All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between the Regents of the University of California and Edward C. Crafts, dated 25 March 1975. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Library, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. The legal agreement with Edward C. Crafts requires that he be notified of the request and allowed thirty days in which to respond.
Edward C. Crafts, 1959
Photograph courtesy
U.S. Forest Service
TABLE OF CONTENTS -- Edward C. Crafts

PREFACE i

DESCRIPTION OF SERIES iii

BIOGRAPHY OF EDWARD C. CRAFTS vii

INTERVIEW HISTORY viii

I THE FOREST SERVICE, 1950-1962: STAFF AND RESPONSIBILITIES 1

Duties as Assistant Chief of the Forest Service 1
Comments on Chiefs of the Forest Service 3
Change from Democratic to Republican Administration, 1953 4

II INTER-AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS 7

Relative Independence of the Forest Service 7
Soil Conservation Service 8
National Park Service 9
Bureau of Land Management and Army Corps of Engineers 12
Olympic Park Boundaries 13
Forest Service Support of State Forestry Departments 14
Congressional Committee's Oversight of the Forest Service 16

III TIMBER INDUSTRY RELATIONS: POLICY, PRESSURE AND PUBLIC REGULATION 19

Timber Resource Review 19
Pressures to Increase the Cut 22
Role of Organizations and Special Reports 24

IV CHANGES IN FOREST SERVICE POLICY 27

Custodial Management to Intensive Management 27
Recreation and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission 28

V CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS 32

Oregon and California Controverted Lands 37
Mining Claims 40
Timber Management 43
Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act 47
Wilderness Bill 54
Outside Help: Individuals and Organizations 57

INDEX 66
THE RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE SERIES
Tape-recorded interviews on
THE HISTORY OF FOREST POLICY, 1900-1950

Clepper, Henry, Executive Secretary, Society of American Foresters.
The Society of American Foresters, 1968

Crafts, Edward C., Assistant Chief, U.S. Forest Service
Congress and the Forest Service, 1950-1962, 1975

Dana, Samuel T., Dean, School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan.
The Development of Forestry in Government and Education, 1967

Gill, Tom, Forester, author, head of Pack Foundation.
The Summary of the Career of Tom Gill, International Forester, 1969

Granger, Christopher, Assistant Chief, U.S. Forest Service.
Forest Management in the United States Forest Service, 1965

Hall, R. Clifford, Director, Forest Taxation Inquiry.
Forest Taxation Study 1926-1935, 1967

Hartzog, George B., Director, National Park Service.
The National Parks, 1965, 1973

Hornaday, Fred, Executive Vice-president of American Forestry Association.

Keller, John W., Forester, Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters.
Recollections of Gifford Pinchot, 1974

Kelley, Evan W., Director, Guayule Rubber Project, U.S. Forest Service.
The Making of a Regional Forester, 1974

Kotok, I. E., Assistant Chief, U.S. Forest Service, state and private forestry; research.
The U.S. Forest Service: Research, State Forestry, and FAO, 1975

Kniepp, Leon F., Assistant Chief, U.S. Forest Service.
Land Planning and Acquisition, U.S. Forest Service, 1975

Marsh, Raymond, Assistant Chief, U.S. Forest Service.
Collected papers and unedited transcript of interviews
Peirce, Earl, Chief, Division of State Cooperation, U.S. Forest Service.
Salvage Programs Following the 1938 Hurricane, 1968

Pomeroy, Kenneth, Chief Forester for American Forestry Association.
The American Forestry Association: Operations, 1968

Ringland, Arthur, Regional Forester, Region 3, U.S. Forest Service; Secretary of National Conference on Outdoor Recreation; founder of CARE.
Conserving Human and Natural Resources, 1970

Roberts, Paul, Director, Prairie States Forestry Projects, U.S. Forest Service.
Forest Service Issues and Legislation to 1951, 1974

Shepard, Harold B., in charge of Insurance Study conducted by the Northeastern Experiment Station with Yale University.
The Forest Insurance Study, 1967

Sieker, John H., Chief, Division of Recreation and Lands, U.S. Forest Service.
Recreation Policy and Administration in the United States Forest Service, 1968

Swift, Lloyd, Chief, Division of Wildlife Management, U.S. Forest Service.
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Department Head
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Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
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The significance of the proposed project for securing information from certain selected people long associated with the development of the U. S. Forest Service rests on two facts. On the one hand, there are a small number of men still alive whose personal experience and memory covers virtually the entire history of the growth and development of the Forest Service since 1905. If we are to secure the best possible insights and understanding of the history of the Forest Service as a conservation agency the recollections and mature viewpoints of these men who were associated with the Service throughout their careers would provide unique and invaluable source material. The time remaining during which this information could be collected is obviously limited. A second justification is found in the fact that to date there has been no comprehensive historical evaluation of the role of the Forest Service as a conservation agency. Ise has published a critical history of National Park policy under the sponsorship of Resources for the Future which serves as an initial evaluation of the National Park Service. About 1920 Ise published a study on forest policy but that is obviously now confined to only a very small part of the significant history. A series of views such as are suggested in the present proposal could provide both new source material and the inspiration for a critical historical evaluation of the Forest Service.

The results would be of the greatest importance to the field of forest policy. The Forest Service pioneered both the articulation and the implementation of the concepts of sustained yield and multiple use as policies for natural resource management in the U. S. It instituted numerous innovations in the organization and administration of programs of handling federally owned resources. It developed on a large scale new techniques for cooperation with state and local units of government in such matters as fire protection and landowner education. It pioneered in a number of respects in the development of research as a functioning guide to operational policy of the government. Each of the contributions just enumerated are of the greatest possible significance for forest policy and for important implications going far beyond the natural resources field. The project here proposed would throw much light on the way in which each of the innovations noted above developed and would contribute greatly to our understanding of them.

Very sincerely yours,

Henry J. Vaux
Dean
DESCRIPTION OF SERIES

Interviews: A Documentation of the Development of the U.S. Forest Service 1900-1950

This Resources for the Future interview series on the birth and development of the Forest Service began as a sudden disturbance in the ever-active brain of Ed I. Kotok in early 1964. One wintry day in early 1964, as we were putting away the tape recorder after one of our last sessions together, I mentioned casually that I would not be in the Bay Area for the summer: I had to go East.

Ed's eyebrows shot up. It was obvious that a final piece had fallen into place in a mental jigsaw that he had been carrying around for some time. He said that there were quite a few of his retired colleagues still in Washington, D.C., some of whom were the original "Pinchot boys." If only, he mused, the Oral History Office could find financing for an entire series on the Forest Service, maybe from a foundation like Resources for the Future.

Henry Vaux, then Dean of the School of Forestry at Berkeley, was the logical one to turn to. He gave advice and counsel on a priority system for selecting the men to interview. From deep in his perspective of specialized knowledge of forest policy, he saw the opportunity to preserve information that would otherwise be permanently lost.* At best, the tape-recorded memoirs could reveal, more frankly than annual reports and official letters, some of the political and economic facts of life that influenced the development of policy in the agency. The actual decision-making process, told first-hand and linked with the official rationales and actions on particular issues, could be useful in appraising contemporary policy questions and their multiple alternatives. Today, as in 1905, forest policy is a field where special interest pressures are in a state of varying equilibrium with the public interest. To see the policies and decisions of the past materialize, to witness through the administrators' eyes the expected or (more often) the surprising effect of those actions in the past - such a visible continuum could provide a depth of experience for those who are presently wrestling with the economic and political disequilibrums of resource management.

Horace Albright, a veteran interviewee of oral history operations, lent his encouragement to us and probably his enthusiasm to his friends on the board of Resources for the Future. We contacted three top-priority potential interviewees to see if they were willing to indulge us in our tape recording scheme, and we received a yes, a no, and a maybe. This changed to two yeses and, in place of the no, a substitute interviewee equally as valuable. By late spring, a modest grant to the Oral History Office marked the beginning of the series, Henry Vaux agreed to be Principle Investigator, and we were off.

* See appendix, Letter from Vaux to Fry, March 20, 1964.
Structure of the Series

The series, with a working title of "The History of Forest Service Policy, 1900-1950", began and ended as a multiple use project. Its major aim was to provide tape-recorded interviews with men in the Forest Service who during most of the half-century had been in policy-making positions. The series also served as a pilot attempt to try the relatively new technique of oral history as a method of gathering primary information within a specific subject field (one which might be defined here as the origins, operations, and effects of policy in public administration). The method, in turn, was hung on the superstructure of a list of retirees who were considered to be able to contribute the most to that subject.

Each major interview contains the standard stock of questions on Service-wide controversies of the past: the attempts to reorganize the conservation agencies - specifically, to transfer the Forest Service out of the Department of Agriculture; the efforts to get passage of federal legislation that would have regulated timber management on private lands; the competition with other agencies and with private owners for land acquisition determinations; on-going issues, such as competing land uses like mining or grazing, which often reflected years of patient negotiation with and bearing up under the pressures of well-organized special interest groups.

Each interview covers as well topics that are unique to that particular person's experiences, so that tracing "policy in its origins, operations, and effects," necessitated a detective job to discover, before an interview took place, those policy questions with which the particular individual had had experience. It was here that an interviewee's own contemporaries frequently gave guidance and counsel; advice was also provided by academic specialists in forest economics, recreation, fire control, silviculture, and so on.

Given questions on the same subjects, the interviewees sometimes speak to them from contrasting points of view, and thereby provide a critique of inner validity for the series. For instance, while Lee Kneipp and Ed Crafts comment on the informal power in Congress of the Forest Service's widespread constituency, other men (such as Ed Kotok) who actually had been in the field and involved in local public relations verify how the system worked.

The structure of an oral history series depends on many factors beyond the control of the oral historian: the health of the interviewee, his willingness to interview, and how much he can or will say about his career. The fluid state of our interview list caused our cup to runneth over more than once with more interviewees than we could add to our original list of three. Twice the list was enlarged - and fortunately funded further by Resources for the Future. The phenomenon of expansion was due largely to the tendencies of a few memoirists (especially Christopher Granger, Lee Kneipp, and Raymond Marsh) to touch lightly on events in which he had only slight involvement, then refer the interviewer to the man who could tell the whole story from a leader's eye view. The result is that some of the interviews on the accompanying list are one-subject, supplemental manuscripts.
Results

One will find more comprehensive and general information in the longer interviews of Christopher Granger (who was the head of timber management), Ed I. Kotok (Research; state and private forestry), Leon F. Kneipp (land acquisition and management), Arthur Ringland (field activities in setting up the new forests under Gifford Pinchot), Tom Gill (international forestry), Ed Crafts (Congressional relations), and Samuel T. Dana (Research; forestry education), the latter interviewed in cooperation with Elwood Maunder of the Forest History Society. Earle Clapp (research, Acting Chief), shunned the tape-recorder and is currently proof-reading his own written account of his career, a manuscript that will be deposited in Bancroft Library along with the other interviews.

The single subject interviews consist of Paul Roberts on the shelter belt project of the New Deal; R. Clifford Hall's account of the Forest Taxation Inquiry, coupled with H.B. Shepard's story of the Insurance Study. A view from without is provided by Henry Clepper of the Society of American Foresters and Fred Hornaday and Kenneth Pomeroy of the American Forestry Association - a trio who provide a fitting introduction to the series for the reader. George B. Hartzog, Director of the National Parks, comments on the relationship of the two agencies; Earle Peirce gives a first-hand account of the first time the Forest Service stepped in as principal agent in salvage operations following a disastrous blow-down on both state and private timberlands. John Sieker and Lloyd Swift both contributed a telling picture of their respective divisions of recreation and wildlife management. Without these shorter, from-the-horses' mouth accounts, the series would have sacrificed some of its validity. There are of course still other leaders who can give valuable historic information on policy development, men who perhaps can be included in the Forest Service's current efforts to further document its own Service history.

With a backward glance at the project, one can say that the basic objective of tape-recording, transcribing, and editing interviews with top men in the Forest Service was realized. The question of quality and value of the interviews must be decided later, for the prime value will be measured by the amount of unique material scholars use: the candid evaluations of leaders by other leaders, the reasons behind decisions, and the human reflections of those in authority; how they talked in conversation, how they developed trends of thought and responded to questions that at times were neutral, at other times challenging. The value of the series also depends on how many leads lie in the pages of the transcripts - clues and references that a researcher might otherwise never connect in his mind or in the papers and reports he reads.

Since this series was built with tentative hopes that in the end it could justify itself both as a readable series of historical manuscripts and as a valuable source of easily retrievable, primary material, a master index of uniform entries from each volume was developed after the transcripts came out of the typewriter and landed on the editor's desk. Dr. Henry Vaux helped in setting up the broad areas of subjects to be included, and as entries were
added, the Forest History Society at Yale became interested. At present the development of the index is a cooperative enterprise between the Oral History Office, the Forest History Society, and the U.S. Forest Service. A master index of uniform headings from each volume is available at the Oral History Office and at the Forest History Society.

By-products

One frequently finds that the oral history process is a catalytic agent in the world of research. First, it stimulates the collection of personal papers and pictures which, while valuable during the interview in developing outlines and chronology, are later deposited either with the transcript in Bancroft Library or with related papers in another repository.

Another happy by-product comes from the more literate who are motivated by the interview to do further research and writing for publication. Thus, Paul Roberts is currently writing an entire book, complete with all the documentation he can locate, on the shelter belt, its whys and hows. Ray Marsh is meticulously combining both writing and recording in a pain-staking, chapter-by-chapter memoir which will cover his earliest reconnaissance days, the administrative posts in New Mexico, the fledgling research branch, and his work with Congress; his stories of those earliest years have already appeared in American Forests. Tom Gill, fortunately frustrated by the brevity of the interviews, which were condensed into the short travel schedule of the interviewer, is writing a more comprehensive treatise that will no doubt be unique in this or any other forest history: Tom Gill on Gill and international forestry.

Also, there is the self-perpetuation phenomenon-- oral history begetting more oral history. The interview with National Park Director George Hartzog has led to serious efforts on the part of the Park Service to establish a regular annual interview with the Director-- not necessarily for publication. Also under consideration is a Service-wide plan for oral history interviews of all its major leaders, which could serve as a continuation of the series conducted by Herbert Evison in the early 1960's.

Ed Kotok did not live to see the finished series. Just as Lee Kneipp never saw his finished manuscript, and Chris Granger's final agreement, covering the use of his manuscript, was found still unmailed on his desk after his death. All other contributors, however, were able to devote hundreds of man hours to the reading, correcting, and approving process required in finishing a manuscript. Although Ed did not get to read and approve his own transcript, all who knew him will agree that the series stands as one more symbol of his propensity for plunging in where few have tread before.

(Mrs.) Amelia K. Fry
Interviewer - Editor
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EDWARD C. CRAFTS

Edward C. Crafts was born in Chicago, Illinois April 14, 1910. He was the first director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, U.S. Department of the Interior (1962-69). During that time, he also served as executive director of the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty, a cabinet level coordinating council, and of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission.

Prior to his seven years in the Department of Interior, he spent 29 years as a career civil servant in the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, first in a variety of research positions in several western states and Forest Service regions, then as Chief, Division of Forest Economics in Washington, and for 12 years (1950-62), as Deputy Chief of the Forest Service for Congressional relations, legislation, and program development.

In 1949, he was economic advisor to the U.S. Delegation to the Third World Forestry Congress in Finland.

Dr. Crafts is a professional forester who attended Dartmouth College and holds Bachelor of Forestry, Master of Forestry, Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Science (honorary) degrees from the University of Michigan. He is the only individual to hold distinguished service awards from both the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. He also received a $10,000 Rockefeller Public Service Award from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs of Princeton University. In 1969, he was recipient of Holiday magazine's commendation for a more Beautiful America.

Since resigning from Federal service in 1969, Dr. Crafts has served as special articles editor, American Forests magazine; lecturer at the University of California and Colorado State University; Director of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, and Forest History Society; member of the National Camping and Conservation Committees, Boy Scouts of America; and consultant to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Conservation Association, Corps of Engineers, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Natural Resources Council of America. He is consulting forester for the National Parks and Conservation Association and the Environmental Coalition.

Dr. Crafts is a Fellow of the Society of American Foresters and American Institute of Park Executives, and is an honorary vice-president of the American Forestry Association. He is a member of numerous conservation organizations, and the Cosmos Club.

Honorary societies include: Phi Sigma, Phi Kappa Phi, Sigma Xi, and Les Voyageurs honorary forestry fraternity.

Dr. Crafts is married to the former Sara Sherwood, has two children, three grandchildren, and lives at 11910 Hitching Post Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

June, 1972
INTERVIEW HISTORY

At the time of the interview, April 3, 1965, Mr. Crafts was Director of the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. As we talked in the relative quiet of a private room, the annual meetings of the Wilderness Society swirled around us in San Francisco's Hilton Hotel.

Background for the interview had been gathered from major books on the history of forestry and forest policy, and previous memoirs produced in the series, such as Raymond Marsh's, Ed I. Kotok's, Lee Kneipp's, and Earle Clapp's, including much off-tape talk with those reservoirs of Forest Service history. Since the interview had to be squeezed in between sessions at the Wilderness Society conference, Berkeley's School of Forestry dean Henry J. Vaux and Professor Albert Lepawsky had been called upon for counsel in setting priorities for topics to record.

The entire session could have been spent on any single phase of this conservationist's working life, such as his early work (before World War II) in forest economics in Research, the land classification study in California under A. Everett Weislander, in which his boss, Ed Kotok, says that the Ph.D. in economics did a remarkable job in resolving conflicts between Weislander, Weeks, and Carey L. Hill on questions of emphasis and points of orientation for the report so it could be published. Kotok recalled that when he left for Washington to be Assistant Chief of Research, he "took Crafts along to handle the economics division" and that on inspections of research stations he was a "splendid analyzer."

The portion of Crafts' career that was chosen for this short memoir was his position without portfolio, as Special Assistant to the Chief. Beginning in 1950, this job called on him to handle relations of the Forest Service with Congress, with external agencies (and all the conflict of overlapping and hoped-for jurisdictions that that implies), and with pro- and anti-pressure groups over the country. Add to that his general responsibilities in program planning, and it appears likely that he influenced the course of forest policy and practice more in those years than any other.

Kotok, in looking back over that period, saw Crafts as one who had been well trained in the legislation investigations that were a part of Crafts' previous job in the division of economics. The former head of Research saw three attributes of Crafts which probably made him quite valuable to Chief
Watts: (1) He was fast and could meet deadlines. (2) He would
give complete pros and cons to Watts, was a good analyst, wrote well
but did not indicate final decisions. (3) In conferences, he took
good notes, could analyze the proposals made and weigh them in re-
lation to the problems at hand.

Crafts' no-nonsense approach to the interview, therefore,
did not come as a surprise. His razor sharp perception of what
we were attempting eliminated any extraneous comments. In the
short conference we had before taping, he quickly scanned the
group of suggested topics, made a few rearrangements in the out-
line, added one or two of his own and beefed up others with
subtopics, and we were off. Rarely has this office enjoyed the
beauty of the succinct interview as much.

When the rough-edited transcript was sent to Director
Crafts for his approval, a great deal of judgment on his part and
negotiations (handled mainly by Dean Vaux) were necessary to de-
cide whether it should be under seal or not released at all.
In the meantime, funds to continue the series mandated a sus-
pension of the project here for that reason alone. His decision
to release it came shortly before the Forest Service solved the
funding problem and all could proceed. Crafts went over the
rough transcriptions with his critical eye, adding a needed
point of information here, changing an ambiguity there, and at
last his copy was final typed.

In the meantime, and quite unrelated to our efforts, he
was invited to the Berkeley campus in the spring of 1970 as
Regents' Lecturer in Forestry and Conservation, during which
time we taped a seminar he held on the recent creation of the
Redwood National Park. With funds from Save-the-Redwoods
League, the transcript was typed. However, the difficult re-
cording conditions for all voices in the large classroom pro-
duced inconsistent tape and a questionable transcript. At
Crafts' suggestion, readers are referred to his series in the
June and July 1970 issues of American Forestry, which is the
same material "except," as Crafts notes, "for some personal
references." In the same letter (15 May, 1975) he says that
his papers are scheduled, under a written agreement, to go to
the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan
Historical Collection at some future date.

Amelia R. Fry
Interviewer-Editor

5 September 1975
Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California at Berkeley
I THE FOREST SERVICE, 1950-1962: STAFF AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Duties as Assistant Chief of the Forest Service

Fry:
I would like to ask you first, what were the functions of the Assistant Chief of Forest Service, which was your job from 1950 to 1962?

Crafts:
In this particular job, I succeeded Ray Marsh; he in turn succeeded Earle Clapp. This job was, in effect, the deputy or associate chief position, although not in name. The alleged functions were long range program planning, policy formation, legislative matters, and Congressional relations.

My duties cut across the board and covered all Forest Service activities. They were not confined to just National Forest matters, research matters, or state and private matters. They covered everything.

But a great deal of what the job really included was what Chief McArdle used to refer to as being "in charge of snakes." In other words, my job involved putting out the "fires," getting things done behind the scenes as well as the more routine matters mentioned above.

Fry:
Did you find that the facilities of the Forest Service really were at your disposal?

Crafts: Definitely yes.

Fry: How about the research division?

Crafts: No question. I could call on anyone that I felt like in the Washington office or the field. Of course, we worked things out as to the availability of manpower on a negotiated basis, but if we really

Interview Date: April 3, 1975, Hilton Hotel, San Francisco.
Crafts: needed someone for a top priority job, he was made available.

[Lyle F.] Watts was Chief when I became Assistant Chief, but he was there for only two more years and then he retired. Following him was [Richard E.] McArdle.

Sometimes when a major project like the Timber Resources Review or some other major undertaking came along, we had to divert many people from their normal assignment.

Then, I had my own small program and legislative staff of a dozen or fifteen people who were with me all the time. There were two division heads, one for legislation and one for program planning. In addition, I had a key staff assistant whom you may have heard of. Certainly she deserves mention; namely, Mrs. Martha Combe, a professional who is with me now in my present assignment as Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. She is an extremely intelligent and able person. She was the highest paid woman in the history of the Forest Service up to that time. In effect, she crashed the Forest Service's barrier against high level professional women.

Fry: Did you find that your job expanded or changed in character as you went along?

Crafts: It expanded tremendously. The Forest Service, during that period, encountered many problems and expanded its activities. I suppose any group that is in the responsible position of running the Forest Service feels that their particular time is the time when most of the controversies come and most of the difficult problems and policy issues arise. In addition to expansion and many other problems, we had a complete change of the top staff over a relatively short period of about four or five years.

I cannot compare this period with other periods, but I do know that during that ten-year period, Forest Service work became more difficult at the policy level and we underwent and survived a major transition from long-standing Democratic
Crafts: to Republican administration without serious harm. Also, our Congressional relations expanded a great deal. Many more legislative items were thrown at us because there was constantly increasing pressure on the Forest Service in numerous ways.

Also, we would undertake to defend against certain adverse things, like the Stockmen's Bill or the Ellsworth Compensation-in-kind Bill, or other infringements on long-standing principles. So over a period of ten years, I would say that the work both changed and increased a great deal.

Comments on Chiefs of the Forest Service

Crafts: I would like to say something, too, about the two Chiefs of the Forest Service with whom I was closely associated. Although I knew Watts before I was Assistant Chief, he served only for a couple of years after my appointment before he retired. He had more courage than anyone with whom I had ever been associated in the Forest Service. It took tremendous guts to stand fast in the face of the pressures and opposition to which he was subjected. I should also say that Chris Granger, who retired during this transition period, was one of the most capable, intelligent, and astute men that the Forest Service ever had. Many people felt that he should have been Chief, particularly during the period when [Earle H.] Clapp was Associate Chief. When Watts was picked as Chief instead of Clapp, they had a confrontation and Clapp walked out. After that Watts and Granger were the two really strong men during the early 1950's.

McArdle was a very different type of Chief. He was much more flexible and much more amenable to pressures. I would say, without criticism of him, and with 20-20 hindsight, that he didn't stand firm the way he should at all times. But at times he was like a rock. He depended heavily on his staff but was quite flexible to the desires of the Secretary's office, and there were times, in my judgment, when he should have been more firm under pressure. On the whole, he was a good Chief;
Crafts: he did a good job and he had things going for him that Lyle [Watts] didn't. In my judgment, comparing the two men, Lyle was more courageous and in some ways more capable but he will never in history get the credit he deserves. Both men dedicated their lives to the Service.

Fry: I would like to back up and ask you if you would like to comment on any differences of attitudes and outlooks between Granger and Clapp that might have led to--

Crafts: No, it was not that. Clapp was the Associate Chief and he was the natural one to succeed [Ferdinand A.] Silcox when the latter died. Clapp was the natural successor but he never had a chance because he opposed Franklin D. Roosevelt on the Olympic National Park fight. This cooked his chances of becoming Chief. So although while he functioned as Chief, he never was appointed to the position. Actually, there were no major policy differences between Granger and Clapp. They worked beautifully together. But Clapp was an idealist; he had a fixation on the one thing that he was trying to get, namely, public regulation of private forest practices. Chris was much more balanced. He ran the national forests. He had better relations with Congress and people. In my judgment, he was about the most capable man I have ever known. I admired him greatly.

Change from Democratic to Republican Administration, 1953

Fry: You mentioned McArdle in contrast to Watts. During this period of changeover in administrations, I detect that there was some change of outlook on professionalism.

Crafts: Let me talk about the change of the administration while we are on that subject. The way this was handled demonstrated part of the astuteness of the Forest Service. You see, Lyle was a Democratic appointee of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Although the Forest Service has been and still is a career organization with a non-political approach, nevertheless part of Watts'
success was due to the fact that he always had his antenna out. He was sensitive to the political winds. Watts knew that he was going to be leaving shortly and he talked with me at length about the timing of his retirement in order to best make the transition for the Forest Service in case Eisenhower was elected and the Democrats lost. It was pretty obvious that this was the way it was going to go. Watts had a hard time deciding whether he should retire before or after the election. He decided (and I think very wisely) to retire beforehand. This also explains why McArdle was picked as Chief to succeed Watts from among the other Assistant Chiefs. McArdle served as Assistant Chief in charge of state and private forestry. He is a good extrovert; he had good relations with the states and with industry. The job he had was to hand out money. He did not have to make the hard negative decisions. The tough part of Forest Service administration is running the national forests.

Therefore, Mac was the only one that we thought might have a chance to ride out the change in administration. He had the most friends and the fewest enemies. This was really why he was selected and our plan to continue the Forest Service's tradition of a career chief worked because McArdle did ride out the change of administration. However, it was touch and go several times when the change came whether he would make it.

There was a clean sweep when the Eisenhower administration came in. Just before they took office, [Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft] Benson interviewed the bureau heads for about fifteen minutes apiece. Mac did not know whether he was going to be retained. Ultimately, it turned out that he was, but it was a very precarious situation for about six months. All of the career heads and their immediate assistants in all of the bureaus were under suspicion. There was no mutuality of confidence. The newly elected and appointed officials did not trust the holdovers. This was made worse by a number of incidents.

Perhaps the number one blunder was when Benson assembled everyone in the Department who was
Crafts: GS-14 or above in one of the cafeterias. There were several hundred people there. Benson gave us a lecture about how he wanted a day's work for a day's pay, and so on.

This sermon was to the highest officials in the Department. Benson was completely out of tune, could not bridge the gap, and right then he alienated himself from his career personnel on which every Secretary is dependent. He never overcame that during the whole period of his administration. It was about six months before there began to be any rapport between the new administration and the holdover career people.

Benson's first Assistant Secretary to supervise the Forest Service was [J.] Earl Coke, formerly one of the vice presidents of the Bank of America. Before that, I think Coke was with the Extension Service. Personally, I got along fine with Coke but a lot of people in the Forest Service did not like him. He was a very effective administrator and he did a good job for the short time that he was there.

He was succeeded by Ervin Peterson—"Pete" we called him. Pete was raised in Coos Bay, Oregon. The back door of his home bordered the Siuslaw National Forest in Southwest Oregon so he had an understanding from boyhood of what the national forests were all about. Pete had a splendid personality and was a very capable man.

I should say this: The Benson appointees were by and large, with a few exceptions, capable people. At the end of six months, the initial period of suspicion was beginning to fade. Benson became more friendly. During some of the earlier difficulties when we never knew whether we had his support or not, as during the stockmen's push for the D'Ewart-Barett Grazing Bills, we finally ended up getting Benson's support so there developed a much better relationship. Peterson, in my judgment, was a magnificent Assistant Secretary of Agriculture except for the fact that because of his aggressiveness and McArdle's desire to please Peterson, he, rather than McArdle, sometimes tended to be the real chief of the Forest Service on major policy matters.
II INTER-AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

Relative Independence of the Forest Service

Fry: This brings up another thing that I would like to have you comment on. That is the position of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture. It seems that the Forest Service traditionally has been more autonomous and independent because it is an agency which does not share its responsibilities for public resource management; functionally it is different from the other agencies within the Department, it does have some independence. Perhaps there has been pressure applied at times to get the head of the Forest Service to be more on an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary level.

Crafts: There were no such moves to raise the chief to a secretarial level during my period. But as I have already said, Assistant Secretary Peterson exercised much greater control over the Forest Service than any other Assistant Secretary we ever had. So actually the position of the Chief, in fact, if not on paper, was downgraded during that time.

As far as the autonomy part goes, the Forest Service is a large organization whose employment ranged from 15,000 to 30,000 people, depending upon the season of the year. It had some eight hundred offices scattered throughout the country. The Forest Service is a very effective political instrumentality. The public land management aspects—the national forests—were different from the other responsibilities of the Forest Service and of the Department of Agriculture. In this respect they were more similar to some of those of the Interior Department.

Unfortunately, many people think the Forest
Crafts: Service is only a public land management agency and forget it has two other major arms. One is research and the other is the cooperative state and private forestry work. The research work was certainly coveted by the Agricultural Research Service and as a matter of fact, was to a considerable extent brought under the supervision of that service. This was sort of a dual situation which could have been very difficult except for the skill of Bryon Shaw, who was head of Agricultural Research Service, and Les Harper, who was in charge of Forest Service research. Thus, Harper really had two bosses—one was McArdle and one was Shaw.

In state and private forestry work we had state relations which were very similar in those days to the forestry work of the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service except that we handed out money to the states for fire prevention and technical forestry assistance.

It should never be forgotten that the theoretical aspects of the practice of forestry tie in very closely with the agricultural sciences.

But the real reason why the Forest Service was more independent than some of the other agencies in Agriculture was because it had the political know-how and the power to be independent. Part of my main job was to build up that political know-how. I remember once when Clint Anderson was Secretary, he said, "God help the Secretary of Agriculture who crosses the Forest Service." This, I think, is a pretty good reflection of the power of that service. The Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers had the reputation around town as being the two most powerful lobbies.

Soil Conservation Service

Fry: I would like to pursue that further, but we should stick to this outline right now. Maybe we can get to that more when we discuss congressional relations. Right now we probably should consider other inter-agency relationships. What about the Forest Service relations to the Soil Conservation Service?
Crafts: The Soil Conservation Service and the National Park Service were probably the main inter-agency problem areas. There was straight-out conflict between the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service on giving forestry assistance to farmers and small timber landowners. Both agencies had the authority to do it; they both did it; they both wanted to do it; neither one was about to give it up.

The Soil Conservation Service built up the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. This was its lobbying arm and very powerful. Finally it took control of the Soil Conservation Service.

The Forest Service had its friends through the state forestry and conservation departments and as it turned out, the two agencies went down parallel and competitive paths. This was very unfortunate—it is still happening. Neither one is about to give up. The agencies would spar around, make gestures of cooperation, but compete for appropriations and favors from the Secretary's office. The main question was that of appropriations. Sometimes this competition would get back to the grass roots. For example, a farm forester appointed by a state with Forest Service financing and a Soil Conservation Service farm forester would both approach the same farmer at the same time and offer him the same assistance. This was very bad. It was bureaucracy at its worst.

Crafts: The National Park Service was another area of great controversy. Relationships with the National Park Service when I took office were quite good on the surface. We used to have frequent exchanges at the top level or policy discussions, monthly social dinners of the respective executive staffs and this sort of thing.

Fry: That was with Newton Drury?

Crafts: No, he was out before I became Assistant Chief.
Crafts:

When Connie Wirth was Director and after McArdle took office, this situation rapidly deteriorated. The National Park Service embarked on its Mission 66 and an expansion program. The Forest Service embarked on Operation Outdoors which was development of the recreational resources of the national forests. There was just a collision course between the two agencies. This was reflected especially at the top.

The National Park Service wanted to acquire more parks and monuments and about the only place they could get them cheaply was from the national forests. If you look at a map of the western national forests and parks, you will find that a great many of the national parks and monuments are surrounded by, and were carved out of, the national forests. There were many more new proposals to further this under the Mission 66 program. The Forest Service was pretty non-cooperative and the National Park Service responded in kind. There developed mutual distrust and personal dislikes. Each agency had its own avenues and private sessions with top people but there were always leaks on these things. The relationship deteriorated to the point where there almost wasn't any relationship at the top.

On the contrary, at the working level (and by that I mean in the field and between the Forest supervisors and the Park superintendents) good relationships continued pretty well. People who were actually running the forests and parks got along all right. But when you got to the policy level and agency objectives, the two drifted further and further apart as long as I was there.

Of course, this is one of the things that I tried to improve in my new job. [George B.] Hartzog and [Edward P.] Cliff are both trying. I think there has been some progress and things have changed somewhat since the fifties, even though there are still numerous suspicions and conflicts. But during that period they were very bad. I remember once when the National Park Service people met at Williamsburg, that agency issued practically a declaration of war against
Crafts: the Forest Service in print. This will go to show you how bad things were.

Fry: Was it over a specific issue?

Crafts: I don't remember off-hand whether it was or not. More likely it was a number of issues.

Fry: Did this then make your job and relations with Congress even more important, since the only body where you could resolve some of these things was in the Congressional hearings?

Crafts: You could resolve them between the Secretaries or by the White House, but you also resolved them through the pressure of public opinion. These pressures usually manifested themselves through Congress. I would say the inter-agency squabbling definitely made our Congressional relations much more important. We stopped a lot of National Park Service shenanigans in Congress. Do you now want to talk about Congressional relations?

Fry: Not yet. I am not sure if I listened closely enough to you or not; did you include the Secretary in this breakdown of relationships between National Parks and the Forest Service?

Crafts: I would certainly include the Assistant Secretaries. This was very bad, because our Assistant Secretary supported us and there was the same thing in reverse over at Interior. As between Benson and [Secretary of Interior Douglas] McKay, relationships were not too good, but they never really got into specifics. Those we stopped at the Assistant Secretary level and went from there to the Hill.

Sometimes [White House Secretary] Sherman Adams would get in on these things, such as the Stockmen's Bill. He would adjudicate some cases for the administration; he was very effective and a very good friend of the Forest Service. Regardless of what happened to him eventually, while he was on duty, I think he did a fine job. He had an understanding of both administration and natural resource problems that not many men who were that close to the President had. You see, he came from a small operating lumber company in New Hampshire. I don't know whether Sherman
Crafts: Adams ever worked for the Forest Service or not. But he had worked for this lumber company and had a pretty good layman's knowledge of forestry.

Fry: Do you think this was largely on his own initiative and not any sort of move by Eisenhower in recognition of the problems between the Forest Service and the National Park Service?

Crafts: From what I know about the setup in the White House during the Eisenhower era, most of the decisions of this nature and level were made by Sherman Adams. I would judge this to be true in the conservation area. He had a special knowledge and interest in conservation, and I think he functioned in conservation pretty much without the President's direction. Eisenhower had no particular interest.

Fry: I was going to ask you something else along the line of relationships between other government departments. What about the Bureau of Land Management?

Crafts: Actually, we had good relations with the Bureau of Land Management. There were no real issues with that Bureau. The only consequential problems with the Bureau of Land Management were with the Bankhead-Jones land utilization areas which subsequently became the National Grasslands. There were some problems in this area but they were relatively minor relating to questions of jurisdiction, exchanges of lands and so on, but these were worked out. Also, there were some differences in timber sale policies between the two agencies which since have culminated to considerable issues, but at that time they were on the back burner. I would say our relationships with the Bureau of Land Management during the period I am talking about were fairly good to good.

Fry: What about the Army Engineers? I don't know whether this enters into the picture or not.
Crafts: Not too much at that time. But since then, the Forest Service has had some problems with the Corps. But during the period that I am speaking of, we had no particular difficulties.

Olympic Park Boundaries

Fry: I wanted to ask you especially about the Olympic Park problem and then the Kings Canyon problem. Or was that too early timewise for you to comment?

Crafts: These issues arose at an earlier period. They were settled for all practical purposes by the time I was Assistant Chief.

Fry: But they kept coming up in Congressional hearings.

Crafts: Yes, that's true, but not in a consequential way. The Olympic Park boundary matter was simply a question that we stayed away from. I mean that had been pretty much settled, and whenever it did come up we would do our best to bury it again. We did not try to reactivate it. Although I believe it could have very easily been reactivated with some stimulus from the Forest Service. But we deliberately chose not to do so.

Fry: Was there some pressure to do so?

Crafts: Oh yes, certainly there was. The timber companies would very much like to have had the question reopened in those years, but there was no point to it. Since then I think the timber companies are not particularly anxious to reopen the question because of the unpopular public reaction that might be engendered. Even at the time I am speaking of, there was not enough popular sentiment to support transfer of some of the Olympic Park back to the Forest Service. So we just buried it, as I have said before. The question may come up sometime in the future, but it did not come up then, largely because we didn't let it come up. We figured that we would not have won if it had arisen. We didn't wish to take on a fight that we knew we would lose.
Forest Service Support of State Forestry Departments

Fry: Would you like to go into any discussion of relationships between the states and the federal government?

Crafts: Yes, I would, because one of the three main areas of operation of the Forest Service involves cooperation with the states and with private forest industry. This includes the cooperative fire protection measures in the Clarke-McNary Act [1924], the farm forestry assistance to private owners, and so on.

The state forestry departments by and large were poorly financed. The heads of these departments were poorly paid, their work was largely fire control. The states were not leading out on their own, with a few exceptions. The heads of the agencies were insecure and in many instances subject to change when the political parties in power changed. They just did not exercise leadership and guidance to the local governments or offer much aid to the private sector. In states where there were big timber industries, they largely controlled the policies and often the appointments to state forestry agencies.

The Forest Service's objective, and I think it was a laudible objective, was to try to build up the strength, quality, and technical and consultant functions of the state forest and conservation departments. We did this utilizing the authority of the Clarke-McNary Act on a matching fund basis. It was very difficult to accomplish much because of the continual changes in the individuals serving as state foresters, plus the fact that the positions they held in state governments were not policy positions at the power level. In other words, we realized that it is necessary to walk before you run, and the state forestry departments were not able to run. We were trying to get some of them to start walking.

So in this area of cooperative relations with the states, we tried very hard to strengthen the states technically, professionally, monetarily, and policywise.
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Gradually the states began to get some expertise. They began to realize that they had to get their views known to the Congress if they were to get federal monies available to match state funds. As a consequence, a few of the leaders in the state forestry departments built a very effective association of state foresters, one of whose principal purposes was to lobby for funds before Congress. Two of the long standing leaders in this field were Perry Merrill of Vermont and Joe Kaylor of Maryland. Over the period of ten years that I'm talking about, there was very great improvement in the state forestry departments and also in their funding.

Nevertheless, state and private cooperation was small in relation to total Forest Service programs. The pressures on the national forests, the funds that went for national forests administration and development, the policy problems, the difficult issues to be faced, and the hard nuts to crack were in the national forests, not in the state and private forestry area.

The cooperative functions still remained a matter of largely fire protection and technical assistance. Although the state and private forestry cooperation improved greatly, just as did research, during that ten-year period, nevertheless, the national forests continued to get the lion's share of attention, and in the eyes of many laymen this was and is the total Forest Service job. Such a view is unfortunate because as a consequence the Forest Service to this day remains unbalanced. Emphasis is still on the national forests, the second emphasis is on research, and the third emphasis is on cooperation with the state and private sector.

Another reason for this unbalanced aspect is that most of the employees of the Forest Service during their early employment are in national forest administration. This is where we were able to train the young men and this was the career ladder by which most of them surfaced toward the top.

Employment in the state and private forestry branch of the Forest Service was small because
Crafts: the employees that actually carried out this work were on state payroll and state employees, even though they were paid in part with federal monies. I think the Forest Service over the years has accomplished a great deal to get the state forestry departments strengthened, to improve the quality of their personnel, to improve the respect with which they are held, to improve the development of a system in state forest complementary to those in the Forest Service and so on. Some of the states which have outstanding state forest systems are Pennsylvania and Michigan, for example.

Fry: Would you like to now go into the relationships with the private forest industries?

Crafts: Well, that gets pretty much into the question of the Timber Resource Review as well as some other matters.

Congressional Committee's Oversight of the Forest Service

Fry: I wanted to ask you about a particular House Subcommittee hearing that urged consolidation of forestry programs of three or four agencies under the Forest Service. Was this an indication that there was some concern about forestry being divided among several federal agencies or was it a concern which emanated mostly from the Forest Service?

Crafts: As a matter of fact, I don't even remember the hearings you refer to so they couldn't have been very consequential. There was no strong effort during that period to move the Forest Service to the Interior Department as had happened from time to time in the past.

Fry: I don't think this is what those hearings were about. I think they were considering moving other forestry functions from other agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management, to the Forest Service.

Crafts: There was no strong movement in that direction either. I don't remember the hearing, as I've said.
Crafts:

I would like to say this, however, even though we may be getting ahead of ourselves:

There was considerable competition in the Congress with respect to the oversight functions of the House Committee on Agriculture on the one hand, versus the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the other, as to which Committee had supervisory responsibility over the Forest Service.

This goes back to the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1936, which gave the Committee on Agriculture the responsibility for "forestry in general and related activities" and it gave responsibility to the Interior and Insular Affairs for the "forest reserves created out of the public domain." You know there are no "forest reserves" any more, as such. They have all been changed to national forests. But probably eighty percent of the national forests were created out of what was once the public domain. The eastern national forests of about twenty million acres are purchased lands, but the western national forests were nearly all created out of the public domain. The two committees were jealous of each other's rights and both were seeking greater control over the Forest Service.

This placed the Forest Service in the very difficult position of being caught in the middle of a jurisdictional fight between two Congressional committees which, as I have said, emanated from lack of clarity and overlapping assignment of responsibilities under the 1936 Congressional Reorganization Statute.

We dealt with both committees, however, and had good relations with both committees; but this was one of the most difficult things that the Forest Service, in general, and I personally, had to do. This question of committee jurisdiction still continues but it has simmered down as personalities have changed. At the time I'm talking about, however, it was a major problem in our Congressional relations. The problem applied on the Senate side as well, although in the Senate it didn't come up as forcefully as it did on the House side. This was because the Senate committees were not so aggressive with respect to the Forest Service.
Fry: The particular hearing to which I referred earlier was a party matter, too. The Democrats came out with a majority report and the Republicans came out with a minority report.

Crafts: I am sorry but this particular matter has just escaped my mind.
Then can we go on and discuss the Timber Resource Review and timber industry relations?

First, let me talk about timber industry relations. We of course had many relations, both compatible and contending ones, with the timber industry in connection with forest management activities in the national forests. We also had them with respect to preparation of the timber resource review. And these were very controversial at times.

The reason the Forest Service undertook the Timber Resource Review is because periodically, since the beginning of the Forest Service, that agency had carried out other similar surveys, including what has been called the Capper Report, the Copeland Report, the Joint Congressional Committee Report, the Timber Reappraisal, and several others. These are all listed in the front pages of the Timber Resource Review itself. For the most part, these were technical studies but they formed the basis for the Forest Service timber program on the national forests and as such were of great importance to the timber industry.

Furthermore, one of the most controversial features of the Forest Service program over the years had been its recommendations for regulation of cutting practices on private timberlands by the states and then if the states didn't come through and do the job, the federal government would have the authority to step in and do it. The timber industry was always strongly opposed to this program.
Crafts: The report that just followed the Joint Congressional Report was called the Timber Reappraisal and was done under the supervision of Raymond Marsh who was my predecessor. That report, likewise, strongly supported public regulation of cutting practices on private timber lands. Watts, when he was Chief, made this one of the strong points of his program.

When McArdle was appointed Chief and when the Benson administration came in, the timber industry was strong enough, pressurewise, and also there had been sufficient time lapse since the timber reappraisal for a justifiable reassessment by the Forest Service of the timber situation presently and prospectively. This is what we did and what ultimately surfaced was the Timber Resource Review. We were not adverse to making this at all because it bought us time with the Republican Administration to reconsider and reformulate policies. We were able to study the question in depth, as we did in the Timber Resource Review, and it was a wise and proper undertaking.

The job took several years, during which time we were able to establish relationships with the new Administration and create some confidence on the part of the Administration with us. So the Timber Resources Review served a dual purpose of helping us to ride out a change in the political administration of the country and also had the unquestioned merit of reassessing our timber basic policy. Therefore, it served both a tactical and meritorious purpose.

However, the timber industry was suspicious of the Timber Resource Review all the way through because the findings of all the previous timber assessments had ended up by recommending public regulation of private cutting practices, and the industry was fearful that the Timber Resource Review would do the same thing. The industry was successful in many respects in causing difficulties. With the exception of a few outstanding leaders in the industry, I would say that the organized timber industry, in general, sniped at the Timber Resource Review all the way through. They questioned our techniques, demanded and succeeded in getting repeated meetings and hearings, they ob-
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jected to this, delayed that, and there was just constant difficulty and harassment on the part of the industry. As I have said, there were some exceptions with respect to farsighted individuals and leaders, but the general tone is what I have outlined.

Furthermore, the timber industry was successful in getting the Timber Resource Review confined to a technical analysis and conclusions of what was happening to the timber resource, but program recommendation as to what to do about it were completely omitted. They later surfaced in 1961 for the national forests in a "Management, Development Program for the National Forests." A program for private lands was prepared but never issued. This program omission was really the major victory that the timber industry achieved as a result of its sniping and harassment tactics.

Also, this was the first time that the Forest Service had ever been forced into that position. The rationale was that the technical resource report, as exemplified by the Timber Resource Review, would shortly be followed by a separate and succinct program report with recommendations for forest lands in all ownerships. However, this never happened and as a consequence, out of the Timber Resource Review and its lack of recommendations, the Forest Service, for the first time in years since the days of [Forest Service Chief] Silcox or even since the days of [Chief] Bill Greeley, abandoned its position of favoring regulations on private timberland cutting.

Much of the Forest Service position, over those many years, was misrepresented, and I can't help but believe that this was done purposely. Actually, the Forest Service timber cutting recommendations were very mild if you study them, but they became a rallying point of opposition and a cause celebre. They gave the industry a reason to make the Forest Service a whipping boy, and individuals in the Forest Service were subjected to a good bit of abuse, as a result of which there were very strong emotions on both sides.
Despite all of this, the Timber Resource Review was a major program undertaking and probably the best analysis technically of the timber situation that the Forest Service had ever made. But it never got translated into an affirmative program of recommendations. This, I believe, was one of the great omissions of the McArdle administration. It was a sign of weakness on the part of the Forest Service.

Pressures to Increase the Cut

On another subject: When timber markets were good, industry lands were increasingly cut over, particularly on the West Coast, and the pressure was on the Forest Service to constantly increase the cut of Forest Service timber as well as to lower its appraised prices and to change its bidding procedures. The industry employed every device at its command to accelerate these two things that would let them get more public timber at less cost.

At the beginning of my time, early in the 1950's, the Forest Service made a great mistake and has had to live with it to this day. Lyle Watts made it, and he admitted it to me privately before he retired. Many people in the Forest Service never did realize it but the Forest Service has never overcome it.

What happened was that when the Forest Service was struggling for timber management appropriations back in the late 1940's and the early 1950's, it related appropriations to the amount of timber that it would guarantee could be harvested off the national forest lands in a particular year. The Forest Service also made a great deal of a point that revenues from national forests exceeded expenditures on the national forest. At that time, this was true because high-price old growth high quality timber was being liquidated.

So the Forest Service was caught in a double bind. First, in order to get money from the Congress, it had to promise to cut so much timber, and second, in order to return more revenues to the Treasury than it expended, it had to cut more
Crafts: and more timber. Once it got itself into that pattern, it has never been able to work itself out. Despite all the silvicultural rationales that have been made, it has been my feeling that the Forest Service probably has been substantially overcutting the national forests in the recent past. Certainly rotations are lowered, and the growing stock is unbalanced.

The third mistake that the Forest Service made, and this is not attributable to Lyle Watts, is that its technicians started to use the term "allowable cut" rather than the term "sustained yield." This may sound like a purely technical distinction, but the difference is that allowable cut is a short term matter which started out to be used as a ceiling above which a cut would not be made in any one year within the long range framework of sustained yield.

Over a period of a few years, however, industry pressure was such that in its literature, its talk, and in other ways, it gradually converted allowable cut to a floor below which cuts should not fall, rather than a ceiling above which they should not go. So allowable cut has pretty much come to mean that the Forest Service should cut at least that much rather than the original concept of cutting no more than the allowable level. In other words, allowable cut was converted from a maximum to a minimum level. Unfortunately you will find this concept all through the Forest Service, especially with the young men who now talk allowable cut constantly and forget the more respected, longer range, and more valid term of sustained yield.

The Forest Service personnel itself talked themselves into this and has pretty much gotten away from the long range concept of sustained yield and the regulation of timber cuts in accordance with the classical forms of timber management as taught in European forestry and as originally practiced in this country. I think this was, and still is, a very great mistake that the Forest Service is making. They did most of these things as a result of Congressional pressures, and pressures that the timber industry
Crafts: was able to bring upon the Forest Service and the Congress. Partly, they did it through mistakes they made themselves and lack of foresight.

Role of Organizations and Special Reports

Fry: In the introduction, or the first chapter of the Timber Resource Review, you mention the various organizations which were on your advisory committee to the Timber Resource Review, such as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the AFL, the CIO, the American Pulp and Paper Association, and a number of others besides the American Forestry Association. Were any of these organizations able to help in any way in fending off the timber industry influence?

Crafts: Some of these organizations were obviously controlled by the timber industry. You take the American Forestry Association. In my judgment, it was then controlled by the timber industry through its advertising and some of its board members.

The Society of American Foresters at that time didn't have any spine in general, and did its best to confine itself to technical matters and avoid controversy. It then was a technical organization, avoided policy and controversy. It has since changed somewhat and I think for the better.

The American Farm Bureau was right in bed, so to speak, with the timber industry. The National Farmers' Grange would have been more independent, and the Farmers Union would have been better still. The American Federation of Labor and the CIO tended to be helpful. The American Paper and Pulp Association, of course, is a timber organization.

Actually, the group you refer to had relatively little impact on the Timber Resource Review though the timber organizations tried some harassment. There was a research advisory committee to the Forest Service, and later on there was established a Multiple-Use Advisory Committee to the Chief, but these were not par-
Crafts: Particularly related to the Timber Resource Review. What I think you are referring to is a group of individuals who were invited to a one-time meeting to be brought up to date and to comment and make recommendations on the Timber Resource Review. That organization was ineffective and it had only the one meeting.

Fry: After your preliminary report came out, is it true that the forest industries got together and had a separate report made by Professor John A. Zivnuska. Is that correct?

Crafts: Yes, that is correct. This is a rather touchy question, but John did do this. The industry hired him and he made a report in which he challenged the Forest Service technical forestry analysis. Its economic analysis, its estimates of timber needs and supply, and his conclusions fit right into what the timber industry hoped they would be. I have never known the contractual arrangements between Zivnuska and the timber industry nor any mutual understandings outside of contract. I would not in any way impugn John's motives or integrity. I am sure he said just what he thought in that report, and I respect his ideas. But I am also pretty sure that the industry had a pretty good idea what his conclusions would be before they took him on. They certainly would not have hired him and paid money to have him come out with a report that would torpedo their viewpoints. Zivnuska's report was used by the industry as a counter-weapon against the Forest Service.

Fry: What about the men who were retained by the Forest Service to review the preliminary draft of the Timber Resource Review? In my notes, these consisted of Arnold C. Harberger of the University of Chicago, Samuel Dana of the University of Michigan, and John D. Black of Harvard.

Crafts: Yes, we hired them to review the report and they made an analysis which we made available to those who wished to see it. We really did this because of the critique of Zivnuska's and to see what three other individuals of reputation would say on some of the points that Zivnuska raised. I suppose you could raise the same question that we
Crafts: knew what their conclusions would be before we hired them, but whether you believe me or not, this was not so. I didn't know Harberger at all. I knew Sam Dana was completely independent, and so was John D. Black.

As I recall, when their reports were prepared some of them were quite critical and others were not, but we used their reports and incorporated many of their comments and suggestions in the final Timber Resource Review. However, their reports were advisory to us and we exercised the privilege we had of using or rejecting their suggestions. We made up our own minds in the long run.
IV CHANGES IN FOREST SERVICE POLICY

Custodial Management to Intensive Management

Fry:

Do you wish to comment on other changes of emphasis in the Forest Service during this period?

Crafts:

There was one further major thing that happened as far as national forest administration went. Because of increased pressures on the use of economic resources, and the decline of private resources (both timber and grazing on the non-public lands), the Forest Service was in a transition period with respect to the national forests from largely custodial management to more intensive management of the lands and its resources.

This of course did not happen overnight. It was a major transition and was reflected in our policies, appropriations, and manual instructions gradually over this ten year period. I would say that the process is still going on and can be expected to go on. You can expect this as the country matures. Initially the job was to protect the national forests from fire and trespass, but during the 1950s it changed very rapidly from custodial protective management to really affirmative, intensive resource management.

Also, the relative emphasis given to the various resources changed substantially. Grazing lost ground, timber increased in importance, recreation began to come of age, so to speak, although it had a hard road ahead of it because most of Forest Service personnel came up through the timber route, worked on timber sales and that sort of thing.

The Forest Service was very slow to sense a real future in the recreational field. It has paid
Crafts: some penalties for its slowness in this, although it finally began to get aboard and recognize the importance of serving people recreation-wise as well as serving economic uses through the utilization of resources for various commodity purposes. During the 1950's recreation did grow in stature, watershed management stayed about the same in importance, timber management intensified, and the timber cut greatly increased.

It seems that there was some impetus then for change toward more intensive timber management in a period when the pressures were greater than they had otherwise been. The pressures were undoubtedly on for greater utilization and increased timber cut, but along with this went complementary pressures for more intensive management of the timber resource. In other words, more intensive management accompanies and is part of accelerated utilization. This means more planting, more detailed forest management plans, more frequent timber sales. One of the difficult questions was the sales to big timber companies versus sales to small companies. There were more sales perhaps than there should be in order to keep some of the small marginal mills going and a great many other detailed technical things occurred that resulted in more intensive forestry. This can occur, while at the same time the timber cut is increasing. They are not necessarily counterforces.

Recreation and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission

Fry:

What about recreation? I have been told before that some of the recreation policy emphasis in the Forest Service came from the competition of the National Park Service, that the Forest Service felt that if it could get recreation as a more important part of its land use policy, it could compete with the national parks better in land acquisition and so on.

Crafts:

I think it is a reasonably fair statement that the Forest Service was pushed into recreation somewhat by the aggressiveness of the National Park Service.
But I think it was broader than just the question of land acquisition. There were other things, of course, that pushed the Forest Service into recreation, but competition with a sister agency such as the National Park Service was a significant factor.

One of the other important factors was simply the pressure on the use of national forest recreation facilities that were not available but had to be supplied. Some of the maintenance problems were terrible. We had certain situations like one in California where the concentration of use got so bad that the county health authorities closed our campgrounds because the sanitary facilities were unsafe. Along with this sort of thing of course went a great deal of adverse publicity, and you had to do something about it. With a few notable exceptions for a few who could see the handwriting on the wall about recreation, the Forest Service in those days was sort of a reluctant dragon. It didn't demonstrate leadership in recreation as it should have done.

I might add this explanation which may be of some interest. The Forest Service carried out the Timber Resource Review, and no one questioned the Forest Service prerogative to do this because that agency was recognized as an authority in timber resources.

Recreation, however, was something different. The National Park Service and the Forest Service were both deeply involved in recreation. The Bureau of Land Management was involved to a small extent as were several other federal agencies. No one agency was in a position to take on the job of a recreation resource review as the Forest Service did on timber. This is really why the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was established by Congress to do a job on recreation that was comparable to what the Forest Service did unilaterally on timber.

Because recreation was handled by a much broader umbrella of various agencies, no single agency could, on its own initiative, undertake and do a total recreation analysis. The National Park
Crafts: Service could not because its field is limited. Also, there was too much competition between the National Park Service and the Forest Service. The National Park Service concept is primarily that of the park and historical aspects of recreation and not recreation in its far broader sense. The lack of a single executive agency qualified to take on this job is really what gave birth to the Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission.

I remember one day, shortly after completion of the Timber Resource Review, Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League and I sat in my office and pretty well roughed out the bill that ultimately passed and set up the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. This I think is a fact that is not generally known.

When the commission was set up, the Forest Service then really got busy on recreation matters because it didn't know what the commission was going to say. One of the things that the Forest Service did was to make its own internal recreation review, which was completed but never released. There was released a much boiled-down and rather inconsequential version, but the basic analysis that was made was never made public. It exists to this day. I believe I have a copy. As it turned out, the findings of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission were objective and constructive so it was not necessary from the Forest Service viewpoint to release its own review with respect to Forest Service responsibilities. However, the Forest Service did this as a defensive move in order to be ready, if there was need to be ready.

Fry: We should mention here your role in this. You were appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to represent the Forest Service on this study?

Crafts: Do you mean on the Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission?

Fry: Yes, and in the events leading up to it.
Crafts: No, I didn't represent the Secretary of Agriculture in an advisory capacity to the commission. I did work intensively on the legislation that finally passed, and I believe it would not have passed without Forest Service concurrence and help, but the advisory committee of federal officials which the Rockefeller-Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission set up was held at the Secretarial level. The representative for the Department of Agriculture was Assistant Secretary Erwin Peterson. There was nobody from the Forest Service as such on the commission, but there were various Forest Service people that back-stopped Peterson and rendered him staff assistance, including myself. I did some work on various committees associated with the commission and so did numerous other Forest Service people.

Fry: Then your contribution was on the Congressional level in getting the bill through.

Crafts: I think the above pretty well sums up the relationship of the Forest Service to the Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission.
V CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

Fry: Shall we go into the Congressional grazing legislation part then? Would you like to start with the grazing problem?

Crafts: Legislative and program matters including Congressional relations were really my main area of responsibility. During the ten year period that I was Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, I think that Congress passed about 350 acts that in one way or another affected the Forest Service. The average was about 35 a year. Also, an interesting fact is that as of the time I left the Forest Service, there were on the statute books about 700 or 800 acts that in one way or another affected the Forest Service.

Furthermore, although the enactments averaged about 35 a year, the Forest Service through the Secretary's office of the Department of Agriculture took policy positions on about 200 to 300 pending legislative proposals every year. This meant going through the initial consideration of the policy position, preparation of the legislative report, getting departmental review including concurrence of the Solicitor's Office, Budget Bureau review, and all of the necessary procedure that is required to formulate Executive Branch opinion on pending legislative matters. Furthermore, the Forest Service testified on maybe 50 or 75 bills each year at Congressional hearings wholly aside from appropriation matters.

So you can see that the matter of handling pending legislation was a continuing and major undertaking. In a very real sense getting ready for a Congressional hearing on a piece of major legislation is like getting ready for an oral
examination for a doctor's degree. It requires this sort of intensive preparation if the witness is to do a good job at the hearing particularly during the interrogation stage.

One other thing that I think needs emphasizing, which is often overlooked, is that an agency's legislative accomplishments should be gauged frequently as much by what fails to pass as by what actually does get enacted. The reason for this is that much of the pending legislation included proposals that we thought were adverse to Forest Service interests. If these bills did not get enacted and the Forest Service contributed to this adverse decision by the Congress, this was often as important or more important as getting affirmative action. It is true, however, that this negative type of success never appears on the statute books.

The Stockmen's Grazing Bill was of the latter character. The grazing interests were riding high at the beginning of the Eisenhower Administration. They had strong connections with the American Farm Bureau Federation. Further they felt that as a result of the change of administration to a Republican president after so many years of Democratic administration under FDR that now was their opportunity to attain some of the things that they wished. Consequently, the livestock associations pushed very hard for enactment of the so-called D'Ewart-Barrett Grazing bills. The technical aspects of this can be easily looked up and I have prepared a separate statement of the history of what happened in connection with consideration of these bills in early 1953.

Basically, however, the proposed legislation would have converted the privilege of grazing on the national forests and the permits issued in connection therewith to a legal right which meant that the Forest Service would have had taken away its right of distributing grazing privileges among the various applicants in accordance with the need as we saw it.

In a nutshell, the issue here was not a new one and really dated back many years. It involved
Crafts: whether a grazing permit was a revokable privilege or a legal property right, the cancellation of which should be compensable by the government.

It is also important to realize that in the handling of the grazing resources of the national forests these were allocated among the various users by administrative decision rather than on a competitive bid basis as is the case with timber. Also, if the Stockmen's Grazing Bill had been enacted, the purchase and sale of base-ranch property dependent in part upon national forest range would have been greatly enhanced because the grazing permit on the public lands would have been transferred to the new purchaser and the value of it included in the purchase price of the ranch. This actually occurs to a degree although it is a calculated risk on the part of the purchaser and he does not always receive by transfer the grazing privileges that the prior owner had.

Livestock interests pushed this bill very aggressively. The Forest Service prepared strong adverse reports and strong adverse testimony. These were suppressed in Secretary Benson's office by Assistant Secretary Coke, whether on the direction of the Secretary I never knew. The Forest Service was ordered to destroy this material although a few copies of it are still in existence, and I have a set myself.* Hearings were held by both House and Senate but the transcripts were never printed and the Forest Service was not allowed to testify. The Eisenhower administration nearly came down with a favorable position to the stockmen on this matter, but it came to the attention of Sherman Adams, who was shrewd enough to read the public posture involved and directed that the Administration take no position on these bills, which it never did.

This was the bill on which Lee Metcalf, who was then serving his first term in Congress, made his reputation. It was the bill on which Bernard DeVoto wrote many articles in Harper's Magazine including "Conservation on the Way Out," "The West Against Itself," and commentaries in "The Easy Chair."

*To be deposited in the Bentley Historical Library of the University of Michigan historical collections.
Crafts:

The legislation was aggressively pushed by livestock interests and the Forest Service was in a very difficult and precarious time. Secretary Benson was in a most difficult position and it was during the first few months of his administration where no confidence had been developed by him in the Forest Service at that time. As a matter of fact, he was distrustful of the Forest Service.

Being from Salt Lake City, which is of course grazing country, the Secretary had many friends in the livestock industry and he was overwhelmed with letters from stockmen, and friends of stockmen, many of whom were members of the Mormon Church. They would write letters to Secretary Benson addressing him as "Dear Brother Benson." That sort of thing placed him in a very difficult position.

Some of these situations we had to explore and examine in the field, particularly complaints about Forest Service administration of a particular grazing permit. Usually we did this by sending out one of our grazing experts who was likewise a Mormon to take a look at it, and thus we cancelled out the church influence that would otherwise have been involved.

At any rate the livestock grazing bill did not pass largely as the results of Lee Metcalf, Clint Anderson, Senator George Aiken, Ira Gabrielson, Pink Gutermuth, and a special conservation committee formed at that time. This conservation committee was the forerunner of the present day Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources.

There was one night that will remain forever in my memory. I don't remember the date, but we called it Black Friday. On that particular night, McArdle and I stayed very late in the office because it was touch and go as to what position the Administration was going to take on the Stockmen's Grazing Bill; and we had to decide whether to take certain actions that were extremely risky, but which we felt were necessary in order to prevent enactment of the bill.
Crafts: At the same time, we knew that such action could very well jeopardize the future of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture and would certainly jeopardize McArdle in his position as Chief of the Forest Service which at the time was most unstable. So we sat there for several hours cogitating about it and discussing all angles and finally decided to set the wheels in motion. This we did and the action had an effect (whether decisive or not, I don't know) but the bill was not enacted. The Forest Service won this fight, but it was very, very difficult. From that night on, the influence of the stockmen on Forest Service policies has been considerably less.

Fry: What was the specific action that you took?

Crafts: I don't remember the details of it, but we went to some of our friends on the Hill and many friends of the Forest Service around the country so that they would let their views be known and apply counter-pressure to the stockmen's pressure on behalf of the bill. We had a detailed plan of action all worked out in advance, and all we had to do was make a half dozen phone calls to trigger it. This we did. It was a good example of the very powerful Forest Service lobby at work. I was the one who actually set the wheels in motion, so the Chief would not be involved if anything backfired. Part of my job was to take the risks and protect the Chief for the good of the Service.

I have no recollection of what people or organizations were contacted but it was a major turning point in relationships between the Forest Service and one of the main consumers of the resources supplied by the national forests, namely grass. This was very, very significant too, because grazing matters in the Forest Service go way back to the beginning of the national forests, many of which were established primarily to control unlimited grazing of the public domain, and to establish watershed management. Timber management problems actually didn't become really important until just before World War II. Grazing in the early days was by far the dominant resource activity.
Crafts: You must remember, too, that the Forest Service at that time had about eight hundred offices scattered throughout the country, and by this I am speaking down to the ranger level. Thus the Forest Service had contacts in countless communities throughout the country, and its call for help could go very deeply into the fabric of the American people. This is why it has been said that the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers are the two most effective lobbying organizations in the nation's capitol, and I think that this could very well be true.

Oregon and California Controverted Lands

Fry: What do you consider to have been the major problems in Forest Service legislation during this period?

Crafts: There are four or five that stand out in my mind. I can name you a few of them. One, of course, was the stockmen's grazing problem which we have just discussed. Another one was the question of administration of Oregon and California controverted lands.

Fry: Yes, we had some discussion of this from Mr. Leon Kneipp.

Crafts: This was a problem of long-standing, relating to the checker-board pattern of Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands in southern Oregon. It dated back to some of the railroad grant lands of alternate sections and then the revesting or retaking of these lands by the government. This resulted in some cases of the Forest Service administering alternate sections with the Bureau of Land Management as well as a considerable segment of alternate sections administered by Bureau of Land Management and private ownership just outside but bordering the national forests in southern Oregon.

The main problem, however, was those areas where the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands overlapped on an alternate section basis. The agencies followed different policies in timber management and the use of
Crafts: other resources.

This was a problem with the Bureau of Land Management, but it was a more significant problem with the counties involved in southwestern Oregon because they received seventy-five percent of the receipts from the O. and C. lands, as against twenty-five percent of the receipts from Forest Service lands. I would say in general there were about 800,000 acres of checker-board lands so involved.

For many years the Forest Service had been trying to obtain jurisdiction over the Bureau of Land Management lands and vice versa. The counties in effect said, "a plague on both your houses" and labeled it a bureaucratic jurisdictional fight, which indeed it was. The counties really didn't care who administered the lands so long as they continued to get their seventy-five percent cut.

McArdle and I decided that it was time to get the matter settled and quit squabbling with another agency because it was kind of foolish. Really on a national basis it was sort of a local brush fire. To do this, we approached Senator [Guy] Cordon and finally convinced him that we really wanted to get the matter settled and were willing to compromise to do it. We compromised the traditional Forest Service position by agreeing to draw back Forest Service boundaries part way (because these lands were on the outer periphery of the national forests) and made the proposal that within this withdrawn boundary all the lands become Forest Service lands. As compensation for this, the Forest Service lands outside the withdrawn boundaries would become Bureau of Land Management lands. Thus we ended up with no overlapping jurisdiction but with a belt of solid Bureau of Land Management lands surrounding many of the national forests in southern Oregon. By so doing, we got rid of the checker-board pattern, which was extremely difficult to handle and almost impossible to administer.

With the passage of time this may seem like minor action. However, it was a very controversial and major business in Oregon, because, as I have indicated, it involved revenue sharing with the
Crafts: Counties in lieu of taxes.

Senator Cordon at that time was either chairman or had high ranking seniority on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Harris Ellsworth on the House side came from Eugene and was brought into the picture by Senator Cordon and cooperated throughout. Fred Mynatt of the Solicitor's Office and I largely worked out the details. Fred was Associate Solicitor of the Department at that time, and extremely astute and capable.

I don't know whether it has ever been brought out before or not, but during that then year period that I was Assistant Chief, Mynatt exercised a very key role in development of Forest Service policy and legislative matters. He has never received the credit due him. He was not in the Forest Service, but he had an extensive knowledge of Forest Service matters and for all practical purposes, we considered him part of the Service. He was privy to all of our confidential knowledge and many of our staff meetings. Mynatt was a very fine lawyer from eastern Tennessee who retired a number of years ago.

Settlement of the O. and C. controverted lands issue with the Department of Interior was a long drawn out accomplishment. But it finally was settled by affirmative legislative action; Senator Cordon was a hero; and the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have gotten along much better since that time.

Fry: Do you feel that the O. and C. action amounted to a change in policy?

Crafts: It was not so much a change in policy as it was settlement of jurisdiction of lands. The policy change was the decision to get the matter settled rather than just to continue to squabble about it. We achieved the settlement in such a way as to minimize financial effect on the counties. Actually we changed the revenues that the counties received very little by gerrymandering the boundaries in such a way as to balance things out.

Fry: What was the Congressional role in this?
Crafts: Before the matter could be settled, it required an act of Congress.

Fry: So the question centered in the Congress. When you were there did the matter go up to the Supreme Court?

Crafts: Yes, the Supreme Court was involved but I am a little dim about just what issue the Supreme Court did settle. However, a law suit had been brought on the matter over an issue that I don't remember which did go to the Supreme Court, and the Court handed down a decision. I can't give you the reference to it. Shortly thereafter, however, the Congress straightened out the mess by legislative action so the Supreme Court ruling had relatively little lasting effect.

Mining Claims

Fry: What about mining matters, did you have dealings with the miners?

Crafts: Yes, there were two basic events during that decade involving the mineral resources of the national forests. First was the Al Sarena Mining Claim situation, and following that came the Multiple-Use Mining Act of 1955.

The Al Sarena Mining Claim issue was almost a scandal. This was one or more adjacent mining claims on a national forest in southwestern Oregon. The claimants were cutting timber on the claim which was legal under the law at that time if it was a valid mining claim, but illegal if it was an invalid mining claim. The question of validity, of course, rested with the Department of Interior.

There was also widespread feeling among conservationists at the time that mining laws were used illegally to obtain timber off the national forests free of charge. In other words, all an individual had to do was file a twenty-acre mining claim, do a minimum of development work, and then go ahead and cut the timber. This was a widespread practice in the western national forests at that time. Some of those who felt that way, including particularly Senator Dick Neuberger of
Crafts: Oregon, thought that the Secretary of Interior had accepted false evidence in connection with his determination of whether the mining claim was valid.

The key matter got into the question of the assay of the ore samples that were taken from the claim and there was strong feeling and charges made that these samples had been "salted." The hearings on the Al Sarena case which were really investigative, not legislative hearings, were held before an overflow audience, motion picture lights and all the trappings, in the caucus room of the Old Senate Office Building. I remember one of the mineral examiners involved was a young man who testified how he took the gold dust samples following the assay work down to the bridge that crossed the Rogue River and threw the samples into the river. This admission at the hearing caused a sensation because the sample had been lost—possibly deliberately destroyed—and there was no way to recheck it later as to the gold content of the sample.

The Al Sarena Mining Claim situation was extremely embarrassing to the Secretary of Interior and to Under Secretary [Clarence E.] Davis, who in my opinion made some erroneous judgment decisions. Then the Department of Interior either had to admit this or attempt to ride it out. They chose the latter course with the result that Interior's image with the conservationists was severely damaged when Secretary McKay was Secretary. The matter almost became another Ballinger-Pinchot controversy.

The mining claim matter was something that Dick Neuberger took on personally during the few years that he was in the Senate, just as Lee Metcalf took on the grazing fight. It was over this matter that Dick Neuberger really attained his reputation as a conservationist. It received publicity all over the country and particularly in western newspapers, some of the eastern financial papers, and business journals.

There was no legislation at stake here at the time of the Al Sarena controversy. No suits were filed by the government against the alleged
Crafts: claimants, but public opinion was stirred up sufficiently that the mining industry represented by the American Mining Congress (its trade association) finally and reluctantly under the pushing of the American Forestry Association, decided that it was time to work out compromise legislation with the Forest Service.

Up to that time, the mining industry had been adamant against any legislation. To its everlasting credit, the American Forestry Association, whose forester at that time was Lowell Besley, took a very aggressive role here and I would say that out of this aggressiveness came the Multiple-Use Mining Act. Basically this provided for determination of the validity of the thousands and thousands of mining claims on the national forests over a ten-year period, retention by the Secretary of Agriculture of surface rights on new claims except those resources needed directly in connection with mining.

There were hundreds of thousands of existing mining claims that were used for all sorts of purposes in addition to the utilization of timber. One of the most common was for summer, or even permanent, homes. So there was a procedure developed, a so-called "in rem" procedure, that wiped out the claimant's surface rights over a ten-year period unless he took affirmative action to establish them. He didn't lose his mining claim, but he did lose his surface rights. In this way, the Forest Service under this act regained control of hundreds of thousands of acres of national forest lands and timber which had been expropriated under the guise of the mining laws of 1872. This 1955 act was and still is very major resource legislation.

It could never have been done without the cooperation of the American Mining Congress whose executive secretary at that time was Julian Conover. The assistant executive secretary at that time was Harry Moffit, and the lawyer for one of the mining companies from Salt Lake, whose name does not come back to me, also exercised a very key role. These three men showed the leadership for the mining industry. The American Forestry Association led the way for the conservationists. But I do believe
Crafts: that the industry would have not done so except for public pressure and the adverse public image thrown on it by the Al Sarena situation.

I might say that during part of that time, Wes D'Ewart, who had been defeated following the fiasco on the Stockmen's Grazing Bill and had been given a staff position to Secretary Benson in the Department of Agriculture, worked with us in connection with the mining legislation. Subsequently, he was nominated to be an Assistant Secretary of Interior, but his confirmation was blocked by the Senate Interior Committee over the Stockmen's bill. Despite the picture that many people have of Wes D'Ewart, I found him to be likeable, easy to work with, and very helpful. He certainly represented the public interest in his dealings with the mining industry on this mining act. He never was given any credit for this and I think he should have been.

Fry: You have alluded to the pressures from the timber industry in preparation of the Timber Resource Review. Is there anything further that you would like to add to that now?

Crafts: I think not with respect to the Timber Resource Review as such. In my earlier comments I think I also mentioned that we had policy problems continuing and enlarging constantly with respect to management of timber on the national forests. The former discussion pretty largely took care of the subject except for a few additional thoughts.

I should say, however, that the timber industry was really gratified when the Forest Service gave up on regulation of private cutting practices. Here again was another major change in Forest Service policy that McArdle instituted.

Despite its satisfaction with the Forest Service on the Timber Resource Review, the timber industry held a very hard line with respect to national forest timber management and in my judgment to a very considerable extent called the shots on the Forest Service in its management
Crafts: of timber during this period.

Frankly, I was quite dissatisfied with Forest Service timber management policies, feeling that the Forest Service was not doing this right in a number of ways involving the use of stumpage in lieu of money to build roads, the chopping up of the hillsides with too many roads, and resulting erosion, excessive cutting, pressures to achieve allowable cut, use of clear-cuts instead of selective cuts, excessively large blocks of clear-cut timber, failure to require adequate regeneration measures, failure to require adequate slash disposal and erosion control measures. This is a whole list of things that I thought the Forest Service timber management people were far too easy on with the timber industry.

On the other hand, the Forest Service was in continuous trouble with the timber industry. But this probably will always be the situation, because there is simply too much mill capacity. Private timber lands are going through a period of regeneration so the pressures are now on the public lands and nobody wants to go out of business. Therefore, the Forest Service is under the pressure to cut more timber, to grow timber at too short rotation, and to forget about growing quality timber. Largely, it caved in to these pressures.

Also, the Forest Service was trying to keep a lot of the small family marginal operations in business just like it tried to do in connection with grazing and this put excessive pressures on timber resources. In so many places in the West, the national forests are really the base of the economy for thousands and thousands of small western communities, families, and business firms.

On the reverse side of the ledger, many of the larger companies were certainly moving aggressively during this period to intensify and improve the practice of forestry on their own lands. In many instances, as a matter of fact, the private timber companies during that period began to practice better timber management than the Forest Service did.
This was sort of a change-over period where-as prior thereto the Forest Service timber management generally had been better, the leaders in private industry began to catch up and surpass the Forest Service, particularly in the matter of regeneration. I think I am right that the Forest Service was making little net progress in regenerating its cut-over lands. It was regenerating about as much as was being cut and burned each year; but it wasn't reducing the back-log of past cut-overs and burns which in effect means that many thousands of national forest acres were lying idle because of lack of sufficiently extensive timber planting programs. I believe there was about a sixty-year backlog.

One of the reasons, of course, that the major timber companies were leading out on progressive forest management practice was the consequence of past Forest Service pressures to regulate timber cutting on private lands. It was the fear of regulation as well as economics that forced the companies to improve their practices. This was the club, or the threat, that the government held over their heads.

Present day foresters seem to think that the Forest Service efforts on regulation failed. They did insofar as actual federal participation in regulation, but they did not with respect to getting some state regulatory laws enacted, and with respect to pushing the timber operators to carry on improved forest practices of their own. In those two aspects the regulation pressures of the Forest Service over many years were very successful. This generally is not recognized.

Did you notice during this period any lessening of the financial backing of the timber lobby against the Forest Service?

No, probably the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association and affiliated regional associations were better financed than ever. I, of course, do not know this; but my impression is that they were pretty well-heeled at that time.

Let me correct one inference, however, that you made. Not all actions of the timber industry were against the Forest Service. In many instances,
Crafts: The timber industry and the Forest Service worked side-by-side. They did this on the Multiple-Use Act, finally, as a result mainly of the leadership of Bernie Orell, vice president of Weyerhauser. They were reluctant at first, but finally they did it. The timber industry also supported the Forest Service on the Multiple-Use Mining Act. There are many things on which the Forest Service and the timber industry worked in partnership. Fire control was another instance. But there also were many areas of controversy and it always is the controversial areas that tend to be emphasized rather than the joint-cooperative efforts. Sometimes controversies degenerate into personalities. That is most unfortunate. Usually, however, this could be overcome if handled properly.

Fry: Do you think the relationship between the Forest Service and the timber industry was better in the fifties than it was in the forties?

Crafts: No. There were many more difficulties in the fifties. This is because the Forest Service was supervising the cutting of more timber, building more roads, and planting more land. There were many more timber sales and it was a time of greatly accelerated activity. There were many more pressures. So, I think the fifties were much more difficult than the forties. In the sixties likewise it has been more difficult than in the fifties.

The sad part of the situation in the fifties was that the Forest Service was pressured by the timber industry in many ways, as I have mentioned, and too frequently it succumbed to those pressures. The issues came right up to the edge of over-cutting the national forests and of course this was one reason for the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act, which I think we will get to later. We switched to use of "allowable cut" rather than "sustained yield" in order to support our appropriations.

As far as working relationships on the ground between the timber sales staff officer and the various forest or ranger districts and the logging engineers for the companies, these were usually pretty good. The problems I am talking about, when we got into controversial issues, were at
the policy level between the companies and the Forest Service. Usually the officers of the company, and the trade associations which were hired to represent the industry viewpoint, were those that took issue at the policy levels with the Forest Service. At the ground level or working level, so-called, relationships were generally satisfactory.

Of course with the trade associations you have to expect that relationships won't be too good because the employees of trade associations want to show that they are doing something to justify their pay and one of the most popular ways to show this is to create issues with the government and try to harass federal agencies. This is standard practice by association people to demonstrate the effectiveness of their work to their bosses.

**Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act**

Fry: Let me see, are there any other major items that you dealt with during that period that we have not covered yet?

Crafts: Well, we haven't discussed the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act, which was probably the most important of all the acts that were passed. We might talk about that.

That act, as I have mentioned, came partly because of the pressures of the timber industry to continually cut more timber. It came partly because of more intensive use of the national forests for water, for recreation, and as a matter of fact, for all of the national forest resources. We anticipated that unless we had statutory protection looking ahead to the future, the Forest Service would be in difficulty on two counts.

First, we should have a statutory prohibition to prevent overuse of any national forest resource and this would give us a legal prop to fall back on when the pressures got to be overwhelming to overcut the timber. Second, we felt that all the
Crafts: resources of the national forests should be treated with equal attention and equal priority.

We felt sure that the time would come as the country and the economy grew in complexity, when we would not be able administratively to withstand the pressures to overcut, overgraze, and over-recreate on the national forests. Also the uses in many instances were competitive, not necessarily complementary, and the time would come when one use would tend to be predominant over the others. This we felt would be inequit- able to the public at large.

Therefore, we decided, after most careful consideration and much internal reluctance inside the Forest Service, to propose the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act. Now it is usually referred to as the Multiple-Use Act, which is too bad because it overlooks a very key part. This was sustained-yield, which means continuous production at high levels, but not over-use. Sustained-yield is just as important as multiple-use. Multiple-use assures that all of the resources will be considered, but sustained-yield assures that none of them will be over-utilized.

We were hesitant to try for the act. We knew it was a gamble; we just didn't know whether we could get it. Many of the timber people felt that they then occupied a preferential position over other resources and they wanted to continue to be first, so initially, they opposed the legislation. They didn't want to recognize that grazing and recreation should have equal consideration.

There was great uncertainty in the Forest Service whether we would be successful in its passage. If we tried and failed, then we would be faced with adverse legislative history which would be very bad. So we entered this knowing the risks involved, but determined to make it work if we could.

I might say that two of the real leaders of the Forest Service were strongly against our trying it, according to my recollection. One was Chris Granger, who had recently retired but nevertheless was still brought in frequently on
Crafts: major policy questions. The other was Ed Cliff, who at that time was Assistant Chief in charge of National Forest Resource Management. McArdle and I and the rest of the staff, however, thought that it was then or never, so we decided to take a shot at it. It turned out to be the hardest job of getting a piece of legislation enacted that I faced during my period in the Forest Service.

I truly believe that this was the major legislative accomplishment during that decade, and I think the Forest Service generally has since come to this conclusion. They constantly refer to it now as the basis for their policy and it ranks along with the 1897 Act, the 1905 Act, the Weeks Act of 1911 and the Clarke-McNary Act, as one of the real milestones of Forest Service basic legislation.

The bill had a very rough road going through the Congress. There is no use going into details because I have prepared separately and will make available for historic reference a day-to-day, blow-by-blow account of what happened.

This has never been made generally available and I am not even sure that the Forest Service has a copy of it. I have about six copies and in due course will put them in one of the forest history depository libraries.* I prepared this statement shortly after the successful conclusion of that effort while it was fresh in my mind because it named the people involved, and who did what. The statement interpreted many of the words in the act, which most Forest Service men then and even now do not understand, and I think someday will be of valuable reference to the Forest Service.

Among the main contributors were certain leaders in Congress, as always, and Bernie Orell, vice president of Weyerhauser who almost single-handedly brought the timber industry along. Orell pretty much laid his own reputation on the line with the industry to do so. The Forest Service should be forever grateful to him. Without Orell's foresight, this act would never have been passed and he should be given great credit for what happened.

*To be deposited in the Bentley Historical Library of the University of Michigan historical collections.
Fry: On what basis did the timber industry join with you in your efforts on this?

Crafts: I think basically it was because Orell could see the handwriting on the wall. Also, as an ex-state forester he basically believed in sustained yield. He thought that if the timber industry opposed a proposal like this it would put them in a very disadvantageous public light, much as the stockmen were placed in 1953. The timber industry would be pictured to the public as being against sustained yield. He also realized that other uses were growing in importance and had to receive their equitable share of attention. I would say that it was a real statesmanlike position on the part of Orell. It certainly was not a self-serving position as far as he was concerned. He had enough stature to get the industry to go along and to call off their dogs, but he had a difficult time doing this. He staked his own reputation and succeeded.

Fry: Could you name some of the members of Congress who worked with you on this?

Crafts: Clint Anderson was probably the leader. He was just a tower of strength and a real statesman. His health was still good at that time. He was still close to the Forest Service remembering his days as Secretary of Agriculture. He helped us immensely.

In addition to Clint on the Senate side there were Congressmen [Harold Dunbar] Cooley, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Cliff McIntyre of Maine, who was the ranking Republican on the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Forestry Affairs. George Grant of Alabama was chairman of that Forestry Subcommittee and he too helped a great deal. John Saylor of Pennsylvania was not on Agriculture, but was on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. John had his reservations and he thought that the Forest Service was trying to pull something fancy, but when he finally understood the issues involved, John was fine. [Wayne Norviel] Aspinall of Colorado was also on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and could have made it very difficult for the Forest Service because of the jurisdic-
Crafts: The decision was made by the Forest Service staff which consisted of the Chief and various Assistant Chiefs, and of course in consultation with Assistant Secretary [Ervin Leroy] Peterson, whom I

Fry: What was involved in the original decision to pursue the legislation necessary for this?

Crafts: But Wayne [Aspinall] went along and helped us. Also there was Bob Sikes of Florida. These are the ones who immediately come to mind. Going back to the Senate, there was Senator George Aiken of Vermont, who I believe at that time was ranking Republican on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He certainly should be mentioned. Then there was Carl Hayden of Arizona and numerous others.

That is about all I can say about the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act except to re-emphasize that legislatively this was the major affirmative Forest Service accomplishment during that decade. The Multiple-Use Mining Act was probably second. The major negative accomplishment was prevention of passage of the Stockmen's Grazing Bill.

The Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act really has become the main organic act of the Forest Service and will be for years to come when the Service has to stand up against pressures to overuse the resources against the law of the land. This had not been true heretofore. Sustained yield up to that time was just the policy of the Executive Branch. Thus, a policy of the Forest Service became the law of the land. The Forest Service is now under a directive to practice it and is prohibited from over-utilizing resources of the national forests which it administers in trust for all the people.

The other major thing that that act did was to give Congressional recognition and sanction to equal consideration of all the multiple resources of the Forest Service. This again had heretofore been by Executive policy only and this gave Congressional direction to it.
Crafts: previously mentioned. It was an outgrowth of the Timber Resource Review and of timber management problems that the Forest Service was confronting. I have described this earlier. The Forest Service could see the handwriting on the wall from the Timber Resource Review. Although we didn't recommend regulation, as a result of the study, we could foresee the potential impact and pressures on the public lands. In other words, this was definitely an outgrowth of the Timber Resource Review that the industry had not anticipated; as a matter of fact, neither had the Forest Service at the time.

I said earlier that there was no program that came out of the Timber Resource Review as such and that's correct. What actually happened was that we just skipped the program recommendations and went directly to legislation. We didn't do this consciously. We didn't know we were going to do it at the time, but that's the way it worked out and it turned out to be a plus for the Forest Service.

We could see from the Timber Resource Review, from what was developing in connection with the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report, from the pressures we were getting on timber management, from the growing recreation pressures, and from the continuing livestock pressures, that the conflicting interest groups and demands on national forest resources would be more than the national forests could supply. We couldn't supply them in the quantity or quality needed and we felt we needed Congressional direction and protection.

The people who made the decision initially were the Chief and the Chief's staff. Probably McArdle and I had the most to do with it. As I have said before, Ed Cliff was initially against it because he is basically a conservative person and he was afraid that we would not be successful. Ray Marsh, as well as Chris Granger, men for whom I have the highest respect, also questioned the wisdom of going ahead. Mac and I weighed these things out and finally made the decision against the advice of some of our closest and most trusted advisors. The Forest Service really knocked it-
Crafts: self out trying to put this bill through Congress and I suspect violated in many ways the regulations against promotion of legislation applicable to federal employees.

There never had been up to that time such a planned, concerted and organized effort by the Forest Service on a piece of legislation. I believe this applies not only to my time but to the whole life of the Forest Service up to that time. The very early acts pretty much slipped through, were very general, and I believe were not too controversial. There was a problem of course, on the Multiple-Use Mining Act, but it wasn't in the same league with the support that was cranked up for the Multiple-Use Act.

Fry: Could you explain to me what were the risks that were foreseen in undertaking this?

Crafts: I thought I had done this. There was no risk involved if we were successful. But there was great risk involved if we went ahead and failed to succeed because of the adverse legislative precedents that would be set. These precedents would be used against us by those who wanted this or that resource given first priority and those who wanted to serve their own particular interest by over-utilizing a portion of the national forests.

Fry: I thought there was some question, too, whether the idea was basically a good one of equating the various national forest resources?

Crafts: There was some thought about that too, but that was rather minor. This, I think, was a reflection of the fact that some individuals, both in the Forest Service and outside, were not at that time quite attuned to the fact that some of the uses which in the past had been minor, such as recreation, should be given equal consideration. We simply overrode those questions. As a matter of fact, it's a good thing we did because now recreation has become so major that if it weren't for the requirement for equal consideration, in many cases recreation would receive priority attention and timber and grazing would be minor uses.
Crafts: I think, probably, Ed Cliff again was the main one here in a policy position, who questioned the wisdom of equal treatment. I don't say this in criticism of Ed, but he is a very cautious individual and he tends not to lead out on new things, new innovations, or new programs. It takes Ed a long time to make up his mind. He doesn't accept new ideas readily nor does he create them himself. When he finally does make up his mind, it's usually a very solid decision and he is effective in implementing it. He is an excellent administrator but as far as pioneering advances and new policy, he is extremely conservative. He just wasn't quite ready for the Multiple-Use Act. It was a little bit ahead of his thinking at that time. Of course he was in a key position because he was Assistant Chief in charge of national forest resources.

Fry: This act would have caused a great change in the character of his work.

Crafts: It could and it did.

Fry: Do you think the pressures for more acreage for resort hotels and things of that sort were important enough to comment on?

Crafts: No. We had so much acreage that was available in those days that this wasn't very consequential. It has since become more important.

Wilderness Bill

Fry: Wasn't the Wilderness Bill evolved during your tenure as Assistant Chief of the Forest Service?

Crafts: Yes, the Wilderness Bill evolved during that time. There were various drafts of the bill over a number of years. Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society worked with Ray Marsh and myself on different drafts at different times. The bill really started as far back as prior to 1950 when Ray Marsh was Assistant Chief and became sporadically active at various times during the fifties. Zahniser and a number of people, of whom I was one, worked on these different drafts. They were introduced during several sessions of the Congress
Crafts:

and numerous hearings were held on them. I think I testified three times on the Wilderness Bill at different times.

It was going through the usual evolutionary process of several sessions of Congress which is normal for legislation as far-reaching as the Wilderness Bill. This had to happen because here again the bill was ahead of the thinking of most people both in and out of the Forest Service and in the general conservation field. Congress wasn't quite ready to move and it took an educational process extending over several years.

The bill was very controversial because it locked up for a particular specialized use and for a relatively small number of people rather large national forest areas. The timber industry was dead set against it. The mining people were dead set against it. The grazing people tended to be against it because they were fearful that grazing would be excluded from national forest wilderness areas in the future.

The timber industry was greatly concerned about the locking up of timber in the wilderness areas and pointed out the numerous permanent wilderness areas that had been established since the first one was created, I believe in 1924, on the Gila National Forest in New Mexico. At any rate, when the Forest Service did establish a permanent wilderness area, it stayed established and the executive action had been very stable. So the opponents of the bill made the point that administrative protection was adequate, and legal protection and recognition were not necessary.

On the other hand, the Forest Service felt that a process of attrition could begin to take place under pressures to cut more timber and gradually these wilderness and primitive areas would be whittled down if the pressures got sufficiently great. Wilderness was mentioned in the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act as worthy of particular consideration and as being compatible with multiple use.

The same fundamental reason was behind Forest Service support of the Wilderness Bill as was
Crafts: behind its conviction that the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act was timely and needed. We felt that looking ahead fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five years, whatever it might be, the pressures to utilize in an economic way and commercially for profit the resources of wilderness areas would be such that the Executive Branch alone could not withstand the pressures. Therefore, in order to preserve segments of wild and natural America, we had better get some statutory protection while the getting was good. This was done both through the Wilderness Act and the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act.

Fry: What made you think that the getting was good?

Crafts: Probably I should have said that while the getting was possible. As it turned out, there was so much difficulty in getting the Wilderness Bill enacted that it was almost too late even at that time. You know it didn't finally pass until 1964, and when it did pass it was enacted in a much different form than some of the earlier proposals.

In my judgment it was not nearly as satisfactory from the standpoint of wilderness preservation. The final passage was compromise legislation in the truest sense of the word because only half of the combined primitive and wilderness areas of the national forests were included in the system, namely just the wilderness areas. But the primitive areas were not included in the system and provision was made in the bill for individual acts in subsequent years if individual primitive areas were converted to wilderness areas. This was the concession that was made to opponents of the bill.

On the other hand, there was included at the outset a wilderness system of all the wilderness areas in the national forests plus a directive that the primitive areas were to be assessed within a period of ten years, I believe, and presented to the Congress.

My judgment is that there will be a legislative fight on almost every single primitive area conversion to wilderness. So the bill as
it came out won about half the battle.

Furthermore, there was provision in the bill for creating wilderness areas in national parks and wildlife refuges which had not had any until that time. Each one will generate controversy. I think this is particularly so with respect to the national parks system because there will be conflict there between the two basic tenets of the 1916 National Park Law requiring on the one hand preservation of the national parks in their natural state and on the other requiring that they should be made available for enjoyment of the people. The Park Service is going to have a real difficult time with this situation.

Outside Help: Individuals and Organizations

Did you have any help on the Wilderness Bill from the timber interests?

None whatsoever. We had nothing but opposition from the organized timber industry, although again some of the leaders had enough foresight to stay out of the fight. The mining industry vigorously opposed the bill in so far as the mineral aspects went and received a major concession which allowed mining to continue, I think for twenty-five years after enactment, which would permit mining in wilderness areas up until about 1989 with respect to those areas that were included in the system initially. On new areas, the mining provisions will be considered on an individual basis, area by area, as Congress considers each case.

Of course the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club, and the various other outdoor and conservation clubs were very aggressive and really carried the load. There was one very effective group that I believe I have not mentioned before and this was the organized fish and wildlife groups under the leadership of Ira Gabrielson. I'm referring specifically to the Wildlife Management Institute and an offshoot organization called the Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources which is an organized lobbying group.
The Wildlife Management Institute was formed, I believe, by Ira Gabrielson, whom we all call Gabe, and he used to be chief of the old Biological Survey. The money for that organization comes primarily from the manufacturers of sporting arms, such as Remington, Winchester, DuPont, and similar organizations. These manufacturers are not so much interested in the use of the resources but they are interested in the sale of their products to sportsmen and feel that this is good public relations.

The Wildlife Management Institute is not a lobbying organization, however. There is no membership in it and therefore, Gabe has a very free hand to act as he wishes to and has to obtain only the approval of his board of directors occasionally from time to time. As far as I know he is given almost a completely free hand to make policy. Gabe is a great conservation statesman, one of the greatest. Here is another individual that stood out in the forties and fifties and who should be included in the conservation hall of fame.

Although the name of the organization is the Wildlife Management Institute, Gabe's conservation interests are very broad based and across the board in the conservation field. He was astute enough to realize that you get these things done not by making speeches, but by doing your homework behind the scenes where it counts.

So he organized a Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources which has a staff of one or two people that function as professional lobbyists. The Citizens' Committee is registered under the lobbying act. It has a board of directors and an executive committee. Because of the way they are organized, they are not worried about tax-exempt status and all this sort of thing.

They do have a very difficult time getting adequate financing and it is just a shame that the other conservation groups haven't either put more money into the Citizens' Committee or haven't seen fit to forego their tax exempt status and go ahead and do the same thing. If the other conservation groups would either strengthen the Citizens'
Crafts: Committee or themselves recognize that lobbying in the respectable sense of the word is an effective instrument in the formulation of national policy, a great many of the conservation battles that are compromised or lost could be won very easily.

However, the conservation groups are for the most part tax-exempt and are so fearful that they will lose major financial contributions if they lose their tax-exempt status that they are frankly afraid of their own shadow when it comes to lobbying matters.

In my judgment the conservationists make a great mistake and have done so through the years on this matter. I just wish that I had enough money, personally of my own, to establish such an organization. Wealthy philanthropists like Rockefeller, and others are reluctant to do this because it opens up the whole Internal Revenue tax matter and creates a major problem in the handling of their own personal foundation and corporate fiscal resources.

I did, however, specifically want to mention the Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources.

I already have mentioned that Orell helped get the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act through and I believe that he helped somewhat on the Wilderness Bill, although on the latter my memory is dim.

There is another individual who has done far more than Orell on conservation matters in general in the last several years who likewise is not recognized. It seems odd that the people who do the work usually don't get the credit for it. Spencer Smith is the employee and the lobbyist of the Citizens' Committee. Gabrielson is his boss. Now Spencer and Orell haven't got much use for each other. Their backgrounds are different, they think differently, but Spence just has knocked himself out and has helped, on a roll call of major conservation legislation including the Stockmen's Bill, the Multiple-Use Mining Act, the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act, the Wilderness Bill, the Land and Water Conservation Fund
Crafts: Act, and a host of others. Also, he's been very effective in preventing some bad ones from passing.

Most people do not know about the inside workings of how these conservation matters get accomplished in Washington and the people whom I am naming such as Spencer and Gabe, Chris Granger, Lyle Watts, while he was living, Ray Marsh, Pink Gutermuth, Lee Metcalf, more recently Stewart Udall, Orell a time or two, are the men outside of Congress who get things done. As far as the relationship between Gabe and Smith goes, Gabe raised the money and the reputation, but Smith did the work.

Spencer is a former professor of economics from the University of Maryland and the University of Minnesota. Probably ninety-nine percent of the conservationists in the country today have never heard of Spencer Smith and don't know what he has done. He doesn't waste his time going to meetings but he can contact more members of Congress and more doors open for him on the Hill than any other individual that I know.

Unfortunately, there is sort of a competition for a place in the sun going on today between the various conservation groups as well as a changing emphasis on the utilization of resources. The latter refers to the great surge of recreation in recent years.

By the former, I mean that you have several competitive blocks. The Sierra Club is one and aligned with them, you might say, is the National Parks Association and the Wilderness Society.

Then, there is what I call the fish and wildlife lobby which is the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, and probably the Izaak Walton League in this category. Here you have Gabe as a grand old man being pushed for a place in the sun by Tom Kimball of the National Wildlife Federation who is handsome and aggressive but so far has not made the contributions nor does he have the judgment and experience of Gabe.

A third group is the Rockefeller organization
Crafts: and satellites and affiliates such as the National Recreation and Park Association, the Conservation Foundation, and the various other things that he has brought about. The latter is where the conservation money lies today in big chunks.

The Sierra Club is militant and overly aggressive. It has alienated a great many members of Congress and a great many people around the country.

The fourth and last group is sort of a hodgepodge of such organizations as the American Forestry Association, Society of American Foresters, the Natural Resources Council, Resources for the Future, many of the professional societies which largely stay out of the political arena and so they are ineffective in formulation of policy. It's just a shame that these conservation organizations, all of which want certain basic goals, are so competitive between each other, because if they would simply join forces on occasion, they could swing terrific weight.

Fry: It is correct that the Wildlife Management Institute helped you in similar activities in the early fifties.

Crafts: Yes, that's correct. It was primarily Gabrielson who gave leadership to the fight against the livestock grazing bill in the early 1950's.

Fry: The next thing I wanted to go into was to ask you some general questions about the help you get and the support you received from various pending legislative measures that come up in Congress and other activities concerning conservation. How do you send out the alarm to the people that might help you?

Crafts: This is what I call tricks of the trade. The real guts of it is willingness and know-how in doing things that you are not supposed to do in order to get things accomplished. You never get things done if you are not willing to take risks and to take chances. The only thing you must be careful about is (1) don't worry about your own personal risks and (2) don't jeopardize your organization.
Crafts:

Getting these matters done involves a number of things. In the first place, you have to have the confidence of your own internal organization. They have to be educated; they have to be trustworthy; you talk to them in private conferences; you get your key people educated and knowledgeable about the legislative process; you get them acquainted with members of Congress and acquainted with possible support groups in their particular territories.

As I have said earlier, the Forest Service had when I was there about eight hundred or a thousand offices all over the country. So you push a button from the top and it channels on down to the grass roots. Then the response comes back. Also, you have to, of course, have continuing and close working relationship and confidence with conservation groups all over the country. You have to have a good spy system to know what your opponents are doing, and you have to have confidential channels to key members of Congress.

Fry:

Are you talking about your regional people?

Crafts:

Yes, as far as the internal aspect of the Forest Service goes I'm referring to the regional foresters and directors of the Forest Experiment Stations but primarily, the regional foresters.

I think I said once before that the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers are reputed to have the two most effective lobbies in Washington. This probably isn't far wrong. Both the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers deal in the big leagues as far as activities are concerned, and as far as money is concerned. Their people come up through the ranks, they are tempered by experience; the no-goods are eliminated along the way; people who can't be trusted are eliminated; the alcoholics are eliminated; those who talk too much are eliminated. In other words, the key people in the key spots are real pros.

So far as the national conservation groups are concerned, they vary greatly. Some are extremely effective, such as the Wildlife Management Institute with Gabe and Pink Gutermuth and
Crafts: Dan Poole. Some are naive, ineffective, and afraid even of their own shadow. The National Rifle Association and the Sports Fishing Institute are real pros. The National Wildlife Federation stays out of lobbying activities, but the National Rifle Association is never sold short. They have tremendous membership; they work with the military; with police forces, and with sportsmen. Those are their three major lines of activities and they can really turn it on when the time comes.

There are about fifteen or twenty of these national conservation organizations in Washington. Some are helpful, some are not; some are knowledgeable, some are not; some are afraid, some are not; some will work on these things, others won't. You learn this over time. You learn whom you can trust and whom you can't trust, and you just don't bother with those that are ineffective.

Unfortunately, the Society of American Foresters over the years, when Henry Clepper was executive secretary, was a very ineffective force in shaping forest conservation policy. It was a tepid organization with wishy-washy membership and of course, since it was made up on a fairly equal basis, at that time with both publicly-employed and privately-employed foresters, they tended to offset each other on many policy issues of the day.

The American Forestry Association used to be a militant and effective organization but during the fifties they were scared to death except when Lowell Besley was their forester. Then they really went to town on the Multiple-Use Mining Act, as I have said.

The American Forestry Association often is on the right side of things, but they don't do very much to make things happen except file a brief statement for the record or maybe testify for one page even on something that is extremely complex and controversial.

There's another whole avenue open and this is through the state conservation organizations,
Crafts: the counties, the National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, CIO-AFL, National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and so on. These people are all organized. They're effective in their own particular field, but usually their interests are somewhat limited in natural resources. Occasionally you can get support of the farm organizations but most of the time they don't get into these conservation matters very deeply.

The other avenue which I mentioned involves personal relationship with members of Congress and the confidence that they have in you. This is not achieved overnight. You build this up over time and you build it up mainly by being honest with them and leveling with them. They gradually get to know you and appreciate your integrity. I am quite sure that congressmen are very astute in sensing whether you are telling the truth, or holding back, or being misleading. Finally, they get so they have confidence in you and they like you. Sometimes, they have confidence in you even if they don't particularly like you, but if you have their respect and are honest and above board, this is what counts.

Fry: Does your own staff help you in learning the local concerns and points of view in the congressmen's own districts?

Crafts: Yes, indeed, all the time. Within the Forest Service there is a complete avenue of communication outside official channels between the field and the regional foresters and between the regional foresters and either McArdle or myself. These things are handled by phone call or personal mail addressed to home addresses and nothing ever goes in the files. Again I bow to Spencer Smith. Most Forest Service people have never heard of him. As I said, he doesn't waste his time going to meetings but can talk to more members of Congress than possibly any other conservationist. He is not getting rich; he does this because he believes in it, and I take my hat off to him.

Fry: Do you think there was any increase in this type of activity within the Forest Service in the fifties as contrasted to the forties?
Crafts: Yes, indeed there was. There was just no comparison at all between the two decades. There was so much more going on in the fifties than in the forties, so many more key legislative items, and the Forest Service was much better organized on how to handle these things. This was political sensitivity, if that's the name to attach to it, and how to go about achieving things. It was one of the major changes in Forest Service doctrine during the 1950's.

Also, I think too that there was a major change in Congressional viewpoint on conservation matters in the 1950's on at least two counts. First, the Congress became much more aware that some key conservation legislation was needed after a lapse of quite a few years. The second major change in the Congressional outlook was that in the early part of the century the legislation that was enacted, such as the 1897, 1905 and 1911 Acts, gave the Executive Branch very wide latitude to exercise administrative or executive discretion. The bills were framed in broad terms with few specifics. On the other hand, in the 1950's Congress exercised much more careful oversight control and spelled out the details of legislation a great deal more than they had twenty, thirty, and forty years before. In other words the Congress gave much less discretion to the Executive Branch.

There was a distinct difference, and still is, between the Senate and House in this matter in that the Senate tends to pass much broader legislation with less detail than the House. The House really gets down and digs into the details. This is partly due to the fact that the Senators have to serve on more committees than the House, and the Congressmen have more time to do this type of thing. Also, I think it reflects the increase in the size of Congressional staffs that complement the members themselves and of course it reflects the personalities of the people involved. Now I really have to leave. I'm sorry because this has been very interesting talking with you.

Fry: Thank you very much.
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Nickel Aide Resigns Post
By Request

Washington

Dr. Edward C. Crafts said yesterday he has resigned as director of the Interior Department's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, effective tomorrow.

In an interview, Crafts confirmed that Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel had advised him he would be replaced by May 31.

On February 8 the Interior Department denied an earlier report that Crafts was being fired.

But Crafts said he submitted a letter of resignation Tuesday setting the date himself at February 28.

"I decided there wasn't any point in staying around," said the veteran of 29 years of federal service.
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8:15 p.m. Wednesday, February 11, 1970
Room 145 Dwinelle Hall
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(Admittance to capacity of hall)
Thousands May Die
Before Smog Perils Known

By PENNY HERMES
Science Writer

Only a catastrophe will jolt Americans into realizing just how far our environment has gone downhill—into making them act, a speaker here claimed Wednesday.

"Thousands of Americans may have to die of smog in a major American city" before this happens, Dr. Edward C. Crafts, a forester and former high public official who has served under six presidents, said.

He has been a director of the US Interior Department Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for the last eight years.

Crafts, who set forth his conclusions in a speech sponsored by the Committee for Arts and Lectures and the School of Forestry and Conservation, cited a recent Gallup Poll which showed "only 22 percent of Americans are willing to increase their annual budget to clean up the environment" as evidence that "environmental concerns have n't hit home yet."

He doubted that Americans are "ready to bite the hot bullet" to pay for saving ourselves and our environment.

Crafts described the cost of survival as "giving up big cars . . . fancy homes, weedless lawns, status living . . . and big families."

We should have to "pay more taxes . . . pay more for goods and get less, as we absorb the cost of the industries' cleanup, and we must accept compulsory population control."

Like most recent campus speakers on environment problems, Crafts emphasized that the solutions were political, economic, and social—not scientific.

Right now, environment is a "motherhood" issue, Crafts said, but legislation to protect it has been "slow paced, piecemeal, and colossally underfinanced."

Crafts said that the 1969 Act creating a National Council on the Environment has "some teeth if it is allowed to be effective."

But he added that President Nixon is reportedly opposed to a second bill that would provide a staff for this national council.

Crafts believes that the test of Nixon's "war on pollution" will be spelled out in the details of his up-coming budget message.

As there are more than a hundred bills pending before Congress, and no central authority to decide environmental issues, Crafts predicts that Congress will set up a joint committee on environmental problems to be a "watchdog over the legislative branch."

Such a group, he explains, could "keep track" and do everything about environmental problems except start legislation.
ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM FOR THE PERMANENT GOOD OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JULY 27, 1961.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

MINORITY AND SEPARATE VIEWS

[To accompany S. 174]

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred S. 174 to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, having considered same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the measure, as amended, do pass.

AMENDMENTS

The amendments and their purposes are as follows:

On page 4, line 1, strike the word "fifteen" and insert the word "ten."

This will require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a review of primitive areas in the national forests in 10 instead of 15 years, speeding determination as to which portions of each such primitive area should continue to be preserved as wilderness and which portions should revert to ordinary forest land status and again be subject to normal forest uses. Department of Agriculture officials believe that the work can be done on the remaining 39 primitive areas in that time and that it would be well to accelerate final decisions on the 7.9 million acres of land involved, reopening any areas not predominantly of wilderness value to normal use, while making known positively those areas which are to be preserved and giving them legislative protection as wilderness.
On page 4, strike everything beginning after the period on line 5 through line 19, inserting instead the following:

Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: Provided, That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be continued in the Wilderness System, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value: Provided further, That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be continued in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the continued inclusion in the Wilderness System, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: Provided, That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a part of the Wilderness System and shall be administered as other national forest lands: And provided further, That primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as a part of the Wilderness System until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resubmission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for continued inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within 14 years following the enactment of this Act, shall cease to be a part of the Wilderness System and shall be administered as other national forest land.

This amendment prescribes a more exact procedure than in the original language for determination of portions of primitive areas which are to be continued in the wilderness system and for the return of areas which are not of wilderness character to ordinary national forest land status, as well as to make mandatory that a recommendation on continued inclusion in the wilderness system be submitted to Congress on each and every primitive area. It also limits the size of any primitive area recommended for permanent inclusion in the
wilderness system to an area not exceeding, after exclusions and additions, the present size of the primitive area involved.

On page 8, line 24, strike all of the line starting with "the Congress," strike all of line 25, and on page 9, line 1, strike all through the word "recommendation," substituting the following:

neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: Provided, That, in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided.

On page 9, line 1, strike the word "concurrent".

On page 9, line 16, strike the word "concurrent".

These three amendments provide that either the Senate or the House of Representatives may reject a recommendation from the President for the inclusion or exclusion of an area from the wilderness system, instead of requiring that it be done by a concurrent resolution of both houses. Either the House or the Senate can prevent the enactment of a law. The amendments give either body the ability to stop a wilderness recommendation within the time provided.

On page 9, line 8, strike the first word "The" and insert after the words "public notice" the words "when given".

This amendment makes the sentence read more clearly.

On page 10, line 1, after the word "specific" insert a comma and the word "affirmative".

This amendment makes certain that only the national forest, park system, and wildlife areas specifically dealt with in the bill shall be included in the wilderness system under the review and recommendation procedure authorized by section 3(f) in the bill, and that the inclusion of any other area or areas of public lands in the wilderness system shall be done only by the enactment of a law to that effect.

On page 10, line 8, strike the period, substitute a comma, and add: "subject to the approval of any necessary appropriations by the Congress."

This amendment prevents the making of commitments or contracts to buy lands with appropriated funds without congressional approval. It is not intended to limit any existing authority of the agencies involved to acquire privately owned holdings inside wilderness area boundaries by exchange of land or with donated funds.

On page 11, beginning after the period in line 5, strike all through line 10, and substitute the following:

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the wilderness system 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.

This amendment inserts the phrase "except as provided in this Act," before the original language for purposes of clarification.

On page 12, line 14, after the word "works," add "transmission lines,".
This amendment is for clarification.
On page 12, line 25, change the word "may" to "shall" and after the word "restrictions" add "and regulations".
This amendment is to make it clear that the enactment of S. 174 shall not be cause for reducing or terminating grazing in areas in the national forests where the grazing of livestock was well established prior to its enactment. It is not intended, however, that the amendment will in any way affect the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate and control grazing in such areas. He will continue to have the authority to reduce or terminate grazing within these areas for all other purposes or reasons that he can take such action with respect to other national forest areas.
On page 14, after subsection (7), add a new subsection (8) as follows:

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

Section 6(2)(a) provides that the President may authorize prospecting and mining in wilderness areas when he determines it will better serve the interests of the Nation and the people than will its denial. It will be necessary to have facts upon which to base an application to the President for any such authorization. This amendment permits gathering of information about mineral deposits in wilderness areas, on which to base any application to the President, by means which are not incompatible with the wilderness environment.
On pages 14 and 15 strike all of section 7 and substitute the following new section:

Sec. 7. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each maintain available to the public, records of portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction, including maps and legal descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. Within a year following the establishment of any area within the national forests as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: Provided, however, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made with the approval of such committees. Within a year following the establishment of any area in the national park system or in a wildlife refuge or range as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be corrected with the approval of such committees. Copies of maps and
legal descriptions of all areas of the wilderness system within their respective jurisdictions shall be kept available for public inspection in the offices of regional foresters, national forest superintendents, forest rangers, offices of the units of the national park system, wildlife refuge, or range.

Inasmuch as designation of an area of the wilderness system carries with it restrictions on the public's use of the area involved, and because modifications of boundaries, additions or eliminations, are subject to the approval and will of Congress, this amendment requires that maps and legal descriptions of all wilderness areas be filed with the Interior Committees of Congress and be maintained at offices reasonably accessible to all interested citizens. The amendment recognizes the possibility, if not probability, that inadvertent clerical and typographical errors may occur in the preparation of such voluminous and precise descriptions and provides for correction of such errors with the assent of the committee only. However, any changes which modify the original boundaries approved by Congress will require congressional consideration under section 3(e) of the bill, or, if an addition or elimination of land area, under section 3(h).

On page 15, after section 8, add the following new section:

**LAND USE COMMISSIONS**

Sec. 9. With respect to any State having more than ninety percent of its total land area owned by the federal government on January 1, 1961, there shall be established for each such state a Presidential Land Use Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of five persons appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party, and three of whom shall be resident of the State concerned. The Commission shall advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior on the current utilization of federally owned land in such State and shall make recommendations to the Secretary as to how the federally owned land can best be utilized, developed, protected and preserved. Any recommendations made to the Congress by the Secretary of Interior pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be accompanied by the recommendations and reports made with respect thereto by the Commission.

This amendment is applicable only to the State of Alaska, where more than 99 percent of the land area is owned by the United States. More than 25 million acres in the new State have been set aside as parks, monuments, or wildlife areas. Inasmuch as there is less known about the nature and resources of these areas than of those in other States, this amendment authorizes a Presidential Land Use Commission which will, in connection with studying and advising on best use of the Federal land holdings in Alaska, also make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior in regard to the designation of wilderness areas in the national parks, monuments, and wildlife refuges and game ranges within that State.
Less than a century after the establishment of the United States, proposals were made to set aside some of the scenic wonders and great primitive areas of our new Nation for future enjoyment.

In 1864, President Abraham Lincoln signed an act which transferred to the State of California for preservation an area of including the present Yosemite National Park, which was returned to the Federal Government after the national park concept was established.

In 1872 Congress established Yellowstone National Park.

In 1894, an article was written into the New York State Constitution directing the preservation of a forest preserve in that State that now comprises nearly 2.5 million acres, a constitutional provision which the citizens of the State have repeatedly sustained in referendum. In all, there are today about 3 million acres of "wilderness" being preserved in a dozen State parks. California has about 500,000 acres in six State parks.

Shortly after the turn of the century, Congress adopted the National Monuments and Historic Sites Act of 1906 which authorized the President to set aside landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic and scientific interest on Federal lands.

Individual park acts followed.

**NATIONAL PARK WILDERNESS-TYPE AREAS**

In 1916, Congress established the National Park Service and the park system, directing the conservation of "the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife" of the areas in its jurisdiction. The same act directed that the park system should be administered to—

provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

In the years which have followed, the Park Service has attempted to establish a pattern of "preservation with reasonable access" which would accommodate the increasing flow of visitors to the parks but conserve and preserve as much as possible of their outstanding primitive and wilderness values. Increases in park visitors have caused mounting pressure for more roads and service facilities which impinge on remaining primitive areas.

There is now approximately 22 million acres in 27 parks, 20 national monuments, and 1 seashore recreational area regarded as suitable for consideration as part of the wilderness system. Of this total, 7,150,000 acres are in Alaska.

**NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS-TYPE AREAS**

In 1924, under the leadership of Aldo Leopold and others in the U.S. Forest Service in New Mexico, the regional forester established a wilderness area in the Gila National Forest. Later, under the designation "primitive area," this was confirmed by the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture who also set aside other wilderness-type areas for protection.
In the twenties and thirties, 83 such areas of great scenic beauty and wilderness value, and relatively poor accessibility or value for other purposes, were set aside in the 181 million acres of national forests. They compose 14.6 million acres. The areas were first designated as "primitive" areas, without an acre-by-acre study, and protected to the extent possible under Executive powers against exploitation or development that would destroy their primitive character and wilderness values. These areas were excluded for consideration for timber sales. Prospecting was strictly regulated to minimize damage to natural conditions. Grazing was permitted in some areas.

After this first designation of "primitive areas," the Forest Service set about reviewing each area carefully. Areas more valuable for timber, mining, and other purposes than for wilderness preservation have been eliminated by such reviews. Some additional contiguous forest land areas, most valuable for preservation, have been added. At the conclusion of each review there have been public hearings, revision of recommendations, and finally classification by the Secretary of Agriculture of the adjusted area as "wild" if under 100,000 acres, or "wilderness" if more than 100,000 acres.

The review work, started in 1939, has been handled by the regular Forest Service staff as a "spare time" job when regular duties were least pressing.

Out of the original "primitive areas," there are now 14 "wilderness areas" in the national forests containing 4,888,173 acres. There are 29 "wild" areas containing 998,234 acres. There is one "canoe" area of 886,673 acres. There are 39 "primitive areas" in various stages of review which now comprise 7,890,973 acres.

(A table of these areas by States appears as appendix I.)

**WILDLIFE REFUGE AND GAME RANGE AREAS**

Out of more than 275 federally owned wildlife refuges and game ranges, there are approximately a score, comprising totally between 22 million and 23 million acres, which contain large areas of primeval lands suitable for saving as wilderness. (More than 18 million acres of these areas are in Alaska.)

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has advised the committee that—

the future of many species of wildlife and game resources generally is dependent in a large measure upon the wild lands in public ownership retaining their present character. The Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife has endeavored, through the national wildlife refuge program, to preserve wilderness characteristics of the refuge properties * * * some species of wildlife are dependent upon an undisturbed environment.

The Service advised that it would welcome designation of appropriate areas in its jurisdiction, where wilderness would be compatible and contribute to the primary wildlife preservation purposes of the Service, as parts of a wilderness system.
In 1948, at the request of Members of Congress, the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, undertook one of the first studies made of the desirability of a Federal policy and program in regard to wilderness preservation. It was an analysis of opinion on the problem directed by Mr. C. Frank Keyser.

A questionnaire was widely distributed to Federal agencies, States, and interested citizens, seeking opinions on whether wilderness preservation was desirable and, if so, who should preserve it, and how, as well as for data on available wilderness areas being preserved and many other details.

The replies indicated the availability of wilderness areas in national forests, parks, and wildlife refuges and game ranges (discussed above), and on unreserved public domain and Indian lands under Federal ownership or jurisdiction.

There was a wide variation of understanding of the term "wilderness." There was a wide variation of views as to how wilderness preservation should be handled. The replies reflected a wide belief that wilderness areas should be preserved for recreational, scientific, scenic and cultural reasons, sustaining this comment by the director:

In recent years there has been an increasing awareness by the Government and the people of the United States of the many problems of land use. With the growing population and the resulting utilization of more and more previously unutilized land it is becoming evident that before many years have passed there is danger that the original wilderness which was met and conquered by our forefathers in building our country will have disappeared entirely. It will exist only in the history books. If, then, there is reason for preserving substantial portions of the remaining wilderness it must be decided upon before it is too late.

The report was issued in September 1949.

Legislative History of the Wilderness Bill

The first major wilderness bill introduced in Congress was filed in March 1957—S. 1176 of the 85th Congress. It was a slight revision of a study bill, S. 4013 of the 84th Congress, introduced to stimulate broadened discussion.

More than 7 years of study, conferences by proponents of wilderness preservation with agencies, drafting, redrafting, and adjustment of views intervened between the study and this first introduction of a wilderness bill. Hearings were conducted June 19 and 20, 1957. They reflected concern among the Federal agencies administering public lands about the need for a congressional declaration of policy in support of wilderness preservation to strengthen the hand of agencies attempting the job under executive authority. There was continued disagreement on details of administration, and opposition to a proposed "Wilderness Council" which, although limited to assembling facts, publishing lists of areas in the wilderness system and making policy recommendations, was regarded as a threatening new agency which might assume administrative authority over some or all of the lands and attempt to "build its own empire."
There were further conferences and in 1958 a revised bill—S. 4028 of the 2d session, 85th Congress—was introduced. Hearings were held in Washington, D.C., on July 23, 1958, and, during November 1958, in Bend, Oreg.; San Francisco, Calif.; Salt Lake City, Utah, and Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Another revised bill, S. 1123 was introduced in the 1st session of the 86th Congress and field hearings were held on it at Seattle, Wash., and Phoenix, Ariz.

At this point, more than 500 witnesses had been heard and more than 2,213 pages of hearing record filled.

During subsequent staff and committee conferences on S. 1123, three successive redrafts of the bill were prepared, printed as committee prints and circulated for comment. The proposal to establish wilderness system units on Indian lands, and later modified to require the assent of affected tribes, was dropped altogether. The proposed Wilderness Council was dropped. In executive sessions of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Print No. 3 of S. 1123 in 1960 the Departments of Interior and Agriculture assented to passage of the bill but the measure was not voted upon nor reported by the committee.

The Present Wilderness Bill

S. 174, herein recommended for passage as amended, was introduced in the 87th Congress on January 4, 1961. Hearings were conducted February 27 and 28, 1961. The committee heard or received statements from more than 180 organizations and individuals plus hundreds of letters of which only a sampling could be printed in the hearing record.

General

S. 174 establishes a national policy of wilderness preservation and brings into existence a National Wilderness Preservation System to be comprised of Federal lands also serving other purposes. It designates as part of the new system, 6,773,080 acres in 44 wild, wilderness, and canoe areas in the national forests which have already been carefully reviewed and classified by the administering department. It establishes a procedure for the review by both the administering agency and Congress of the wilderness character and value of each of certain additional areas in the national forests, national park system, and wildlife refuges and game ranges under which the areas, or portions of them, may finally become designated parts of the wilderness preservation system. It leaves all lands under the administration of the agency now in charge and provides no interference with the basic purposes which the areas are now serving. In 14.6 million acres of national forest lands (approximately 8 percent of total national forest), or portions finally designated as part of the wilderness system, new mining operations, reservoirs or certain other commercial operations will require authorization by the President upon a finding that such operations will better serve the people than continued preservation as wilderness.

In a large measure, S. 174 gives Statutory sanction and protection to maintenance of the status quo of the Federal wilderness lands involved and provides that the wilderness character of each area finally included in the National Wilderness Preservation System shall
not be changed except on authorization at the highest levels of Government—by the President and/or Congress.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Section 1 states the title as the "Wilderness Act."

Section 2(a) is a statement of Congress' belief that increasing population and human developments will occupy or modify all areas of the Nation except those set aside for preservation in their natural condition; it declares congressional policy to assure the Nation of an enduring resource of wilderness and establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of appropriate federally owned areas.

Section 2(b) defines wilderness in two ways: First, in an ideal concept of wilderness areas where the natural community of life is untrammeled by man, who visits but does not remain, and, second, as it is to be considered for the purposes of the act: areas where man's work is substantially unnoticeable, where there is outstanding opportunity for solitude or a primitive or unconfined type of recreation, which are of adequate size to make practicable preservation as wilderness, and which may have ecological, geological, or other scientific, educational, scenic, and historical values.

Section 3 sets out the areas of Federal lands in the national forests, park system, and wildlife refuges and game ranges which are to be designated as part of the wilderness preservation system, or considered for such designation. A procedure is established that will assure review of every area by both the executive agency in charge of it and by the Congress prior to its final inclusion in the wilderness system.

Section 3(b) provides that four categories of wilderness-type areas in the national forests will become units of the wilderness preservation system: wild, wilderness, roadless (canoe), and primitive. Inasmuch as the wild, wilderness, and roadless areas have already been carefully reviewed by the Forest Service and reclassified as such by the Secretary of Agriculture, the enactment of S. 174 will complete their designation as part of the new wilderness preservation system.

The 39 unreviewed primitive areas are put into the wilderness system subject to a review by the Secretary of Agriculture and recommendation to Congress by the President with such boundary adjustments as are deemed proper to include only areas of predominant wilderness value. The President may recommend exclusion of parts of any primitive area not of predominant wilderness value. He may recommend the inclusion of national forest lands adjacent to the primitive area which are of predominant wilderness value but not to exceed, after exclusions and inclusions, the original size of the primitive area. Following the receipt of the President's recommendation in respect to each primitive area, it is provided in section 3(f) that either the House of Representatives or the Senate may disapprove at any time during the next following complete session of Congress. In the event of such a disapproval, the primitive area may again be reviewed and resubmitted to Congress within 2 years, affording the executive branch an opportunity to take into account congressional reasons for disapproval and make adjustments to meet them if it is possible and desirable. All primitive areas must be reviewed and recommendations submitted to Congress within 10 years. All such areas not
continued in the wilderness system under the procedure within 14
years—10 years plus time for congressional consideration and a
resubmittal—return to the same status as other national forest lands.

Section 3(c) provides for the inclusion of national park system lands
in the wilderness system. The Secretary of the Interior is directed
to conduct a review of park system units containing 5,000 acres or
more of contiguous, roadless lands, and report his recommendation
for the incorporation of each such unit into the wilderness preservation
system. His recommendations to the President are to include a de-
scription of parts of each park system unit, determined in accordance
with section 4, the Administrative Procedure Act, which should be
reserved for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors
and administrative installations. Before the convening of Congress
each year, the President is to advise Congress of his recommendations
with respect to the incorporation of the reviewed areas into the wilder-
ness system. As in the case of national forest areas, either the House
of Representatives or the Senate may disapprove at any time during
the next following complete session of Congress under section 3(f).

Section 3(d) deals with wildlife refuges and game ranges. It pro-
vides for inclusion in the wilderness preservation of such portions of
such areas as the Secretary of the Interior may recommend to the
President within 10 years, the President recommends to Congress,
and neither the House nor the Senate disapproves under section 3(f).
The Secretary of the Interior may also recommend inclusion in the
wilderness system, by the same procedure, portions of new refuges or
ranges added to his jurisdiction in the next 15 years. Such recom-
mandation is to be made by the Secretary of the Interior within 2
years after the addition of the new unit.

Section 3(e) provides that any modification or adjustment of
boundaries of a portion of the wilderness system may be made only
after publication of public notice in the vicinity, public hearing in the
area, and submission of a recommendation to Congress under the
procedures of section 3(f).

Section 3(f), referred to above in regard to finalizing inclusion of
forest, park, and wildlife areas in the wilderness system, and in modi-
fying or adjusting boundaries, provides that a recommendation of the
President in regard to one of the proposed wilderness areas shall
become effective upon the adjournment sine die of the first full
session of Congress following receipt of the President’s recommenda-
tion by the Senate and House of Representatives if neither body
has passed a resolution of disapproval prior to sine die adjournment.
Resolutions of disapproval are made subject to procedures in the
Reorganization Act of 1949 which provide that any Member of
either body may, after a resolution of disapproval has been before
committee for at least 10 days, move to discharge the committee and
bring the resolution to the floor.

The provisions of this section assure the Senate and House of Repre-
sentatives opportunity to pass on each unit or area proposed for
inclusion in the wilderness system separately, without affecting any
other unit or area, and assure each Member of the two bodies the
right to bring before the body of which he is a Member a resolution
of disapproval of any area which may be recommended to Congress
by the President.
Section 3(g) provides protection for areas intended to be proposed for wilderness from any and all appropriation under public land laws, to the extent deemed necessary by the appropriate Secretary, pending their review and consideration for wilderness status. Such segregation ends in 5 years if no proposal has been submitted to Congress within that time for inclusion of the area in the wilderness system, or upon the rejection of the proposal by the President or by Congress.

Section 3(h) provides that no area, other than the national forest, park system, and wildlife refuge and game range lands specifically provided for in the act, shall be added to or eliminated from the wilderness system except by "specific, affirmative authorization by law * * * *.*" This limits the application of the procedure of Presidential recommendations which become effective if not disapproved by the Senate or House of Representatives, to the areas specifically dealt with in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 3. Beyond those areas, no Federal lands can become a unit of the wilderness system except by the enactment of a law to that effect.

Section 4 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire private land holdings within any portion of the wilderness system subject to the approval of necessary appropriations by the Congress. Acquisition of such lands with donated funds, or under existing authority to exchange lands, is not prohibited.

Section 5 authorizes the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to accept gifts of land for preservation as wilderness, subject to regulations in accordance with agreements incident to the gift or bequest which are consistent with the policy of the act.

Section 6 deals with the administration and use of lands in the wilderness preservation system. Section 6(a) provides that nothing in the act shall interfere with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved except to make the administering agency responsible for preserving the wilderness character, and to so administer each area for its other purposes "as also to preserve its wilderness character." Subject to the provisions of the act, the wilderness system is to be administered for recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use in harmony with the wilderness environment and its preservation.

During committee consideration of S. 174, an amendment was offered which provided that mining should be allowed to continue in national parks in each instance where the act establishing the park permits such mining. Inquiry was made of Secretary of the Interior Udall of the need for an amendment for the purpose. Secretary Udall's reply follows:

Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Clinton: Your letter of June 13, 1961, addressed to Director Wirth of the National Park Service states that a suggestion has been made that the wilderness bill, S. 174, should be amended so as not to
interfere with mining activities in park areas where mining is now permitted.

In our opinion, such an amendment is unnecessary in order to permit mining activities in those few park areas where mining is now permitted. We believe that sufficient protection is afforded to mining by the language of the bill on page 6, lines 16 through 22, as recommended by our report of February 24, 1961, to your committee. Also, section 6(a) contains further assurance that such limited mining would be continued. Inclusion of specific provision on mining might cast doubt as to the retention of other uses under the language cited.

Although a number of park areas were established initially subject to existing rights, there are now only four park areas which are open to the acquisition of mineral rights in addition to those rights in existence at the time the park area was established. In each of these four areas, certain mining and prospecting activity is specifically allowed by statute. These four areas and the authority for mining activity in each area are as follows:


Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,  
Secretary of the Interior.

Secretary Udall’s interpretation of the act as written, in which he refers to this provision and a portion of section 3(c)(2), coincided with that of the committee, so the proposed amendment in regard to mining in parks was set aside as not necessary.

Section 6(b) prohibits any commercial enterprise in the wilderness system, except as provided in the act (i.e., the continuation of grazing in some areas and mining as cited above), and subject to existing private rights. Also prohibited are construction of permanent roads, use of motor vehicles or motorized equipment, motorboats, landing of aircraft, or use of any other mechanical transport. The construction of temporary roads or structures or other installations is limited to the minimum necessary to the administration of the area for the purposes of the act, including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within wilderness areas.

Section 6(c) contains eight special provisions as follows:

(1) Provision for continued use of aircraft and motorboats where there use is a well-established practice, and authorization of necessary measures to control fire, insects, and disease.

(2) Provision that within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, the President may authorize prospecting, mining, exploration for and production of oil and gas, establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest when he determines that such use is in the best public interest. Also, that grazing of livestock shall be permitted to continue in areas of national forest or public domain
where it is a well-established practice, subject to such restrictions and regulations as the appropriate Secretary deems necessary.

(3) A provision that various acts applicable to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in Minnesota are to continue to be applicable to the area and are not modified by S. 174.

(4) Authorization of performance of commercial services within wilderness areas which are necessary to realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system, such as provision of horses and guide service to wilderness visitors by persons headquartered and conducting their business operations outside the wilderness area, or taking of pictures or observing and recording of scientific data for pay.

(5) Permits the continuation of any existing use or form of appropriation authorized in executive orders or laws establishing a national wildlife refuge or game range which may be included in the wilderness system.

(6) Provides that nothing in the act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(7) Provides for the maintenance of the present jurisdiction and responsibilities of the several States in respect to fish and wildlife in the national forests.

(8) Authorizes gathering of information about mineral resources in national forest areas included in the wilderness system by means, including prospecting, not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

Section 7 provides for the maintenance of maps and legal descriptions of areas in the wilderness system at locations convenient to citizens who may be effected, and maintenance of copies of regulations and other records in regard to wilderness system actions, available to the public, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior. Maps and legal descriptions of each wilderness area are to be filed with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House of Representatives and Senate within 1 year after their inclusion in the wilderness system. Provision is made for the correction of typographical or clerical errors in these descriptions with the approval of the committees, but modifications of intended boundaries involving elimination from or additions to a wilderness area must be cleared by Congress in accordance with section 3(e) or section 3(h), as appropriate. Section 3(e), governing modification of boundaries, is intended to provide for relatively small adjustments to regularize boundaries, to serve administrative convenience, and similar purposes. Section 3(h), requiring that additions or eliminations from the wilderness system beyond those specifically provided for within the act, provides that they shall be done only by specific, affirmative authorization by law. This provision covers the establishment of any new or additional wilderness system unit, or any addition to or elimination from a previously established unit within the wilderness system. The act does not include a specific acreage limit on areas which may be involved in a modification of boundary under section 3(e) since such modifications are subject to disapproval by either the House of Representatives or the Senate. It is not intended, however, that section 3(e) governing modification of boundaries shall be used to achieve a change primarily for the purpose of adding to or eliminating an area of land from, the wilderness system.
Section 8 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to accept contributions and gifts to be used to further the purpose of the act and makes such gifts for public purposes subject to the usual deduction for purposes of income, estate, and gift taxes in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Revenue Code of 1954.

Section 9 authorizes the establishment of a Presidential Land Use Commission in any State having more than 90 percent of its total land area owned by the Federal Government and defines the duties of such commissions. The section is applicable only to the State of Alaska, where more than 99 percent of the total land area is federally owned. The Commission is to be composed of five members, including not more than three from one political party and including three members from the State affected.

The Commission will advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior and make recommendations on the utilization, development, and protection of Federal land areas in Alaska generally. It is charged specifically with making recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior in regard to inclusion of Alaskan areas in the wilderness system. The Commission's recommendations are to accompany each recommendation made to Congress, under this act, for designation of a wilderness area in the State.

REASONS FOR THE ALASKA AMENDMENT

Section 9, constituting the "Alaska amendment" was approved by the committee for a number of reasons, including the unusual preponderance of Federal land holdings in the State, the comparatively large acreages in national parks and in game refuges and ranges in the State, and the uncertainty in such a new area as to how the pattern of settlement and economic development will occur.

There are no primitive areas in the national forests in Alaska. The committee is advised by the Forest Service that it does not intend to designate any further primitive areas either in Alaska or any other State, but to eliminate this temporary interim classification through reclassification of existing primitive areas under the provisions of this act if it is passed.

There are, however, 25,818,884 acres in Alaska in national parks, monuments, game ranges, and wildlife refuges—approximately a third of the total in the whole Nation. While the committee did not feel that establishment of wilderness system areas in Alaska should be delayed, it did believe that because of unusual and unparalleled circumstances in Alaska that concurrently with the establishment of such wilderness system areas there should be informed consideration of the needs and best uses of all of the Federal lands in the State. Section 9 provides for such concurrent study and consideration of overall land needs and uses and establishment of wilderness areas.

OPPOSITION TO S. 174

S. 174 has been vigorously opposed by groups with a legitimate and real concern with restriction of the use of portions of federally owned lands. These groups included segments of grazing, mining, petroleum and the timber industries.
The same growth of population which makes imperative the establishment of a wilderness system and preservation of some of the Nation's primitive areas for their unique values, also increases pressure for lands for other uses. Conflict between land use interests will intensify in the future, making decisions between various uses of available lands—all necessary in a healthy and vigorous nation—increasingly difficult.

Serious consideration has been given to the various competitive uses. Provisions have been included in the bill for future modifications in the wilderness system, or in regulations governing specific areas, if it is the finding of the President of the United States that a nonwilderness use is in the greater public interest than is wilderness use in some specific area. Congress itself can at any time enact legislation making changes.

Wilderness system areas are not "locked up" and the key thrown away. Physicians, scientists, soil conservationists, sportsmen, irrigators concerned about their high mountain watersheds, advocates of a resource reserve for future generations, and spokesmen for other interests, as well as recreationists, have testified eloquently and convincingly of the multiple values that will flow at all times from wilderness areas and a wilderness system. These very real values must be weighed against the urgency of the needs and the values of competitive uses.

The majority of the committee is convinced that the potential effect of S. 174 on competitive use industries has been considerably overdrawn and that it is clearly in the greatest public good to establish a wilderness preservation system.

THE EFFECT ON MINING AND OIL OPERATIONS

With the exception of the four park areas where mining is and will continue to be permitted under S. 174, national park system areas are now closed to these industries and the mining law is not applicable.

National wildlife refuges and game ranges are now strictly regulated and all but closed to mining and petroleum activity.

The greatest effect which S. 174 will have on the mining industry—and it does not affect any existing private rights—is in relation to the approximately 14.6 million acres of national forest areas—an almost miniscule fraction of the Nation's 2,271,304,320 acres of land area in the 50 States.

Mining laws are now applicable to these wild, wilderness, roadless and primitive areas in the national forests. But executive department regulations to protect their wilderness character, prohibiting use of motorized equipment which leave wheel tracks that erode into ruts, forbidding bulldozer exploration which leaves giant scars, and similar practices, makes them relatively inaccessible for exploration today—and little explored. Further, much of the area has already been prospected, some repeatedly.

To the extent that nonwilderness lands in the primitive areas are excluded from the wilderness system in the review required under S. 174, and the primitive areas comprise 7.9 million acres of the 14.6 million acres of national forest lands involved, the mining industry will be aided by the passage of S. 174. The excluded areas will again be open for prospecting and mining without cumbersome regulation.
Areas of national forest lands finally designated as part of the wilderness system will continue to be subject to exploration by means not inconsistent with the preservation of the wilderness character of the lands. If minerals are found, and the President finds mining in the area would be in the greater public good than preservation of wilderness, he is empowered to authorize such mining. Congress can at any time, by enactment, remove areas from the wilderness system.

The extreme contention is not true that S. 174 might lock up in the wilderness system some now unidentified mineral on which the Nation's fate might hang. In any such eventuality the wilderness system could and undoubtedly would be opened to exploration for the mineral and, if found, mined with the consent of the President.

In view of the vast unexploited land areas of the Nation that remain and the safeguards written into S. 174, the majority of the committee does not feel that the mining industry will actually be injured by the bill, and that the release of some primitive lands will be of advantage to it.

THE TIMBER RESOURCE SITUATION

The Nation can have a wilderness system and an abundance of timber next year, and for many, many years ahead with prudent management.

There is no timber harvest today from the lands being considered for inclusion in the wilderness system under S. 174. Parks and wildlife lands are restricted from extensive timber exploitation by the basic legislation creating them.

The national forest lands affected by S. 174 are not now subject to exploitation for timber. Timber sales were barred by executive regulation, with rare exceptions, when the 14.6 million acres of national forest primitive areas were set aside in the twenties and thirties for preservation as wilderness. Actually, because of their inaccessibility, there was little need for such a regulation. Most of the areas were, as they always had been, and still are, too inaccessible for exploitation.

The States with national forest wilderness areas have 65.9 million acres of commercial national forest lands, outside wilderness, with an allowable annual cut, on a sustained-yield basis, of 8.475 billion board feet. In 1960 only 7.835 billion board feet were cut, including special cuttings in some areas due to fire salvage. The gap between actual timber cut and the amount which could have been cut was in excess of 1 billion board feet of timber, making allowance for the special salvage operations.

In the years immediately ahead, there is a margin of allowable cut over actual cut to support a considerable expansion of timbering. The gap in Montana alone, some 524 million board feet, is more timber than all national forest wilderness-type areas could produce if they were committed to exploitation and it was economically feasible to exploit them.

The commercial timberlands in the wilderness-type areas are not a significant portion of our timber resource for future years. Only 4.7 million acres of the 14 million acres in the wilderness-type areas involved is designated as commercial timberland. This does not give consideration to the fact that the wilderness forest is at higher than
average elevation, resulting in a lower ability to produce timber. They are also relatively inaccessible, making the cost of exploitation high due to expensive access road construction costs. And some of the 4.7 million acres involved will unquestionably be excluded from the wilderness system during review of primitive areas required by S. 174.

The Nation's best opportunities to provide an abundance of timber in future years is in sound management of its forest lands.

There are 52 million acres of accessible forest land needing reforestation in the United States. Planted to trees, these idle acres could produce 6 billion board feet annually—at least 12 times the potential capacity of the higher, less accessible wilderness forest lands.

The annual national loss of sawtimber in the Nation from insects, fire, disease, and other causes is 43.8 billion board feet, including direct mortality and growth impact, or retardation of growth caused by insects, fire, and disease. This is more than 80 times the growth capacity of the wilderness forest areas and nearly equal to our present annual timber cut.

The need is for the application of modern forestry techniques to all the 488 million acres of commercial forest lands in the Nation, outside the forest wilderness areas, rather than to cut over the nine-tenths of 1 percent of such lands in the areas of wilderness value to permit a few more days of procrastination. Wilderness forest could supply us with only about 4 days additional supply of wood on an annual harvest basis if the heavy costs, in real dollars and wilderness values, were disregarded and they were exploited. Needed reforestation could provide nearly 50 days additional supply. Arresting losses by application of modern forestry techniques could add up to 320 days additional supply.

THE EFFECT ON GRAZING RESOURCES

S. 174 does not reduce grazing in areas in the national forests which are put into the wilderness system. The bill provides that it shall be continued where it is a well-established practice without diminution as a result of the passage of the act.

Should public domain lands be put into the wilderness system by an affirmative act of Congress in the future, the same provision for continuation of grazing will apply under S. 174.

The effect of S. 174 on grazing parallels that of our forest resource. S. 174 will not diminish the amount of the resource immediately available to this important industry. And the best opportunity for expansion of livestock range is not on the higher altitude, less productive wilderness lands, where plant growth is slow and increasingly sparse, but by the application of known, modern management practices to the vast areas of more accessible and more productive grazing lands which need seeding, brush, pest and weed control, fencing, water facilities, soil conservation, and other improvements.

The Bureau of Land Management program Twenty-Twelve released in 1960 for its 161-million acre holdings estimated that the forage production of BLM rangelands could be increased profitably from 17 million animal-unit months of forage at the time of the survey to 29 million by 1980 and 46 million by the year 2012.

The BLM study reflected a need for brush control on 32 million acres of its lands and for seeding on 12.3 million acres—areás vastly in excess of wilderness tracts involved.
In the national forests, outside wilderness-type areas, there are 4.4 million acres which need to be revegetated under the short-term phase of the program for the national forests.

**EFFECTS ON WATER RESOURCES**

The Federal Power Commission has estimated that within areas which might go into the wilderness system under S. 174, there is existing 748,900 kilowatts of generating capacity and another 257,000 kilowatts under construction. These licensed projects are not affected by S. 174.

It is estimated that there is in the prospective wilderness areas other potential power capacity, of undetermined economic feasibility, of 2,870,000 kilowatts and about 265,000 acres of prospective powersite lands, comprising less than 4 percent of Federal lands withdrawn nationally for power purposes.

During hearings, reclamation groups have expressed concern that establishment of the wilderness preservation system may interfere with development of necessary future reservoirs and water supply facilities for irrigation and other uses.

S. 174 has been amended to provide that the President may authorize the construction of water facilities in national forest and public domain wilderness areas when he finds such use in the greater public interest than its continued preservation as wilderness. Congress can, of course, at any time enact a statute authorizing a water facility anywhere on the public lands and will continue to have that power after S. 174 is enacted.

S. 174 does not, therefore, make it forever impossible to construct water facilities within wilderness system areas. It establishes a procedure by which the value to the people of the Nation of competing uses for Federal lands shall be weighed and a decision made between such uses, by the President in this instance, subject always to either affirmative or negative intervention by Congress through legislative action.

The committee is convinced that the values of wilderness areas, largely intangible values, are great, and in many instances outweigh the values of competing uses which may be forfeited by wilderness preservation. It recognizes, also, that primitive areas, once exploited, will never again be primitive, and that some must be set aside for preservation now if they are to be preserved in their natural state and retain certain irreplaceable values.

It is not in man's power to foresee accurately what the comparative values of competing uses for land may be for many years ahead.

During its lengthy hearings on the wilderness proposal, there were no separate instances of conflict, or vigorous protests that establishment of the wilderness system would interfere with specific, currently planned and urgently needed water projects.

S. 174 has consequently been written to designate the finest available lands suitable for wilderness preservation—approximately 2 percent of the Nation's more than 2 billion acres—to be preserved in their primitive condition for their wilderness values until a use in the greater good of the people of the Nation has been clearly demonstrated.

S. 174 recognizes that it may become necessary to sacrifice some tracts of wilderness for other uses, including water facilities, and makes
provision for such eventualities. If citizens are threatened by a water shortage which cannot be met by means other than a reservoir in a wilderness area, it can be built. If food needs require irrigation water which cannot be caught and stored below a wilderness area, or otherwise supplied, the power of the President or Congress to authorize a water project within a wilderness area can be exercised.

For the present, there appears no necessity for additional water developments in the proposed wilderness areas to meet current needs. As in the case of other resources, the area involved is comparatively small—approximately 2 percent of the Nation's 2 billion acres of land. In some instances alternative sites for water facilities can be found. Alternative sources of energy may alter the need for hydropower in the future. Saline water conversion may in a few years lessen the urgency of projects involving runoff waters. Or an upsurge in population might increase the urgency for water development and other uses of wilderness.

S. 174 establishes a wilderness preservation system and provides that areas within it may not be yielded to other uses except after examination of the issue at the highest levels of government. But it does not, and is not intended, to lock every acre of the wilderness system up against all contingencies.

**The Uses and Values of Wilderness**

Lands devoted to wilderness provide benefits beyond those identified as wilderness benefits and are truly multiple-use lands.

They provide watershed protection and clear, pure water for users below them.

They provide game which, if it could be produced at all, would cost tens of millions of dollars to maintain, propagate, and produce in artificial facilities. Scientists testify that some species cannot exist except in wilderness.

Under the provisions of S. 174, areas of the wilderness system will continue to supply forage for domestic livestock.

And they supply the recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use values to which S. 174 directs emphasis in future management of the wilderness preservation system.

Although these values are most often described as intangible, unmeasurable values, their worth to the Nation and to mankind is becoming increasingly easy to perceive and to estimate, even in dollar terms, as the Nation attempts to reacquire title to lands for necessary outdoor recreation areas facilities, or for wetlands essential for fish and game, or to build museums in which relatively miniscule evidences of natural history may be preserved for scientific, educational, and historical purposes.

**Recreational Values**

Wilderness areas, as distinguished from park-type facilities where mass recreation is available, are being used by 2 to 3 million persons annually.

The use is less casual than use of other types of recreational facilities. Trips into wilderness are frequently of many days or weeks duration. They are often a once-in-10-years event in life, or even a once-in-a-lifetime expedition to some remote scenic or historic mountain or area.
As a consequence of the nature of wilderness use, annual visitor figures—even if more adequately and reliably gathered—would not be indicative of the proportion of citizens interested in wilderness recreation.

In 1957 testimony, the Forest Service reported 450,000 persons used Forest Service wilderness areas in the preceding year. There is similar use of wilderness and primitive areas in the national park system, some on public domain lands, wildlife range and refuge areas, and State and private holdings.

Commenting on the national forest policy toward wilderness, Chief Richard E. McArdle testified:

* * * we are not providing for 450,000 people in the wilderness. We are providing for many more. We are looking ahead 100 years, 150 years. That number will increase. It will not be 450,000.

Wilderness recreation has values not present in other types of recreation. Doctors have testified of the therapeutic value of an experience in a natural area. Many individual witnesses in their pleas for passage of S. 174, or one of its predecessors, in often eloquent descriptions of scenes, sunsets, historic and scientific objects, and educational observations in wilderness, have confirmed that both the intangible spiritual and therapeutic values and benefits claimed for wilderness recreation are realities which greatly enrich the lives of those who experience them.

**SCENIC VALUES**

John Ruskin wrote in his second volume on "Modern Painters," published in 1846:

* * * beautiful things are useful to men because they are beautiful, and for the sake of beauty only; and not to sell, or pawn, or in any other way turn into money.

In spite of Ruskin's injunction, paintings and objects of art are evaluated in economic terms. They are bought to satisfy pride of possession. Admissions are paid to view them. They are a basis of economic activity.

Similarly, the scenic wonders of our forest, park, and public lands have their greatest value to men because they are beautiful—a beauty that can be lost if the areas are opened to physical exploitation and not preserved substantially as the Creator has presented them to us:

At the same time, these same scenic wonders have direct monetary values as tangible as the forests and minerals on and within them. They are the magnets that energize travel, tourism, and economic activity which, in some States, ranks among the first few sources of income.

**SCIENTIFIC, EDUCATIONAL, AND HISTORIC VALUES**

Separation of the scientific, educational and historic values of wilderness into neat categories is not possible.

The wilderness hiker, primarily interested in recreation, observes evidences of geological and natural history, resource management and conservation by natural forces, the interrelationships of various forms of life. His recreation is flavored and enriched by the other values.
Students using wilderness as a laboratory for observation of geological, biological or other categories of phenomena, reap recreational values.

Excerpts from the statements of a few of the many educators, scientists and scientific groups who have supported a wilderness preservation system, are indicative both of the separate and interrelated values which will flow from natural areas and must be appraised in making a sound determination on the desirability of setting aside primitive areas for protection as such.

Dr. Walter P. Cottam, professor of botany at the University of Utah, testified:

Besides the great spiritual and recreational blessings afforded to all the people living and unborn, this bill also provides laboratory sanctuaries for biological research that should prove to be of inestimable academic and economic worth. One of the most perplexing problems in land management today is the lack of available wilderness areas from which comparisons can be made and lessons learned on the life histories, on food chains, and other ecological interactions of myriads of living forms whose impact on the future of man himself may well prove to be far greater than any of us can possibly realize.

Speaking as an educator, Dr. Angus M. Woodbury, emeritus professor, University of Utah, testified:

The bill sets up areas which can be used as yardsticks, or experiments, by which things as they are in used areas, can be compared with these as they were before they were disturbed, and this proposal to make everything available for use destroys that ability, especially for educators who need samples which they can teach to their children or to their students, to show what was, as a basis for comparison, for the future guidance and control of biological resources in the country.

A resolution of the Wildlife Society, composed of scientists concerned with wildlife management, adopted in 1947, and reiterated at the committee's hearings, said:

** the remnants of primitive America and of irreplaceable value to science as sites for fundamental research and as check areas where none of the human factors being compared by investigators have been operative.

** the science of wildlife management is peculiarly concerned with the perpetuation of primeval areas as check areas against which the practices in game production on lands under management can be measured.

The American Society of Mammalogists said in a resolution adopted in 1946, and submitted to the committee in 1958:

** the few remaining representative areas of American wilderness are of value not only as a heritage of the past and as unique recreational areas, but also as the scenes of research
and as locations for check areas in connection with scientific investigations involving comparison of conditions on natural areas with those on farms, rangelands, and other areas under management.

Luna B. Leopold, Chief of the Water Resources Division of the U.S. Geological Survey, has emphasized the value of untouched areas of significant size as "benchmarks" in connection with water problems, including falling water tables.

A similar value in connection with observation of transpiration from plant life into the atmosphere, and effect on climate and rainfall, has been suggested.

Historical, scientific, educational and other values of wilderness were well epitomized by Howard Zahniser, spokesman for wilderness proponents, in his description of a primitive area as: "a piece of the long ago that we still have with us."

The very real values of having some of it cannot be questioned.

**Some Dollar Considerations Involved**

**SHORELINE—AN EXPENSIVE PURCHASE PROGRAM**

On January 2, 1935, the National Park Service submitted to the Secretary of the Interior a study indicating that the Federal Government could and should acquire 427 miles of seashore frontage in areas embracing 602,000 acres at an estimated cost of $11,988,000.

Only one of them was acquired, the present Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreation Area.

Today, the Senate Interior Committee is considering a bill to acquire 88 miles of Padre Island, off Texas, at a cost of $4 million for acquisition alone. In 1935 the entire 117-mile island could have been acquired for one-eighth of that amount.

Other areas listed in 1935 have been developed or otherwise made unavailable, so the Nation has belatedly turned elsewhere in search of comparatively small tracts of seashore which can be acquired to assure some public access to our oceans. Cape Cod, approved by the Senate, will cost more than the whole 427 miles would have cost in 1935. Cost of Point Reyes, Calif., is estimated at $30 million—nearly three times the 1935 estimate on 427 miles.

Twenty-five years after the original seashore report to the Secretary of the Interior, it is not difficult to see that expenditure of $11 or $12 million at that time would have saved the Nation tens of millions of dollars.

There is an opportunity to establish a significant wilderness preservation system in the United States today without any cost of acquisition to the Government, for it would be on lands still in Government hands.

Even though the acreage remained in Government hands, if it were exploited commercially and lost its wilderness character, the Government would inevitably in the future be confronted—as it is confronted today in relation to seashores—with buying and preserving remnants of wilderness in private ownership to meet the needs for fast vanishing wilderness recreation and other wilderness values.
MUSEUMS WITHOUT COST

We take it for granted—
says Dr. Luna Leopold—
that there is some social gain in the erection of a museum of fine arts, a museum of natural history, or even an historical museum. Sooner or later we ought to be mature enough to extend this concept to another kind of museum, one which you might call the museum of land types consisting of samples as uninfluenced as possible by man.

This quotation presents another concept of the value of a wilderness preservation system.

The budget estimate for the Smithsonian Institution in 1962 which includes $10 million for additions to the natural history building and $13.6 million for the museum of history and technology, as well as approximately $9 million for salaries and expenses, totals $35,162,000. While this figure covers both construction and operating expenses of a museum of many fields of interest, it is nonetheless indicative of a dollar evaluation which could be placed on the natural museums which our wilderness areas represent. The fields of scientific interest represented by the proposed wilderness preservation system areas are far wider than the single purpose—museums of land types—which Dr. Leopold suggested. They would be living museums of geological, biological, ecological and many other values which could not be duplicated by a future generation at any cost, although they are available today without expense to the Government.

WETLANDS—A $150 MILLION COST ITEM

The present generation cannot criticize its forebears for disposing of wetlands once owned by the Government, nor for draining a part of them. They had no way to know that the existence of wetlands would in a few generations be a critical need. Nonetheless, there is before Congress today a bill—passed by the House of Representatives—authorizing a 10-year, $150 million program to buy up just 4½ million acres of wetlands to provide habitat for migratory wildfowl and related purposes. The sum is to be liquidated by receipts from duck-hunting stamps, without interest.

This situation is another indication of the opportunity which S. 174 presents.

CONCLUSION

We know that there has long been a genuine demand for wilderness preservation. Theodore Roosevelt recognized in it his first annual message to Congress on December 3, 1901, when he said:

Some at least of the forest reserves should afford perpetual protection to the native fauna and flora, safe havens of refuge to our rapidly diminishing wild animals of the larger kinds, and free camping grounds for the ever-increasing numbers of the men and women who have learned to find rest, health, and recreation in the splendid forests and flower-clad meadows of our mountains.
It is not too late in our disposition of the public lands and land holdings to meet the fast growing need for wilderness without damaging other interests, requiring real sacrifices, entailing enormous expenses, or requiring the acceptance of second rate remnants.

If we act promptly by the enactment of S. 174 we can preserve without cost for the present and future generations, truly priceless areas.

If we do not we shall have no valid excuse to leave to our progeny for our delinquency.

Reports of the executive agencies on S. 174 follow:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Anderson: Your committee has requested a report on S. 174, a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

We urge the enactment of this proposal. We suggest hereafter certain minor amendments to the bill that we believe would be desirable.

Wilderness resources contain basic values and provide undeniable benefits to the American people. We believe this has been amply demonstrated from the previous hearings of your committee on wilderness proposals. In our opinion, the establishment of a wilderness system, along the lines outlined in this bill, is in the public interest.

This proposal recognizes equitably the various facets to the problem of wilderness preservation. We believe that it resolves many, if not all, of the objections that have been raised in the past to wilderness proposals. It clearly delimits the wilderness system to well-defined areas and prescribes an orderly method for establishment of the system. It prescribes sound procedures applicable to both the executive and legislative branches of the Government in determining the particular areas or parts of Federal reservations to be included in the wilderness system.

The system to be established by this bill would be composed of federally owned lands. Portions of the national park system, wildlife refuges, and game ranges administered by the Department and portions of the national forests administered by the Department of Agriculture would be included in the system. It should be noted in this connection that the national park system areas, wildlife refuges, and game ranges that we administer would not be included immediately following enactment of the proposal in the wilderness system. Portions of these areas would be selected and included in this system over a 10-year period, in accordance with prescribed procedures set forth in the bill. In the case of the national forest areas, however, there would be included in the wilderness system immediately upon enactment of the legislation those national forest areas classified by the Department of Agriculture as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe. The primitive group of areas, however, would be subject to
subsequent review over a 15-year period in order to determine which of these areas should be retained in the system.

One of the major provisions of the bill is contained in section 3(h). This subsection provides that the addition of new wilderness areas to the system or the elimination of the areas from the system that are not specifically provided for by the bill shall be made only after specific authorization by law for such addition or elimination. We believe this requirement is desirable.

Section 2 of the bill contains a statement of policy that would express the desire of the Congress to secure for present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. Sections 2 and 6 contain the general provisions that would govern the administration of wilderness areas as well as prescribe the purposes and uses of the system. Significantly, the bill provides that the system shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people, in such manner as will leave the system unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of the areas and the preservation of the wilderness character. This provision is very similar to the requirements now applicable, pursuant to the basic National Park Act of 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1–3), to the national park system. On this point we observe that wilderness-type areas constitute an important segment of the national park system and have contributed heavily over the years to the enjoyment by the American people of wilderness values.

We believe that section 6(a) is worthy of special note. This subsection provides that nothing in the act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes and also to preserve its wilderness character. This provision, we believe, has the effect of preserving the status quo to the maximum extent in the management of the Federal reservations in question, subject however to the overall requirement that the administering agencies carry out the essential requirements set forth in the bill for wilderness preservation.

While the bill prohibits, consistently with wilderness preservation, as prescribed in section 6(b), commercial enterprises within the wilderness system, roads, motor vehicles, motorized equipment, et cetera, it provides in section 6(c)(4) that commercial services may be performed within the wilderness system to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system.

In addition to the general provisions relating to administration of the wilderness system, there are specific provisions in the bill that are applicable to national forest areas. These provisions would permit certain uses to continue that are already well-established within the forest areas in question. Also, certain additional uses may be authorized by the President upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial. In the case of wildlife refuges and game ranges, the bill provides that any existing
use or form of appropriation authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing such areas and which use exists on the effective date of the act may be continued under such authorization of provision. In this connection, we note that the bill makes no provision for special uses within the national park system. We believe this is appropriate and is consistent with long-established policies and standards, established by the Congress for administration of that system.

There are other provisions that are worthy of mention. Boundary adjustments may be made in wilderness areas in accordance with certain prescribed procedures whereby the appropriate Secretary, after public notice and hearing, subsequent recommendations to the President, and transmittal of such recommendations to the Congress, the boundary adjustment may be accomplished if the Congress makes no objection thereto. We note that in the case of areas of the national park system the bill provides for the inclusion of those areas of more than 5,000 acres where such areas exist without roads. The Secretary would be required to determine what portions of the parks would be required for roads, utilities, et cetera. The bill contains no minimum acreage limitations regarding wildlife refuges and game ranges to be included in the system.

We recommend the following amendments to this bill:

(1) On page 5, line 7, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen".

This amendment is suggested in the interest of uniformity. Fifteen years are allowed in the bill for the review of certain national forest areas to determine their suitability for inclusion in the wilderness system. We believe that national park system areas, as well as the wildlife refuges and game ranges, should be governed by the same requirement.

(2) On page 6, line 16, beginning with the word "Further", strike out the language in the sentence up to and including the word "area" in line 20, and substitute in lieu thereof "The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to but not in interference with the purposes for which parks, monuments, and other units of the national park system are administered".

This amendment is desirable in the interest of clarification. It is in harmony with a similar provision relating to national forests in section 3(b)(2).

(3) On page 7, line 10, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen".

As previously explained regarding a similar amendment relating to national parks, this amendment is suggested for the purposes of uniformity. If this amendment is adopted, in the interest of promoting further clarification, the next amendment would be desirable.

(4) On page 7, line 10, insert a period immediately following the word "Act" and strike out the rest of the sentence beginning with ", and" in line 10 and ending with the word "jurisdiction." in line 16.

(5) On page 8, line 10, following the word "shall" insert "if found to be justified by the Secretary,".

(6) On page 9, revise line 8 to read "(g) Public notice when given by either the Secretary of the".

We consider this amendment to be desirable in the interest of clarification. Subsection (g) provides that "The public notice by
either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that any areas to be proposed under the provisions of this Act for incorporation as part of the wilderness system shall segregate such area from any or all appropriation under the public land laws to the extent deemed necessary by such Secretary." [Emphasis supplied.]
The only requirement for the giving of public notice, however, is contained in subsection (e) concerning modification of boundaries. We believe the language of subsection (g) probably would be limited in application to boundary modifications under subsection (e). On the other hand, it appears that the intent of subsection (g) is to have the provision apply also to new areas. Our amendment is suggested in order to permit the giving of notice, and the segregation of the lands in question from the public land laws pursuant to subsection (g), in the discretion of the particular Secretary. There would be no need to give notice or use the authority under subsection (g) to segregate the lands within the national park system from the public land laws as these areas are already segregated from such laws.

(7) On page 9, line 22, the following the word "any", insert the word "new".
This is a clarifying amendment.

(8) On page 10, line 7, strike out the words "privately owned" and insert in lieu thereof the words "non-Federal".
This is a clarifying amendment.

(9) On page 10, line 25, and on page 11, line 1, strike out the words "except that any", and insert in lieu thereof "Each".
This amendment is suggested for clarification. So far as the national parks are concerned, the present language indicating that an exception is required to preserve the areas for wilderness purposes is inaccurate. These areas, as we have indicated previously, are administered in keeping with wilderness standards.
The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, subject to your consideration of the foregoing amendments, enactment of S. 174 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

Department of Agriculture,

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Anderson: This is in response to your request of January 17 for a report on S. 174, a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

We strongly recommend that the bill be enacted insofar as it affects this Department.
The bill would declare a policy of the Congress to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For that purpose, the bill would establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, which would include national forest areas, national park system areas, and national
wildlife refuge and game range areas. The bill would provide that the federally owned lands within areas of the wilderness system would be administered in such a way as to leave them unimpaired and to provide for the protection and preservation of their wilderness character. It would provide for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

The bill would include in the National Wilderness Preservation System all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of the act as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe. The areas classified at that time as primitive would be reviewed within 15 years as to their suitability for continued inclusion in the wilderness system. Recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture following such review would be reported to the President and each year the President would submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect thereto. Provision would be made for including in such recommendations appropriate adjustments in primitive area boundaries.

The President would be authorized to recommend modifications or adjustments of boundaries of areas in the wilderness system.

The recommendations of the President with respect to the continued inclusion of primitive areas in the wilderness system and for modifications or adjustments of boundaries of areas in the wilderness system would take effect if not disapproved by the Congress by concurrent resolution within a full session of Congress following the date the recommendation was received.

The bill would provide that the addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for in the bill could be made only after specific authorization by law. It is understood that this would apply to the addition of a completely new wilderness-type area to the system or the complete elimination of a wilderness-type area from the system, and not to additions or eliminations of land areas to an existing wilderness-type area in the system by a modification or adjustment of boundaries.

With respect to national forest areas included in the wilderness system, the bill would permit the use of aircraft or motorboats where well established to continue, and measures for fire, insect, and disease control could be taken. Prospecting and mining and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, and other facilities needed in the public interest within specific portions of national forest areas in the wilderness system could be authorized by the President upon his determination that such uses would better serve the interests of the United States than would their denial. The grazing of livestock where well established on national forest areas in the wilderness system could be permitted to continue.

Otherwise, with respect to national forest areas, subject to existing private rights, commercial enterprise, permanent roads, use of motor vehicles and equipment, and mechanized transport within areas of the wilderness system would be prohibited, and temporary roads and structures in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of the act would be prohibited within areas of the wilderness system. Emergency measures for the health and safety of persons would be permitted within such areas.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area in the Superior National Forest would continue to be administered under this and other applicable
acts for the general purpose of maintaining the primitive character of the area without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber.

Commercial services proper for the realization of recreational and other purposes of the wilderness system could be performed within areas of the system. The bill would not affect the present situation as to the application of State water laws, nor the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States with respect to wildlife and fish.

The bill would authorize the acquisition by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture of lands within areas of the wilderness system under their respective jurisdictions and would provide for the acceptance and use of contributions of money to further the purposes of the act. Each Secretary would maintain public records pertaining to the portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction and would make annual reports to the Congress.

This Department believes that the establishment and maintenance of wilderness-type areas is a proper use of the national forests and has steadfastly maintained continuity of policy in this regard for over 35 years. In 1924, the first area for the preservation of wilderness in the national forests was established. It comprised a large part of what is now the Gila Wilderness Area in Gila National Forest in New Mexico. In 1926, parts of the Superior National Forest in northern Minnesota were given special protection. These areas later became parts of areas designated as roadless areas and which are now designated as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. The first primitive area in the national forests was established in 1930 under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. By 1939, there were 73 primitive areas and 2 roadless areas, totaling 14.2 million acres.

In 1939, new secretarial regulations were issued providing for the establishment of wilderness and wild areas in the national forests. The term "wilderness area" originated on the national forests. These regulations provided for somewhat more stability and protection to the areas established thereunder than did the earlier regulation for the establishment of primitive areas issued 10 years previously. Wilderness and wild areas provided for in these regulations meet essentially the same criteria except that wilderness areas exceed 100,000 acres in area, and wild areas range from 5,000 to 100,000 acres. Wilderness areas are established by the Secretary of Agriculture, whereas the Chief of the Forest Service may establish wild areas.

No new primitive areas were established after 1939. Since that time, primitive areas have been managed in accordance with the regulations applicable to wilderness areas. The Department has been restudying primitive areas and reclassifying those areas or parts of areas which are predominantly valuable for wilderness as wilderness areas. We are continuing that study and plan to complete the study as to all remaining primitive areas. As of this date, there are the following wilderness-type areas within the national forests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,888,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>970,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7,907,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>886,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14,661,416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the restudy and reclassification of primitive areas, boundary adjustments have been made to eliminate portions not predominantly of wilderness value or add to adjacent national forest lands that are predominantly of wilderness value. Some new areas have been established, including two established within the last year. Taking into consideration the transfers to national parks of lands previously within primitive or wilderness areas in the national forests and corrections in area calculations, the total area of national forest land classified for administration as wilderness has remained about the same as it was in 1939.

The wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas of the national forests include some of the most remote and scenic areas of the Nation. They have unique and special values, which have long been recognized by wilderness enthusiasts, and by the Forest Service. They comprise valuable and essential parts of the national forests.

The wilderness-type areas within the national forests have been established and are administered pursuant to administrative action under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Until last year, they had no specific statutory recognition. The establishment and maintenance of such areas has long been maintained by this Department to be within the concept of multiple-use management, which this Department has applied to the national forests for over half a century. For the first time the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86–517 (74 Stat. 215), which directs the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the renewable surface resources of the national forests for multiple use and sustained yield, gave statutory recognition to wilderness areas. In this act, the Congress declared the establishment and maintenance of wilderness areas to be consistent with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. In inserting this provision as a committee amendment to the bill which became that act, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made it clear that the enactment of that provision was not intended as a substitute for the enactment of legislation to establish a national wilderness preservation policy and program.

There was pending before the Senate at the time the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act was passed, the so-called wilderness bill, S. 1123 (86th Cong.). This Department, in its report of June 19, 1959, recommended enactment of that bill, with certain amendments. The substance of these amendments are accommodated for the most part in S. 174. We have consistently recommended the enactment of wilderness legislation insofar as it would affect the national forests ever since our first report on such legislative proposals in the 85th Congress. We strongly believe that not only should wilderness areas be established and maintained in the national forests, but also enactment of S. 174 would be desirable resource legislation and in the national interest.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman.
ESTABLISH A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in response to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 174, a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

S. 174 would establish a National Wilderness Preservation System which would include national forest areas, national park areas, and national wildlife refuges and game ranges. Lands within the wilderness system would be administered in such a way as to leave them unimpaired and to provide for the protection and preservation of their wilderness character. Section 3(f) provides that any recommendation of the President for addition, modification or adjustment of a wilderness area shall not take effect until the recommendation has been before the Senate and the House of Representatives for a complete session of Congress. Further, Congress may disapprove any addition, modification or adjustment during that session by use of a concurrent resolution.

The Bureau of the Budget favors the objectives of S. 174. With respect to section 3(f) the committee may wish to consider shortening the time during which a Presidential recommendation must remain before the Congress prior to its effective date. As now written, this period could extend over a year and a half.

Subject to your consideration of the above suggestion you are advised that enactment of S. 174 would be in accord with the President’s program.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip S. Hughes,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference,

Federal Power Commission,
February 24, 1961.

Report on S. 174; 87th Congress: A Bill To Establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the Permanent Good of the Whole People, and for Other Purposes

This bill, to be known as the Wilderness Act, for the purpose of “securing for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness,” would establish a National Wilderness Preservation System comprised of such federally owned lands (subject to existing private rights) made up from the following: (1) all areas within national forests classified on the effective date of the bill by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as “wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe,” the primitive areas only being subject to review by the Secretary within 15 years from the effective date of this act as to their suitability for inclusion into the wilderness system, the results of which are recommended to the President; (2) portions of national parks or
monuments embracing "a continuous area of 5,000 acres or more without roads" as may be recommended subsequent to enactment of the bill by the Secretary of the Interior to the President within a specified time; (3) such portions of national wildlife refuges and game ranges as may be recommended subsequent to enactment of the bill by the Secretary of the Interior to the President within a specified period; (4) acquisitions of "privately owned land within any portion of such system" under either Secretary's jurisdiction, and, in addition, acquisitions by gift or bequest to the respective Secretaries.

Provisions in sections 3(b)(1), 3(c)(1), and 3(d), provide that the President shall advise the House and Senate, before the convening of Congress each year, of the areas he recommends for incorporation into the system. Thereupon, under the provisions of section 3(f), any recommendations so made would take effect only upon the day after adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates upon which they were received by the House and Senate, provided however, the Congress did not approve a concurrent resolution in opposition thereto.

This Commission's interest in the bill arises from the fact that it would set up a wilderness system embracing lands and powersites having existing and potential power value subject to the Commission's authority under part I of the Federal Power Act. Section 4(e) of the Power Act provides that licenses shall be issued within reserved lands of the United States "only after a finding by the Commission that the license will not interfere or be inconsistent with the purpose for which such reservation was created or acquired, and shall be subject to and contain such conditions as the Secretary of the Department" having jurisdiction "shall deem necessary for the adequate protection and utilization of such reservation."

Under section 24 of the Federal Power Act any lands of the United States included in a proposed project "shall from the date of filing of the application therefor be reserved from entry, location, or other disposal under the laws of the United States until otherwise directed by the Commission or by Congress." In addition to reservations effected under this provision of the Power Act, other lands of the United States have been reserved or withdrawn from time to time for power purposes under other statutes and in the future, lands may be reserved pursuant to section 24 or under other statutes.

Based upon the available but incomplete information concerning wild, wilderness, or primitive areas, the hydroelectric generating capacities of the sites, licensed and potential, which would be affected in those areas are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity under license:</th>
<th>Kilowatts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>748,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under construction</td>
<td>257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other potential capacity</td>
<td>2,870,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,870,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It further appears that about 265,000 acres of powersite lands would be included in wilderness-type areas that would be established by the bill. The total area of lands withdrawn for power purposes is approximately 7,217,000 acres as of June 30, 1960.

The bill would not incorporate in the wilderness system as of its effective date any lands presently within wildlife refuges or game
ranges, but sets up procedures under which portions of such refuges and ranges, as well as portions of primitive areas, may subsequently be incorporated into the system. It is assumed that when future recommendations are made to the Congress by the President to incorporate additional areas into the system, this Commission will be requested to advise the Congress as to the power potential affected by any such recommendations.

It is clear from provisions in sections 3(a) and 6(b), which preserve existing private rights in lands placed in the wilderness system, that the bill would not adversely affect a licensee's right to continue use of such lands under authority of a license previously issued by this Commission. Furthermore, it is noted that the bill contains no language which would expressly vacate or rescind any power withdrawal or power reservation created prior to enactment or which would expressly modify, repeal, or otherwise affect the Commission's authority to issue licenses in the future to use lands in the wilderness system for power purposes provided the above-discussed finding of consistency and noninterference can be made under section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the use of reserved lands.

In order to safeguard the public interest in the development of waterpower resources on lands belonging to the United States through licenses under the Federal Power Act, and to eliminate any misunderstanding that may otherwise exist, the Commission recommends that the bill be amended by adding a new subsection 6(c)(8) to read as follows:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as superseding, modifying, repealing, or otherwise affecting the provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792-825r)."

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
BY JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
WASHINGTON, MARCH 8, 1961.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of February 1, 1961, for this Department's views on S. 174 (87th Cong.) entitled "A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes."

S. 174 would allow certain Federal lands to be set aside in a wilderness system for the use and enjoyment of the American people. Section 8 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of the act. The second sentence of section 8 would provide that, "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."
Sections 170, 2055, and 2522 of the Internal Revenue Code now provide that gifts to or for the use of the United States for exclusively public purposes are allowable as deductions for Federal income, estate, and gift tax purposes. Therefore, there is no need for a specific provision in S. 174 to accomplish this result. The Department believes that tax provisions generally should not be incorporated in nontax legislation and that the incorporation in S. 174 of a tax provision, which is not necessary to achieve the objectives of the bill, would provide an undesirable precedent in other areas.

In view of the foregoing, the Department recommends that the second sentence of section 8 be deleted from S. 174.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that subject to your consideration of the recommended deletion the enactment of S. 174 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.
MINORITY VIEWS ON S. 174

While in complete sympathy with the concept of preserving the primitive aspects of certain public lands, we who oppose enactment of S. 174 are convinced that this measure would deprive Congress of its constitutional authority over the territory of the United States, would deny to all but an infinitesimal fraction of the people of this country—less than 2 percent—their rights to land which belongs to them all, and would put a brake on the development of the West, where most of the potential “wilderness” lies. We believe that enactment of the bill would nullify the very purpose it professes, “to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness,” for we believe its effect would be to lock away from the use and enjoyment by the people of America great tracts of land and thus keep from them the benefits of recreation as well as other uses this land might afford them. The proponents of S. 174 say they wish to preserve these “wilderness” areas for the people. How many people have the physical and financial resources to pack into these practically inaccessible areas? Only a handful at best.

As a matter of fact, S. 174 is “class legislation” in that it proposes to set aside vast tracts of public land for the exclusive use of a small minority of well-endowed citizens, while excluding from its vaunted recreational delights the great numbers of citizens who probably need it most—those retired men and women who, having completed their contributions to their country, now have time to travel and see the natural beauties of that country, but who have not the physical stamina nor the rather considerable funds necessary to indulge in arduous, expensive pack trips; the families who want to take the children and drive into the country to enjoy the great outdoors; and all others except the favored few who can ride horses or hike for long distances. There is ample terrain already set aside as wilderness to accommodate these fortunate ones.

In recent years increasing public attention has been directed to certain segments of the national forests that have been designated as “wilderness,” “wild,” or “primitive.” More than 14 million acres of lands in these categories have been officially set aside for more than 20 years and have remained unused or unknown by over 98 percent of the American people. Nevertheless, legislative proposals designed to add 50-100 million more acres of untouchable lands and to create within this country a “wilderness system” have appeared with regularity, each with an “urgent” label tagged on it by its supporters. Although these bills have varied considerably in detail, they all seek congressional action blanketing into a “wilderness” system many millions of acres of public lands, the natural resources of which have never been inventoried.

While S. 174 as amended in this committee is a decided improvement over earlier bills, we feel not only that the legislation is premature, but that we could not, in any event, lend support to a bill dealing with large areas of the public lands unless the bill were
amended to allow Congress to retain a positive control over the inclusion of each separate area that would go into the wilderness system. The Constitution gives Congress exclusive power to dispose of territory of the United States. To us this indicates affirmative action by Congress on any proposal to dispose of a tract of public land, certainly including the locking away of thousands of acres of land and its resources, known and unknown, from use by the people of the United States. The courts have ruled that no appropriation of public land can be made for any purpose but by authority of Congress, and we are unalterably opposed to Congress giving away that authority to the executive branch of the Government or anyone else.

**MAIN FEATURES OF THE BILL**

Through enactment of S. 174, Congress would permanently incorporate into a wilderness system some 44 separate tracts of national forest lands, totaling almost 7 million acres, which have heretofore been classified by administrative action as "wilderness," "wild," or "canoe." It should be emphasized that we have no objection to this phase of the bill. The lands in question have been carefully studied and classified; they are now and have been for years classified as wilderness or the equivalent. Their incorporation into the wilderness system would be by positive action of Congress upon this bill being enacted into law.

The bill, however, would also blanket into the wilderness system almost 8 million acres of unclassified national forest lands presently designated as "primitive," and make possible the inclusion of an estimated 22 million acres of lands presently contained in national parks, monuments, and other units of the national park system, and an estimated 24 million acres in wildlife refuges and game ranges. Within 10 years the desirability of having these areas, totaling approximately 54 million acres, made a permanent part of the wilderness system would be reviewed by the Secretary of the Interior. This official would report to the President who would in turn make his recommendations to Congress. If, during one full session, neither House of Congress took action to disapprove any such recommendation, the areas included within such recommendation would become a permanent part of the wilderness system.

The appalling significance of this abdication of congressional authority over such a large portion of public lands becomes clear when viewed in connection with the act's prohibition within the wilderness system of commercial enterprise, permanent roads, 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 roads, nor any structure of installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this act **.*

(These prohibitions are subject to certain limited exceptions authorized by the President upon his determination that such expected uses in the specific area will

better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial.)
Stripped of their rich rhetorical raiment, these phrases mean simply land that is not used by man except to a very, very limited extent by a very, very limited number of the species. Granted that man does not live by bread alone, we submit that he cannot live by communion with nature alone either. He does need bread, and the citizens of the public land States should not be denied their right to develop the natural resources of their States, on which their economy—their bread—depends.

The bill defines "wilderness" in such nebulous but high-sounding terms 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 undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation,* * * which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude * * *.

CONGRESS LEFT IN A WILDERNESS

As noted, S. 174, as amended, provides that any time within 10 years, the President may recommend to Congress the permanent inclusion within the wilderness system of areas which now total approximately 54 million acres. His recommendation will then have the force of law if neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives approves a resolution rejecting such recommendation. This type of provisions has been dubbed a "congressional veto" and as "negative approval" by Congress. It purports to be a safeguard against an unconstitutional delegation of express congressional powers and responsibilities with respect to the disposition of public lands. In the actual practices of government, however, it clearly amounts to a disguised delegation of congressional authority without a hint of legislative standards. As such it is unquestionably a violation of the purpose of those provisions in the U.S. Constitution vesting in Congress the authority to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting federally owned property as well as the principle of separation of powers between Congress and the executive branch of Government.

Aside from any constitutional objections, the bill, by divesting both the House and Senate Interior Committees and Congress itself of any meaningful role in creating wilderness areas, and abdicating such authority to the executive branch, would represent extremely bad legislative policy. Logic and orderly procedure call for inventory, evaluation with public hearings, and reclassification of the primitive areas to their highest use before Congress takes action with respect to them. Before any proposal to create a new wilderness area is acted upon by Congress, the Governor of the State in which it is located should be afforded the opportunity to submit his views on the matter, and, where possible, separate public hearings should be held in the affected States for each separate tract to be incorporated into the wilderness system. It is well-known that such separate hearings usually precede the creation of national parks by Congress.
THE BURDEN OF PROOF

A thoughtful consideration of the varied interests represented by people in the Western States who are dependent upon the multiple-use concept of management of public lands dictates that the burden of justifying the reservation of portions of those lands for single-use purposes should be placed squarely upon those seeking such reservations. Once land is placed in a wilderness system, even though tentatively, it is reasonable to expect that enormous pressures will be exerted to prevent removal of any parts found after study to be primarily valuable for other purposes. An almost impossible burden of proof will be imposed by S. 174 upon those communities which see their future welfare and economic development completely dependent upon multiple-use of public lands.

Actually under the restrictions imposed by the wilderness bill, it is doubtful that the potentialities of the areas concerned would ever be discovered. Who can say today what treasures will be found in any area tomorrow? Several decades ago the presence of uranium under the surface of the West was unknown, and in all probability it would not have been discovered there had the area been locked up in a "wilderness system."

It was only slightly more than a century ago that Daniel Webster, objecting to the annexation of the Oregon Territory, dismissed the area that now comprises 17 prosperous States as "a vast and worthless area." Speaking on the floor of the Senate he asked:

What do we want of that vast and worthless area—that region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, of shifting sands and whirling winds, of dust, of cactus, of prairie dogs? To what use could we even put those endless mountain ranges? What could we do with the western coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, and uninviting?

That West the grandiloquent Daniel so arrogantly condemned today produces untold quantities of coal, oil, timber, and other riches. Tomorrow it may provide us with a substance as yet unguessed at but which will prove vital to the development of the West and the expense of our country.

The present absence of resource inventories of the "primitive" areas would combine with the restriction on exploration imposed by S. 174 to render practically meaningless the provisions of S. 174 for certain allowable exceptions to the ban on development in wilderness areas. Communities or individuals could apply to the President under this section for permission to carry on limited nonwilderness activities in predominantly wilderness areas. However, the dearth of factual data and the ironclad restrictions on obtaining such data would leave them virtually no way to justify their request.

Members of Congress from affected Western States find little consolation in the availability of the procedures of the Reorganization Act of 1949 in their efforts to get a "congressional veto" of a Presidential recommendation which would commit more acreage in their States to eternal wilderness. When the provisions of that act are carefully studied it must be concluded that the obstacles the congressional representatives of any one State would face in attempting to influence Congress to a veto would, for all practical purposes, be insurmountable.
WHY THE ADDITIONAL 54 MILLION ACRES?

When there are almost 7 million acres of national forest lands which admittedly have been properly classified as wilderness and about which there is little opposition to Congress setting aside and preserving in a wilderness system, reasonable minds should inquire why the sense of urgency to persuade Congress to blindly dump into the wilderness system an additional 8 million acres of unclassified "primitive" lands in the national forests. Is there any immediate danger that "wilderness values" in primitive areas are being lost? Are these areas vulnerable to invasion by hordes of humanity: Is their continued preservation in their present state unprotected by law or adequate regulation? Quite the contrary, for as the Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out, these primitive areas were all established between 1930 and 1939, and they have been managed in accordance with the regulations applicable to wilderness areas ever since 1939. The argument has been made by advocates of immediate enactment of S. 174 that wilderness or primitive areas could be wiped out overnight by administrative action. No one has produced any tangible evidence that there is any likelihood of this happening before the 1962 report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission can be analyzed. To make any such possibility even more remote, last year Congress, for the first time gave official recognition to wilderness as an authorized use of national forest land in the Multiple Use Act of 1960.

Is there urgent need for immediate congressional action to preserve the wilderness status of national park lands? No one will seriously dispute the fact that national park wilderness was assured in the act of 1916. According to Director Wirth, 90 percent of the national park system qualifies under a reasonable definition of wilderness and it is the National Park Service's plan to keep it that way. The national wildlife refuges and game ranges were established for wildlife management purposes rather than for wilderness values.

THE WILDERNESS USE

We do not choose to engage in the arena of emotional controversy which on the one hand sees a "wilderness experience" as an equivalent of fine music and the other arts, or on the other sees the purpose of the wilderness system as being designed to keep people out. That there are recreational values in wilderness areas, we feel is beyond dispute. There is a wide divergence of opinion, however, upon both the question of the extent of the demand for this type of recreation for our expanding population, and the amount of land that can and should be preserved to meet such needs consistent with other justifiable demands upon our public lands. While it may be conceded that 9 out of 10 who visit our national parks choose to stay within close proximity to at least meager traces of civilization, roads, and automobiles, how many of those who venture away from the roads and beaten paths must go as far as 1 mile, 5 miles, or 25 miles into wilderness to enjoy a wilderness-type recreation? How does the demand for this type of recreation compare with other varied types of outdoor recreational activities that have been expanding so rapidly in our Western States? Very little factual information has been presented which is relevant to these questions. It would seem that the marshal-
ing of all pertinent facts bearing upon these issues would be regarded
as an imperative necessity before millions of acres of public lands,
containing unknown natural resources, are dedicated to such purpose.

THE HORSE BEFORE THE CART.

Fortunately, there is presently underway a comprehensive study of
wilderness that will most surely provide many answers to these
questions. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission,
which is making an inventory of the Nation's recreation resources, and
which is scheduled to report early in 1962, has contracted a study of
wilderness with the wildlife research center at the University of
California. The broad objective of the study is to make a careful ap-
praisal of the place of wilderness and wild areas in the national pattern
of outdoor recreation. Various Federal and State agencies are
cooperating with the study, and views on major aspects of wilderness
problems are being sought from various interest groups and users of
the areas.

While the charge of the ORRRC is to review all present and future
recreation resources and opportunities, it is clear that wilderness is
being given special emphasis. The Commission has said:

This is a prominent national issue on which there should
be some policy recommendations from the Commission. What should be the standards and criteria for establishment
of wilderness areas? How should wilderness areas be defined? How should the desires of those who wish wilderness experi-
ence be balanced with those who want other recreational
activities? How can preservation of extensive wilderness
areas be justified in the face of demands on our resources
from other land uses.

If answers to these and similar questions are contained in the report
of the ORRRC, and if Congress may utilize fully the information
contained in that report before taking action upon wilderness legisla-
tion affecting millions of acres of public lands, the 3 years spent on the
Commission's study may prove to have been a good investment. For
Congress to take affirmative action on S. 174 before the benefit of that
report is available to Congress would be a waste of the taxpayers' money. Some $2.5 million have been appropriated for this study,
and the Commission has scheduled a meeting at Colorado Springs
within a matter of weeks to finalize its report.

WHERE IS THE FIRE?

Literally hundreds of witnesses have appeared and testified before
this committee on S. 174 and earlier wilderness measures, yet there
has been a failure of the numerous proponents of such legislation to
produce any satisfactory evidence of substantial injury or threatened
injury to the wilderness values of the areas included within S. 174.
There has not been the slightest suggestion that existing administra-
tive regulations protecting wilderness are breaking down. It has not
been demonstrated that the recreational appetites of any sizable
segment of our population have taken a sudden shift to wilderness.
Why, then, the "sense of urgency" which has surrounded this
legislation?
The explanation for this urgency given by the Secretary of the Interior was that "further delay can only open up additional problems which will make enactment of legislation even more difficult * * * ". What are these additional problems which will interfere with later passage of sound wilderness legislation? Could they result from factual data likely to appear in the 1962 ORRRC report relating to the numbers of visitors to wilderness areas or the numbers and size of wilderness areas needed for this type of recreation? Surely such problems do not arise from any contemplated relaxation of administrative regulations protecting the status quo in wilderness type areas.

We feel that the "sense of urgency" that lies behind the drive for enactment of this legislation is artificial and fictitious. We do not attempt to challenge the motives of our colleagues who sincerely support this legislation, but we firmly believe that the "problems which will make enactment of [such] legislation even more difficult" in the event of further delay are among the following:

1. An analysis of the 1962 report of the ORRRC may well disclose that the 7 million acres presently classified as wild, wilderness, or canoe will be more than adequate to meet the recreational needs of those rugged few who seek the solitude of these areas.

2. Further administrative study of many primitive areas will likely disclose that they are not all of true wilderness quality or will produce insufficient justification to support affirmative action by Congress incorporating such areas into a wilderness system in an orderly fashion, area by area.

3. That any further efforts to compile inventories of the total natural resources within primitive areas or game ranges and refuges could upset the unproven premise that wilderness is the highest type of use to which these areas could or should be dedicated.

In the event any one of these three possibilities becomes a reality, then further delay in action on this legislation will have been justified.

THE IMPACT ON WESTERN STATES

In effecting a permanent incorporation into the wilderness system of an area of many thousand or possibly hundreds of thousands of acres of public land, a positive approach requiring affirmative action by Congress is not only the constitutional approach, it is not only sound legislative policy, but such approach is imperative as applied to the varied factors and influences affecting the public lands which are located almost entirely in our Western States. The economy and the foundation for future growth and development of these Western States are largely dependent upon the production of minerals, oil and gas, and forest products as well as grazing, tourism, and other commercial recreational activities within the public lands located within their borders. Well over 50 percent of the land area of the 11 Western States and Alaska is in Federal ownership or management. The total population of these States is expected to increase more than 25 percent during the decade of the 1960's.

In looking to the possible impact of S. 174 upon these 12 States, we find that more than 90 percent of the land areas affected by
S. 174 are located in these 12 States. The extent to which the land areas of these States would be affected by S. 174 is clearly illustrated by the following table:

Proportion of Federal lands in 11 Western States and Alaska which would be reserved for single purpose use by S. 174

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federally owned land (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of State's total land area</th>
<th>Federally owned land committed by S. 174 to single purpose use (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of Federal lands committed to single purpose use by S. 174</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>362,194,000</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>25,885,978</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>32,396,000</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>3,732,927</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>45,071,000</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>3,762,974</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>24,166,000</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>1,229,125</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>34,060,000</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>3,120,916</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>27,815,000</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>4,194,007</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>60,738,000</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>3,287,909</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>27,300,000</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>1,386,837</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>31,580,000</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>1,345,103</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>36,465,000</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>2,630,000</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>12,666,000</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>2,615,300</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>30,219,000</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>4,770,052</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The official concern of these States over wilderness legislation has been demonstrated through resolutions, memorials, and letters from the governmental officials of those States. Either the legislatures or other officials having jurisdiction over natural resources of the following States have taken a stand against the restrictive provisions of S. 174 or a similar bill in the 86th Congress: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. The State house of representatives in Oregon passed a resolution to like effect, whereas, no official position of the State of Montana has been communicated to Congress.

A VITAL AMENDMENT NEEDED

We have deep concern over the provisions of S. 174 which would initially blanket into a wilderness system millions of acres of public lands which have never been classified as wilderness. Nevertheless, we feel that our fears could be largely laid to rest by adoption of one simple amendment to section 3(f) of the bill so as to provide that before any recommendation of the President made in accordance with that section shall take effect, Congress shall approve a concurrent resolution expressing itself in favor of such recommendation.

We are heartily in favor of such an amendment, and we strongly urge that S. 174 not be adopted without this, or a comparable amendment.

Henry Dworshak.
J. J. Hickey.
Barry Goldwater.
Gordon Allott.
INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING ON S. 174, THE WILDERNESS BILL

I am unqualifiedly in favor of establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System. I think it essential that we act to set aside and preserve, in their primeval state, some of the Nation's superb natural areas. The definition of a wilderness area, as set forth in Senate bill 174, which was ordered reported favorably by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on July 13, 1961, is one "where the earth and its community of life are untraveled by man; where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

Given our exploding population and the foreseeable disappearance of much land now virgin, it is essential that we move in the direction provided by S. 174.

The issue has been before Congress for a number of years. A massive volume, totaling 1,995 closely printed pages, representing hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 85th and 86th Congresses, and indeed only a part of a longer record of hearings, discussions, reprints, resolutions, and addresses, testifies to the amount of interest in and intensive work that has gone into the preparation of the bill which finally has been approved by the Senate committee and which, I have no doubt, will be by the Senate.

Of course, it would be impossible, with the various conflicting interests involved, to secure the draft of a bill which would be wholly satisfactory to everyone, indeed to anyone. Some of the more extreme, and, I regret to say, even fanatical, of my fellow conservationists would like to keep all of Alaska a wilderness—even to denying the accessibility upon which the enjoyment of wilderness is predicated. They oppose the harnessing of rivers and lakes for hydro. They are more concerned for a nesting duck and an anadromous salmon than for the economic welfare of a multitude of people. Their error, as I see it, is that they do not believe, as I do, that we conserve natural resources, whether wildlife, timber, water courses, soil, and scenic beauty, not for themselves but for the future enjoyment of human beings. We preserve moose not for the sake of the moose, but so that coming generations can ever see moose, photograph moose, hunt moose—in undiminished supply. A wilderness that few, if any, can ever get to and hence enjoy, may furnish a snobbish and selfish pleasure to the few exceptional ones who can manage, at great expense not available to their fellow citizens, to get there, but it is not in keeping with what I deem the premise of our national park system, of our national forest wonders, and, indeed, of the proposed wilderness preservation system. Kings enjoyed such solitary monopolistic privileges in the Old World, in the days of feudalism, but they are unsuited to a contemporary and future democracy.

There is, on the other hand, the fear—a legitimate fear—on the part of various interested groups that natural resources which may well be needed by the Nation—resources of timber, waterpower, minerals,
The bill provides, in general, that within three vast categories of federally owned lands, wilderness areas may be established. They are in the national forests, the national parks, and in the national wildlife refuges and game ranges. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to withdraw areas of the national forests forever for wilderness purposes, and provides that the Secretary of the Interior may do so within the national parks and national wildlife refuges.

This is subject to the limitation that the establishment of such wilderness areas could be rejected by passage of a resolution of disapproval of either House of Congress. This, it should be understood, is a very dubious protection, since it might be extremely difficult to mobilize either House of Congress to reject a withdrawal that in only one State was considered injudicious. Needless to say, I would much prefer affirmative action by Congress in all such cases and throughout the legislation.

My special concern about this bill is what may happen in Alaska. There, in an area one-fifth as large as the older 48 States, conditions pertinent to this legislation are totally different from those which exist in the 48 older States. Alaska is a vast area of sensational scenic beauty, of the loftiest mountains in North America, of a million lakes, of virgin forest, of high waterfalls, of untamed rushing rivers and streams, the greater part of it still wilderness, and there is much in it that is wonderful and entitled to permanent wilderness status. The problem that Alaska confronts is that this 49th State is merely in its infancy, with a population of only 225,000 people, or 1 to approximately every 3 square miles, as compared with a density of population for the United States of 50.5 for every square mile.

Despite the present sparsity of population, the withdrawals already made in Alaska eligible for wilderness areas are tremendous and contrast not only with those made in any other State, but indeed with the entire Union. For example, in Alaska a total of 18,974,731 acres—virtually 19 million acres—have been withdrawn for wildlife refuges and game ranges. This contrasts with the total of 10,194,040 for the other 49 States. In other words, Alaska alone has been subject to wildlife and game range withdrawals almost double those in the entire rest of the Nation—an area five times larger.

Alaska's national forest area—with the Tongass and Chugach national forests—is greater than that of any other State in the Nation. It totals 20,742,224 acres (Idaho comes second, California third, and Montana fourth).

Alaska's National Parks

Alaska has three national parks or monuments, the largest of which, Katmai, with 2,697,590 acres, is larger than the largest park in the national park system—Yellowstone, with 2,213,207 acres. Katmai National Monument, with 2,697,590 acres, Glacier Bay National Monument, with 2,274,595 acres (also larger than Yellowstone), and Mount McKinley National Park, with 1,939,334 acres, total 6,911,519 acres, exceeding by more than 50 percent the next most generously endowed national park State, California, which has 4,050,346 acres.
in national parks and monuments, and representing for Alaska a total which is approximately two-fifths of the total national park and monument areas of the rest of the country.

Let me say, at this point, that I consider these three Alaska parks and monuments highly desirable, and that I rejoice in their creation. Each of them contains natural phenomena and other qualities which are unique and fully deserve their status in the national park system. However, it should be pointed out that these have suffered a lack of attention and lack of even minimal development which is peculiarly pertinent to the provisions of the wilderness bill. This lack is part and parcel of the neglect and discrimination which Alaska suffered during its 91 years as a Territory. The wilderness bill has a distinct bearing on the question of whether this will be remedied.

The wilderness bill provides that in the national park system, the Secretary of the Interior may set aside any continuous area of 5,000 acres or more without roads. There are no roads whatever in the Katmai National Monument. The Federal Government has not built even a trail there. The absurdity of this neglect lies in the fact that the Katmai National Monument was created as a result of the cataclysmic volcanic explosion in 1912 which sent ash around the world's atmosphere and in Alaska created the Valley of 10,000 Smokes and much else. Yet today, visitors to Katmai cannot reach this Valley either on a motor vehicle or boat, and unless they are prepared to camp out for weeks and carry their own subsistence, cannot walk into these areas. They are, in effect, inaccessible to the park public. Visitors to Katmai—which is being ably developed, in the matter of accommodations, by one of Alaska's local airlines—must get their satisfaction and recreation from fishing, which is indeed excellent, but leaves totally unutilized and unenjoyed the original values for which this mammoth monument was set aside. Yet, if some future Secretary of the Interior 10 years hence saw fit to blanket this whole area into wilderness, reasonable access to tourists and visitors to the volcanic phenomena for which the park was created would be permanently denied. (Unless, as stated before, it could be possible to mobilize one House of Congress to reject such action.)

The situation is only a little better in Mount McKinley Park. Set off arbitrarily without adequate surveying in 1917 with straight boundary lines running east and west and north and south, this park is roughly a rectangle 200 miles long from east to west and 50 miles from north to south. The only road extends half the park's length along its northern edge. It was never planned as a park road, but before the park was created, was a trail leading into the Kantishna mining district, which lies just north of the central portion of the northern park boundary. From that trail, the road was gradually developed. It completely misses some of the truly finest areas in the park. Visitors never see them.

Mount McKinley, North America's loftiest summit, 20,300 feet, and the raison d'être of the park, is not visible from the only entrance to the park on the Alaska Railway. A brief glimpse of its summit is obtained as one drives along the road at about the 15-mile mark. It is then again invisible until one gets to the sixties and continues to be visible until the end of the road 90 miles from the entrance. During those last 30 miles, the road continues at a distance of about 25 miles from "the mountain."
If the visitor wishes to approach this noblest of mountains, he has to ford the McKinley River, a torrential glacier stream passable by the hardy at various times of low water (as I have), but frequently dangerous and impassable when the water is high and the current swift, and therefore really not possible for tourists.

Under the provisions of S. 174, a future Secretary of the Interior could include practically the entire area of the park as wilderness and prevent even a footbridge from crossing the McKinley River, thus denying, to all intents and purposes, even the pedestrian access to Mount McKinley.

Mount Foraker, 17,340 feet, also located in the park—the third highest mountain in Alaska, and far higher than any peak in the lower 48 States—is at no time visible from the existing highway. For the visitors it might as well not exist. To go to a point where it can be even seen, numerous unbridged and unfordable rivers would have to be crossed—an assignment impossible for the ordinary tourist.

Glacier Bay National Monument is in a different category but will require marine transportation facilities if it is to be seen. To date, there are none except a small boat used by the Park Service officials. If it becomes wilderness, motor boats will be forbidden and its galaxy of glaciers largely invisible.

So much for Alaska’s national parks.

**ALASKA’S GAME RANGES**

In 1940, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes withdrew 2 million acres on the Kenai Peninsula and created the Kenai National Moose Range. No hearings were held on this withdrawal, and no information was given to the public about it. I was Governor of Alaska at the time, and was not even notified concerning this action until it had been consummated. It so happened that a former Governor of Alaska—George A. Parks—who had served as the Territory’s chief executive from 1924 to 1932, was the cadastral engineer of the Federal Land Office, and thus the matter came to his attention. He registered an emphatic protest, urging that at least hearings be held, but this was ignored.

This great withdrawal for moose—by the latest count 500 acres per moose—aroused little opposition at the time, first because few people knew about it and because the area was then roadless and inaccessible. Now, two important highways connect Anchorage with Seward, and Anchorage with the rapidly growing communities on the thin fringe of land along the Kenai Peninsula’s west coast along the shore of Cook Inlet, where human habitation is permitted: Kenai, Soldotna, Kasilof, Cohoe, Ninilchik, Clam Gulch, Anchor Point, and Homer.

The purpose of this withdrawal was to make it a moose range, on the assumption, which appeared valid at the time, that it was the habitat of the largest species of moose. It is not, of course, a refuge, and moose are hunted there, as elsewhere in Alaska, under existing game laws. However, the area, with an exception to be noted subsequently, is withdrawn from any other form of development. It is not possible for a lodge to be built on one of the two great and beautiful lakes in this area, Lake Tustumena and Skilak Lake, nor is it permitted to build a dock on their shores so that needed larger boats, safer than canoes, can be utilized there.
One tragic consequence of that restriction was that two employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service lost their lives when a canoe they were paddling was upset by the turbulent waves in these very considerable, at times windswept, bodies of water, which cannot safely be navigated by such frail craft. It has been forbidden for anyone to bring into this vast area of mountains, lakes, and rivers anything bigger than a sleeping bag or a pup tent. Not even a shelter cabin can be constructed. In fact, except for the Anchorage-Homer Highway through it and but for an exception about to be noted, it is a wilderness area now.

However, the exception took place in 1957, when it became known that a vast oilfield underlay the Kenai National Moose Range, and a group of Alaskan citizens interested in developing this resource took what steps they could to promote oil exploration and drilling in this area. This was violently opposed by the Fish and Wildlife Service, strongly supported by a group of professional conservationists who prophesied death and destruction of the moose if oil exploration or drilling were permitted. The battelines were closely drawn, and I was a volunteer in the combat. Fortunately, reason prevailed, and oil drilling was permitted, so that 4 years later Alaska now has 30 producing wells, all in the Kenai. In consequence, Alaska’s economy, suffering the grave diminution of its formerly two major industries, fisheries and mining—the former because of salmon depletion, the latter because of the gold price—has been given an essential lift without which the State probably would have had great difficulty in satisfying the basic public needs. Meanwhile, the moose have flourished, frequenting the roads that have been built by the oil companies and suffering no damage.

However, one interesting aspect of this Kenai National Moose Range deserves mention. In 1945, a devastating forest fire destroyed some 250,000 acres of standing virgin timber in this range. Most conservationists, including myself, would naturally have considered this a disaster; but not so the guardians of the range—the Fish and Wildlife Service. They pointed out that as a result of the destruction of these 250,000 acres of virgin spruce, second growth of birch, aspen and willow would follow, which was excellent browse for the moose. Indeed, this unfortunate so-called act of God, this tremendous conflagration, has now been followed by systematic acts of man, by which every year several hundred acres of standing virgin conifers are deliberately burned in order to make browse for the moose.

A paradoxical and relevant fact, however, is that since the establishment of the Kenai National Moose Range, in 1940, the moose have spread all over Alaska. They are far more numerous outside the range. They have penetrated the Arctic. The largest specimens have actually been found recently across Cook Inlet, on the Alaska Peninsula. Moose have invaded the Matanuska Valley, where they were nonexistent before the colonization and farming experiment launched there in 1935, under the administration of President Roosevelt. In fact, they constitute a serious problem for the farmers, on whose garden drops they enjoy feeding.

This is pointed out to indicate—among other things—that the habits of wildlife change, that game migrations take place, and that irrevocable commitments sometimes produce immutable and possibly undesirable results.
My reservations as to the wilderness bill lay and lie in the fact that the kind of arbitrary actions taken by Secretary Ickes in 1940, in disregard of any attempt to ascertain public opinion or consult anyone in Alaska, and by Secretary Seaton in December of 1960, after his party had been retired by popular vote, in withdrawing, despite adverse action by the Congress, 9 million acres of Arctic wildlife range, may be repeated by their unknown successors 10 years hence under the provisions of this bill.

I am not alarmed about any similar action by a future Secretary of Agriculture. That is, I believe, without danger to Alaska. The Forest Service has consistently and wisely adopted a policy of multiple use. Moreover, in the nearly 16 million acres of Tongas National Forest and 4,800,000 acres of Chugach National Forest, are tremendous scenic areas above and below the timberline—jeweled lakes nestling under towering peaks, high meadows riotous with alpine flora, sensational ice caps, deep fiords, at whose farther end tidel glaciers discharge their crystal-blue cargoes into the clear salt waters, oases of majestic solitude ideal for wilderness purposes, which can safely be established without fear of interfering with economic pursuits, especially the basic timber resource, and safeguarded in a national emergency by the Presidential power to make exception in case some valuable and needed resource were ascertained to be there. These desirable and natural wilderness areas in our Alaska national forests alone total millions of acres.

The committee, in response to my presentation of the different conditions in Alaska, however, kindly agreed to an amendment, modified somewhat from the original form in which I introduced it, which offers, I believe, a reasonable safeguard to the fear I have that distant men, without adequate knowledge of Alaska's needs, will act in such a way as both to limit the possibilities for enjoyment of our parks, wildlife refuges, and game ranges, and also interfere needlessly with required economic development. The amendment reads as follows:

**LAND USE COMMISSIONS**

Sec. 9. With respect to any State having more than 90 percent of its total land area owned by the Federal Government on January 1, 1961, there shall be established for each such State a Presidential Land Use Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of five persons appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party, and three of whom shall be resident of the State concerned. The Commission shall advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior on the current utilization of federally owned land in such State and shall make recommendations to the Secretary as to how the federally owned land can best be utilized, developed, protected, and preserved. Any recommendations made to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be accompanied by the recommendations and reports made with respect thereto by the Commission.

With the inclusion of this amendment in any law finally enacted, I would be willing to risk passage of this bill because I think it is clear
that three residents of Alaska, constituting a majority of the commis-
sion of five, would bring a rational and intelligent understanding to
the task devolving upon the Secretary of the Interior.

The committee also agreed to an amendment, at my request, that
any additions to the wilderness system not specifically provided for
under the provisions of the act could be made only after specific
affirmative authorization by law for such addition—that is, by an
act of Congress.

Existing rights in any area which is to be declared wilderness are
safeguarded. That protects the present provisions for mining in
Mount McKinley National Park and in Glacier Bay National Monu-
ment. An amendment which I proposed, to spell out this protection
more specifically, was withdrawn on the chairman’s and the Secretary
of the Interior’s assurance that the language in section 6(b) provided
that safeguard. Likewise, I supported an amendment by Senator
Church, which reads:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent, within
national forest and public domain areas included in the
wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the
purpose of gathering information about mineral resources
which is not incompatible with the preservation of the
wilderness environment.

which was adopted. That makes ascertainable the existence of
potentially highly valuable subsoil resources even though an area
has been included in the wilderness system, and would make possible
the utilization of such resources in case of need under the Presidential
power provided in the bill.

I believe that the act should be further amended by a provision
that any withdrawals, whether in parks, monuments, wildlife refuges
and game ranges in excess of 100,000 acres, be subject to an affirmative
act of the Congress—in other words, a special bill for each such area.
I presented this amendment in the committee and it was defeated
9 to 7. I intend to offer it again on the floor. One hundred thousand
acres is a very large area, and unless Congress wishes, in this instance as
it has in so many others, to abdicate its powers and delegate them to
unseen and unknown men in a vague future, I believe this amendment
should be enacted and that amount of control retained by the people’s
elected representatives.

It is my belief that when the program is finally completed, Alaska
should, can, and will have wilderness areas far in excess of those of
any other State—areas of superb attractiveness to residents of
Alaska and to visitors from the other States and from abroad—and
thereby laying an enduring foundation for Alaska as a vacation land
and making possible a tourist industry that can become world famous.
And these areas, if knowledgeably established after survey and study,
and when the pattern of population distribution is recognizable in
Alaska as in the older States, can better carry out the dual objectives
of Alaska’s destiny as I see them, namely: (1) to safeguard the price-
less heritage of its wilderness and (2) to foster a sound economic
development, utilizing Alaska’s resources for the establishment of a
stable, diversified, expanding economy, able to support whatever
growing population the State acquires, and to support it in conformity
with the high standards, cultural, social, and material, to which
Americans have a right to aspire.
APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Summary of wilderness-type areas in national forests, as of July 17, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of areas</th>
<th>Net acres</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of areas</th>
<th>Net acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>673,913</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,557,822</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,014,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>739,392</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,004,069</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>749,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>866,673</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,921,347</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,384,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64,667</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,354,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14,664,053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National forest wilderness-type areas—Name, date of establishment, and acreage of area and national forest, by States, as of July 17, 1961

WILDERNESS AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, name, and date established as primitive area</th>
<th>Date established</th>
<th>National forest</th>
<th>Net area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazatzal (1932)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Tonto</td>
<td>295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition (1939)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>124,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble Mountain (1931)</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Klamath</td>
<td>213,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolla Belly-Middle Eel (1931)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>72,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shasta-Trinity</td>
<td>36,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana; Bob Marshall (1931-33)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Flathead</td>
<td>109,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis and Clark</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>359,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila (1933)</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>438,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecos (1933)</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>599,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Cap (1930)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Walla</td>
<td>136,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>80,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>216,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Sisters (1937)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Deschutes</td>
<td>59,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Willamette</td>
<td>136,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington: Glacier Peak</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Mount Baker</td>
<td>212,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>245,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>458,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridger (1931)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Bridger</td>
<td>383,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Absaroka (1932)</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td>339,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Absaroka (1932)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>505,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton (1934)</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Teton</td>
<td>563,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (7 States, 14 areas, 18 national forests)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,888,173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Portion of area remains in primitive area classification.
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### WILD AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, name, and date established as primitive area</th>
<th>Date established</th>
<th>National forest</th>
<th>Net area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiricahua (1933)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galiuro (1932)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Ancha (1933)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Tonto</td>
<td>20,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cucamonga (1931)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>San Bernadino</td>
<td>9,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover (1931)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gorgonio (1931)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>33,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto (1931)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>20,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Lakes (1931)</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>15,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou (1931)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>19,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroon Bells-Snowmass (1933)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>White River</td>
<td>66,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Zirkel-Dome Peak (1951)</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Routt</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawah (1932)</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>22,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Elk (1952)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Munnison</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana: Gates of the Mountains</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>28,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada: Jarbridge</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>64,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire: Great Gulf</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>White Mountain</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro Parks (1931)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Sante Fe</td>
<td>41,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain (1933)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>28,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler Peak</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>6,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina: Linville Gorge</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Pisgah</td>
<td>7,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Peak</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Deschutes</td>
<td>19,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willamette</td>
<td>16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gearhart Mountain</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>35,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmjepis</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Siskiyou</td>
<td>18,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Hood (1931)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Mount Hood</td>
<td>78,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Washington</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Deschutes</td>
<td>14,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willamette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Lakes (1930)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Rogue River</td>
<td>46,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Mountain</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>23,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat Rocks (1931)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Gifford Pinchot</td>
<td>59,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>22,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Adams</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Gifford Pinchot</td>
<td>82,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (10 States, 29 areas, 26 national forests)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CANOE AREAS

| Minnesota: Boundary Waters Canoe Area:            |                  |                 |                 |
| Caribou Division                                 | 1948             | Superior        | 36,059          |
| Little Indian Sioux Division                     | 1939             | do              | 64,117          |
| Superior Division                                | 1936             | do              | 786,497         |
| Total (1 State, 1 area, 1 national forest)        |                  |                 | 890,673         |
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PRIMITIVE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, name, and date established as primitive area</th>
<th>Date established</th>
<th>National forest</th>
<th>Net area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Range</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>(Apache (Arizona part)</td>
<td>180,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Apache (New Mexico part)</td>
<td>36,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>216,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Baldy</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>9,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Tonto)</td>
<td>7,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Canyon</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>21,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaibab</td>
<td>5,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>18,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agua Tibia</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>25,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desolation Valley</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Eldorado</td>
<td>41,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devil Canyon-Bear Canyon</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Angeles</td>
<td>35,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigrant Basin</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>97,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sierra</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>30,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sequoia</td>
<td>7,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>181,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>303,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dana-Minarets</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>43,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>39,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Trinity Alps</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Klamath</td>
<td>28,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shasta-Trinity</td>
<td>194,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>223,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Los Padres</td>
<td>74,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Warner</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Modoc</td>
<td>68,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneta</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Los Padres</td>
<td>32,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Tops</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>White River</td>
<td>117,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore Range-Eagle Nest</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Arapaho</td>
<td>32,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White River</td>
<td>28,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGarita-Sheep Mountain</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>30,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>235,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompahgre</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Uncompahgre</td>
<td>53,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rio Grande</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>56,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Mountains</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompahgre</td>
<td>17,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selway-Bitterroot 1</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Bitterroot (Idaho part)</td>
<td>476,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>143,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lolo</td>
<td>251,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nez Peros</td>
<td>250,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bitterroot (Montana part)</td>
<td>250,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,800,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>223,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challis</td>
<td>73,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>685,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>249,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,224,976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Blue Range primitive area enumerated for Arizona; not in New Mexico.
* Selway-Bitterroot primitive area enumerated for Idaho; not in Montana.
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**PRIMITIVE AREAS—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, name, and date established as primitive area</th>
<th>Date established</th>
<th>National forest</th>
<th>Net area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawtooth</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>144,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challis</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sawtooth)</td>
<td>48,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absaroka</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Beaverhead)</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Bitterroot)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Deerlodge)</td>
<td>49,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda-Pintlar</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>144,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Gallatin)</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Mountains</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lolo-Kaniksu)</td>
<td>42,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Mountains</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Flathead</td>
<td>89,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>73,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Peaks</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>262,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Range</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>120,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(do)</td>
<td>169,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deschutes</td>
<td>25,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon: Mount Jefferson</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Mount Hood</td>
<td>3,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Willamette)</td>
<td>57,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah: High Uintas</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>166,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>73,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington: North Cascade</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>366,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mount Baker)</td>
<td>434,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud Peak</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Bighorn</td>
<td>83,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td>177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(do)</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(do)</td>
<td>202,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (10 States, 39 areas, 47 national forests)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,890,973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Alaska Wilderness Type Areas

(Comparable maps of other States containing prospective wilderness appear in the printed hearings on S. 174.)
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