures. A common pattern is an exponential growth in numbers until some factor supervenes (food for example) and then a catastrophic drop in numbers may occur that frequently wipes the population out altogether. If predators exist, the populations (prey and predator) may come into near-equilibrium with each other and with the rate of food production or may fluctuate as in the case of the grass, rabbit and fox relationship. If a competing species exists or enters the environment, one may exterminate the other if it is the better adapted or more viable unless one of the species achieves a mutation that partially or completely removes the competition: in most cases fractional equilibrium between the two species will occur. If a predator is destroyed that was relied on to hold another species in balance, the no-longer-preyed-upon-species explodes as does the virus or mold with similar results if there are no other population checks. If the rate of reproductive increase is too much greater than the rate of production of food, the species acts almost precisely as if there were a finite amount of food and may be exterminated by its own competition.

SRP05759

If it is a short enough lived species, a small number may survive that are mutants (as in the use of insecticides) so they can eat something slightly different than the bulk of their kind, or resist debilitating influences more effectively; the original species disappears, totally survived by only a tiny handful of mutated descendants which may themselves not survive unless there are enough of them.

In man's case we can already see the exponential growth of numbers which is now known to have occurred for several thousand years virtually unaffected by wars, catasrophes or plagues. The Malthusian laws, long thought not to apply to man because in the yearly 19th century his rate of increase was overshadowed by the technological expansion in food supplies that was occurring, is now seen to be limited by energy in the form of petroleum, water power, coal, and possibly nuclear energy. Man is a "free energy" burner as are other animals but his technology permits him to "digest" materials other than meal and grain, including rocks, minerals and the air itself much as do the plants and lichens but on an enormous scale and the waste products in the form of air and water pollutants (including radioactive contamination and that from chemical or mill operations) are more complicated in effect than those that result from simple animal catabolism.

Man's concern as a special type of species is with the flow of energy through his own body and through the machinery and chemical systems he needs for life (and indeed for the good life). Consequently it is critical for him to have standards available with which to compare his effects on his environment (are we gaining on the insects or are they gaining on us; are we really decreasing the losses of energy to intermediate stages in the production of food, to mention two different types of examples). In physics we can produce and store platinum-iridium references of length or mass or can refer to especial atomic isotopes whose behavior will give us other standard references. In the life sciences such references are very much more difficult to achieve. Standard environments for study and reference are as critical for ecology and biology as similar standards are for the physicist. In the deep wilderness the bioenergetics of natural ecosystems can and will provide the reference and study standards needed. But significant interference by chemicals, by choking of streams with tailings, by artificial alteration of habitat by artificial or excessive fire control or by selective lumbering, hunting, or displacement of species by ones introduced by man, a shift in the evolutionary balance by the reduction of natural predators—all these things (including the use of insecticides and poisons whose effects are almost totally unknown on species or ecosystems), destroy the references we need to evaluate the rest of man's effects. Without these our course is one of uncharted drifting and we may be drifting onto rocks or over a waterfall.

Socially, ecologic processes can also be seen to operate. The sheer inability of the natives of certain western Pacific islands to collect enough extra resources to send young and intelligent boys away out of the country to agricultural schools so the food production can be increased sufficiently to keep up with the population growth is one clear-cut example of a type of near-disaster ecological situation. The laws of Malthus may start to apply in these communities soon and disastrously. Many of the very rapidly growing States (such as Nevada) do seem not to have the resources to educate their own children. This has its counterparts in the ecology of certain social animals like the beaver. Ultimately this can lower the educational level at the very time that a high degree of education is necessary just to live in a modern world and where to extract the raw materials, develop power, keep communications alive, or produce foodstuffs from obscure sources, advanced education on a broad base is needed. There is a hint that we should look carefully at the comparisons between ourselves and the lemmings, both highly gregarious basically tolerant creatures, for when lemmings are too crowded "panic" and "high stress" type ailments (similar to those of man in the cities) develop and the lemmings embark on their characteristic and destructive "march to the sea" with enormous drop in numbers. There are probably many socioecological diseases and hazards man must learn about. We may have to learn about these first through ecology rather than wait until man himself is in a panic condition.

It is also conceivable that man's numbers and health may be limited sooner by his own waste products than by his sources of energy or by his social impact. (We talk about the maximum daily dosage of radiation or of arsenic or of DDT, etc. that will not incapacitate man.) We must know more about populations limited by various agents ranging from waste products to natural predation.

SRP05760

All these are hints to show that ecology must be viewed in a very selfish light by mankind. While experiments can be conducted in test tubes and even in sealed laboratories, no ecologist will be at all satisfied with such results. Extended field investigations covering decades if not longer are seriously needed and at this time the only places where such studies seem possible are in wilderness where the only ecosystems exist that are not too badly disturbed by man and where the only habitats exist on earth the various species have already evolved to fit.

No physicist could conduct significant experiments unless he could keep the dial twiddlers or the apparatus snatchers out of his laboratory or at least under control. Similarly ecologists need large wilderness areas for study that can minimize man's effects (which primarily will work in from the periphery) and also so that the recreational and industrial activity density in the area can be kept low. Some recreational use such as hiking is not incompatible with ecological studies if the recreational use is sufficiently small. Most industrial use is incompatible. Of course from a strict scientific point of view only the scientists should get in. This is probably not possible to achieve in America so as the best compromise a number of large wilderness areas (of as much bigger than a million acres as possible) should be preserved in unpopulated parts of the United States such as Idaho, Nevada, Alaska, Montana, etc.

Wilderness is needed for more than study of course, and it is my personal belief that the social strains of our civilization can have their effects minimized if those individuals (frequently leaders) who respond particularly adversely to the high tension pressures of sardine life in modern world (even if technically they represent a minority) can get out and blow off steam, retreat to reality in a manner of speaking. Wilderness available to such people can serve a purpose for scientific study of course; man's impact on his environment must be understood also in the graded degrees of impact that would be possible in a wilderness system that ranged from true deep wilderness on the one hand to simple small wild areas like San Gorgonio that abut metropolitan districts on the other, and then into the other nonwild areas that include man's structures such as forest areas continuing ski developments or summer cabins, etc.

As examples of the sort of deep wilderness needed whose preservation as wilderness is critical, I would like to suggest that one of the best choices is the Idaho primitive area including the Salmon River Breaks Primitive Area. This is an area which is not too well known as yet, one with immense variety of subenvironments, one which is at once large enough and far enough away from major centers of population to be very desirable for ecological research and yet it is in a climate permitting fairly ready access by scientific parties. It is not yet reclassified, its historical mines have played out, the inholdings are not extensive and could be purchased, the timber is of weed species primarily and there is little timber of other merchantable types. Although the areas west and south of the Salmon and its Middle Fork are mineralized extensive prospecting has not yet turned up a bonanza, the antimony mines of the Stibnite Mining District on the western edge having been economically feasible only because of wartime needs.

Another such might be the Okefenokee Swamp (of Walt Kelly and Pogo fame). Another might include some of the roadless and desert areas containing high desert mountain ranges in southeast Oregon, Nevada, Utah, or Arizona. Another would be needed in the Northeastern States such as in cooperation with the States of New York or Maine and one or two more in the State of Alaska (the Brooks Range certainly should be one of these). I believe not one of these areas preserved as deep wilderness would involve major financial or economic hardships on their circumjacent States.

Some of the above areas are already protected such as the Mount Marcy area in upstate New York and the Okefenokee swamp in Georgia. The Selway-Bitterroot wilderness area in conjunction with the Idaho primitive area would be a superb candidate for deep wilderness of the sort need in that part of the country. (Incidentally the much discussed landing fields in the Idaho primitive area would provide the least disturbing quick method of ingress and egress for detailed scientific studies in the deep interior and provide no argument against the ecological study and reference purpose of the primitive area at all.) There are still roadless areas of the sort so desperately needed for monitoring man's effects in the basin and range country and also in Arizona.. Such areas properly should include adequate samplings of desert through high altitude and a million acres would not be too little. Since the lands available are not under the ad-

SRP05761

ministration of a single agency substantial discussion and agreement between the BLM and the USFS might have to occur, but this can be accomplished on an administrative level if further study confirms the need of such a wilderness area. Then specific recommendation could be made to the Congress through the President and the area designated at that time. Thus although a wilderness preservation system is necessary to receive such an area, whether or not one is actually included can be reserved for further study by the several agencies and the interested scientists and the local residents who might be affected in some way.

In conclusion I urge the most serious consideration be given to these several suggestions which encourage me to favor the Saylor or Cohelan bills since man's near and remote future depend on his being able to keep himself from the uncontrolled ecological catastrophic paths he now seems to be following. At this point, I see no other approach that has much hope than that through the preservation of a broad spectrum of wilderness including selected areas of virtually true wilderness whose circumference-to-area ratio is small and whose deep interior areas are significantly large. A million acres is none too great for such study and use, and to prevent the destruction of the areas that exist I urge the Saylor-Cohelan mining restrictions.

Mr. BARING. We now have completed the list of witnesses who requested to be heard. Are there any others who wish to testify?

Mr. BEHR. I am on the list. Perhaps you called my name while I was not here. I am Armin Behr.

Mr. BARING. I remember calling your name. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ARMIN BEHR, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. BEHR. Mr. Chairman and gentleman, I am Armin Behr of Las Vegas, an industrial relations officer with the Atomic Energy Commission, and on my own time a hiker and climber.

Since moving here less than 2 years ago, I have spent many weekends enjoying the still unspoiled and unpopulated mountains of southern Nevada and the surrounding desert country of Utah, Arizona, and California. There is still elbow room here, although there is also scarcity. For example, the oasis of Mount Charleston with its slopes covered with tall ponderosa and bristlecone pine is under such demand for homebuilding and recreational uses of many kinds that its de facto wilderness character is disappearing rapidly. I mention this, although it is not connected with the legislation under discussion here, merely to illustrate that wilderness is a local problem too.

Since the wilderness bills do affect only two relatively minor areas in Nevada—the Desert Game Range here, and the Jarbridge Wild Area in the northeast corner of the State—I assume that the subcommittee is holding these hearings in Las Vegas not to discuss local problems, but to discuss a matter of great concern to all of us as Americans and also as people who happen to be living in the West.

Speaking as a westerner—for the past decade only, but a confirmed one—I feel that it is extremely important for the committee and for Congress to recognize that every American has an equal stake in the future of our land and particularly of our federally owned land. Those of us who live in the West are fortunate in being able to use the national forests and parks for pleasure more often, and some of us to use them for profit. But we do not own them. The people of the country have inherited the land and will have to pass it on to future generations in some form. In deciding in what manner this is to be done, I believe that the resident of New York or Florida should have an equal vote with mine.

I am on the side of those who believe that this session of Congress should pass a good wilderness bill, and I support the Saylor and Cohelan bills. The most important feature, in my opinion, which distinguishes these bills from those of the Dingell type is that they afford primitive areas protection from mining during the period of review for reclassification. Without such protection, much of our small remaining amount of de facto wilderness could disappear before we have time to decide what to do with it. Whether we allow 5 years or a longer period for the process of reclassification seems to me of secondary importance, provided there is protection of the status quo during the study period.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the New York Times of this morning in connection with the discussion that was had after Mr. Austin's statement earlier about exploitation, and particularly about the problems that he remembers in Wisconsin.

This article is headed "Poverty Blights Iron Ore Region—Mines in North Woods Area of Midwest Shut Down—U.S. Help Is Sought."

It says, in part:

> The north woods, plundered for its timber and facing depletion of its iron ore, is sinking into poverty.

It says further:

> The land of Paul Bunyan has been sinking steadily in recent years. Out of its virgin forests came the lumber that built most of the houses of the Middle West. But the forests were ravaged by the lumber barons.

And finally:

> President Kennedy visited the region last September and said: "Year after year this area has had the short end of every economic indicator."

I think this is testimony to the fact that exploitation does not necessarily lead to the longrun benefit economically of the people in a particular area.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit the New York Times article for the record.

Mr. BARING. It will be accepted for the committee files.

Mr. BEHR. I would also alike to submit for the record a statement of another resident of Las Vegas, a friend of mine, Mr. Howard Booth.

Mr. BARING. Without objection, the statement will be included in the record at this point.

(The statement of Mr. Booth follows:)

STATEMENT OF HOWARD G. BOOTH, NORTH LAS VEGAS, NEV.

This statement relative to the wilderness bill represents my personal views.

I have been a camper, hiker, skier, and amateur naturalist for about 16 years, in which time I have traveled extensively by foot through 10 of the areas that would most likely be affected by wilderness legislation. The physical well-being and esthetic enjoyment experienced by me and my friends in these pursuits has made me a solid proponent of wilderness protection as a national policy.

Over the years I have become increasingly aware of the vulnerability of wilderness to those pressures having their roots in an expanding population and a traditional attitude, only slowly changing, of wilderness exploitation. I believe the central point to be considered by the committee is the impossibility of recovering wilderness once destroyed. It is an interesting fact that whereas the exploitation of forest and land products in wild country has an almost irreversible effect in destroying the wilderness resource, the reverse is not true.

SRP05763

In land preserved as wilderness the other resources remain essentially unchanged and are available should the Nation some time in the future find it imperative to exploit them for the country's good.

Our wilderness areas are a national treasure. How truly great a treasure will, I believe, become evident only with the passage of time. I believe we need laws to give the remaining wilderness maximum protection from our own ignorance. It is not so much this generation, but those after us, that will be the winners or losers in this decision.

Of those bills recently introduced, I feel that H.R. 9070 and other very similar ones are the best compromises. They require affirmative action by Congress for final inclusion of each area while at the same time giving suitable protection to areas having predominant value as wilderness.

I appreciate very much having had the opportunity of giving this statement.

Mr. BARING. You may proceed, Mrs. Gray.

STATEMENT OF MRS. EDNA J. GRAY, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mrs. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am Edna Gray, proprietor of the Edna Gray's Riding School in Paradise Valley. I am instructor for the YMCA, the Campfire Girls, the Girl Scouts, the Boots-Spurs Club, two 4-H Clubs. I did not know juniors were allowed to present testimony here today.

As former trails director for 5 years for the Nevada Horse Association, I have been through a great deal of the back trails in the State of Nevada. I feel the existing primitive areas we have now should be protected, as we have only now set aside about 2 percent of our precious wilderness area for our future generations.

By opening up even a small amount of this land, we are doing the same as was done to the American Indian many years ago. First, he was pushed out of the Kentucky Valley; then, across the Mississippi River; the Black Hills, so that we might have the gold; then, off the Oklahoma Strip for the farmland; he was crowded into the badlands of Arizona, Nevada, and Montana.

If we don't protect our wilderness area, our future generations will have no hunting, fishing, or camping.

Who is to blame? We are, the ones who originally opened up our wilderness area. Even a small amount will be repeating the mistake we made in our treatment of the American Indian.

I'm for Mr. Saylor. Let's take care of our wilderness area. It is small enough as it is. Let our children and their children after them enjoy it as our folks do now.

Thank you.

Mr. BARING. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

Mr. DUNCAN. One question. Do you think we ought to protect the wilderness areas from horseback riders?

Mrs. GRAY. Well, sir, horseback riding has been known all over the United States. If it was not for riders and horses, I am afraid the United States would not be the populated area it is today.

Mr. DUNCAN. Your answer is "No" then?

Mrs. GRAY. I would say no. Even in Alaska in primitive areas they are using horses. I am glad to say in California and Nevada the hikers and the horsemen agree on the use of the same trail.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. I think you answered the question very well in your answer to Mr. Duncan. Do you not think, by the same token, if we

had not have moved into some of these areas we would not have been able to have developed the country as we have today?

Mrs. GRAY. Yes, sir, certain areas I think so. But I think also that the areas that have been set aside as wilderness areas now should be taken care of as such.

Mr. WHITE. I agree, certainly this needs consideration.

I feel I should comment on some of the Indians we pushed into Palm Springs who are worth a quarter of a million dollars apiece today.

Mrs. GRAY. I do not believe, Mr. White, we did it at that time willingly.

Mr. WHITE. I know. And had they known the future oil potential in Oklahoma, they would not have put the Indians there either.

Mrs. GRAY. Or the uranium in Arizona.

Mr. BARING. I have one thought. As chairman of the committee I have acted as neutral as I could in order to hear this testimony and get everyone on the record that wanted to talk. As you know, the Government owns about 87 percent of Nevada. So that is considered public lands.

Mr. Saylor made the remark—and I notice you alluded to him in your statement—that these lands belong to all of the United States. I am sure Governor Sawyer would like to think he is Governor of more than 13 percent of the State.

So there is a whole lot more than just one facet that must be taken into consideration in the bill. We must think of the cattle people and the mining people who build up our chief industries in this State. We do not have the logging that higher elevations like California and Idaho have. But I assure you we are going to get some kind of a bill out, but we must compromise with these other facets.

Mrs. GRAY. I spoke of the areas we have set aside now as primitive areas. I did not explore into the use of lands that are now used by cattlemen and the mining industry in the lower country.

Mr. BARING. Our cities are landlocked. Every city in Nevada is landlocked and cannot grow any more. You know what Las Vegas is. We put a bill through this year enlarging Henderson by a few more acres. It has to be done by a private special bill.

There has to be an opening up and a complete study of the land laws and public lands, which we are doing. This bill is through the committee and goes to the floor of the House within the next week or two. So we will have a comprehensive 3-year study of the whole United States.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mrs. GRAY. You are welcome.

Mr. BARING. Are there any others now who wish to testify?

Identify yourself for the record, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD ZAHNISER, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

Mr. ZAHNISER. My name is Howard Zahniser, a representative of the Wilderness Society.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a great privilege this past week to attend these hearings that have been held in Olympia, in Denver, and here.

 SRP05765

This hearing in Las Vegas, I believe, is the 18th one that I have attended devoted to the discussion of wilderness legislation.

The hearings have been increasingly helpful.

Such hearings as these, which have been so fairly and expeditiously conducted, Mr. Chairman, and have developed in such an orderly way a record that can be read and examined and studied later, are a great contribution to those of us who are concerned with developing policies and programs that will preserve some wilderness and fit such a program into our other programs.

I could not let the hearings end without expressing this appreciation to you gentlemen and to the others who have participated in these and the Denver and Olympia hearings, for paying attention to this program and these problems that seem so important to us. I want to say a thank you very deeply. [Applause.]

Mr. BARING. Thank you for appearing, Mr. Zahniser.

I want to say that Mr. Saylor, who is the ranking minority member of this committee, had to leave last night to go back to Washington. That accounts for his absence this morning.

I generally call on the minority side for a final statement.

I will say that the record will be kept open for 2 weeks, and you can submit statements during that time if you so desire.

I want to say that I have appreciated the actions of the witnesses here in the last day and a half. We have been on the road some 8 days now. We have contacted over 500 witnesses. That is a big job. We were in Olympia, Denver, and here. We heard regional witnesses from New Mexico, from Arizona, from California, from Nevada, from Oregon, from Wyoming, from Idaho, and Colorado. We have had a nice hearing.

We have many statements that will be of much value to us, and we have made every attempt to be fair and to hear all of the different classes with regard to wilderness.

I have asked in each city that the audience cooperate with us due to the shortness of time. We did not adjourn at all last fall or we would have gone out in the field then. We worked right up to Christmas. We are in session right now and these gentlemen all have their own business and have to get back to Washington to handle their duties in their own particular office. I am particularly thankful to them for accompanying me on the trip so we could get the testimony of the witnesses right out in the field.

We have had great cooperation from you people. I think we have had a very orderly hearing, and I want to thank you very much.

Are there any other statements?

The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN. I would like to say it has been a real pleasure accompanying the chairman, your Congressman, on this series of hearings. I think he has conducted them very expeditiously and very fairly. While we were short of time, we certainly appreciate your statements.

It has been a real pleasure visiting with you people down here in Congressman Baring's home district, and I can only say that Las Vegas has been most hospitable.

I noticed Mr. Baring commented that he would like to have some of that Snake River water. Observing some of the local citizens and

some of your visitors around here, I would have thought you already have a lot of snake juice that you put in bottles and sell.

Thank you, Mr. Baring, and thanks to your friends in this area who have made this such a pleasant interlude.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I want to concur with the gentleman's remarks up to the snake juice part.

I certainly want to thank you, Walter, for having me on these hearings to gain what knowledge I can. I can assure you that at each hearing I learned something. It has given me a broader outlook. I believe I can say fairly that probably each person who attended the hearings, as a witness or otherwise, gained also, because you get to see the other side of the picture. You realize the magnitude of the problem we have to face up to, and we are going to do as good a job as we can.

Maybe many of you know Mr. Zahniser, but I think it should not go unnoticed that he has more than a casual interest in wilderness. He is one of the fathers or grandfathers of the entire recent wilderness concept and has been one of the foremost proponents of it in the United States. I am sure I thought his remarks here were very gracious to us who perhaps do not entirely agree with him, and I think this has been the entire tenor of these hearings and meetings. We are all getting a better look at each other's problems, and I hope we can come up with the best legislation not only for our immediate needs, but for the needs of our posterity and the ecology that has been referred to here so often.

Thank you ever so much.

Mr. BARING. The subcommittee will now stand adjourned.

(Whereupon the subcommittee adjourned.)

(Committee note: Subsequently the following statements and communications were received for the record.)

STATEMENT OF HOWARD AND HARRIET ALLEN, SPRING VALLEY, CALIF.

After familiarizing ourselves with much of the written data on the natural resources of the United States of America, it appears imperative that every effort be made immediately to control the gross misuse of our natural resources and, furthermore, to preserve, intact, without deletions or changes, those areas which, fortunately, have been set aside as wilderness areas.

May we commend the foresight of our predecessors and contemporaries in attempting to preserve, intact, representative areas of our wilderness.

We appreciate the great pressures which are being exerted currently on members of your committee. Historically, Congress has been more influenced by money and the immediate, than with concern for the future. It is possible, through the actions and recommendations of your committee, to reverse this ignominious historical reputation of Congress.

In considering bills 9162, 9163, 9164, 9165, due care should be observed in drastically reducing from 10 years the period of permissible mining; and, furthermore, that the present status of wilderness, national-forest, refuge and park areas be maintained in status quo pending review, and that provisions be made for contributions and gifts toward wilderness areas.

In considering other bills (9070 in particular), we are not convinced that Congress is the agency which should be charged with placing future areas under "wilderness" category. The record of the past few years would indicate a lack of interest, concern and/or knowledge on the part of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. In other years, it is conceivable that the Senate committee might stall or undo the work of the House. Perhaps, veto power of the Congress would be a more realistic solution.

SRP05767

May we earnestly suggest that your committee consider presenting to the House of Representatives as soon as possible a wilderness bill which would (1) give maximum protection to present and future wilderness, national-forest, park and refuge areas, and (2) which will keep, intact, without deletions and/or changes in classification, present wilderness areas.

STATEMENT OF ALBERT B. BARTLETT, E.M., SANTA FE, N. MEX.

My occupation is the discovery and acquisition of mineral deposits in the public land States, and to a lesser extent in Latin America, to obtain their development. I am a former State geologist of Wyoming. I have run a sawmill, and have been a manager of an incorporated livestock ranch, although I have no financial interest now in either lumber or ranches.

This letter will discuss the following points:

1. That timber is a crop which should be harvested when ripe in the interest of true conservation and national need, and also to prevent it from becoming a fire hazard.
2. That grass in wilderness is an annual crop that should not be allowed to go to waste, and also to prevent it becoming a fire hazard.
3. That mining should be continued on public lands since this country is a have-not nation in most mineral resources.
4. That recreation in wilderness areas should be available to all the people, and need not be incompatible with the above activities.

I consider myself a conservationist; I am a big-game hunter, a lover of wild life, a birdwatcher who daily supplies feed and water to a flock of 100 to 300 wild birds in winter, and I would like to have a wildlife sanctuary of my own if I could.

Since these proposed wilderness areas include many timbered mountain ranges, legislation should carefully bear in mind that at a certain point in the life of a tree it ripens or matures, and after that begins to rot inside, eventually to be blown over and an unsightly fire hazard. A good tree will provide the lumber for from one to six or more homes; so, since numerous alarming statements have been made concerning the depletion of our lumber reserves, it is not consistent with the general welfare to withdraw forests and prevent their orderly harvesting.

Wasteful lumbering practices in the past have given rise to statements that it is destructive to the soil covering, resulting in erosion. This is not true with modern practice which requires that only ripe trees be cut, so that the timber is thinned with the younger trees left. Cutover land soon grows a great variety of grass and shrubs, and where extensively lumbered it is replanted, so that the ground cover is really benefited. As a beneficial side effect, the wild game population is greatly increased, the Oregon Game Commission reporting that there may be 5 to 10 times as many deer per acre on cutover land as compared to dense timber where there is practically no vegetation to furnish feed for birds and animals. And let's not forget the delicious wild fruit that grows in these places, which would delight the summer rambler, so homeowners, hunters, and hikers would all benefit from orderly lumbering.

Unintentionally, no doubt, misleading statements have been made to the effect that timber is necessary to prevent erosion and conserve water supplies. These statements may have arisen from observation of lands that have suffered forest fires, where erosion is very serious, but this is not the case with cutover lands. Soil conservation experts call trees phreatolites, or consumers of water, and they are making big plans to eliminate trees in parts of the Southwest in order to increase water supplies which are so greatly needed.

Often I have observed a single evergreen tree after a snowstorm with several inches of snow all around it on the open ground, with the ground under the tree dry. This certainly is not increasing the water content of the ground. In heavy timber much of the winter snow lodges in the treetops and never reaches the ground, so that when a chinook wind comes it is evaporated and blown away. The snow that does get to the ground is very light, is not packed by wind, so that when warm weather comes in spring it turns to slush, then to water, which runs off in a hurry. On mountain slopes that are free of timber the snow is whipped around and winds up in big drifts of hard packed snow that runs off slowly all summer to provide the "late water" for irrigation. What do you see when you look at the mountains in summer? Snowdrifts in the valleys in

open country, and none in the timber. Those who claim timber as an asset to water supply evidently have not been in the mountains in winter.

In the scattered timber and open slopes of our mountain ranges there is luxuriant grass that supplies feed for countless game animals and thousands of sheep and cattle of better quality than those grown anywhere else, adding to our food supply and aiding our national economy. If this grass is not grazed off fire can travel through it with the speed of wind, in fact our worst forest fires, in 1910 and 1911, were caused by a shortsighted policy of restricting grazing on the forests. These fires darkened the sun at Cheyenne, Wyo. No one can call himself a conservationist if he does not subscribe to thoroughly grazing down the grass where it would otherwise contribute to fires. I have fought forest fires myself, and want no more of it.

The United States is annually becoming more and more dependent upon foreign sources for its mineral supplies, as our population increases and our high-grade ore bodies are exhausted. Some of these foreign sources are in countries where the governments are unstable and where our supplies are very likely to be cut off as time goes on. We still have immense deposits of low-grade ore that can be mined and processed to keep our factories going, that is, if they are not withdrawn so that the few places where they occur can be used by a few summer hikers. The development of these low-grade deposits would add materially to our employment, a help to our economy, also.

Regulation of wilderness areas should not handicap development of water supplies for cities and for crops, and other purposes. Floods and also water shortages plague the Western States, and often can best be controlled by structures built near the headwaters, which, incidentally, can be very beneficial for recreation, boating, fishing, etc.

Part of my work is in Colorado at an elevation of 10,000 feet. Here we find that on weekends many cars come up with sightseers who are more interested in the old mine dumps that scar the landscape than they are in the fine high mountain slopes which are an interesting challenge to the hikers. From our observations here I would say that these visitors would benefit from a few simple facilities and parking space. The high mountains are already there for climbing, and no law is needed to keep others out. They regard these old mines and ghost towns more as matters of interest than as desecration of nature, so these should be promoted as attractions to tourists. An exploration geologist wrote a letter to a Denver newspaper this fall relating that he had spent all summer in the high mountains of Colorado and had seen none of these hikers who are understood to be anxious to stop the use of the wilderness to lumbering, grazing, mining, and other recreation than hiking.

Skiing is rapidly becoming a national pastime, with considerable promise to our vigor. All the good mountain slopes will be needed for this sport, which will contribute substantially to the economy of all the Mountain States, so it would be wrong to say verboten to this sport when it really does no damage to nature, but affords much pleasure and health to its devotees.

In the interests of true conservation, these wilderness resources should be available to all, under present laws and reasonable regulation. Modern mineral exploration will use less digging and more geophysical, geochemical, and aeromagnetic methods which will not be so detrimental to the landscape. Roads and facilities are needed. The Forest Service can do all this without the expense of setting up a new cumbersome administration for something that is not needed.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD C. BRATTON, CHAIRMAN OF THE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE OF THE NEW MEXICO OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the New Mexico Oil & Gas Association contains in its membership practically all of the individuals and companies producing, transporting, and refining petroleum and its products in the State of New Mexico. The petroleum industry is the largest single private industry in New Mexico, and is extremely interested in any laws touching on the public domain lands of the United States.

We have repeatedly appeared before this committee to affirm our continuing belief in the principle of the multiple use of the public domain. We again state our belief in the validity of that basic principle. The expanding population of the United States and the continuing growth in demand on its industries and resources make it imperative that any proposal to depart from the principle of

SRP05769

multiple use be carefully scrutinized and that it be adopted only after clear proof of absolute necessity for single or limited use is demonstrated.

Recognizing that there have been extended hearings and voluminous testimony on the question of whether or not there exists a necessity for the establishment of a wilderness preservation system, we will not go further into that point. If the Congress determines that there has been established a clear and imperative necessity for a wilderness preservation system, we believe that of the bills under consideration, H.R. 9162 and its companion bills, present the most generally acceptable approach, and contain certain necessary safeguards.

We strongly advocate the requirement of positive congressional action to expand the wilderness system beyond the presently established wild, wilderness, and canoe lands in the national forests. The requirements for notice and hearings in the State involved where recommendations are to be made for further inclusions in the national wilderness system seem to be most appropriate.

The provision that the Mineral Leasing Act, and other similar laws, would continue to apply for a period of time, to the extent that they are now applicable, to the lands designated as wilderness areas, is equitable and consistent with previous congressional policy. However, we would urge that the committee consider extending the deadline when the lands affected would be withdrawn from leasing. A period of 25 years would appear to be more realistic and would not impair the long-range effectiveness of the legislation.

In summary, we feel that the most important principle to be considered is that any departure from the principle of multiple use should be made only after the most careful consideration and proof of necessity, and that under any circumstances departures from this principle should not occur either as to principle or as to substantial application without positive congressional action.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the views of our association on these matters.

STATEMENT OF GORDON CLEAVER, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.

My name is Gordon Cleaver, I reside at 1183 East 28th Street, San Bernardino, Calif., and am employed as an electrician.

I would like to take this opportunity to strongly urge you to pass a bill to preserve the small amount of wilderness we have left. A bill such as S. 4 (which passed the Senate April 9, 1963) or very similar to this is very adequate as long as there are no exclusions added to make a special case of any one particular area.

Many of our States are rapidly becoming overcrowded and we are in great need of areas where people can get away from cars, telephones, trains, and all the rest of the wonderful, but at times frustrating, necessities of our modern civilization. What areas we now have are in need of protection from the well-meaning people who would, because of the very nature of these areas, exploit them. I feel sure that if you review the people who oppose any wilderness bill, you will notice that the great majority of them want to develop an area for financial gain or in some other way stand to lose money if such a bill is passed. Their viewpoint is strictly financial. I would like you to remember that wilderness is not something we can create or destroy, what we have is here now and once we change this land it is no longer wilderness, and nothing we can do can turn it back to a true wilderness. Remember; you either keep it wild or change it, and lose it.

What the wilderness bill calls for is not an overly large amount of our land and it is not a bill that will cost the taxpayers a lot of money. The overall total land suggested for the bill is somewhat less than 2 percent of our Nation's land. The cost is nil, as I am told all this land is now owned by the Government. To me a bill that seems so simple should have been passed long ago. The fact that it has not been passed is appalling, and if one is not passed soon, in years to come it will be a black mark on this great country of ours. Wilderness areas are a form of recreation and we need them the same as we need all our theaters, bowling alleys, ski areas, and other recreation areas.

In southern California at this time we are particularly interested in San Gorgonio. I have hiked and camped in this area in winter and summer and request that you keep this area as it is. The Forest Service states that only about half the available ski areas in San Bernardino National Forest are developed, so let the skiers utilize the remaining areas before they look at San Gorgonio.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. GARDNER, SIERRA MADRE, CALIF.

My company is engaged in minerals exploration throughout the Western United States and Alaska. I am not, therefore, a dogmatic conservationist in favor of placing all presently nondeveloped lands "off limits." I personally can understand well the opposition of commercial interests to any legislation that would, in effect, remove a segment of public acreage from all use save recreation. However, I feel the time has come in the history of our Nation when some recreational values must be preserved for the future millions of Americans, lest we unknowingly sentence them to an existence minus the outdoor recreational opportunities we now take so much for granted. In essence we are becoming and will continue to become a nation of more people and less land. Unless we now legislate to preserve in perpetuity a small portion of still primitive Americana, we will do a great disservice to future generations.

This, I believe, is what the Senate bill (S. 4) had as its basic philosophy, but, as those of us in minerals exploration know, S. 4 could and very well would work a hardship on mining and petroleum companies in regard to future exploration. Mr. Aspinall, of your committee, has stated opposition to the Senate measure for essentially these reasons. The bill, introduced on November 7, 1963, by Hon. John P. Saylor (H.R. 9070), to my mind eliminates these grounds for objection. Naturally some of the diehard commercial interests will object to this legislation as strongly as to S. 4. Nevertheless, we as a nation need legislation of this type and both sides are going to have to be flexible enough to eventually agree for the benefit of all Americans.

If we cannot tolerate S. 4, and the recent measures introduced by Representatives Dingell, Reuss, O'Hara, and Bennett (H.R. 9162, 9163, 9164, and 9165) are by no means adequate to provide the protection needed, it seems that H.R. 9070 or the recent bill introduced by Hon. Jeffery Cohelan (H.R. 9520) are the logical foundations around which further refinements can be worked out.

I strongly urge the committee to report either H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9520 favorably. I further urge the committee to reject any attempts to amend either bill on the part of local special interest groups such as ski development operators, etc. Amendments of this type serve only to weaken the legislation and set a precedent for future decay and degeneration of a well-intended measure.

As far as the violent objections from mining companies is concerned, it is interesting to note that many of the areas now tentatively slated for wilderness protection are not now open for mineral location (national parks, etc.). Furthermore, many other areas comprise the interior of batholiths and do not encompass significant contact areas around the margins of these intrusive bodies. I am sure a strong case could be made against this last statement, but I think we will find in the majority of cases the areas selected for wilderness protection are of negligible value from a mining standpoint.

I thank the committee for its consideration of my comments.

STATEMENT OF IDAHO BUREAU OF MINES AND GEOLOGY, MOSCOW, IDAHO

Elementary conservation requires that the Nation know what mineral resources occur within the proposed national wilderness system before these lands are, for all practical purposes, permanently "locked up."

Because of their relative inaccessibility, little is known about mineral resources within the existing and proposed wilderness areas. In the interest of national security, an inventory should be made of the distribution of deposits of strategic minerals within wilderness areas.

A two-stage program utilizing teams of Federal and State geologists and mining engineers is suggested. First, a detailed economic appraisal of known mineral deposits in existing and proposed wilderness areas should be made to ascertain the quantity and quality of the mineral resources to be preserved. Second, systematic, detailed section-by-section geologic, geochemical, and geophysical reconnaissance should be conducted in all existing and proposed wilderness areas to appraise their mineral potentials and the possibilities of the occurrences of significant amounts of strategic mineral resources.

The reconnaissance studies can be conducted without disturbing the primeval character of the wilderness areas. The areas can be mapped by teams obeying the restricted-use provisions of the proposed legislation. The size of the required geochemical samples is so small (a twig, a teaspoon of soil, a cupful of water)

SRP05771

that all wilderness values can be retained. Airborne geophysical studies can be undertaken without marring the wilderness.

Mineral resources are common in the primitive and wilderness areas. Two major mines in Colorado, the Idarado and Camp Bird, tunnel beneath the Uncompahgre Primitive Area. Hundreds of patented claims lie within this area. More than 15 base and precious metal mines have been operated in the Needle Mountain mining district in the San Juan Primitive Area, Colo. Significant mineral resources occur in 14 of the 16 largest primitive and wilderness areas in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico. Iron and mercury deposits occur in the Mazatzal Wilderness Area, Ariz. Gold is reported from the Superstition Wilderness Area, Ariz. Tin deposits are known in the Black Range Primitive Area, N. Mex. Fluorspar and base-metal deposits occur in the Gila Primitive and Wilderness Areas, N. Mex. Copper, beryl, monazite, and tantalite are reported from the Pecos Wilderness Area, N. Mex. Base and precious metal deposits have been found in the High Uintas Primitive Area in Utah. Molybdenum is reported from the Bridger Primitive Area, Wyo. Gold, sulfur, and molybdenum deposits are known in the Absaroka Wilderness Area, Wyo. Extensive lignite deposits underlie part of the Teton Wilderness Area, Wyo. Idaho is so little explored that few data comparable to the foregoing are available. Nevertheless, some prospects exist in the Idaho wilderness areas, and a careful inventory should be taken.

Provision should be included in the legislation allowing mineral resources within wilderness areas to be extracted by the most modern methods whenever they become economic or essential to the Nation's welfare, with a minimum of disturbance to the surrounding wilderness. Known resources which can now be worked at a profit should be excluded from the proposed wilderness system. Modern exploration techniques should be encouraged, but traditional methods such as trenching and bulldozing should be discouraged.

STATEMENT OF D. H. AND JOAN S. JANNEY, LOS ALAMOS, N. MEX.

It is unfortunate that at this time there are bills of opposite natures before Congress which all allege to preserve wilderness.

One such bill, H.R. 9162, is virtually no protection to wilderness and was apparently introduced in order to permit the passage of a "wilderness bill" which would be acceptable to those economic interests which have always opposed real wilderness preservation. We are opposed to passage of this bill as it will make the preservation of wilderness even more difficult than it is now.

There are, however, two measures, H.R. 9070 (Saylor bill) and H.R. 9520 (Cohelan bill) which do offer real protection. We favor prompt passage of this legislation. The opposition, composed almost entirely of commercial interests, would have us believe that these bills would strangle the economy of the Western States and imperil the national security. The absurdity of this thesis is readily apparent when one realizes that this legislation would do very little but maintain the status quo so far as wilderness areas are concerned. This realization, coupled with a reasonable appraisal of the small area actually involved, makes the arguments against passage essentially nonexistent.

We urge prompt passage of genuine protective measures, before it is too late to save a small portion of our country from commercial exploitation, before it is too late to save a small portion in its natural state for our children and grandchildren.

STATEMENT OF DELMAR JANSON, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

The real proliferation of wilderness bills which have been recently introduced to your committee make it rather difficult for a layman to understand just what is going on. However, as I see it, these new bills are basically attempts to weaken a sound bill, S. 4, which was passed by the Senate last spring.

I fail to see why so many commercial interests are opposed to a wilderness act. The assertion that millions of acres would be locked up is without foundation. No logging, mining, or grazing operation would be shutdown where it had already become established. The fact that a natural resource is not being used

up commercially does not mean it is being wasted. A wilderness system might be compared to a trust fund for future generations. Our country would be a dreary place today were it not for the forsight of conservationists several decades ago.

If a compromise must be made to get this bill out of committee, I suggest that Representative Saylor's bill (H.R. 9070) is not without merit. It provides that areas being considered for wilderness classification will be protected until Congress takes action on them. I believe that as the years go by the commercial interests will be replaced by a public demand that these undeveloped areas be set aside for scientific and recreational uses. We must set up the machinery for this now. In a few more years it will be too late.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD G. JOHNSON, CHICO, CALIF.

I earnestly urge the passage of a strong wilderness bill (similar to H.R. 930 (Saylor)) because—

1. Now is the time to preserve all land that we can in its natural state.
2. Wilderness is so important to many men as an antidote to the tribulations and pressures of modern civilization. (It has helped me.)
3. The near future will bring even greater demand for wilderness and remote areas where man can really think and recuperate.
4. The present overly crowded conditions in most camping areas point up the fact that great numbers of people pursue camping as a means of true relaxation.
5. Wilderness vacations have been the best of all types of vacations that I have enjoyed over the past 30 years, and my wife and I hope to enjoy many more wilderness outings in the years ahead. Save some areas for us and our descendants.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD K. KLEBSCH, UPLAND, CALIF.

I am an electronics engineer with 23 years of residence in southern California. I have witnessed the high rate of population increase in this area. I have felt the impact of this growth as the area was changed from one where an uncrowded, unmechanized respite from urban routine was easily available to one where the tide of outdoor seekers flooded every roadway to the very end. This experience can be projected to almost every area of the United States at some future time. This should be a matter of concern sufficient to prevent further delay in passage of the wilderness bill.

In my concern over our own local conditions I became cognizant of the Wilderness Act and its purpose in protecting certain areas from commercialization. I have spent a great amount of time in wilderness activities and have found them to have unparalleled recreative value. I have seen a great increase in wilderness hiking, camping, and ski touring in the past few years. This could be due, in part, to the overcrowding of the national parks in California in recent years. In introducing many friends and associates to wilderness recreation, I have seen unanimous elation upon discovering that southern California has a completely untouched preserve in the Mount San Gorgonio area.

I have naturally been hopeful that legislation would eventually be enacted to create permanent guidelines to protect what remains of our wilderness. I have watched with dismay the repeated failure to bring the wilderness bill to open debate and final vote in the House of Representatives. In following the progress of this bill I have studied the provisions of each version. I cannot find evidence that the wilderness bill will curtail the operation of existing commercial enterprises or in any way disturb the general economy. I have seen the wilderness bill called "the big lockup." Nowhere do I see any lack of provisions for making material resources available if emergency needs arose. I have even seen the contention that the economy could not live with the wilderness bill. If the economy cannot live with the wilderness bill, then even without a wilderness bill we certainly do not have a very long life expectancy in view of the small amount of wilderness remaining today.

In looking back for lessons from which to live and learn, there are many examples of needless exploitation and extermination of our wilderness resources. These things we all regret now. Looking at the more fortunate events in our history we find a prime example in the establishment of the national

park system. The opposition to the addition of public lands to national parks then was the same special interest element that now so bitterly opposes the wilderness bill. Then, as now, the interests of the general public were defended by the unrelenting efforts of the conservationists. The national parks have been "loved to death" by the public as would the wilderness system if given the opportunity. The conservationists were proven to be the realistic and far-sighted element in the national park issue as they now are in the wilderness bill controversy. I feel that the nature of my work and education is conducive to objective and analytical thinking and after all things are considered, I repeatedly arrive at the same conclusion; in all the years to come, the passage of a good wilderness bill will serve the best interests of the most people to an overwhelming degree.

I feel justified in asking that our local San Gorgonio wilderness area not be altered by any amendments to the wilderness bill which would allow commercial ski resort development. I have been an ardent skier myself for some 14 or more years and have had extensive experience with San Gorgonio in the winter as well as the summer. I know the wilderness value of this area is unique in all of southern California and that it is the last untouched wild area in southern California. In the past 10 years I have made, what I think, is a pretty accurate estimate of the average length of the skiable snow season on San Gorgonio. The winters when there was no snow bring this average down close to 2½ months. If the urban areas expand from the desert to the sea as expected, it would be impossible to get enough resort-type skiers on the mountain in 10 weekends to outweigh the man-days of nonskiing and ski-touring use that would be accumulated in 52 weeks with the ever-increasing demand for wilderness recreation.

Ski resort interests claim that the wilderness values are not impaired by their enterprises and many resort skiers, not being outdoor enthusiasts, will believe this. One only needs to spend a weekend hiking the trail system in San Gorgonio to see how ridiculously ineffectual this wild area would become with a ski lift complex installation. It would be impossible to locate ski lifts far above all the hiking trails, as claimed, because the trails are well beaten to the very summit by people from age 6 to age 60. My recent trips to San Gorgonio have revealed that snow conditions have been extremely misrepresented as being excellent this season. There is for all practical purposes no skiable snow on San Gorgonio and has been none for the past 2 months.

As a skier, I appreciate a lift up the hill as much as anyone else. As an outdoor enthusiast, I cannot justify changing the scenic heart of the San Gorgonio area from an unblemished wilderness to a mechanized resort and thus deprive all future generations the privilege of enjoying true wilderness recreation in this unique area.

STATEMENT OF RAY LINCOLN, PRESIDENT, IDAHO WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION, BOISE, IDAHO

The Idaho Wool Growers Association is a voluntary organization with a membership of approximately 2,000 owners of sheep. All of these individuals are property owners. They are producers of feeds. They are an important part of the overall economy in the State of Idaho and are greatly concerned with any legislation which will materially affect drastic changes in the land pattern of areas within their State. We appreciate the privilege of presenting this statement regarding wilderness legislation under consideration by your committee.

We firmly believe wilderness legislation is unnecessary but if Congress is to enact such legislation, it is hoped it will be in a more modified form than even the Dingell bill, H.R. 9162, or the Saylor bill, H.R. 9070. Both of these bills have points of merit but should be further clarified and amended to insure safeguards if areas are established and then only set up with caution after a most comprehensive study.

It is hoped legislation if adopted will provide concurrence by congressional action and that no areas will be placed into a "wilderness" classification automatically. Any prior designation of "wilderness" should not signify such areas should be retained in that category. Certainly in appraising whether an area is solely valuable as a wilderness, it should first be appraised as to its full multiple-use values not only as of present but of great importance at a future

date. Our resource needs are never status quo, nor are potential possibilities as to what may be found in a given area in the way of eventually needed resources.

Merits of the proposal pending before National Congress as introduced by Wayne N. Aspinall in H.R. 8070 should be fully explored prior to consideration of wilderness legislation or any other similar type of land classification. This measure sets out a worthy provision whereby a most comprehensive study could be made in regard to the retention, management, and disposition of public lands. It is our most considerate opinion this review should be first in sound procedure for wise administration of Federal lands.

A shift away from the principle of full multiple use of resources in and on Federal lands can adversely affect property outside of such areas as the economy of Western States is closely tied to such lands as they have within their areas well in excess of 90 percent of all such lands. Within the State of Idaho, federally owned areas are approximately 65 percent. It can readily be seen locking up of vast areas under such conditions could materially and adversely affect the tax base in some counties and the State as a whole.

We concur with recommendations submitted by other groups of the State of Idaho in their suggested and proposed amendments to pending legislation. Suggested amendments to clarify are justified and should be considered prior to passage of legislation setting up inviolate wilderness areas. Just because certain areas are now classified as "wilderness," "wild," "primitive," or "canoe" areas is no evidence they have only one use. They should be explored fully as to other resource values prior to being permanently designated.

In summary, we restate our position that we believe wilderness legislation is unnecessary. If such legislation is to be adopted, certainly the basic principles as contained in H.R. 9070 and H.R. 9162 should be carefully appraised with all ambiguities and unclear provisions spelled out so there will not be any possibilities of interpretation.

STATEMENT OF HENRY I. MANDOLF, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

I desire to enter my testimony as an individual and as a convinced conservationist and skier in order to place my opinion, borne from 40 years of outdoor sport, on record.

My remarks and the position I take are based on facts only.

The sport of skiing is definitely one of the healthiest for the Nation and is increasing far beyond expectations. It is also becoming fast a richman's and a dangerous sport. Contributing to this are the long travel distances required to reach reliable areas; for the southern part of California, the only reliable place today is Mammoth Mountain, 400 miles away. The distances traveled by many thousands of cars every weekend takes an unnecessary toll on wear and tear and is reflected in the logically increased accident rate on highways, a most deplorable condition.

The availability within sight of the Los Angeles metropolitan area of the shiny San Gorgonio Range, snow covered from early fall till late spring, makes many people, with common power of reasoning, doubt whether their representatives and the Forest Service are planning ahead or for reasons not fully explained and understandable, are unintentionally aggravating the situation.

I suggest that the committee obtain from the U.S. forest ranger station at Mammoth, Calif., very important and unexpected facts and occurrences during the Thanksgiving and the Christmas weeks, bearing strongly on the importance of intelligent foresight and planning, even when no laws are impeding developments.

The committee's attention is invited to the fact that the situation at Mammoth is strongly related to the development of San Gorgonio. When the new and really unnecessary Trans-Sierran Road near Mammoth, along the San Joaquin River is built, the San Francisco and the Los Angeles crowds will swamp that skiing area. Under such conditions and even without such roads, a few years later, moves at San Gorgonio might be precipitated rather than come about with orderly long-range planning, whereby only the minimum loss would occur to the important conservation idea in that region.

 SRP05775

I therefore humbly recommend that nothing be done to prevent a free hand to qualified authorities at a later date to be in a position to do what orderly, studied, logical planning, dictated by public welfare, will indicate to be the correct solution. This will be best for the health of the Nation, the beloved sport of skiing and above all with a minimum sacrifice of wilderness area.

STATEMENT OF A. E. MILLAR, PRESIDENT, NEVADA MINING ASSOCIATION, INC., RENO, NEV.

Nevada Mining Association, Inc., has long been opposed to the enactment of so-called wilderness bill inasmuch as we consider it inimical to the mining industry. We favor multiple use of all public lands. We subscribe to the "declaration of policy—public lands," adopted by the American Mining Congress at its last convention in Los Angeles, Calif., September 15–18, 1963, which is quoted below:

"This Nation's future strength, prosperity, and security depend upon assured sources of minerals for military and industrial needs. For such assurances, there must be an active, healthy domestic mining industry. This requires free access to and full utilization of our public lands and development of their productivity through private enterprise.

"We support the principle that the public domain should be put to as many compatible uses as its resources permit.

"We oppose any law, regulation, decision, or order prohibiting or limiting access to or utilization of any public land for the purpose of prospecting for and mining natural resources unless it is clearly established by examination and appraisal that such action will far better serve the national welfare. Future withdrawals should be kept to a minimum. Orders withdrawing public land from mineral entry should be reviewed periodically with the purpose of eliminating areas found to be in excess of need and opening them to mineral entry.

"The concept of 'discovery' as developed by judicial decisions should be adhered to by all departments of the executive branch of our Government. Government agencies should follow the decisions of our courts and should not impose their own definitions. We condemn the decisions of the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior which distort and disregard longstanding precedents.

"Where a person of reasonable prudence is willing to do substantial work and expend substantial sums in exploration of a mineral deposit, or in the development of the means or processes to put the deposit to use, any holding that the deposit is not a 'valuable mineral deposit' or that it has no 'economic value' is not in accord with the mining laws. Value lies in potential as well as in present use, and this fact should be recognized by administrative agencies.

"We urge upon the Department of Agriculture and its Forest Service, and upon the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Land Management and all other Government agencies dealing with public lands, that their regulations be administered fairly and uniformly and that their policies be formulated and carried out in a manner which will encourage, and not discourage, the development of our mineral resources.

"Future exploration must, for the most part, be directed to the discovery of nonoutcropping and often deeply buried mineral deposits. Hence, appropriate supplementary legislation, in keeping with the basic concepts and intent of our present mining laws, is required to afford reasonable prediscovery protection to one who is in good faith engaged in seeking a discovery of mineral. Such protection is needed to encourage the expenditures of vast sums necessary to carry forward mineral exploration.

"We endorse the enactment of legislation which will provide for a study by a committee composed of Members of Congress of existing laws and procedures relating to the administration and disposal of public lands of the United States. Such legislation should recognize as the policy of Congress that the public lands be retained, managed, and disposed of in a manner consistent with the principles of multiple use and of the general mining laws."

The proposed wilderness system comprises about 65 million acres, practically all of which is in the Western States, and it is proposed that these vast areas be withdrawn for the exclusive use of those seeking recreation. The Federal

Government owns approximately 86 percent of the land area of the State of Nevada and, to date, land withdrawals by the Federal Government for various purposes is probably larger than that of any of the Western States. Included in such withdrawn areas are lands having some actual and a great potential mineral value.

The increase in the population of the State of Nevada in the past 10 years poses a serious problem for the residents and taxpayers of our State, making necessary the full utilization of our natural resources, profitable employment for our citizens, and revenue necessary to care for the additional cost of State government.

Nevada Mining Association is of the opinion that the States, wherein land withdrawals are to be made, should have a voice in approving or disapproving the proposed withdrawals rather than having to submit arbitrarily to the decisions of persons unfamiliar with the economy of such States, or the potential of the land to be withdrawn.

Nevada Mining Association, Inc., consists of 26 regular members representing active mining companies in the State of Nevada; 49 affiliate members representing purveyors of machinery, equipment, and supplies to the mining industry; and 262 associate members representing mining engineers, geologists, mining attorneys, stockholders in mining companies, and others interested in the mining industry.

STATEMENT OF MRS. DANIEL E. MURPHY, SAN MARINO, CALIF.

I am Mrs. Daniel E. Murphy (Edith H.), 1340 Old Mill Road, San Marino, Calif., and a member of a family-type ski club, Southern Skis, and have no financial connection with this sport. I was strongly influenced by my father, Dr. Hill Hastings, an acquaintance of John Muir through their membership in the Sierra Club, a fisherman and a hiker. My husband's grandfather was Silas Lamoreux, Land Commissioner under President Cleveland, and had the honor to open the first national park, Yellowstone. I see no conflict with preservation of nature and the needs of the skier.

It is my strongest wish that under the management of the Forest Service San Gorgonio be opened to skiing. My husband and I have skied for 20 years and firmly believe this sport can contribute to the moral fiber of our family and country. At this moment there is not accessible snow to us and we cannot afford to take our three children the long distance to ski areas in central and northern California or other States. Also we have felt the suffocating press of expanding population when we do ski during the short undependable season in one of the 13 lower altitude surrounding areas. One further point please—we have shared my family's summer home at Lake Arrowhead since 1933 and can see the enumerable benefits to San Bernardino residents in recreation and economic stimulation.

The rights of ski naturalists should be respected for these wilderness areas are closed to all without an access and ski facilities. We beg you gentlemen to heed the need of many families such as ours and make San Gorgonio, which fulfills all physical needs, as a year-round recreational area.

STATEMENT OF BERNARD L. NUTTING, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, MEDFORD CORP., MEDFORD, OREG.

We are industrial tree farmers, practicing forest management on 80,000 acres of timberlands in fee-simple ownership, and our 40-year-old logging and manufacturing operation producing lumber and plywood with a direct payroll of 600 employees is entirely dependent for its future life upon the growing of trees.

With this background, you can understand from our industrial viewpoint our concern over legislation that would take over vast areas of forest lands into a wilderness system.

We are not opposed to the setting aside of certain lands as wilderness areas for the benefit of recreationists and nature lovers, and believe the time is appropriate to make such appropriate set-asides from the standpoint of future needs. However, considerate judgment must be exercised in laying down rules and regulations within the law that would serve as a happy medium toward making the legislation acceptable and palative to proponents both for and against a wilderness system.

 SRP05777

We believe that H.R. 9162 comes nearer to meeting the thinking of opponents of an all-out wilderness system than any legislation introduced to date. It is conceivable that before final action is taken on the floor of Congress that H.R. 9162 might be considerably amended or an entirely new bill may be introduced as a satisfactory compromise to all concerned.

Regardless of the bills before your committee at this time, we would hope that final legislation would include a thorough study and inventory of each proposed area to determine its size and need for the present and future inclusion in the system and the impact that its inclusion may have on the economic life of the surrounding area, and at least some thought given to the extent of problems concerning future protection and development. We believe this would work toward limiting the size of the system by taking in one area at a time from among the many areas presently classified as wilderness and primitive. Also, the legislation should provide that to establish designated areas into the system, congressional approval must be had and in this connection, no lands should presently be considered other than national forest lands now classified as "wild" and "wilderness" and those portions of primitive areas that might be determined as having a preponderant value to the system. A paramount provision that should be included in the law must provide for periodic reviews to provide compulsory consideration at stated time intervals to adjust the overall system to changing needs and conditions that are bound to occur.

We thank you for your consideration of our views expressed above.

STATEMENT OF PAUL W. AND VIOLET M. ORR, ALTADENA, CALIF.

We support the wilderness bill, H.R. 9070, introduced by Representative John P. Saylor, and the similar one sponsored by Representative Jeffrey Cohelan, of California. We request that you report these bills favorably in the next month to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs so that this very important matter of wilderness preservation may be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives for its first vote in three Congresses.

We are small business people who get out of town as often as we can. We work with the conservation committee of our hiking, skiing, and camping club, the Nature Friends, which has 125 members in Los Angeles County. We are also members of the Los Angeles Audubon Society.

We believe that people are a part of the natural universe and can only be balanced in mind and body when they have an opportunity to renew this relationship in parts of the earth where nature is able to follow her own laws of plant and animal growth unobstructed by tract divisions, acres of asphalt, and smog from industries and millions of cars.

The rapid and appalling increase of urbanized areas makes necessary the setting aside of at least 2 percent of our national area for unmolested wilderness for our own generation, and those to come.

This urbanization is particularly rapid and overwhelming in southern California, and that is why we feel it is so important to safeguard the San Gorgonio wild area, and not to permit any commercial ski lifts, as this is our only bit of complete wilderness in southern California, which now has a population of 10 million, with thousands more people pouring in every day.

STATEMENT OF H. A. SHIFFER, PACIFIC INSTITUTE OF EARTH SCIENCES, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman and members, it is a distinct pleasure, to have the honor of appearing before this most able and highly informed committee, and offer opinions and some conclusions, in testimony format, if you will, respecting matter upon the Las Vegas hearings agenda, in behalf of myself individually as an attorney of some 40 years a so-called earth scientist and in behalf of Pacific Institute of Earth Sciences, a nonprofit educational and research facility and its sometimes revenue producer for nonprofit applications, the Shiffer Associates, Mining Services, with whom I am identified.

If I may be permitted to so state I think there are few whose so-called "conflicts of interests" are more often called into play than my own due to the variance of responsibility I hold respecting the above and other organiza-

tions, including an underwriting foundation, in the sciences, arts, and humanities, named for my father, H. A. Shiffer, Sr., the middleman in three generations of mining, that began with the California gold rush, traversed Chilikoot Pass, entered Africa, and wound up presently in the Traverse and Basin Ranges and the Southwestern deserts of the United States and northern Mexico.

Be all of this as it may, I believe that conflicts of interests are far more often a matter of verbiage, and possibly some bullheadedness, than fact, and both as an attorney and as a geologist I firmly state that the legitimate mining community is far more in accord with conservation principles than it is presently credited for. As we see it here at the institute, basic conflicts are not between mining and wilderness, not between the gouge left by mineral removal, nor defacement of natural terrain, which at most, in mining is minimal and subject to nature's reentry, and the maintenance of the status quo of selected lands and the trust position present generations hold for future generations.

Permit me to set forth and summate a few facts which I believe are known to all and accepted by most:

1. The basic mining law of the land is fundamentally sound and workable in the 1960's and in the foreseeable future even though technical advancement in discovery extraction and processing has been great and although the day of the lone prospector has long since been pretty well over, mineral entry laws continue to promote discovery and assessment of mineral wealth.

Wherever and whenever revisions appear from time to time advisable, close examination indicates that abuses in the applications of mining law arise from outside the mining community per se, and may be traced to promotions, manipulations, title clouding, and other squeeze plays (usually against proposed Government improvements, reclamation, and like projects).

2. We now recognize that geophysical, geologic, plane flight anomoly, and other modern discovery procedures are an inherent part of today's mining industry and mining law.

3. A healthy mining and milling industry is essential to the maintenance of the Nation's economy in the time of peace and in the time of war or other national distress as a supplement to such stockpile resources we possess or purchase markets that remain unclosed to us abroad.

4. That "hi-grading" is a thing of the past. That low grade large quantity ores much capital, technical know-how, updating research, and ability to market extractives and/or compounds whether arising out of flotation volatile ion and resin exchange, atomic or other processes, is the lifeblood and resource inventory of any mining industry this or any modern competitive nation can ever again know.

5. The multiple use doctrine is generally accepted as inherently sound, and in due time will of necessity be adopted by all nations as in both the public and private interest.

But that neither the Congress nor the people, and certainly not the legitimate mining community, ever intended that the adoption of, or subscription to, multiple-use concepts, would automatically be affixed to every section and acre of unallocated public domain held by the Government in trust for its needs, its people, and its future.

6. The resources of a nation are not limited to maintenance of, or augmentation of, its gross national product and sound business principles dictate that some rationing of minerals and metals and even of the nonmetallics may be necessary at this time, to assure any degree of longevity to industry which must rely upon the slow processes of nature for concentrates of important elements.

7. That we, the American people, while perhaps upon times, and for short terms of duration, get a little more greedy, than we later wish we had been, or "turn a fast buck" with too much alacrity, we nevertheless do place high values upon such values as the "great open spaces," unspoiled and uncommercialized escarpment, and the thesis of sharing our natural esthetic resources, with each other in the form of monuments and parks and with our successors.

8. Neither "the rule in *Shelley's* case" (life or lives in being and 21 years) nor the 99-year leasehold or other tenancy are longer total law and this young Nation, virulent though it is and with pride, is thinking into the terms of its growth and survival well into the future, and until it become as aged in duration and progress as the Roman Empire's 1,000 years, or the maximas of any other civilization.

9. It is clear that the world as an entity may, all too soon, have to reassess both its values and the basic components of those values, and Dr. Harrison Brown, of California Institute of Technology, and others have from time to time made it

 SRP05779

abundantly clear that in some instances "we are closer to the lower common denominators than we think." This too can be said to apply to resources which refurbish man's association with nature, including the untarnished of the flora and fauna, that he may decreasingly hold on to.

10. There is little evidence however to support the assertion that mining, in its controlled activities today, moves into and ruins in perpetuity, these other values, of men.

Mining as such however is prime in prompting the location of mineral resources. We are no longer a nation of unentered frontiers; the USGS and other agencies have mapped and inventoried this land pretty well and we are, therefore, in position to begin to allocate terrain for desired special purposes.

11. It is basic: modern war may well make resources, fixed, esthetic, or otherwise valueless simply because a land has been made untenable to government, or people, or any phase of life. Loss today can be total loss; therefore rationing, even rationing by padlocking, is desirable in America while we have the ability to set aside, to earmark and so to enjoy both as to ourselves and as to posterity.

Permit me then to suggest that both compromise and modification in thinking and hence in statute are inherent in the Congress and its prerogative. That we may earmark wilderness for wilderness sake; specify that which may not now be tampered with, set aside and classify lands and areas as "sole-purpose premises" for the present and permit reevaluation thereof at, but not before, future dates. In short, a term of say 100 years, at which time our lineal descendants and their Congressmen, shall, or may, reevaluate that which we have done and at that time determine in accordance with their needs, as they see them.

I am certainly of the belief that at no time of critical cold or hot war national emergency, wherein survival might be dependent upon disfranchisement, or the closing of eyes to idealistic guarantees, that this Nation would ever permit itself to do homage to prior assertions and hence go down the drain, for lack of access to any of its resources, padlocked, partially fenced off, or otherwise.

But; if we continue to permit mining in all forms to move in, we permit multiple-use doctrines to apply with priority nationwide; and we otherwise offer these challenging and ofttimes "for free" contaminations in and to th public domain without reserved areas, that the inevitable will follow, as we now know from experience, and commercialism, will, like leukemia, in due and early time, follow close behind, too close in fact for later comfort or redecision, and we shall end up a Nation "of shopkeepers, black-top, concrete pavement, and fenced off, no trespassing signs."

It is the subdivider, the speculator, the promoter, the hog, who destroys nature's handiwork; the mining industry has too little money and too little concern with lands adjacent to small and localized veins, placers, outcrops, and deposits, too, to clutter up the landscape or mountain roads, access ways, or facilities after limited amounts of material have been removed. (A few may remember Weepah, Nev.; Stanley Buttes, Ariz.; try and find either today—on the ground—and both are, or were, within this century.)

It is suggested that no Government agency, or bureau, is sufficiently lacking in selfish, vested, or perpetuating interests, nor so publicly so inclined as to be a fair representative of all, or of conflicting interests, and that it is the Congress itself, which has the studies made by many agencies (recreation, mining, parks, etc.) before it, that can and should summate the evidence, and certify certain selected areas as set aside now, for later evaluation, by its future Members, after allowing sufficient time for politics and present interests, to be detoured, so that the Nation itself and its industry as such may operate now, and redetermine issues, when the Nation is up against other conditions. It is the opportunity to reassess that we believe must be protected now, if ever. And Congressmen, and mining men and wilderness, and recreation, and all others have a prime overlapping duty to the whole of the Nation now and to what it may wish to be, around the corner.

STATEMENT OF OBED E. AND MARGUERITE A. SMELSER, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.

The remaining American wilderness does not belong to those of us now living. We are merely the present custodians of America the beautiful.

We and our forefathers have despoiled great areas of our wilderness heritage unnecessarily, seeming to think it to be inexhaustible. Future generations will

despise us if we allow the continued destruction of their rightful inheritance for nothing more than profits for a favored few.

Are we Americans so crass that we cannot see beyond power and dollars to the great uplift that wilderness gives to the human spirit? We cannot believe this of the serious, conscientious majority of our people.

We want a good wilderness bill without an amendment cutting off San Gorgonio in southern California for commercial ski lifts, car parking paved lots and all the roads and enterprises that ruin true wild areas. The Forest Service, the San Bernardino Board of Supervisors, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society and other genuine conservationists are opposed to this desecration of our remaining wild area which is so important to outdoor groups and to the preservation of native flora and fauna. There are presently some dozen ski lifts in this general area.

During the weekend of December 20, 1963, Astronaut John Glenn and family were pictured in our newspapers enjoying skiing at Big Bear—some 100 miles from Los Angeles. Yet in the same newspapers, business enterprises were alleging that Los Angeles ski enthusiasts could not afford to drive the necessary 300 miles for their sport.

We urge the House to take heed of the need for legislation, as has the Senate twice, to save for us and future generations our fast-vanishing wilderness.

STATEMENT OF FRED E. AND IRMA STEINITZ, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

As residents of southern California, with its tremendous population growth, we are especially aware of the damaging results of unrestricted exploitation of our land, and its natural resources.

At 55, we are retired, and just as many thousands of other men and women in a similar position, enjoy the pleasures and relaxation of outdoor life. Modern medicine recommends exercise against heart disease, fresh air to guard us against lung cancer. What better way to regain, or retain, your health, than in a hike on a mountain trail, or fishing in a quiet mountain lake, with nothing but the beauty of nature around you.

We have long noted with alarm, that areas left in their natural wilderness state are dwindling more and more. For this reason we have followed the various wilderness bills introduced in Congress with particular interest. We were gratified, when the Senate passed the Wilderness Act, and hope that now, finally, action will be taken by the Public Lands Subcommittee, with results favorable to bills H.R. 9070, and H.R. 9520, and that an effective Wilderness Act will become law in 1964, after so many years of delay.

Monetary gains, and the acquisition of personal property, seem to have become the dominant spirit of our country. It becomes more and more difficult to find a place to enjoy without commercial exploitation. We are strongly opposed to the opening of the San Gorgonio Wild Area to commercial skiing, although we are devoted skiers ourselves. We feel that the loss of this unspoiled area to millions of southern Californians far outweighs the benefits which would be derived mainly by the operators of the ski lifts, restaurants, and other enterprises to be erected.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT N. WHEATLEY, FULLERTON, CALIF.

I wish to protest any amendment to the wilderness bill which would allow exclusion of any part of the present San Gorgonio primitive area to permit installation of mechanized skiing facilities.

At present, in the periphery of mountains surrounding the Los Angeles Basin there are no less than nine of these installations at elevations ranging from 5,000 to 9,000 feet. It is true that the proposed ski complex on the slopes of San Gorgonio would be slightly higher in elevation, taking advantage of a little longer season, but is it worth it? In dry winters none of these areas can support skiing while in the wet years everybody is happy.

Sacrificing rare (for southern California) alpine meadowland for the sake of an occasional few extra weeks of skiing a year does not appear to be a sound conservation procedure, particularly when this area is already enjoyed by large numbers of hikers, campers, and cross-country skiers who do not require all the accruments of a mechanized civilization to enjoy themselves.

SRP05781

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 2, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: During many years of hiking in and observing the forests and mountains of California, I have seen the beautiful areas available to the citizens gradually diminish. At a time when the population is increasing, and when the demand by urban dwellers for such areas is becoming more and more pressing, this is a very serious matter.

It is most important that special interest groups should not be allowed to spoil these natural areas and thus deny the rights of our future citizens to enjoy them.

I hope that your committee will approve a strong wilderness bill, one that will protect the wonderful areas which are the heritage of this Nation. Crippling amendments which would sacrifice areas such as San Gorgonio to commercial interests should not be allowed.

Please make this letter a part of the Las Vegas hearing record.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS AMNEUS.

ROSEVILLE, CALIF., *January 13, 1964.*

Chairman WALTER BARING,
Las Vegas Convention Center,
Las Vegas, Nev.:

Please record my strong support for Wilderness Act. Act will encourage needed research, protect disappearing wildlife, recognize value of scenic resources, provide Americans needed recreation areas, recognize dollar value of recreation industry, and establish example for all nations to follow.

I urge your favorable action.

KENNETH R. ANDERSON.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA,
ARROWHEAD AREA COUNCIL, INC.,
San Bernardino, Calif., January 2, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In regard to your hearing in Las Vegas on January 13 and 14, 1964, on the wilderness bill, our Boy Scout council would like to once again go on record in support of this bill. Therefore I am attaching a resolution previously sent to your group regarding our support.

We are sorry that the rush of business keeps us from appearing at the hearing.

Sincerely,

LYLE E. BULL, *Scout Executive.*

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA,
ARROWHEAD AREA COUNCIL, INC.,
San Bernardino, Calif., February 22, 1963.

Re: Resolution regarding maintaining the San Gorgonio Wild Area.
To: The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman.
From: Arrowhead Area Council, Boy Scouts of America.

Whereas the San Gorgonio Wild Area is an important part of our vanishing wilderness area and is the only such undeveloped area of its kind in southern California; and

Whereas it is important to retain this primitive wilderness area to provide suitable camping experiences readily accessible to southern California and such camping experiences as are available in the wilderness area are essential to Scouting's program of character building, citizenship training, and physical fitness and to the teaching of self-reliance and the ability to take care of themselves and others on the part of Scouts; and

Whereas it is obvious that the proposed development of mechanized skiing facilities would permanently damage the wilderness aspect of the area; and

Whereas it is essential that such wilderness area be retained for future generations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the San Gorgonio Wild Area be maintained as it is currently being managed by the U.S. Forest Service.

This resolution adopted unanimously by the executive board of Arrowhead Area Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, at its regular monthly business meeting February 20, 1963.

EDWARD H. SAXTON,
Scout Executive.

ARROYO GRANDE SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, INC.,
Arroyo Grande, Calif.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: The Arroyo Grande Sportsman's Club supports the original wilderness bill, S. 4, which passed the Senate on April 9, 1963. We feel that other bills and resolutions are in conflict with the intent of the original wilderness bill.

We therefore hope that your committee will not accept any substitutes to wilderness bill S. 4.

Sincerely yours,

BOB HOLMES, *President.*

BANNING SPORTSMANS CLUB, INC.,
Banning, Calif., December 20, 1963.

WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We would like to go on record as wanting the wilderness bill to be passed without any amendments.

ROBERT K. NELSON, *President.*

BEAUMONT, CALIF.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Being an artist, I am interested that we have wilderness areas which are available for all to be able to see the beauties of Gods creations.

Please enter this letter on the Las Vegas hearing record for wilderness bills H.R. 9520, H.R. 9070, and H.R. 9101.

Yours truly,

PORTIA L. BARNES.

AMERICAN BUILDING MAINTENANCE CO.,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 9, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I would like to urge that legislation be passed which will maintain San Gorgonio as a national forest wild area.

I live in Anaheim, Calif. During each year, my two teenage sons and I pack into the San Gorgonio, San Jacinto, and Sierra primitive areas. It is our feeling that the tramway up Mount San Jacinto has seriously jeopardized one of the few primitive areas left within reasonable driving distance of the Los Angeles area.

Legislation should be passed which will prevent commercial development in the San Gorgonio National Forest area.

I wish my views to be incorporated in the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. BARTA.

ARTHUR G. BARTON & ASSOCIATES,
Glendale, Calif., January 7, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMITTEE MEMBER: My husband and I are writing regarding the wilderness bill and ask that our letter be made part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings.

We urge your prompt and favorable consideration of the wilderness bill without amendments which would exclude the San Gorgonio wild area, in order that this bill may reach Congress without further delay.

Mr. Barton as a landscape architect with broad experience, locally and nationally, is naturally interested in the preservation of our national resources and beauty. Also, he has been a leader of a Boy Scout troop for over 30 years continuously. During this period, he has hiked and camped in most of the mountain areas in southern California. Because of this, he is aware of the great need for young people for the preservation of areas free from commercial enterprise or too easy access. I have been active in Girl Scouting locally, regionally, and nationally for the same period of time and share my husband's concern. In addition, we have traveled extensively throughout the United States and have seen in our casual contacts with fellow travelers the very real need of adults to escape from the pressures of today's civilization.

We feel that every passing week or month increases the danger of these areas being lost for all time.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. ARTHUR G. BARTON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *January 2, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: My name is Gilbert H. Belike. I live in San Diego, Calif., where I am employed in the electronic field. I would appreciate having this letter included in the record of the forthcoming hearings that you are about to conduct on the wilderness bill.

Until I enlisted in the Air Force in 1945, I lived in Minnesota. My love of the outdoor life was born on various farms in southern Minnesota, where it was soon apparent that civilizing the land was a much harder task than enjoying the woods and fields in a wild state.

However, this was not fully appreciated until I moved to California after the war, for while there is a lot of wildlooking land around here, it is only for a fortunate very few to enjoy. The only things in southern California more numerous than people and empty beer cans are the "Keep Out—No Trespassing" signs.

Once I thought that California was the sole claimant to fame for fencing people out, but I've noticed in the last couple of years that a large portion of Colorado has gone in for "the look but don't touch" attitude, also. This is very sad for I can think of no other two States that offer as much in scenic beauty and opportunities for natural recreation.

My wife and I spent last Thanksgiving at Big Sur, Calif., which is a noted tourist area. Its forests of coast redwoods, large green hills, clear flowing streams, and the nearness of the ocean attract thousands every summer month. We were told that every morning during summer there is a long line of people waiting at the State park hoping to get a campsite in the one public camp area. The park offers about 11 miles of trails and if one wishes to see more it must be from the hazardous position of walking along the road. During the course of the year I shall go to San Jacinto State Park and to the San Gorgonio Wild Area at least once and perhaps twice—in the fall and winter, for in the summer vacationtime one cannot see the trees for the people, most of whom are Boy Scouts and other youth groups. This is a fine place for them to go to, to get into unspoiled country. I've been informed that over 40,000 people enjoyed the San Gorgonio Wild Area in 1962 alone. This is tremendous, I believe. These are active sports people, not just passive spectators.

My wife and I do a lot of weekend backpack hiking into the Sierra Nevada during the year and this means driving about 400 miles one way in order to

enjoy a few hours and a few miles of fresh clean air with good water and singing birds. And we are not alone in this. Highway U.S. 395 is always jammed with cars pulling trailers, boats, and loaded with camping gear. The number of people engaging in these activities would positively astound you. I know it has me. We need more elbow room to do this in. Campgrounds are heavily overburdened, even miles from the nearest road, and speaking of roads—it has been my experience that wherever a road goes into good wild country, that that country is soon spoiled for about a half mile within the road. This is why I am asking for your support of a wilderness bill such as S. 4 which the Senate passed. The recreational values alone derived from these lands are above any other that I can think of. Ten or 20 men may make a small income from forest lands for a year or two, but thousands will benefit from these lands by fishing, hunting, and just plain enjoying nature at its best.

Respectfully yours,

GILBERT H. BEILKE.

ARIZONA STATE COLLEGE,
SCHOOL OF FORESTRY,
Flagstaff, Ariz., January 22, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Public Lands Subcommittee, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Wilderness Bill Hearings, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am Dick W. Berry, of 3207 North Park Drive, Flagstaff, Ariz. I am a professional forester and a member of the forestry faculty at Arizona State College, where I teach ecology, forest protection, wild land recreation management, and a freshman orientation course. I have had 26 years' experience with private, State, and Federal forestry agencies in addition to 7 years' formal education in scientific and professional fields, including a Ph. D. in forest ecology from Oregon State University. I have been a participant in wilderness-type recreation since early childhood and participate now with my wife and two children aged 7 years and 10 years. I have traveled in wilderness areas of the United States on horseback and with a canoe in both the United States and Canada. Most of my experiences have been with backpacking, however, since we choose many times to hike where horses cannot travel.

I am grateful for the opportunity to attend the recent hearing at Las Vegas. I especially appreciated the orderly manner in which it was conducted and have acquired a better understanding of the problems faced by the Congress and particularly by your committee in attaining a legislative goal which will achieve the major objectives while honoring the rights of everyone.

Before I make what I regard as professional comment on the need and desirability of wilderness, a few personal observations and expressions of feelings on controversial topics are presented as follows:

I have no objections to hunting in wilderness areas although I do not hunt and prefer to stay out of the forest during hunting season. I find commercial ski developments incompatible with wilderness and highly objectionable although I see no reason why cross-country skiing should interfere with my enjoyment of the wilderness. As far as the San Gorgonio controversy is concerned people with a consuming passion for winter sports should consider making their homes near the magnificent ski areas of Oregon, Idaho, Montana, or northern California.

I have no aversion to horses in the wilderness but think some regulation may be necessary to prevent damage in high use areas. I do not find other domestic livestock objectionable as long as the numbers are kept within limits dictated by production of forage. In fact my family and I enjoy seeing a few comfortably upholstered cattle and the children particularly delight in encountering a band of sheep and in talking with the herder. (A steak broiled over a cow-chip fire is excellent, better than charcoal.) I respect the rights of others however, in their desires to have some areas free from grazing by domestic animals. Roads, powerlines, and motor-driven land vehicles I find extremely objectionable in wilderness areas. I do not share, however, the aversion to aircraft common to most wilderness enthusiasts. A few airstrips and well-regulated traffic might solve some of the problems of getting hikers into the interiors of larger wilderness areas thus relieving congested conditions near the boundaries. Logging and any surface mining activities I feel are entirely incompatible with wilderness although geological surveys, including prospecting, if conducted in a manner compatible with wilderness area restrictions, should not be objectionable.

As a professional forester and a scientist I also wish to make a few comments which I hope you will find useful.

1. There are numerous criticisms of wilderness area advocates which imply that they wish to have the land locked up for only a few wealthy, hardy souls who can enjoy it. The truth is that wilderness area recreation is available to people of all ages and of all economic classes if they can afford to drive to the beginning of the trail. Certainly, however, complete invalids can negotiate mountain trails no better than stairways or steep city sidewalks. I have met many hikers in their sixties and seventies and estimate that most of the wilderness hikers I have met are over 40. If people do not use these areas, it is for the most part because they are unwilling to make the effort. On the other hand, there are millions of acres in a near-wilderness state accessible by automobile and powerboats for those who do not wish to hike, ride, or paddle.

2. Accusations of selfishness on the part of wilderness area proponents are likewise easily refuted. They are asking that only about 0.07 percent of the total land area of the United States be reserved in a natural state. The total land area involved including primitive areas is only 3 percent of all rural Federal lands outside military reservations. They are not asking for anything other than that this relatively small land area remain free of commercial exploitation. They are not asking that they be given special privileges on all other public lands as are some of their critics from the mining, water, and power interests in their insistence that all Federal land be open to their exploitations.

3. Criticisms of wilderness peoples' intransigence in regard to developments within wilderness areas is to be expected from anyone who understands the concept of natural wilderness. Any compromise in this respect completely destroys the wilderness. It is analogous to the case of the farmer's daughter who surrendered only a little of her virginity to the traveling salesman and found herself only a little bit pregnant as a consequence.

On the other hand some of the purists insist that all areas, including these under the present primitive status, be maintained precisely as they are and that existing uses and private rights be terminated. In this I do not concur. Wilderness areas should remain inviolate but not at the expense of democratic processes or individual rights.

4. Careful study of at least all existing primitive areas should be made to determine their suitability for wilderness status. Portions with well-established uses incompatible with wilderness status should be deleted and, if necessary, to preserve values, compensating areas added. Diversity, however, rather than great size should be a major consideration. Areas with potentially important mineral deposits should be eliminated. Other essential uses which may be predicted should be taken into full consideration.

5. Although most of the public pressures for or against legislation stem from selfish desires, other considerations are equally important. The biological scientists almost universally agree that preservation of some wilderness, relatively unaltered, is essential to understanding plants and animals, their relations to each other and to man. In the future these relics will be of tremendous value to scientists in their endeavor to discover means by which man can better survive as a part of a harmonious natural system. Early civilizations learned how to conquer nature temporarily but were ultimately beaten by her. The Near East wastelands which were once considered the cradle of civilization are good examples of the consequences of man's ignorance of his impact on living systems.

6. The purely philosophical considerations for preserving small portions of those lands which are our natural heritage before they go the way of the messenger pigeon, the great herds of bison, and the tall-grass prairies, are equally important. Man should be able to rise above his everyday concern for material gain and offer these lands as a token of respect for the great natural system which has given us the highest standard of living in the world.

Julian Huxley, biologist and grandson of Sir Thomas Huxley, in a preface to his report on conservation of wildlife in Africa says: "Yet, although man may be considered the most fully evolved of living creatures by reason of his technical and artistic achievements, he is nonetheless the most destructive. By his reckless exploitation of the natural wealth for shortsighted economic purposes he has upset the delicate biological balance of nature and is thus responsible for the extinction of many animal and vegetable species. Like the sorcerer's apprentice, man has squandered an inheritance of scientific, educational, and cultural value, and has even acted against his own economic interests, for his passion for destruction has been the cause of many famines."

Here is the opportunity for us to atone for some of the mistakes our ancestors have made in the past and to preserve a few samples of our natural wealth as museum pieces and scientific laboratories, for the educational and cultural enrichment of future generations. To implement these purposes I strongly urge that a bill such as Mr. Saylor's H.R. 9070 be brought up for consideration of the full House membership.

I sincerely hope that these comments are useful to you and your committee.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. BERRY,
Assistant Professor of Forestry.

ALTADENA, CALIF., *January 10, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I are supporting a good wilderness bill, that has been needed for a long time. We recommend S. 4 without amendments.

We feel that the time has come to do something about our rapidly disappearing wilderness. Europe has lost almost all of it and many people over there envy us Americans for what we have left. Let us try to keep at least some of it. There has to be a place to escape the noise of jukeboxes, motorbikes, TV commercials, etc.

Let us always have the song of birds, the softness of a mountain meadow, the freshness of a rushing stream.

We would appreciate it, if this letter would be included in the record of the hearings on the wilderness bill.

Respectfully,

ELISABETH AND HAROLD BINGHAM.

BORDER GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Deming, N. Mex., January 7, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Wilderness Bills Hearings,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: The Border Game Protective Association of Deming, N. Mex., is vitally interested in the introduction and passage of one of the wilderness bills to be presented during the current legislative session.

We feel that a wilderness bill is necessary to preserve some of our forested area in its natural state so that future generations may observe and enjoy these areas as they were originally created.

We recognize that there is a greater need now for developed recreation areas than ever before and this need will be increasing as time goes on and the leisure-time of the people expanded. In addition to expanding our recreation areas we also feel a need for areas that have not been subjected to commercial use and development and where the natural beauty will be maintained. Such areas can only exist where roads are forbidden, concessionaires excluded, and where the natural resources are not exploited by persons who are interested in their own personal gain.

Now, as never before, we must realize that our forests are being commercialized and depleted, and our game is diminishing in direct proportion and this trend must be arrested now or we may reach the point of no recovery.

Of the three bills offered, S. 4, H.R. 9070, and H.R. 9162, we feel that S. 4 is the most acceptable and the bill that we feel should be given favorable consideration. However, H.R. 9070 would not be unacceptable to our association. We do not feel that H.R. 9162 is acceptable in its present form since it throws the wilderness areas open to mining till December 31, 1973. Such a provision will act to put a deadline for providing access to these areas, which will, in turn, stimulate immediate encroachment by mining interests and by the time the bill becomes effective these areas will be so commercialized that their preservation as such will become futile It will also mean that even though minerals of commercial quantities do not exist that persons may take advantage of mineral laws for erection of cabins, fenced areas, and other uses incompatible with the purposes of a wilderness area.

SRP05787

The Border Game Protective Association, a sportsmen's organization of over 200 members, does therefore urge the favorable consideration and passage of either S. 4 or H.R. 9070.

Yours very truly,

J. E. GILWART, *President.*

CALIFORNIA STATE HORSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
REGION 11, RIVERSIDE AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTIES,
San Bernardino, Calif., January 15, 1964.

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We hope this letter arrives in time to be included with the others presented at your recent hearings on the proposed wilderness bills at Las Vegas. We were unable to send a representative to be heard, since all of our people are working people and could not be away on such short notice.

This organization includes some 23 horseback-riding groups whose membership would number about 1,500 individuals. In addition, there are many purveyors of equipment, feed, and supplies who hold membership in this organization since our membership, plus about an equal number who do not hold membership, comprise their best customers.

A wilderness bill that will protect our last wild area in southern California accessible by horseback, has been discussed in many of our monthly meetings over the past 3 years. Our local U.S. Forest Service holds the same view as we do: Protect and keep San Gorgonio free from commercial development. Our local boards of supervisors have also expressed themselves as opposing any opening of San Gorgonio. However, as you know, pressures from commercial developers and users of these wilderness areas takes the initiative, and those of us who use these areas as a retreat from the hubbub of everyday life are on the defensive. This places us in a poor light, perhaps, but we feel that your committee has within its power to report out a wilderness bill that will protect any private enterprises presently in these wild areas, but will still have some of them for posterity. We trust that you will make your decision based upon a higher plane than immediate monetary returns. After all, most of us spend much of our life gathering enough money to be able to own a horse or two, take it to the mountains for a little pleasure away from commerce and roads. We do not have funds to hire any promoters to protect our interests in such fields; we must rely upon our elected representatives to do that.

Sincerely yours,

MARJORIE HAMBLY, *Trails Chairman.*

NORCO, CALIF., *January 9, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: As a lover of the outdoors, I am deeply worried about the future of our wilderness areas. If land continues to be used for housing tracts, businesses, and resorts, there will hardly be a place left for a person to get away from it all.

The wilderness bill should be passed very soon with primitive, wild, and national forests saved.

In our vicinity San Gorgonio is our last wild area, and it should be kept so with no possible chance of roads and ski resorts in the future, so the passage of a strong wilderness bill without an amendment excluding any part of the San Gorgonio Wild Area is our only hope.

The ski resort interests aren't interested in the great number of youth groups who enjoy San Gorgonio the way it is, they are out for all the money they can get by commercializing it.

I request that this appeal be made a part of the hearings in Las Vegas.

Very sincerely,

MRS. L. R. CHANDLER,
Member of Defenders of Wildlife; Desert Protective Council; Committee for Preservation of Tule Elk; American Forestry Association; Los Angeles SPCA; Cat Care Club, Inc.

SRP05788

NORTHRIDGE, CALIF., *December 30, 1963.*

HON. W. N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Being unable to attend any of the wilderness hearings to be held in early January, I still wish to go on record, as an individual, conservation-minded citizen, as being in favor of H.R. 9070. I have studied this bill and feel it is the most practical method of attempting to preserve the truly irreplaceable natural heritage of our Nation.

Sincerely,

R. J. CHARLTON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *January 4, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am a medical laboratory technician who uses and enjoys our wild areas and am concerned about protecting them. We need a good wilderness bill. America's scenic resources are seldom saved through accident. Men have fought for them and will need to as long as any remain. I want to preserve our wilderness not just for myself but for the future generations who are entitled to explore and enjoy mountains and rivers as pleasant as ours.

The resources of the earth do not exist just to be spent for the comfort, pleasure, or convenience of the generation or two who first learn how to spend them; some of the resources exist for saving, and what diminishes them diminishes all mankind. One of these resources is wilderness, wherein the flow of life, in its myriad forms, has gone on since the beginning of life, essentially uninterrupted by man and technology. Wilderness is worth saving for what it can mean to itself as part of the conservation of ethic. This saving is imperative to civilization and all mankind, whether or not all men know it yet.

I urge you to accept House bills similar to Senate bill 4 or H.R. 9070—with no amendments excluding the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

I request that this letter be made part of the Public Lands Subcommittee hearings record in Las Vegas on January 13, 1964.

Sincerely,

MRS. BARBARA CLITES.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *January 2, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: You, as a committee, have the power which can affect as much as 50 million acres or a total controlled area which is less than 2 percent of our Nation's land area. You are not taking action for a group of individuals who are interested in the dollars that they can obtain from the lumber, the minerals, or the grazing rights; but you are preserving an area in its semi-wilderness to wilderness condition for the future generations. This preservation of land cannot be priced by the dollar standard at this time. With the increase in population, with the increase in interest and need for the wilderness areas, with the increase in recreation time please be concerned with the decision you make and do not be influenced by the pressures of this fleeting moment of time by those who lack foresight.

I recommend you consider the approval of Senate bill 4. If this bill is to be burdened with amendments, then I recommend your approval of H.R. 9070 or H.R. 9101 without amendments.

I request that this letter become part of the records in the Public Land Subcommittee hearings in Las Vegas on January 13, 1964, and that each member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be supplied a copy.

Yours truly,

WAYNE R. CLITES.

SRP05789

COEUR D'ALENE WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, January 8, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: The Coeur d'Alene Wildlife Federation wishes to reaffirm its longstanding support of wilderness legislation. We believe that S. 4, which passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote, indicates the support that such legislation has throughout the Nation.

We consider that the hearings being held in the West this month are unnecessary and a waste of the taxpayers' money, as hearings have been previously held in the Western States.

We believe that action on wilderness legislation has been delayed long enough. We respectfully ask that your committee favorably report out H.R. 9070 for a vote by the House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD H. JOHNSON, *President.*

AMERICAN BUILDING MAINTENANCE CO.,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 9, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to add my voice to those who urge legislation protecting San Gorgonio as a national forest wild area.

The tramway is enough of an invasion of one of the last unspoiled areas in southern California.

Further commercial development should be prevented by adequate legislation.

Please incorporate my statement in the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD G. CONNOR,
La Habra, Calif.

KRYSTAL & PARADISE,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 14, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Presently before your committee are various bills designed to preserve this country's remaining wilderness. Wilderness use is growing at a rapid rate yet wilderness lands are diminishing at an equally rapid rate. This country now needs a congressional mandate defending this resource.

We in metropolitan southern California appreciate wilderness and the protection that the wilderness bill will afford. The bill is needed, in addition, because at the present time commercial interests and some organized ski clubs purportedly representing skiers are attempting to reclassify part of San Gorgonio Wild Area so as to allow the construction of a ski resort therein. As a Boy Scout leader I know the immense danger this resort would do to scouting, as well as other youth and church groups which use San Gorgonio for hiking and camping. As a ski enthusiast I know that San Gorgonio is not needed by southern California skiers. High Sierra resorts, both proposed and existing, will supply the best skiing. Snowmaking combined with natural snow at the present local ski resorts, will supply all the local day-use skiing required. In fact today four local ski resorts are operating on custom snow up to 35 inches deep, more snow than the ski resort promoters reported on San Gorgonio.

Therefore I urge this committee to report favorably to the House a strong wilderness bill, a bill free from any amendments allowing a ski resort within any part of San Gorgonio wild area.

Due to pressing business, I was unable to attend today's hearing in Las Vegas on the wilderness bill. However, I request that this letter be added to the hearing record for consideration by the committee.

Yours very truly,

NEALE E. CREAMER.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *December 31, 1963.*

Representative WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With regard to the many measures presently under consideration for the general purpose of establishing a system for preserving our national wilderness areas, I wish to go on record as a conservationist who heartily supports all efforts for that purpose. I understand that hearings are to be held in January on such legislation.

I live in southern California and am familiar with the already designated wild area on San Gorgonio (our very last major peak in southern California to remain untouched by commercial development). This wild area furnishes recreation and untold enjoyment (camping, hiking, hunting, fishing, skiing) to thousands of southern Californians—this by official estimates by the Forest Service—but I understand commercial interests are trying to have a considerable portion, the heart, in fact, of that wild area removed from wilderness status for their purposes. If this were permitted, much of the value of the area as wilderness would be lost.

I strongly urge, therefore, that when hammering out your wilderness bill, you will see to it that the final bill is foolproof, a bulwark to existing wild areas (of which we no have so few), with no loopholes or amendments that would permit any encroachment of commercial interests and so nullify their character as true wild areas.

Very truly yours,

MRS. HELEN N. DAGGETT.

JANUARY 2, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: We wish to request that this letter be made part of the hearing record at the Las Vegas hearing on the wilderness bill.

For 2 years we have actively followed the fate of the wilderness bill. We were so pleased both years that the Senate really represented the people of the United States and passed the wilderness bill that promises to save a part of wild America for all Americans, present and future.

What happened in the House of Representatives both years is therefore hard to understand; especially in view of the fact that almost every American has some outdoor interest, and turns to the wilderness for both pleasure and inspiration. The National and State park attendance figures prove this conclusively.

The lands that would compose the National Wilderness Preservation System must be saved now.

By passing the wilderness bill S. 4 (and those identical bills introduced in the House of Representatives) Congress will really have saved the essence and soul of our country. It will have saved the land we love.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHANIE DAYWALT.
W. E. DAYWALT

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Indio, Calif., January 2, 1964.

CHAIRMAN,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: De Anza district, California Federation of Women's Clubs, respectfully requests that your committee will recommend passage of the wilderness bill, H.R. 9070, as introduced by Congressman John Saylor of Pennsylvania, and others.

The members of this district, which is composed of 25 clubs in Riverside and Imperial Counties, recognize the importance of an adequate wilderness system, based on a reverence for the esthetic values of nature, a recognition of the need for undisturbed natural areas permitting the fundamental study of ecology, and a concern for the spiritual welfare of this and future generations.

Sincerely,

MRS. HENRY M. WEBER,
Legislation Chairman, De Anza District.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *January 9, 1964.*

HON. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: This letter is to urge you to report the wilderness bill, H.R. 9070 et al., out of your committee, so that it may be voted upon by the House of Representatives.

The essence of totalitarianism is government by a few, without the opportunity of the people to be heard or vote on a measure.

For 7 long years the wilderness bill has been undergoing hearings by your committee. I believe that even though you and others may not wish to see this legislation enacted, you have a moral obligation to democratic government to allow the measure to come to a vote of the whole House of Representatives. If you fail to report this legislation out of committee for a floor vote, I believe that you have done a great disservice to the American people and have failed in your duty to support the concept of majority rule. While you and I may not agree on the wilderness bill, let us both work to make democratic government work by allowing the whole Congress to vote on this measure. As you know, this legislation has passed the Senate as S. 4. President Kennedy has favorably supported this legislation.

Your responsibility to the American people is as important as your responsibility to your constituents and to your own personal convictions. For this legislation to be blocked in committee again would be tragic, because it would affirm what many people are beginning to say about the committee system in Congress. Many people believe that the committee system has become a totalitarian institution rather than an expedient to better study and understand legislation.

Many people have charged that the committee system is an excellent vehicle for vested interests to influence public policy and to prevent legislation from being considered by the Committee of the Whole—the Congress. I do not believe that the committee system is any of those things, but the responsibility rests with you to dignify the committee system and to allow the democratic process to function.

The wilderness bill is, I believe, in the public interest. Others say it is not. In the interest of fairplay, I believe that it should be put to a vote of the House of Representatives.

While I am not one of your constituents and while I may not be in complete agreement with you, I have great respect for the work your committee is doing and for your leadership abilities. The Congress and the Presidency deserve the respect and admiration of all Americans, but that respect must be earned, and that respect must never be dragged through the mud of irresponsibility.

I respectfully urge your support of the wilderness bill, H.R. 9070. I urge that you help defend this legislation from amendments which would negate and invalidate its purpose. If you cannot support this legislation, please report it out of your committee so that the whole House of Representatives may consider it.

Due to my job and my duties, I am unable to attend the Las Vegas hearing. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you would enter this letter in the hearing record on my behalf.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views to the committee and for the leadership I know you will provide in the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. DEWITT.

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF.,
January 13, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: You are being asked to study and decide on the wilderness bills. The Senate bill, S. 4, or H.R. 9070 are favored as being best by conservation groups.

As a private citizen of the State of California, I am interested in seeing the San Gorgonio Wild Area be kept intact. Private skiing interests want 3,500 acres set aside for the development of 15 proposed ski lifts.

In my opinion, any and all remaining wild areas in this heavily populated section should be kept free and open for the use of the general public and not for just a select few and at an admission price.

Therefore, I, the undersigned, urge you, the committee, to report favorably to the Congress of the United States that the wilderness bills, S. 4 or H.R. 9070, be adopted, with no amendments, compromises, or the exclusion of certain areas for the development of private enterprises.

Further, that my views, opinions, and letter be made a part of records of the field meeting held at Convention Center, Las Vegas, Nev., January 13, 1964.

Yours truly,

WALTER G. DOLAN.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., *January 2, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I would like this letter to be a part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas wilderness bill hearings.

If we are to preserve areas of wild beauty and areas for wildlife, action should not be delayed any longer. Commercialism and exploitation by some companies and individuals make it necessary for immediate steps to be taken. One example of selfish interests can be found in southern California where ski interests would like to develop the San Gorgonio Wild Area. Areas such as these are certainly valuable and will become increasingly more so as our Nation continues to grow and develop. Their value on a dollar basis can never be determined, neither can they be replaced once exploited.

I would like to encourage the members of this committee to approve the wilderness bill and without amendment excluding any part of the San Gorgonio Wild Area. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL L. FISCHER.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *January 6, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please make this letter a part of the wilderness bill hearing which will be conducted at Las Vegas, Nev., January 13, and 14, 1964.

I have always supported the principle of setting aside and maintaining wilderness areas where succeeding generations of Americans can experience the grandeur of natural, unaltered, primitive land.

The need for passage of the wilderness bill has become more apparent to me since moving to southern California. The population pressure here is now threatening to engulf the Mount San Gorgonio wilderness area which is the only island of primitiveness remaining in southern California.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT G. FISK.

FLORIDA NATURE CONSERVANCY,
Miami, Fla., January 20, 1964.

Subject: The wilderness bill.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, House Public Lands Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARING: By unanimous resolution passed April 6, 1963, at the annual meeting held in Miami, the Florida Nature Conservancy endorses the enactment of sound wilderness legislation such as wilderness bill H.R. 930 or H.R. 205, as timely and vital in the public interest.

Since the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has conducted extensive studies and exhaustive hearings, it is our hope that it will act promptly and fairly to report the wilderness bill to the House of Representatives for their action.

I am enclosing a copy of a Miami Herald report by Nixon Smiley dated May 19, 1963, entitled "Ravished Wilderness of Growing Concern." This article and others of similar tone appearing regularly in the newspapers reflect accurately the growing public concern for wilderness preservation.

SRP05793

Please include this letter and newspaper report in the permanent record of the committee.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN FINN, *President.*

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—The newspaper story was placed in the committee files.)

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 20, 1964.*

Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to indicate my wish to support the recent resolution of the Rio Grande Chapter, Sierra Club, in favor of the new wilderness bill.

I would appreciate having this letter made part of the record.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

MARGARET T. FRAZIER.

FRESNO COUNTY SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, LTD.,
Fresno, Calif., January 9, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: The Fresno County Sportsmen's Club supports the original wilderness bill, S, 4, which passed the Senate on April 9, 1963. We feel that other bills and resolutions are in conflict with the intent of the original wilderness bill.

We therefore hope that your committee will not accept any substitutes to wilderness bill S. 4.

Sincerely,

HENRY DODDRIDGE, *President.*

BELLFLOWER, CALIF., *January 8, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Please record this statement as part of the wilderness bill hearings in Las Vegas, January 13–14, 1964.

I am strongly in favor of the passage of one of the wilderness bills under your consideration. I particularly favor passage of a strong bill (comparable to S. 4, 1963) such as H.R. 930 (Saylor).

We need such a bill to protect national park and forest wilderness from civilized encroachment.

There is now, and as population pressures increase there will be more, need for persons to escape periodically the rigors and pressures of civilization by retreating to untouched wilderness. Our Nation once contained vast areas of primeval wilderness. We must maintain some parts of it untouched as a national heritage for future generations. The number of persons who will desire to use and enjoy this heritage in coming years will be large.

No specialized interests, commercial or otherwise, should be allowed to prevent the passage of a wilderness bill. No amendments should be allowed which will grant special interest exceptions to the restrictions of the present proposed bills.

I am particularly opposed to any amendment which would allow ski resorts in wilderness areas. This includes the San Gorgonio Wild Area in southern California.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES R. GAHR.

ORANGE, CALIF., *December 24, 1963.*

To: Hon. W. ASPINALL, *chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.*

From: Hugh J. Gammon, school principal and YMCA camp director.

Subject: Wilderness area legislation, inclusion of San Gorgonio area.

1. Although my school responsibilities prevent my attending the hearing in Las Vegas regarding the legislation on the wilderness preservation system, I would like to make a few statements. Perhaps these will help the cause of those who wish to extend for many years and for our posterity the pleasures of permanent wilderness areas.

2. I hope that the San Gorgonio area will be included in this legislation. Ski interests hope to open this area. Ski lifts and access roads, ski towers, huts, etc., should not be allowed. They open the door to commercialism. Also they bring more litter and certainly the cables and towers used by the ski lift would spoil the beauty of the mountain slopes.

3. Five times this past summer I hiked in the company of young people on overnight campouts into this wilderness area. It was a joy to watch the depth of enjoyment and pleasure of these youngsters who for the most part had never been in a primitive area. There are so few of these areas left, that I sincerely hope you will keep this one unblemished.

4. This coming summer as a YMCA leader I plan to take from 10 to 12 boys on a 4-day backpack trip into Whitewater. This is planned as a special challenge to a junior high age boy. I will give them firsthand instruction in planning, packing, camping, building a fire, cooking, fishing, and some information on the stars. This San Gorgonio area is beautiful. On the last trip into Whitewater we saw no other people for 3 days. The solitude and the wild beauty were very inspiring. Please understand that this time is volunteered without pay. I really love this area and hope and pray that it may remain an unspoiled spot for the enjoyment of all who are willing to take the time and the physical energy to hike in.

5. Please include the San Gorgonio area in the wilderness legislation. Allowing the development of skiing facilities would open the door to commercialism as well as destroying the natural beauty of this area.

Respectfully,

HUGH J. GAMMON.

GATEWAY CLUB, AFIELD AND AFLOAT,
Needles, Calif., December 23, 1963.

Mr. WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the Gateway Club, Afield and Afloat, of Needles, Calif., wish to go on record opposing any change of our wilderness areas, especially the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area.

We feel that this area should be left in its original wilderness state.

Yours truly,

MORRIS KNIGHT, *President.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 20, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMITTEE MEMBERS: In thousands of rapidly expanding colleges nature science students (life science) are taught the values of our rapidly diminishing wildlife.

This information dominates their thinking in the preservation of wilderness and leads them to become ardent proponents of wilderness preservation.

Please factor this in casting your vote.

I favor the principles expressed in the Saylor-Quie-Cohelan proposals, bills H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, and H.R. 9520. I emphasize the preservation of the San Gorgonio Wild Area against commercial intrusion.

Respectfully yours,

HERLEY GAYMAN.

P.S.—This letter is for the record.

 SRP05795

LONG BEACH RECREATION COMMISSION,
Long Beach, Calif., January 3, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am very much concerned about the several years' delay in the inactment of wilderness area legislation. Knowing the wilderness bill is still pending in Congress where the Senate has previously given favorable consideration, I am one of many people who are insisting that the House of Representatives take favorable action on this proposed legislation.

We are aware of the many commercial interests which sponsor negative feelings about preserving wilderness areas against mining, timber, and other operations. Because I have spent a great deal of time in wilderness areas in the West, I realize how critical the need is for preserving them. In my lifetime some of them have been devastated by well-meaning commercial interests. Avoiding such mistakes in the present and future is more critical as urbanization builds up a parallel need for families to renew the wellsprings of their lives away from the city.

On the face of the earth there are not many large areas still untouched by some aspect of artificial inroads. Transportation, communication, as well as mining and lumber industries are depriving future generations of a heritage that only we who live in the present can protect before it is too late. I would commend legislators who are wise enough to pass a strong wilderness bill without amendments which exclude certain areas because of pressures from commercial interests.

Respectfully yours,

DUANE GEORGE, *Associate Director.*

JANUARY 12, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: I would like to have my views concerning proposed wilderness legislation entered into the testimony of the hearings held by the Public Lands Subcommittee in Las Vegas, Nev., January 13 and 14.

I have thoroughly studied the pros and cons for the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System and have come to the firm conclusion that passage of H.R. 9070 is one of the most feasible means of protecting the last few remaining pieces of wilderness in the United States.

Although it is unfortunate that this important legislation has been held up so many years in committee, I hope the time has finally come to move this legislation out of committee to the House floor.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC ROBERT GERSTUNG.

GOLDEN GATE AUDUBON SOCIETY, INC.,
Oakland, Calif., January 20, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Golden Gate Audubon Society, representing over a thousand members in San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, and adjacent communities wishes to be placed on the record as in favor of H.R. 9070 in the Las Vegas hearings on the wilderness bill.

While we, as a corporate body, cannot normally endorse or oppose specific legislation, except in the case of such a hearing, I know that an overwhelming majority of our members have been vitally concerned that some sort of national legislation should be achieved—to the end that our few remaining wilderness areas would receive the greatest possible measure of protection.

Your unremitting attention and fastest possible action in the cause of future wilderness preservation—and the participation of all other Congressmen concerned—will be deeply appreciated and gratefully remembered.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL F. COVEL, *Conservation Chairman.*

"WILDERNESS OF THE WEST,"
Carmel, Calif., January 17, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Committee on the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I should like to ask that this letter be entered on the record of the recent hearings on the wilderness bill which I was not able to attend.

I was present when the first public announcement about the wilderness bill was made at the wilderness conference in Portland, Oreg., in the spring of 1956. I have followed it closely ever since. I have written innumerable letters in support of it and am herewith writing one more.

I am in favor of the Saylor bill, H.R. 9070, or one very similar to it. I am against any more delaying arguments. Eight years is long enough for any bill to be considered.

Very sincerely,

C. EDWARD GRAVES.

ANTHONY, N. MEX.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING:

Have you ever spent a week or two in one of our wilderness areas, away from noise, dirt, road signs, houses, telephones, etc.? Have you ever felt the utter peace and complete relaxation of being completely in tune with nature? Have you ever returned to your everyday world renewed in spirit and strength, freshened and revived by being in virgin woods unspoiled by man's inroads in the quest of money?

I have. There is nothing quite like it to give one strength and a "second wind," to pick up one's work and go ahead in this rat race of life.

Man is his own worst enemy, whether or not he recognizes that fact. Surely the avaricious forces who are against wilderness preservation bills can hardly know what a terrible heritage they would create for their children and children's children. We need a few places left where nature can be herself. We need places of refuge from this increasingly hectic world. We need recreation areas in spaces far from our busy cities.

Therefore I wish to go on record as being opposed to efforts to make inroads in our present wilderness areas by those who seek to commercialize and destroy it all. I cannot see that we have yet come to the place where such inroads are necessary. Laws should be passed to insure the perpetuation of the existing wilderness areas. I believe S. 4 has passed the Senate and H.R. 9070 has been introduced in the House.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. ARTHUR G.) ELLA P. HARDING.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
December 31, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I write this letter to urge your approval of a wilderness bill during this session of Congress. I feel the best legislation possible is S. 4, which has been before your group for some time now. However, inasmuch as Mr. Aspinall seems determined to prevent the House from voting on this measure, it would appear that the bill known as H.R. 9070 would represent the next best acceptable piece of legislation.

Accordingly, I urge the Subcommittee on Public Lands to report favorably on H.R. 9070, and to pass it to the floor of the House for an early vote. Further, I would request urgently that no amendments be made in regard to individual areas within existing wilderness—specifically San Gorgonio Wild Area and the proposed exclusions for a skiing development there.

I respectfully request that this letter be made a part of the record of your hearing held at Las Vegas, Nev., January 13, 1964. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

ROGER J. HARMON.

SRP05797

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

I request that this letter be made part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings. I have recently attended a meeting, held at the University of Redlands, of a group of ski-lift operators whose entire attitude was one of concern for the potential of exploitation for profit of an area that is now classified as wilderness area. These operators' callous attitude toward the use of this area for skiing as they know it and can profit from it (downhill skiing) to the complete disregard of its current extensive use and potential use as an area for wilderness skiing, ski touring, summer wilderness use, organized camping and watershed value is appalling. The attitude they represented and stated to sell their program to invited guests was that "it will become a downhill ski resort area in time and with enough pressure, why not now?" This emphasis plus the use of pressure selling of the commercial potential that the downhill ski resort in the San Gorgonio Wilderness would have on local merchandising and tourism probably appealed to the myopic merchants in attendance.

This commercial attitude reminds me of a quotation from Havelock Ellis, "The Dance of Life." "The sun, the moon and stars would long ago disappear had they happened to be within the reach of predatory human hands."

The attitude of these merchants of "anything for a profit," should not influence your responsibility to generations yet unborn and to all of the future generations of Californians not yet migrated into this area who will eventually make of California from San Francisco to the Mexican border, along the coastal plain, the largest contiguous population unit in history. These people and their children should have the opportunity to know the remoteness, the loss of timelessness that their forebears once knew. The area of encroachment may seem small to many, but any commercial encroachment into wilderness areas forever extends the reaching fingers of commercial entertainment, and urbanism into a wilderness that can never be reversed.

Legislation should be written that would insure that San Gorgonio and other wilderness areas would remain forever inviolate.

SYLVESTER HEINBERG,
Coordinator of Athletics, and Chairman, Division of Physical Education, San Bernardino Valley College.

BEAUMONT, CALIF.,
January 8, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIRS: I wish it were feasible for me to be present at your field hearings on the wilderness bill. As it is not, I am adding my voice through this letter to the many who will be urging you to give every consideration to the passage of a strong wilderness bill to preserve, while still possible, the grandeur of our national wild areas for us and for the generations following us. With the advance of automation and lengthier leisure hours for our people, their physical and mental health will become increasingly important, and the wild beauty of the American mountains and forests—which Americans truly love and enjoy—I feel should not be impaired in any way that is not absolutely essential.

My particular personal concern is for the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area, and I trust no amendment to the presently suggested bill will be made that would permit declassification of all or part of this wild area to allow a ski resort or other commercial use.

Common knowledge of Southern California's population growth indicates, I believe, the value of this area in its present state to us all now and in the years to come.

Respectfully,

DOROTHY HICKS.

RENO, NEV.,
December 30, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Being unable to come to Las Vegas on January 13, 1964, to testify in favor of the wilderness bill (so-called) I would ask that my remarks following be included in the record of the hearing. This statement will be submitted in 11 copies as requested, and I might observe that this requirement seems one way of restricting quite arbitrarily a transcript which deserves to be entirely inclusive. Many will be unable to comply.

I am deeply concerned with conserving as much as we can of the remaining wild areas. I am a member of the Wilderness Society and a past chapter chairman of the Sierra Club's Toiyabe—or Nevada—chapter. I have ridden or hiked through a great many of the wilderness areas in various States: national parks, national monuments, wild areas, national forests, etc., and have camped therein. These places are entirely accessible to people of ordinary health and capacities, not limited as opponents of wilderness would have us believe to athletes and specialists.

I would like to point out the untruth of the contention that a wilderness bill would "lock up" the applicable areas. On the contrary, such legislation would throw open to the public these places where private and special interests would themselves fence the public out and lock their gates against a general enjoyment of what essentially is public property. This has been done in the past on a vast scale for benefits of dubious range, from minerals, timber, grazing, and other values. Before further releases and losses to the public, I urge legislation that will enforce proper study, public hearings, and full publicity, to the end that the public interest may be fully preserved.

There are many bills pending in the House of Representatives and confusion may exist as to what each bill proposes. A study of them—two dozen or so in all—would suggest that H.R. 9070 meets most of the valid objections from both sides while it still would achieve the kind of wilderness protection and preservation which sincere and informed conservationists want to bring about.

Therefore I wish to go on record as giving the fullest support to H.R. 9070 submitted by Representative Saylor of Pennsylvania and expressing hope for its early passage without substantial amendment.

Inclusion of these remarks in the transcript of the Las Vegas hearing will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL G. HOUGHTON.

COLLEGE PARK, MD.,
January 2, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Las Vegas, Nev.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This statement is in support of the wilderness preservation bills S. 4 and H.R. 9070. I would appreciate this statement being filed for the records for the wilderness preservation legislation.

Unspoiled recreational areas such as are offered by the wilderness preserves are unfortunately a part of "vanishing" America. There are no recreational facilities available anywhere at any price to compare to the wilderness for pure diversion, rest, and relaxation. These recreational opportunities of the wilderness are readily obtainable to all economic classes in our country. This legislation takes on added importance as we expand urbanization almost geometrically each year. The bills S. 4 and H.R. 9070 should be passed now to insure that these unspoiled areas—that are the last to survive—will remain unspoiled for years to come.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. HOYERT.

 SRP05799

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 4, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: My wife and I wish to express our unqualified endorsement of the wilderness bill. We earnestly request that it be not weakened by any amendment. We especially urge that no part of the San Gorgonio wild area be excluded from the provisions of the wilderness bill. We feel that the present and future use of this area by campers and hikers, both individual and in groups—especially the many youth groups who come from the crowded cities to feel the impact of Nature—this use is of far greater importance than any other. As the population of southern California grows, this need will be even greater.

Sincerely yours,

PAULINE AND RUSSELL HUBBARD.

RENO, NEV., *December 31, 1963.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Although I am unable to attend the wilderness bill hearing in Las Vegas on January 13, 1964, I wish to express my opinion, as well as my husband's, and hereby request that this be included in the record.

Having been a resident of California for many years and a resident of Nevada for the past several years, I have seen much recreational land as well as farmland and grazing land gobbled up by subdivisions and highways. The demand for land for all uses is understood. But it seems to me that the intangible need that man has for quiet and solitude, a short period of "getting away from it all," a viewing of nature in her natural state, should receive top priority.

The opportunity for children to have the thrill of seeing wildlife in its natural habitat, to have wilderness to explore at times during their growing up period, should be safeguarded. Reading about it in books is not enough.

With our rapidly expanding population, now is the time to save these vital wilderness areas for the future benefit of humanity. This is not a locking up of our natural resources. This is a method of preservation and a provision for the benefit and enjoyment and health of not only the present generation but for the many future generations.

We urge a favorable vote on H.R. 9070.

Yours very truly,

BRIAN and CAROLA HUTCHERSON.

DECEMBER 31, 1963.

Re wilderness hearings.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, Pocatello, Idaho, wishes to reiterate its opposition to wilderness legislation as set forth in its previous testimony presented on October 30 and 31, 1961, at McCall, Idaho. Public land should be administered to provide for maximum multipurpose use. Therefore further designation of extensive portions of public lands as wilderness areas in which normal development for other purposes is precluded, is not in the best public interest. Any additions to the wilderness system should be made only after careful review with multipurpose use in mind and then only by positive action of Congress. Multipurpose and wilderness are not compatible, therefore caution should be used in the selection of other areas for wilderness—areas more suitable to sound forestry, mining, hunting, grazing, farming, outdoor recreation, etc., should not be set aside. We contend that, according to surveys taken, the great majority of people want facilities and roads and accessibility not permitted under the wilderness theory. We contend that wilderness will not serve the recreational needs of the many; that the desires of the vacationing public will not be available in wilderness areas; that recreation needs cannot be satisfied in a true wilderness.

We appreciate this opportunity to submit our position again and we shall request time for an appearance if possible at the Las Vegas hearing January 13, 1964, by John Sanborn, a director of the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, 845

West Center, Pocatello, Idaho, who will appear on that organization's behalf. His appearance will be generally as in opposition.

In the event that an emergency should arise to prevent his appearing, we would request that this statement be filed and made a part of the record.

LLOYD D. BROWNING,
Executive Secretary, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation.

SAUGUS, CALIF.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing in favor of the wilderness bill. Our wilderness and wildlife need this protection. Also all our people now and in the future need the wilderness bill. This bill should not be held back by selfish opposition who are only thinking of the dollar and themselves. Such a group is trying just this in the San Gorgonio Wilderness in California. This kind of thinking is disgusting.

Please pass this important bill and please make this part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings.

HORTON JOHNSON.

LEAGUE OF OHIO SPORTSMEN,
Columbus, Ohio, December 30, 1963.

Re wilderness bills hearings.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: As a representative of the organized conservationists and sportsmen of Ohio, I feel very strongly that 1964 must be a year of decision for our wilderness areas. In both 1963 and 1962 the Senate of the United States passed very acceptable wilderness bills. For some ununderstandable reason the House of Representatives has failed to follow the lead of the Senate. We sincerely hope that this failure will be corrected early in 1964 with the passage of H.R. 9070.

Sincerely yours,

CARL H. KNIRK.

GARDNERVILLE, NEV., *January 5, 1964.*

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The controversy surrounding the various versions of the wilderness bill presently the subject of hearings being held by the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has only recently been brought to my attention.

As a fellow resident of Nevada you are no doubt as acquainted as I with the very positive, if intangible, effects that the wilderness exerts on life in our own State. It is the same everywhere, for the wilderness is our land as it was created and as it would now be but for the hand of man. Myself an architect, no one is more aware than I of the faltering nature of that hand in such affairs. It has been traditionally so and the wastelands of "progress" bear grim witness on every side. The unfortunate implication is that man cannot be fully trusted with his own birthright. Unborn millions are already committed to life in a world created by men and reflecting more often their ambitions than their aspirations. Just as we must protect the right of future generations to improve this world if they will, we must protect their right to venture, even briefly, into a world which bears only the mark of the Creator, for it is here that they will find their inspiration. This, then, is what we call wilderness. Able to withstand centuries of natural cataclysm it can be lost irretrievably to the greed or indescretion of just one man. Such a precious heritage cannot rest on just one conscience whether it be that of a forest supervisor or a mining engineer. Firm and sensible legislation is the only answer.

 SRP05801

Therefore, I wish to record my support for the wilderness bill, generally, and for bill S. 4 and its H.R. counterparts in particular. I further urge you, sir, to exert your own influence toward speedy passage of such legislation in the House of Representatives. It is my desire to have this letter included in the record of proceedings of the forthcoming hearings if at all possible.

I have the honor to remain,

Yours very truly,

VINCENT R. LEE.

LEONARD, DOLE & FORMICHELLI,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 2, 1963.

Re the wilderness bills.

Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Federal Offices, Denver, Colo.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ASPINALL: I strongly support wilderness preservation.

As an attorney with substantial experience in matters relating to the best use of our Federal lands, I have carefully analyzed each of the wilderness bills since the first was introduced in 1956. I have also had extended personal outdoor experience in more than half of the primitive, roadless, and wilderness areas of the United States.

Based on this experience, as a lawyer, and in the wilderness itself, I recommend the most recent bill by Jeffery Cohelan of California (H.R. 9520) as best meeting the problems which have been noted by your committee.

I have testified at prior hearings on the wilderness bills, but cannot do so this time because of the distance to the hearings.

Please therefore make this communication a part of the record.

Thank you for your action in scheduling hearings, and in moving this important matter along again.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD M. LEONARD.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Hearings at Las Vegas, Nev.,
January 13–14, 1964.

GENTLEMEN: Wilderness legislation is a serious need now. Areas which are now wild are coming under increased pressure for "development." We are asked by opponents of the wilderness bill, "What is the hurry; just where is wilderness in danger?" One example: San Gorgonio Wild Area.

The area for which we ask is but a small percentage of Federal lands. The economic value of this area is relatively minute.

Because the threat to these unspoiled lands is advancing, we must act now. The Saylor bill will constitute this action if it is allowed to come before Congress for a vote. It meets objections of wilderness bill opponents while providing practical protection.

Please place this statement on the record of the hearings.

Sincerely,

CHARLES LESLEY.

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF.,
January 8, 1963.

THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I would like to request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas wilderness bill hearings.

The passage of a strong wilderness bill without any exclusive amendments is of great importance to myself and many of my friends.

I am a member of the National Audubon Society whose work I am sure you are familiar with.

As an employee of the Los Angeles City Fire Department, I have many associates who also take great pleasure in our natural wilderness heritage.

It is my sincerest hope as it is of many of my friends that your committee will take favorable action on this bill that means so much to us all.

Sincerely yours,

DAN L. LEVIN.

SRP05802

VAN NUYS, CALIF., *December 23, 1963.*

Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please have my protest read into the record of the hearings being held on the wilderness bills. I would like to register a protest against the unreasonable and uncooperative attitude of Secretary Udall and his agency in opposing the desires of so many who have attempted to keep our wilderness areas open for prospecting and rock hounding for the people.

A lot of us desire to look for and prospect mineral deposits. Any forest area that is closed to us for this purpose, that prohibits us from this activity, is of no further interest.

I don't quarrel with those who like the look of a fallen leaf, and wish them well, but wonder how they can overlook the pleasures to be obtained by prospecting and rock hounding, also.

The rigid attitude of the Government that either the parks will all be as large as they want, and as useless [for man] as they want, or they won't be parks at all is a very sad state of misrepresenting all the people; at least a segment of us who want a larger use of these parks.

There is no reason these parks can't be used by all of us except a desire by a few people to impose their will to the detriment of everyone else.

I would suggest that if as much work was required in restoration, forestry, and picking up fallen, rotten, fire-causing branches on each 20 acres of these proposed parklands as is required of the prospector, maybe these people would be a little more modest in their demands for all they want.

I am somewhat familiar with the proposal for the Great Basin Park around White Pine County, Nev., near Mount Washington. It seems the Federal Government's attitude is to force its uncompromising will upon the local residents despite any protests or reasonableness. I've prospected in this country and have no claims there now. It's a big country, room for all. Why does the Government seem unwilling that any except those few who are satisfied to walk along a Government-policed path with heavy tax burdens for forestry policemen to keep the rest of us on their narrow-use privilege? Will the trees grow taller, be any greener, more people get to use these lands?

It's a shame when the Government takes such a position. Why can't you fellows get together with Representative Baring and do it in a reasonable fashion as recommended by a duly elected official who more nearly represents what the people want?

Respectfully,

FRANK W. LEWIS.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *December 30, 1963.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to record again my wholehearted endorsement of the wilderness bill, essentially as passed already by the Senate.

What little unspoiled wilderness we have left on public lands needs full congressional protection. Future generations would hold us responsible for any loss in their national heritage of scenic values.

All commercial enterprises should be kept out of the wilderness preserves. There is abundant place for mechanized skiing and other commercial sports outside our parks and primitive areas.

The public lands belong to all the people rather than to the local interests and privileged few with commercial investments in these lands. These facts should be considered at the public hearings now scheduled.

Please have this letter included in the minutes of the hearing to be held next January 13 in Las Vegas, Nev.

Sincerely,

ERIC LINDROTH.

SRP05803

H. MARTEL TOOL & DEVELOPMENT CO.,
Paramus, N.J., December 28, 1963.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Wilderness Bills Hearings, Las Vegas Convention Center, Las Vegas, Nev.

DEAR SIR: We wish to urge you to support H.R. 9070, introduced by the Honorable John P. Saylor, and S. 4, already passed by the Senate.

We feel that it is of utmost importance that sizable areas of our country remain in their primitive state—not only untouched by commercial enterprises but also to remain inaccessible to vehicles.

We believe such action would be in the national interest as it would preserve these lands for the enjoyment of future generations in addition to providing ideal refuge for our wildlife in those areas—both flora and fauna.

While we are well aware of the tremendous pressure exerted upon you by members of industry who are seeking admittance to these areas we are sure that by supporting the above bills and any strengthening provisos you will feel that you have acted correctly and for the benefit of the majority of Americans—both present and future.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY MARTEL,
CELIA MARTEL,
ERICH H. MARTEL.

SAN MARINO, CALIF., *January 9, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I urge you to report favorably on a strong bill which would set aside areas in the national forests and other areas as wildlife and/or wilderness areas. I also urge you to not make exceptions whereby commercial interests could and/or would encroach upon such areas.

With population increasing, it is essential that areas be set-aside where one may go to enjoy nature's beauty and solitude—a place to get away from the pressure and noise of our modern city living.

The areas presently set aside as wildlife or primitive areas are indeed small compared to the national forests. Please do not make them smaller.

As a former Boy Scout leader, I have camped in the San Gorgonio Wildlife Area and would hate to see any part of it turned over to commercial use.

Please make this letter a part of your hearing on the wilderness bill.

Respectfully,

CURTIS W. MASON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *January 20, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please enter in the minutes of the Las Vegas hearing record, my vote to preserve intact the wilderness areas under discussion, especially discouraging the commercial development of the Mount San Gorgonio area.

In addition I am anxious to have the wilderness bill brought out of committee and onto the floor of the House of Representatives.

Very truly,

JANICE M. MEREDITH.

CARMICHAEL, CALIF., *January 12, 1964.*

Congressman WALTER S. BARING,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARING: We urge favorable action on H.R. 9070 (Saylor) one of the bills to be considered at the field hearing in Las Vegas, Nev., on January 13, 1964, by the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The policy and program of a National Wilderness Preservation System as set forth in this particular bill is, in our opinion, the best of the various bills to be considered.

Our Nation's ever-growing population has a present and future need for wilderness areas that have remained in their unchanged, natural state.

We request that this letter be made part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearing. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES B. MILLER.

MORGAN HORSE CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 15, 1964.

HOUSE INTERIOR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Our membership includes more than 100 horsemen in southern California, most of whom trailride in the Morgan horse tradition. We could not afford to send a representative to your Las Vegas hearing, but appreciate your willingness to consider our statements submitted by mail.

We are in favor of a wilderness bill that will protect our national wild areas for future generations. The area that we know and love is that of the San Gorgonio, just 60 miles east of Los Angeles by freeway. All week long we and our horses are penned up in civilization. Weekends we take our horses and go get a breath of fresh air and there are very few places where this can be done either on horseback or on foot. To us, San Gorgonio, is very precious and we do not want the commercial ski lift operators to hack up the beautiful peaceful scenery for roads, parking lots, and lifts for skiers who spend most of the day sitting by a fireplace anyway. We have no quarrel with skiers who enjoy cross-country fun just as we do on horseback. They use San Gorgonio now in the winter and we use it in spring, summer, and fall. There are many church and youth camps at the foot of San Gorgonio who use it the year round to build character, give city youth a chance to see nature. These are in addition to the many hiking individuals and groups whom we see on our frequent horseback trips there.

The local forest service has gone on record opposing the opening of San Gorgonio, after lengthy hearings, but a strong wilderness bill will stop them from having to use their time in this fashion, when they could better be spending it building more trails into this beautiful country. With more trails, there will be added use by persons on foot and on horseback. We do not have an advertising or political budget as do the ski lift operators, who are only after the dollar. We must depend upon you, our elected Representatives, to protect our interests in this vital area.

Sincerely,

CHARLOTTE SCHMIDT, *Secretary.*

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *January 6, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Please make this a part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas hearings.

I am speaking for the preservation of our wilderness areas, and especially southern California's San Gorgonio.

San Gorgonio is a very precious year-round area to many adults and youth groups. One need only see the beaten trails and smokey campsites to realize this. To permit commercial ski operations would be a tragedy indeed. No one who has hiked these trails for pleasure could fail to see that its very heart is what is sought and would be destroyed by such action. A treeless ski slope with its attendant parking lots, roads, and buildings are usable only in winter for one purpose, by one group.

We owe this cherished outing area to our grandchildren.

I support H.R. 9070 introduced last November by Representative John Saylor.

Sincerely,

E. A. MULVANEY.

SRP05805

RIO DELL, CALIF., *January 13, 1964.*

Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: I would request to have these comments included in the record of your current hearings on legislation to establish a wilderness preservation system.

It is my deep conviction, based on my walk of life as a physician, that the preservation of wilderness and its values is of greatest importance for the mental health, in the widest sense of the word, of our Nation.

Experience has furthermore convinced me that without a sufficient and clear-cut legislative frame of reference the preservation of wilderness is a forlorn cause in the face of competing interests, meaning monetary gain to only a minority of individuals without concern for the public well-being.

I therefore urge your committee promptly and favorably to report to the House of Representatives on legislation to this end. This action is overdue after years of deliberation.

Facing the multitude of different bills, all details of which are hard to comprehend for the nonparliamentarian, that legislation is preferable which most clearly recognizes and guarantees the protection of the specific wilderness values as against any secondary values. It seems to this observer that H.R. 9070 best meets these criteria.

Yours truly,

KURT H. MUNCHHEIMER, M.D.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *January 19, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We urge favorable and speedy action on H.R. 9520 (or H.R. 9070, or H.R. 9101) to bring the bill out for consideration by the full House of Representatives. We further urge that no amendment be adopted which would exclude any part of the San Gorgonio Wild Area from the wilderness system.

We should like this letter to be made a part of the hearing record for the Las Vegas, Nev., hearings of January 13–14, 1964.

I am employed by the Planning Department of the City of San Diego as a zoning investigator and enforcement officer. I daily see examples of attempts at personal gain in land use which is to the detriment of the whole community. I see the wilderness bill as a master plan of land use which is essential to our long-range national interest.

Mrs. McConnell had, before her retirement, been employed for many years as secretary for the dean of San Diego architects. She observed firsthand many of the battles to preserve our beautiful Balboa Park from uses not compatible with the esthetic, educational, and cultural interests of our residents and visitors. The establishment and maintenance of Balboa Park is a local example of land use under an approved master plan and is an indication of the national good which can come from the wilderness bill.

It has been my privilege to hike and camp in the San Gorgonio area and I wish to see that privilege, of enjoying an uncommercialized wilderness, extended to generations yet unborn.

A visit to Italy, Switzerland, and Denmark in 1960 impressed us with the achievement of those people in establishing a balance between using and conserving the land. We believe the wilderness bill will help us to gain such a balance.

Sincerely yours,

F. WRIGHT MCCONNELL.
MARGARET W. MCCONNELL.

ALTADENA, CALIF., *January 7, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: This letter contains a statement on the wilderness bill which I request be made a part of the record for the Las Vegas, Nev., hearing. My occupation is plant manager, Carlson Rules Works, Hardware & Industrial Division of H. K. Porter Co., Inc. The plant is in Monrovia, Calif.

I make this statement as an individual who frequents and appreciates designated wilderness areas of this State:

The importance of maintaining wilderness areas is increasing even while man-made changes are taking more areas out of the natural state. As population and congestion increases, the benefit to people of visits to wilderness areas in terms of peace of mind and renewal by momentary escape cannot be overestimated.

A wilderness area is not closed. It is open for the use and enjoyment of sport and outing groups and individuals who cherish unspoiled natural areas. However, it is protected against commercial exploitation and the disturbance of natural ecology and depredation that usually accompany this kind of development.

In particular, the protection of the San Gorgonio wilderness area against commercial development and its maintenance as a wilderness area is doubly important because it is one of extremely few areas within weekend reach of Los Angeles area residents.

I urge the adoption of the wilderness bill in a form to assure maximum preservation of the natural state of wilderness areas and that the San Gorgonio wild area remain a part of the wilderness system.

Very truly yours,

C. V. and VIRGINIA M. NEWTON.

MINING ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 8, 1964.

Re proposed wilderness system.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Las Vegas, Nev.
(Attention of Walter S. Baring, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee.)

DEAR MR. BARING: Heretofore, back as far as 1958, the Mining Association of Southern California has filed its objections to various bills introduced in the Congress for the purpose of creating a so-called wilderness system, particularly to the one passed by the Senate. We now suggest:

(1) There is no need of a wilderness system, because there are plenty of National and State parks.

(2) If a wilderness system is created, it should be based on the multiple use of the land.

(3) A period of at least 25 years should be provided for prospecting and location of mining claims.

Before we discuss these items in detail, we must again emphasize the fact, which seems to be overlooked by the proponents of only one use of the wilderness; i.e., for amusement and recreation, that mining is most important in the economy of the United States.

Not long ago a conference was held in London, England, on the subject "The Countryside in 1970." The Illustrated London News of November 16, 1963, in reporting the matter made the following statement:

"* * * This attitude was firmly ignored by the conference which took the view that the needs of industry, housing, and transport have higher priority than those of recreation and amenity * * *."

As one mining man in the United States expressed it recently:

"As mining men, we know that we are responsible for providing essential raw materials for the tools and equipment used in agriculture, in industry, in transportation and communication, and in the ordinary household * * *."

Next to agriculture, mining is the most important segment of our economy. However, what would agriculture be now if it were not for the minerals provided for plows and all other machinery which has stimulated agriculture? As a matter of fact, even fertilizers are petrochemicals coming from liquid minerals.

I

An examination of the number of U.S. national parks, national forests, national monuments, and the numerous State parks, in our opinion, proves that no wilderness system is necessary.

For a number of years we tried to find out whether any of the Eastern States, which seemed to be leading the drive for the wilderness system, had provided any parks for its people. We did not have facilities for procuring such information, and no one else seemed to have the information. However, we now have the information in a very good form.

(*a*) Enclosed find a copy of a portion of the National Geographic Magazine for November 1963. In order not to burden the record, I have torn out the

 SRP05807

article entitled "The Parks in Your Backyard," beginning on page 647 and running through page 707. From an examination of the article you will see that the number of parks in each of the States in the United States is indicated on three maps—at pages 674 (the East), 690 (the Midlands) and 698 (the West). Also, there is indicated on each map the number of people who have visited the various parks in each State during the year 1962.

Our point in this regard is that most people are going to visit parks and wilderness areas close to their respective homes. This is well demonstrated by the map on page 674, which shows that the State of New York has 100 parks, visited by 37,176,379 people in 1962. Pennsylvania is third with more than 22 million visitors in its parks.

(*b*) In this connection, there is also enclosed a folder from Yosemite Park, which illustrates that the present parks are adequately provided with trails for those who wish to walk through the wilderness.

Your attention is especially called to the map on pages 14 to 17 and data on page 8, which show that there are in excess of 700 miles of trails. On page 8 we also find there are hiking trips from 1 mile to 212 miles, which should suit the fancy of all the "nature lovers" and "contemplators." At the top of page 10 we read that there are only 216 miles of roads which cut across the middle of the park for access. The map shows that the whole north half and most of the south half of the park have no roads, only trails.

(*c*) Attention is called to an article by Frank J. Taylor in the Saturday Evening Post of December 16, 1961, wherein he quotes Mr. Laurence Rockefeller, who has been active in the preservation of American recreational areas. The latter said, on page 83, "less than 5 percent of the Yellowstone is developed."

(*d*) There is also filed with this memorandum a copy of the Arizona Highways magazine for the month of January 1964. This whole issue is devoted to "Lake Powell, America's Newest Playground." Lake Powell is 181 miles long and will have 1,800 miles of shoreline. Evidently the land withdrawn for recreational areas is between 10 and 12 million acres, which should furnish plenty of room for hikers, "contemplators," etc.

II

If there is to be a wilderness system, it should be based on the multiple use principle which has heretofore been adopted by Congress, and is fair to all the people. True conservation is not locking up natural resources for one purpose, but is putting natural resources to the best and varied uses for the whole country and all of its people.

As pointed out in our previous objections to the then pending bills, people who can actually use the wilderness are a very small fraction of all the people. Old people cannot use such wilderness, young people with children cannot use it and, as we know, most people want to ride where they are going. They do not even walk to the grocery store at home.

III

In H.R. 9162, introduced by Congressman Dingell, on page 10 thereof, section 4, paragraph (d)(2), provision is made for location of mining claims within the wilderness for 10 years, to December 31, 1973. That was the original period allowed in H.R. 776. In the amendment thereof such time was increased to 25 years which, in the present bill, should be to December 31, 1989. While we think there should be no limitation on the time for the location of mining claims within any wilderness created, if a time limit is necessary it should at least be for 25 years after the passage of the bill. Certainly the necessary investigation of possible mineral deposits within the mountain, desert, and wilderness areas in the Western States cannot be completed in less than 25 years. At the end of that time it will doubtless be determined whether more time would be necessary.

We appreciate the great care and thought given to the problem by the committee, and send cordial good wishes to all for the new year.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. NILSSON, *President.*

P.S.—If, in order to make the record complete, we should file more copies of the National Geographic Magazine, the Arizona Highways magazine, and/or the folder from the Yosemite Valley, please let me know, as we desire to do whatever is necessary to comply with the rules of the committee.

GEORGE W. NILSSON, MINING LAWYER, AND PRESIDENT OF MINING ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

1. Graduated from Northwestern University Law School in June 1915. Admitted to practice in Illinois in July 1915.

2. In September of 1915 I went to work for Hon. Leroy Anderson, a lawyer at Prescott, Ariz. I was admitted to practice in Arizona and before the Federal court in Arizona, and began practicing before the Interior Department on mining matters.

3. Hon. Leroy Anderson was general counsel for the United Verde Copper Co., whose mine was situated at Jerome and its smelter at Clarksdale, Ariz. I soon became assistant general counsel.

While we had a general practice, most of the practice was in mining law, as we represented mining companies as well as individual miners.

4. I moved to Los Angeles in June of 1924, and have practiced here ever since. My major practice has been in connection with oil and gas. I was attorney for the Kettleman North Dome Association during its whole operation for 22 years—from 1931 to 1953—which was one of the first and largest of the unit operations. Much of the land operated by Kettleman North Dome Association was held under U.S. oil and gas leases.

5. I have continued to practice mining law; was a member of the mining committee of the chamber of commerce for about 16 years; have been secretary, vice president, and now president of the Mining Association of Southern California, and am a director of the California Mine Operators Association. I have been an associate member of the AIME since 1938 and a member of the American Mining Congress for many years, serving from time to time on the public lands committee.

6. I have been a member of the American Bar Association since 1919, and a member of its section of mineral and natural resources law since that section was originally organized in 1929 or 1930.

7. I am a member of the Western Governors' Mineral Advisory Council.

OASIS GARDEN CLUB OF INDIAN WELLS VALLEY,
Ridgecrest, Calif., December 8, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The members of the Oasis Garden Club of Indian Wells Valley (Ridgecrest and China Lake) in the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area, vitally interested in conservation, are concerned over the possibility of making any exception to the wilderness bill.

We maintain that the vast majority of the people in the United States are in favor of the wilderness areas idea, and that only a small percentage would even consider the possibility of monetary gains from them.

Therefore, we wish it to be known that we are in favor of a strong wilderness bill, with no amendments that would exclude San Gorgonio therefrom.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR WILKERSON,
Corresponding Secretary.

PRIEST RIVER WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Priest River, Idaho.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: As an interested sportsman, I am appealing to you to act favorably on the wilderness bill (S. 4) at the January congressional hearings.

I would like to request that my statement be included in the official record of the hearings.

Sincerely yours,

DAROLD E. OOKER, *Secretary.*

 SRP05809

PACIFIC BEACH GARDEN CLUB,
San Diego, Calif., January 10, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: The Pacific Beach Garden Club, with a membership of 46, is behind the wilderness bill 100 percent. We are especially concerned about the San Gorgonio region and are very much opposed to an amendment excluding any portion of this wild area. We request that this statement be made a part of the Las Vegas hearings. In verification of this, all those present at this meeting have affixed their signatures.

(Twenty-six signatures.)

SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIF., *January 15, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Will you please make this letter part of the record of the hearing on the wilderness bill held at Las Vegas, January 13, 1964.

It is extremely important to save our parks, forests, and national heritage by having a good wilderness bill. I would like to go on record as favoring wilderness bill S. 4 or H.R. 9070 with no amendments to either bill.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MRS. ROBERT D. PAGE.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *January 2, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I will be unable to attend the hearings on the wilderness bill. I would like to have this statement included as part of the hearing record of January 13–14, 1964, at Las Vegas, Nev.

Preservation of part of our country in its natural wild state is very important to future generations, and to our own generation in these harried times. Life is too fast. It should be possible for those who want to, to get away from it all for a period of time.

I hope your commitee will give favorable consideration to the strongest possible bill.

Of particular local interest is the attempt by certain commercial interests to exclude the San Gorgonio area. The full inclusion of this area is most important because of its proximity to crowded Los Angeles.

Yours very truly,

G. VAUGHAN PARKER.

PASADENA AUDUBON SOCIETY,
Pasadena, Calif., January 10, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: To live, as we of the Pasadena Audubon Society do, in an area where population pressure is a severe reality, is to be given a particular awareness of the acute need for a strong wilderness bill. Our first choice, despite the many virtues of H.R. 9070, is S. 4 because we feel the power to quickly protect a valued area would be well placed in the President's hand, especially since such action could be revoked if after consideration Congress saw fit to do so.

It is clear that all privately held land in our country moves toward maximum use for maximum profit. Our moral obligation to the public future, then, is to hold fast to remaining public lands against private aggression.

To us locally, an example is the precious San Gorgonio area. It is of prime importance and its sacrifice should be no part of compromises that may be essential to the passage of a wilderness bill.

Sincerely,

BARBARA C. HORTON,
Conservation Chairman.

P.S.—Please include as part of official record, Las Vegas hearing, January 13.

JANUARY 9, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: All citizens of our land who have observed the unspoiled, uncommercialized and natural beauty of our national parks and wilderness areas realize the importance of preserving these areas in their natural state.

The pressure of increasing population plus pressures exerted by vested-interest groups will result in rapid depletion of these wilderness area resources if adequate legislation is not promptly enacted to prevent this from happening.

We hereby affirm our strong support of adequate legislation introduced to protect wilderness areas and the wildlife, water and forests lying therein. Senate bill 4 and house bill 9520 are good examples of necessary legislation. We stand in favor of preservation of wilderness areas for all future Americans.

(80 signatures.)

PHILADELPHIA CONSERVATIONISTS, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 22, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, House Public Lands Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARING: I am very glad that your subcommittee has held hearings in three western cities on the wilderness bill (H.R. 9070). I regret that pressure of business prevented me from attending the hearings in person.

The wilderness bill has been before Congress and before the public for 7 years. It has had the most extensive hearings, and expert revisions, and appropriate modifications which could be afforded to any bill. It has solid public support. It was passed overwhelmingly by the Senate of both the 87th and 88th Congresses. It is opposed only by special commercial interests. The bill is as perfect as long consideration, extensive hearings, and hard work can make it. The bill represents perhaps the last opportunity to assure the preservation of a representative portion of a most precious commodity which is fast disappearing in our country—our natural wilderness heritage.

On behalf of our organization of 800 members I respectfully urge that H.R. 9070 be favorably reported to the full House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to work for its approval by the full committee and its passage by the House. If it is appropriate I respectfully request that this letter be made a part of the record of the subcommittee hearings.

Sincerely yours,

ALLSTON JENKINS, *President.*

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
January 18, 1964.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Our family would like this statement made part of the Las Vegas hearings on the wilderness bill. We were not able to attend, but wish to commend you for the impartial and efficient handling of the hearing, as reported to us by friends who did.

Millions of words have been uttered and printed about the urgent necessity of preserving permanently some parts of our remnant wilderness. We sincerely believe this has been proved over and over.

However, for the record, we wish to say we believe that any possible economic benefits accruing to any commercial interests whatever cannot possibly compare in value with the re-creational (as well as recreational) rewards that will be realized by millions of Americans for generations to come. We also wish to remind you that our late martyred President Kennedy gave high priority to this proposed legislation in his program for a truly great and enlightened America.

Finally, one of America's greatest philosophers, Henry Thoreau, wrote over a century ago: "This curious world is more wonderful than it is convenient; more beautiful than it is useful; it is more to be admired and enjoyed than

used." We request with all sincerity that the selected sections of our American wilderness be protected and left unaltered, to be admired and enjoyed for all time.

This protection would, we think, be best extended by the provisions of H.R. 9520, by our California Congressman, Mr. Cohelan. Please report this out and see that it is made law.

Sincerely,

ROSCOE A. POLAND,
WILMA D. POLAND,
STEPHANIE L. POLAND.

POMONA, CALIF., *January 9, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR WILDERNESS AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Representing the garden section of Pomona Ebell Woman's Club we would like to protest the opening of San Gorgonio wilderness area for ski resorts or commercial resorts.

It is so important that we reserve the few wilderness areas still remaining as such, for use of our young people such as Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, church groups and other similar organizations and for thousands of other nature lovers.

Once such an area is opened commercially it no longer remains a wilderness area.

So as a group representing 200 Ebell members we would like to go on record strongly opposing any reclassification of San Gorgonio wilderness area.

Yours truly,

MARIE M. HELSLEY, *Curator.*

THE RESOURCES AGENCY OF CALIFORNIA,
STATE CAPITOL,
Sacramento, January 16, 1964.

Congressman WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARING: On behalf of the Resources Agency of California, which includes the departments of parks and recreation, conservation, fish and game, and water resources, I should like to submit our views on the wilderness bill for the record of the hearings currently being conducted.

As you know, Gov. Edmund G. Brown has strongly supported S. 4 during this session of Congress, as well as S. 174 of the 87th Congress. We still support S. 4, however, we would not object if some reasonable compromise became necessary.

We have consistently supported the authority of the President to designate units of the wilderness system, and still do. However, since this is a major point at issue we would support provisions for reasonable action by Congress as an overall safeguard to the development of a wilderness system if that would secure passage of the wilderness bill during this session.

We favor a provision for a continuing survey of mineral resources. Concerning the several suggestions for the period of time which should be allowed for review of the present primitive areas, we would concur to any reasonable period with a specified termination date.

It is our strong desire to see a wilderness bill passed this year if the points in issue can be solved equitably.

Sincerely yours,

HUGO FISHER, *Administrator.*

WOODLAND HILLS, CALIF., *January 6, 1964.*

Representative WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to urge that the wilderness bill, S. 4, be promptly reported out of committee and passed by the House of Representatives. Prompt action is important because once a wilderness area is lost, it is lost forever. Although our country was once all wilderness, development has progressed so

rapidly that only 2 percent of our land area can be classified as wilderness today. This is a very small part of our country to preserve from commercial development. Certainly if 98 percent of our land area isn't enough to carry on our economic activities of logging, mining, grazing, etc., then the remaining 2 percent wouldn't make hardly any difference. In any event all the proposed bills provide for exceptions if it is required in the national interest. The spiritual values derived from wilderness outings and the value of wilderness areas to scientific research far outweigh any other use to which these areas can be put.

If it is felt that specific affirmative action by Congress is a necessity, then I urge you to consider H.R. 9070 (Saylor) for then all areas considered by Congress would be protected as if they were a part of the wilderness system until Congress takes final action. This is important, since action may take a long time due to the volume of other important issues which Congress must consider and again, once a wilderness area is lost, it is lost forever.

As before, an amendment will probably be offered excluding a portion of the San Gorgonio wild area for a ski development. I would like to urge that this amendment not be approved, for it actually eliminates an already existing wilderness area and in a location close to one of the largest metropolitan areas in the country. There are numerous organization camps adjacent to this area and it is used heavily by youth groups. There are many other areas nearby suitable for ski development but there are few other wilderness areas in southern California and most of these are closed to public use during our long fire season.

Please make this letter a part of the hearing record for the hearing held in Las Vegas January 13 and 14.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR A. RICH.

ROAMER HIKING CLUB, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 5, 1964.

DEFENDERS OF SAN GORGONIO,
San Bernardino, Calif.

DEAR FRIENDS: The entire membership of the Roamer Hiking Club wishes to go on record in behalf of the original wilderness bill, S. 4, which, has twice been passed by the Senate.

We wish our support so indicated in the hearings at Olympia, Denver, and in Las Vegas, Nev.

In spite of our inability to send a representative to the hearings we reiterate our position and voice a strong vote for prompt passage of the bill in its original form.

Yours truly,

BLYTHE O. EDWARDS,
Conservation Chairman.

RIALTO, CALIF., *January 6, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am a teacher in the San Bernardino City schools who has often hiked in our nearby San Gorgonio and Cucamonga wild areas. I know that many of my personal friends and students have also enjoyed these beautiful natural areas for camping and hiking.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank our National Government for its foresight in setting up these areas throughout the Nation and urge your committee to approve firm legislation that will put these wilderness areas—particularly San Gorgonio—out of the grasp of commercial enterprises. As the metropolitan areas of our Nation rapidly expand and our citizens are increasingly caught up in the stresses of our highly materialistic society, the preservation of such islands of natural beauty becomes imperative.

People who love the wild areas hope that more and more of our citizens can, without the destruction of bulldozers and the distraction of machines, enjoy unspoiled wild areas in the years to come—enjoy them for hiking, skiing, camping, hunting, fishing, nature study, and, most important of all, the refreshment of the soul.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. RUTHERFURD.

SRP05813

SAFE PROGRESS ASSOCIATION,
Miami, Fla., January 21, 1964.

Re the wilderness bill.
Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, House Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARING: For many years the wilderness bill has been under consideration. It has received overwhelming support in the Senate and supported by the President. We detect an overwhelming public demand for sound and enduring wilderness protection for the good health, welfare, and enjoyment of thinking citizens.

The wilderness bill passed by the Senate, S. 4, is a good bill. So are H.R. 295 and H.R. 930. Many new bills have been introduced into the House, all attempting sound wilderness preservation policy. It behooves the House to pass a wilderness bill and not a special-interest bill. We demand a sound policy for wilderness protection for the areas described as worthy in the many proposed bills. We ask the Subcommittee on Public Lands and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to cease this long drawnout stalling and give us a worthy wilderness bill. Let it be reported to the full House for consideration and vote. There have already been enough hearings, field studies, discussions, field hearings, lobbying, and politicing.

Please support a sound and worthy wilderness preservation policy.

Please enter this letter in the record of the hearings.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD MILLER, *Vice President.*

SAN BERNARDINO AREA MOTEL ASSOCIATION,
January 9, 1964.

HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: As president of the Motel Association of San Bernardino, I want to go on record for our group as opposing the stand taken by our San Bernardino Board of Supervisors who voted to oppose the opening of the San Gorgonio wilderness area to lift skiing.

Who exactly are these folk representing when they argue that bringing in additional ski lifts will "bankrupt those now established." This argument simply is not valid—anytime we increase the attractiveness of our now unused San Gorgonio skiing area (winter season, also unusable because of its isolation) the additional people so attracted are bound to help existing ski facilities.

As our association includes 24 members, we are vitally concerned with the future of San Bernardino. It is our belief that a proper use of this contested area would greatly benefit the total community.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM D. MORRIS, *President.*

RESOLUTION

On motion of Supervisor Break, duly seconded by Supervisor Dana, and carried unanimously, the board of supervisors adopts the following resolution:

Whereas the board of supervisors and the citizens of San Bernardino County have expressed their concern and desire to preserve the primitive character of portions of the U.S. national forest; and

Whereas San Bernardino County is an important segment of the State of California, consisting of one-eighth of the land area of the State of California and comprising more than 20,000 square miles; and

Whereas within San Bernardino County there is a major national forest area within which is located the San Gorgonio Wild Area; and

Whereas the county of San Bernardino is a part of the southern California area which is now experiencing rapid growth and urbanization, with a present population in southern California exceeding 7 million persons and destined to double in population in a comparatively few decades; and

Whereas because of these evidences of growth and the obvious accompanying critical need for all types of recreational and recreation areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors, by action on this date, reiterates its previous stand and again urges the Public Lands Subcommittee of the U.S. Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the House of Representatives in Congress to support and approve a wilderness bill as comparable to that of Senate bill No. 4 as possible, and to preserve the integrity of the San Gorgonio Wild Area as it is now classified and used, in order that there may continue to be recreational opportunities in areas preserved in their natural state and as free as possible from commercialization and disturbance by man.

NANCY E. SMITH,
Chairman of the Board.

Dated: DECEMBER 30, 1963.
Attest:

V. DENNIS WARDLE,
County Clerk and Ex-officio Clerk of the Board.
By RUDOLPH L. CORONA,
Deputy.

SAN BERNARDINO HORSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
San Bernardino, Calif., January 15, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We did not hear of your Las Vegas hearing on the proposed wilderness bills until it was too late to request permission for us to be heard. However, we understand that you will receive views by mail for a few days. We hope this is received in time to be included.

Our group consists of 35 families in this area who enjoy trail riding. We can do this only by trailering our horses to some area where there are trails, facilities such as water, and little traffic. Naturally we prefer going where we can gaze upon some beautiful natural scenery, to "get away from it all." Riding in such surroundings is an important part of our life.

The only such area near enough to trailer to in a weekend (since trailers are restricted to slower travel) is the San Gorgonio Wild Area 40 miles east of here. There has been great pressure by the ski lift operators to install lifts in the only part of San Gorgonio now adequately covered by trails. We do not feel that the present undeveloped areas not now in "wild" classification are fully in use for this type of skier. San Gorgonio is our last refuge. We hope a wilderness bill can be passed that will protect it and others like it throughout the country, not only for us but for generations to follow, whether they ride horseback, just hike, or cross-country ski.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY KAUFMAN, *Secretary.*

SAN LUIS OBISPO SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
ASSOCIATED WITH CALIFORNIA WILDLIFE FEDERATION AND
CENTRAL COAST COUNCIL OF SPORTSMEN,
January 13, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: The San Luis Obispo Sportsmen's Association supports the original wilderness bill, S. 4, which passed the Senate on April 9, 1963. We feel that other bills and resolutions are in conflict with the intent of the original wilderness bill.

We therefore hope that your committee will not accept any substitute to wilderness bill S. 4.

Sincerely,

BUD HILDENBRAND, *President.*

SRP05815

CONCORD, CALIF., *January 7, 1964.*

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: We endorse the wilderness bill, H.R. 9070, the almost identical H.R. 9101, and H.R. 9520 introduced by J. Cohelan, of California.

Man receives a supreme recreational and philosophical experience in wilderness areas—a much-needed relief from the strains of everyday life. The growth in population, increased proportion of leisure time, and the ease of travel have contributed to pressures on recreational areas.

Wilderness regions also provide a habitat for wildlife, watershed protection, and an unmatched laboratory for natural science.

Unless these areas soon receive enduring protection from a strong wilderness law they will lose much of their value for posterity. We can preserve the beauty of our wilderness areas by acting now. We strongly urge passage of the wilderness bill.

We request that this letter be included in the record of the hearing.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM SATTLER
(Mrs. Wm). GENEVIEVE SATTLER.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., *January 6, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIRS; Please incorporate the following statement concerning wilderness bills into the hearings which your Subcommittee on Public Lands will hold at Las Vegas, Nev., on January 13 and 14, 1964.

It seems imperative that some public lands be held in wilderness status for our present and future needs. I wish to make several observations.

Wilderness areas cannot be heavily used without destroying them. However, a boy who makes a trip into a wilderness area such as that in the environs of Mount San Gorgonio will enjoy it 1,000 times over in his memories. Some pleasures must be enjoyed by a few people at a time.

Commercial people who wish to take these precious wilderness assets from us will persist until an administration comes to Washington who will give them what they want. Please give our wilderness areas the joint protection of Congress as well as that of the administration's.

Please do not take the San Gorgonio wilderness away from the millions of children who will enjoy it in the years to come.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY SCHNEIDER.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF., *January 13, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: In order that a small portion of our original wilderness area may be preserved for this and future generations of Americans to enjoy I believe it is obligatory that a wilderness bill be passed by Congress now.

I urge your committee to submit a bill to the House essentially the same as S. 4 which was passed by the Senate on April 9, 1963. Also I urge that the House bill should not carry any section which would exclude the San Gorgonio ski area. The San Gorgonio wild area should remain intact and not be opened up for commercial exploitation.

Please make this letter a part of the hearings record for the Las Vegas hearing.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. SCHONBORN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 15, 1964.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: It is my understanding that there are several different bills dealing with wilderness preservation and that hearings on them have just been concluded.

Since I did not know about the hearings in time to write sooner, I would like to state my preferences now.

In my opinion, wilderness bill S. 4, which has already passed the Senate, is by far the best. H.R. 9070, Representative Saylor's bill, is very good, also. May I insist that there be no changes or amendments to either bill and that a really good wilderness preservation bill become law as soon as possible.

Please have this letter included in the record of the public hearing held at Las Vegas, Nev., on these bills.

Anything you can do to further the passage of these bills, S. 4 and H.R. 9070, will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

CATHERINE D. SHAW.

SIERRA CLUB, RIO GRANDE CHAPTER,
Los Alamos, N. Mex., January 6, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representative, Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. BARING: The executive committee of the Rio Grande Chapter of the Sierra Club, representing members of the club in New Mexico and Texas, at a meeting in Santa Fe on January 5, 1964, went on record as expressing their satisfaction at the prospect of approval by your committee of the Saylor wilderness bill.

Our members would doubtless welcome an even stronger bill, but the proposed Saylor bill goes far toward meeting the desires of those of us who advocate the increase and preservation of wilderness areas.

Respectfully,

ELMO A. ROBINSON,
Chairman, Rio Grande Chapter.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *January 8, 1964.*

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Las Vegas, Nev.

GENTLEMEN: As an introduction to my background, I have lived in Redlands or San Bernardino all of my life. I have been interested and active in skiing since 1937. Since 1946 I have been active in youth programs and still remain so. Most of this activity has been in junior racing (skiing), Little League, Pony League, and Colt League baseball programs and tennis.

I am 44 years old and have been in business since 1946. I am a very active skier as is my wife and 17-year-old son.

As a San Bernardino businessman totally interested in the future of both our city and county, I fail to understand the reasoning behind certain members of our board's outright attack on the San Gorgonio ski-lift people. Only recently the Sun Telegram carried an up-to-date account in which it was clearly stated that the matter of whether or not San Gorgonio was to remain a wild area was resting in the very capable hands of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman—a great believer in the wilderness concept—and that the ski developers were to be given additional time to allow them to bring their case before the people of San Bernardino, even obtaining the blessing of the Forest Service in so doing.

Why then, or how, one must ask, did they come to a 4-to-0 vote? The absence of one supervisor and the silence of another are more meaningful than one realizes, especially since the former has never voted against San Gorgonio's opening, and the chamber of commerce in the other's home, Colton, voted in

favor of a public hearing. Isn't this what the issue is all about? Shouldn't the facts be made public? Why is the Sierra Club so committed against having such a hearing? Certainly our own board of supervisors, men and women vitally interested in the future of San Bernardino County, can rest assured that in Secretary Freeman they have a champion of conservation who can be relied on to weigh carefully wilderness values.

Or can we assume a private interest brought pressure to bear on our board? Consider for a moment these statements: The development of San Gorgonio is "a little premature, particularly now that there is so much use of manmade snow." And referring to Astronaut John Glenn's skiing visit at Big Bear: "How come Los Angeles people are writing us to say they have to go to Mammoth to be able to ski?" And then amazingly, this statement: "Ski-chair operators already established in the mountains are having trouble making their lifts pay. Addition of another might bankrupt those now established." If I had not already heard all these statements, I might easily become confused or have trouble discerning their source. But as to snowmaking equipment, its locale and its chief spokesman, I know personally.

Let's take the "manmade snow" statement first: Of primary concern to every resident of San Bernardino is water conservation. Might we then ask ourselves what is the prime ingredient in the manufacture of the precious white stuff. Shouldn't we consider carefully the fact that snow is already existent and has been since mid-October in the area which is being studied for possible reclassification?

About "Los Angeles people going to Mammoth to ski": They surely do in ever-increasing numbers and are, in fact, the major support of its operation, so major in fact, that $5 million in trade comes from the Los Angeles basin alone. And people go to Mammoth, which is considerably farther away, and exceedingly inconvenient, because of superior snow conditions and superior ski runs, to any locally available.

And as to "any additional lifts bankrupting those now established": This is the weakest argument of all. When one considers the ease of diverting that northbound traffic from Mammoth, the fact that Sun Valley, Idaho, gets one-third of all its clientele from southern California, ski flights totaling over $1 million annually originate from Los Angeles, destination Europe, it is easy to see how bringing all these many lovers of the sport to San Gorgonio will benefit the total skiing community. The State of California also estimates that such a local day-use area will draw well over 75 percent of the people from the realm of the absolute beginner and the sightseer. So it is the total population that is being catered to; and whenever you can draw more people into the mountain areas all existing ski areas must benefit. I cite as proof the experience of the lift operators in Vermont surrounding Mount Snow who worried about "the colossus" and who later testified: "It didn't hurt them but rather helped by calling attention to them" (Sports Illustrated, Nov. 18, 1963).

The remark that "10 percent of the 35,000-acre wilderness area" would not suffice for the expansion that is sure to follow, indicates a not too conversant understanding of the size of the area involved. At 3,500 acres, this would rank as one of the largest ski areas in our country, completely capable of handling any future expansion. Of course, if a supervisor talks knowingly of expansion, there is inferred the great need existent.

Sanitation—a problem? It is now; right? But when the Forest Service issues its prospectus to possible lessees, you may rest assured this matter will have to meet their exacting demands. Has Sun Valley, Aspen, Mammoth fulfilled like demands? Of course, they have.

I find it absolutely imperative to voice an opinion I know to be held by many of my business associates—men who are acknowledged leaders in our community: Our board has not acted in the interests of its total constituency. April 1, 1964, is the time extension given the San Gorgonio lift people by Secretary Freeman. Shouldn't our board also honor this date in a spirit of fairness?

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. SLAMAL.

BISHOP, CALIF., *January 8, 1964.*

Please include this statement in the hearing record.

I am a teacher in Bishop High School. I live in this area because I love the mountains and wilderness country near here. I have made many trips with my wife and small children into the surrounding wilderness area. I hope that the wilderness areas will be protected sufficiently to provide such recreational opportunities for all time. Wilderness may easily be unmade, but is slow to grow.

I understand that the Saylor bill, H.R. 9070, is backed by both wilderness advocates and commercial interests. Wilderness areas should receive vigorous protection. If this bill will do the job, I urge that it be passed soon.

I trust that action may soon be taken on this measure.

Sincerely,

RONALD E. SMITH.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *January 9, 1964.*

Re hearings at Las Vegas, Nev.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
January 13–14, 1964.

GENTLEMEN: In view of the fast-dwindling wilderness acreage left in this country, any effort on the part of Congress to preserve what little land is left for that purpose is not only desirable, but also necessary for the future.

The Saylor bill, designated "H.R. 9070," although the result of compromise in many ways, is a just and reasonable attempt to promote the best possible scenic use of public lands. I am in favor of the Saylor bill.

I request that this letter be placed on record of the hearings.

Respectfully yours,

POLLY STEWART.

TAFT SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, INC.,
Taft, Calif., January 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: We of the Taft Sportsmen's Club support the original wilderness bill, S. 4, which passed the Senate on April 9, 1963. We feel that other bills and resolutions are in conflict with the intent of the original wilderness bill. We therefore hope that your committee will not accept any substitutes to the wilderness bill S. 4.

Sincerely,

K. R. KOOKEN, *President.*

JANUARY 16, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Interior and Insular Affairs Commitee.

DEAR SIR: I would like to have my endorsement of wilderness preservation entered as part of the wilderness bill hearings record for the Las Vegas hearings.

I am an electronic engineer living in the Pomona Valley area of southern California. My attention was first drawn, understandably, to the wilderness bill by concern for our own local wild area. Recalling the results of overexploitation of vast areas of forest in my home State of Michigan I could picture what would happen to the small isolated bits of mountain wilderness in southern California. In considering ways to protect these nature preserves, I find that the passage of a good wilderness bill such as S. 4 or H.R. 9070, with no attached amendment to alter or remove any part of San Gorgonio from wild area status, is the most satisfactory solution.

Being a skier and outdoor enthusiast and a resident of the San Gorgonio vicinity, I feel justified in including, in more detail, my feelings about San Gorgonio.

It would be a mistake to allow the commercializing of the San Gorgonio area. As a skier I can appreciate the desire to take advantage of southern California's highest and longest seasoned slope. As an outdoor enthusiast, I cannot condone

 SRP05819

the marring, by any commercial venture, of this outstanding mountain area unique in all of southern California.

The argument of "serving the interests of the majority" may sound reasonable at this time. Indeed, if the area were commercialized, there would be an influx of skiers whose number may exceed the number of hikers and campers. However, from my experiences of recommending the area to others for the enjoyment of the outdoors, and their elation in finding that such a place exists locally, suggests that as time goes on, more and more people will come to know and enjoy this haven divested of commercial aspects.

Also, with the southern California area growing at such a rapid rate, it is not difficult to imagine what living conditions will be 100 or more years from now. I feel we have an obligation to the future generations to preserve some aspect of the wilderness that once was. Considering this aspect, we will certainly serve the interests of the majority of the future by preserving San Gorgonio intact.

Now to consider some of the practical aspects of the skier's viewpoint. Because the Gorgonio area has been publicized for its outstanding snow conditions, many people have been led to overemphasize San Gorgonio's snow advantages over other areas. If some of the editors of newspapers who publicize "excellent snow conditions at San Gorgonio" would take the bother to investigate firsthand, they would often have to retract their statements.

One very important point to remember is this—the majority of skiers have had their skiing by the time most local slopes are melting away while San Gorgonio remains white. As an enthusiastic skier, I know that only the minority diehards want snow to the bitter end, and this type is usually willing to do some hiking to get their skiing.

Consequently, the commercializing of the San Gorgonio area means essentially the sacrificing of the outstanding and only wilderness area in southern California to add just one more chair-lift complex to the many others that already exist.

I repeat, it would be a mistake.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE A. TERAKOWSKI.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *January 20, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Neither my wife or I were able to attend any of the hearings your committee held in the Western States on the wilderness bill. However, we wish to make our opinions on this matter known, and hereby request that this letter become part of the record of your hearings. By profession, I am a marine biologist and my wife is an ex-schoolteacher.

We are in favor of the principle that all areas presently in the wild state be given congressional as well as executive protection. This would include those areas in the national forests presently classified as "wild," "wilderness," "canoe," or "primitive" areas; and all areas in the national parks, monuments, and wildlife refuges that are presently roadless. At present such areas have only administrative protection by the agencies which govern them. We feel strongly that the Congress should have its say in this protection since the opinion of the Congress more directly reflects that of all the people.

We have made many most enjoyable trips into these areas. Their scenic beauty could be so easily marred by roads, buildings, or commercial development. To us, such areas are God's great works of art, and need protection in the same sense that we preserve other works of art in our great National Gallery in Washington and elsewhere throughout the Nation. We want our children and grandchildren to be able to experience the same worthwhile experiences that we have had in these areas. To travel in them, one has to be truly independent, and is on his own to the same extent that our forefathers were when they traversed the vast expanse that once existed. Such independence is character building and has long been a part of the American heritage.. Surely we can afford, even in the face of our expanding population, to give these areas more positive protection than they now have. Surely we can afford to continue to set aside 1 to 2 percent of our total land area for these experiences.

These areas are at present mainly used for recreation and watershed protection. No cutting of timber in them is underway, nor do any of the present bills before your committee remove any present mineral rights. The opposition to these bills appears mainly to be from those who might, in the distant future, wish to exploit these lands for commercial gain. If such use appears desirable to the Congress, it could still be carried out under any of the bills. However, we feel that the recreational need should take precedence over such other uses, since the land involved is such a small fraction of our total land area, or even of the total land in the national forests and parks.

In particular, in southern California, there is presently only one such area left in the wild state in our high mountains. It is called the San Gorgonio wild area of the San Bernardino National Forest. It has been proposed that the heart of this area be developed for commercial downhill skiing—some 14 chair-lifts would be built under the proposal. Such use is very much incompatible with the scenic values of this area, and since it is the only such high mountain area left in southern California, it should be kept inviolate. No amendment to any wilderness bill should be made that would change the boundaries of the San Gorgonio wild area. It serves principally for watershed protection on the Santa Ana River, but, more importantly, some 30 youth camps are clustered around its periphery. These camps use the area to give their youngsters the uplifting, character-building experience of hiking on their own into truly untouched country. Such use is entirely more important than any possible downhill skiing development, particularly when other parts of the same national forest could be used for more ski areas.

We wish your committee well in gathering opinion on the wilderness bills; we wish we could have presented our views in person; and we hope that you will be able to report a bill favorable to our opinions out of committee as soon as possible. Of the various bills, H.R. 9070 (Saylor) seems most acceptable to us.

Thank you very much for holding these hearings. We look forward to favorable action.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. THOMAS.
SARA S. THOMAS.

ARIZONA STATE COLLEGE,
SCHOOL OF FORESTRY,
Flagstaff, Ariz., January 21, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am William P. Thompson, assistant professor of forestry at Arizona State College in Flagstaff. My work here is in the fields of forestry economics and policy and my particular interests are in the area of land use economics and theory. My formal education consisted of a B.A. from Yale in economics, a master of forestry from Yale, and my doctoral work was in forestry economics at Duke.

I felt most fortunate to be able to attend the hearings held in Las Vegas on January 13 and 14 and later will make a few specific comments concerning some of the testimony, most of which I felt was excellent and enlightening to all of us. First, however, I would like to make a few general comments on the subject of land use economics.

I would like to suggest that money, in itself, is a convenience rather than an absolute necessity to an economy. Some people feel that if some value cannot be expressed in terms of money, the science of economics cannot be of service in determining its value. This is not true, the value people place upon something is really measured by what they are willing to give up in order to have it; prices are merely a convenient measure of this. If we can get some idea of what people will give up in order to have something, we can approximate its economic worth. In the case of city parks people give up great real estate values to have their parks, in the case of wilderness areas they may give up mineral, timber, or other values in order to have their wilderness. It is important that the people have some idea of the values they are giving up and it is equally important that those making the decisions have a knowledge of the will of the people.

Second, I feel it is very important to avoid the false idea that economics holds all the answers. An estimate of economic value may be useful, but it is far from the complete solution. As an example, heroin is much more expensive than penicillin, but it could hardly be considered more valuable. There are many noneconomic values and, without doubt, these are often far more important than the economic ones. Obviously, no economist (or anyone else) can weigh these noneconomic values against the economic ones.

Not uncommonly, the use people make of something is considered as a measure of its value. This is even a poorer measure than its price, in my opinion. One need only look at the gambling halls of Las Vegas or the cigarette consumption in the United States to see the lack of a relationship between use and true value.

Next, before arriving at what I feel is the most logical method for making land-use decisions, I would like to suggest that there are two general types of decisions; those which are easily changed and those which are difficult or impossible to change. For example, when prime agricultural land is subdivided and houses built, it is virtually impossible to plow it up and grow crops again. Or, when an area of wilderness is developed with mines and logging it is difficult or impossible to return it to its former condition. However, when an area which is presently wilderness is so designated by legislative action, the decision can easily be reversed. If our children and grandchildren decide we were foolish to set aside wilderness and would prefer to have such timber and minerals as exist in these areas, they can (assuming we are still a democracy) have them by calling upon their government to change the legislation. In other words, wilderness to other uses is not very difficult to accomplish; the reverse is virtually impossible.

How, then, are land-use decisions to be made, considering these and a multitude of other factors? Of course, one would consult the owner of the land. In this the people of the United States. Presumably this includes all citizens and probably should consider future generations, but it is difficult to obtain the views of the unborn and even of many of our existing society. We can only logically consult the voters, through their elected representatives in Congress. There is one vital consideration: the people we consult must be as well informed about the decision they are being asked to make as is possible. They should be informed about the values to be given up, the values to be received, the relative ease of reversing the decision, and anything else which might be pertinent. The public hearings on the wilderness bill informed many people, far more than those attending, and I feel that the public is about as well informed on wilderness as we can expect (obviously we cannot expect anything like complete understanding). I feel that the voters are ready to make this decision and should be permitted to do so.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON LAS VEGAS HEARINGS

1. Mining and wilderness: Mining (not prospecting) and wilderness are totally incompatible.

2. Hunting and wilderness: Personally, I object to firearms in wilderness areas, but it is easy to avoid use of these areas in the hunting season and the hunters actually disturb the environment very little (possibly improve it), so I do not feel that hunting is incompatible with wilderness.

3. Grazing and wilderness: I have no objection to livestock in the wilderness areas in fact, I enjoy seeing them in these areas. The use of horses for transportation can present difficult administrative problems, but I feel that horse transportation on main trails is probably desirable.

4. Water and wilderness: There was conflicting testimony on water. This does not reflect upon the testimony, but points up the need for more research on the extremely complex subject of water. I would suggest that the testimony presented by the Salt River project be examined very critically; there are many ways to increase water supply besides burning the watershed, and, in fact, too little is known about the subject of watershed manipulation to reach any certain conclusions. The Southwest will always be short of water, in my opinion, since the population growth is so great. Possibly some rise in price and increasing difficulties might as well start now as in 10 or 20 years.

5. Rationing and wilderness: I believe that rationing, as used in the hearings, meant some type of quota system for determining use. There is also the possibility of charging a fee for use, which might be considered a form of rationing. I feel that charging for use would probably only effectively ration local use, especially that of hunters. This might be desirable. I hope a quota system won't ever be necessary, but if use becomes very great, many values of the wilderness will diminish or disappear.

6. San Gorgonio: Far too much time was spent discussing this area, but it did have the value of demonstrating the desirability of having wilderness legislation. In its present use the area apparently has great value, however measured, and these values would obviously be destroyed by the development of a ski area. A wilderness cannot become just a little bit exploited in a place like southern California; it would be analogous to becoming just a little bit dead.

Mr. Chairman, and members of your committee, thank you for holding your hearings and thank you for reading my comments, I hope they include something of value to you.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. THOMPSON,
Assistant Professor of Forestry.

BANNING, CALIF., *December 27, 1963.*

Re wilderness hearings, Las Vegas, January 13–14.

Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that I will be unable to attend the wilderness hearings to be held in Las Vegas, Nev., Monday and Tuesday, January 13 and 14, but would like, nevertheless, to put my opinions on record, I am addressing this letter to you, in expectation that you will make note of it there.

Please record my vote in favor of the wilderness bill, S. 4, which has already passed the Senate (April 9, 1963) and/or of the several bills (9070, 9101, 9162 through 9165) which are now before the House.

I feel it most imperative in these times of "exploding population" that sound measures be taken in protection of our fast-disappearing wilderness areas. Let us have fewer encroachments upon them by "nibbling" commercialism.

Being a resident of San Gorgonio Pass, I am particularly interested in the preservation of the San Gorgonio wildlife and winter sport area. We already have seen what commercialization can do on San Jacinto slopes. Won't this satisfy the local commercial interests? Why must they encroach upon San Gorgonio too?

If you will be kind enough to make note of this protest at the Las Vegas hearings, I would greatly appreciate it. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. THOMAS F. TRACY.

TROPICAL AUDUBON SOCIETY,
Miami, Fla., January 18, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Lands,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARING: The Tropical Audubon Society has by resolution for the past 3 years unanimously supported proposals for a wilderness bill which in fact and purpose will safeguard some of our vanishing natural heritage. We favor a policy of complete wilderness protection of our national parks, wildlife refuges, wilderness, primitive and wild areas, so classified as such by the National Forest Service, and other areas to be included which are deemed worthy of preservation in their natural state. Please enter this letter in the permanent record.

Very truly yours,

DADE W. THORNTON, *President.*

SRP05823

TULARE FISH & GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Tulare, Calif., January 15, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: The Tulare Fish & Game Protective Association supports the original wilderness bill, S. 4, which passed the Senate on April 9, 1963. We feel that other bills and resolutions are in conflict with the intent of the original wilderness bill.

We therefore hope that your committee will not accept any substitutes to wilderness bill S. 4.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. PODLESAK,
President.
CHARLES MCKINNEY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
SOUTHERN REGIONAL DIVISION,
Las Vegas, Nev., January 20, 1964.

Hon. WALTER BARING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: I would like the following included in the records of the Las Vegas hearings on the wilderness bill.

My name is Herbert C. Wells. I am assistant professor of engineering science at the University of Nevada Southern Region Division in Las Vegas. I am representing myself in this hearing.

I am a mining engineer, a skier and a conservationist. If these things appear to be incompatible I will explain their relationship. As a mining engineer who does some consulting and has 8 years' experience in mining, I like to see the maximum exploitation of our mineral resources. As a skier I like to see the greatest convenience of ski area development available to the population, but as a conservationist I deplore the eternal destruction of our vast scenic resource for the convenience of very few.

I believe that provision for thorough evaluation of existing mineral resources should be made not only in wilderness areas but in all of our lands. Development of most minerals can be made without destruction of the scenery, but in those areas to be set aside it should be done only during a national emergency or exceptionally acute international shortage of a strategic mineral. Even then, any exploitation should be handled in such a fashion that the scenic and wilderness values are maintained.

As a skier I am aware that one of the greatest skiing countries on earth, one which has produced a number of international ski gold medalists, Norway, had no ski lifts until the Olympics were held there. This means that skiing is very definitely possible in places such as San Gorgonio without a winter sports corridor or other change to the wilderness area.

Any person examining the record will note that I spoke on behalf of a winter sports corridor into the San Gorgonio Primitive Area at the Forest Service hearings in the spring of 1947. I've matured since then. It is a wonderful place to ski and hike and camp. It would be a good place for a winter development, but these arguments were used to put in the infamous tramway on Mount San Jacinto. Many of those people arguing about the San Gorgonio area have been there only on a quickie tour, but I've camped in Mushy Meadows and at the foot of little Christmas Tree Hill and skied the Big and Little Draws. I'd like my children to be able to go there or places like it to camp out and ski, too. They'll be able to get the satisfaction of a good day's skiing and a long run back to the campsite, a satisfaction not known to a large number of today's skiers who knock it without trying it, or think only in terms of all downhill and a ski lift back up.

I saw the mess of tin cans and general debris left by the Tube company camp on the top of the mountain after World War II. I've seen the beer cans floating in Tenaya Lake since the new trans-Yosemite Highway opened; Kleenex bushes in bloom along all of our highways; and the general mess usually found in the developed park and forest areas. We need those developed areas, but we need wilderness areas, too.

Incidentally, there are many areas, not proposed for wilderness use, where snow is good and skiing potential high. Some of them are in the San Gabriels

SRP05824

closer to the population than San Gorgonio. It's too bad some of the effort which is going into attempting to break down the wilderness bills can't be put into developing what is more readily available.

I will sincerely hope that a strong wilderness bill with a mineral evaluation as outlined above but without normal exploitation possibilities will be passed at the next session of Congress.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my views.

Sincerely,

HEBERT C. WELLS,
Assistant Professor of Engineering Science.

WESTERN MINING COUNCIL, INC.,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Santa Cruz, Calif., January 22, 1964.

Re wilderness bills.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: As president of Western Mining Council and representing 18,000 small miners throughout the West, I would like to inform you and your committee that we are opposed to any wilderness legislation. We feel that the present procedures offer adequate protection for wilderness areas and that there is no need for any new legislation.

Should you and your committee report a wilderness bill out of your committee, I would like to make the following recommendations:

(1) The public lands involved should always remain under the control of Congress.

(2) Any additions or subtractions to these areas can only be done by an affirmative vote of Congress.

(3) All wilderness areas should be carefully surveyed and should not include minerals and other natural resources equal or superior to wilderness values.

(4) A method should be devised for resurveying these areas at certain stated intervals (every 10 years or so). This would give Congress the opportunity to review the need of our mineral resources and to take into consideration new recovery methods.

(5) A strong development program for our domestic minerals is vitally needed for the defense and economy of the United States. Therefore, by its very nature, the recovery of mineral deposits must supersede wilderness values. I therefore recommend that any wilderness legislation include the same mineral entry as other public lands.

Sincerely yours,

NEWELL H. LEPPERT.

P.S.—We also urge prompt enactment of H.R. 8305 or H.R. 8405.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 1, 1964.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIRS: Subject: Wilderness bills H.R. 930 (Saylor); H.R. 9070 (Saylor); H.R. 9101 Quie); H.R. 9162 (Dingell); H.R. 9163 (Reuss); H.R. 9164 (O'Hara); and H.R. 9165 (Bennett).

Request: That no amendment be added to these pending wilderness bills that would weaken their area protection, or remove any area coming under their protection.

Reason: My wife, two sons, and I hike in, camp in, and enjoy these areas in their natural beauty now, and I want my grandchildren and theirs also to be able to enjoy them, too.

Please include this letter in your hearing record to be held in Las Vegas, Nev., on January 13, 1964.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE F. WILMINGTON.
PATRICIA WILMINGTON.

 SRP05825

UPPER MARLBORO, MD., *December 27, 1963.*

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Chairman Public Lands Subcommittee, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Las Vegas, Nev.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please accept my statement on behalf of the wilderness preservation bills S. 4 and H.R. 9070. I understand hearings have been scheduled on this legislation in January 1964.

I am David B. Wilson, 41, of Upper Marlboro, Md., and employed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as agricultural research technician at ARS, Beltsville, Md.

About 1 year ago in reading the American Forestry Association magazine I learned about the trail riders of the wilderness. This led to a very memorable ride with their Pecos wilderness expedition this past September. Until then I did not know of the wilderness areas. I was very much impressed with the real wilderness, the absence of picnic and camp rubble now found in so many of our public recreation areas, and the lack of commercialization. It was great to slow up from the go-go-go of nowaday life and enjoy the untrampled woods and see wildlife in its natural habitat. The editor of our local newspaper was so impressed with my telling of the trip into the wilderness that he had me write it up for publication. So many folks I have talked with want to know more about the wilderness areas.

I feel that the wilderness areas are our only hope for a bit of America to remain in its natural, majestic, God-made grandeur. I am planning to pack again into the wilderness in 1964 and to take a friend along.

I would appreciate this statement being filed for the records in support of the wilderness preservation legislation.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID B. WILSON.

WITTEK PRODUCTS CO.,
Van Nuys, Calif., January 13, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Passage of the Wilderness Preservation Act in the House of Representatives is vital to the establishment of a fair and impartial national policy for management of our remaining wild land resources.

An overwhelming majority of individual and organization conservationists have, during the past 6 years, with widespread public support, devoted their most sincere efforts to including in the Senate Wilderness Act (S. 4) those provisions which will preserve an irreplaceable reservoir of ecologic and natural assets in the wilderness preservation system, for the highest purposes which ours and future generations will surely assign to them.

It is for this reason that the Senate form of the Wilderness Act (S. 4), or alternately, Representative Saylor's bill (H.R. 9070), without weakening amendments, are most highly to be recommended for passage by the House of Representatives.

Please make this letter part of your record.

Sincerely,

RUDOLPH J. WITTEK.

THE WOMAN'S CLUB OF HAWTHORNE,
Hawthorne, Calif., January 9, 1964.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We are in support of the wilderness bill in its original form as passed by the Senate.

We propose immediate action by the House without any crippling amendments.

Very truly yours,

MRS. THELMA C. YOUNG.

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
THE WOMAN'S CLUB OF INDIO,
Indio, Calif., January 4, 1964.

CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Woman's Club of Indio, with a membership of 180, has in the past supported legislation establishing an adequate wilderness system. We wish to be on record in support of the new wilderness bill, H.R. 9070, introduced by Mr. John Saylor, of Pennsylvania, and others.

We urge passage at an early date.

Sincerely,

MRS. FRIEND F. WILSON, *President.*

CARMICHAEL, CALIF., *January 10, 1964.*

Representative WALTER S. BARING,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I note that hearings are being held on the wilderness bills out in the western area. Las Vegas, Nev., appears to be nearest to where I live. Please enter the following statement in the official record.

S. 4 is my choice, but if nothing can persuade Mr. Aspinall to report it out of committee, I wish to go on record as favoring H.R. 9070, H.R. 9101, or H.R. 9520 which appear to be identical bills.

I am an educator and I am much concerned over the rapid disappearance of wilderness areas—I feel they are vital to our continued existence as a nation from the standpoint of scientific studies in ecology and for conservation of vital natural resources.

Sincerely,

EFFIE C. YEAW.

PETITION

Yucaipa Valley Garden Club, Yucaipa, Calif., appeals to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., to favor a good wilderness bill without an amendment to exclude a part of the San Gorgonio wild area and other wild areas for commercial development.

Club members do not want commercial projects in the only wild area in southern California accessible to free public use. This area, if commercialized, would result in the destruction of valuable watershed. It is the headwaters of the Santa Ana River. Denuded slopes, water source destruction, and the beauties of the wilderness would be destroyed. The public would no longer have free use of the area.

Following are signatures of citizens protesting this ultimate wilderness destruction:

(Sixty-four signatures).

STATE OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
DIVISION OF FORESTRY,
Carson City, Nev., January 7, 1964.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
U.S. Congressman for Nevada,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As State forester for Nevada I have been asked to send you my views for the record on pending wilderness legislation to be presented at a public hearing in Las Vegas on January 13, 1964. These are as follows:

We now have several million acres in wilderness areas in national forests, parks, and wildlife refuges. To my knowledge the administration of these lands has been handled in a competent manner by the responsible agencies. They have recognized the need and have been working toward meeting it. I therefore believe that additional wilderness legislation at this time is prema-

SRP05827

ture and would create confusion and additional complexity in the management of our natural resources.

The proper approach, I believe, would be to establish a public-land law review study, as proposed by Representative Aspinall, of Colorado, and then reconsider wilderness and other needs in the light of the study results.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE ZAPPETTINI, *State Forester.*

O