Y4
.In 8/13
C 16/
PT. 2

PROPOSED CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK IN UTAH

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
JUL 2 1962
MANHATTAN, KANS.

GOVERNMENT
Storage

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 825335

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2387

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK IN UTAH

MONTICELLO, UTAH, APRIL 20, 1962
MOAB, UTAH, APRIL 21, 1962
SALT LAKE CITY, APRIL 23, 1962

PART 2

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
82324 WASHINGTON : 1962

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Y4
.In8/13
C 16/
pt. 2

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico, *Chairman*

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada
JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho
ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah
OREN E. LONG, Hawaii
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
LEE METCALF, Montana
J. J. HICKEY, Wyoming
HENRY DWORSHAK, Idaho
THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California
GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado
JACK R. MILLER, Iowa
MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR., New Hampshire
JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas

JERRY T. VERKLER, *Chief Clerk*
STEWART FRENCH, *Chief Counsel*
BENTON J. STONG, *Professional Staff Member*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

ALAN BIBLE, Nevada, *Chairman*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico
ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah
OREN E. LONG, Hawaii
LEE METCALF, Montana
HENRY DWORSHAK, Idaho
GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado
JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
JUL 2 1962
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

CONTENTS

Page

S. 2387 (Committee Print No. 1, April 16, 1962) 193

STATEMENTS

Acton, Hugh, director in charge, Blanding Sportsman's Club 284
Allshouse, Jack, president, Utah Wildlife Federation 477
Bailey, Kenneth R., Jr., mayor of Monticello, Utah 206
Barlocker, William A., mayor of St. George, Utah 434
Bauer, Carl E., Utah vice president, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs 479
Bennett, Hon. Wallace F., a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah 201
Beyers, John M., Logan City Democratic chairman and assistant professor, Utah State University 475
Black, James, president, Monticello Chamber of Commerce 215
Black, Hyrum T., commissioner, San Juan County 299
Blake, Glen T., Richfield, Utah 342
Boyd, Norman G., mayor, Moab, Utah 306
Brimhall, Dean R 464
Brownfield, H. A., president, East Carbon Wildlife Federation, Dragerton, Utah 219
Bruhn, William G., chairman, Citizens Committee for Canyonlands National Park 391
Bunce, Winford, chairman, Grand County Commission 309
Cannon, D. James, director, Utah Tourist and Publicity Council 467
Carlson, Wayne L., chairman, Salt Lake County Democratic Party 499
Chapman, J. C., on behalf of the Board of Education of San Juan School District 291
Claus, E. J., president, Chamber of Commerce, Moab, Utah 313
Clyde, George D., Governor, State of Utah 352
Cox, R. LaVaun, executive director, Utah Petroleum Council 326
Crane, Harold S., director, Utah Department of Fish and Game 353, 425
Dalton, Melvin, Monticello, Utah, State representative from Moab 262, 321
Dalton, Melvin K., rancher and miner, Monticello, Utah 262
Diamenti, Steve J., president, Highway 50 Federation 417
Foushee, Eugene D., on behalf of the San Juan County Canyonlands Committee 242
Fowler, William G., attorney 456
Frost, George T., chairman, Weber County Commissioners 456
Frost, Mrs. Kent, director, Monticello Chamber of Commerce 217
Gardner, Max C., director, Utah State Land Board 471
Giddings, Dr. J. Calvin, president, Wasatch Mountain Club 384
Gilbert, Ray E., district geologist, Bear Creek Mining Co 256
Harline, Dr. Osmond L., director, Department of Business and Economic Research, University of Utah 459
Hawkins, Jack, Cortez, Colo., on behalf of the Cortez Chamber of Commerce 271
Hayward, Aldin O., director, Utah State Park and Recreation Commission 500
Hazleton, Marion, Monticello, Utah, businessman 210
Healy, R. L., Utah Association of Petroleum Landmen 336
Hess, Benjamin K., vice chairman, San Juan Planning Commission 286
Hewitt, William P., director, Utah Geological and Mineralogical Survey 482
Howells, Rulon S., former commissioner, Utah Tourist and Publicity Development Department 399
Hurst, Riley, mayor, Blanding, Utah 288
Jessen, Kenneth C., chairman, Conservation Committee, Ute Alpine Club 381
Johnson, Minnie, vice chairman, Blanding Chamber of Commerce 228
King, Hon. David S., a Representative in Congress from the State of Utah 274

	Page
Kizer, Raymond L., mayor, city of Milford, Utah	205
Knell, Ray, Cedar City, Utah	334
Lamb, Harold B., M.D., chairman of the Utah Audubon Society	480
Lindstrom, Philip, mining engineer	323
McKnight, Dr. Kent H., professor of botany, Brigham Young University	418
McKnight, Richard S., vice president, Independent Petroleum Association of America	448
Merritt, Dr. Phillip L., vice president, Hidden Splendor Mining Co	249
Miner, Gordon, La Sal, San Juan County, Utah	233
Mulaik, Dr. Stanley, B., associate professor of zoology, University of Utah	416
Murdock, Dr. Joseph, professor of conservation, Brigham Young University	383
Musselman, Ross A	315
Musselman, Ross A. (Rusty), on behalf of the Chambers of Commerce of Bluff and Mexican Hat, Utah	301
Nelson, Claron E., professor, Department of Business and Economic Research, University of Utah	449
Olsen, Chester J., chairman, Governor's Committee on Canyonlands National Park	405
Ottinger, Mrs. L. E. (Marion), Moab, Utah	345
Oviatt, Gerald L., county Commissioner, Carbon County, Utah	216
Pearson, Paul E., on behalf of the National Association of Letter Carriers	402
Peterson, Hon. M. Blaine, a Representative in Congress from the State of Utah	204
Piggott, Margaret H., Sierra Club	502
Rasmussen, Ralph H., staff representative, United Steelworkers of America	374
Reavley, William L., western field representative, National Wildlife Federation	500
Redd, Charles Hardy	277
Redd, F. Bennion, county attorney for San Juan County	212
Redd, Miss Lucy, attorney	494
Redd, Ray, Commissioner, San Juan County	211
Rogers, Howard, Monticello, Utah	285
Rogers, Lester W., Moab Chamber of Commerce	318
Romney, Miles F., manager, Utah Mining Association	356
Schoene, John R., president, Utah AFL–CIO	491
Shriver, Robert S., San Juan County, Utah	264
Smoot, Steve, chairman, Utah State Democratic Party	353
Spilsbury, Ethel M	470
Stokes, Dr. William Lee, chairman, Department of Geology, University of Utah	394
Strong, Paul E., Monticello, Utah	224
Summers, Kenneth S., director, San Juan Livestock Association	294
Tanner, Vasco M., professor of zoology and entomology, Brigham Young University	399
Taylor, D. L., president, Southeastern Utah Cattlemen's Association	338
Tippetts, Harold J., Utah State Park and Recreation Commission	495
Tobola, John J., general manager, radio station KUTA, Blanding and Monticello, Utah	274
Wallace, John M., Jr., on behalf of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce	493
Weid, Walter, La Sal, Utah	330
Weston, Joseph H., Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate	466
Williams, J. R., vice president, Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association, Salt Lake City	440
Woodbury, Angus M., professor emeritus, ecology, University of Utah	377
Wright, Frank	229
Wright, Raymond S., vice president, Bank of Utah, and former mayor of Ogden, Utah	388
Young, Darrell P	283
Zupko, John, Roosevelt, Utah	290

COMMUNICATIONS

Allcott, G. A., secretary, East Carbon Wildlife Federation, telegram, dated May 7, 1962, to Senator Bible	223
Bear, Robert G., president, Desert Protection Council, Inc., letter, dated May 8, 1962, to Senator Anderson	504

Page

Buchheister, Carl W., president, National Audubon Society, letter to Senator Bible, containing a statement 206
Dalton, Melvin K., Monticello, Utah, letter, dated March 19, 1962, to Senator Moss 263
Jiacoletti, S. J., Wyoming Game and Fish Commission:
Acton, Hugh, letter to, dated April 24, 1962 284
Moss, Senator Frank, letter to, dated March 5, 1962 269
Migliore, Dr. F. A, chairman, legislative committee, Carbon-Emery Fish & Game Association, letter, dated May 2, 1962, to Senator Bible 503
Nadel, Michael, assistant executive secretary, the Wilderness Society, letter, dated April 12, 1962, to Senator Bible 505
Peterson, M. Blaine, Member of Congress, letter, dated April 17, 1962, to Senator Moss 294
Phelps, John E., assistant director, Utah Department of Fish and Game, letter, dated March 28, 1962, to Senator Bennett 270
Sigler, Lewis A., acting legislative counsel, Department of the Interior, telegram, dated April 19, 1962, to Senator Bible 225
Taylor, Vance, chairman, Wayne County Commission, letter, dated May 7, 1962, to Senator Moss 504
Tippie, F. E., project manager, Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Inc., letter, dated April 20, 1962, to Miles Romney 359
Williams, James A., director, Alaska Division of Mines and Minerals, letter, dated March 8, 1962, to Miles Romney 357
Wirth, Conrad, Director, National Park Service, telegram, dated April 20, 1962, to Max Edwards 364

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

City Council of Monticello, Utah, resolution 207
"Meaning of Wilderness," an address by Sigurd F. Olsen, president, National Parks Association, to 50th anniversary general session of the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters 418

PROPOSED CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK IN UTAH

FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 1962

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Monticello, Utah.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., in the county courthouse of San Juan County, in Monticello, Utah, Senator Alan Bible (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Bible, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Metcalf.

Also present: Senator Bennett, Jerry Verkler, committee clerk, Benton J. Stong, professional staff member, and Allen Mitchem, minority counsel.

Senator BIBLE. The subcommittee will come to order.

This is a continuation of the hearings which were commenced in Washington, D.C., on March 29 and 30 on the proposed Canyonlands National Park in Utah.

Mr. Reporter, at this point in the record, would you make a part of the record, Committee Print No. 1 dated April 16, 1962, on Senate bill 2387; and those of you who are following the hearing, I would suggest that you obtain copies of this committee print from our staff director, Ben Stong, because I think it will avoid a number of questions which quite often come up in any hearing as to exactly what committee print the committee itself is considering. We had first an original bill. We then had a substitute. We now have this Committee Print No. 1. So, insofar as possible, if those of you who are testifying will direct your comments or criticisms or suggestions to this committee print, I think it would make a more orderly record.

(The document referred to follows:)

[Committee Print No. 1, Apr. 16, 1962]

[S. 2387, 87th Cong., 2d sess.]

AMENDMENTS (in the nature of a substitute) Intended to be proposed by Mr. Moss to the bill (S. 2387) to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That in order to preserve an area in the State of Utah possessing superlative scenic, scientific, and archeologic features for the inspiration, benefit, and use of the public, there is hereby [authorized to be] established the Canyonlands National Park which, subject to valid existing rights, shall comprise the following generally described lands:

[That area in San Juan County, Utah, bounded on the north by the Grand County line, on the west by the Green River, and on the east by the Colorado River, but excluding those lands comprising Dead Horse Point; those lands lying southerly and westerly of the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers, known as the Standing Rocks Country, including such well known landmarks

as the Maze, the Gong, Candlestick Spire, Standing Rock, the Fins, Doll House, and Spanish Bottom, and extending southerly to the confluence of Calf Canyon and the Colorado River; those lands lying southerly and easterly of the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers downstream to Gypsum Canyon, easterly from such confluence to include Salt Creek Canyon, and northerly and westerly therefrom to the Colorado River near the confluence of Elephant Canyon, containing such well known landmarks as Devils Lane, Chesler Park, Virginia Park, Druid Arch, Angel Arch, Castle Arch, and Tower Ruin; comprising altogether not more than three hundred thousand acres.

[SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary shall establish the Canyonlands National Park by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register and such notice shall contain a detailed description of the boundaries of the park which shall encompass an area as nearly as practicable identical to the area described in section 1 of this Act.

SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, UTAH

Beginning at the point on latitude 38 degrees 30 minutes common to Emery, Wayne, Grand, and San Juan Counties:

Thence east along said parallel (the boundary between said Grand and San Juan Counties) to the west line of the east half of section 36, township 26 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake base and meridian; thence south along said west line of said east half of said section 36 to the south line of said township 26 south, range 19 east;

thence east to the west line of township 27 south, range 20 east; thence south along said west line of said township 27 south, range 20 east to the south line of the north half of section 7, said township 27 south, range 20 east;

thence east along said south line of said north half of said section 7 and along the south line of the north half of section 8, said township 27 south, range 20 east, and along the south line of the north half of section 9, said township 27 south, range 20 east, to the west line of the east half of said section 9;

thence south along said west line of the east half of said section 9 and the west line of the east halves of sections 16, 21, 28, and 33 of said township 27 south, range 20 east, and the west line of the east halves of sections 4, 9, 16, and 21 of township 28 south, range 20 east, to the north line of section 28, said township 28 south, range 20 east;

thence west along the north line of said section 28 and of section 29 of said township 28 south, range 20 east, to the west line of said section 29;

thence south along said west line of said section 29 and the west line of section 32 of said township 28 south, range 20 east, and the west line of sections 5 and 8 of township 29 south, range 20 east, to the north line of the south half of section 7, said township 29 south, range 20 east;

thence west along said north line of the south half of said section 7, said township 29 south, range 20 east, and along the north line of the south half of unsurveyed section 12, unsurveyed township 29 south, range 19 east, to the west line of the east half of said section 12;

thence south along said west line of the east half of said section 12 and the west line of the east half of unsurveyed sections 13 and 24 of said township 29 south, range 19 east, to the north line of unsurveyed section 25, said township 29 south, range 19 east;

thence west along said north line of said section 25 to the west line of said section 25; thence south along said west line of said section 25 and the west line of unsurveyed section 36, said township 29 south, range 19 east, to the north line of unsurveyed township 29½ south, range 19 east;

thence east along the said north line of said township 29½ south, range 19 east to the west line of the east half of unsurveyed section 36 of said township 29½ south, range 19 east; thence south along said west line of the east half of said section 36, and the west line of the east half of unsurveyed section 1, partially surveyed township 30 south, range 19 east, to the south line of the north half of said section 1;

thence east along said south line of the north half of said section 1 to the east line of township 30 south, range 20 east; thence south along the west line of section 6 of said township 30 south, range 20 east, to the south line of said section 6;

thence east along said south line of said section 6 to the west line of section 8, said township 30 south, range 20 east; thence south along said west line of said section 8 to the south line of said section 8;

thence east along said south line of said section 8 to the west line of section 16; said township 30 south, range 20 east; thence south along said west line of said section 16 to the south line of said section 16;

thence east along said south line of said section 16 and the south line of section 15, said township 30 south, range 20 east, to the west line of section 23, said township 30 south, range 20 east; thence south along said west line of said section 23 and the west line of sections 26 and 35 to the south line of said township 30 south, range 20 east;

thence east along said south line of said township 30 south, range 20 east, to the west line of unsurveyed section 35, partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 20 east;

thence south along the west line of said section 35, said township 30½ south, range 20 east, and the west line of section 2 and of unsurveyed sections 11, 14, 23, and 26 of partially surveyed township 31 south, range 20 east, to the north line of unsurveyed section 34, said township 31 south, range 20 east;

thence west along said north line of said section 34 to the west line of said section 34; thence south along said west line of said section 34 and the west line of unsurveyed sections 3, 10, and 15, partially surveyed township 32 south, range 20 east, to the north line of unsurveyed section 21, said township 32 south, range 20 east;

thence west along said north line of said section 21, section 20, and unsurveyed section 19, said township 32 south, range 20 east, to the east line of partially surveyed township 32, south, range 19 east; thence north along said east line of said township 32 south, range 19 east, to the north line of unsurveyed section 13, said township 32 south, range 19 east;

thence west along said north line of said section 13 to the east line of unsurveyed section 11, said township 32 south, range 19 east; thence north along said east line of said section 11 and the east line of section 2, said township 32 south, range 19 east, to the north line of said township 32 south, range 19 east;

thence west along the north line of said township 32 south, range 19 east, the north line of partially surveyed township 32 south, range 18 east, and the north line of partially surveyed township 32 south, range 17 east, to the east line of the west half of unsurveyed section 34, partially surveyed township 31 south, range 17 east;

thence north along said east line of the west half of said section 34, the east line of the west half of unsurveyed section 27, and the east line of the west half of unsurveyed section 22, said township 31 south, range 17 east, to the north line of said section 22, said township 31 south, range 17 east;

thence west along said north line of said section 22, said township 31 south, range 17 east, to the east line of section 16, said township 31 south, range 17 east;

thence north along the east line of said section 16, said township 31 south, range 17 east, the east line of unsurveyed sections 9 and 4 of said township 31 south, range 17 east, and the east line of unsurveyed sections 33 and 28, partially surveyed township 30½ south, range 17 east, to the north line of said township 30½ south, range 17 east;

thence west along said north line of said township 30½ south, range 17 east, to the east line of unsurveyed section 33, partially surveyed township 30 south, range 17 east;

thence north along said east line of said section 33 and of unsurveyed sections 28 and 21 of said township 30 south, range 17 east, to the south line of unsurveyed section 15, said township 30 south, range 17 east;

thence east along said south line of said section 15 to the east line of said section 15; thence north along said east line of said section 15 and of unsurveyed section 10, said township 30 south, range 17 east, to the south line of section 2, said township 30 south, range 17 east;

thence east along said south line of said section 2 to the east line of said section 2; thence north along said east line of said section 2 to the south line of partially surveyed township 29 south, range 17 east; thence east along said south line of said township 29 south, range 17 east, to the east line of said township 29 south, range 17 east;

thence north along said east line of said township 29 south, range 17 east, to the south line of unsurveyed section 18, partially surveyed township 29 south, range 18 east; thence east along said south line of said section 18 to the east line of said section 18;

thence north along said east line of said section 18 and the east line of unsurveyed sections 7 and 6, said township 29 south, range 18 east, and the east line of unsurveyed section 31, township 28½ south, range 18 east, to the north line of said section 31; thence west along said north line of said section 31 to the east line of partially surveyed township 28 south, range 17 east;

thence north along said east line of said township 28 south, range 17 east, to the north line of unsurveyed section 25, said township 28 south, range 17 east; thence west along said north line of said section 25 and of unsurveyed section 26, said township 28 south, range 17 east, to the east line of unsurveyed section 22, said township 28 south, range 17 east;

thence north along said east line of said section 22 to the north line of said section 22; thence west along said north line of said section 22 to the east line of section 16, said township 28 south, range 17 east;

thence north along said east line of said section 16 and the east line of unsurveyed sections 9 and 4, said township 28 south, range 17 east, the east line of unsurveyed sections 33, 28, and 21, and of section 16, partially surveyed township 27 south, range 17 east, to the south line of the north half of unsurveyed section 15, said township 27 south, range 17 east;

thence east along said south line of the north half of said section 15 and the south line of the north half of unsurveyed section 14, said township 27 south, range 17 east, to the east line of said section 14; thence north along said east line of said section 14, the east line of unsurveyed section 14 and of section 2, said township 27 south, range 17 east, to the true right bank of the Green River;

thence continuing due north to the boundary line common to said Wayne and said San Juan Counties; thence following said boundary line common to said Wayne and said San Juan Counties generally northwesterly to the point of beginning; such tract containing approximately 332,292 acres.

SEC. [3] 2. Within the area described in section 1 hereof or which lies within the boundaries of the [park as described pursuant to section 2 of this Act,] *park*, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest. The Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the [park] *park, including state owned school sections and river bed lands*, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within the State of Utah and adjacent States, notwithstanding any other provision of law. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value *and shall be offered for transfer by the Secretary on or before the expiration of thirty days following the date of enactment of this Act*: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. Federal property located within the boundaries of the park may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, without consideration, for use by him in carrying out the purposes of this Act. *Any lands within the boundaries of the park which are subject to Bureau of Reclamation or Federal Power Commission withdrawals are hereby freed and exonerated from any such withdrawal and shall, on the date of enactment of this Act, become a part of the Canyonlands National Park subject to no qualifications except those imposed by this Act.*

SEC. 3. Where any Federal lands included within the Canyonlands National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however*, That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions

as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Canyonlands National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default.

SEC. 4. (a) Within the Canyonlands National Park, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, exclusive of the land containing them, and minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area. The provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended, shall have no application within the Canyonlands National Park.

(b) Within the Canyonlands National Park the valid rights of locators, entrymen, and patentees under the mining laws of the United States, and of permittees and lessees under the mineral leasing laws, existing before this Act takes effect, shall be recognized.

SEC. 5. (a) In order to provide suitable access to the Canyonlands National Park and facilities and services required in the operation and administration of the park, the Secretary may select the location or locations of an entrance road or roads to such park and to points of interest therein from United States Route 160 and State Route 24 and 95, including necessary entrance and related administrative headquarters sites upon lands located outside the park, and he may select a suitable location or locations outside the park for connections between entrance roads and between roads lying within the Canyonlands National Park.

(b) To carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary may acquire non-Federal lands or interests in lands by donation, purchase, condemnation, exchange, or such other means as he may deem to be in the public interest: *Provided*, That lands and interests in lands acquired outside the park as rights-of-way for said entrance roads and connections shall not exceed an average of one hundred and twenty-five acres per mile. Rights-of-way and entrance and administrative sites acquired pursuant to this authority shall be administered pursuant to such special regulations as the Secretary may promulgate in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

(c) The Secretary may construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain upon the lands or interests in lands acquired pursuant to this section, or otherwise in Government ownership, and entrance road or roads and connections of parkway standards, including necessary bridges and other structures and utilities as necessary, and funds appropriated for the National Park Service shall be available for these purposes.

SEC. [7] *6.* (a) The [Department of Fish and Game of the State of Utah and the] National Park Service shall *join with the Department of Fish and Game of the State of Utah to* devise, from technical information and other pertinent data assembled or produced by necessary field studies or investigations conducted jointly by the technical and administrative personnel of the agencies involved, and recommended to the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") and the Governor of Utah for their joint approval, a program to insure the permanent conservation of the wildlife population within Canyonlands National Park. Such program shall include provisions for the controlled reduction of wildlife in such park by hunters licensed by the State of Utah and deputized as rangers by the Secretary, when such reduction is found

necessary to prevent injury to the soil, plant life, or to any wild or domestic animals dependent upon the land comprising such park for sustenance.

(b) At least once a year, between February 1 and April 1, [such Department of Fish and Game and] the National Park Service shall submit [their joint recommendations] *its recommendations, together with such recommendations as may be made by the Utah Department of Game and Fish*, for the management protection, and control of wildlife for that year to the Secretary and the Governor of Utah for their joint approval. The yearly plan so recommended shall become effective when approved by the Secretary and the Governor. The Department of Fish and Game and the Secretary [shall] *may*, upon the approval of any such plan, issue separately but simultaneously, such appropriate orders and regulations as are necessary to carry out those portions of the approved plan that fall within their respective jurisdictions. Such orders and regulations shall include provisions for the controlled and managed reduction of wildlife within Canyonlands National Park by qualified and experienced hunters licensed by the State of Utah and deputized as rangers by the Secretary, if such a reduction is required as a part of the approved plan for the year.

(c) After the approval of a plan for any year calling for the controlled and managed reduction by the method prescribed in this Act of wildlife within Canyonlands National Park, and the transmission by the Department of Fish and Game to the Secretary of a list of persons who are qualified and experienced hunters and who have proper hunting licenses issued by the State of Utah, the Secretary shall, on or before July 1 of that year, cause to be issued, without charge, orders deputizing the persons whose names appear on such list, in the number specified by the plan, as rangers for the purpose of entering the park and assisting in the controlled reduction plan. Each such licensed qualified hunter, deputized as a ranger, participating in the controlled reduction plan shall be permitted to remove from the park the carcass of any wildlife killed by him in accordance with such plan.

SEC. [8] 7. [The] *Subject to the provisions of this Act, the* administration, protection, and development of the Canyonlands National Park, as established pursuant to this Act, shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 and the following), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. [9] 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to [provide for establishment of] *establish* the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes."

Senator BIBLE. The hearings in Washington, D.C., have incorporated in them the various official reports of governmental agencies involved.

May I say first, as a neighbor of the great State of Utah, I'm delighted to be here, to participate in this hearing, in an attempt to be helpful in working out a problem with a few complexities and possibly a few little controversies in it; and I think as we move along that we'll be able to make some real headway.

The committee print which I have introduced in the record generally outlines an area for a proposed Canyonlands Park, as shown on the map on the southern wall, and this embraces an acreage of approximately 328,000 acres.

This is described in section 1 of the committee print of April 16, 1962.

Section 2 of the committee print authorizes the exchange of lands within this area, title to which stands in the name of the State of Utah, for lands outside the proposed park area.

Section 3 is the so-called grazing provision. It's lifted, I believe, almost bodily from the provisions of a bill to create the Great Basin National Park in my State of Nevada. It provides that anyone holding valid grazing privileges and permits on the date of the approval of the act may continue to hold those permits during the

holder's lifetime and through the immediate family and the heirs and successors of that holder. If the permit is sold, it would confer a grazing privilege, subject to the regular rules and regulations and laws governing the granting of grazing privileges, for a period of 25 years.

Sections 4(a) and 4(b) of the act are sections that were likewise lifted, I think, almost in their entirety from the provisions of the Great Basin National Park bill, which has passed the Senate and is pending in the House. They are sections that deal with mining.

I think it might be well to just read those, because certainly one of the hearts of the problem that we find here concerns itself with mining, exploration, development, and actual operation. Section 4 (a) of the committee print of April 16 reads as follows. I'm purposely going through this, so we can somewhat lay the framework of the bill under which this committee is operating.

(Whereupon Senator Bible read into the record sections 4(a) and 4(b), which appear in the preceding text.)

Senator BIBLE. Section 5 is the so-called access provision. Section 5(a) is the access provision of the Canyonlands National Park. Section 5(b) is the authorization to the Secretary to acquire non-Federal lands or interest in lands by donation, purchase, condemnation, exchange, or such other means as he may deem to be in the public interest.

Section 5(c), the Secretary may construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain upon the lands or interests in lands acquired pursuant to this section, or otherwise in Government ownership, an entrance road or roads and connections of parkway standards, including necessary bridges and other structures and utilities as necessary, and funds appropriated for the National Park Service shall be available for these purposes.

Section 6 is the so-called hunting provision of the Canyonlands Park bill and provides for cooperative managed hunting upon and within the area, upon the approval of a plan adopted by the Secretary of Interior and the Governor of the State of Utah under conditions as set forth in that section. The sections are simply the authorizing sections.

I think this sets the framework, and I think it would be helpful to us in considering the bill and those who are testifying and those who are interested to understand the general provisions of this particular section.

We had a very, very helpful visit to the Canyonlands yesterday by plane and helicopter and by foot and by jeep. I've said that on all of these national parks and seashores and areas of this kind that there's no substitute for an actual inspection of the area. I think we then know what we're actually talking about. Confucius said, "One picture is worth more than a thousand words," and I'm sure one visit is worth far more than.

As I said, this is an area of spectacular and amazing grandeur. There is no question in my mind that it is worthy of national park status. It has inherently in it, as most of these park problems do, a problem of size and a problem of uses permitted within the park.

With that short preliminary statement, rather a background of the ground rules under which we're going to operate, I would first recog-

nize the distinguished junior Senator from Utah, Senator Moss, the author of the bill, the man who spent a great deal of time in pushing this legislation forward to the position in which we find ourselves today. Senator Moss.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I won't spend any time talking about the bill, because I've been down in this part of the country talking with the people about the bill before; and I'm sure that the folks who are here today know more about the area and about the problems than I could elucidate by talking to the bill. In any event, I testified in the hearings which we held in Washington. So in the record as it is printed now, my statement exists and may be read by anyone who would like to see it.

What I would like to do, however, is to express my gratitude to the members of the committee for coming out to Utah at this time to hold these hearings: Chairman Bible, the senior Senator from Nevada; Senator Long from Hawaii, who sits on my right, came out to sit with this committee, as a member of this committee; Senator Metcalf of Montana, who is also a member of the committee, came and spent the full day yesterday viewing the Canyonlands area and will spend today and tomorrow in this southeastern part of the State on hearings, and then will sit in Salt Lake City Monday to hear testimony up there. I'm sure that we all recognize that these committee members in so doing have forfeited their Easter weekend, as it were, to be in their home States or elsewhere. I think it's generally known that around Eastertime Congress has a little breathing spell of a few days when the Senators and the Congressmen try to get away to go home for Easter or to have 4 or 5 days, at least, of relaxation. Now, the members of this committee have given that up in order to come out here, because I was anxious to go forward with the hearings on this bill, and I thought it was important. I asked the chairman if he would do it, and he has agreed to do it. These members of the committee have come along to do it, and I personally am very grateful to them for doing it at this particular time. It could easily have been put off for a month or 2 months, but the chairman thought we should go forward with the bill.

I appreciate, too, that my senior colleague, Senator Bennett, has come down here to attend these hearings, not as a member of the committee, but he has come to sit with the committee and hear the testimony given by the witnesses. The chairman has invited the Senator to come and be with us, and I am most happy that he has done that. So we have here a rather representative group from the Congress to hear the testimony that will be given by people who wish to speak to the bill.

I also express my appreciation that the chairman has outlined the provisions of the bill about which we're talking. One of the things that I discovered when I came down not long ago to Blanding and Monticello and Moab was that many people did not understand fully what the bill contained; and without knowing the terms of the bill and what we're talking about, of course, we couldn't have very intelligent testimony. So I'm sure that with the provisions of the bill before us, we can speak to it, and we can make a record here for the committee that will then be considered by all members of the subcommittee and the full committee of the Senate, the Interior Com-

mittee, who will then be prepared to act on the legislation that is before us now.

I appreciate very much, Chairman Bible, your holding the hearings here today, and I'm sure that the people of Utah and particularly of San Juan County are grateful to you for coming.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Senator Moss. Senator Long.

Senator LONG. I have nothing to say at this time, Mr. Chairman, except it's a great privilege to be here.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Metcalf.

Senator METCALF. No. Mr. Chairman, I'm here to listen and to learn. I do want to say that we've had magnificent hospitality from the people in the area, and your hospitality matches your scenery, which is superb.

Senator BIBLE. I need not introduce the next gentleman to the Utah audience, the senior Senator from Utah, Senator Bennett. I am delighted that he is here. I joined with his colleague, Senator Moss, in inviting him to participate with us, as I have previously in these deliberations. Senator Bennett, we're happy to have you here with us.

Senator BENNETT. I appreciate the opportunity of being here with you. I, too, enjoyed the day yesterday, my second visit into the area, and I'm still appreciating, and my appreciation is growing, for the beauty of this area. I'm hopeful that we can develop a program which will produce a national park.

Now, I've asked the chairman for permission to submit a statement this morning without taking the time to read it, because, as the chairman has told you, we had a new bill or, we had some changes made in the bill as of 4 days ago. I made a rather extensive presentation before the committee when it met in Washington. My statement is limited to comments on the changes made in the new committee print. I'm sure you won't take time to read them now, but I have copies for the press if they're interested in them. And there are your copies [handing].

I'm very grateful to the chairman for making it possible for me to sit here with the committee. Unfortunately, none of the minority members of the committee were able to come, so that there's no member of my party here except myself; and I've assured the chairman that I will not abuse his hospitality; but it is a privilege to be down here to hear the testimony and to take a minor part in the discussions that will follow.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

As the committee will recall from my previous testimony, I strongly favor creation of a 310,000-acre Canyonlands National Park and Recreation Area of which up to 102,000 acres would be administered under traditional national park standards, and at least 208,000 acres of which would be administered as a national recreation area with multiple use expressly permitted. This approach adopts the recommendations made by the State agency committee established by Gov. George D. Clyde, of which C. J. Olsen was chairman. After the hearings are completed, I intend to introduce such a bill with appropriate modifications as recommended by those to whom I have sent a working draft of the bill.

It was not my intention to appear again before the committee, but several changes have been made by my junior colleague from Utah [Mr. Moss] to the substitute for S. 2387, which my colleague introduced on February 7, 1962, in

his Committee Print No. 1, dated April 16, 1962. Since I have not had an opportunity to testify on this revised bill, I felt that I should do so today.

Size increased.—First of all, the latest version of the Moss bill increases the size of the proposed Canyonlands National Park from 300,000 acres to 332,292 acres. This is an increase of over 10 percent. Since the State agency committee and I both objected to the previous size, the increase makes the bill even more objectionable.

Dead Horse Point State Park.—Under the earlier Moss substitute, it would have been theoretically possible to leave out the 22,000 acres needed by the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission to develop an adequate State park in the Dead Horse Point area. However, with the increase it is now clear that the entire area wanted by the State would be given national park designation, therefore undermining the State park program. The State agency committee regards this as "a case of almost total disregard for the State's long-range program in this area." The State of Utah applied to the Department of Interior on June 23, 1960, for 4,845 acres under the State park legislation I sponsored that would be added to the existing Dead Horse Point State Park. Subsequent applications will be filed as the State park is developed. But it is now apparent why the Department of Interior has refused to approve the application. It does not want a State park, it wants a national park. This is an unwarranted blow to our State park system. I therefore urge that the 22,000 acres desired by the State be eliminated from the Moss bill.

Revenue for Utah schools not adequately protected by Moss bill.—The Moss Committee Print No. 1 does make a slight change in the section dealing with the 43,214 acres of State school sections and State-owned riverbed lands and with school sections which will pass to the State when surveyed. However, the amendments fail to describe which lands will be exchanged for the State lands as recommended by the Utah State Land Board and School Board. Likewise, it provides that the lands must be "approximately equal in fair market value." It is impossible to determine the fair market value of the school lands without full exploration of the mineral and metal values contained therein. So the State will be no better off than under existing law which has proved to be so cumbersome and unsatisfactory. While the amendment does direct the Secretary to transfer the lands to be exchanged within 30 days, it does not specify which lands, and therefore does not assure adequate protection of the State school fund.

Mining and mineral development endangered in Moss bill.—Any fair-minded person must admit that the Canyonlands area is rich in minerals and has a tremendous wealth-creating potential for the economy of Utah and the Nation. That being so, the committee should be doubly cautious about including provisions in the bill which would lock up this wealth. This is true even though the Secretary of the Interior in his statement to the committee implied that because little wealth was produced in that isolated area last year that it has no potential. The same could be said for the whole of Utah in 1847 under the Secretary's novel reasoning.

The committee print makes no changes in those provisions of the Moss substitute dealing with mining and mineral lease activities. Thus, all of the objections to this section which I raised before still apply. All such activity under the bill is subject to "general regulations" prescribed by the Secretary of Interior for the control of mining and mineral activities as "he determines necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the areas." It is not difficult to imagine the nature of such "general regulations" since both the Secretary and the Director of the National Park Service said in their statements before this subcommittee that they were strongly opposed to mining and mineral leasing in national parks. It is my strong feeling that multiple use should be expressly permitted in at least 208,000 acres of the area, so mining and mineral leasing activities could be carried out, rather than to place the entire area at the mercy of the Secretary's "general regulations."

Single use areas should be selected jointly by Federal and State officials.—Under the approach which the State agency committee and I have adopted, the areas to be devoted solely to national park use, in which virtually no other uses would be permitted, would be selected jointly by the Secretary of Interior, the Governor of Utah, and the affected county commission. Under the Moss bill the Secretary of Interior would have sole authority to make this determination. Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities over the public domain to the Secretary.

Single use areas selected in advance.—Under my approach, the park areas would be selected and substantially known in advance, based upon the joint

Federal-State study. Under the Moss bill the selection, if any, would be made after the bill is passed, on a case-by-case basis. Under the Moss approach we would not know for sure how much of the area would be locked up until after the bill became law, although probably all of it would be.

Quite obviously someone must make the selection. It is my strong conviction that this selection should be made cooperatively by the Secretary, the Governor, and the affected county commission, and not made solely at the discretion of the Secretary of Interior. If the Moss procedure is followed, the Secretary of Interior will be under tremendous pressures to permit multiple use activities throughout the entire area. Under my procedure, however, the single use areas would be clearly set aside, thus obviating the administrative problems created under the Moss bill.

Hunting effectively barred by Moss bill.—Although the Moss Committee Print No. 1 makes a slight change in the section which purports to permit some limited hunting in the Canyonlands area, it is still grossly inadequate. This language is virtually identical to the legislation which created the Grand Teton National Park. I have a letter from S. J. Jiacoletti, State game and fish commissioner for the State of Wyoming, which expresses a strong dissatisfaction with the entire procedure. The letter is identical to one which appears on page 72 of the committee hearing. Mr. Jiacoletti speaks of "the autocratic and highhanded attitudes of the National Park Service" and urges that the State game and fish departments should "receive priority consideration." He also described the provision dealing with deputizing of State hunters as "most cumbersome." He concludes by saying that State agencies should have "final say," and that is why I propose and urge the bill be amended as I recommended earlier. I have received a similar letter from the Utah State Fish and Game Department, expressing strong dissatisfaction with the Moss bill. We permit hunting in park-type areas in the Wasatch National Forest where we have many thousands more visitors than we have in our national parks. This is done without any significant problems. Moreover, the hunting in the Canyonlands area would be done in the off-tourist season; so my proposal has been tested and proved practical.

Access roads.—The latest version of the Moss bill still leaves the construction of access roads discretionary with the Secretary of Interior. I urge, therefore, that the Secretary be directed to build such roads—otherwise we may never have them, particularly since he testified that it will be from 15 to 20 years before the area will be fully developed.

Southern Utah National Parkway left out.—The Moss committee print fails to authorize a survey of the proposed southern Utah national parkway as I urged in my previous testimony. Since such a parkway would open up a magnificent area and would bring far more tourists to Utah and the southwest than would any combination of new national parks, I again urge that this amendment be added.

"Arches National Park."—Likewise, the Moss bill fails to include the amendment I urged to give the magnificent Arches National Monument, national park status. It is as large as Bryce Canyon National Park, and has a unique beauty all its own, fully deserving national park status. Such a designation would bring many more tourists than now visit the area.

Other omissions in Moss bill.—The Moss bill also fails to provide for concurrent Federal-State jurisdiction with respect to the police power and tax power and for State jurisdiction of boating and water laws, as recommended by the State agency committee.

Alleged problems of administration under the Bennett approach.—The problems of administration will be virtually the same under either the Moss bill or under my approach. Much has been made of purported problems of administration under my bill. It is said there must be contiguity and not separate park areas. This objection betrays an ignorance of the terrain involved. The three principal Canyonland areas may be contiguous on a map but they are totally isolated from each other to a tourist on the ground. It will be necessary to build dead-end roads into each of the areas, utilizing existing roads to get from one to the other. To try to connect them directly would be of fantastic cost.

Interestingly enough, the Moss bill itself provides for the three dead-end roads into the three isolated areas. In a memorandum entitled "Vital Statistics on Canyonlands National Park Bill," which was widely distributed, he said, "Within the park area there are three distinct scenic divisions separated by the Colorado and Green Rivers," thus agreeing with my point of view.

Moreover, my bill places the entire area under Park Service administration just as much as do the other three bills. There is, therefore, just as much contiguity with this bill as with the others, and no more problems of administration.

All the tourism advantages without a "lockup" under Bennett approach.—Under my approach, we can have all the economic advantages of tourism without locking up all of the precious resources of the mineral-rich Canyonlands areas. Tourists want to see and enjoy the incomparable scenery; they don't measure the number of acres in making a decision to visit a national park. In any event, there would be nearly as much acreage in the total park and recreation area under my approach as under the Moss bill. However, the Moss bill would empower the Secretary of Interior to block all mineral development without attracting any more tourists to compensate for this great loss than would my bill.

In conclusion, let me reaffirm that I fully support establishment of a Canyonlands National Park and Recreation Area, but we can do this without jeopardizing the economic future of the area if the amendments I have urged are adopted.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Senator Bennett. We hoped up to the last moment that Senator Dworshak from Idaho, the ranking member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, would be here, but he was unable to be here. We do have a staffman, Allen Mitchem, who is occupying the judge's bench. He is minority staff counsel for the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He's a very thoroughgoing lawyer, and I'm sure he will participate as we move along in these deliberations.

I would first like to read a telegram from Congressman Blaine Peterson received by me:

Circumstances beyond my control preclude my appearance to testify before your committee. My decision not to appear to testify in Monticello, Moab, or Salt Lake City at this time should not be construed as being in opposition to the Moss bill nor as favoring any other concept of the park. As I stated before your committee on March 30, I am vitally concerned with the creation of this park and in my letter to the chairman of the San Juan County commissioners I reaffirmed my stand by stating: "I am firmly committed to the proposition that we are entitled to and should have a national park in our area."

M. BLAINE PETERSON,
Member of Congress.

(Congressman Peterson subsequently submitted the following statement:)

STATEMENT OF HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I appreciate this opportunity to make a statement in support of S. 2387, as amended by Senator Moss, which provides for the establishment of a Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah. The park area is located in the southeastern part of my State, entirely within the First Congressional District which I am privileged to represent.

Mr. Chairman, your committee is to be commended for having expedited the hearings on this measure and for your considerate planning in holding hearings in Monticello, Moab, and Salt Lake City last month. Your thoughtfulness gave local residents an opportunity to present their views on the park and I am sure their views will be fully considered in your deliberations on the bill. For me it was a great privilege to join you at the hearings in Salt Lake City.

All those who testified both here and in Utah agreed that this great unspoiled area of spectacular scenic wonder and historic Indian ruins justifies park status and that it must be preserved for posterity. The two basic questions to be resolved by your committee and by our House committee relate to the size of the park and the extent of primary and secondary uses within the park area. I should like to comment on these two questions:

With reference to the size of the park, I wish to point out that Senator Moss, Congressman King, and myself introduced bills on August 8, which provided for

a park of not more than 300,000 acres. Thereafter we unanimously agreed that the size of the park should be increased by approximately 30,000 acres. The present Moss amendment reflects this increase. I was of the opinion then and am still of the opinion that this is the minimum size for a park for the protection of the values and for the efficient management of the park.

The other question of secondary uses within the park area poses a real problem of basic policy as it affects national parks. It entails a new concept in park management. The people of southeastern Utah are sincerely concerned with the preservation of their basic rights and are urging that these rights be spelled out in enabling legislation. Senator Moss has very carefully considered the secondary uses allowed by your committee in other national parks and has included them in his present bill.

It appears from the testimony of witnesses that there is no unanimity as to what uses, if any, should be allowed in national parks. I am committed to the people of my district to do my utmost to protect those rights relating to grazing, mineral exploration, hunting, and so forth, which they have enjoyed for so long. It seems to me that under experienced park management it should be possible to control these secondary uses in such a manner that they do not impinge on the primary recreational uses of the area. In my opinion the present Moss bill adequately provides for these maximum secondary uses.

In conclusion, I urge S. 2387 as amended by Senator Moss be approved by your committee.

Again, I am most appreciative of your indulgence in permitting this statement to be included in the record of your hearings. I am confident your conclusions will resolve controversial points consistent with the best interests of those who will be enjoying this great wonderland in years and generations to come, and at the same time be of maximum benefit to the local economy.

Senator BIBLE. I would also like to insert a statement from the mayor of Milford, Utah.

(The statement referred to follows:)

CITY OF MILFORD,
Milford, Utah.

Senator FRANK E. MOSS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: Regarding the controversy over the proposed Canyonlands National Park for Utah, would like to state for your information my personal position.

I heartily favor, and I believe almost everyone in Milford favors, establishment of the park, and I don't feel that there's too much reason for worrying about encroachment upon mining and grazing rights. It seems to me that the wording of your bill would adequately protect these rights.

In Utah, at present, we don't have a national park that begins to offer the public the scenic wonders that would be included in Canyonland; and, actually, while the Utahans cry about tourists leaving our State in a day or less, the only national parks we have can be seen from the windows of an automobile, while driving through at whatever speed the tourists desire, and after seeing the parks there's no reason for them to tarry.

Canyonlands National Park, as outlined in your bill, will offer so many major attractions, such as a wealth of breathtaking beauty and natural wonders that can be seen nowhere else in the world, that I am convinced addition of this area to the national park system will be a great advantage to the State, financially and otherwise, and I cannot understand the many objections voiced to this park, unless it is because the objectors have selfish motives.

My sincere congratulations on your efforts to help Utah and our national park system.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND L. KIZER,
Mayor, City of Milford, Utah.

Senator BIBLE. I would likewise like to have inserted in the record a statement from the National Audubon Society.

(The statement referred to follows:)

NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY,
Audubon House, New York, N.Y.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The National Audubon Society sees the need for expansion of the national park system as important, even urgent, as existing parks and recreation areas are overcrowded and their resources threatened by overuse, and it appears to us that the proposed Canyonlands area in Utah is potentially of true national park significance. It has the size, the wildness, the scientific interest, and scenic grandeur. We commend Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall for bringing the remarkable features of this area to national attention and for his vigorous advocacy of its park potential. Likewise, we commend Senator Frank E. Moss for introducing legislation to establish a national park there and we would have been pleased to support his original S. 2387 with some amendment to limit mining and grazing. We regret that Senator Moss has lately introduced a substitute version which incorporates provisions not in keeping with the national park concept as established by Congress and as historically followed by the National Park Service.

It is understandable that the local boosters who have in mind the publicity and tourism values would like to see the area designated officially as a "national park." But if the words "national park" have a special meaning to the public, it is because of the high standards that have been adhered to in the conservation and protection of "the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein" (quoted words are from section 1 of the National Parks Act of 1916.)

To designate as a national park an area in which hunting would be permitted, as proposed in section 7 of the substitute bill, and in which prospecting and mining would be permitted, and in which livestock grazing might well continue for two generations or more, would be to create a national park in name only. S. 2387, substitute, actually proposes to delineate by law a "multiple-use area"—to use a currently popular catchphrase—that would be little different essentially from a national forest or from the present public-domain status of the lands involved.

Moreover, to create areas called national parks in which such exploitative and commercial activities are legalized and encouraged would establish a precedent which inevitably would endanger the high standards of existing national parks and monuments. If hunting, mining, and grazing are appropriate and compatible activities in a national park in Utah, it would be argued—and with considerable logic—then hunting, mining, and grazing surely would be equally appropriate and compatible in national parks in Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Washington, Oregon, California, Florida, Virginia, and other States. And if mining and grazing are to be permitted, why not logging?

In short, Senator Bible, the National Audubon Society opposes the enactment of substitute S. 2387 which contains provisions that are alien to the traditions and purposes of our national parks.

We favor a Canyonlands Naional Park if recognized national park standards are written into the law which establishes it.

Please make this letter a part of the record of the recent hearings on S. 2387 as indicative of the views of the National Audubon Society.

Sincerely yours,

CARL W. BUCHHEISTER, *President.*

Senator BIBLE. Our first witness this morning will be Mayor Kenneth Bailey, of Monticello. Delighted to have you with us, sir.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH R. BAILEY, JR., MAYOR OF MONTICELLO, UTAH

Mr. BAILEY. I have here with me a statement by the City Council of Monticello which I would like inserted into the record. Then I have a statement of my own on which I would like to testify.

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, the resolution from the City Council of Monticello will be inserted into the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED CANYONLANDS PARK

Whereas it is proposed to establish a national park within the boundary limits of the county of San Juan, to be called the Canyonlands National Park; and,

Whereas several legislative bills have been prepared for presentation to the Congress for the purpose of establishing by law the above-named Canyonlands National Park; and

Whereas much controversy has arisen regarding the size of acreage which should be included in the said Canyonlands National Park; and

Whereas it is known and established that much of the area now being contemplated for inclusion in the Moss bill (S. 2387) amounting to some 332,292 acres, more or less, is potentially rich in minerals and oil deposits of which future development could possibly provide great wealth and industry to the county of San Juan and the State of Utah, as well as to provide for great effect upon the national economy and safety in the event of world conflict; and

Whereas under section 5 of the Moss bill, any operation to develop said mineral and oil deposits would be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary to preserve the scenic and recreation values of the area; and

Whereas the announced statements and the history of National Park Service administration are such as to indicate that the regulations adopted under said section 5 would inevitably be so stringent as to eliminate any effective multiple use within the park area which would have the effect of seriously limiting the development of the oil and mineral resources of San Juan County on which the economy of the county is so dependent; and

Whereas the rugged and desolate physical characteristics of the area to be included in the Canyonlands National Park are such that they do not readily lend themselves to the possibility of destruction or material alteration by the acts of men and machines, due to their predominant inaccessibility to travelers, considering also the predominant nature of the area being that of normally high or rapid erodibility from wind and weather due to the inherent barrenness of much of the area; and

Whereas administration of these lands under the National Park Service program would not materially change the erodible nature of the ages generally; and

Whereas there are certain small areas within this vast wilderness that could well be benefited by establishment of parks of smaller acreages, which would preserve those areas which should be preserved, and which would within themselves be vast in size from the standpoint of accessibility to the populace as a national park and playground, and which small areas would in very deed preserve the great beauties of the Needles area and the Land of Standing Men, and of Chesler Park and other areas of national interest without prohibiting the future possibilities of the area to provide industry and wealth to the inhabitants of our county and State; and

Whereas in the beginning all this controversy arose from the initial attempts to have a national park established in the Needles area, which in truth is the most important and beautiful portion of all the proposed Canyonlands National Park; and

Whereas the present outlined plans for the said park includes portions of the streambeds of the Colorado and Green Rivers, which inherently belong to the State of Utah: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Monticello, Utah, in session this 4th day of April 1962, That it be made known that it is our unanimous opinion that the purposes of the Park Service in establishing a national shrine in the Canyonlands area can best serve the welfare of the county of San Juan, the State of Utah, and the national interest by the establishment of a park of smaller size, encompassing the Needles area and the important scenic areas contiguous thereto; be it also

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to establish the headquarters of this park at Squaw Springs, due to its strategic location with regard to the most scenic areas and the availability of water for develop-

ment of facilities and the present accessibility of Squaw Springs by roads presently existing; be it further

Resolved, That all the remaining lands, including the riverbeds of the Colorado and Green Rivers, be left to be developed in a manner best suited to the needs of our people, including citizens now unborn; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the congressional committee hearing to be held in Monticello, Utah, April 20, 1962, to apprise that body of the official attitude of the governing body of the city of Monticello.

Councilman Darrol P. Young moved the adoption of the foregoing resolution. Councilman Arlow Freestone seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously by the council. Mayor Kenneth R. Bailey, Jr., declared the resolution passed and approved.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct excerpt from the minutes of the regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Monticello held at 7:30 p.m. on April 4, 1962, at the Monticello city office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto affixed my hand and the seal of said city.

LAURA R. LEATHAM, *Recorder*.

Senator BIBLE. You may proceed now with your own statement.

Mr. BAILEY. I am at the present time mayor of Monticello, Utah, and am engaged in business in Monticello. I have been actively engaged in business in Monticello and in the uranium mining industry in San Juan County since 1950.

I am familiar with the area that is covered in the Moss Canyonlands National Park bill. I have flown over this area many times. I have traveled over much of the area on the ground. I have furnished money to develop roads in some of the area in search of uranium. I have owned mining claims in this area, and I have done a limited amount of prospecting and development of uranium in this area.

It has been my impression and hope for years, and that of many people that I have personally contacted, that someday the Needles area would be made into a national park. The Needles and the confluence of the rivers are the prime national park areas. These other areas, such as Standing Rocks, Grand View Point, and Upheaval Dome, and some of the surrounding areas, do complement this prime Needles area. In my opinion it is very questionable whether the surrounding areas would be of national park quality without the Needles area. Therefore, I feel that the Canyonlands National Park headquarters and the first development of the Canyonlands National Park should be in the Needles area. I feel that it is so important that there should be written into this Moss national park bill a stipulation requiring that this development be made first and that the park headquarters be in this Needles area.

Senator BIBLE. Right on that point, Mayor, I think the Park Service plans, as they envision the creation of a Canyonlands National Park as called for in the Moss bill, the establishment of headquarters in this Squaw Springs area, if I understand their plans correctly. I would think personally that it would be an error for a committee to attempt to direct the administrative agency as to exactly where they must locate the headquarters. However, this is under their prospective plan.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, it has been my impression of reports in the Salt Lake papers that prominent influential people in northern Utah are pulling for too many developments in the north end of this park, which I feel are for selfish reasons. I feel that it's to get tourists off of the Interstate 70 Highway and take them to the north end of the

park, put them back onto the Interstate 70, so they can go on into northern Utah; and I feel that it is very important that we have this headquarters down in the Needles area, so that the people that come to visit the Canyonlands National Park can truly see the canyonlands of San Juan County.

I welcome the establishment of this development near Monticello. We have had good development of the cattle and farming industries in San Juan County, and we've had fabulous development in the mining and oil industries; and we need this park, and we need to have it developed. We need this tourist industry to help round out the economy of this county.

There has been much discussion about the multiple-use aspect of the Moss Canyonlands National Park bill. I feel that these guarantees on grazing, mining, and oil exploration, are very important to Monticello, San Juan County, and to the State of Utah. I feel that they must be retained in this bill, because of their importance to the entire State. I can in good faith support this Moss Canyonlands National Park bill as a constructive, progressive development of a large portion of our county. I wish to thank this committee for letting me state my views on this important piece of legislation which is so important to our area.

Senator BIBLE. We are delighted to have you here this morning, Mayor. Thank you very much. Were there questions?

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I have one question. As a mining man who owns locations in the park, you're satisfied that the provision in the Moss bill is adequate protection for your mining interests?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, I don't have mining interests within this area at the present time, but I feel that it is adequate.

Senator METCALF. Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Now, what was that answer?

Mr. BAILEY. That I feel that these provisions are adequate.

Senator BIBLE. That you feel that these provisions are adequate. Thank you.

Senator MOSS. I understand you, Mayor Bailey, to support the hunting provisions to provide for the removal of excess game in the event that it is found to exist in the park; is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Senator MOSS. Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Long? Senator Bennett?

Senator BENNETT. Well, I just note that there's a difference between the mayor's statement and the resolution adopted by the city council—is it of Monticello?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Senator BENNETT. Apparently the majority of your council do not agree with you on this particular question of the adequacy of the Moss bill to protect the opportunity to develop mining?

Mr. BAILEY. On the city council, I don't even get a vote.

Senator BENNETT. I see.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mayor. Our next witness will be Commissioner Hazleton, chairman of the county board. Good to see you again this morning.

STATEMENT OF MARION HAZLETON, MONTICELLO BUSINESSMAN

Mr. HAZLETON. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to state that I'm testifying as a Monticello businessman and not as the chairman of the San Juan County Commission. I wish to say at this time that I support the Moss bill. However, I feel that the multiple-use concept should be strengthened by inserting two words: "continuous," and "supervised."

Senator BENNETT. At what point?

Mr. HAZLETON. Instead of just "multiple use," I would like to have it read, "continuous supervised multiple use." By inserting those two words, the "continuous" would eliminate the time period when these various things on multiple use would phase out.

Senator BIBLE. In other words, you would be opposed to phasing out grazing permits in 25 years, or whatever the situation was?

Mr. HAZLETON. That's right.

Senator BIBLE. Of course, you understand that if you sell the permit, whoever buys the permit can hold the permit for 25 years; but if you hold it in your own family, you can hold it for your life and for the life of your heirs, so that the grazing would be there forever in perpetuity.

Mr. HAZLETON. That's right. And the word "supervise." In the past we've found that the BLM that has administered these areas, there's not enough teeth in the laws that protect our county roads, as an example. Seismograph crews come in, and in some cases they drill holes in the middle of the road and so forth. I think there should be strict supervision on that. With the word "supervised" and the word "continuous" in there, I think that that would satisfy the cattle people and also the oil and gas industry and the mining industry.

If these words could not be incorporated in the bill for any reason—and I feel that instead of the clause where it leaves it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, I think that the county commission in whose county the lands are involved should have a say before any final decision is allowed to let this phase out.

Senator BIBLE. Now, this is your personal position?

Mr. HAZLETON. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Do the county commissioners of San Juan County have an official position in this bill?

Mr. HAZLETON. The county commission appointed a seven-man board to work up a stand that they were going to present in behalf of the people.

Senator BIBLE. And that will be presented during the course of this hearings?

Mr. HAZLETON. That's right, sir. That will be presented by Eugene Foushee of Bluff, who is the chairman of that committee.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you. Questions?

Senator MOSS. No, I have no questions.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness is Commissioner Ray Redd of San Juan County.

Senator BIBLE. You may proceed. You live here in Monticello?

STATEMENT OF RAY REDD, COMMISSIONER, SAN JUAN COUNTY

Mr. REDD. I do. Well, my conception of this situation is, folks, that it will do more to help the economy of San Juan County than—it's next to our Aneth and Lisbon oilfields. We need it.

Senator BIBLE. Will you speak just a little louder.

Mr. REDD. I say that passing this Moss bill will do more to help our economy than any thing other than the Aneth and the Lisbon fields and the mining industry. I'm sure we need it. Since the Senator has provided that we can mine, that our oil and gas can be produced, our grazing, our hunting—now, what are they taking away from us? Why are we standing in our own light? It seems to me that it's just absolutely frivolous. And I'm sure the way the thing is located, our Glen Canyon Dam, the Powell Lake, the way it's located with our other parks in southern Utah, Mesa Verde, it has a marked significance, and it should be passed, gentlemen. We're just standing in our own light if we don't.

Senator BIBLE. You've lived in this area, I take it, practically all of your life?

Mr. REDD. All my life.

Senator BIBLE. Do you have any comments as to the size of the proposed national park? This is one of the issues we have, not only here, but in the creation of any national park or seashore or lakeshore area in the United States. We always have run into the problem of size. What's your views? Too big, too little?

Mr. REDD. There's only $2,100 in grazing fees that come in from this area.

Senator METCALF. How much was that?

Mr. REDD. $2,100. Now, that's very minor, folks. Our grazing is not the situation, but our minerals are the situation that really count, that amount to something. That's the backbone of our country, and there's no use closing the door. This 120,000 acres that Chet Olsen came up with at your Governor's committee, that's folly. Why are we going to close the door to 120,000 acres in our country, when we know that we've got the greatest potential right in the Four Corners area and right in this area? It's proving its point every day. This new well that just came in. There's an offset well. The Pure Oil is drilling another well right close to it. So I don't see why we should hate to see a cow graze out there, an oil well, or a good uranium mine, or a potash mine. I think, folks, we're just stumbling and just batting our heads against a blank wall when we don't accept this park as Senator Moss has written it up.

Senator BIBLE. Your theory is, though, that in creating this national park you would have to have the benefit of the permission for grazing and for mining; is that correct?

Mr. REDD. Well, I'm for the mining and for the grazing, absolutely. As long as it's held in that one family, I think that's fine, just the way he's stated it, because I don't think in 25 years from now there will be a lot of cattle run on some of these western deserts. They'll be run in the southeastern part of the United States.

Senator BIBLE. What would be the possibility of passing a bill without the provision of grazing and mining?

Mr. REDD. Well, I'd certainly favor a national park there if we can mine and have our oil——

Senator BIBLE. That was not my question. What if you could not have a national park with the grazing provision and the mining provision in? Would you favor it? What if you had a national park that would absolutely prohibit grazing or mining? Would you be for it or against it?

Mr. REDD. I'd favor part of it; yes, yes, sir. You bet. I'd favor the Needles especially. I doubt very much if you'd get any oil there. I'm not a geologist, though. But I think that stuff across the Colorado River certainly has merit and should be held at multiple use, because the structures are there; and a man from your geological survey at the University of Utah, his idea was that absolutely you could have that mined just like you have in other parks.

Senator BIBLE. We only have it in four parks. We have it allowed in the Mt. McKinley park in Alaska. The other exceptions are closer and it is allowed in the Great Basin National Park bill, which has just passed the Senate, in my State of Nevada, White Pine County. I'm very familiar with it. These are the only national parks, as such, that actually provide mining and prospecting; so it's rather an exception to the general concept of a national park, and admittedly it is.

Mr. REDD. Well, isn't it a fact that it was in 1916, when the park bill was enacted? We're not riding a 1916 automobile. Things are progressing, and I think our books are full of poor laws. We all know that. You gentlemen do, I'm sure. The law is obsolete. The conditions, the situations have changed, we shouldn't hide these resources and close them to the public.

Senator BIBLE. I understand your position very clearly. You're for this national park?

Mr. REDD. Absolutely.

Senator BIBLE. Providing we have a provision in it for grazing and mining?

Mr. REDD. That's right. Your hunting is never going to be a problem. There's only one spot, at the head of Salt Creek, that has been congested. Forty-one deer were killed in the whole area. There will never be a problem on the Colorado River. Salt Creek is your only place where there are many deer. Anybody that knows that country and will be honest knows that's correct, Senator.

Senator BIBLE. I think the testimony on the hunting is pretty fully developed in our Washington hearings. It did not in complete honesty seem to me that that would be one of the critical issues in the creation of this national park.

Mr. REDD. There are a few little deer out in Lockhart, and some are on the Big Flat, but it is no problem at all.

Senator BIBLE. Any questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Redd. The next witness is another Mr. Redd, the county attorney, Mr. Redd.

STATEMENT OF F. BENNION REDD, COUNTY ATTORNEY FOR SAN JUAN COUNTY

Mr. REDD. Mr. Chairman and committee members, I'm a lifetime resident of this community, this county. My folks were pioneers here. I have a large family, and I hope that my posterity stay here. So I have more of an interest in this county than the chance to make a quick dollar, so to speak.

I have at the top of my statement, you will notice, the assessed valuation of this county from 1950 to 1961; and to the right of that are the population figures by decades from 1880 until 1960. You will note that the spectacular increase in the valuation of the county occurred during the 6-year period of 1955 to 1960.

(The tabulation referred to follows:)

San Juan County

ASSESSED VALUATION FROM 1950 THROUGH 1961[1]		TOTAL POPULATION BY DECADES	
1950	2,000,000	1880	204
1951	3,000,000	1890	365
1952	3,000,000	1900	1023
1953	3,000,000	1910	2377
1954	3,000,000	1920	3379
1955	6,000,000	1930	3496
1956	13,000,000	1940	4712
1957	22,000,000	1950	5315
1958	37,000,000	1960	8965
1959	93,000,000		
1960	132,000,000		
1961	123,000,000		

[1] Rounded to nearest million.

Mr. REDD. This great increase was caused by the production of depletable natural resources, such as uranium, oil, and gas.

Now it can be expected that these depletable resources will be exhausted sometime. The uranium mines will be phased out within the next few years, and the oilfields which have been found in the county, while important to us, are relatively small compared to the major oilfields throughout the United States. And so these depletable resources which contribute to our tax base are of temporary nature.

Primarily our county is a livestock and farming area. We have a large land area and almost 1,500 miles of county roads, and we have one of the smallest populations of any county in the State. When these depletable resources are exhausted, our taxpayers will then be the homeowners, the farmers, and the stockmen, and I think it's important to the future that we create some new industry. As far as I can tell, the tourist industry is our best hope, and it can be a great industry here.

I'm sure that you have enjoyed your visit to the Canyonlands area and can appreciate what a tourist attraction it could become with proper development.

Now, I recognize that any park legislation will not be controlled by our local desires, but rather by what Congress considers to be in the national interest, and therefore I feel that we residents of this area are going to have to work for the aspects of the park which will benefit us the most now and in the years to come. And I sustain the previous witnesses that the park headquarters should certainly be south of the confluence of the Colorado and Green rivers. When you viewed the film of San Juan County last night you saw the many scenic attractions in the other parts of the county, the Natural Bridges, Hovenweep, and Monument Valley, and such as that; and if we can get the tourists off Interstate 70, to the south of the Colorado River, they're more apt to travel on south down through Blanding

and Bluff and Mexican Hat and visit the other attractions which I've mentioned.

Senator BIBLE. Right at that point, approximately where will the proposed Interstate Highway System come through Utah in relationship to San Juan County?

Mr. REDD. Well, it's about 40 miles north of Moab.

Senator BIBLE. Forty miles north of Moab?

Senator BENNETT. It follows approximately where Highway 50 goes now, doesn't it?

Mr. REDD. Yes, it does.

Senator BIBLE. But your theory is with an Interstate Highway System some 40 miles north of Moab and going east to west, or west to east, that this would draw off a lot of prospective tourists and visitors to this area?

Mr. REDD. That's right. And I think it's essential that they be brought to the south of the Colorado River. The river is a natural barrier, and if we can't get them across the river, they aren't going to do San Juan County too much good. And so I think that inasmuch as practically all of this park will come out of this county that we deserve to have a very fine development here which will help the people.

Of the various proposals which have been made concerning the size and type of a national park, I feel that this Moss bill will do by far more good for San Juan County than any other proposal which has been made, and I wholeheartedly support it.

Another reason why I favor this bill is that it has the support of the present administration, and I feel that such support is essential if a Canyonlands Park is to be created. In the Senate we have 100 Senators, and therefore Utah has one-fiftieth of the voting strength. This is relatively insignificant. In the House of Representatives, Utah has less than one two-hundredth of the voting strength; and without the support of the administration I don't think we'll get a park bill, and that's another reason I support this bill.

The present Secretary of Interior has shown an intense interest in the creation of the Canyonlands National Park. In my recollection I do not recall of a previous Secretary of the Interior who has shown so much interest in preserving for future generations the scenic attractions of America, and there's no way of knowing how long it will be in the future before we get another Secretary of the Interior who shows so much interest, and I think we should cooperate with him in the establishment of this park.

As to the size of the park, I'm sure that in your travels you realize that you can't compare acreage in that type of land, rough canyon land, with prime grazing lands or farming lands. I think that the 53,000 acres or so which the previous administration traded to the Navajo Tribe for lands on the Green Canyon are of far more importance than 330,000 acres out in this rugged canyon land would be; and therefore 100,000 acres out in the rough canyon lands isn't so important as acreage in more valuable land would be.

I certainly encourage you to support this bill and to render all assistance you can in causing it to become legislation.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Redd. Questions?

Senator BENNETT. I would just like to clear up one thing in my mind. Mr. Redd has made clear that he feels that these natural re-

sources will be depleted, and in the nature of things they will eventually. Do you think that this rate of depletion is going to be so fast that this should be given little if any consideration? And to ask the question that was asked of the Commissioner, if you had to make a choice between a national park without mineral development and no national park, would you choose a national park?

Mr. REDD. For the rest of my lifetime, I'd personally sooner there not be a national park if we couldn't develop our natural resources. Looking forward 50, 100 years, and into the future, I think the long-range benefits to the county for the national parks would exceed the short-term benefits from the development of natural resources.

Senator BENNETT. No other questions.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Redd. Our next witness is Jim Black, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Monticello.

STATEMENT OF JAMES BLACK, PRESIDENT, MONTICELLO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Senator BIBLE. Yes, Mr. Black. You are president of the Chamber of Commerce of Monticello?

Mr. BLACK. Yes, I am.

Senator BIBLE. A might fine jeep driver, too.

Senator BENNETT. You notice that this county is "Redd" and "Black."

Senator BIBLE. Yes, it is. I noticed that. And they are all experts with jeeps.

Mr. BLACK. I am Jim Black, president of the Monticello Chamber of Commerce, and I will testify in behalf of the Monitcello chamber and give their views on the proposed Canyonlands Park. The directors and I drafted the following resolution for the chamber to vote on, as the stand we would take on the park issue. It was brought to a vote before the body of the Monticello chamber, and they gave their full support to the resolution. It reads as follows:

> The Monticello Chamber of Commerce definitely wants a park without specifications to size or limits, but with the most effective multiple-use clause possible. But we especially want to stress the Needles area as having national park significance and request it be made into a national park, as it is the most outstanding, spectacular, and noteworthy of such stature. We favor the Needles area as a park, and if necessary, exclusion of the areas west and north of the Colorado River, as they were later added to the original Needles area park proposal. We want the first development of this area as a park to be in the Needles with good access roads leading from here to there. We want the park headquarters to be located at Squaw Springs, with the park administration headquarters at Monticello. To sum it up, we want a park that is best for the county.

Now, I would like to clarify a few phrases in our resolution and add to it. When we say we want a park in the Needles area, and if necessary, exclusion of the lands west and north of the Colorado River, we say this so that if this controversial issue brings it to a matter of choosing, we definitely do want the Needles area made into a national park. As for wanting the park headquarters at Squaw Springs, we feel this is the more logical place as it is more centrally located, not only for the proposed Canyonlands Park, but to the other parks and monuments in the area. Also, there is a source of water available for development there.

We feel Monticello will benefit greatly from a park near us, and especially if we can have improved roads leading from here and development in the area as soon as possible. Another thing we would like to ask for in the proposed park, is that we could keep the park concessions at the smallest possible that would be necessary to handle the tourist traffic so that the surrounding towns will have a chance to build and grow to help take care of the additional tourist business.

In conclusion, we want to thank this congressional committee for honoring us here in Monticello by holding these hearings here; and we hope you enjoyed your trip into this spectacular country, and we invite you back.

Senator BIBLE. Speaking for myself, I certainly enjoyed my trip into the Canyonlands.

Senator METCALF. You're speaking for all of us.

Senator BIBLE. This is a tremendous area, and I certainly was greatly impressed. I have no questions.

Senator BENNETT. No questions.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness is Gerald Oviatt, county commissioner of Carbon County.

STATEMENT OF GERALD L. OVIATT, COUNTY COMMISSIONER, CARBON COUNTY, UTAH

Mr. OVIATT. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Carbon County Commissioners, Louis Kosec and Albert Santi and myself, I wish to make this statement as an official opinion, and the stand we have taken.

Senator BIBLE. It would be helpful to the committee if you'd point up on the map roughly where Carbon County is.

Mr. OVIATT. It's not on that map.

Senator BIBLE. How far are you north?

Mr. OVIATT. We are 110 miles northwest—mostly north—of Moab.

Senator BIBLE. I've been over in your county, but I just want some orientation. You're a hundred miles roughly north of Moab?

Mr. OVIATT. 110. It would be up in approximately the northwest direction.

Senator BIBLE. We have full maps of the entire State in the record, but this would help us in identifying it.

Senator MOSS. Carbon County is almost in the center of the State of Utah.

Senator BIBLE. Show us where we are now and where you are.

Mr. OVIATT. At the present time we are right here in Monticello, and the county seat of Carbon County is in Price, right here. The county proper is in this area (indicating).

Senator BIBLE. How far is Price south or southeast of Salt Lake City?

Mr. OVIATT. 125 miles.

Senator BIBLE. 125 miles.

Mr. OVIATT. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Fine. I think we're oriented.

Mr. OVIATT. Mr. Chairman, committee members, we are honored in having the opportunity to present our views in support of the proposed national park legislation pending in Congress at the present time.

While our county is not affected in the area included in the park proper, the impact of its creation would have a lasting effect upon us. Carbon County is situated in an ideal position geographically for north-south tourist travel, and our present economic condition could certainly stand any additional trade this would bring to the county and the State. Through information gathered by our tourist people, the establishment of the park with access roads could make tourism one of the major industries in our area. We of Utah are very dependent upon Government programs at the present time; and though parts of our State are enjoying an economic boom through the missile and other related industries, many areas are losing population. Any development in tourist trade would be beneficial.

The question of multiple use of the park has made the proposal very controversial. We believe that all aspects of this issue should be studied very thouroughly and if possible a satisfactory solution of the use be agreed upon prior to the passing of the park bill.

The bill, as amended, provides for conditional multiple use to be determined by the Secretary. We believe that, with all due respect to the Secretary, this section should be clearly defined in the bill giving full consideration to local and State rights in the administration of the wildlife programs and mineral development. It is our position that a fair and equitable solution can be reached to the mutual benefit of all.

In summation, we believe that the beauty and splendor of the Canyonlands should be opened to everyone. The people of our country are entitled to see the unusual and rugged formations found only in this area. Our group does not object to the proposed size or location of the park, and we sincerely hope that this committee can resolve the question of use and not jeopardize enactment of the legislation. We are looking forward to the opening of Canyonlands and the Golden Circle of parks and recreation areas.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Oviatt. Any questions?

Our next witness will be Mrs. Kent Frost.

Very happy to have you with us, Mrs. Frost.

STATEMENT OF MRS. KENT FROST, DIRECTOR, MONTICELLO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mrs. FROST. I am Mrs. Kent Frost from Monticello. I help my husband run jeep tours, the Kent Frost Jeep Tours. I am also a director of Monticello Chamber of Commerce.

We have been in the business, the jeep tour business, for 8 years; and we have taken many people into the wilderness area of San Juan County, especially the Needles, Salt Creek, over in the Standing Rocks, and the Grandview Point area. My husband, Kent Frost, knows this park area better than any man living. He has hiked San Juan County since he was 6 years old, and he loves it. He is now out on a 2-week hiking trip. That is the reason he isn't here today.

All the people that we take into these areas say that it should be preserved and made into a national park. We were camped out on Grandview Point one evening. It was full moon, and the guests were standing looking out over the area south. And one man spoke up and said: "This is one of the grand viewpoints of the world."

Kent and I feel that this should be made into a national park. If it can be made into a park with multiple use, that would be all right; but if it can't, we should have a national park, and the bigger, the better. And I would also like to say at this time that we both feel that we would like to back Senator Bennett on his bill for the parkway connecting the different national parks in southern Utah.

Senator BIBLE. Well, thank you very much, Mrs. Frost. I suppose there is no one that is any better acquainted with this entire Canyonlands than you and your husband are; and I note one thing that you say in your statement that it should be at least this large.

Mrs. FROST. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. You have a feeling that probably there is other scenery within this area that is of equal stature with that that's being included?

Mrs. FROST. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. I'm a westerner, and I have kind of a fond attachment to both North Six Shooter Peak, which we're going to call the Metcalf Six Shooter Peak, if we can move it far enough east, and the South Six Shooter Peak. They are two features, though, that could well be put within Canyonlands.

I recognize that determining what goes in a park and what goes out is a hard problem; but we should all remember that in the original conception of this park it was a complete 1 million acres, as shown by the blue line on the map on the wall. So these are problems of judgment, and the entire area is of such grandeur and so spectacular that it's rather hard to know what to put in and what to leave out.

Mrs. FROST. That's the way we feel.

Senator BIBLE. I have no further questions.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to concur at some stage of the hearing today, in your comments, and I think this is a good time. I'm not satisfied that enough land is incorporated into the area that is outlined in black on the map and presented by Senator Moss' bill. Now, on our way up in the plane, one of the things that was pointed out was Elaterite Butte, and another that was pointed out was Cleopatra's Chair, both of which are outside of the proposed park. As we traveled over, from Grandview Point, and in that Standing Rock Basin area, we looked out across the Lockhart Basin and saw those magnificent orange bluffs, also outside the park. As we looked across west, we saw magnificent scenery, outside the park, outside the proposed park in the bill by Senator Moss. And having been on the ground, I want to say here today that I, too, am not completely satisfied that the park should be held down to the size that Senator Moss' bill proposes.

Senator Moss. Let me tell you, I haven't been criticized very often for making it too small.

Senator METCALF. Thank you.

Senator BENNETT. May I make one comment? I'm delighted with the Chairman's generosity in renaming the North Six Shooter Peak, and I think we could find a narrow neck of land somewhere in here that we could call the Bible Belt.

Senator BIBLE. We'll find something for you, too, there, Senator Long.

Senator LONG. I would like to be associated with Senator Metcalf. If we were planning just for the next 10 years or 50 years or 100 years, perhaps this would be adequate, but we are not. We are planning for all time, and if this so-called population explosion continues, we're going to need every acre of it, and we should have more, certainly, instead of less. That's all.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Senator Long. Thank you very much, Mrs. Frost. Delighted to have you with us.

Our next witness is Mr. H. A. Brownfield, president of the East Carbon Wildlife Federation. Mr. Brownfield.

Very happy to have you with us, Mr. Brownfield.

STATEMENT OF H. A. BROWNFIELD, PRESIDENT, EAST CARBON WILDLIFE FEDERATION, DRAGERTON, UTAH

Mr. BROWNFIELD. Senator, the East Carbon Wildlife Federation, an affiliate of the Utah and National Wildlife Federations, is an organization of approximately 300 sportsmen dedicated to conservation through wise management and utilization of natural resources. The organization originated in Carbon County, Utah, a short 3 years ago, and has made measurable progress since its inception on a local level, and has made its mark at State levels, and is gaining national recognition at the present time.

The reason for being represented today at this public hearing is to comment on section 7 of the Senate bill, S. 2387, which deals exclusively with the permanent conservation of wildlife populations within the proposed Canyonlands National Park. We specifically wish to point out that we are not taking an active part in the pros and cons regarding the size of the park, nor for that matter whether the park should be created or another tack should be pursued. Further, we are not committed on the financial implications of the bill, nor are we going to comment on any other areas of discussion which will be presented by other representatives at these hearings.

The revised Senate bill, S. 2387, has evolved as a result of the democratic process of this Nation. None of the original park proposals reflected the true concept of "multiple use," which must recognize the use of the lands by existing big game animals and the consequence of not providing adequate control of the herd.

It may be elementary, but let us review for you the limiting factor of the maintenance of a deer herd. The most critical element of its existence is winter range, which limits the size of any dear herd; and, gentlemen, the proposed park encompasses a large portion of winter range for a major deer population, which, by the way, is normally hunted beyond the park boundaries. It is imperative that the board of big game control, the State agency established under the jurisdiction of the fish and game department, which is responsible for setting deer kill quotas, et cetera, be allowed the management of this herd, particularly with the advent of the improved accessibility which may be provided by park access roads. The Honorable Senator Moss heard our pleas, and doubtlessly those of others, and has amended his bill to provide some measure of relief to the problem.

The bill as amended is greatly appreciated by our members, but has some limiting conditions and wording which, because of its basic

82324—62—pt. 2——3

nature, may be used for development of bills for future national parks, and therefore should, if at all possible, be rectified. It is understood that the similar legislation enacted in 1952 is now controlling elk harvesting in the Grand Teton National Park, Wyo. Because of restrictive wording in that bill, the hunting is limited to elk alone, while deer and other big game species continue to pose a range-management problem.

A somewhat similar but more deleterious situation exists in the Yellowstone National Park elk harvesting program.

Certainly the Canyonlands National Park bill, S. 2387, is a most commendable approach to proper wildlife management in the best interests of all concerned, and we would extend our most sincere felicitations to the honorable Senator for his endeavors in this measure.

However, with the proposed administration of the joint approval program, an impasse might be encountered between the National Park Service and the fish and game department authorities on the agreement of wildlife management interests. Such an impasse is not mere conjecture on our part. Let's consider the difference of opinion expounded by the Department of Interior and the Utah Fish and Game Department related to wildlife harvest on the Dinosaur Monument area in eastern Utah, wherein a wildlife management problem could not be mutually agreed upon. This problem is still unresolved, and after many months of study and correspondence.

We feel that such a possibility with this bill is real and should be eliminated by including a third party to act as an arbitrator. Said arbitrator would act only in the event that a mutually agreed wildlife harvest program could not be reached by the National Park Service and Utah Fish and Game Department representatives.

It is further felt that in the interest of all sportsmen this arbitrator's position should be occupied by a National Wildlife Federation representative, possibly the regional director for the area involved.

A second area of this bill that warrants consideration is the timing of the submission of the mutually agreed plan and the timing of the deputizing of the licensed participants. Because of statewide wildlife management responsibilities, the April 1 deadline for submission of the joint approval program is unrealistic. It is suggested that this date be adjusted to August 1. And because the normal wildlife harvest is accomplished in the fall and State licensing normally is not available as early as is presently required by the proposed bill, we recommend the Secretary of Interior's issuance date of orders deputizing the list of people submitted by the department of fish and game be altered from July 1 to September 1 each year.

Inasmuch as this bill may be applicable for conditions not now obvious nor recognized, and because of the possibility of this bill being the pattern for other bills in other geographic and climatic locations, we contend that the word "hunters" should be replaced with the word "sportsmen."

In summary, from a wildlife conservation point of view, the bill is better than any which has been approved in the past; we have recommended a third-party arbitrator to act in the event of an impasse of our joint recommendation by State and Federal agencies; we have also recommended changes in timing of the submission of the mutually agreed plan and the timing of the deputizing of the licensed

participants; we have further recommended terminology changes to broaden the base of wildlife conservation.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Brownfield. That's a very fine statement. This problem that you pose is one that has personally bothered me for some period of time; and as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee I've asked Conrad Wirth, who is the Director of the National Parks Service, to make a complete up-to-date factual survey of the 29 national parks that are now under his jurisdiction and give us a complete accounting of the number of game that they find within each of these national parks, how they're managed, and how many they take off each year. I'm sure you people here heard about the harvesting of the elk herd in Yellowstone, just as those of us on the congressional level did; and I know that my fish and wildlife people and sportsmen made their feelings known in a not uncertain manner, and I'm sure you probably did that same thing here.

Mr. BROWNFIELD. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. I'm not completely satisfied that the National Park Service's present approach to this problem is the correct one, and I've asked them to make a complete study of the game management within these various national park areas. But now, tell me this: Each of us were over this Canyonlands National Park as proposed, yesterday. We flew it and jeeped it and walked it. Is wildlife management much of a problem within this particular area? We're told that last year at most they took 41 deer within this proposed Canyonlands National Park area.

Mr. BROWNFIELD. What I was speaking of, or the organization I represent, is this area here, the winter range.

Senator BIBLE. I understand it's great winter range and great deer country, but how will the creation of a national park with limitations on it affect the deerherd out to the south? How is this going to affect you? I just want your honest views on it, because we're just trying to work out a problem.

Mr. BROWNFIELD. If the herd gets too large on the winter range, it will ruin the range. It will be apt to remove the surface. And if you ruin the range, erosion will start, and it will be worse than what it is.

Senator Moss. Wouldn't the removal be done farther up on the mountain in the forest, rather than down in the park area?

Senator BIBLE. This is the thing. This is what we were told in Washington. You people are the experts on this. We're here in your backyard, and I think all of you have hunted deer with varying degrees of success. But what if you had no game management within this particular area? Is this going to affect the deer hunting to the south of the Canyonlands?

Mr. BROWNFIELD. Down here?

Senator BIBLE. That's right, sir.

Mr. BROWNFIELD. If you have a few bad seasons during your regular season, snow and so forth, the hunters can't get in and adequately harvest the deer. Then you throw more deer on that winter range, and sometimes you have to go in——

Senator BIBLE. But whether or not they can get in that area you're indicating depends on the seasons and upon the regulation by the State of Utah itself, doesn't it?

Mr. BROWNFIELD. Well, no——

Senator BIBLE. I'm talking of the area south. How many deer actually find their way into, well, the southeastern, Chesler Park, Squaw Springs country, which is the southeastern part of the park?

Mr. BROWNFIELD. I have no accurate count.

Senator BIBLE. It occurs to me that there wouldn't be too many deer get into this park.

Mr. BROWNFIELD. This basin country, they migrate to the river for winter range. Snow comes, and they've got to go. And if they get too many deer in there, they'll eat themselves out of house and home. There will be variation.

Senator Moss. I was interested in your recommendation that there be an arbitrator, some third party, to break an impasse. I would call attention to the language in the bill that says: "The National Park Service shall—" you see, they're required, "—shall join with the department of fish and game and the State of Utah."

Now, the department of fish and game is not required, because the Federal Government, of course, can't order a State agency to do anything, but we can require the Secretary to do something. He's required to join with the department of fish and game. So they have to be willing to do it, to devise. And this is the part that I wanted to call your attention to:

> devise, from technical information and other pertinent data assembled or produced by necessary field studies or investigations conducted jointly by the technical and administrative personnel of the agencies involved.

This is the plan we would use to decide whether or not there should be a harvest of surplus game. Now, my question is, Do you believe that there actually would be an impasse of the technical people that deal with wildlife who know how these studies are made and finally come together and say, "Well, there is a surplus"? One might say there is a surplus that would require 500 to be taken off, and the other say, "No, it's 450." But don't you think they could come to a figure without getting to this impasse you're talking about?

Mr. BROWNFIELD. I don't know. I've seen Federal and State agencies lock horns before and can't agree.

Senator Moss. But do they do that at the technical level? We're talking about technical people that make a study, and based on some rather well established criteria that are developed by experts, they finally say, "Well, there is predicted to be a surplus of game which is going to be damaging to the herd or damaging to the foliage," or whatever else; and having decided that a technical basis, they come up with a number that should be harvested. Now, do you think that we really could put an arbiter in between to arbitrate among these technical people?

Mr. BROWNFIELD. Our organization feels so; yes, sir.

Senator Moss. Well, all right. It's a good suggestion. It's one that I've puzzled about a great deal. I recognize that whenever you have two or more organizations that come together, there's always the possibility of getting in an impasse of some sort, and I've puzzled long about whether you ought to throw in a third tie-breaker, as it were. And I was just testing this out on you, because up until now I've felt that perhaps by placing it on technical people to make a technical study, you could come up with a figure; that we could feel assured that they would come up with an answer.

Senator BENNETT. May I ask a question?

Senator BIBLE. Certainly.

Senator BENNETT. In which Department is Fish and Wildlife located? Isn't that located in the Department of the Interior?

Senator BIBLE. Department of the Interior.

Senator BENNETT. Then, how can you have a subordinate come in and break a tie in which his superior was involved?

Senator MOSS. No. I don't think he recommended that. He talked about the national association.

Senator BIBLE. He means the national association would be the arbiter.

Mr. BROWNFIELD. National Wildlife Association, 50 States wide.

Senator BIBLE. Any further questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Brownfield.

Senator Metcalf has indicated that he would like to ask a question of Mrs. Frost.

(The committee subsequently received the following telegram:)

DRAGERTON, UTAH, *May 7, 1962.*

Reference S. 2387, Moss Canyonlands National Park bill.
ALLEN BIBLE,
Washington, D.C.:

Because of interpretation applied to East Carbon Wildlife Federation testimony at Senate hearing in Monticello April 20, 1962, please enter this qualification telegram in the hearing records.

Please be advised that by reason of S. 2387 (February 7, 1962) section 1, line 5, "subject to valid existing right" the East Carbon Wildlife Federation agrees to support S. 2387 with the exception of setcion 7. Since the management of wildlife is and must remain a State responsibility as per the Utah State constitution, ratified by Congress in 1896, we therefore believe that the management of wildlife in the Canyonland National Park should be delegated to the administrative bodies presently responsible for the management of wildlife in the State of Utah.

Recognizing the incompatibility of section 7 with the above quotation of section 1, section 7 then is not supported. However, if the State rights are to be usurped as a process of democratic procedure our comments on section 7 are still applicable.

EAST CARBON WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
G. A. ALLCOTT, *Secretary.*

STATEMENT OF MRS. KENT FROST—Resumed

Senator METCALF. Mrs. Frost, the question of the management of the Yellowstone National Park elkherd has been raised, and the question has had a very vital effect in my own State, because that Yellowstone Park elkherd comes north into the State of Montana. But in Yellowstone Park—after you've seen the hot water phenomenon and after you've seen that magnificent canyon of the Yellowstone—one of the delights of the park is to see the bear and moose and elk and deer. In fact, the people that go back into the park time and time again miss Old Faithful Geyser Basin and don't go into Mammoth, but drive the park in order to see the wildlife, and children especially are interested. And so I would be very much opposed to opening up Yellowstone Park or Glacier Park, which is a similar situation, to hunting.

Now, with that preface, as I went through the park yesterday I didn't see any wildlife. It does seem to me that the magnificent rock formations and colors are the things that people would go to see, and

we wouldn't have the problem of preserving the deer and the bear and the elk that we have in Yellowstone. Now, in your trips in the park have you seen very much wildlife during the normal tourist season?

Mrs. FROST. The only place we have seen much wildlife is in the Big Basin area at certain times of the year.

Senator METCALF. And that is in an area that's south of the proposed park?

Mrs. FROST. Yes. Now, yesterday I was the first jeep that went through, and I saw two deer. I told my companion I'd run them real fast and get them out of sight. [Laughter.]

Senator METCALF. Now, I wanted to be sure that if this were made a national park, we wouldn't expect to have that same opportunity to see wildlife in its natural surroundings that you have in some of the other parks where wildlife is more plentiful.

Mrs. FROST. No. There isn't the water there. They just don't come in there, because of the water.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Mrs. Frost. Our next witness is Mr. Paul Strong.

Happy to have you here today, Mr. Strong.

STATEMENT OF PAUL E. STRONG, BUSINESSMAN OF MONTICELLO, UTAH

Mr. STRONG. I have a prepared statement. Can it go in the record?

Senator BIBLE. Certainly, then you present your views in your own way.

Mr. STRONG. Thank you. Well, gentlemen, I'm a businessman here in town. I wasn't raised in Utah. I was raised in Oklahoma, and so my first consideration on this park is the fact that it doesn't belong to San Juan County, and only a small portion of it belongs to the State of Utah. It belongs to all of the people all over the United States, and I feel that the best way for the people that own the thing to derive a benefit from it is to open it up so they can see it, see the beautiful structures and the various formations in the park. My second reason for wanting a park is, I believe that the tourist trade is the most stable form of business that we have today. Factories shut down, oil booms will boom for a little while, and then they're gone. In uranium, you have booms, and then that's gone.

I have some figures here. In 1904 less than 14,000 people viewed Yellowstone National Park, while in 1960 there was 1,524,000 visited Yellowstone Park. Now, that is quite an increase.

I was raised in Oklahoma. I was born just 4 miles from the famous Cushing oilfield, and when I was 13 years old my people moved to Oilton, which is on the north edge of the Cushing oilfield. I wrote to the chamber of commerce in Cushing to find out how oil production compared with tourist attractions. And in May in 1915 the Cushing oilfield produced 305,000 barrels of oil a day—in excess of 110 million barrels in 1 year. Then in 1960, in spite of the fact that they did an extensive amount of drilling, trying to locate more oil, that dwindled to 2½ million barrels. From 110 million down to 2½ million barrels in 45 years.

In 1917, the postmaster there at my hometown, Oilton, told me there were more than 14,000 people getting their mail out of the post office there. Looking at a road map just the other day, I believe there was 1,126 people live there now. Those people were employed in the oilfields.

For that reason, I'm highly in favor of a park in the area for the stable economy there is in tourism. Medical scientists now say that people have to have pleasure, they have to get out and have recreation. We're living at such a fast pace that you have to get out and relax. And the population is increasing in the United States to such a rate that we've got to have more places for relaxation.

A lot of people that I have talked to have seen Yellowstone Park, Zion, and other parks several times. They're looking for new adventure, and I believe that the Canyonlands is the answer to that quest. It will be something that they will really enjoy.

Now, I mentioned a while ago that in 1915 this Cushing field produced in excess of 110 million barrels; and I see in the paper the other day where they estimate that the Lisbon field, if we were to have another Lisbon field they estimate that the entire reserve in Lisbon is 26 million barrels. So that's about one-fourth of a year's production of the Cushing field in Oklahoma.

Now, I followed oilfields for a number of years. In fact, from 1915 to 1941. I moved to Salt Lake City with my family, and I followed the booms. There are a bunch of fellows that do that. They work for oil companies, or in construction. They work for various construction firms. They go in and get the cream of the crop, the big money, and they go on to the next boom; and there's very little left for the people that make that their home. When the boom is over, it's down to practically nothing.

Now, along in 1930 I was at Garber, Okla., and one pumper was taking care of 40 wells on a shift. Just one pumper. So you see the way that the mechanical equipment has been produced and invented it doesn't take very many people to operate an oilfield after it's once developed. And we do not know that there is any oil there. So if it's a matter of multipurpose or single purpose, I'm highly in favor of a park, regardless of what it takes to get it. We give up oil or uranium.

I came to Monticello in 1955. Apartments, even trailer spaces, were at a premium. Now there's a lot of nice apartments vacant.

In 1957, I believe it was, I had six men working for me; and now I have a hard time finding enough work for myself. So I'm not in favor of even considering doing away with the park if we can't have multiple-purpose use. I'm in favor of that park regardless.

And then, on multipurpose use, the way the bill is written, they can go in there and prospect for oil, uranium, without tearing up the park. Now, they used to come when I was a kid, they drilled oil wells, spaced them about 300 feet apart. Then they found they could go to 40-acre spacing. Now in some of the oilfields, 160 acres, or every quarter section. So I'm satisfied, after having driven around over the Needles area and walking back into the canyons, hiking in there, I'm satisfied that they can recover any oil that might be in there without distracting from the beauty of the park. So I think that multipurpose can be installed into this bill. It can be kept in there. The

Secretary of the Interior, and I have enough confidence in my Government officials that I think that the Secretary, or any Secretary in the future, would look after the well-being of the country enough to where that that can be taken care of.

Now, as to hunting being a multipurpose use. Senator Bible mentioned a while ago, I believe, there were 41 deer taken out of this area last year. Now, the State of Utah every year has what they call a deer count. They had, I guess it's been 2 or 3 weeks ago in this area, in San Juan County, a deer count. Anyone that wanted to go could go. It lasted just about a week, and they went down into the area just adjacent to the Needles. So they set their fall hunt according to the condition of the range when they have this deer count. Now, they have in San Juan County here the Blue Mountain, where they have extra hunts, they have special hunts, special permits. They have the Blue Mountain, and they have Elk Ridge. So, if they find that the winter range is becoming too short, won't supply the herd, then they increase the special permits. In Beef Basin, all over this country, Blue Mountain area, even back over and around Bears Ears, they increase the permit, they sell special permits, and kill off the deer that would normally go down into the lower country in the wintertime and grass off the winter feed and die.

So I can't see any trouble there, because the State of Utah, that's what they do anyway. And the deer herd is harvested outside of this proposed park. Beef Basin and all of that area back in through there is where the hunting is done.

As the commander of the San Juan Sheriff Patrol, I've been called on different times to get out and hunt for airplanes that have fallen, wrecked, and for hunters. So I've been pretty well over it, all over the Needles area, everywhere. Everywhere that there's a road, I've been with my jeep, hiked back into the canyons, been on the high rims; and I cannot see any place where the park can be cut down in size. I've asked various people that were in favor of cutting it down, "What part would you cut out?"

"Well, I've never been there, so I don't know."

And I don't see how anyone who hasn't been there can make an intelligent statement or appraisal of the size of the park. It has to be someone that's been either in the park or flown over it.

I thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Strong. Questions?

Senator MOSS. No. Excellent statement.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Strong is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY PAUL E. STRONG, BUSINESSMAN, OF MONTICELLO, UTAH

In January 1915, I moved with my parents to Oilton, Okla., which is on the north end of the Cushing oilfield, and at that time it was one of the largest, if not the largest, oilfield in the United States. I followed in or near oilfields and oil booms until I moved with my wife and children to Salt Lake City in 1943—a period of more than 35 years—so I think I know something about oil booms.

It has been my experience that an oil boom lasts for a few short years at best, then tapers off to a mere ghost. For instance, from 1915 through the early twenties, Oilton had an estimated 7,000 population, and Drumright, which is located approximately 7 miles due south, had an estimated 12,000, with several thousands living in the oilfields in between the two towns. Now Oilton has very few more than 1,000, and Drumright has 5,000, with only a very few inhabitants in between.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY JUL 2 1962 KANSAS

In 1915 the Cushing oilfield produced in excess of 110 million barrels of oil and in 1960 it produced only 2¼ million barrels, despite the fact there was an extensive drilling campaign carried on. In some instances, fair production was cased off to get to the big production. Then later another well was drilled in the formation that had been cased off to salvage any oil they possibly could. The entire estimated oil reservoir in the Lisbon field is 26 million barrels.

In the early twenties, one man seldom pumped more than 2 or 3 wells; but due to progress and automation, it is possible for one man to take care of as many as 40 wells on a shift.

In spite of the fact that in 1915 anyone that wanted to work could get a job and demand a fabulous wage, in 1929 and 1930 very few people were working in the Oklahoma oilfields. Hence the influx of Oklahomans into California during those years. At the age of 13 in 1915, I drew man's wages. Then in 1932 I couldn't get a job at any wage.

Oil booms are a fine source of tax income and are very fine for the people that own the land, but it is not a stable source of revenue for the people at large. On the other hand, it is a proven fact that a tourist trade is increasing at all times and is a sound and stable economy for any community.

The Canyonlands belong to all of the people of the United States, with the exception of the State-owned land; and I believe it is wrong to leave it undeveloped and without decent highways so the owners of this vast scenic wonderland cannot view their property.

We do not know that there is a drop of oil, or a pound of uranium or potash in the entire area, and the only time grazing is possible is when there is snow for the cattle to get water.

I have made numerous trips into the proposed Canyonlands park area with a jeep; and in instances I have hiked back into canyons that a jeep could not get into, and I think it would be wrong to take away any of the proposed area from a park. It takes someone from another part of the country to appreciate the full scenic beauty that is offered. Too often the people of any area live too close to the scenery to see it.

I have seen where a 400-foot offset to a 500-barrel well was a dry hole, so even though a formation runs in a certain direction, it is no assurance that there is oil at any given place. It is an acknowledged fact that scientific means are the best assurance for the discovery of oil, and a large portion of the proposed Canyonlands Park area has been drilled extensively by seismograph crews. Therefore, the oil companies should have a good idea if there is any favorable formation in the area, and if there is, and they have a lease on the land, they have ample time to drill for it.

It is common knowledge that during the uranium boom in Grand and San Juan Counties, the entire park area was prospected for uranium; so there surely isn't any uranium there, or it surely would have been found.

A fair comparison of the value of oil versus tourism would be to take the Cushing oilfield which at one time was one of the largest in the United States, and the Yellowstone Park, which I suppose is the largest in the United States. In a period of 45 years the production of oil in the Cushing field dropped from more than 110 million barrels to 2½ million barrels, while in the same period of time the tourist trade at Yellowstone Park increased from 13,727 in 1904 to 1,524,000 in 1960.

When I moved to Monticello in 1955, the town was on a boom, jobs were plentiful, business was good, and it was almost impossible to find a vacant apartment or even a trailer space; but now, 7 years later, business is poor, jobs are scarce, vacant houses and apartments are numerous. In 1956 I had six men working for me in the plumbing and heating business; but now I do not have enough work for myself, and there is no other plumber here.

In the early days of the big oil booms, wells were drilled 300 feet apart; then later they began to be spaced to one well to every 40 acres. Now in some instances they are being spaced to one well to the quarter section. Therefore, I believe that if there is any oil under the proposed park, it can be recovered without distracting from the scenery.

The State of Utah now controls the wildlife by issuing special permits where they find the food is not sufficient to feed the various wildlife and allow it to be hunted and killed; therefore, the Moss bill is in line with the common practice, other than the permit holder would be made a ranger under the Moss bill.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter from the Cushing Chamber of Commerce.

In closing, I wish to urge you gentlemen to endorse the Moss Canyonlands bill in its entirety.

CUSHING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Cushing, Okla., March 30, 1962.

MRS. GOLDA STRONG,
Secretary, Monticello Chamber of Commerce,
Monticello, Utah.

DEAR MRS. STRONG: Your request for information relative to oil production in the Cushing area required considerable research. That is the reason for the delay in replying to your inquiry.

Peak production of oil in the Cushing area was reached in May 1915 with 305,000 barrels daily. According to our State corporation commission, the latest complete figures show that the Cushing fields produced 2,500,000 barrels during 1960.

If there is any more information you need, please feel free to contact us again.

Yours truly,

ALLEN D. FITCHETT, *Manager.*

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness is Mrs. Minnie Johnson.

STATEMENT BY MINNIE JOHNSON, VICE CHAIRMAN, BLANDING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, UTAH

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Minnie Johnson, vice chairman of the chamber of commerce, and this statement is my own.

Senator METCALF. Where is Blanding?

Mrs. JOHNSON. Blanding is 22 miles south of Monticello.

Senator METCALF. In San Juan County?

Mrs. JOHNSON. In San Juan County. I am not a native of Utah. I was born and reared in the Shenandoah Valley of old Virginia down where the Blue Ridge and the Allegheny Mountains come together to form an amphitheater. I have traveled in all of the States east of the Mississippi River, not once but many times. It is quiet and serene and beautiful. I would say these States give a feminine aspect of beauty and grandeur as the panorama of nature passes before one's view for a distance of perhaps 20 miles.

I have traveled in Canada and old Mexico, not once but many times, and have seen their wonders in lakes and streams and mountains; and Alaska by highway and air.

I have been to Europe five times. I have seen all of the Scandinavian countries many times and much of the Continent. I am amazed at the thousands of dollars spent to make man-made attractions to lure the traveling public.

I have seen much of the West—Mount Rainier, Yosemite, the Grand Teton, Yellowstone Park, Grand Canyon of the Colorado; these and more. This bold and daring land lends a fantastic allure for the lover of adventure to the lover of the great out of doors, a land where one can stand and look off into the distance 100 miles or more. Utah has not been left out of this awe-inspiring spectacle. And now we come to the purpose of this meeting—the proposed Moss bill to establish Canyonlands National Park, a park unlike any other in the world.

Here we have nature's masterpiece, unscathed by human hands, the bold and daring athlete, the masculine offspring of Mother Nature and Father Time. This highly eroded and precipitous region has never attracted much commercial activity. Prospectors have roamed over it for the past 100 years and have found very little to market.

There is very little potential for logging or agriculture. The small

meadows have been grazed and overgrazed by sparse herds that have made very little contribution to the Nation's food supply.

This proposed Canyonlands Park can become one of the most delightful recreational areas in the Nation; in fact, in the whole world, for there is no other place like it. It is a scenic fantasy of domes, spires, and towers, a region to be enjoyed, but not destroyed, under the protective custody of park rangers.

I share the opinion of many Utah residents that the highest yield to San Juan County and the State of Utah would be the income from the tourist business. The out-of-State motorist would find here a delightful canyon hideaway and ancient history of prehistoric man and delve into this Nation's past.

The greater part of this area is in public domain and belongs to you and me and other Americans and I am sure under the protection of the National Park Service will yield to the American people far greater values in beauty, education, and recreation than can be gained from the meager mineral and grazing resources to be found here.

I plead to you in favor of the Moss Canyonlands bill, S. 2387.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much.

Senator Moss. You're a poet, Minnie. That's very good.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness is Frank Wright.

Just be seated, Mr. Wright. Delighted to have you with us.

Senator Moss. The panel met the jeep drivers yesterday, and now we'll meet the boatman.

Senator BIBLE. Your reputation has preceded you, Mr. Wright. Delighted to have you with us. Where do you live, Mr. Wright?

STATEMENT OF FRANK WRIGHT

Mr. WRIGHT. I live in Blanding.

Senator BIBLE. You live in Blanding?

Mr. WRIGHT. And for the past 14 years I have been conducting river trips on the Colorado and on the San Juan River, and I would like to depart from my testimony here a little bit, if I may.

Senator BIBLE. You may. Your prepared statement will be incorporated in full in the record as it's given, and you may develop it in your own manner.

Mr. WRIGHT. I'm in favor of the park, with mineral rights, if it's practical. I think the park size is not too large. But with those statements, I'd like to depart from what is contained in my statement.

From the experiences I've had on the river with tourists, we know that Glen Canyon Recreational Area, known as such, when the dam is completed and the water is backed up into this area it's going to cover some of the most magnificent scenery that there is in not only San Juan County or the State, but in the world. This has been made known to me by people who have traveled all over the world. These glens, natural glens, and canyons, side canyons, and historical ruins, and so forth, are going to be covered by Lake Powell as soon as the dam is completed.

Senator BIBLE. I think we should have something for the record. I'm not completely knowledgeable as to whether or not you are the correct expert witness to speak on this point; but my understanding is that when Glen Canyon is completed and when it's filled to its height,

that Lake Powell will be backed up approximately 180 miles back along the Colorado River and that that would bring the back waters of Lake Powell very close to the southwest corner of the proposed Canyonlands National Park. Is that your understanding?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, that's right.

Senator BIBLE. I want this to be very accurate, because there has been some indication from some places that when Glen Canyon is filled, it would back up even into the Needles country. Now, this is not my understanding, and I want to have the record, very, very clear on this. And maybe you can speak about it.

Mr. WRIGHT. My information indicated that it would be 187 miles.

Senator BIBLE. Back of Glen Canyon?

Mr. WRIGHT. Back of Glen Canyon, which would come up about to Gypsum Creek.

Senator MOSS. There's Gypsum right here, Frank, down at the bottom, Gypsum Canyon.

Mr. WRIGHT. Now, that's my understanding.

Senator BIBLE. Well, we will verify this, because this has been alluded to a number of times in the press, in testimony, and in witnesses' versions of what will and will not happen when Glen Canyon is filled up; so we'll get authoritative data from the Bureau of Reclamation people.

Senator MOSS. I just wanted to explain that one of the small amendments I made on boundaries at the time of our Washington hearings was to take out a little corner of the park in the southwest corner, because at that time the Bureau of Reclamation had supplied me with information that at the maximum water level there was an impingement on the boundary line of the park, and therefore about 1,000 acres was taken out in that corner, so that it definitely will not include any area that would be inundated at the maximum level of the reservoir.

Senator BENNETT. My comment, Mr. Chairman, was that I understood Senator Moss had done that, and I understood his purpose, and I agree that it was the wise thing to do; but if the original park proposal of a million acres had been developed into legislation, there would have been a serious impingement. I mention it here, because the people here can look at the map.

Senator BIBLE. Yes, I just wanted to have the record clear on it; so the record now is clear that Glen Canyon when it's filled to its height will not impinge within the southwest corner of the Canyonlands National Park.

Mr. WRIGHT. This is the point that I wanted to make. When the waters are backed up, this scenery will be covered, and it will be destroyed forever. Now, no matter what we do in the years to come, man will never be able to restore that scenery that is being covered. Now, I don't know what the economic impact will be on the State or the Nation, but that's the point I wanted to bring, that it will be destroyed forever. Now, another place up here below Moab that is not in the park—some of it will be included in the park—but the place I want to mention is the area on the river immediately below Moab and extending from there down to the potash mill, the development of this mine.

Senator MOSS. The shovel and the pick crossed up there on the map represent the location of the potash mine. You see up in the corner of the map.

Senator BIBLE. Do you have that designation of the crossed pick and shovel as designating the potash mine on the northeast corner of the map slightly southwest of Moab?

Mr. WRIGHT. In 1952 I made a trip from Green River, Utah, down the river, and up to Moab. We didn't see another living soul. There wasn't much travel on the river there. I would say that there were less than 5 boats or 10 people that made that trip in a year. Last year I understand there were over 500 boats made this trip, indicating that it's becoming more and more important, our river travel is becoming more and more important and it's more important that we preserve what we can of the scenic values along the river, because our boating industry is increasing by leaps and bounds. And also in 1948, when I started to running rivers, there was relatively few people on the rivers. I would say that less than 200 people in a year made the trip from Mexican Hat down to Lee's Ferry and from Hite, down. This was estimated from the records at the bridge, at Rainbow Natural Bridge, taken from the records there.

Last year it's estimated that there were over 2,000 people that made this trip. So our boating industry, or our boating public, is becoming more numerous.

Now, the point that I wanted to make, from Moab down to the potash plant, that country has been destroyed of a lot of its natural scenic wonders. To me it has lost all appeal. It's just a matter now of a river going down through there to get to a country that hasn't been touched by man's hand. And to me I think Senator Moss can agree with me that that is some of the more spectacular country in the area, along the rivers. So it is my feeling that we should do all we possibly can to preserve our natural scenery.

When minerals and oil development come along, let's do what we can to help the economy, but I should say our first consideration should be to preserve our natural beauty in this area.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much. Do we have questions?

Senator BENNETT. I have a question that I would like to raise for the committee, but I'd like to do it in the presence of Mr. Wright; and I think this is something that the committee should investigate carefully before this legislation is finally written. Once you draw a line around a park of any size which includes the bottom of the river, then the Park Service will regulate the passage on the river. They do in every other aspect. And their normal procedure is to make a contract with one concessionaire, who would then have the monopoly for bringing people for hire into the park. We have one concessionaire in Yellowstone that operates the buses. Private people can go in, but nobody can go in a hired vehicle unless they travel, according to my understanding, in the concessionaire's vehicle.

Now, I think the committee should check to find out whether, if the river bottoms are included in the park, the Park Service would intend to open bids for the concessionaire who should have the rights to run the river in the park and all other river runners might possibly be excluded.

I've never heard this discussed, and I think the committee would want to check this.

I think there is also involved the problem of Mr. and Mrs. Frost, who have been taking tourists into the park for hire, and whether

or not they would find themselves competing and required to bid and pay a price for the privilege of taking tourists in.

Senator BIBLE. I might say to Senator Bennett that this question was informally discussed with Mrs. Frost and Mr. Frank Harrison, who is the Assistant Director of the Park Service, yesterday while we were in the Canyonlands. I think that we can ask the National Park Service to furnish a statement of their policy in both of these respects, both insofar as concessions on the river are concerned, and likewise concessions insofar as running jeeps into the area is concerned.

Senator METCALF. May I make a brief explanation of what the policy is in Yellowstone and Glacier? That grew up as a historic thing, because at the time Yellowstone was started—and Glacier came along a little later—we had to have means of access to the park through the railroads, and that was about the only way to get there. So we made a contract with the railroads that they in turn would provide transportation. But the dude ranchers around Yellowstone and Glacier have free access to taking parties into and outside the park. There is some controversy about boat regulations on Yellowstone. I think very wisely they have zoned the lake. Perhaps the zoning isn't quite as some of us would want, but at least they have zoned it so motor boats can't go in certain wilderness areas; but boats can come in, and commercial boats can be used on the lake. I think it was an historic accident, Senator, in Yellowstone and Glacier, but I think it's well that this committee should be sure——

Senator BENNETT (continuing). To clear this thing up.

Senator METCALF. So there would be perfect freedom to take care of the commercial aspects in this area.

Senator MOSS. I appreciate Senator Bennett's raising this point, and it's one that we have discussed informally with the Park Service, as we talked about the bill. My understanding is that under their regulations that dude ranchers, guides, people who take parties in, would have full access to the park, both on the river and on the surface of the park. These people would be registered from the park rangers, quite naturally, so that they would know who's in the park and going in and out; but other than that, the purpose of it is to open it up to more people under guidance.

Senator BIBLE. Do we have further questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Wright.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Wright is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY FRANK WRIGHT

Mr. WRIGHT. It is my belief that any action necessary to preserve scenic and scientific features of the proposed Canyonlands National Park be taken by those agencies that are qualified, authorized, and recognized by the people of the United States.

It is also my belief that, insofar as possible, mining and exploration for oil should be allowed in the area under consideration, if it does not jeopardize in any manner the scenic and scientific values of the land.

Minerals and oils "locked up" under park rules and regulations are available whenever a national emergency arises. God-given scenery once destroyed cannot be replaced, regardless of our wishes. Let us first give consideration to the preservation of our natural scenery.

It is becoming more and more important to develop and protect from destruction natural scenic areas of recreational and scientific value. It has been my privilege and pleasure to meet many people who have expressed themselves

regarding the unusual and attractive features found in San Juan County and how they should be developed and made available to the many people who appreciate a visit to the most unusual scenic attractions found in San Juan County. The same people feel that manmade creations are much inferior to those created by Mother Nature, and that adequate action should be taken to preserve these attractions that have been created naturally.

The value of mineral and oil development in our State should be recognized for its importance to our economy. The value of tourism to the economy of the State should not be overlooked, especially while planning for the future.

All mineral and oil resources are subject to becoming exhausted. Our scenic areas will increase in value if protected from the destruction and infringement of those who do not value the scenic possibilities of any given plot of earth.

It is my belief that all rules and regulations governing the administration of national parks cannot be effectively applied to all parks and monuments. Each area has special features of its own. This fact should be taken into consideration while enacting laws to regulate the administration of any one park.

It is my belief that the area in consideration for the Canyonlands National Park should be retained as such, in one piece, and that fair and adequate laws be enacted to preserve the scenic and scientific values of the park and that mineral and oil development in areas where it would not detract or interfere with the primary use of the park.

A majority of the people who are interested in the issue concerning the establishment of Canyonlands National Park are in agreement as to how it should be used and are anxious to see the work go forward. Disagreements seem to be caused by difference of opinion as to how we can attain this desired goal.

Senator BIBLE. The committee will take its morning recess until 11.

(Recess.)

Senator BIBLE. The subcommittee will come to order. The first witness is Bert Warren. Mr. Warren. Is Mr. Warren here?

The next witness is Gordon Miner of the San Juan Canyonlands Committee.

STATEMENT OF GORDON MINER, LA SAL, SAN JUAN COUNTY, UTAH

Mr. MINER. Gentlemen, I am a representative on the Canyonlands Committee, but I'm not testifying as a member. Mr. Foushee will speak for the committee.

Senator BIBLE. I see. Are you testifying individually?

Mr. MINER. At this time I'm testifying individually, but not on behalf of the committee. Mr. Foushee will do that.

Senator BIBLE. Very well.

Mr. MINER. I'm not going to read this, but I am going to make any comments in line to go along here.

Senator BIBLE. Very fine. It may be understood that the full statement of Mr. Gordon Miner, resident of La Sal, San Juan County, will be incorporated in the record. You may highlight the statement.

Mr. MINER. I am Gordon Miner. It is my belief that the residents of Utah must do everything possible to keep the remaining public lands available for development of natural resources and to vigorously campaign for tourism. We cannot afford to sacrifice one for the other, nor in my opinion is it necessary to do so.

Here in southeastern Utah we are very fortunate by having some land that is a geological zenith for mineral exploration and scenic enjoyment. In order for full obtainment of its maximum potential, access must be provided. Upon examination of the area, it is quite apparent that roads will be very expensive and that the area will be quite slow in developing unless considerable money is available for such construction. Means of providing money for such a program

has been on the minds of most of the residents for quite a period of time, so naturally we were most elated when we obtained national interest in our surroundings.

Shortly after receiving national attention, Senator Moss, of Utah, introduced bill S. 2387, and at a later date, amendments in the nature of a substitute.

At first glance the bill seems to give the area national park status and true multiple use, which should draw unanimous support from most interested parties. On closer examination and by carefully researching various points, this is not the case. Therefore, the bill should be altered to allow true multiple use or the land reduced in size, as suggested by the approved resolution of the San Juan County Canyonlands Study Committee.

The resolution is here. I won't bother to read that at this time.

Purpose of a national park: Conserve the scenery and natural and historic objects and wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Sections 4, 5, and 7 of S. 2387 appear to expand the above concept, but such language as "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area" actually nullifies the clauses which seem to support multiple use.

One implied purpose of a national park is advertising such as road maps, Government pamphlets, and encyclopedias. This helps to attract tourists to an area, and I highly support this concept.

Grazing is provided for in the bill, but the wording, "Secretary may adjust privileges," makes the provisions very weak.

Senator METCALF. Would you take that provision that the Secretary would have the power to adjust privileges out of the bill?

Mr. MINER. Yes.

Senator METCALF. Would you take it out of the Taylor Grazing Act?

Mr. MINER. I'm not familiar with the wording in the Taylor Grazing Act.

Senator METCALF. Well, it's in the Taylor Grazing Act. Would you provide in grazing legislation—would you put a provision in there that wouldn't permit the Secretary to adjust grazing in order to protect the public domain in the grazing lands?

Mr. MINER. I think it is protected now by the Bureau of Land Management's control.

Senator METCALF. That's the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MINER. That is correct. I believe it should be left under the power of the Bureau of Land Management——

Senator METCALF. No, the Bureau of Land Management is the Secretary of the Interior. That is an agency of the Secretary's Office. And in every bit of grazing legislation in the public domain, under the Secretary of the Interior, we have this provision, that the Secretary shall adjust grazing quotas in order to protect the grazing land from overgrazing as a result of seasonal variations.

Mr. MINER. I think we're both together on this. The only thing I'm trying to point out is that I believe that everything is under the Secretary of Interior, and the point I'm trying to make, I think the Bu-

reau of Land Management should be the ones that use the control——

Senator METCALF. Yes. I just want to——

Mr. MINER (continuing). Rather than the National Park Service. That's all I want to do.

Senator METCALF. Would it be satisfactory if the language was changed, so that the Bureau of Land Management could make the adjustment in the grazing quotas?

Mr. MINER. I believe that would be more satisfactory; yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. I merely interrupted you to point out that in every bit of management of the public lands there has to be this provision, for adjustment of the grazing quotas in order to protect from overgrazing. And I brought up the Taylor Grazing Act, because it is the model act by the stockmen and the lessees of public land in America, and even more power is reposed in the Secretary than in this instance; and we have used the same language as in the Taylor Grazing Act.

Mr. MINER. I'm glad you did bring it up, because the point I was trying to make, I didn't think it should be under the actual personnel of the Park Service, but under the Bureau of Land Management, who are familiar with the stock problems.

Senator BIBLE. Next, then, deal with hunting.

Mr. MINER. Then, I did want to mention that the national park policy on a nonconforming use such as grazing is as follows. This gets to where I wanted to point out.

National parks and monuments of scenic or scientific character have been established to conserve the outstanding natural features and to provide for their enjoyment by the public in an unimpaired state. Nonconforming uses that disturb or damage the natural features, including wildlife, or that encroach upon their settings, are not compatible with the preservation and use policies within these parks and monuments. Grazing of livestock is an incompatible and conflicting use, to be avoided or eliminated as rapidly as possible. Where grazing is temporarily permitted because the industry was established before the lands were dedicated for park purposes, reductions are made as equitably as possible to prevent hardships to individuals concerned. In some instances grazing is permitted by law or regulation and is managed in such a way as to minimize damage to park values and conflicts with recreational uses within these areas.

Now, on hunting, I think that's been touched on enough, and I will skip my remarks on hunting.

Senator BIBLE. Very well.

Mr. MINER. Mining is provided for in the bill. However, the wording, as I have previously stated, makes multiple use extremely doubtful.

Now, I have a few examples I'd like to cite here.

Tremendous pressure to abandon and added costs to a mining company that occupies one 20-acre mining claim in Grand Canyon National Park. This claim was established prior to the park, or it would not be valid today. I feel the effort that has been expended by the Park Service to remove this claim should make it clear to everyone that Park Service policy is to eliminate mining in national parks.

82324—62—pt. 2——4

Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, head of the National Park Service, has said:

> The goal of the National Park Service is to get rid of all private holdings within the park and to eliminate a mining operation and an unregulated tourist business described as inconsistent with the purposes of the park.

Mount McKinley National Park, with similar wording to S. 2387. This park has excellent geological possibilities; yet, I can find no record of any mining. Regulations prohibit ore hauling on park roads, landing of aircraft in undesignated locations. So again, another case shedding doubt on multiple use. I might point out that I am not aware of any mines located after a park was established, becoming a producer.

Secretary Udall does not want multiple use. Mr. Udall stated in the October issue of National Wildlands News:

> My statement, "With wise conservation and statesmanship, we can have both," was directed at the total southeastern area. I do not favor multiple use, as it is usually interpreted, in the national parks.

Senator Moss. Well, of course, you're aware of the facts that Secretary Udall has endorsed the bill that is as now written, with the mining provision?

Mr. MINER. Yes, sir; I am.

Senator Moss. So this statement here that you've read where he doesn't favor multiple use as it's usually interpeted has to be set in opposition to his statement that he endorses the bill.

Mr. MINER. No, I don't think so at all. I think that he should endorse the bill in the form that it's in. That's the point I'm trying to make. I think that the power is—the way the wording of the bill is, where it provided—that I quoted back here—"provided that he can apply these regulations to protect the scenery, and so forth"—that it will give, within his own right—and he should—administer it, if it is a national park, in such a way that mining would not be permitted through regulation.

Senator Moss. Well, the bill says that he shall issue a general regulation on mining, so that that mining will not impair the scenic, scientific, and recreational values of the park. It establishes really a criterion of a park at this level.

Mr. MINER. Yes.

Senator Moss. And says: "These secondary uses may go on under a regulation that will not impair the primary use."

I take it from what you say that you think the Secretary would bar mining altogether, whereas the bill says he shall permit mining so long as it does not impair?

Mr. MINER. That is correct. That's why I included this in here, to build a background for his general philosophy that he does not go along with having multiple use in a national park.

Senator Moss. Of course, "multiple use" is a different term from saying "secondary use under regulation."

Now, I would suspect that the Secretary wouldn't be in favor of just throwing it open to multiple use. He's going to have a regulation, so that he can run this thing as a park. But he shall permit these things, as long as that can be done without impairing the park.

Mr. MINER. Well, to back up a little, Senator, that's what I was trying to include here in my McKinley statement, that I believe the wording is very similar to the wording you have in your bill, and

that we do have the wording, and yet as a practicality, it does not seem to be working in that park; and, therefore, because of this statement I thought this would highlight the man's general philosophy, and if he does not want mining and these multiple uses in this park, I'm sure he has power to limit these to where it would be very seriously doubted if mining would exist in the park; and that was what I was trying to bring up here.

Senator METCALF. I don't view Secretary Udall's statement the same way you do. In fact, his statement is just about my own philosophy, and that is that I don't believe that we should open Yellowstone, Glacier, Yosemite, and the existing national parks to multiple use, but in the creation of new national parks, as a member of this committee and as a Member of the Senate, I have voted for multiple use, recognizing the changing situation. For instance, the other day we passed a bill for multiple use on Padre Island, so we could have developments of oil there; and I believe that it is a satisfactory solution, both to the oil people and to the use and development of the park.

I am convinced out here that hunting would be of very small importance in the park and wouldn't destroy the park value. And I'm convinced that continuation of grazing wouldn't destroy the park values. And as far as the mining that I have seen in the park, I am convinced that it wouldn't destroy any scenic values out there.

So I would subscribe to Secretary Udall's statement, but I would vigorously oppose opening up a mine in Yellowstone or logging in Glacier.

Mr. MINER. I think, sir, that we more or less both share the same philosophy; that we support multiple use. That's just what you said. Both you and I feel that way. We'd like to see these parks or areas set aside, but we do not want—like you pointed out—an oil well or whatnot in a park is really not going to destroy a lot of the scenic views of the area, and you go along with that concept. But I am just bringing out from this statement—this is the way I read it, because he has directed this not to parks in general. He was talking about southeastern Utah and this particular area, and I—the way I read it—he would not support having any mining or oil in the area that was considered to be a national park. And that's why I brought it in here, to point out his philosophy in the way I interpret it.

Senator METCALF. We give a different interpretation to the language.

Senator BIBLE. You may proceed.

Mr. MINER. The gains from creation of a national park are your tourist trade, park personnel, and supplies for maintenance and construction in the park.

Some of the losses from creation of a park are industrial development, jobs, supplies, local and State taxes, raw materials for defense and domestic consumption, and freedom of land use for recreation.

Now, I'll touch on the industry's effect on the economy. I feel that the industry's effect on economy should be of utmost concern to the people of Utah; and yet I have seen less material on the subject in conjunction with S. 2387 than any other point. This motivated me to research the point quite thoroughly, thus enabling me to present some rather interesting facts. I will mostly present data pertaining to the mining industry of San Juan County, because I have been a part of it since 1955.

It should be noted that most of the people in the mineral industry feel that the mineral potential of the proposed park area is quite extensive. In any geologically favorable area covering 332,000 acres the chances of finding ore bodies in small areas can be expected. As a point of illustration, the Big Indian district near La Sal, Utah, is composed of less than 4,000 acres compared to 332,000 acres canyonlands. The last 6 years, 1956 to 1961, uranium mining in San Juan County has expended approximately $58 million for payrolls and $40 million for supplies. Approximately 70 percent of this $16 million annual expenditure has come from the Big Indian district, which represents this 4,000 acres.

Uranium property taxes have provided tax revenue of $5,150,000 over the same 6-year period, and over $1 million has been paid to the State in the form of occupation taxes.

These taxes are an important source of revenue to us in Utah, and this is one item that tourists do not help offset. This is the largest county in Utah, and we must budget about $5½ million annually to satisfy our needs. We formerly paid our teachers the lowest salary of any county in the State, making it impossible to complete the staff with certified teachers. We now have one of the highest salary schedules and best school systems in the State. We do not want to jeopardize our potential tax revenue and sacrifice such things as good school systems for a single-use park.

I thought that it would be pertinent to check on two of our neighboring counties, that harbor national parks, to see how they live. The focal point of their economy is tourism. The following table gives a comparison for the years 1950–60–61.

Note the premineral year of 1950 versus the others. I picked the counties of Garfield, in which I think is one of the most outstanding parks in the United States, Bryce, Washington, which has Zion, and San Juan County. I've listed the visitors; and when we get the assessed valuation, I think those are quite enlightening. And then the taxes that have been paid to the counties for use to support our economy down here, or the needs that we have.

(The tabulation referred to is as follows:)

	1950	1960	1961
Park visitors:			
Garfield (Bryce)	212,976	271,963	(1)
Washington (Zion)	323,402	515,814	(1)
San Juan			
Assessed valuation:			
Garfield	$2,610,430	$3,779,526	$3,722,291
Washington	6,909,176	9,306,868	9,539,300
San Juan	2,643,504	132,483,785	123,891,559
Property tax charges:			
Garfield	131,942	220,356	186,114
Washington	350,759	619,475	538,018
San Juan	123,093	4,317,215	5,534,236

[1] Did not obtain.

If San Juan County did not have industry, other than tourism, and had comparable assessed valuations, I find the following example to be true. This year as a resident of San Juan County, I paid $34.40 taxes on my automobile. If we had Washington County valuation and San Juan County expenditures, I would have paid $440. The Garfield County comparison would have been $1,080.

Senator BENNETT. May I interrupt the witness at this point before he leaves this table. The first part of your table you show that San Juan County had no park visitors.

Mr. MINER. We didn't have a park.

Senator BENNETT. You've had a national monument since 1904.

Mr. MINER. That's true. But I did not take into consideration a monument. Just a national park. This does not include Cedar Breaks National Monument. I kept those figures separately. But go ahead with what you're going to say.

Senator BENNETT. I was just going to make the point. You've had a national monument. I've been in it several times. I'm sure Senator Moss has.

Mr. MINER. And I have, too.

Senator BENNETT. And you have, too. This is a red rock monument, with three magnificent natural bridges in it. Has this developed any tourist business in San Juan County of any appreciable size?

Mr. MINER. Well, tourist business—I mean, like you point out, there has been some tourists there, but I think it's been so unaccessible that the average person has not been able to go down there. As far as to answer your question directly, I would say very little has been developed through this national monument.

Mr. Moss. And almost unknown?

Mr. MINER. I would say. I lived down in that area for a while, and I know I used to meet quite a few people on the road, tourists passing on through, to Monument Valley, on down south, and they would want to know how to get into the park. And you explained to them that the roads at that time were very rough and that you'd have to walk in, and that usually scared them away.

So I think that this, which I mentioned in the first part of this, access to an area, is so very important, if we are to attract tourists. Was that all you had, Senator?

Senator BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. MINER. This rather shocking example indicates the importance of natural resource development to all of us. I believe my testimony has provided evidence that we will not have true multiple use in national parks. Consequently, I do not believe that the citizens of Utah should support a bill providing for a national park of this size.

Now, in conclusion here, I'm 100 percent behind having a national park if we could have 100 percent multiple use; and I think that both Senator Bennett and Senator Moss are to be congratulated for the work that they've done in trying to get a park into this area, because we certainly in this end of the State need it to help things out.

Senator BIBLE. Might I ask one question?

Mr. MINER. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. If we were to have a Canyonlands National Park created in the very near future, would the amount of assessed valuation that you've shown for San Juan in 1960 or 1961 be altered in any way?

Mr. MINER. If we were to have—would you restate your question again?

Senator BIBLE. Yes. If the Canyonlands National Park were to be created, would that alter the assessed valuation that you've shown for San Juan in 1960 and 1961?

Mr. MINER. No.

Senator BIBLE. It has no relationship?

Mr. MINER. That's what bothers me tremendously, that we need tourists in here to help us in business, but the tourists do not offset the taxation; and that's one thing that a lot of us tend to forget. The tourists contribute to sales tax. People contribute through payrolls. But as far as any great value contributing through that, why, they just don't. That's why I think it's so important, because this is a good potential area, as far as geological. It has so much potential that we should not jeopardize any of the area in such a way that if there is an oil field, potash mine, uranium, or whatever it may be, that we have that so that we can draw on that industry for taxes to the county, because the tourists are not going to give us a valuation.

Senator BENNETT. I have been handed the hearings on the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area held by this subcommittee on November 13, 1961; and on page 26 of those hearings, Congressman Griffin, questioning Mr. Edmunds, who is regional chief of recreational resource planning, referred to question and answer between Mr. Heimberger, counsel for the Subcommittee on Forests of the Committee of Agriculture, who was questioning Conrad Wirth. And Mr. Heimberger's question was: "Is my understanding correct that the basic policy of the Park Service is that prime land ownership is not permitted, at least certainly is not wanted, within boundaries of national parks?"

And Mr. Wirth answered:

> That is correct. Our policy is to eliminate all in-holdings.

And then Congressman Griffin quoted Mr. Wirth, who wrote an article in the May 1958, issue of the National Geographic Magazine, which contained this statement:

> Another thing I would like to see accomplished is the elimination of all private ownership inside park boundaries.

So that seems to be a rather clear statement of the policy of Mr. Wirth, who is head of the Park Service.

Senator BIBLE. Well, I think that may be true that that may be his wish or ideal or policy; but notwithstanding that, the Congress of the United States has created a Cape Cod Seashore Recreational Area where there are in-holdings and uses. We have created Point Reyes National Seashore Area, where there are extensive cattle and ranch holdings. It's over on the House of Representatives side this year. And these are extensive in-holdings. We've created in the Senate the Padre Island Recreational Area, which has in-holdings in the nature of oil wells and even grazings.

These are examples. Congressional enactment into law of uses that were contrary to what Mr. Wirth may have thought was a committee deal, and they were created in different areas of the country under different times.

Senator BENNETT. The only one of these that has been actually made into law is Cape Cod?

Senator BIBLE. That is true.

Senator METCALF. We have Glacier National Park that has a railroad running through it. Periodically Congress appropriates money to pick those up as they come on the market. There's an intensive trade in the park. Right at the foot of Lake McDonald there's a private recreational area.

Senator BIBLE. This is Mr. Frank Harrison, the Assistant Director of the National Park Service, and the question has been asked of him.

Senator Moss. Well, the first reference was to an inholding in Grand Canyon National Park of a privately owned piece of land in there that the National Park Service would like to pick up, so it can manage it in the way it manages the rest of the park.

Senator METCALF. And as I understand it the quarrel is not with the mining in Grand Canyon.

Mr. MINER. I believe it was both, sir. My understanding is that they were very stringent on their mining regulations. For instance, only a 20-acre claim. And when you're shaping up uranium ores, there's a certain amount of blending that you have to do; and if you can pile your ore on the surface to do this blending, you can save a lot of money. This was not allowed, and they had to transpose their waste, I believe, some 38 miles outside of the national park. There were a lot of those restrictions that didn't encourage the mining.

Senator METCALF. There is a bill before us now to try to prevent some other use other than mining—building a hotel.

Mr. MINER. As far as the Grand Canyon?

Senator METCALF. Yes.

Mr. MINER. I understand that. I think we're all together on this mining. If we could just have the mining and oil and whatnot. But as a practicality—I think McKinley is our best example, where it has so much potential up there, and yet the point I'm trying to make is these restrictions that are placed on by the Park Service can hamper mining and prospecting to such an extent that they are impractical. I can think of one example: A helicopter party of fellows in Mount McKinley; they were restricted, they could only use the designated airports. Therefore, with that rugged terrain it's so darn hard to prospect the outlying areas without having such access.

Mr. FRANK E. HARRISON. Glacier was established on May 11, 1910.

Senator BENNETT. But have there been any inholdings in Glacier?

Mr. HARRISON. May I say, sir, that the total area of Glacier is 1,013,129 acres. Of that, 4,018 are still in private ownership. I should say that the quotation from the Sleeping Bear Dunes actually was a statement made by Mr. Wirth at hearings before the House committee. Actually it was a committee of agriculture on Ozark Rivers. I was present at those hearings, and Mr. Wirth was stating the general policy, which is to acquire inholdings in parks within the authorization which Congress has given to it. So if the Congress sets forth some restriction in the legislation, we, of course, abide by that, but Congress each year appropriates certain funds for acquiring inholdings that are authorized to be acquired. And that is what he meant at that particular time, Senator.

May I point out, I think it's rather interesting that the total acreage in the national park system is 22,925,000 acres. Of that total, 434,376 acres are still in private ownership. So it's a long, it's a gradual, process. We feel that eventually the land should be in public ownership if you're going to achieve the purpose of your park. It's a slow process. We live with it, and we look to the day when the parks will be an ideal, so to speak. But it's a long process. We accommodate private ownership.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Mr. Harrison. He just supported what I was saying, that the goal is to limit to a single use, and I want to congratulate Senator Moss for trying to get the multiple use, but I don't think we have enough teeth in it to hold it. This is a question that happens to become our responsibility.

Your testimony has been very helpful.

(The portion of the prepared statement of Mr. Gordon M. Miner not given is as follows:)

A national park comprised of several small areas of particular interest which are joined together by roads with wide right-of-ways. This would all be under national park management and maintenance, in complete accordance with national park policy. Large areas surrounding the national park would be under joint jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and the Utah State Park Commission. The surrounding areas, or buffer zone, could be a national recreation area under National Park Service jurisdiction provided multiple use would continue. It would also be the responsibility of the National Park Service to provide access roads to the park.

It is assumed that if stock meanders into park campgrounds or comparable areas that the holder of the permit might be required to reduce his herd to a more manageable size.

Wording of the bill is such that the Governor in conjunction with his State game and fish department and the Secretary of the Interior in conjunction with his Park Service must agree jointly on policy. If they are not in accord, the Secretary dominates. In essence, complete control of policy is held by the Secretary, and the State is powerless. This has already become a cause of great concern to the State Game and Fish Department of Wyoming in their attempt to help control the wildlife in Grand Teton National Park. Similar language to S. 2387, but only covering elk, exists in the Teton bill.

The severe criticism from the Yellowstone area should be taken into consideration when analyzing Park Service policy toward hunting.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Miner uses the term "single use" on the one hand and "multiple use" on the other, which is not exactly right. Park use involves more than one use. It involves the protection of watershed. You have your wildlife, which actually is propagated in the parks. You have your recreation use, just to name three of them. Multiple use implies every kind of use conceivable. I think that the proper title, as Senator Moss expresses it, is secondary uses with primary park use. So I think that the terms are misleading.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Mr. Miner. We will next proceed with Eugene Foushee, San Juan Canyonlands Committee.

STATEMENT BY EUGENE D. FOUSHEE, REPRESENTING SAN JUAN COUNTY CANYONLANDS COMMITTEE

Mr. FOUSHEE. Mr. Chairman, just as a general and personal introduction, I'd like to say I am a geologist by training. Right now I am a motel owner and operator by occupation. One summer I worked as a park naturalist in a State park back in North Carolina. I am now a resident of Utah. Utah is my home. San Juan County, I've chosen as my home, not by birth, but by deliberate choice. I have approached the whole problem from a nonemotional basis. I'm interested in what's going to help my business and help my future, and inevitably this is going to help the rest of the country, too.

Now, in this prepared statement I am representing the San Juan County Canyonlands Committee. I will go ahead and read this.

Everyone I have talked to in Utah wants a national park. The reports that have been written continue to emphasize the importance

of a national park in fully developing our tourist industry. Almost everyone I have talked to wants the opportunity to continue to explore and develop to the maximum extent all other industry in addition to tourism. In order to realize the maximum economic development, our position is the logical position of every area in the United States. This brings us to the Moss bill, which is the reason for the present hearings.

The San Juan County Canyonlands Committee still stands on its original resolution, which was decisively approved at a county meeting on March 6, 1962. To summarize that resolution in one sentence: We want a national park with its traditional standards and of a size that will minimize the loss of other economic developments.

We believe Senator Moss originally wrote his bill with the fullest intentions of providing Utah with the maximum economic development, both tourist and industrial. However, since then many facts have been presented which have given us cause to worry.

The attempt at putting true and useful multiple use—and perhaps we should clear up this multiple use and secondary use. In general, we know we're talking of mining.

Senator BIBLE. We understand that.

Mr. FOUSHEE. That's fine.

The attempt at putting true and useful multiple use into a national park is clearly against the founding policy in establishing the national park system in 1916. Tremendous pressures will be against multiple use from the wilderness and conservationist groups; and the only way the national park people could sanction the multiple-use wording of the Moss bill (and continue to uphold the clearly stated national park policy) would be in realizing that they, under the Secretary of the Interior's regulations, could effectively and legally prohibit all but the most meager mining and oil exploration. The exploration and mining problems being experienced in Mount McKinley National Park are examples of the national park system's effectiveness in minimizing and discouraging mineral development, even though the permissive multiple-use wording was in the bill. I feel sure that attorneys representing their client's best business interests in drawing up a contract would not permit such nonspecific wording as found in S. 2387, page 5, lines 15 through 18.

The wording pertaining to oil and mineral exploration and development would not be important if the area involved had been thoroughly prospected and/or if it were not underlain by the productive Pennsylvanian and older formations. This, plus the highly potential Paradox Basin. Because of its inaccessibility, subsurface exploration has been very slight; however, other geologists with whom I have talked say the area has good potential for oil and potash.

I won't read this other, but it is substantiating evidence pertaining to this thing.

Indication that hunting has been successfully followed for years in Grand Teton National Park is misleading in view of a letter from the Wyoming Fish and Game Department decrying the redtape involved in the hunting process. This is another example of the discrepancy between the intent of the wording in the bill and the reality of attempting to put hunting or other multiple use into effect in a national park.

Here in San Juan County the thinking concerning multiple use falls in three primary categories:

(1) Some people want multiple use as written in the Moss bill, and they actually believe there can be realistic effective multiple use, the national park policy notwithstanding.

(2) More people don't particularly mind the multiple-use concept in a national park, but they don't believe that realistic effective multiple use is possible; therefore they are opposed to a bill which includes the multiple-use wording. These people fear that realistic multiple use would be impossible because of too stringent regulations, and then the county would have lost its opportunity to develop all of its resources.

(3) The third group I believe is fairly small, but I am one of them. These people do not want to start a breakdown of national park policy. They want to follow the policy of preservation for all generations of some of our natural wonders. I personally cherish the thought that my children and grandchildren will be able to see some of America in its natural state just as the earliest white men did when they arrived on this continent.

The multiple-use provisions of the Moss bill are causing the controversy. Representative Peterson expressed our committees thoughts precisely in his recent statement: "I question the advisability of permitting the Canyonlands Park being made a battleground for this new concept." This new concept, of course, is the breaking down of park policy to permit oil and mineral exploration and development and hunting within the proposed Canyonlands National Park. We feel a new bill is our only hope.

April 9, 1962, the San Juan County Canyonlands Committee mailed letters to Senators Moss and Bennett strongly urging them to draw up a new bill cooperatively We are confident there are enough facts now available to write a good new bill that will not automatically incur the wrath of various groups, and by uniting, they could lift a canyonlands bill out of politics, doing Utah a great service.

In summation, our committee presented six points to our Senators which we believed could be useful guides in writing a new bill. They are as follows:

1. Utah needs both the national park and all other continued economic development.

2. There is a good mineralogic potential for the area involved.

3. We want a park with the traditional national park standards. By asking for no special concessions, a park bill would not be automatically opposed by the national park system and conservationists.

(*a*) No hunting in the national park. Leave as much good hunting outside the park as possible, and then Utah should concede the rest of the deer land to the Park Service.

There has been a good deal said about this. There seems to be fair agreement that this is not a real problem.

The Park Service will probably make special provisions for reduction of game animals as a result of unfavorable publicity concerning the recent elk killing.

So for this reason, let's don't again make this bill a battleground for hunting.

(*b*) As for no multiple use. National park policy is clearly against this. As a result, their regulations can make this impossible. Mount McKinley National Park is a classic example of this.

4. An acreage figure should not be set until after the most scenic land has been carefully determined by a study using all possible media. Acreage should be kept to a minimum to avoid any necessity for multiple use.

5. An exchange of school section land involved in the park for all Lisbon Valley oil land seems unreasonable, and would probably draw much opposition from other States. Perhaps a provision could be made for exchange of some of the Lisbon land of equal value. Prompt exchanges should be made.

6. A national recreation area surrounding the park and access road lands should be a good idea, provided true multiple use would continue without impossible regulations.

At this time I publicly and personally urge our Utah Congressmen to unite and work for the common good of Utah.

Senator BIBLE. Well, thank you for your statement. I'm convinced that the people interested in this Canyonlands National Park are attempting to work out a problem, and that problem obviously does have a little controversy in it. As I said, this is not new. We have had very similar problems in Cape Cod, which is just out of Boston, Point Reyes, which lies north of San Francisco. We went down to the great State of Texas, and we found they had a few problems. I'm hopeful out of these hearings we can resolve these difficulties. Many people have different viewpoints, sizewise and usewise. But this is our burden. Your suggestions are hopeful. They point up where some of the real areas of difference lie.

Mr. FOUSHEE. Could I make another statement here?

Senator BIBLE. Surely.

Mr. FOUSHEE. Concerning this Cape Cod, this is quite obvious. It would have been completely impossible to have essentially thrown the people out who owned land there, something that was completely established that's been there for many, many years, since the Pilgrims, as a matter of fact. This is a different situation from our proposed Canyonlands area. Now, if we had extensive or practically any type development within the Canyonlands area, if we had an oil field there, I'm sure this committee would not include this in there without specific and definite provisions that they could continue production, and the park service people would definitely go along with this, because this is something definite and realistic which we would have to do. As a matter of fact, the northeast corner of the original proposed park has since been moved out because of recent production. That was, I believe, to avoid this obvious controversy of the park people having to live with the oil rigs and the crews around there.

Senator BIBLE. Of course, the park people are living with the oil people on Padre Island.

Mr. FOUSHEE. That's what I say. They are there.

Senator MOSS. And drilling new ones in there.

Senator BIBLE. They're not prohibited from doing that, any more than they are in there.

Mr. FOUSHEE. Padre Island is a long fingerlike piece of ground, where you can get exploration and drilling and production by not being directly right on top of the park service land itself. This again is why our thinking of smaller sections would be more desirable, because from an exploration point of view, you would be able to explore under and around it. Suppose an Aneth field did lie in the

middle of one. The odds are highly against that sort of thing. If one lies outside, fine. We will not violate national park policy by drilling within the country.

Senator METCALF. Cape Cod and Padre Island are to be Seashore Recreation areas, not strictly parks.

Senator BIBLE. If you were creating a Canyonlands National Park, you would carve this into little parts?

Mr. FOUSHEE. If you would call these small. That's a relative term, of course. We would prefer three areas. Automatically it is three areas. There's river which is not a highway connecting them. It's an actual barrier between the three. Yes, sir. These are our recommendations, that it would be divided into three areas. This is quite correct.

Senator Moss. Would you leave the rivers and river gorges out?

Mr. FOUSHEE. That would be under the recreation area would be our recommendation, which is also under National Park jurisdiction and would give them the control.

Senator Moss. You recognize, of course, the Secretary would control the uses in the recreation area if it were created.

Mr. FOUSHEE. That's correct.

Senator Moss. And therefore you think he wouldn't permit certain things in a park. Do you have any reason to believe he would permit it in a recreation area any more readily?

Mr. FOUSHEE. Because of precedent, I do. Lake Mead and other areas, this is continuing, and we think it would continue.

Senator Moss. You say the Secretary wouldn't let a well be drilled in the park. If somebody wanted to drill a well right off of Devil's Pocket, you think he'd say: "Well, there is an imaginary line there. That happens to be recreation area. So go ahead. I'll let you out there, but I won't let you in here."

Mr. FOUSHEE. Should it come to this precise point, that would be his prerogative. We know what rough country this is. Many times these wells can be spotted and moved 1,000 feet. Sometimes it's critical. Now, by being in a recreational area, he would have this control, which would be under the National Park Service, again. He could move this well, I believe, over here, which would not damage this national park policy, which I personally want to keep inviolate. He can move this over here not to damage the entire system, and that way we've kept the conservationists and the State content.

Senator Moss. You could move it over there into the park, if it were a park, and not damage it?

Mr. FOUSHEE. He would immediately be opposed very strongly. Realistically, to my satisfaction, it's extremely difficult to continue multiple use with all of the abundance of stated policy against it.

Senator Moss. Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. No further questions.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Foushee, we've heard about your committee from several of the other members. So we have been waiting for your testimony. For the record will you tell us how the committee was formed?

Mr. FOUSHEE. Well, yes, sir; I will. This committee or some committee should have been started last summer when Secretary Udall was in this country. I was approached, and at that time some people said we should start working to him coming in with a national park. "This

is important." As many other good citizens, we tended to put these things off. We did nothing until after the Moss bill came out. Things were moving along. As a matter of fact—excuse me for going back just a moment. Representative King last summer told me: "You don't have any worry." Now, this is a quote. I asked him at that time: "Should we begin drawing something up? Should we start working toward a development of a national park? What should be our role in this?"

Representative King told me, and I think that there were a couple of other people present: "We're working on this. This is fine. You don't need to do anything. There is not a rush on this. We are not in a hurry. This will not come about in a year anyway."

To continue now with the development of this committee. We did nothing. Consequently, all fall—during January the interest was moving along more strongly continually of the park. We were still very much interested in a national park. There's no way we could deny that. The bill had come out, and a number of us were a little apprehensive of——

Senator METCALF. That's the first Moss bill?

Mr. FOUSHEE. Yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. Yes.

Mr. FOUSHEE. With the amendments. S. 2387, the one that we have before us now.

Senator METCALF. Yes.

Mr. FOUSHEE. Personally, I talked to several of the other chambers—Blanding, and Monticello—Monticello particularly. "You're up there close to the area. Let's have San Juan County come up with a united stand. Let's look into it. Let's come up with something beneficial. We're interested in it ourselves. Let's face it."

At a later date, Jim Black, the president of the Monticello Chamber of Commerce, did call such a meeting. He invited, the Monticello chamber, invited all of the chambers of our area, of our county.

Senator BENNETT. How many chambers are there?

Mr. FOUSHEE. Monticello, Blanding, Bluff, and Mexican Hat. And I suppose other interested people. But those are the chambers, actually. But it is——

Senator METCALF. Those are the principal communities?

Mr. FOUSHEE. That's correct. And it was strictly an open meeting, not just a chamber of commerce meeting, spearheaded by the Monticello chamber, and Mr. Black acted as chairman in that. There was great discussion all through the meeting. Needless to say, as we've heard this morning, lots of discussion, lots of emotion.

Senator BENNETT. May I ask another question at this point? Were there any elected State representatives present? By that I mean, were there any Senators, Congressmen? Was the Governor there? Was any representative of the Governor there? Or just a meeting of the local people?

Mr. FOUSHEE. To my knowledge, it was only the local people. Certainly the Governor was not there or Senators or Representatives were not. I can say specifically for those people.

Senator METCALF. Some of your local elected officials?

Mr. FOUSHEE. Our commissioners were there. I believe that the three of them were there. They were. Our meeting continued to be a discussion. Finally we came up with—actually there were several

proposals, several resolutions, which are not important, right now, but one of them was to try to develop a committee out of this group that could look into some facts and that could come up with something that we thought would be useful to us.

The importance of this thing and the thinking behind this was, we did have emotion on both sides—the extremes of each side. And they were still talking in generalities. This was also before the National Park Service had come out, the Governor's report had come out. Again, we were reading editorials and generalities. None of us had any figures.

So we held our next meeting. First, let's get the committee started, then. So Jim Black made a resolution or asked the county commission chairman if he would appoint a committee to study it, to look into this, and this was Commissioner Marion Hazleton, who has already testified.

Senator BENNETT. You were appointed and selected by him?

Mr. FOUSHEE. We were appointed by Commissioner Hazleton, and by the other two commissioners.

Senator BIBLE. This was a commissioner action?

Mr. FOUSHEE. It was; yes, sir. And this action did not take place at this time. In fact, at their next regular meeting they——

Senator BENNETT. Just also for the record, can you identify the dents or the members of the Canyonlands committee? Did you cover the full county, or——

Mr. FOUSHEE. It was a general attempt to. I'm from Bluff, the south part. We do not have Mexican Hat represented. LaRay Alexander is from La Sal. Carl Mikesell farther to the north, the very northernmost part of our country.

Senator METCALF. What are the occupations of the various members?

Mr. FOUSHEE. I stated mine, LeRay Alexander is a schoolteacher or principal in Blanding. Other than that, I don't know. Reed Wilson has the Conoco station next to the Out West Cafe up here, Don Barton, livestock. Gordon Miner is a miner. He's the manager of Homestake Mining Co., at La Sal. Carl Mikesell is, I think, "tourist business" would be the best definition for him. He's a retired Army officer, I understand. And Mr. Cecil Huff, I've never met him, and he has not been in attendance. He has been notified, and he, I understand, is with a drilling company and was out of town many times.

Senator BENNETT. He was not active?

Mr. FOUSHEE. He was not active. His name has been carried, but as stated, he has not been active.

Senator METCALF. This is a report of the majority of the committee, or is this a unanimous report?

Mr. FOUSHEE. I think it's a unanimous report. Now, I think this. This has been our pattern of thinking. Originally there was a letter written to Representative Peterson stating this generally in the beginning. It was concurred in by all members. They had copies of this. They signed it, actually. I have a copy at home.

Senator BIBLE. If it isn't unanimous, anyone who wants to give a dissenting opinion, we would be very happy to have this in the record.

Further questions? Thank you very much.

(A portion of the prepared statement of Mr. Foushee not presented orally is as follows:)

"An Economic Study of the Proposed Canyonlands National Park and Related Recreation Resources": Concerning oil, it says: "Geologists interviewed in the preparation of this report have stated that oil and gas prospects within the park are good, but that the extent and size of any discovery cannot be determined at this time."

Concerning potash, the report says: "The important question is whether or not undeveloped potash deposits exist within the park. A recent U.S. Geological Survey study * * * indicates that it probably does."

Concerning uranium, the report states from information obtained from staff members of the Grand Junction office of the Atomic Energy Commission: "Deeper exploration which could best be done by diamond drilling the area back from the canyons has not been done; thus the possibility of unknown deposits exist." However, the canyons have been extensively prospected and the resultant uranium mining has amounted to about "* * * 1 percent of Utah's uranium production during the last 8 years." This would indicate that the uranium potential is small for the Canyonlands area.

Senator BIBLE. Next witness, Mr. Phillip Merritt, vice president of the Hidden Splendor Mining Co.

We have made the record very clear that anybody that wants to file any type of a dissent can.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT BY DR. PHILLIP L. MERRITT, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE HIDDEN SPLENDOR MINING CO.

Dr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, my comments are directed to the size of the park as it relates to further mineral resource development in the area.

Nearly 20 years ago I made my first trip through the Colorado Plateau and the fringes of the Canyonlands.

Senator BIBLE. I'm wondering if I might interrupt you, Dr. Merritt, simply to ask if anywhere in your statement you tell us a little more about the Hidden Splendor Mining Co., how large a company it is, what it produces.

Dr. MERRITT. We have uranium mines in the Big Indian area. We have uranium mines in Wyoming. We have oil properties. We have many exploration projects around the West.

Senator BIBLE. This is a stock corporation, is it?

Dr. MERRITT. A stock corporation.

Senator BIBLE. You operate in a number of these Western States?

Dr. MERRITT. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. In uranium and oil?

Dr. MERRITT. Yes. We have other prospective operations we hope to get into soon.

Senator BIBLE. Where do you live, Dr. Merritt?

Dr. MERRITT. Salt Lake City.

Senator BIBLE. Where does the Hidden Splendor Mining Co. operate in San Juan County?

Dr. MERRITT. We operate in the Big Indian area in the San Juan County.

Senator BIBLE. And where is that in relationship to this map?

Dr. MERRITT. Southeast. Between here and Moab.

Senator BIBLE. Between here and Moab. Thank you.

Dr. MERRITT. At the time of my first visit I was an officer in the Manhattan District of the Corps of Engineers, and, my duty was to gather data on uranium from all parts of the world for our uranium project. I was greatly impressed on that trip and in countless later trips with the vast potential of the uranium resources of this area, and also with the awe-inspiring scenery here. In addition to the beauty of the area, we should be cognizant of the economic potential of the untapped resources beneath the surface, which if allowed to develop in the normal method could materially benefit the well-being of our citizens.

This area is conscious of its wealth and mineral resources. New developments are now taking place in both petroleum and potash. In the early 1950's, this area was the focal point of the first uranium boom the world has ever known.

Senator BIBLE. Your statement will be incorporated fully in the record, and you just highlight.

Dr. MERRITT. That's what I'm trying to do. This boom was touched off by the fabulous discovery of Charles Steen in the Big Indian area. I might say that this area had been passed over by many others for many years before he had the fortitude to put a hole down and find this deposit which led to development of the Big Indian area. The uranium discoveries in this area and in the virgin lands near Grants and the Gas Hill areas of Wyoming were largely responsible for the success of our domestic uranium program. Under the impetus of this program, which began in 1948, our domestic reserves increased from about 1 million tons of ore to nearly 90 million tons of ore. Due to the lack of the exploration incentive at the present time, our reserves are on a rapid decline. Production increased from 110 tons in 1948 to 18,000 tons in 1961. Foreign imports increased from a few thousand tons in 1948 to 18,000 tons in 1959.

This worldwide production effort which I have traced had virtually one purpose: to deliver to our armed services adequate supplies of uranium to meet their requirements, so as to insure our defense, as well as the defense of our allies.

By 1967, at the close of the established program, the AEC will have purchased over 300,000 tons of U_3O_8, most of which is designated for weapon use. In 1967, however, we will have dismantled part of our productive capacities both here and abroad, and we will have depleted our ore reserves very badly. We need extensive exploration in the future in order to replenish these supplies. There could well be a military weapon requirement after 1966. This I do not know. There most certainly will be a small but growing atomic fuel requirement here and abroad. Mr. Johnson, Director of Raw Materials for the Atomic Energy Commission in giving his views of the industry recently stated that the total power requirements from 1967 to 1970 are estimated at the equivalent of 10,000 tons of U_3O_8; that by 1980 domestic needs for the nuclear industry may range from 10,000 to 20,000 tons of U_3O_8 annually. Domestic requirements for the period from 1971 to 1980 may range from 75,000 to 100,000 tons. If something on the order of Mr. Johnson's predictions materialize, then this Nation could in the next decade face a critical reserve situation. We could well become a have-not nation unless something is done to turn the tide.

Most of the known reserves in the Big Indian district of San Juan County will be virtually exhausted by 1967. The people of this area should be aware that a mine is an ever-depleting asset and can only be replaced by new discoveries. In order to maintain domestic reserves which both the military and the atomic industry can depend on, this uranium industry will need some kind of an incentive and will also need the elbow room in which to search for new supplies. If we cannot have both of these, we may find ourselves in the same position we were in 15 years ago, and that was a pretty sad situation.

The impact of natural resource development on Grand and San Juan Counties during the decade between 1950 and 1960 has been large. In this decade, the assessed valuation of property increased from $7,500,000 to $145 million, and the property taxes charged increased from $300,000 to over $5 million. The population doubled during this period, which was the period of the greatest boom in mineral resources that this area has ever known.

The people of Utah and of this area in particular have an important economic stake in the Canyonlands, where geologically this is a favorable area for mineral resource development, whether it be for petroleum, potash, uranium, or for some other commodity.

To inhibit exploration and the development of our mineral resources could have an adverse impact on the future well-being of the citizens of this area and the citizens of the State.

Some might say that the Canyonlands is not a good area to search for mineral research, prospecting is difficult, it takes a lot of fortitude, money and knowledge; but who will say that great mines or petroleum reserves do not exist buried beneath the surface? Not I. After all, we have seen what has happened in the past decade right here in San Juan County and in many parts of the West.

I am not sold on the highly controversial multiple use principle in national park lands legislation. I would think it very difficult for the Congress to write a multiple use provision so well defined as to leave no question as to its intent, so that there would be no leeway for administrative interpretations left to officials of the executive branch that might well have an adverse effect either on the park lands or the public domain to the detriment of one or the other.

I feel that when park lands legislation is being written, it should be park land, and the rest should be left open. I am confident that the Congress will follow a wise course in its Canyonlands legislation.

Wise legislation to me would establish a Canyonlands National Park embracing carefully selected areas which preserve the scenic beauty. The surrounding areas of public domain, I believe, should be left untouched so that it can develop in its normal, natural, economic manner, unfettered by needless regulations. I feel that only through this course can the people of our country, of Utah, and of Grand and San Juan Counties, in particular, obtain the maximum benefits from these Canyonlands.

Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you. Might I ask you this question. Does the Hidden Splendor Mining Co. have any uranium claims within the Canyonlands as proposed by this particular legislation?

Dr. MERRITT. No.

82324—62—pt. 2——5

Senator BIBLE. Have you ever held any patent claims in that area?

Dr. MERRITT. We have held claims along the—no, I don't think in this area.

Senator BIBLE. Have you done exploration in this area?

Dr. MERRITT. Our company has not. Many others have.

Senator BIBLE. Are you knowledgeable on the amount of prospecting that's been done within this area, speaking for uranium? I understand your testimony to be on uranium.

Dr. MERRITT. There has been some done. It's a very difficult area. Because something has not been found, I don't say it won't be found. After all, Paddy Martinez found the great area near Grants. This had been walked over within about 3 or 4 miles of the Santa Fe Railway, but it took an observing person to see this. Mr. McNiece in Wyoming saw kind of a hungry-looking outcrop that people had passed over and oil wells had been drilled right at. He found the great Gas Hills area. The first time I visited White Canyon I saw a little mine. They had a hole in the wall about as long as this table, in the cliff. It was owned by the late Joe Cooper and the Bronsons of Blanding. It didn't look like much of a mine, but they persevered, they worked hard. It turned out to be quite a nice mine. Well, just because we don't now know what's there, it doesn't say it isn't there.

Senator BIBLE. The only purpose of my question was that if you felt that this was such an attractive mineralized area, why wouldn't a company of your stature go in there and do a little prospecting?

Dr. MERRITT. Right now there is no incentive for prospecting. If one finds something, one cannot sell it.

Senator BIBLE. At the present time then you have uranium running out your ears; is this true?

Dr. MERRITT. Yes, so to speak.

Senator BIBLE. I mean it's in oversupply.

Dr. MERRITT. That's what I understand. It will not always remain that way.

Senator BIBLE. I think I have no further questions.

Senator MOSS. No.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Dr. Merritt.

(Portions of the prepared statement of Dr. Merritt not given are as follow:)

The nuclear industry was born in the wartime secrecy of the Manhattan project, with which I had the great honor to be associated. It is hard to believe that 20 years ago there was not one uranium mine, as such, operating in the world. We were faced with the task of collecting the required uranium from such faraway places as the fabulously rich Schinkolobwe Mine in the Belgian Congo, the Eldorado Mine in Canada near the Arctic Circle, and from our own Colorado Plateau. Mines had to be reopened, plants built, and logistics organized under wartime conditions. We were in a hurry, for our objective was to produce an atomic weapon in the shortest possible time. Consequently, expedience did not permit an extensive exploration. As you know, the goal of the Manhattan project was reached in a short space of about 3 years.

Upon the termination of hostilities, our Government gave little support to its atomic program except to keep it alive. In the meantime, futile attempts were being made through the United Nations to agree upon satisfactory controls of nuclear materials and weapons. Production came to a grinding halt on the Colorado Plateau, and the uranium supplies needed to maintain our vast plants in operation were imported largely from the Belgian Congo. The Canadian deposits made but a small contribution to our supplies.

By 1948 our relations with Soviet Russia had deteriorated to an alarming extent, and it became evident to our Government that no meaningful agreement on nuclear arms control could be quickly consummated. Our Nation found itself in a weak position as far as domestic production and reserves were concerned, and in a somewhat better (though not strong) position in foreign supplies and reserves. Our Government then decided to encourage an all-out search for and production of uranium both here and in friendly foreign countries. How successful this program turned out to be is a matter of history. However, it was necessary to start almost from scratch to find the reserves upon which to build a solid foundation for production. The Atomic Energy Commission records indicate that our known domestic reserves in 1948, of about 1 million tons of ore (2,500 tons of U_3O_8), increased tenfold in 6 years and by 1959 reached nearly 90 million tons of ore (225,000 tons of U_3O_8). This effort was a cooperative enterprise of private initiative, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of the Interior. Hundreds of technicians, during the course of the program, walked and flew tens of thousands of miles of canyon rims, and drilled an estimated 45 million linear feet of holes in order to find and develop our resources. Due to the lack of incentive during the past few years, our Nation's reserves have declined to about 74 million tons of ore, according to the AEC reports. With the continued lack of exploration incentives in the present AEC program, there will no doubt be a serious decline in available resources during the next 5 years.

In 1948 two domestic uranium plants were placed in production and in that year they produced 110 tons of U_3O_8 in concentrates. The output increased in 5 years to 1,000 tons; in 10 years it exceeded 10,000 tons; and a peak production of 17,760 tons was attained in 1961 in 27 plants.

An excess of $300 million has been invested in the raw material industry in order to attain its present stature. New districts have been found, towns have been constructed, and roads have opened the back country. Today it is estimated that some 9,000 people are directly employed in this industry which in 1961 produced concentrates with a value of about $285 million.

Similarly, production was vastly increased through our stimulation of the search in friendly foreign countries—in Canada, in South Africa, in Australia, and in Portugal. The base was not as low at the start as was ours, but it was not until 1959 that imports from foreign sources reached a peak of 18,165 tons of U_3O_8. Some $500 million has been invested in exploration, the development of mines and the construction of production facilities in foreign countries contributing to our supplies. Again the same pattern of development followed with new districts and mines being opened up, plants erected, roads built and towns constructed.

The rise in reserves and production during the past 15 years illustrates that, when offered an incentive in the form of a market, our citizens and our mining industry are fully capable of fulfilling the need, but it also illustrates that ample leadtime is essential. These things just do not happen overnight.

The worldwide uranium production effort, which I have traced, had virtually one purpose—to deliver to our armed services adequate supplies of uranium to meet their requirements so as to insure our defense as well as the defense of our allies. By 1967 at the close of the established program, the AEC will have purchased well over 300,000 tons of U_3O_8, most of which is designated for weapon use. In 1967 we will, however, have dismantled, in part, our production capability both here and abroad, and depleted our ore reserves. We will need intensive exploration in the future in order to replenish these supplies.

There could well be military weapons requirements after 1966, and there most certainly will be a small but growing atomic fuel requirement both here and abroad. The growth of the atomic power industry has been disappointingly slow in the past few years, but then, it is an infant industry and perhaps we expected too much in too short a time. Past predictions of the future uranium requirements for the atomic power industry have been almost invariably on the optimistic side, but as time progresses, I believe the forecasts have become more realistic. Mr. Jesse Johnson, Director of Raw Materials for the Atomic Energy Commission gave his views of the future of this industry in a speech before the Colorado Mining Association on March 17, 1962. I take the liberty of quoting from his speech on the outlook for power requirements:

"Future estimates of nuclear power growth still must be based upon a number of assumptions and are particularly sensitive to variations in the cost of producing power. A reduction of a half a mill would make nuclear power com-

petitive for a much larger share of the power market. However, improved technology, which increases fuel efficiency, may reduce the quantity of uranium needed for a given power output. Consequently, increased use of nuclear power as a result of technical improvements may not be accompanied by a corresponding increase in uranium requirements.

"Power reactors using enriched fuel will use a relatively small quantity of uranium between now and the end of 1966. The enriched fuel for both domestic and foreign power reactors, under construction and planned, together with developmental projects, is expected to be less than 3,000 tons of U_3O_8 equivalent per year.

"No important changes can be expected in these requirements because all of the large power stations which will be operating at the end of 1966 already have been built, are under construction, or are well along in the planning stage and have been considered in arriving at the estimates.

"Beyond 1966, estimates gradually give way to educated guesses. However, it is reasonably certain that nuclear power requirements for U_3O_8, in relation to uranium production capability, will remain relatively small until the 1970's. Total domestic power requirements from 1967 through 1970 are estimated at the equivalent of about 10,000 tons of U_3O_8, with 1970 requirements about 3,000 tons. Foreign requirements for enriched fuel may be about the same.

"The demand is expected to begin increasing rapidly as we approach 1975, and by 1980 domestic needs for nuclear industrial power may range from 10,000 to 20,000 tons of U_3O_8 annually. Total domestic requirements for the period 1971 through 1980 may range from 75,000 to 100,000 tons. About the same quantity may be needed for foreign power reactors using enriched fuel.

"The estimates I have given appear conservative in the light of those made by the power industry and by independent consultants. This statement applies both to estimates of power cost and of installed capacity by 1980, which are the bases for calculating requirements.

"I have used the estimate of a 7-mill power cost by 1970, which compares with a recent industry estimate of less than 6 mills for a reactor which can be constructed now. The estimate of uranium requirements is based upon the installation of 31,000 electrical megawatts during the 1971–80 period, the lowest of several recently published. Titus LeClair, in the 'Electrical World' of May 22, 1961, estimated 40,000 megawatts; an article in the September 18, 1961, issue of the same publication gave an figure of 53,000 megawatts. Gen. K. D. Nichols in an address to the Edison Electric Institute on June 7, 1961, estimated from 50,000 to 80,000 megawatts. A report issued by the Edison Electric Institute in 1959 contained an estimate of 31,000 megawatts."

If something on the order of Mr. Johnson's predictions materialize, this Nation after the next decade may well face a critical reserve situation. We could become a "have-not" Nation unless something is done to turn the tide. The AEC has forecast a domestic ore reserve remaining in the ground in 1967 of some 40 million tons of ore containing about 100,000 tons of U_3O_8. Many operators in the uranium industry are less optimistic when taking into account the economics most likely to prevail after 1966.

The impact on Grand and San Juan Counties of natural resource development during the score of years between 1940 and 1960 has been gigantic. During this period the population increase from 6,782 in 1940 to 7,218 in 1950 and then doubled to 15,385 in 1960. The increase in both assessed valuation and property taxes charged during the 1950–60 period was far larger than during the previous decade. It was in the 1950–60 period that this area witnessed its great natural resource development including the uranium boom.

	Grand County	San Juan County	Total
Assessed valuation:			
1940	$3,411,369	$1,307,271	$4,718,640
1950	4,906,713	2,643,504	7,550,217
1960	12,661,202	132,483,785	145,144,987
10 year gain—1950–60	7,754,489	129,840,281	137,594,770
Property taxes charged:			
1940	107,228	50,306	157,534
1950	179,584	123,093	302,677
1960	786,277	4,317,215	5,103,492
10 year gain—1950–60	606,693	4,194,122	4,800,815

In 1960 the gross value of the uranium products produced in Utah was $38,290,277 of which nearly 73 percent or $27,776,253 was produced in the Big Indian district of San Juan County. In 1960 uranium mines in the State employed 1,500 people who drew a payroll of $9,756,913.

The prospector of the future may well find mines just as rich and large as those I have mentioned, but only if he has the room in which to search. The people of Utah and of this area, in my opinion have an important economic stake in the Canyonlands, for, geologically this is a favorable area for natural resource development. Are our citizens to be excluded forever from gaining the maximum economic benefits by legislation which recognizes the beauty and tourist attractions and disregards the vast natural resource potential?

Senator BIBLE. I think this may be an opportune time for our noon recess. I'm wondering if I could get an indication, so that the committee might govern itself as to when we come back, as to approximately how long the following witnesses would take.

(Discussion.)

Senator BIBLE. Suppose we be back here at 1:30. We stand in recess.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator BIBLE. The subcommittee hearing will come to order. I would first like to have read into the record a telegram which I have received from Lewis A. Sigler, Director of Legislative Council of the Department of the Interior.

(The telegram referred to follows:)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 19, 1962.*

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senator, Moab, Utah.

The following report was submitted to Senator Anderson on April 18, 1962. Your committee has requested the views of this department on Committee Print No. 1 of amendments (in the nature of a substitute) to S. 2387 a bill to establish Canyonlands National Park. The comments in this letter also are intended to comply with your committee's oral request made at the hearings on S. 2387 on March 30 that we submit comments on the hunting and mining provisions proposed by the author of the bill. Because of its similarity in all but two respects to the draft of bill we transmitted to you on January 31, 1962, as a substitute for S. 2387 we recommend the enactment of Committee Print No. 1, amended as we suggest herein.

We have no objection to section 4 (relating to mining) of Committee Print No. 1 but we do oppose the enactment of section 6. Section 6 provides for the controlled reduction of wildlife by hunters licensed by the State of Utah and deputized as rangers by the Secretary when the reduction of wildlife is needed to prevent injury to the soil, plantlife, or any wild or domestic animals dependent upon the land comprising the park. Although there is precedent for the language of section 6 in the act authorizing Grand Teton National Park, that is the only exception to the traditional rule which has regarded hunting as inimical to the true concept of the national parks. Such activity permits a relatively small number of people to take wildlife which would otherwise be available for the enjoyment of all of the visiting public. Moreover, hunting tends to transfer the emphasis of park wildlife management away from the objective of preserving intact a segment of nature to one of increased game population to support the hunting interest. The Department is well aware that a contrary view exists among well-informed segments of the wildlife conservation movement. We have not, however, had an opportunity to conduct the kind of study which would lead to an objective determination on this issue. Definite plans have been made for the conduct of such an analysis by a panel of unbiased and thoroughly expert persons, from which we hope to derive a general con-

clusion which can be applied to many of the large park and recreation areas.

For this reason, it is strongly recommended that section 6 be deleted from the proposed substitute bill and that the issue of hunting in the Canyonlands project be left for determination under whatever policy evolves.

One further amendment is desirable. Section 2 of Committee Print No. 1 requires the Secretary to offer to make all his exchanges within 30 days following enactment of the bill. This is impractical because proper investigations of lands to be acquired and conveyed cannot be made in 30 days. We therefore recommend that all the italicized words on page 11, lines 10, 11, and 12, except the word "provided," be deleted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

The report was signed by John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

LEWIS A. SIGLER,
Acting Legislative Counsel, Department of the Interior.

Senator BIBLE. I see that we have Congressman King with us. I don't know what your commitments are, Congressman King, but we'll hear you anytime you want to this afternoon.

Mr. KING. I don't have to go right now, if you have others.

Senator BIBLE. If this is all right with you, I'm going to first call Ray E. Gilbert, geologist of the Bear Creek Mining Co. I would ask Senator Metcalf to preside for me temporarily. I have a long-distance telephone call. I'll be back in a few moments, but you proceed in my absence.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Gilbert, we're glad to have you here. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF RAY E. GILBERT, DISTRICT GEOLOGIST, BEAR CREEK MINING CO.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am district geologist for Bear Creek Mining Co., which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Kennecott Copper Corp. Bear Creek's function is to conduct mineral exploration for Kennecott in the United States.

My purpose in appearing here today is to express Bear Creek's and Kennecott's opposition to the present version of Senate bill S. 2387, concerning the establishment of a Canyonlands National Park in Utah.

As a brief introduction to our competence to discuss the problem, I would like to point out that Kennecott has conducted mining operations in Utah for many years and has contributed substantially to the industrial growth of the State. Bear Creek, as a subsidiary company, has its headquarters in Salt Lake City and maintains three permanent offices and one field office in Utah. Bear Creek geologists and engineers are continuing extensive studies of the natural resources of Utah, and we feel that the economic value of these resources is far beyond what it appears today.

I'd like to digress a bit from this prepared statement to stress a point that has been brought out by others this morning, and that is to the effect that we think that the multiple-use concept and the national park concept are incompatible, that you can't have both together, regardless of what words you use.

Senator MOSS. May I interrupt to ask you, You think you can't have them because it couldn't be administered, or why can't you have them?

Mr. GILBERT. I think it's because of the national park regulations, which within themselves rule out mining operations within a national park.

Senator MOSS. Well, have you read the wording of the bill?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes, yes. And the wording here, first it says that mineral entry and prospecting, exploration, and mining will be permitted. Then it has: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe general regulations" about this.

And as I see it, it would be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior in supporting the park regulations to rule out mining. I just don't see how the two can go together.

Senator MOSS. Well, if Congress passes a law and it becomes the law of the land that this shall be permitted, subject only to a regulation to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreational values, certainly that would supersede any general policy that the Department might set down.

Mr. GILBERT. Well, I don't think so. I don't think that shuts—it would still provide that the Secretary of the Interior would abide by the park regulations.

Senator MOSS. Well, he makes the park regulations?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes, he can do this. And he can follow whatever is set forth in this law; that is, he will prescribe such general regulations as he thinks necessary. And in so doing, I think from what we have seen in park operations in the past, that it will follow the course that has been taken in the past to try to take mining out of the park, to prohibit mining, even though it's your intent to permit it. I don't think you can put wording in here which will make that intent effective.

Senator MOSS. In other words, you say you think it's impossible for us to write language, congressional language, in the law that will permit the thing that Congress intends to have done, because you think that an administrative officer would nullify the intent of Congress?

Mr. GILBERT. That's right.

Senator MOSS. OK.

Senator METCALF. I think the witness has made himself very clear. Suppose it's decided that there's going to be a park. Then your recommendation would be that there be no mining permitted and no multiple use?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes, that's right. I think that this point should be faced up to to begin with.

Senator METCALF. So as a mining man, your recommendation is to this committee that if this committee recommends to the Senate, and the Senate and the House of Representatives decide that it's in the public interest to create a park, you would say that it should be what Governor Clyde called a pure park, and no mining allowed?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes, that's right. I think that the provision here now is fooling too many people into thinking that there would be exploration and possible mining permitted, when it would not be. I'll go on with my prepared statement here.

Senator METCALF. Go right ahead.

Mr. GILBERT. We are in favor of preserving our natural wonders and scenic vistas for all those who wish to enjoy them now, and for

those to follow us. We are also in favor of setting aside specific limited areas of exceptional interest for a single purpose use, if, after careful evaluation and analysis it appears that this specific use is the best possible for the present and foreseeable future.

However, as citizens, taxpayers, residents of Utah and persons vitally interested in making the best possible use of our natural resources, we are opposed to legislation such as the Canyonlands bill which would tie up forever these resources and thereby obstruct the economic progress of this State and the Union.

The Senate bill as proposed calls for the creation of a national park of—I had 310,000 acres here. I see that this committee—an amendment of the bill has 332,000. It has grown some since the first bill.

In general, these features are separated by mile after mile of unchanging scenery, each mile having a remarkable similarity to the one just passed. In part hidden beneath this vast county and in part occurring at the surface are other natural wonders which are without doubt of equal or greater interest. I am speaking now of the geological features that contain the natural resources so vital to our existence. Geologic studies to date indicate that features favorable to the accumulation of oil, gas, potash, salt, and metallic minerals are known to lie adjacent to at least three sides of the proposed park area and in some cases actually within its boundaries. For more details on the mineral, gas, and oil potential of the proposed Canyonlands Park area, I refer you to a report by William P. Hewitt, director of the Utah Geological Survey, dated February 13, 1962.

In this report Mr. Hewitt states: "The area can be described in one phrase—potentially mineral rich." Dr. Hewitt goes on to list potash, salt, gas, uranium, vanadium, copper, and clays as existing in quantities important enough to warrant further search by those willing to invest their capital in mineral exploration.

I'd like to digress there again. There were statements made this morning about the definite limits to these natural resources and the fact that as we mine them we are depleting them and removing them forever; but the statements this morning were put in such a way as to indicate that the life of these resources was going to be very limited, and I think that this is not the case. The life of presently known and measured resources may be limited, but we feel, those of us in the exploration business, that there are other deposits to be discovered to replace those which have been mined.

Prior to 1950, there was no mineral or petroleum production from this region. Today we have the Aneth oilfield, the Lisbon field, and the Big Flat field, Texas Gulf Sulphur's $30 million investment in a potash mine. And certainly they cannot consider their resources limited to make an investment such as that.

Further search will very likely disclose additional valuable mineral resources within the presently proposed park area.

I'm going to skip a part here that has to do with the length of time that it takes to bring about the discovery of a deposit, a mineral deposit of any kind.

We have proof that the Canyonlands area contains valuable minerals, and we feel that it would be wrong to limit the use of such resources, when they can actually be detected, and explored, and developed with relatively little disruption of the appearance of the area, and with no destruction of its specific scenic wonders.

Senator Moss. Isn't that exactly what we were trying to do in the language of the bill? Permit them to be explored and developed with relatively little disruption of the appearance of the area and with no destruction of the specific scenic wonders?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes. I think this is exactly what you're trying to do, and what we would like to see done. I just think that it cannot be done if the land is classified as a national park.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, the witness' position is that Congress is powerless to do this very desirable thing?

Mr. GILBERT. Well, if you can put wording in this thing which you feel will guarantee this right, fine, but I doubt that you can.

Senator Moss. Well, if you make it a part of the Federal law, what stronger way can you do?

Mr. GILBERT. Well, I think that as long as the final decision is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, that Congress does not have the control of it.

Senator Moss. He has only a limited discretion. He can have a general regulation to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreational values. That's his standard.

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Senator Moss. Now, if he doesn't meet that standard, he can either be removed executively, or he can be taken into court because he acted capriciously and arbitrarily in carrying out his function; and certainly the Congress is there all of the time, and there can be further action taken, if you get a Secretary that doesn't obey the law.

Now, I think we have to start with a presumption that all of our officers, our administrative officers, will obey the law. We assume that the Governor will and that the county commissioners will and Federal officers will obey the law. If they don't, there are means of bringing them into line.

Mr. GILBERT. The only example that I know of specifically is one that was mentioned this morning about McKinley National Park, in which there is a provision to permit prospecting, exploration, and mining, I think very similar to the wording in this proposed bill. And then within the park regulations there are restrictions on the use of aircraft. They can be used, I think, in only two specific locations within the park.

Senator Moss. Can land only in certain places.

Mr. GILBERT. Yes. And in that country up there, this would greatly handicap exploration. Further, one of the general regulations in the park is that the roads will not be used by any commercial vehicles.

Senator Moss. Now, that one I challenge, because I had to look that up back there, and there is no general regulation against their using of the roads. In some of the parks there are requirements that the commercial users make a contribution to the maintenance of the road, because when you have big ore trucks rolling over the road it costs more to maintain it, and they're required to make a contribution to the maintenance.

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Senator Moss. But actually they have not been barred from using them.

Mr. GILBERT. The reference I have here is 36 C.F.R. 1.27, under the heading of "General Regulations for all Parks," which says:

> The use of the Government roads in any park or monument by commercial trucks when such trucking is in no way connected with the operation of the park or monument is prohibited.

Senator Moss. That's in the general regulations. But in McKinley and in Big Bend, in Grand Canyon, all of these places, is where they're using the roads to transport ore through the park. I think in Organ Pipe Cactus they're doing that, too.

Mr. GILBERT. Are they doing this in McKinley?

Senator Moss. Yes, in McKinley.

Mr. GILBERT. Well, I was not aware of that.

Senator Moss. Well, I am aware, I think, of a letter from which you are reading and that was the occasion of my checking into it, and that's the word that I'm given by the Department.

Senator BIBLE. You may proceed.

Mr. GILBERT. It appears obvious that the size and features of the proposed Canyonlands area make the recreational uses of this area entirely compatible with mineral—here again, I'm saying what I've said above—mineral exploration and development and oil and gas operations under the existing Federal mining laws and leasing acts. The rights inherent in these mining laws and leasing acts should be clearly spelled out in any Canyonlands proposal, be it national park or recreation area, so that there will be no question that mineral entry and mineral development may take place within the proposed boundaries, and that such activities cannot be stopped, canceled, or terminated by decisions of the Secretary of Interior.

In closing, let me repeat that there is no need to deny a multiple purpose of this land. With adequate planning and understanding by and between all interested parties, this great area may be used judiciously for the enjoyment and betterment of all.

Thank you for your attention to these words and for allowing me to present this testimony.

Senator BIBLE. What you're saying is that you would be satisfied with the mining provisions as written into the Moss bill, if they would be strictly ahdered to and lived up to by the Secretary of the Interior you'd be satisfied?

Mr. GILBERT. That's right. That's the whole point of my concern.

Senator BIBLE. You have a feeling that he wouldn't follow what the Congress says he should follow?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. I have no further questions.

Senator BENNETT. May I have a comment?

Senator BIBLE. Surely.

Senator BENNETT. I'd like to pick up the idea that the chairman has just suggested. It seems to me in this discussion during your testimony that the question you are asking is, if it's the intent of the bill to preserve the mining rights, mineral rights, why isn't it plainly so stated in the bill in an unequivocal fashion, rather than leaving it to the discretion of the Secretary? Is that a fair statement of your position?

Mr. GILBERT. That puts it very well.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you.

Senator Moss. Well, the bill says in section 4(b):

Within the Canyonlands National Park the valid rights of locators, entrymen, and patentees under the mining laws of the United States, and of permittees and lessees under the mineral leasing laws, existing before this Act takes effect, shall be recognized.

And then section (a) says:

Within the Canyonlands National Park, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States—

and skipping on down—

shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws—

That's mandatory, it isn't permissive—

shall be subject, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals.

Now, there's the law laid down—

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area.

Now, that's where you come into the primary purpose of setting this up to be a national park if you're going to preserve all rights that now exist, permit continued exploration and production within the parks, so long as they do not impair the primary use of the park.

I would invite any more positive language that you might have to suggest. This is the thing we've worked over trying to make it as mandatory as we could, and still have this primary use as a park.

Now, of course, if you rub out all control, so that it cannot be managed as a park, then you might as well forget the whole thing and just leave it as it is now.

Mr. GILBERT. On this section 4(b), that takes us back to what was referred to this morning as "in-holdings," I think, existing lands or existing rights. And I think that these would be protected.

Senator Moss. Well, yes. In-holdings, in that it protects both patented mining claims or ones that are presently under the process of being taken to the patent because there is a right existing and mineral leases that exist are well protected. And this area I'm told is practically all under lease for oil and gas, and there are a number of claims that have been staked in there.

Senator BIBLE. Further questions? Thank you very much.

(A portion of the prepared statement not given by Mr. Gilbert follows:)

A further point to consider is this: Discovery and development of nonrenewable natural resources do not happen overnight. It takes years of planning, study, and research and expense to turn theory into reality. Such work has led to the development of new methods and tools for discovery of hidden deposits of minerals, gas, and oil. These new methods and tools, in turn, open up new areas for exploration, and we therefore are now able to explore regions which the geologist of a generation ago would have considered worthless. This explains our reason for feeling that any legislation which imposes limitations on mineral, oil, and gas exploration and development in the proposed Canyonlands Park area would be legislation which is unwise and not in the best interests of the State and Nation.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness is Melvin K. Dalton.
Mr. Dalton, we're happy to have you here with us.

STATEMENT OF MELVIN K. DALTON, RANCHER AND MINER, MONTICELLO, UTAH

Mr. DALTON. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I'm not used to speaking very much.

Senator BIBLE. You can just proceed in your own manner, sir. Glad to have you here.

Mr. DALTON. This is kind of like—I rode a little bit in a rodeo one time, and I was always scared to death until I got on the horse and he made his first jump. Then I was all right.

Senator BIBLE. You've made the first jump. You're all right, now.
Senator Moss. Sink your spurs in and go.

Mr. DALTON. I'll just read my statement.

I appreciate the chance to make a statement on this very important matter of Canyonlands National Park. I am a rancher and miner and have been a resident of San Juan County all my life except for time spent in the Armed Forces.

I can only express my own opinions and beliefs, and I am appearing in my own behalf. I have nothing to gain by the passage of the bill, and the only way I lose is that the county will have less tax base. We have already lost a good sized chunk of the county for an Indian reservation.

This is a busy time of the year for a rancher and I wish I had more time, because it is hard for me to express my thinking on paper.

Last month I wrote Senator Moss a letter voicing opposition to his Canyonlands National Park bill, a copy of which is attached. In addition to the matters stated in the letter, I still oppose the bill for the following reasons:

1. I do not believe it possible to have any true form of multiple use in a national park. Even though permitted in the bill, the regulations, redtape, and conservationists would prevent it. I think we should develop and have as many uses as possible out of our public lands. Multiple use in the rugged Canyonlands will not spoil the scenic attractions. After all, an oil company only drills about a 12-inch small hole in the ground, and if they don't find oil the location is abandoned, and after a year or two it's hard to tell where the hole was drilled. If they do find oil, I think a producing well is more valuable than scenery.

2. The area has been grazed in the past and has not been spoiled or ruined, and under the bill you can continue to graze for 25 years. If grazing did not spoil it in the past and will not spoil it for the next 25 years, why not have grazing from now on? Grazing is a renewable resource.

3. Hunting should be permitted as in all public lands, and persons should not have to be specially deputized to hunt there.

Now, I would like to state my views on how it should be handled. The area is beyond scenic description and should be open for all the public to see. There are three distinct scenic divisions and because of geographic locations will have to have three different approach roads. The rivers make it into three different parks. My idea is to have three small national parks and to leave the rest of the area open for multi-

ple use under a national recreation classification. By going this route, I think we will make better use of the resources granted to us.

Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Dalton. I have no questions, and the letter which you have attached will likewise be made a part of the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

MONTICELLO, UTAH, *March 19, 1962.*

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOSS: I'm not much of a letter writer and it's hard for an average person to put his feelings and thinking on paper, but I can sit still no longer and not voice opposition to your Canyonlands National Park bill.

I'm sure you have heard of the parable of the talents quoted in the Bible. Well, I'm going to compare the Canyonlands area to a beautiful girl. This girl has three talents. No. 1, she is very beautiful and wonderful to look at; No. 2, she is a very good singer; No. 3, she is a very good dancer.

Now, Canyonlands has more than three talents, but for comparison three is all I shall use. No. 1, it has beautiful scenery; No. 2, it has minerals, no telling how much; No. 3, it has grazing.

Now, this is what you are saying: We will take this beautiful girl that is most wonderful to look at, and we will seal her mouth so she can't sing, and we will bind her legs so she can't dance, and in this way we will maintain the beauty of this girl who is most wonderful to look at.

Now, singing will not detract from this girl's beauty, nor will orderly mineral explorations and development detract from the scenery of Canyonlands. The sun will still shine there, and outside of an atomic bomb, the rocks will still stand as nature carved them. There is not much man could do, even if he wanted to spoil the scenery in this rugged Canyonlands area.

Now, dancing will not detract from this girl's beauty, nor can I ever remember anyone saying that cattle grazing on the range made anything but a beautiful sight. I believe your bill will bury the talents of this area and I just cannot go along with it.

Now, I realize that in your bill as you amended it, you have recognized the value of minerals and have tried to say that there will be some multiple use. But you know and I know that the history of national parks does not stand for multiple use. Besides, you give the Secretary too much power to say what and why. Also, I can't see the idea of a selected few to do the hunting. Now I will add my small voice to the way it should be handled.

From your own description you stated that there are three distinct scenic divisions and because of geographic locations will have to have three different approach roads. Now, why not take the most extremely scenic areas in these three distinct scenic divisions and make small national parks out of them and leave the rest of the area open for multiple use under a national recreation classification.

I think it is appropriate to call it Canyonlands National Parks and Recreation Area. I think in the long run the people of Utah and the Nation as a whole will be better served by going this route than any other.

I will have to get someone to type this letter, because I doubt if you could read my writing and I sure want you to read it.

I want to thank you for the letters and documents that you have sent me. I take time to read them all, but you have to be really interested before you sit down and write a letter.

The organizations I belong to are opposed to your bill and are planning to file statements, but I am writing this letter as a private citizen concerned with the welfare of his country.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN K. DALTON.

P.S.—Would welcome a chance to testify at hearings.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness Robert Shriver.
Do you have a prepared statement, Mr. Shriver?
Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, sir.

Senator BENNETT. While this is being passed out, I hope the reporter got that comment about the relationship between a bucking horse and a person as a witness before the committee.

Senator BIBLE. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT S. SHRIVER, MINER

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am a resident of San Juan County, Utah, and engaged or endeavoring to be engaged these past 7 years in the mining industry of this county. At this hearing I represent myself, and therefore the opinions given represent no industry, committee, or organization.

However, I do feel that the opinion I will express in this statement is, to some extent or degree, that of the majority of the residents of San Juan County who are not testifying here today. This is supported by a recent press notice in which Representative M. Blaine Peterson stated to the effect that "90 percent of the people in southern Utah oppose the present legislation unless it is greatly amended."

In referring now directly to the bill S. 2387, I shall at times paraphrase it, and also the documentation I shall use. Primarily the documentation shall be a study entitled "An Economic Study of the Proposed Canyonlands National Park and Related Recreational Resources," which was prepared for the National Park Service by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research at the University of Utah, hereafter referred to as "the study."

Section 1 of the bill deals with the establishment of the park, its location, and its size. The vagueness of wording and lack of preparation of this bill can clearly be seen. Only landmarks are given for reference, and even they and directions are not given in detail or with any degree of clarity, except it "will be bounded on the north by Grand County."

Senator BIBLE. I think the committee print that we're working against is a metes and bounds description; so this criticism that you're making there I don't think applies to the subject which we have before us. This is a metes and bounds description.

Mr. SHRIVER. I have the one that Senator Moss' office gave me, which was dated February 7, 1962.

Senator BIBLE. Well, the one that we adopted this morning is the committee print bearing date of April 16, 1962, which has a very extensives metes and bounds description, and I think actually does describe by metes and bounds the area in the black here. In any event, I agree with you that an indefinite description should be corrected, and it should be a definite description, so we know exactly where we are.

Mr. SHRIVER. I believe we can clarify this when I go on to section 2.

Senator BIBLE. OK. Proceed.

Mr. SHRIVER. It states "that area in San Juan." No mention is given to Garfield and Wayne Counties. And this is this study here by the University of Utah. The study on pages 5 and 39 states "the largest portion of the park will be in San Juan County, smaller portions in Garfield and Wayne Counties."

The bill states "comprising altogether not more than three hundred thousand acres." The study on pages 5 and 39 states "consists of 332,000 acres."

Such vagueness, unpreparedness, and discrepancy is ample proof that this bill has not been given careful consideration or planning. If, for no other reason, this bill should be rejected on this account.

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Shriver, if the Chair will permit me to interrupt, the new committee prints specifically mention 332,000. So the study and the bill are now in approximate——

Senator BIBLE. Yes, and it's a metes and bounds description which I think is completely accurate and does show the total acreage in there. The criticism you make may have been true of the earlier bill.

Mr. SHRIVER. I noticed that this section 2 states—and I'll come to it here——

Senator BIBLE. All right. You go right ahead.

Mr. SHRIVER. In section 2 it tries to clarify section 1 and states that "the Secretary shall give a detailed description of the boundaries after enactment of this bill."

Senator MOSS. Mr. Chairman, this again is something we're not addressing ourselves to. This is the early bill that was introduced last year, in August.

Senator BIBLE. I think the criticism that you're making in this regard has, I will say to you, been corrected by the substitute of April 16, 1962, the committee print. So I think the description part of your criticism has been corrected. This is what I'm saying.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, Senator, how then could we have testified on this—the 16th was Monday, I believe. We didn't have much time to prepare for it.

Senator BIBLE. I understand. And the bills sometimes undergo changes as we go along. But I think on this point that your criticism about indefiniteness of description is not a sound criticism, but I think it has been corrected as it is now contained in this Committee Print No. 1 bearing date of April 16, 1962.

Senator MOSS. And they were submitted on March 29 when we had the hearings in Washington.

Senator BIBLE. I would indicate that they do run into this problem in the development of a bill of any kind. I don't think there's anybody alive that can draw a bill that comes out exactly the way it was first introduced. When we have problems, problems of size, the bill does evolve in different forms as it goes along.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, this statement of mine then was sound criticism up until March 29?

Senator BIBLE. I'm not saying it wasn't. I'm saying it might have been sound criticism up to the time we had a metes and bounds description.

Mr. SHRIVER. I'd also say that even though you do have to make amendments and changes and so forth, that this bill is very vague and should have had more preparation on it before it came out.

Senator BIBLE. You may proceed.

Mr. SHRIVER. Such procedure is not in accordance with proper legislative practices, nor proper government. I hope that no U.S. legislative body would enact any bill under such conditions. Such power certainly should not be put in the hands of any appointed official.

In section 3 the Secretary of Interior "is authorized to acquire and exchange lands." No mention is made as to when, on what date, this

exchange will take place. This pertains especially to, and is important to, the exchange of lands owned by the State of Utah.

Senator Moss. May I interrupt again. The present bill has a 30-day period. He's required to authorize the change within 30 days of the date of the bill, the enactment of the bill.

Mr. SHRIVER. Also there is no provision for lands to be set aside for the erection of a reclamation dam at the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers.

Section 4 deals with grazing privileges for a period of 25 years and renewal of such privileges during the holder's lifetime. Again the wording is indefinite, and too much power placed at the discretion of the Secretary. Also it should be realized that the study states on page 124 "that permits are held by 10 livestock operators for the grazing of 683 cattle, 6,436 sheep, and 18 horses." I suggest that instead of a "phasing out" of grazing privileges, that district headquarters, visitor centers, lodges, and so forth, be grouped together in an area and the necessary fencing and cattle guards be installed so that grazing might go on indefinitely.

Section 5 pertains to the exploration and disposal of mineral deposits. Lines 15 through 18, inclusive, which state "Secretary may prescribe general regulations for control as he deems necessary to preserve scenic value," is of special interest to me and every other person who is interested that multiple use will be assured. Such wording means, in essence, that all mineral development will proceed at the discretion of the Secretary and therefore might well be nonexistent at all. It certainly erases all impressions that this park would have multiple use in the manner which is desired; that is, joint utilization for the purpose of both its scenic and mineral values.

The study on pages 25 and 120 states "mineral development provision does depart from past national park policy," and "this report does not evaluate advisability of allowing mining activities nor the possibility of realistic exploration and development being permitted by regulations."

It should be understood by this committee that the park area has tremendous value as a potential producer of minerals, especially oil, gas, and potash, possibly uranium and other unknown minerals. On page 24 of the study it states "existence of possible mineral resources are significant." On page 133, "Geologists interviewed in preparation of this report have stated that oil and gas prospects within the park are good." On page 144, "there is possibility of other minerals present within the park that today might be thought valueless." On page 26, "A recent U.S. Geological Survey study indicates that potash probably exists within the park." On page 27, "uranium-bearing formations exist within the northern portion of the park." * * * "Thus the possibility of unknown deposits exist."

We must not give away such mineral potential without a written guarantee that it can be explored for and developed. This bill S. 2387 does not make this guarantee.

Section 6 pertains to the construction of roads and building sites. Since San Juan County is providing most of the land for this park and since its benefit from the tourism might be small in comparison to the total value of tourism created, it is desired that the main district headquarters be located at Squaw Flat or in vicinity of the "Needles" and that the administration offices be located in Monticello, Utah.

Section 7 pertains to the management of wildlife. Of primary importance is the deer population which on page 128 of the study states "fairly large numbers of mule deer along the river bottoms." "If park remains a game preserve so that hunting pressure forces the deer within the park, it will be difficult to regulate the size of the herd. The result, it is feared, would be a herd buildup."

Although this section of the bill is said to be a duplicate of the method used in the Grand Teton National Park and said to be very satisfactorily solving game management, I submit a copy of a letter from the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission which states that this method has not been successful.

Senator Moss. May I interrupt there? I think you refer to the letter I put in the hearings that we held in Washington that I received from Mr. Jiacoletti, the Wyoming fish and game commissioner. Is that correct?

Mr. SHRIVER. It's on the rear of this statement.

Senator BIBLE. Yes, that's on the end of this statement. I think that's been made a part of the record.

Senator Moss. Well, the thing I interrupted for is just the general statement that it had not been satisfactory—as I read the letter, Mr. Jiacoletti had two or three things that he would like to see improved, such as having other game rather than just elk controlled and having the whole area of the park hunted rather than part of the park, and he wanted to move the date up earlier, so they could find out the number of people that would hunt, and he wanted the regional director to act, other than Washington. But other than that, it seemed to me what they did up there was all right.

Mr. SHRIVER. I'll refer you, Senator, to the fourth paragraph, which states:

> The very recently displayed autocratic and high attitudes of the National Park Service are of concern to this commission and the State officials of Wyoming. In order to fully protect the sovereignty of the State in which any national park is to be located, we would recommend that, in the event of a lack of agreement or controversial recommendations regarding hunting within the park, the requests of the State fish and game department should receive priority consideration. We have found it necessary to hunt in Grand Teton National Park every year except two since the inception of Public Law 787. We feel that the effectiveness of this hunting has been limited due to the restricted area in which the law allows us to hunt.

Senator Moss. Well, doesn't that, translated, say that he wants to be able to hunt in the whole area of the park, and he wants the Wyoming Fish and Game Commission to decide, rather than to have the park people decide?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes.

Senator Moss. Well, if it's a national park, there's a little problem of jurisdiction.

Mr. SHRIVER. Still, it's within the State of Utah, and I think that the Utah State Fish and Game Commission should, as he says, have priority as to what is done.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you. I think you were down to, "In summary these facts should be listed."

Mr. SHRIVER. In summary these facts should be listed. The direct personal income in San Juan and Grand Counties in 1961 from tourism was $185,976. The direct personal income from the minerals

industry was $14.4 million, and from agriculture $2.6 million. Tourism would have to increase 7,700 percent to equal the mineral industries of 1958 or 1959. The Canyonlands Park tourism is estimated to increase only 623 percent in the period of 25 years.

Senator BENNETT. May I interrupt? Were those figures on tourism contained in the study?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, they were. I would have used them for documentation, but there are some computations there which I made, and——

Senator BENNETT. So this is a computation of your own, based on your figures in the study?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, that is correct.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you.

Mr. SHRIVER. Senator, that is correct through these figures from here on.

Aneth oil field grosses over $70 million per year, compared with $16.5 million gross estimated for the Canyonland Park in its best projected year, which is its 25th year of operation.

Aneth oilfield grosses over $70 million per year, compared with lion as compared with the estimated total park gross of $213.5 million in 25 years. Based on a gross of $16.6 million per year, which is the estimated gross in the 25th year, it will take the Canyonlands Park over 60 years to equal the Aneth gross.

Aneth field is expected to pay in royalties, taxes, and local incomes a total of $156.2 million. No figures are available to make a comparison what taxes and local incomes will be created by the park, but based on a total gross of $213.5 million in 25 years, it can be estimated not to be more than $30 million.

It also must be realized that at present the minerals industries pay 95 percent of all San Juan County taxes. Encouragement, assistance, and incentives must be given to the minerals industries to continue to operate in San Juan County. This can be done by means of a reasonable and stable taxation; road and water development; and by not locking up areas of potential mineral value.

San Juan County needs industries of a productive nature, industries which will create a diversified economic base, thereby creating increased population of diversified employment. The tourist industry falls in this category, but it should not be used or assumed to be the base for the economy of this county; preferably it should be used only as a "bonus" to the health and wealth of San Juan County.

We as a county or as a nation should not emphasize the need or desire of recreation over production. We as a country or a nation must not stifle the incentive of those who would be productive; we must encourage those who would risk a loss in hope of attaining a gain. They are the ones who have given the United States its greatness. The opposite might well be the seed of our destruction.

In conclusion, I am not in opposition to the creation of a park in the proposed area. I am opposed to bill S. 2387, since it does not guarantee, or even provide, a joint utilization of both the scenic and mineral value it possesses. It should be realized that as individuals we must pay for our own mistakes, but San Juan County will pay for the mistakes of its elected representatives.

This bill S. 2387 should be rejected on the grounds that it is not fully and completely prepared; does not guarantee true multiple use; that if it were amended to guarantee multiple use it would be unacceptable to the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior, and, therefore, to Congress. Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Shriver. I have no questions.

Senator Moss. I wanted to ask Mr. Shriver if he had read sections 4 (a) and (b) of the bill that is before the committee. Have you read those sections?

Mr. SHRIVER. Section 4?

Senator Moss. 4(a) and 4(b), which formerly were 5(a) and 5(b).

Mr. SHRIVER. This copy which I got from your office doesn't have (a) and (b).

Senator BIBLE. I think it has section 4.

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes.

Senator Moss. 5(a) and 5(b).

Senator BIBLE. The mining provision, in other words.

Mr. SHRIVER. 5(a). OK.

Senator Moss. And then you say in there that it does not guarantee or even provide a joint utilization of both the scenic and mineral values it possesses

Mr. SHRIVER. That's right.

Senator Moss. You mean you could read that section and say that—I can understand why you'd say it wouldn't guarantee, but you say it doesn't even provide for?

Mr. SHRIVER. Does not provide for the joint utilization. The provision for primary and secondary. Not joint.

Senator Moss. Oh, I see. Your criticism is they are not of equal status, the scenic and the mineral usage?

Mr. SHRIVER. Correct.

Senator Moss. But you must admit they're joint. If you have scenic value and permit the minerals to be worked in there, they're jointly used.

Mr. SHRIVER. The primary can outweigh the secondary use completely.

Senator Moss. The primary has to go first?

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, it could go completely.

Senator Moss. But the bill does provide for joint utilization, doesn't it?

Mr. SHRIVER. No.

Senator Moss. All right.

Senator BIBLE. Further questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Shriver.

(The letters referred to follow:)

STATE OF WYOMING, GAME AND FISH COMMISSION,
Cheyenne, March 5, 1962.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: I have received your letter dated February 22 in regard to your sponsorship of a bill to provide for the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in Utah. We have reviewed the amended copy of this bill (S. 2387) and appreciate very much the opportunity to comment on the proposals therein.

As you are well aware, very restricted hunting occurs in Grand Teton National Park under the provisions of Public Law 787. Our experience in this matter certainly dictates the advisability of making positive that all lands to be included in the proposed park area are subject to public hunting if and when the need arises. Public Law 787 provides for public hunting in only a portion of Grand Teton National Park, which hampers game management to such a degree that proper harvest is obtained only with considerable difficulty.

Another point of utmost importance is that all game animals should be included in the huntable species. Public Law 787 provides for the killing of elk only. Game managers the Nation over know that the removal of one big game species and the competition created by them opens the door for population boom in other species.

The very recently displayed autocratic and high-handed attitudes of the National Park Service are of concern to this Commission and the State officials of Wyoming. In order to fully protect the sovereignty of the State in which any national park is to be located, we would recommend that, in the event of a lack of agreement or controversial recommendations regarding hunting within the park, the requests of the State fish and game department should receive priority consideration. We have found it necessary to hunt in Grand Teton National Park every year except two since the inception of Public Law 787. We feel that the effectiveness of this hunting has been limited due to the restricted area in which the law allows us to hunt.

We would also suggest that every effort be made to explore the possibilities of other methods to be used in allowing this hunting rather than the deputizing of hunters as park rangers. The system whereby applicants for park hunting permits must be approved by the Governor and Secretary of Interior is most cumbersome. It appears to us that certification of these applicants could be more effectively attained by granting the director of the State game and fish department and the regional director of the National Park Service the authority to grant such certification. The 1961 list was comprised of 2,000 names, and no registrations can be accepted until agreements reached at local levels have Secretary of Interior sanction.

The system, as presently outlined, requires that the dates and lengths of seasons must be agreed to on the local level, but again the Secretary of Interior and Governor of the State must concur. This year our meeting with the National Park Service at Grand Teton will be held in mid-March. After agreements have been reached at this meeting, it is quite possible that it will be July before the Secretary of Interior takes positive action notifying us of his concurrence or lack of same on these recommendations. It is again felt that the authority to establish season dates and other pertinent regulations should be left with the director of the State game and fish department and the regional direcor of the National Park Service.

We feel that only by taking steps to assure that all the park area can be hunted, that all game animals be included in the huntable species, and that the State, as the responsible game and fish management agency, have the final say as to when and where the species will be hunted, can future national parks be established without receiving the criticism and scorn so recently heaped on Yellowstone National Park.

Again, we appreciate very much the opportunity to comment on your proposed bill; and we wish to extend to you our cooperation and offer of assistance at any time you have need for the same.

Yours very truly,

S. J. JIACOLETTI,
State Game and Fish Commissioner.

THE STATE OF UTAH,
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 28, 1962.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: Reference is made to your letter of March 15, in which you request the department's comments on the specific language contained in Senator Moss' amendment No. S. 2387. I am sorry I have been late in replying to your letter, but I have been out of the office for the past week.

We feel that the wording in section 7 of this amendment is cumbersome and circumvents our desires to manage the wildlife resources. We would like

similar wording to that which has been proposed by the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners.

As an example of the cumbersome wording, we do not know what constitutes a qualified and experienced hunter. Under the laws of the State of Utah, the only qualification necessary is that all first-time hunters, of a certain age class, must successfully pass a gun safety program. Other than this, we have no means of determining "qualified and experienced hunters."

We feel that this amendment does not insure the right of the State of Utah to manage their wildlife resources.

Yours very truly,

JOHN E. PHELPS,
Assistant Director.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness will be Jack Hawkins.

You may proceed, Mr. Hawkins.

STATEMENT OF JACK HAWKINS, RADIO STATION OWNER, AND REPRESENTING THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF CORTEZ, COLO.

Mr. HAWKINS. My name is Jack Hawkins. I live at Cortez, Colo. I own radio station KVFC in Cortez and also radio station KUTA, Blanding-Monticello, Utah. I'm also representing today the Cortez Chamber of Commerce.

These two radio stations that I have referred to give primary service to the Four Corners country and in many instances provide the only daytime radio service. Both stations depend strongly on local programing, and both of them concentrate on local and area news.

Radio station KVFC, established since 1955, has had correspondents in Bluff, Mexican Hat, Blanding, and Monticello, Utah.

I have personally visited much of the country that would be embraced in the Canyonlands National Park. By this I don't mean that I've gotten over the 330,000 acres, but I've looked at it from the air and gone over it personally. I've done a great deal of taped and live broadcasts from the area that is accessible. That includes the dedications of the hospital and the Navaho Tribal Park in Monument Valley; have covered a boat trip in the San Juan River; hunting and jeeping expeditions into the Needles country; to Dead Horse Point, Natural Bridges, the Goosenecks, and many other points that would be embraced in the proposed park.

I have had a keen interest in southeastern Utah, especially San Juan County, ever since first coming to the area in 1955. I know personally most of the business people in Mexican Hat, Bluff, Blanding and Monticello, and many in Moab. I saw firsthand the uranium growth at Moab in 1953, 1954, and 1955, along with the subsequent slump in 1957, 1958, and 1959, then the new resurgence of activity there through the Lisbon oilfield development, the potash exploration, and the new tourist interest.

I traveled in Monticello, Blanding, and Bluff before the advent of the Aneth oilfield in 1956. I saw this oilfield, which burst upon us unexpectedly, cause a surge of residential and business construction in 1957, 1958, and 1959. I saw many business houses like Parley Redd Mercantile, Pay Day Drug, Monticello Mercantile, and others in Blanding vastly enlarge their facilities to take care of an expected and predicted oil boom. I saw others, like Monticello's Western Mine Supply, Redd Motors, Monticello Mercantile, City Mercantile, and many others build increased facilities during the same period. I saw

Monticello and Blanding add wonderful new school facilities and a marvelously complete new San Juan County Hospital at Monticello. I saw true and sincere men put their investment dollars—and in many cases their borrowed dollars—into facilities to take care of the needs of an influx of people who came into San Juan County in connection with the oil and mining business.

Suddenly, and without warning, I saw the collapse of much of this activity commencing in 1959 and continuing to the present day. A world surplus of oil halted exploratory drilling, and a surplus of uranium and Government decree halted uranium exploration; and indeed, the industry does well to retain at least what I consider to be even a modest level of production.

Monticello, Blanding, and Bluff had prepared for a level of economy which suddenly disappeared. Real hardship has ensued as the population of Blanding sunk from an estimated 3,500 in mid-1958 to about 1,800 in 1960 and as Monticello fell from an estimated 2,800 to about 1,800 in 1960. To make matters worse, just as the oil and uranium development collapsed, the large Government-operated uranium mill at Monticello was abandoned by the Government. This mill is presently being dismantled.

In addition to the scenic and recreational potential of the Canyonlands National Park—which have been dwelt upon by people much more capable than myself—the park would serve as a great economic tonic for southeastern Utah and also for southwestern Colorado, where tourist business is and always has been a major annual "crop." In our opinion, the estimates of $10 million annual revenue are conservative in the extreme.

I haven't heard anybody else say that, but we really believe it.

Cortez, whose chamber of commerce I have twice served as president, is located only 10 miles from the entrance to Mesa Verde National Park, which last year attracted about 250,000 visitors. Our chamber of commerce and other agencies have figured that Mesa Verde visitors will average an expenditure of about $20 per day per person. This would mean that Mesa Verde National Park represents a cash "crop" to Cortez, Mancos, and Durango of at least $5 million per year.

I believe that all of your estimates about the Canyonlands Park are very conservative and that the $10 million annual figure may be reached as soon as passable access roads are completed. People want to go to this outdoor country. This would also be a winter park, as during most of the winter, Canyonlands would be readily accessible and temperatures are usually mild; that is, for people who like to get outdoors.

This Four Corners country of northeastern Arizona, southeastern Utah, and southwest Colorado is a great and colorful and scenic and potentially rich area. It has a great variety of natural resources, but they are primarily in an undeveloped state. Our abundance of spectacular scenery is probably excelled nowhere else on the globe. This scenery and "room to breathe in" should be made available to all the people of the United States.

In my opinion, the Canyonlands National Park would accomplish this as well as provide a stimulus needed desperately by a hardy, pioneering group of business people who are now hard pressed to keep their businesses alive.

Now, as a representative of the Cortez Chamber of Commerce, our group has gone on record (1) as favoring—and this is unconditionally—the Canyonlands National Park; (2) as extending any service that our office can gracefully render; and (3) as not participating in any division of opinion as to single use or multiple use of facilities, as we believe this is a topic of chief concern to our Utah neighbors and that it would ill behoove us to have any place in an item controversial in nature.

We of southwestern Colorado join in expressing our appreciation to you gentlemen of the U.S. Senate who have taken the time and interest to come to our colorful, but remote country and investigate this matter at firsthand.

I can summarize it real quickly. We are in favor of the Canyonlands National Park, period. Thank you very much.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Hawkins, and the statement that you have here from Mr. Tobola, general manager, will be incorporated.

Mr. HAWKINS. I'm putting it in there because it's roughly the same thing.

(The statement referred to follows:)

KUTA,
Blanding and Monticello, Utah.

Honorable Members of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee:

GENTLEMEN: As general manager of radio station KUTA—the only radio broadcasting station in San Juan County, Utah—I am vitally interested in the proposed Canyonlands National Park for southeastern Utah.

The establishment of the Canyonlands National Park would open up a vast area of scenery, such as cannot be seen anywhere else in the country and has heretofore been inaccessible, except by jeep, in many of these areas.

Besides giving the people of the Nation the opportunity to view this unusual and heretofore almost inaccessible proposed park area, the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park would also result in the improving of the economic standards of this area.

In taking trips in other parts of the country, I have always noted that where there is a tourist attraction, the communities in or near these areas all benefit from the results of the influx of the additional visitors into the area.

With the economic standards of San Juan County down, and the need for added revenue for the welfare of our county, I recommend that the Canyonlands National Park be established.

We who are in business in San Juan County can readily see the many advantages of the establishment of a national park in our area. While it probably would bring some new businesses into the area, it would also provide additional revenue to those businesses already established here, and would provide much-needed new revenue from an outside source, to maintain the businesses we already have in our area.

The establishment of Canyonlands National Park would be the equivalent of a new, substantial industry in the county and bring new revenue into our business establishments that heretofore have not had this opportunity. We need the Canyonlands National Park in southeastern Utah to show the Nation what we have in the way of unusual and different scenery; also to bolster our local economy, which has suffered considerably in recent years.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN J. TOBOLA,
General Manager, Radio Station KUTA.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness will be Congressman David King. Mr. Congressman, we'll be very happy to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID S. KING, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished Subcommittee on Public Lands. I'm very happy to appear here on behalf of the Moss bill as it has been amended and as it is now considered by this subcommittee.

I flew here from Washington. I had to drive here from Grand Junction this morning, because of the winds that would not allow us to land, as you gentlemen know. I was anxious to get here, however, lest my absence be construed as my unwillingness to make a statement or a commitment, and I certainly am willing and am anxious, and that's why I am here.

I appeared before this subcommittee on March 30 and at that time made a formal statement. For that reason I have no written statement at this time, but would like to discuss the matter for just a moment.

I have considered this matter for at least a year. I am one of the two sponsors of a corresponding bill in the House of Representatives. For about a year I deliberately refused to make extreme statements on this matter, because I realized that it was controversial. I realized that there were many facts that had not yet been brought to light. I wanted to avoid any possibility of getting out on a limb which later might prove to be unsound.

At this time I feel, gentlemen of the subcommittee, that the essential facts are before us. I feel that the time has come when we can in propriety make up our minds and move forward resolutely to pursue the course that you gentlemen decide best.

I have no hesitation in endorsing the Moss bill. I feel that it is reasonable. I feel that it does take care of the interests of those who might feel that they have conflicting interests in this matter.

I believe the provision covering the mining interests, the oil interests, the fish and game and wildlife people, and others, I think the provisions of the bill protecting these people are eminently reasonable; and I think the overall purpose of the bill being to give paramount emphasis to the scenic values of this area is consistent with the high scenic value of the area, and I think the Moss bill does offer a very fine and adequate answer to this problem.

Much has been said about the size of the park, the suggestion being made that the park is too big. I feel the park is not in any way too big. I think the park is just right to cover the area which needs to be included in a national park. I might say that my position at this time does have this much flexibility: If this subcommittee should find, after examining each acre or each section in the park, that there are some areas that definitely do not measure up to park standards, of course, they would not be included in the park. I might say, however, that I have personally seen about half of the area in the park, personal inspection. I've carefully looked at the maps and projections covering the other half of the park. I personally have found nothing in the park, nothing in the maps, nothing in my personal inspection that suggests that there is anything there that does not meet park standards. So I'm prepared to stand behind all of the area as it has now been included in the proposed bill.

I call attention to the fact that the proposed park is only six-tenths of 1 percent of the total area of the State, and if the acreage of this proposed park is added to the acreage of Zion and Bryce National Parks, our other two national parks in the State, that the total square mileage would still be only 750 square miles out of 84,990 square miles total area of the State, which would mean about nine-tenths of 1 percent. I don't see how by any yardstick one could conclude that this is too much acreage. I think this is very modest.

I might add also that this argument that we hear about protecting and preserving the conflicting interests, this argument has been gone through many times before with other parks—way back in 1872, when the granddaddy of all of the national parks, the Yellowstone in Wyoming, was under consideration. As I remember my history, it was the same story then. The Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone had been staked out by prospectors, and it was their dream to turn that area into a great mining camp. And the battle was waged then, and the debate waxed hot. Fortunately, those who were interested primarily in preserving this area for posterity and for all of the peoples of this country and the world—preserving the integrity of this area, its scenic beauty—fortunately their opinion prevailed. Wisdom and courage prevailed, and they held the line. And I am hoping that the line will be held here in the fashion as set forth under the Moss bill, which, as I said, I think is a very reasonable line to hold.

I'm wondering sometimes what would have happened if Yellowstone National Park had been chopped up into 6 or 8 or 10 small, irregular, and unintegrated pieces. I'm wondering what we would have had. Well, it certainly would not be what we have now. I'm wondering if it would in any way measure up or could be called a national park. I'm wondering what would have happened when the Grand Canyon National Park was being considered. Suppose that had been chopped up into four or five pieces or perhaps one small piece with buffer zones. I'm wondering if that could have measured up to what we now have.

I think the answer is self-evident. I think the people of this country and the people of Arizona in the case of Grand Canyon and the people of Wyoming in the case of Yellowstone join in complete satisfaction with the way the problem was handled through maintaining the integrity of these park areas; and I feel that the people of the State of Utah will respond in the same way if the scenic area, the integrity of this area, is maintained in its purity.

It was suggested by one of the witnesses here today that in the proposed Canyonlands National Park area there are miles and miles of scenery that is essentially the same, it's duplicative, and that some of that could be eliminated. That, I have not seen. In fact, one of the miracles of this area is the fact that it is so versatile, that contained within a relatively small and compact area you have such a wide variety, such tremendous diversity, and, as I pointed out in a hearing about 3 weeks ago, no matter who you are and what you want—if you happen to like the long vista type of scenery of the Grand Canyon, or if you like to go down into the canyons or down to the bottom and thread your way along the narrow defiles, or if you like to go down the river and do some river running and boating, or if you're interested in archeology or paleontology, or interested in camping and interested in getting

away from it all, that park has everything. I think it has something to appeal to every person that could possibly find any interest in going to a national park.

So it seems to me, gentlemen, that the real issue is whether we are going to have a national park, or whether we're going to have a national park.

The Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior have made it very clear that the park that they will recommend is a park that follows pretty much the pattern of other parks, the pattern that has already been worked out; namely, a unit that has maintained its territorial integrity as a unity, so that it can be administered as a national park, and not as small pieces and fragments. It is this type of park that they are prepared to endorse. It is this type of park that I now endorse. And these very favorable figures that have been discussed at this hearing that are brought out in the Harline, as well as Governor Clyde's report, that show the tremendous income that could be anticipated through the development of this park, it's my feeling, gentlemen, that this would be true only if you maintain one single unit as a park. I don't think that these very fine and encouraging results would come if we had little scraps and fragments. I think we have to have a large and impressive park, a park that can take its place proudly in the great sisterhood of national parks that we have in this Nation. We maintain them proudly. We have built up a wonderful park tradition, and I think that the Canyonlands National Park is one that can in every way measure up to the high standards of the other parks, and by all means I think that this bill should be enacted.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Congressman. That certainly was a very fine statement. It's in line very much with the statement that you made in Washington, D.C., just a few short weeks ago.

Senator BENNETT. May I ask a question?

Senator BIBLE. Certainly.

Senator BENNETT. He's the author of H.R. 8573, which I assume was the same as the original Moss bill?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Senator BENNETT. You intend to introduce an amendment to replace H.R. 8573 with a new bill which contains the versions of the present Moss bill?

Mr. KING. I do, yes.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you.

Mr. KING. I deferred doing it specifically because I wanted to wait until all of the facts were in, so I wouldn't have to amend my bill and then amend it again and then amend it again. I thought I would wait until the facts were in.

Senator BENNETT. You realize that this was amended within the week? Are you conscious of the fact that there is another Moss version less than a week old?

Senator Moss. Well, that isn't quite correct, Senator. It was on March 29 that the amendment was put in.

Senator BENNETT. Yes. But it comes to us officially under the date of April 16.

Mr. KING. I was perfectly happy to let the Senate go ahead and work out the details, and then in the light of the facts as they were brought out, I would make my own amendment conform.

Senator BIBLE. And I would certainly say this is not at all unusual in the legislative process. We've had committee prints after committee prints after committee prints in all kinds of legislation. It's just an attempt to resolve a problem and come up with a fine end rule. I compliment you.

Mr. KING. May I say, I think it's very gratifying that thinking has been able to come into sharp focus as relatively quickly as it has in this case. There are many national park bills that have not fared anywhere nearly as well as this. Some of them have been gathering dust for years. The fact that this one is moving ahead so quickly with breathtaking quickness I think is a tribute to the fact that people are very much interested in it.

Senator BIBLE. We have found considerable interest since we've been in Utah, in the problem.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, because I served in the House of Representatives with Congressman King, I wanted to especially welcome his testimony before the committee as a former colleague of his.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Senator.

Senator METCALF. And I want to comment upon this business of the legislative process. There is no assurance that the bill that goes over from the House of Representatives is going to be the Moss bill. A couple of times today many of us have said that maybe the boundaries should be changed a little bit to include some of the other scenic wonders in this park; and this may be expanded or shrunk in different ways. And so whether you introduce another bill or not, the Interior Committee and the conference committee are going to be confronted perhaps with different legislation other than any that is before us; and this is the normal legislative process, to work out the details of this. And I've had some completely new ideas, both from my trip yesterday and from the testimony that has been presented today here; and I anticipate that before I leave Utah I will have learned a good deal more about the feeling of the State of Utah and the people of Utah on this legislation.

Mr. KING. I thank the Senator.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Congressman. I appreciate your testimony.

The next witness is Mr. Charles Redd.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES HARDY REDD

Mr. REDD. I'd like to point out to the committee that my name is not Charles Redd. It's Charles Hardy Redd. I don't want to be confused with my father. I'm a chip off the old block, but just a chip.

Senator BIBLE. Very fine. We have you properly identified as Charles Hardy Redd. You may proceed.

Mr. REDD. I come here today to oppose the proposed Moss bill for Canyonlands National Park.

I am not opposed to a national park in essence, but I am opposed to withdrawal of a large area from all of the uses except one. Now, we've had a lot of discussion here today about the multiple use and

whether it will be effective or not. All I can go by is the experience and the traditions of the National Park Service. Tradition, as brought out by many people, including a man from the National Park Service today, is that there shall be no multiple use in national parks. Experience in the Mount McKinley National Park has shown that the Secretary, if he so chooses, can make the regulations and the requirements so stringent upon miners or upon oil developers that it's economically impossible to explore or develop mineral resources.

Now, even our good friend, Secretary Udall, says, no matter how many of you interpret it or not, he said to the wildlife federation:

> I do not approve of multiple use in national parks.

And one of the problems I see with this bill—Senator Moss says that it's worded quite clearly; I don't think it is—and one of the problems we're going to have is that one of the Secretaries of Interior in the future is going to say, "That's the way I interpret it." It's kind of like the Bible. He can get anything out of it he wants to.

I hope that you'll forgive me when I'm quite blunt in saying that frankly we do not trust a lot of the gentlemen back in Washington, because of the things they've done to us in the past. One of the——

Senator METCALF. Maybe you'd like a change of administration.

Mr. REDD. We're working on it.

In the bill it says that "Mining of present rights." I would like to ask the committee to consider, does this "present" mean that no new mining or oil or grazing rights may be established in the park?

Here's the point. Here's a natural resource. There are probably natural resources under the ground there that ought to be harvested; and if we lock up this area and say that they can't be harvested, or at least there will be restrictions on their harvesting, it will be a natural resource that might not be harvested. The same is true of grazing. Now, I don't have any personal interest in the grazing in that area; but after all, some people do. Grazing admittedly is very small in that area, very few cattle. It's a rough-tough country as far as livestock is concerned. However, here again is a natural resource, a recurring natural resource. The only way that it can be profitably harvested—and some of us in the livestock business doubt that it can be profitably harvested—the only way that it can be profitably harvested is to have livestock, to graze it as range animals. If after 25 years you say, "We no longer want to harvest this resource," it's very foolish to take that position, or after, say, two or three generations are dead.

All of our natural resources in the country ought to be harvested. The point has been brought out that we're having a population explosion, and as far as I'm concerned, in the future we're going to need every productive area we can get to produce food and fiber for our people; and if we're going to support the rest of the world, as we're doing in part, we're going to certainly need all of that we have.

What would have happened back in 1950, or after the war, if the Lisbon area had been locked up and we had said, "No uranium production in that area"? Where would we have got our uranium for our atomic bombs? Now, we'd probably have got it somewhere else, certainly, but it would have cost us a lot more.

A couple of other points that I'd like to bring out that have been mentioned. As I understand it, in the national park there would be no hunting or control of predatory animals. Now, in this I do have a personal interest. If that area is not hunted for example, from coyotes, those coyotes can breed and live there and move onto the ranges that Redd Ranches operates, to kill their sheep and cattle. It is much like the analogy suggests itself of the Chinese Communist coming down across the Yalu River and bombing the Americans and hurrying back and not being able to be apprehended or captured.

Another point that is probably more important to Utahans than anything else is our water development. There is a proposal that sometime in the future there could be a dam built below the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers. The amendments, as I read them in this committee, prohibit—I hope I interpret it right—all of the commitments or all of the rights that the Reclamation Association has in this area are rescinded, and Utah, or the Government, will have no rights to develop any kind of water resources or power resources in that area. Again, I say that this is a natural resource that we ought to have a chance to use. Even if we did have a national park there and they said, "You can build a dam," we Utahans have had a bitter experience with the Echo Park Dam and with the great promises made by F.D.R. and the New Dealers. We haven't got the Echo Park Dam, and it's assured that we probably never will get it.

Another thing I'd like to point out, I think that the Secretary should be directed to convey like school lands to the State of Utah. As I understand it, in these amendments, it says he "may" do it.

Senator BENNETT. No.

Senator MOSS. No. He's required to make the offer.

Mr. REDD. Now, on page 11, line 5, it says: "in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property."

Senator BIBLE. Where were you reading from, again?

Mr. REDD. Page 11, line 4.

> Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the park, including State-owned school sections and riverbed lands, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction.

Senator BIBLE. I think maybe the next sentence might clarify that for you.

Mr. REDD. "Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value and shall be offered for transfer by the Secretary on or before." Well, that's the "shall" I wanted.

Senator BIBLE. Yes. I think that's probably in there designed to take care of the criticism that you are making.

Mr. REDD. OK. That's fine.

Here's what I would recommend. I'm not against, just against Senator Moss' park bill. I would recommend that a park be set aside where just those outstanding scenic areas be withdrawn and be under single use, the way that the National Park Service has historically done things.

Senator BIBLE. Would you put these areas together as contiguous, or separate them?

Mr. REDD. No, I wouldn't. There is another point. The fact that he argues they should be contiguous. But the point is that all the literature that I've read, including this pamphlet, this propaganda from the Interior Department, there will be no road between the Chesler Park area and the Standing Rock area.

Senator Moss. That's correct. I don't think it contemplates any bridge across the river.

Mr. REDD. So in reality, as far as getting from one area to the other, they're not contiguous. A person is going to have to drive to Monticello and back to Moab and back down to the Standing Rock area.

Senator Moss. Well, they're not contiguous for the purpose of driving from one to the other. They are contiguous for managing the whole area.

Senator BENNETT. How do you manage it without getting from one area to the other?

Senator Moss. You manage it by protecting it.

Mr. REDD. For example, Senator Bennett's proposal here, how would it be any harder to administer from the standpoint of the Park Service than if the whole area were contiguous?

Senator Moss. Well, you're talking about management of the area. If you confine it to there, for instance, and if there were not in the—the Chesler Park area—then you could have all the other uses around here, some of which may be destructive of this scenic area. And you may not want it for the purpose of driving from here to there, but you may want to keep intact the natural wonders that exist clear across this sweep and clear across this sweep [indicating].

Well, now, for example, what could hurt it might be a mine dump. It might be anything you can do on the public lands. I was going to say building of honkey-tonks. But you'd have to homestead it, I guess, to get some title before you could build a private dwelling. But anything that can be done without regulation outside of a park. You might even destroy some of the formations, the way the Goblet of Venus was picked up.

Mr. REDD. That was under National Monument auspices.

Senator Moss. I know. There isn't any absolute guarantee against vandalism, but the chances are infinitely better if it is in a park than when you'd simply have it open and available to anyone with no check.

Mr. REDD. If people cannot travel across there, there would be no reason to get out into that area. There would be no reason to really be concerned about controlling it. And actually, I don't think there's much grazing in that area now between those two. It's pretty rough country.

That about ends my testimony, such as it is. Any questions?

Senator BIBLE. Yes. Senator Metcalf.

Senator METCALF. You do not object to locking up a little bit?

Mr. REDD. No.

Senator METCALF. But your objection is to locking up the greater amount?

Mr. REDD. Well, now, I was just looking at the map. I don't know if it's shown on that map or not. By gosh, if you want, up there next to La Sal there's a Looking Glass Rock. Now, that's outstanding. We ought to stick that in there.

Senator Moss. Be careful, or they will.

Senator METCALF. That was the impression I had when I went over this area.

Mr. REDD. Now, if you want to get all this here, you're going to take all of San Juan County. As far as I'm concerned, your State of Montana is one of the most beautiful States in the United States, but how would you feel if I came up there and said we ought to withdraw all of this? Nobody would pay your wages.

Senator METCALF. We have much more national park in Montana than you have in Utah. I feel it would have been very, very unfortunate if we had just carved a little bit of national park out around that Hanging Wall and around Lake McDonald, and then over at Two Medicines and said, "The rest of this area is just lumber area and not fitted for national park," and allowed the people to go in and log off that other area that is very little different from down in Flathead County and many of the other counties. But tying it together and putting these noncontiguous but very beautiful areas in one big park is what made Glacier the significant park it is.

Mr. King said, What would have happened in Yellowstone—2,200,000 acres? But if we had carved out Inspiration Point, and Old Faithful Geyser Basin and Mammoth and said, "Well, the rest of these things will be open for development," we would have destroyed some of the most delightful things in Yellowstone National Park. And going on the same basis of tradition and precedence that you suggested, it seems to me if we're going to create a national park here, then we have to take in these areas that are significant and tie them together, so that the majesty of these overlooks can be protected.

Mr. REDD. Now, Cedar Breaks is over here pretty close. Do you want to include that in there? Do you want to go over there and get that?

Senator METCALF. I want to go over and get a little more. I suggested this morning that Elaterite Butte should probably be in the park, from what I saw of it, the Two-Gun Peaks, Six Shooter Peaks, and maybe some of the area across the Colorado up against the Hatch Point and Lockhart Basin, those seem to me to be significant overlooks and park area; but I'm willing to go along with a suggestion that we have a park of reasonable size. Secretary Udall, as you know, said when he came here that he thought a million acres was justified.

Mr. REDD. He wanted to take the whole State. We have to draw the line somewhere on the boundaries of this park.

Senator METCALF. That's right. And no matter where we draw them somebody will say, "Oh, I think we should put this in, I think we should put this in."

Mr. REDD. Let's just withdraw the outstanding scenic areas, hook them up with the roads. They can be managed just as well. And leave all this other area for potential and mineral development.

Senator BIBLE. You're very effective. Your dad must have trained you well. Senator Bennett has a question.

Senator BENNETT. Charlie, you've heard other witnesses today suggest that the headquarters of the park should be in the Squaw Springs area.

Mr. REDD. Yes.

Senator BENNETT. When we get up to Grand County tomorrow, we may hear different testimony. But let's suppose they're located there. How many miles would you have to drive to get around to the Land of Standing Rocks?

Mr. REDD. Quite a ways. A hundred miles.

Senator BENNETT. My estimate is it's over 200 miles.

Mr. REDD. I was thinking from La Sal.

Senator BENNETT. You get out of here and get onto the road, go all the way up to Green River, and then across toward Hanksville, and then come back. So by the very nature of the existence of the river, with its confluence, you do have a problem of communication, and many people will probably come in from the west and see the Land of Standing Rocks who will not come around this side, and vice versa.

Mr. REDD. Yes.

Senator BENNETT. So you do have three separate areas. Now, the question of selecting the areas of greatest scenic value in the three is something we're talking about, but nobody suggests that we've found a solution to the elimination of the three seperate areas; and if the park headquarters are going to be at Squaw Springs, then somebody has either got to get on the road for 200-odd miles to get around to the Land of Standing Rocks, or you have to put an airstrip over there and you have to jump over the river by air.

Senator Moss. Could I ask a question?

Senator BIBLE. Certainly.

Senator Moss. How far is it to drive from the south rim of Grand Canyon to the north rim in an automobile?

Mr. REDD. It's quite a ways. The problem is, here's a big canyon they put a big ring around. But we're talking about three or four areas that are separated by quite a distance and by quite a physical barrier, the river and rims and so on. And it doesn't seem to me that the argument it will be easier to administer if it's all together really holds water. If they can control the areas in there, it will be just as easy, if they are going to have two or three administration areas.

Senator Moss. On the basis that it would be a long drive from the south rim of Grand Canyon around to the north rim, Bright Angel Point, would you recommend then that Grand Canyon be broken into two parts, just the overlook on the south and the overlook on the north?

Mr. REDD. No, because people could go down there and destroy the scenic value in the middle, what people are looking at.

Senator Moss. Thank you.

Senator BENNETT. At this point that you could have separated those parks at the river, and during the early development of the north rim, there was great criticism of the Park Service that all the money was going on the south rim and that the real development was there, and it was years and years and years later before very much was done on the north rim, and this was because of the physical separation of the two sections.

Mr. REDD. One other thing I'd like to point out is the fact that in Utah 75 percent of the land is owned by the Federal or State government. It's not tax-producing. I think you in Nevada will have the same problem. And any more land that we withdraw from production, even though it is the little production that the livestock bring

on this, or mining may, increases our tax burden. In the State of Utah, we pay a third, one dollar out of every three, to keep you folks in business, and I'll tell you it's quite a burden.

Senator Moss. But this is all Federal or State land in here?

Mr. Redd. Yes, it is; but it does produce some tax——

Senator Bible. But very small? In complete honesty?

Mr. Redd. That's right.

Senator Bible. The record is clear. I think the record is very clear that there is very little tax-producing land.

Our next witness is Howard Rogers.

Senator Bennett. Mr. Chairman, at this point the next man on our list is Mr. Darrell Young. At this point I should offer for the record the statement that Mr. Young has prepared—which he was unable to deliver in person—just to keep your list straight.

Senator Bible. That will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Statement of Darrell P. Young

I want a small park which should encompass the Needles area and which should have its headquarters at Squaw Springs.

In support of this proposal the following items are submitted:

1. The rugged terrain eliminates the possibility of tying the Needles area to the northern areas, such as Dead Horse Point and the Utah State park area together except by massive and expensive construction of roads, which will be many years in coming.

2. The physical terrain lends itself to separate administrative problems even should a large one-piece park be established.

3. Tourists wanting to see the Needles area would not necessarily avoid traveling into Utah's other parks and into northern Utah if headquarters were established at Squaw Springs. However, on the other hand, if headquarters were established at a point north of the rivers, San Juan County would lose much tourist travel, since many tourists would not make the effort to go from that area back into the Needles area before going on their way. This, of course, is a two-way thing. Many would not go the other way if headquarters were at Squaw Springs.

4. Since the area of the proposed park is mostly all in the county of San Juan, that county should be given every consideration to direct the benefits of a park into the county and to its inhabitants since they are those who will suffer from tying up oil, gas, and mineral resources within the park area.

5. The inhabitants of San Juan County are entitled to the preservation of their rightful heritage, which is to enjoy the benefits of the development of their county's natural resources. Persons who reside elsewhere should receive secondary benefits.

6. The rugged desolateness of the area of the entire proposed park is such that a high erosion factor exists with all of it. The protective influence of the park administration will have little influence upon the elements which produced the area in the beginning. The natural face of the area is ever changing due to the action of wind, water and weather, heat and cold. The possibility that vegetative cover could be destroyed by fire is most remote. The actions of men and machines in the area would be infinitely small in comparison with nature. The area exists and will continue to exist regardless of any law or bill we may pass in its behalf. It is there for all to see who wish to make the effort. We should provide a park area within the Needles area with good access roads to it. The citizenry should then find the more remote areas more accessible. However, the depredations of man would still be infinitesimal in those areas if left in their present unprotected state. Yet their natural resources would still be available to supply enterprise in the mining and oil and gasfields and jobs for our citizens in those industries when developments occurred.

I thank the committee for the privilege granted me of making this statement. I desire to see the resource of our Nation preserved for the greatest use of the largest number of people possible. It is my honest judgment that this will

best be done by providing full possibility of development of all uses of the areas in question, both to the utilization of the recreational potential, as well as the industrial. These things can and do go hand in hand.

Senator BIBLE. And I would likewise like to introduce at this time a statement of Hugh Acton, director in charge of Blanding Sportsman's Club, Blanding, Utah. That will be made a part of the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HUGH ACTON, DIRECTOR IN CHARGE, BLANDING SPORTSMAN'S CLUB

My name is Hugh Acton. I represent the Blanding Sportsman's Club at this hearing. I am on the board of directors and was elected to present the views of the Blanding Sportsman's Club on the proposed Canyonlands National Park Senate bill, S. 2387.

The resolution of the Blanding Sportsman's Club was for small national park areas with recreational areas with multiple use. Our primary concern is hunting and the deer winter range in the southern part of the proposed park, mainly Beef Basin. At meetings in Blanding and Monticello where maps were shown, it shows that Gypsum Canyon was outside the proposed park boundaries. But in Senate bill, S. 2387, section 1, where it is describing the land boundaries, etc., it states on page 2, lines 8–11: "those lands lying southerly and easterly of the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers, downstream to Gypsum Canyon, easterly from such confluence to include Salt Creek Canyon." This would include a part of Beef Basin which it does not show on the maps concerning the park boundaries.

Since there is a difference between the wording in S. 2387 and the boundaries shown on the maps of the proposed park, the Blanding Sportsman's Club, for the record, opposes any part of the Beef Basin being included in the proposed park because of its hunting and winter range value.

In closing, we also go on record in support of changes and recommendations which the State of Utah Department of Fish and Game may make concerning the right of the State of Utah to manage their wildlife resources in connection with this bill, S. 2387.

(Mr. Acton subsequently submitted, for the hearing record, the following letter:)

STATE OF WYOMING,
GAME AND FISH COMMISSION,
Cheyenne, April 24, 1962.

MR. HUGH ACTON,
Member, Board of Directors,
Blanding Sportsman Club,
Blanding, Utah.

DEAR MR. ACTON: We have reviewed the amended copy of bill S. 2387 and appreciate very much the opportunity to comment on the proposals therein.

As you are well aware, very restricted hunting occurs in Grand Teton National Park under the provisions of Public Law 787. Our experience in this matter certainly dictates the advisability of making positive that all lands to be included in the proposed park area are subject to public hunting if and when the need arises. Public Law 787 provides for public hunting in only a portion of Grand Teton National Park which hampers game management to such a degree that proper harvest is obtained only with considerable difficulty.

Another point of utmost importance is that all game animals should be included in the huntable species. Public Law 787 provides for the killing of elk only. Game managers the Nation over know that the removal of one big game species and the competition created by them opens the door for population boom in other species.

The very recently displayed autocratic and highhanded attitude of the National Park Service are of concern to this commission and the State officials of Wyoming. In order to fully protect the sovereignty of the State in which any national park is to be located, we would recommend that, in the event of a lack of agreement or controversial recommendations regarding hunting within the park, the requests of the State fish and game department should receive priority consideration. We have found it necessary to hunt in Grand Teton

National Park every year except two since the inception of Public Law 787. We feel that the effectiveness of this hunting has been limited due to the restricted area in which the law allows us to hunt.

We would also suggest that every effort be made to explore the possibilities of other methods to be used in allowing this hunting rather than the deputizing of hunters as park rangers. The system whereby applicants for park hunting permits must be approved by the Governor and the Secretary of the Interior is most cumbersome. It appears to us that certification of these applicants could be more effectively attained by granting the director of the State game and fish department, and the regional director of the National Park Service the authority to grant such certification. The 1961 list was comprised of 2,000 names, and no registrations can be accepted until agreements reached at local levels, have Secretary of the Interior sanction.

The system as presently outlined requires that the dates and lengths of seasons must be agreed to on the local level, but again the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State must concur. This year our meeting with the National Park Service at Grand Teton will be held in mid-March. After agreements have been reached at this meeting, it is quite possible that it will be July before the Secretary of the Interior takes positive action, notifying us of his concurrence or lack of same on these recommendations. It is again felt that the authority to establish season dates and other pertinent regulations should be left with the director of the State game and fish department and the regional director of the National Park Service.

We feel that only by taking steps to assure that all the park area can be hunted, that all game animals be included in the huntable species, and that the State, as the responsible game and fish management agency, has the final say as to when and where the species will be hunted, can future national parks be established without receiving the criticism and scorn so recently heaped on Yellowstone National Park.

Trusting that the above information will enlighten you as to our feeling to the proposed bill, I am,

Very truly yours,

S. J. JIACOLETTI,
State Game and Fish Commissioner.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD ROGERS

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to say that some of these have been long, and I think mine will be quite short. I'm a motel operator here in Monticello. Regarding S. 2387, more commonly known as the Moss bill, I wish to state at this time that I support the Moss bill. The motel industry in this area has been on the decline for the past several years since the uranium exploration. The proposed park will help bolster the economy of the motels in the immediate area and also increase the tourist traffic in the entire State.

The proposed Canyonlands National Park is like a diamond in the crown jewels. It is the ultimate of San Juan County scenery. What other county in the State or Nation can boast of having three national monuments, two State park areas, and now a national park?

In closing, I feel it will keep tourists, meaning the park, it will keep tourists in our local area for at least 2 to 3 days longer and the tourist dollar in the State of Utah.

I might also add as a comment on this last statement, that one of our big problems in this area is the fact that people are in a great hurry to get to other areas and linger very shortly in Monticello and the county.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you for your statement, Mr. Rogers. No questions?

Our next witness will be Ben Hess.

OK, Mr. Hess, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN K. HESS, VICE CHAIRMAN, SAN JUAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. HESS. Gentlemen, I would like to touch on a resource that I think hasn't been touched on today that I think possibly can be very directly affected by the creation of Senator Moss' bill, Canyonlands Park. I'm here today as a member of the San Juan County Planning Commission, who in a previous meeting voted in favor of this. However, they did not write their own report. So this report is strictly my report.

Senator BIBLE. Very fine. It will be so considered.

Mr. HESS. In the past 10 years 249 people have graduated from Monticello High School. Of these, 35 are working in the area as farmers, miners, ranchers, or trades people. Of the 249 high school graduates, only 3 have been able to graduate from college and have returned to Monticello for full-time jobs in professions, and all 3 of these are employed in our school system. This represents a tremendous loss of resource.

During the same 10-year period, four farm machinery dealers have been forced to close their doors due to lack of business.

In 1959 a farm-conservation-needs survey was taken in this locality. This survey showed 109,900 acres of dry farm; 32,028 are under contract to the Government soil bank, a 30-percent decrease in use.

Forest Service records for 1952 show 6 sheep permit holders who grazed a total of 7,278 sheep. In 1961 permit holders decreased to 2 who grazed only 3,942 head. This shows a reduction of approximately 46 percent in the sheep industry and a 66-percent reduction in ownership. In 1952, the Forest Service had 93 cattle permit holders grazing 14,154 cattle. By 1961 this number had decreased to 83 permit holders grazing a total of 13,199 animals, a reduction of 7 percent in cattle and a 10-percent decrease in ownership.

During this 10-year period, Monticello boasted five attorneys practicing law in 1952. Today there are only two practicing.

In 1958 the Government-owned and operated uranium mill was shut down. Since that time there has been no permanent payroll here. The proposed park can far more than offset this loss by making available considerable employment opportunities for our young people. These youth now have to leave our area for employment purposes, which means a great depletion of San Juan's greatest resource, its young citizens.

In 1872 when Yellowstone was made a national park, there was no need to be concerned about fish, game, grazing, mining, or oil exploration. We had vast areas then, and it wasn't the problem then, and it wasn't the problem that it is today. Times change, however; and we should progress with the times. We realize the value of our national resources and wish to preserve them. The Canyonlands Park bill, as proposed by Senator Moss, covers this need very well, naming the secondary uses. It makes provision for the people of Utah to "have their cake and eat it too."

Recently Prof. Osmond Harline of the University of Utah released a business research report done in connection with the proposed Canyonlands Park. This report stated that $225 million would be spent during the first 20 years of this proposed park (a large part of this

money to be brought in by tourists). Assuming Professor Harline to be only 50 percent correct, or that it would bring in only half that amount, no area in the entire Intermountain West could afford to turn down such an opportunity.

I would like to say that I'm personally very much in favor of this park and give it my full blessing.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Mr. Hess.

Senator BENNETT. May I ask him a question?

Senator BIBLE. Yes.

Senator BENNETT. In your assumption—and I think it's a very interesting new approach—that you need this park to provide local jobs for your local people as they go out of high school and college, do you assume that these jobs can be provided by the park alone without any natural resource development in the area?

Mr. HESS. I think, Senator Bennett, that the thing is this. Today we have in front of us no money industry that can possibly create employment for the amount of students that we're losing. In the Aneth oilfield today, there are employed 15 pumpers for the entire Aneth field. I'm told that that's their field patrol. Not one of these is a native of long-term standing in San Juan County. Now, there's a great field. It has done a lot for the county in paying taxes, but what has it done to keep our great resource of our youth here?

Senator BENNETT. Well, now, what kind of jobs are you going to get as the result of the tourist business?

Mr. HESS. There are many jobs available in any park service. It takes quite a battery of them to operate a park, and it takes a lot of people to operate the concessions. It takes a lot of people to satisfy the needs of the tourists who travel through any given area when they travel in the amount anticipated by Mr. Harline. These young people can be employed in many various phases. We don't have the facilities here in the whole entire area that could possibly handle the flow of tourist traffic that could possibly come from this park. There have got to be many more things. We don't have them here, and we could keep the kids here in those capacities. Other small business.

Senator BENNETT. Most of them will be related to service stations, motels, restaurants?

Mr. HESS. Cleaning shops. There will be more people in our schools, more needs here in our school system, more professional services required.

Senator BENNETT. You talk about—is it 15 people running the Aneth oil field?

Mr. HESS. I'm told that, sir, that there are 15 men employed as field employees only, and they are pumpers.

Senator BENNETT. Have you any idea of the estimated number of employees that will be required to operate the potash plant just outside of your county on the edge of the park?

Mr. HESS. I understand it's a tremendous payroll, sir.

Senator BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. HESS. But the bill provides here that we can have that natural resource, we can mine here, and we can still have that employment.

Senator BENNETT. That's all.

Senator BIBLE. Any questions.

Senator MOSS. No.

Senator LONG. I'd like to make a brief comment. I come from a community, the new State, the Aloha State, where tourism has, during the past decade, and particularly, during the past 5 years, had tremendous growth. We've depended heretofore on three major fields for our income: sugar, pineapples, the Military Establishment there. Those are our three basic industries.

Now, we've had a tremendous upswing in tourism, and instead of Waikiki Beach being the little sandy beach that it used to be, now the oldtimers like myself are worried about the changes that have taken place. The beach now has a waterfront, a ski line. At this point I want to stress that this development has not taken away a single occupational opportunity in relation to the three major sources of income. It's velvet. It's a new source of income.

We had the same problem that Mr. Hess has stressed in relation to our young people. We couldn't keep them. Now, they are finding employment in more ways than I could enumerate here.

It doesn't get in the way of anything there, and it does give a tremendous impetus in relation to job opportunities.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Mr. Hess. Our next witness will be Mr. Howard Lathrop. Well, we'll continue on and come back.

Mayor Riley Hurst of Blanding.

Mr. Mayor, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF RILEY HURST, MAYOR OF BLANDING, UTAH

Mr. HURST. Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee, my name is William R. Hurst. I'm a native of San Juan County for 50 years. I am also the mayor of Blanding and am in business for myself in that city. I have been officially appointed by the City Council of Blanding to set forth their thinking regarding this bill that we are discussing here today and was also appointed by the chamber of commerce to testify in their behalf.

Regarding the city council, I think that my testimony can be classified as their unanimous opinion, as there was a formal resolution passed in our council meeting. I do not have a copy of it with me, however. As regarding the chamber of commerce, there were individuals in the meeting that didn't concur with the majority. My opinion will be the majority of the chamber's.

Senator BIBLE. How about the council's opinion? You say this is a unanimous opinion. What did they say about the park?

Mr. HURST. Will you allow me to read, and then I'll explain?

Senator BIBLE. You have the opinion in there?

Mr. HURST. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. Very well.

Mr. HURST. I'm very appreciative of the efforts of your august committee that you are putting into this movement; and especially would I like to thank Senator Moss and Senator Bennett for their untiring efforts to give this great scenic area the national park status it well deserves. I have viewed with considerable concern the recommendations of the extremists on both sides of this bill. I am sure that by reasoning together we can come up with a sound program that will give us the full benefit that the area in question can offer in grazing, mineral development, and preservation of the fabulous beauty of the region for ourselves and future generations.

I am a little concerned in the wording of the bill, in that it appears to place too much responsibility on the Secretary of the Interior. It is conceivable to me that under certain conditions pressure groups could wield an unwholesome influence, where it would be more difficult if authority were left in the hands of Congress.

If it is possible to have the park as it is presently outlined with multiple use, I would favor it. I question that possibility. If the author of the bill is sincere in the multiple-use context of it, why, then, was the boundary changed to exclude the location of a producing oil well that came in after the original bill was drafted? Will the boundary be exchanged to exclude each succeeding producer that may come in?

I would favor—and this is the point I would like to make, as the unanimous opinion of the city council—we would favor a series of small parks with adequate connecting roads, and see no reason why it would distract from the appeal of the area.

Now, it is my personal opinion. After visiting Yellowstone Park, I find that outside of a few of the outstanding points of interest, such as Old Faithful, you may drive all day over highways through beautiful country to get from one point of interest to another. I can see but little difference in the way it is and what it would be if these main points of interest were incorporated in a chain of smaller parks.

It has been argued that it would be difficult to administer and control several smaller parks. It has been stated that there were to be three roads into the park which would not be connected. Why would it be any more difficult to make it in two or three small parks than it would if the whole area was enclosed within one continuous boundary? I believe that the Grand Canyon Park has a similar problem with the North Rim on one side of the river and the South Rim headquarters on the other.

I would like to ask those who are in favor of the bill, how much will the establishment of this park increase the assessed valuation of the county? In the past 10 years I have seen a few mines and a few small oilfields bring the assessed valuation of San Juan County from less than $5 million to over $120 million. During that same period our sister counties of Garfield and Washington Counties who have had the parks, Bryce, Zion, and Cedar Breaks, have increased but a very few million dollars. I will admit that this valuation in our county is based on mineral depletion and is of a temporary nature.

I am in favor of the park as an attraction, to bring tourist dollars into the area after the minerals are depleted. I think we would be doing future generations an injustice if we were to lock up forever the mineral wealth there seems to be strong evidence exists in the proposed park area.

There has been objection raised that if exploration is allowed, it will ruin the natural beauty of the area. I take issue with this concept. I use as evidence the area around Mexican Hat, Utah, where there was an oil boom going on 50 years ago. If you were to visit that area, you would find it difficult, if not impossible, to find the locations of the exploration wells that were drilled at that time.

That would be the end where I'm quoting the opinions of others. This final statement is my personal opinion:

The area in question will be there for millions of years unchanged. I am for a park at this time if we can have multiple use. If we cannot get the bill passed with multiple use at this time, I would rather it be deferred until there has been time for more extensive testing for the recovery of the minerals that seem surely to underlie the proposed park.

I think that's the end of my testimony, but I would like to emphasize the fact that we do go on record as favoring the bill as has been recommended by the Governor and Senator Bennett.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mayor Hurst. I appreciate your viewpoint, and I think I understand what you're telling the committee.

Our next witness is John Zupko. Mr. Zupko.

Mr. Zupko, we're very happy to have you with us. You have a prepared statement, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN ZUPKO, ROOSEVELT, UTAH

Mr. ZUPKO. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I come from the northeastern part of the State, the Uintah Basin. Roosevelt is my address; and I am here as a private citizen. I am happy to have this opportunity to offer testimony at this hearing in support of the proposed Canyonlands National Park and to make a few personal observations because of my devout and abiding interest in the State of Utah as a whole.

Although I have not been as close to this program as many in our fair State, I have followed the pros and cons of Senator Frank E. Moss' bill and later his amendments. I must, without any political reason, agree with the Senator and Secretary of the Interior Udall, that the nature of the Canyonlands National Park must be expansive enough to include sufficient of the beauties and resources of the area proposed in the bill to lure the tourist to spend an extra day or two in Utah.

I have here from the American Automobile Association a statement that last year there were 4 million tourists that stayed in Utah an average of 2.2 days. Arizona had 16 million, and Nevada had 15.5 million tourists that stayed an average of 2.6 days each in these adjoining States. I think that Utah can increase her tourist trade, that there is a great potential there that is right close by that we can get a part of.

I feel quite sure that those fine political leaders and others who have offered rather definite objections to the size and what should be included and what should be deleted from the park, are sincere in their thinking. However, I have felt that they were permitting political feelings to take command of their better judgment and have allowed the proposal to become a political issue. In reading the paper and hearing news releases on the radio, I am lead to believe that Utah's senior Senator has wanted to involve Canyonlands in partisan politics. I have also wondered if this is not true with our esteemed Utah Governor.

At the present time when the rural areas of the entire State are suffering from the loss of people who have left the rural areas because of lack of work and other means to support their families, and who have gone to the industrial places to find work, this Canyonlands National Park would be a boon to the entire State of Utah. I can see

the tremendous advantage that extra tourist traffic will mean for us. While this immediate area may be getting a large slice of the tourist dollar, we who live in Duchesne County and other counties of the State will be getting a portion in an indirect way. We need more and better schools, roads, recreation, and so forth, in many parts of our State; and those extra dollars spent in Moab, Monticello, Blanding, and the surrounding areas will help us get these needed blessings.

I shall not go into the implications of policy and regulations as to use such as wildlife, mining, and oil exploration and production in detail.

I do feel that some control must be effected on all of these, and the Moss bill, S. 2387, and amendments handle these problems very nicely and also pave the way for other areas to adopt, which are already developed.

I am happy to offer these few thoughts at this time as testimony in this hearing; and I will abide by the final decisions of our Congress, the President, and his Cabinet, whom I'm sure are working for our best interests.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you, Mr. Zupko. I appreciate having your statement. I think that everyone is working toward a common objective of creating a Canyonlands National Park. I understand there are certain differences of opinion. We find this in many of these areas where we hear these park problems repeated. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Chapman, Corless Chapman.

Mr. Chapman, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF J. C. CHAPMAN, BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN JUAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am Corless Chapman, and I've been requested to come here for the school board of the San Juan School District. I appreciate very much this opportunity to testify before the subcommittee in behalf of the board of education of the San Juan School District, and I also appreciate the efforts of our people and of this delegation here who have shown the interest they have in this county.

Through the years up to 1954, San Juan County has been one of the poorest counties in the State of Utah. Our schools reflected this poverty in poor facilities, and our source of teacher personnel was limited to what was left after all the other districts of the State had made their selections.

This, of course, because of remoteness and of the tax base which we have.

Now, I've listed here our tax valuation as it increased from 1953 to 1961; and you see the impact which mining has had on our tax base. In all the years prior to 1958–59 school year, we were recipients of funds from the uniform school fund, and since that time, the year 1959, we in the county paid $1,164,137 into the school programs of the State. In 1960 it was $1,738,729, and in 1961, $2,122,277. So this gives you some idea of the impact that mining has had on not only us locally, but the State as a whole, and I think the State is recognizing the potential here and looking for ways to get more.

In order to maintain our schools at the present level, we must

maintain our tax base. For this reason we strongly urge consideration of a park of limited size, embracing only the truly scenic areas, with a large recreation area administered by the BLM, or some other agency that could adequately administer, allowing for the possible future development of minerals.

Of course, we've heard the argument today that we'll get multiple use under the Moss bill, and I'm sure that Senator Moss is acting in good faith in this regard; but everybody doesn't seem to agree about this, and as has been quoted, Representative M. Blaine Peterson, in a letter published in the Salt Lake Tribune, stated that the question of multiple use was doubtful that we could get it even though it went into the bill, that we probably wouldn't end up with effective multiple use.

I would like to mention that our school board is made up of the following persons: Lewis Lasky, who works at the mill down at Montezuma Creek and works at the installation there as a manager over personnel; and Bart Lyman is from Blanding. He has a truckline. Merrill Stevens is a farmer and works in construction from Blanding, and Mr. Summers is a cattleman, and myself, I'm an abstracter. So we have quite a difference of jobs and I think a representative indication of what our group feels; and we were unanimous in feeling that we want a park, but we want to preserve the potential for future development.

And I see no reason why we can't have a small park and still protect our scenic areas around. It seems that this is one of the problems we're faced with. Isn't there an agency that can adequately protect our scenic areas around a national park, so that we can have both of these things?

Senator BIBLE. This is one of the questions being posed to this committee, Mr. Chapman, and this is something that will become the duty of this committee to attempt to resolve.

Mr. CHAPMAN. We know and recognize that we have a beautiful area here, and we want to share it, but we don't want to sacrifice our birthright and the thing which has been locked up in this country for years.

Senator BIBLE. I don't think you'll sacrifice your birthright, no matter what happens. I think this will be completely safe, but I feel that this is an area where there are honest differences of opinion. I think everyone here is working for a common objective, attempting to work for a common objective, as you express in your very last sentence, what you think is best for their county, their State, and Nation. I want to assure you that our committee is simply here in your fair city of Monticello and in this great State of Utah just in an attempt to work out this problem, and we're going to try to do our best to do it.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I want to make one last appeal. I was told it was futile. I believe in democracy and our great system of government, and you men here are Democrats and Republicans, but before that you are Americans, and I see no reason why, as Americans, we can't sit down and resolve it as Americans and get something that is really best for all concerned. I leave that appeal with you that we do work together, that we get a program that will be best for us locally and for the State and for the Nation.

Senator BIBLE. That's just exactly what I said a couple of seconds ago.

Senator MOSS. I think he has described the legsilative process there.

Senator BIBLE. And this is the legislative process.

(The complete prepared statement of Mr. Chapman follows:)

STATEMENT OF J. C. CHAPMAN, MEMBER OF BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN JUAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

I appreciate this opportunity to testify before the subcommittee in behalf of the Board of Education of the San Juan School District, of which I am a member. I am acting pursuant to a resolution of the board of education passed unanimously, April 9, 1962, to the effect that "the board go on record as favoring a Canyonlands National Park, but that the area with potential mineral wealth be reserved for expolration and that Member J. C. Chapman be authorized to represent the board at the hearing in Monticello."

Through the years up to 1954, San Juan County has been one of the poorest counties in the State of Utah. Our schools reflected this poverty in poor facilities, and our source of teacher personnel was limited to what was left after all the other districts of the State had made their selections.

Since 1954 there has been a dramatic change in this situation. We now have buildings and facilities comparable to any school district in the State, and our teachers rank with the best.

This has all been brought about as a result of our increased tax base. The figures on this valuation are as follows:

	Total valuation	Mining		Total valuation	Mining		Total valuation	Mining
1953	$3,389,249	$127,685	1956	$8,353,360	----------	1959	$93,987,348	$78,000,000
1954	3,850,986	----------	1957	22,316,518	$14,100,302	1960	132,483,785	115,300,923
1955	6,269,553	2,053,316	1958	37,415,398	----------	1961	123,873,315	105,969,931

Mining figures do not include related industries.

You can readily see from the above how dependent we are on mining in this country.

In all years prior to 1958–59, our school system received support from the uniform school fund of the State. Payments to the school funds of the State of Utah, since that time, by San Juan County, are as follows:

[Figures approximate]

1959	$1,164,137
1960	1,738,729
1961	2,122,277

In order to maintain our schools at the present level, we must maintain our tax base. For this reason we strongly urge consideration of a park of limited size, embracing only the truly scenic areas, with a large recreation area administered by the BLM, allowing for possible future development of minerals.

It will be argued that we will get multiple use under the Moss bill, but we feel that there are very real dangers that this will either never be allowed in the park, or such stringent restrictions will be placed on developers, that it will never be effectively prospected and developed.

I would like to quote my friend Representative M. Blaine Peterson in a letter published in the Salt Lake Tribune of April 16, 1962, wherein he states concerning multiple use: "I am informed that any change of policy or extension of use will be bitterly contested in the House Interior Committee. I question the advisability of permitting the Canyonlands Park being made a battleground for this new concept * * *. The political heat generated could delay or even defeat the creation of our park if we are not careful."

Why our great concern for effective multiple use in the vast Canyonlands area? One of the best unexplored prospects in the State, for oil, gas, and other minerals, geologists tell us.

In conclusion, we want to do the best possible for our youth, and need not part, but all of our resources available to do this, we feel the small park and continued mineral development in a recreation area, the answer to our needs.

I would like to add that we feel some concern for the need of park headquarters being located on the south side of the rivers, so that we may enjoy some of the prosperity which the creation of a park will bring.

We would like to see the parties concerned with this legislation (including local representation) meet and work out a solution to our problem that would be beneficial to the county, State, and Nation.

Senator Moss. There was reference to Blaine Peterson's letter. May I submit for the record a letter that he wrote for publication, the one that was referred to?

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, the letter stated from Blaine Peterson, April 17, 1962, will be submitted in the record and incorporated and made a part of the record at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate, Washington.

DEAR TED: I regret my letter to Chairman Hazelton has been interpreted as being in opposition to you on the Canyonlands bill. Such was not my intent and it should not be so construed.

My analysis of the legislative problems involved were procedural in nature and not intended to indicate opposition of any kind. The decision as to whether I should testify at this point in the Senate sumcommittee hearings is merely a matter of which procedure would best insure that we have a park in southeast Utah.

As we both know, in the legislative process, it is the function of the Senate committee and of the House committee each to hear and study the testimony of all interested persons and to independently arrive at conclusions as to what form of legislation will be recommended to the Congress.

In my brief appearance before the Senate subcommittee on March 30 I stated, among other things: "I am vitally concerned with the creation of this park * * * and 100 percent behind the administration on what is sought to be accomplished here." In my letter to Chairman Hazelton I reaffirmed my stand by stating: "I am firmly committed to the proposition that we are entitled to and should have a national park in our area."

My decision not to appear before the Senate subcommittee in Monticello, Moab, or Salt Lake City at this time should not be construed as being in opposition to your bill nor as favoring any other concept of the park.

Sincerely,

M. BLAINE PETERSON,
Member of Congress.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness is Mr. Kenneth Summers. You have a prepared statement, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH S. SUMMERS, RANCHER AND DIRECTOR OF THE SAN JUAN LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. SUMMERS. I am Kenneth Summers. I am here representing the livestock industry of San Juan County, the sheep, and the cattle.

I am grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your coworkers, to come here and listen to our viewpoints in this matter. I would like to say first that perhaps there is no organization that has received more criticiscm when it comes to these matters than the great livestock industry, and I would like to say that the users of the public domain, of which I am one, and who are the livestock men of this area, are not opposed to the park, with some clarification.

Now, I am very familiar with the park and the area in San Juan County. I have lived in Utah all my life, and I have lived in San

Juan County for 33 years, and as a livestock man I have had an opportunity to cover much of that country. I am aware of the beauty of the Needles and those places. I think they're unsurpassed. The first time I visited Zions Park, I came back to this area with the feeling that we could pick up and throw it down in a little crack of our area. It's so insignificant compared to what we have.

Now Senator Moss, I would like to address this remark to you. I'm sure that you have sensed in this hearing today a sense of distrust in the privileges that are prescribed to the Secretary in governing these things. I am sure that if this bill which we are discussing here today was passed and was law, with the privileges in it that you men express freely here today, that our attitude would be somewhat changed in this thing; but it is only a bill. It hasn't passed. And consequently we must look at it from that angle, and I look at it from that angle. And it's the only angle that we have to judge it from.

Senator BIBLE. Might I ask a question at this point, Mr. Summers?

Mr. SUMMERS. Yes.

Senator BIBLE. If the bill that is before the committee for consideration is passed as it is before us today, would the provision concering the protection of the grazing rights be satisfactory to the San Juan Livestock Association?

Mr. SUMMERS. I think we could look on it very favorably if this thing was sewed up and tied. We would like one thing to——

Senator BIBLE. I'm going on that assumption, because all of us must recognize that in the legislative process—and this still has to go a subcommittee and to a full committee and to the floor of the Senate, and it could be changed—but on the assumption that that section concerning grazing remained unchanged, then I understand you to say that the San Juan Livestock Association——

Mr. SUMMERS. With some exceptions.

Senator BIBLE (continuing). Would be acceptable with some exceptions?

Mr. SUMMERS. Yes, with some exceptions. And that is that they not be extended just the lifetime of the people who were there, but they be extended for use as the BLM recognizes.

Senator BIBLE. This has been echoed by a number of the livestock people. You're saying the same thing. There shouldn't be a 25-year grant or lifetime grant, but it should be as long as the BLM people would grant you a privilege today under the Taylor Grazing Act?

Mr. SUMMERS. That's right. So with that thing I'd like to—looking at it as it is today, not in the future—I would recommend that the park be held to the more scenic attractions, those of park caliber, and that the buffer zones established would be under the BLM.

Now, Senator Metcalf, I would like to make a point right here that you made this morning, and I think it is worthy of some comment. When you said that no matter which way it was, the Secretary would have the say.

Senator METCALF. I hope you will elaborate on that.

Mr. SUMMERS. That is right in making that statement; isn't it?

Senator METCALF. I'm right in making that statement?

Mr. SUMMERS. Yes. We feel, Senator Metcalf, that the buffer zones should be under the direction of the BLM organization, for

these reasons: First, that by their very existence the BLM organization was set up to stabilize the livestock industry, and I think I'm right in making that statement, because that is in their rules and regulations; second, they have an advisory board made up of various organizations to help direct and to guide them in the things which govern them, and they are very kind and very considerate to consider us people who sit on these advisory boards and consider our ideas that we place forward. And so we feel under those conditions that we have an organization that is friendly toward us and that is sympathetic toward us and that is committed by the law to stabilize the industry which we represent. And we represent a big industry over the United States.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Summers will permit, I'd like to go into that just a little more.

Mr. SUMMERS. Yes, go ahead.

Senator METCALF. I should have asked the last witness this question, and I'm glad that you brought it up, because as I've been here today, I've been puzzled by the distrust of the Secretary of Interior that has been demonstrated when he is acting as Secretary of Interior through the National Park Service, but the confidence that's expressed in him when he's acting as Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management. Now, I mentioned this to Senator Bennett just a moment ago, and he said that he felt that perhaps it was because of past policies of the National Park Service, but the reason that the National Park Service has had past policies is because we in Congress from Yellowstone Park law have said that there shall not be any multiple use in the national parks.

Now, I'm sure that if Congress changes this—and other people haven't felt that way—I'm sure if Congress changes this, the Secretary of Interior will do just what the Bureau of Land Management has done for you, and they will carry out the will of Congress. Congress created the Bureau of Land Management. We passed the Taylor Grazing Act, just as we passed the National Park Acts, and we gave the same man the duties of carrying out the provisions of these various laws.

Now, I hope you'll comment. I think the thing you say is felt throughout this industry: through one organization you trust the Interior Department, through the other organization you distrust them.

Mr. SUMMERS. Now, I would like to make just one quote. You ask why we distrust them. I have here a quote from the Salt Lake Tribune from one of the commissioners here in the State parks, Harold P. Fabian, and he says: "It was important that such uses as mining, grazing, and hunting not be permitted to gain a foothold in the national parks."

I feel sorry for a man that makes a statement like that.

Senator Moss. He's a State man. He isn't connected with the Federal Government.

Senator BENNETT. He's a member of the Advisory Committee in the National Parks, so he was speaking as a member of the Advisory Committee.

Senator Moss. Whichever that you want to say.

Senator BENNETT. But he's not limited to a State assignment.

Senator METCALF. I think you've raised a very important point. The Secretary of the Interior and his various agencies have a duty to carry out the directives that are given to them by Congress, and Congress, if they pass it—I hope they do adopt this multiple-use concept in some areas—Congress gives them the directives, and I have every confidence that the Secretary of the Interior will be just as friendly to you in administering such multiple-use recreation areas as he has been to you through the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. SUMMERS. We hope so.

I'd like just to talk to one more point here, if you would like to follow. It's on the last paragraph on the first page here.

Senator BIBLE. And this entire statement will be incorporated into the record, of course.

Mr. SUMMERS. Yes. We have seen in this county a continual erosion of this multiple-use concept, which has had the effect of restricting further and further the maximum development of our area. Not long ago we witnessed the exchange of lands in this county with the Navajo Tribe for lands in the State of Arizona. We have seen the national monuments continually grow to the exclusion of multiple use. We have beheld the formation of recreation areas wherein all development is limited to that which meets the approval of the National Park Service.

I'd like to make just one comment on that, and then I would like to read the rest of it.

In the great withdrawal down here of the Glen Canyon Recreation Area, which is 2,800,000 acres, the Park Service administers that, part of it, and given to the Bureau of Land Management is the right to take care of the public grazing. If a stockman held a permit in that recreational area, he cannot even build a reservoir without he receives the approval of the Park Service. There is another case of why we trust the BLM and distrust the Park Service. I just wanted to make that point.

We anticipate continued pressure to exchange lands in this county with the Navajo Tribe for the proposed Rainbow Bridge Park to embrace about 300,000 acres. These withdrawals are not new to us, and experience has made us extremely wary. Where is this to stop? How much will we have left for the development of these various resources?

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much. Do we have any further questions?

(The complete prepared statement of Mr. Summers follows:)

STATEMENT OF KENNETH S. SUMMERS, RANCHER, AND A DIRECTOR OF THE SAN JUAN LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee at this hearing. I am a rancher and longtime resident of San Juan County, Utah. I am also a director of the San Juan Livestock Association, an organization composed of the sheep and cattle growers in this county, in whose behalf I am appearing.

On March 9, 1962, the association adopted the following resolution:

"We, the San Juan Livestock Association, go on record as being opposed to the Moss Canyonlands National Park bill No. S. 2387. We believe that there are outstanding scenic areas within the proposed park boundaries deserving of park status and that the park should be strictly limited to these areas. It should not include territory outside these outstanding scenic areas, which should be administered by the Bureau of Land Management."

It is the judgment of the members of the association that the Moss bill would include within the park more areas than is needed to encompass these outstanding scenic attractions.

Let me say by way of background, that until very recent times the economy of San Juan County was based solely on farming and livestock enterprises. Now our tourist industry is growing. The development of our oil, gas, and other mineral resources is now a large factor in our economy. The livestock business still continues to make a stable, substantial contribution to our growth. The livestockmen applaud the development of all these other resources, with the cautioning word that we should be careful that in the development of any one of these resources we do not hinder or prohibit the development of the others.

All the residents of San Juan County, like the inhabitants of other rural counties in the western public land States, because of the arid climate and features of the land, are absolutely dependent upon the public lands, which make up a great part of our county, for the maintenance of their very existence. Our livestock industry must have the right to graze these lands if it is to continue to exist. The development of the mineral resources of the county have largely taken place in the public lands. The scenic attractions on which our budding tourist industry is based are on public lands. Our hunting is done primarily on public lands.

If we are to continue to survive here, to provide education and job opportunities for our children, we must extract from all the public lands in our area the maximum development of all these resources. We simply cannot afford to set aside, in our county, large tracts of land for the purpose of developing one of these resources only, to the exclusion of all others. There is not enough land here to do that. Contrary to some misguided conceptions, these many uses, in and of themselves, are not hostile and detrimental to each other, but can work alongside each other.

We have seen, in this county, a continual erosion of this multiple use concept which has had the effect of restricting further and further the maximum development of our area. Not long ago we witnessed the exchange of lands in this country with the Navaho Tribe for lands in the State of Arizona. We have seen the national monuments continually grow, to the exclusion of multiple use. We have beheld the formation of recreation areas wherein all development is limited to that which meets the approval of the National Park Service. We anticipate continued pressure to exchange lands in this county with the Navajo Tribe for the proposed Rainbow Natural Bridge Park to embrace about 300,000 acres. These withdrawals are not new to us and experience has made us extremely wary. Where is this to stop? How much will we have left for the development of these various resources?

We see in the Moss bill another "setting aside" of a huge block of lands for one use only to the exclusion of all other development. In spite of the protests of its supporters that it does afford "multiple use," the following leads us to believe that the reference to multiple use is a sham and one of lip service only. We assign as reasons for this the following:

(1) Our own Congressman M. Blaine Peterson and Congressman Wayne Aspinall from Colorado have been forthright enough to advise us that any effective multiple use is so alien to the national park concept that it is doubtful if any bill affording real multiple use could ever pass the House of Representatives. The risk is ever present that in the legislative process, even the multiple use provisions of the Moss bill will be deleted. This risk we don't want to take.

(2) An even more serious objection is that if the Moss bill were adopted, as is,, there would be no effective multiple use, as is evidenced by the following:

(*a*) Section 5(a) of the Moss bill provides that oil, gas, and mineral exploration are subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem "necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area."

(*b*) The right to renew the grazing privileges as set forth in section 4 is limited for 25 years to others than the immediate family of the holder of the permit. In addition, the Secretary may limit and adjust the privileges granted to "preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury."

(*c*) To make a long story short, the Secretary may decide that an oil rig or a mining shaft or tunnel adversely affects the scenery, and thus prohibit it or hedge the park with so many restrictions that any development for oil, gas, or

minerals is impractical. He may decide that a grazing cow causes unnecessary injury and "limit" the grazing privileges even further.

(*d*) The committee appointed by the San Juan County commissioners has made a study of the attempts at multiple use in other national parks. Their conclusion was that the regulations would be so srict as to make any multiple use, not under valid existing rights at the time of formation of the parks impossible. The livestockmen agree with this conclusion.

(*e*) That this is not an idle fear is evidenced by the public pronouncements of the present Secretary and the National Park Service to the effect that they do not favor "multiple use" as is commonly understood in a national park.

(*f*) We not only have to concern ourselves with the attitude of the present Secretary, but all the Secretaries in the future. Any could terminate any multiple use. It is unwise to vest so much discretion in one man and leave such important matters subject to his whim.

(*g*) Senator Moss seems to recognize that effective multiple use is impractical in the park because he has now suggested the deletion of the producing oil well in the north end of the park from its boundaries. Why is this necessary if multiple use could be had in the park?

In conclusion, we have a park of sufficient size to attract the tourists and preserve the outstanding scenery without the inclusion of all the lands involved in the Moss bill. This should be done only after careful study and consultation with representative local people. The Moss bill includes too much acreage, and I hope a satisfactory substitute can be worked out.

Senator BIBLE. Our next witness will be Mr. Black, San Juan County commissioner. Mr. Black.

Mr. Black, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HYRUM T. BLACK, SAN JUAN COUNTY COMMISSIONER

Mr. BLACK. Senator Bible, distinguished members of the committee, it was not my intention to take any time here, and I'd like to point out the reason. Some time ago the commissioners named a committee, and we agreed up to a point one evening in a public meeting, at which point certain statements were made whereby we felt that we could back up the committee on the conclusions that they brought forth concerning Canyonlands Park. Since this hearing began this morning, I've had questions come to me from the point that the other commissioners testified and I did not, and I wanted to clear just one little point.

Senator BIBLE. Certainly. You may proceed.

Mr. BLACK. It certainly is not that I'm not interested. I've been very deeply interested. The two Senators from our State will recognize that fact from the correspondence that I've had with them, and also from my personal conversations with them down in the Needles area, and in this area.

I'd like to point out that there was a very definite action taken immediately after the Secretary's group was in here last summer. We asked the heads of organizations and representative people throughout the county to meet. We formed a committee, talked over the situation, and sent our approved statement to Representative Blaine Peterson, I'm sure our other people received that statement.

Our statement contained this idea: That if we could have the guarantee, or at least we put in the word that we insisted upon the multiple use principle, we would go along with the proposed area of around 300,000 acres. There was nothing very definite, but that was, I think, the way our statement read.

If not, we had some reservations about our feeling concerning that.

I should say that this is my opinion, again. I am serving in the second year of a 4-year term as county commissioner. I'm very anxious to see that the economy of San Juan County is lifted out of this deep dive that we're in at the present time. We come from a very low valuation up to a high of $132 million. In 1 year we've dropped down to $124 million, and it's estimated from the way things are going that perhaps we'll go down to $110 million, if not less, in this next year, in this year that we're in at the present time.

We want every resource developed that we can have in San Juan County, of course. I would hate to see our lands tied up in one concept and the other concepts left out, as I'm sure every citizen would and as I'm sure that this committee would. Therefore, I'd like to propose that we have all of them—and I hate to take the defeatist attitude that because the Park Service has been reluctant or has not had in their policy previously to have multiple use within the park jurisdiction, that we can never have it, just because perhaps there is cases pointed out where we do not have it, where it would be a fine thing to have.

We have different conditions facing us. Senator Metcalf made a comment this morning, and I just took down about two or three words: "recognizing changing situations," he said, and went on.

I believe that we've got to recognize that we have changing situations and that we have to meet those situations. I think this is where we can meet the situation. And I see no reason why we shouldn't strive for a multiple-use principle in this park, and we need all the resources, we need the park and what it will bring, we need to show it to America, to all of us, and we need along with that, the tourist dollar, and we need every other resource developed that we can develop in this county and in this State and Nation.

I appreciate the fact that Senator Moss has done exactly like we asked him to do in the report of this first committee. He has provided for it. If his provisions can be carried out, he has provided; and I see no reason why we should say we just cannot have it. Why can't we have it? Why can't we legislate and get it? That's what I'd like to know. I believe we can.

I'd like at this time to recognize publicly the fine efforts and go on record as being grateful as a commissioner and as our people, to Senator Bennett for fighting for the parkway proposition to be considered. We appreciate that. I'd dike to call your attention to the fact that for over 50 years we've had a national monument here in San Juan County—Natural Bridges National Monument—and as has been indicated here today, and I've watched this thing all my life, that we just can't get out there, people can't get out there. So I would dislike very much to see any of our area set apart and set there like the Natural Birdges National Monument. I'd like that understood. Just now we're arriving at a point where the Natural Bridges National Monument should have arrived at probably 20 or 30 years ago; and I'd very much dislike to see this thing lie here with no development, and I'm sure that won't be the case.

I think that we should develop every resource we have for the benefit of our people, and if we benefit San Juan County, we benefit our State and we benefit the Nation. Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much.

Senator BENNETT. May I make one brief comment, Mr. Chairman?

Senator BIBLE. Certainly.

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Black referred to the Natural Bridges National Monument. I saw it first in 1935. I saw it last fall, when we went up the edge of it over a pretty good road. And how was the second road developed? Because of the coming of the uranium industry. The uranium industry provided the roadway that now makes it possible for you to get to the edge of the Natural Bridges Monument and see two of the three bridges almost from the rim and without very much walking from the road. This indicates perhaps symbolically the partnership of these two developments; and as Mr. Black said, I'm hoping we can find a solution to this joint development.

I'd like to ask one final question. If this bill is offered and for some reason or another fails, and you're left with the choice of supporting a park with no multiple use, or no park, what do you think the people of San Juan County would rather have?

Mr. BLACK. I hate to answer that, for the reasons I've stated. I don't like to take that defeatist attitude. Neither do I like to see our Congressmen, our representatives, take a defeatist attitude. We are in a changing situation. Our population is growing by leaps and bounds. Our resources are what we make of them, and we need every resource development. We need the tourist, we need the park, we need the minerals, and we need every development that we can derive from these areas.

Senator BIBLE. I think we'll let that answer stand. I think that's satisfactory. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF ROSS A. (RUSTY) MUSSELMAN, CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE OF BLUFF AND MEXICAN HAT, UTAH

Mr. MUSSELMAN. Mr. Chairman, and committee members. I am Rusty Musselman. I think my father is testifying in Moab.

Senator BIBLE. I see where the Rusty comes from. You go right ahead.

Mr. MUSSELMAN. This report is by Rusty Musselman for the Bluff-Mexican Hat Chambers of Commerce.

I suppose I was chosen not only for my great interest in tourism and this Canyonlands National Park, but for my knowledge of the area, as my father and I took tourists into all of the San Juan County portions of the proposed park area many years before even the jeep roads existed.

I might add that this has all been by horseback. We took tourists in there some 30 years ago in groups of 20 and 30 people on 3- to 6-week pack trips, and we are quite well acquainted with the area involved.

We are in favor of the Canyonlands National Park and would like this park with no concessions. A national park should be as the national park law originally provided.

We're so much in favor and thrilled with not only the park, but the well-chosen name of it, that our chambers have called together all the chambers on this route from Highway 50, or the new Interstate 70 North, to 66, and formed an organization in naming this route the Canyonlands Highway.

We hope in the course we'll get a Federal designation in the future.

We feel the proposed 330,000 acres is too large; and realizing the economic development potential in portions of this proposed area, we suggest the size of the proposed national park be reduced with no concessions and the balance of the proposed area be made a recreational area with assured multiuse.

Contrary to the general belief that Vernal, Utah, had the first oil discovery in our State in 1937, oil was discovered at Mexican Hat in 1907, and, through 1913, 50 holes were drilled in the southern part of San Juan County.

A year ago our county built a road through a very scenic spot for the tourists called the Valley of the Gods. The Valley of the Gods was in the heart of this oil activity, and we are inviting all of this group on a tour of this scenic spot to see how many scars can be pointed out left by this oil activity of some 50 years ago.

This can be found in the Gregory Report of 1915–16.

We feel the wildlife and hunting issue is a small and confusing problem. The portions of the park where there would be some hunting are small compared to the larger portions of San Juan County where we have excellent hunting, and our State could easily afford to give this small deer herd to the park. However, if these portions were under a recreational area with multiuse, we have no problem.

Our chambers endorse the letter to Senators Moss and Bennett—that was a letter dated April 9, 1962—from our County Canyonlands Park Committee and sincerely believe that all of our Congressmen, regardless of politics, should get together and draw up a Canyonlands National Park bill that will better serve the people of the United States, the State of Utah, and San Juan County.

We wish to thank you gentlemen for giving us this opportunity to express our views on the Canyonlands National Park in San Juan County. Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Musselman. This will conclude our hearing this afternoon.

Senator Moss. Before we adjourn, Mr. Chairman, let me just say a word of appreciation for the way that the committee has been received down here. The sheriff and the highway patrol have been on hand whenever we needed to move about. The good people of this county came out in their jeeps and gave us a thrilling ride out in the Needles and provided lunch for the committee out there. We've been helped in every possible way; and I want the people here to know how much I personally appreciate it, and I'm sure all of my colleagues do. Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. This is certainly correct.

Senator METCALF. It surely is. The hospitality has been wonderful.

Senator BENNETT. May I close on this note of cooperation by saying that I, too, appreciate the way in which I have been included as a member of the committee and in which the whole committee has been received in San Juan County.

Senator BIBLE. This has been a very fine hearing today. This is democracy working at its best. This is a park bill which obviously has some problems in it, and this is an area where there are differences of opinion; but I think this is the democratic way of attempting to work toward some final enactment of legislation. I'm appreciative

of the attention that you people have given us today. I particularly want to pay tribute to all of the witnesses for their force and for their sincerity and their convictions in what they were saying. This is the type of thing that really makes America the great place that it is. It's been a privilege to be here, and I express, I'm sure, the sentiments of the balance of our subcommittee.

We will be in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. We will meet in the courthouse at Moab, and we'll look forward to hearing some other witnesses on the problem of the Canyonlands. I want to express my appreciation to each and every one of you. Thank you.

(Whereupon at 4:30 p.m., the subcommittee recessed to reconvene Saturday, April 21, 1962.)

PROPOSED CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK IN UTAH

SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 1962

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE COMMITTEE
ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Moab, Utah.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., in the Grand County Courthouse, Senator Lee Metcalf presiding.

Present: Senators Metcalf, Moss, and Long of Hawaii.

Also present: Senator Bennett of Utah, Benton J. Stong, professional staff member, and Allen Mitchem, minority counsel.

Senator METCALF. The hearing will be in order. The chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, Senator Bible, is unable to be here, and he's asked me to preside over the hearing for him today.

This is a continuation of a series of hearings that began in Washington on S. 2387, introduced by Senator Moss, and a bill to provide for the creation of Canyonlands National Park. Hearings have been held in Washington, and the first part of those hearings are available. We have a few of the copies, if some of the witnesses wish to refresh their recollection. The hearing today is on committee Print No. 1 of S. 2387, which is dated April 26, 1962, and which is the latest committee print before the committee.

Senator Moss. May I say just a word, Mr. Chairman? I just want to say a word of appreciation to the acting chairman today, Senator Metcalf of Montana, and to Senator Long of Hawaii, who is a member of the subcommittee, who traveled out here to hold hearings in Utah at this time on S. 2387, the Canyonlands bill. The Senators came out in time to make a trip over the area for a full day, day before yesterday, including helicopter flights and jeep rides over Elephant Hill and a jeep trip out to the Island in the Sky, Grandview Point, where some of the good people here from Moab and Grand County came out and furnished us transportation. They also participated all day yesterday in a hearing in Monticello, and Senator Bible was with us for all of that time. He left at 6 o'clock this morning by air going to Nevada, where he had a commitment today that he had to fill. But the thing particularly that I want to point out is that these Senators have given up their Easter weekend to come out and do this part of their job of holding these hearings, and I'm very appreciative that they would do that. There are all too few gaps in the legislative session where the congressional people can get away from their work for a day or two without gobbling up the Easter weekend, when we do have three or four days off usually back there; so I'm very grateful that they could come.

I'm also very pleased that Senator Bennett could arrange to come and sit on these hearings, sit with the committee, because he has a great interest in this problem, too, and he has been with us on the tour that we made and also on the hearings that we held yesterday in Monticello. This is a good turnout here this morning, an a Saturday morning, all these folks here because of the interest we have in the Canyonlands bill, and I wanted to express my gratitude right at the beginning, Mr. Chairman.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Senator Moss. In addition to Senator Moss, who is a member of the Senate Interior Committee, and also a member of the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the author of the bill upon which the hearing is held, we have Senator Long of Hawaii, and we have, as Senator has mentioned, the senior Senator from Utah, Senator Bennett. Senator Bennett testified on this bill in the hearings in Washington. In addition to the members of the subcommittee, we have with us members of the Senate Interior Committee staff, Mr. Stong, who will provide you with copies of the bills if you need them, or will assist in any way that he can; and we have Mr. Allen Mitchem of the minority staff, who is representing the Republicans here today.

All the Senators who are members of the committee present are Democratic Senators. Senator Dworshak, the senior Republican member of the minority, had anticipated being able to come, but he was unable to come at the last minute. We also are accompanied by representatives of the Department of Interior, Mr. Frank Harrison, who is Assistant to the Director of the National Park Service, and Mr. Henry Caulfield, who is Deputy Director of Resources Program Staff of the Department of Interior.

I think I've introduced all the members. Do you have anything to say, Senator Long?

Senator LONG. Thank you. I might later, but not now.

Senator METCALF. And Senator Bennett.

Senator BENNETT. I'm just happy to have the opportunity to come down here, and I appreciate being permitted to sit as though I were a member of the subcommittee, even though this is not my particular committee assignment.

Senator METCALF. We are delighted to have you here with us, and you feel free to participate in the questions and as an ex officio member, Senator Bennett.

We've had splendid hospitality while we've been here in Utah. We had a wonderful trip on the ground viewing the proposed area of the Canyonlands National Park. We had fine hospitality in Monticello, and an excellent hearing yesterday. We've had the same Utah hospitality here at Moab, and it gives me great pleasure to call as the first witness the mayor of Moab, Mr. Norman Boyd.

Mr. Boyd, you have a prepared statement. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. NORMAN G. BOYD, MAYOR OF MOAB, UTAH

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I must apologize for my cold this morning, my raspy voice. I don't apologize for my testimony, however.

Senator METCALF. We're looking forward to it.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman and honored gentlemen, it is with conferred honor I welcome our Washington dignitaries. The lawmakers of this Nation have traveled to the doorstep of the people. This hearing has been convened for the purpose of transacting public business. We are here concerning a matter which can easily reach into the home of every American.

As the mayor of this city I feel the weight of a double responsibility on my shoulders. The eyes of Washington and the attention of this Nation is being directed upon our people and upon our land.

A political football is not being tossed into southeastern Utah. The thing that concerns us is far greater than a political issue. The very fact that we are contributing to the possible foundation of a national law indicates the scope and magnitude of this venture.

Without a doubt, the community of Moab, Utah, is vitally affected by the advent of Senator Moss and the Canyonlands legislation. Do our people realize the impact that will accompany the creation of a Canyonlands National Park?

The purpose of this meeting and of other meetings has been to determine the consensus of local opinion.

I have heard the sentiment expressed, "Canyonlands will become a national refuge without regard to the feelings of those of us who live here." This is not true.

As the mayor of this community I have knowledge and I have the awareness necessary and the understanding required to contend on equal terms with what is involved in these proceedings. Moral rights, legal rights, and civil rights are herein involved, as well as the collective rights of the individual.

It is not without a feeling of deep responsibility that I weigh and evaluate the right of this country to set aside and preserve a national shrine.

The scenic beauty of our Utah homeland is but a portion of the circumstances of the case. We must consider the rights of others, consonant to the laws and just customs of this Nation. In whatever manner or degree, it is necessary for us to carefully examine facts closely related and pertaining to this issue.

We cannot overlook expenditures distributed by vacationing Americans. In 1960 over $2½ billion were disbursed by Americans traveling abroad. Within the United States during that year, 105 million Americans, in all seasons, budgeted $16 billion for vacation expenses. Ninety percent traveled by automobile. In 25 of the 50 States, recreation travel is regarded as one of the three most important sources of income. By surface comparison, Utah stands 11th largest in the United States.

From my personal experience, as a resident of southeastern Utah, I find it to be the candid opinion of vacationing travelers and businessmen that this portion of the Western United States is by far the most unique and unusual scenic area in the world.

Outstanding objections made plain and evident with the advent of the Moss bill have been the mistaken concepts which accompany the term "multiple use." The communications media have been somewhat at fault in contributing to the buildup of misunderstandings which now exists within the boundaries of two political camps.

The rights of others are not being denied here.

Measures have been taken beforehand to protect and secure mining rights, grazing rights, and petroleum drilling rights. Hunting and game management have been considered by way of preparation.

In actuality, the Everglades in Florida grant leave and liberty to oil and gas drilling. In every part of Death Valley we find prospecting and mining to be prevalent during the winter months. These rights also hold true within the boundaries of Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument in Arizona and in Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska.

Hunting provisions as stipulated in the Canyonlands proposal have been taken directly from legislation as granted for the Grand Teton National Park bill in the State of Wyoming. Last week the Senate approved the maintenance and protection of a dairy farm in the Point Reyes Park in California. Also passed by the Senate was a multiple-use provision permitting mining in the Great Basin Park of Nevada.

It is easy to perceive the objections brought forth and understand clearly that they have been grossly exaggerated. The rights of others in this matter have been rendered tangible and effective.

Within the midst of this assembly today we find men entrusted with legislative power. They are the lawmakers of our Nation, and, by means of careful inquiry, it is their purpose to search this matter with close observation and give direction to legislation pending in the Congress of the United States.

President Kennedy pointed out in one of his first messages to Congress the urgent need to preserve certain portions of our land for the health, the morale, the recreation, and the culture of the American people.

I believe it to be the obligation of the people of southeastern Utah to willingly preserve this national sanctuary for the benefit of the Nation. A national park is a national place established and maintained by this country for the pleasure and enjoyment of the people. Our State of Utah has been fashioned with a chisel held by the hand of God.

We live in a land of box canyons and standing rocks. Our landscape is one and the same. It is beautiful, and it is rugged. It is a place of mystery and intrigue. The last Indian fight in the United States was fought not far from here. The old cattle path southwest of this city leads to the abyss that is Robbers' Roost, and the land of Zane Grey. Two years ago a prospector discovered the hideout of cattle rustlers. On the limb of an old cedar tree he found a group of rusty branding irons. The branch of the tree had grown over and sealed the running irons to the limb.

The legend of the West is the foundation upon which we base our daily lives. The covered wagon trail and the laboring years of the lonely cowboy and the mark of the American Indian is a spirit varnished and encrusted on our canyon walls and mesa rims.

If the people of southeastern Utah are willing to fulfill this one obligation to the people of America, then we cannot keep our land locked apart and in a state of detachment.

I understand and appreciate the concern expressed by the mining geologists and the men of the oil industry. As seen through the eyes of the geologist, the land involved is, however, an envelopment of speculative potential. As seen through the eyes of the oilman the land under discussion is a point of speculation, enhanced by problems far greater than those to which the oil industry is normally accustomed.

As of late, in successive course, we find the eyes of the lawmakers of our Nation trained upon us. And through the eyes of these men, many of whom are present in this assemblage today, we find our homeland closely observed in the possibility that we set aside a portion of that land for national benefit.

I wish to emphasize once again, with particular and more forcible stress, the purpose of our being here concerns a matter which easily reaches into the home of every American.

Southeastern Utah is the symbolic heritage of the American public. It is a sandstone kingdom. The rocks, the canyons, and the palaces of stone are living symbols of the strength and power that is America, the beautiful.

In conclusion, and speaking as an individual, I urge the members of this committee to press forward and use every effort to create, sanction, and make real the Senator Moss bill as it now stands. I uphold the enactment of this legislation for this very reason: It considers the rights of the miner and the oil man, the rights of the ranch hand, and the right of the American people to enjoy the majestic splendor of this sandstone kingdom.

Someone has rightly said: "What we say here may soon be forgotten, but what we do will never be."

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mayor, for a very excellent statement, and I appreciate the report that you have suggested for this bill. I know that you've thought a great deal about it because of the position of responsibility that you hold in this community and the proximity of Moab to this area that we are considering. You certainly have been most kind to us while we are here. I don't have any questions.

Senator LONG. A very convincing statement, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BENNETT. Naturally, I am concerned about some of the things the mayor has said, but I realize we've got to move along, so I will have no questions.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for a very moving and eloquent statement. The next witness is Mr. Ed Claus of the Moab Chamber of Commerce.

A VOICE. Mr. Claus is in the process of getting enough copies, and also Mr. Musselman is tied up the same way.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Winford Bunce, county commissioner of Grand County.

Senator METCALF. It's good to see you here this morning, Mr. Bunce, after a very pleasant trip through the park, day before yesterday.

STATEMENT OF WINFORD BUNCE, CHAIRMAN, GRAND COUNTY COMMISSION

Mr. BUNCE. Mr. Chairman, Senator Moss, and ladies and gentlemen, some of the statements I am about to make here, or all of the statements, have been approved by the Board of Commissioners of Grand County. There's some reference in this statement to the Moss bill which I didn't understand had been reamended again until yesterday, so some of these sections may be out of order. If they are, we'll have to get them back in.

Senator METCALF. Well, go right ahead, and we'll work it out as we go along.

Mr. BUNCE. All right. It gives me great pleasure to appear before this distinguished subcommittee in support of a bill to create a Canyonlands National Park. It also makes me feel a great responsibility in the fact that I am making statements which are both in favor of the proposed bill and also some that do not entirely agree with the proposal. It may appear that as chairman of the Grand County Commission I am expressing the feeling of all the citizens of Grand County; however, I'm not so presumptuous as to presume that this is correct. I know there are widespread differences in opinion even among the people of Grand County, but I am sure that a great majority of them are in favor of creating a Canyonlands National Park. The main difference is the method used. I am also sure that a great number of them favor more or less the statements I am about to make.

I would like to start out by stating that I am sure that this area is very worthy of national park status. It is probably one of the outstanding areas in the world in scenic value. I would also like to state that tourism is one of the major industries of the area and that Canyonlands would certainly add to that figure.

I have no actual argument with the size of the area. I have been told by people traveling the area a great deal more than I have that there are certainly other areas that should be included in the proposed park and that some areas in the proposal in their judgment could be eliminated. I think a little more study could be made on the necessary area, adding and deleting where necessary. I am wholeheartedly in favor of Park Service control of the area. One of our largest problems today is the fact that we do not have the necessary control to keep unsightly roads, trails, and so forth, from being built anywhere and in all directions. I think this should be stopped.

My first exception, as you might call it, comes from section 4 of the Moss bill (S. 2387), as amended.

Senator METCALF. This is not the amendment that is now before the committee.

Mr. BUNCE. That's right.

Senator METCALF. We understand.

Mr. BUNCE. I will certainly agree that very few livestock graze in the area; in fact, they are so few that they are almost an oddity. I do not think the grazing of these few livestock does anything to detract from the area, and I do not think that any limit of time for grazing rights should be placed in the bill, but that as long as any grazing is needed in the area, it should be permitted. I'm sure that a lot of tourists, especially from the East, would be greatly interested in seeing a few cattle or sheep now and then. Livestock in this area may not be a major economic factor in either Grand or San Juan County, but they are a part of a basic industry that actually started the development of both counties, and to the people who own the rights they are still worth something and should be preserved.

Under section 5 of the bill, it respects all valid rights of locators, entrymen, and patentees under the mining laws; however, they must be existing before this act takes effect. This part I do not agree with. I think outside of certain areas in which there can be no claims filed,

there should be open staking of claims and prospecting for minerals. I am not necessarily worried about the claims that are already staked, but what might happen in the future. I do not know, and I'm sure no one else knows, what minerals are actually in the area today and what minerals may be discovered years and years from now. I think with Park Service control over the area, free staking and prospecting can be carried on in a good orderly manner and will not detract from the scenic values of the park. I believe that it is absolutely necessary that we have basic industry such as mining, livestock raising, development of oil and gas, and so forth, to support a basic sound tax structure. If you will check the statistics, you will find, with very few exceptions, that the counties that have made the growth in population and economic wealth in the past decade have been counties that have had a large growth in basic industry. I know that just people without industry on a tax structure do not support themselves. We have had a very fine example of that right here in Moab. During the uranium boom, the industry (uranium mines) mostly fell in San Juan County, but we got most of the people. San Juan County's valuation has had astronomical growth. Their tax levy has dropped, while in Grand County the tax levy has had to stay at a very high level to support the people. We are coming now into a better tax structure due to the development of the potash.

Do not get me wrong. We in Grand County want the people; we want the tourists, but we also want the industry to supply a good sound tax structure, so we can make the area more attractive for more people and more industry.

Section 7 deals with fishing and hunting. The only fishing in the area is on the Colorado and Green Rivers, with most of the hunting along the same rivers or not too distant from them. In the major portion of the park there is very little, if any, hunting. I think the State of Utah through its fish and game commission is very well qualified to control any fishing and hunting in the area and should be given the right to handle this problem. There may be areas, which could be agreed upon between the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Utah, which might be restricted from all hunting.

The bill makes no mention of boating, but I'm sure we have necessary laws in Utah to control the boating.

I think roads are the most necessary item within the park and also leading to the park. We have good access roads from the north and south, but it would be a good access to the area if the proposed "parkway" across southern Utah was built. This would tie all the major parks and monuments in southern Utah together.

The bill doesn't say anything about concessions within the park, but I understand there is proposed major concessions within the area. I do not agree that any major motels, stores, services, and so forth, should be allowed in the area. I'm fearful that if this is allowed, it will detract from the established businesses in the area and that business could fall off in Moab and Monticello, rather than make a growth from the creation of Canyonlands Park. I think we should have some camping facilities, snack stands, curio shop, and so forth, on a small scale only.

I would like to urge that Arches National Monument and Rainbow Bridge National Monument be made into national parks, thus putting them on the same advertising basis as Canyonlands National Park.

I'm fearful that if this isn't done, the big publicity on Canyonlands will detract from the scenic areas that we now have.

I respectfully submit the foregoing for your consideration. I feel and know that a good portion of the people in the area feel that this is a proper approach to the creation of Canyonlands National Park. I think it is time that the National Park Service begins to live with multiple use, as everyone else does in these times. I don't think it is going to be the big bad policy that is being circulated.

We all live in this great country, and I'm sure we can all live together and get along if we just try.

Again I would like to thank you for this opportunity to express my views on this matter.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Bunce. Questions?

Senator Moss. Thank you, Winford. You mentioned, of course, that you hadn't read Committee Print No. 1, which contains a few amendments that were made at the time of the Washington hearings.

Part of the legislative process, when a bill goes through the committee action, is that as we have some hearings there are some little adjustments that are made as we go along, and there have been adjustments at the time of this hearing. But as to that part of your statement where you indicated that you thought there ought to be continuing prospecting or production, I want to assure you that the bill does provide that. It doesn't protect only existing rights, but there may be continued—

> exploration and disposal, with the right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area.

So the thing the bill proposes to accomplish is to create a park, and that's the primary purpose here; but there may be other activities carried on within the park, provided only that they don't destroy it as a park, they don't degrade or destroy the park.

Mr. BUNCE. That's right.

Senator Moss. And as long as they can do that, they can go ahead with all these other explorations and productions in the mineral field.

Mr. BUNCE. I think that's fine. But the copy I had said they had to be in existence when this was created, which, in other words, if I had a claim and I dropped it, nobody else could go stake it. That's what I was objecting to. I don't think it should be dropped. I think it should be open for control, but I think the Park Service should control it. I think they will. I think it should be open for continuous use.

Senator Moss. I agree with you. So I think we're together on that point. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much for some interesting statements, and you've raised some points that we're going to have to meet in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Claus, representing the Moab Chamber of Commerce. We have your statement now, and you may proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF E. J. CLAUS, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MOAB, UTAH

Mr. CLAUS. Thank you. Well, I'm appearing at my own request, and not as spokesman of the Moab Chamber of Commerce. I am president of the Moab Chamber, a director of the Moab National Bank, a certified public accountant with clients in most fields of endeavor in the Moab area, and was charter secretary when a Rotary Club was established in 1957.

Pertaining to mining, mining brings in temporary residence for a few years, requiring schools, water, and sewer projects, and others. However, each time one of these municipal projects is proposed, the mining interests are frequently among the objectors, and correctly so, to the effect that they are temporary in the community. However, you cannot have that many people around for several years and not provide, for example, schools for their children or water to drink or for their lawns. Contrariwise, while tourism does bring dollars into a community, such dollars are not based on a wasting resource, and while subject to ups and downs between years, will not be completely deserted within a limited period. There are many deserted mining ghost towns and also oil and gas towns in the entire United States that testify to their impermanence.

I personally have great respect for two mining companies for what they have done for this part of the State. Both of these companies have shown a facility for exploration of materials not previously developed in an area. The original was Utex Exploration in uranium and the second, Delhi Taylor Oil Co. in potash. Both have exhibited interest in the Squaw Springs area, where I personally have seen their own or their associates' equipment, but during the last 2 years they appear to have changed their minds. It appears reasonable that either company with their finances, personnel, and previous records would not leave an area that they considered to have a great potential.

In addition, many of the uranium companies active here have either cut back in their operations or stated that their operations cannot be counted on to help sustain the economy of the area past 1966. It would appear that regardless of the potential in this part of the State, there is nothing in Canyonlands that interests them.

I believe that we should have a Canyonlands Park as proposed by Senator Moss in order to relieve the economy of this part of the State from being too dependent on mining and oil and gas. Both Price and Monticello have recently shown the effect of a decline in their principal economy.

I think that the proposed size of the park is necessary to make it useful as far as importance or recognition is concerned in the long run and adequate to insure that the land receives its maximum usefulness as a park. In the near future, Interstate 70 will pass some 30 miles to the north of the Canyonlands area, and the park should be of sufficient size that people in New York and other areas using the U.S. map can realize that a park exists and plan their trip accordingly. Too many of the small parks currently in Utah do not appear on the U.S. map, but only on a parks map or a map of Utah. The U.S. map

on pages 2 and 3 of the Rand McNally Road Atlas, copyright 1959, shows only the Zions National Park in place and refers by a square symbol and a number to nine other parks and monuments in Utah. The size of the proposed Canyonlands National Park would make it recognizable on any national map.

Senator METCALF. You left two paragraphs out. Do you wish to eliminate them?

Mr. CLAUS. No, I intend for them to be in.

Senator METCALF. Make them a part of the record?

Mr. CLAUS. But hunting had been referred to frequently enough.

Senator Moss. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point Mr. Claus raised on size, because that's one of the things we've been discussing back and forth and one on which there is a difference of opinion. I think maybe at this point we might refer to this map that was put up there that may not be intelligible to the people at the hearing here today, because of the varying lines; but the black line, the black outline there, represents the boundary of the Moss bill as it is now before the committee, and that's what we've been talking to as a park area, about 30 miles long and about 15 miles wide. Now, these other colors are different proposals at different times and were superimposed on there simply by comparison. The big blue outline all around is the first area that was talked about by the National Park Service, and that area would include this million acres that we've heard about off and on. The black line that comes in there, the one we're talking about now, is about 330,000 acres. Inside of that is a yellow line, which is the original Moss bill that stayed with the thread of the river, but now has been amended so that the park expands out onto the opposite bank of the river in an attempt to protect the gorge. That's the reason for going out to the opposite bank, rather than stay with the thread of the river. The green areas are roughly the areas that have been recommended by the committee that the Governor appointed recommending parks in three particular areas. And then Senator Bennett introduced a bill to create three parks, and those are in the pink or purple color there.

I didn't want all of those different colors to be confusing, and since we're talking of size right now, I think it should be fair to point in the connection with the testimony of Mr. Claus that the black outlined area is the area of the Moss bill.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Senator Bennett.

Senator BENNETT. I'd just like to make one comment. According to your testimony, you came to Moab 7 years ago?

Mr. CLAUS. April 1955.

Senator BENNETT. You came in with the mining boom?

Mr. CLAUS. I came in right on the end of it. I think 1954, the fall of 1954 would be the peak.

Senator BENNETT. You wouldn't have come into town if there had been no mining boom, probably?

Mr. CLAUS. That's right.

Senator BENNETT. But you still feel that mining is a dangerous thing and probably we'd be better off without it because it is so impermanent and it burdens your tax structure so much that you'd be much better off with tourists, and forget the mining?

Mr. CLAUS. No. I don't think the bill proposes to outlaw mining in this part of the State, and it also allows for usages in the bill. My contention is, though, that we're so extremely dependent on mining as a source of income, or the rest of living here for so many people, that it would be advantageous to the town if we could increase our basis of tourists. In other words, instead of being so much a one-industry town.

Senator BENNETT. But you don't want to let the impression stand that you believe mining is bad, it creates ghost towns?

Mr. CLAUS. No.

Senator BENNETT. And that the big companies that have made the economy of this community for the last little while are deserting it because they went down to Squaw Springs and didn't do what you thought they might have done?

Mr. CLAUS. No. My whole point is, we'll say, to keep Moab on a stable basis, and not to eliminate mining, but to try to keep us from being so dependent on it.

Senator BENNETT. You were never in Moab when it had the Arches Monument and no mining, were you?

Mr. CLAUS. No, I was not.

Senator BENNETT. That's all.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Claus, I think that you made a strong point, however. The State of Montana was founded and built on mining. The great copper industry in Montana is only equaled by that here in Utah and in Arizona, and as Senator Long pointed out yesterday, we have mining our second largest industry, but the growth of tourism as they come into the national parks, Yellowstone, and come up through the old mining country of Helena and Butte and into Glacier, has contributed another payroll and another large industry. I wouldn't want the Anaconda Co. to move out of Butte, and I wouldn't want any of the mining companies that are operating in smaller areas to move out, but this is a bonus that we get from Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks and our national monuments.

Mr. CLAUS. It's a little bit like so many of our corporations today—diversifying. That doesn't mean they're giving up what created the corporation in the first place.

Senator MOSS. You thought mining was fine; you hoped it went on?

Mr. CLAUS. I do.

Senator MOSS. But you'd like to supplement it with tourism, which would leave out the peaks that inevitably come in the mining field?

Mr. CLAUS. That is correct.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much. The next witness is Mr. Ross Musselman. Mr. Musselman.

It's good to see you here again after our trip and see you at the witness table, instead of upon the rocks.

Mr. MUSSELMAN. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. You may proceed, Mr. Musselman.

STATEMENT OF ROSS S. MUSSELMAN, RANCHER AND GUIDE

Mr. MUSSELMAN. Well, gentlemen, I have agreed to testify on behalf of the proposed Canyonlands National Park for several reasons, and perhaps I should state those reasons and the reason why I feel qualified to testify.

In the first place, numerous citizens have asked me to testify. They have been individual members of the chambers of commerce. They've been members of the various service organizations, and quite a number of people that I come in contact with on the street and other places. And the other reason, the second reason, perhaps is because for some 30 years I've been a local cattle rancher, operator of a guest ranch, and a guide for hunting parties, all of which of those things seem to be involved in connection with the establishment of a park. And then because in 1932 I guided what was supposed to have been the first outside group that was ever into this Needles area, which is the major portion of the Canyonlands National Park. And in subsequent years I've guided about a thousand people through. Now, those people have included the National Geographic expedition, archeological expeditions, writers, artists, and many of the ordinary garden variety of people such as myself; and I think that's another reason. And then because I've been a cattle rancher, a guest ranch operator, and a guide for hunting parties; and for the last 3 years I've operated the tourist information center here in town for the chamber of commerce, which brings me in contact, of course, with a great number of tourists and visitors to the area.

It's true, I haven't been connected with the mining industry, but I do have some uranium rock that I'd be glad to distribute among you gentlemen, if you'd like to have it.

With this experience and background, I certainly can not help but be in favor of the Canyonlands National Park.

Now, all the people that I have guided through there—and there have been many of them—I think, to a person, have asked the question: "Why isn't this made available to the public and to some more people?" And of course, there's been no answer to that question up until, shall we hope, the present time. I've come in contact with a great many people, in all connections, and I'm quite sure that the general public is interested in Canyonlands National Park.

Now, there have been many experts on the area. You see their articles in the newspaper and quotes in the newspaper and hear them talking on the street. Unfortunately, a lot of them, and I say the large majority of them, have never been there or have never seen the area. I can't imagine even the people who might most object to it, if they got into the area and really saw it, they would want others to share that privilege with them. And then, too, there has been some misinformation, I think, or half-truths. We've had prominent people from Salt Lake City down who have interviewed our various groups here and have held conferences and meetings, and according to newspaper reports, when they get back to Salt Lake City it seems to me that they give the impression that everybody down here agrees with them. Now, I'm not so sure that's correct. I think sometimes they've come down to tell us their opinion, rather than to get ours; and I'm glad this group is here getting our opinion, or giving us an opportunity to give our opinion, no matter what that opinion might be.

Apparently the fish and game commission have not been very strong in their objections to the area as a national park. There are a few deer along the Colorado River bottom, a few in the Needles area, mostly poor ones that got lost, and there are some in the southern end of the area. However, those in the southern end of the area mostly

winter there and are back on the higher country during hunting season, which ought to be a good thing from the fish and game standpoint.

Senator METCALF. The higher country is the country outside of the proposed park?

Mr. MUSSELMAN. That's right. Now, having been a cattle rancher, I'm appreciative of the fact that cattlemen and stockmen do not like to give up their area. Also, having operated a guest ranch for 30 years, I find that people from other areas, particularly the East, like to see cattle on the range. It's a part of the West. And they get out and take pictures of them and all that sort of thing. They like to see them, and I can't see of any real harm in it.

However, if my figures are correct, the grazing fees from that vast area last year amounted to less than $2,700, and I can't see how that could possibly compare with what a national park would bring into the area.

Now, reference also has been repeatedly made concerning the great amount of land that the Federal Government owns in the State of Utah. That's correct. However, the impression seems to be sometimes given that this new park is going to add more Federal land to the State of Utah, take more Federal land, and I think that ought to be corrected, because they're simply using what is already Federal land to better purpose.

And I would also like to call attention to the fact, and this perhaps is related to mining in a sort of a general way, San Juan County, I understand, takes in in taxes something like $5.5 million a year, which is, I believe, the second richest county from that angle in the State of Utah, and yet, the two largest towns in the county, Blanding and Monticello, are in very poor economic condition. So it doesn't always mean that mining would be helpful from an economic standpoint. In Moab it has been, of course. Very much so.

Now, my impression in talking to a great many mining people, and also geologists here, is that they're in favor of the park, many of them. In all my contact with people since this was first proposed, I've only found two people that are definitely against the park. The mining people would like to see multiple use. During the uranium rush here, which was comparable to the 1849 gold rush, I think the whole country was staked. They even staked the Arches National Monument, and they staked my private ranch. Everything was staked. But up to the present time there's been no major or very little mineral or anything of a mineral value located in this area; and I just talked to one of the leading geologists here yesterday, and he was hoping there would be a chance to ask questions here. I told him I didn't think there would be, but he said I could quote him as saying that after prospecting that very thoroughly—and he is a leading geologist—he's very doubtful there is anything there of very great value.

Now, I agree with others that the scenery there is tremendous, and I feel this: With the exploding population, and America on wheels, and the stress under which people are living, we're going to need more and more places for them to get away from all of that.

And as I understand it now, many of the national parks and monuments are overcrowded already, and we need more such places. Mining may go before very long, and other things of that nature. But

this is something for the future, not 20 years from now, maybe 50 years, 100 years from now. And I think we ought to reconsider that very thoroughly.

I want to say this: We are not against hunting and we are not against mining and we are not against grazing, the people that I'm theoretically representing. And the Navajo Indians, you know, have a rather interesting philosophy. They'll accept a medical doctor, but they won't give up the medicine man. They'll accept the various brands of religion, but they won't give up their own. They say: "One is good; two good is more good." And that's the way I feel about this. We're not against those things, but we do want the Canyonlands National Park, and we believe that another good will be more good.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Ross. [Applause.]

Senator MOSS. A very excellent statement, Ross; and coming from you, who knows the area probably better than any person in southeastern Utah, or any person alive, I think it's particularly effective; and you did an excellent job. I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. MUSSELMAN. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Senator Long.

Senator LONG. In addition to being very convincing, it was also entertaining.

Senator BENNETT. I'm interested in the turn of the testimony thus far which indicates that anybody who is opposed to the Moss version or the Moss proposal to create a park is against the park. Do you feel that anybody who is opposed to S. 2387 is necessarily against the park?

Mr. MUSSELMAN. As I have stated, I've only found two people that are definitely against the park. There are many of them who have certain reservations, but ——

Senator BENNETT. Well, don't these reservations represent differences of opinion, as to the best way to develop all the resources?

Mr. MUSSELMAN. I go along with that.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you. I have nothing else.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much. And I think that we can assure you that this committee has had lots of diversified testimony, and we're out here to learn, rather than to express our opinions.

Mr. MUSSELMAN. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. Lester Rogers. Mr. Rogers, also from the Moab Chamber of Commerce.

Pleased to have you here, Mr. Rogers. You may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF LESTER W. ROGERS, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MOAB, UTAH

Mr. ROGERS. I actually would like to represent my own viewpoint, more than either the chamber or anyone else's.

Senator METCALF. Very good.

Mr. ROGERS. I have been a resident of this county for most of 33 years, owner until recently, operator of businesses serving the public.

I would like to see a national park formed in the proposed Canyonlands area. A park would benefit the people of the United States, the State of Utah, and the surrounding counties by opening a new area

for recreation, by preservation of scenic beauty, and by creation of new business.

I would prefer to see the park formed encompassing as much area as is necessary to preserve its beauty, providing that the multiple-use concept, with some areas excluded, and subject to proper supervision and restrictions, can be incorporated in the proposal, preferably in perpetuity rather than for a limited time. I feel that nothing man made can overpower the beauty of most of the area, and in fact through contrast would enhance it.

If the Congress will not enact legislation incorporating the multiple-use concept, preferably in perpetuity, to fit the Canyonlands situation, I would prefer to see a smaller national park or park areas enclosed in a national recreation area. The main subjects I would like to see additional study given are:

1. The business that will be generated by a park.

2. The cost to the taxpayers of service facilities catering to park visitors, and Government competition with private enterprise.

1. (*a*) The creation of a park does not necessarily mean a business boom in the surrounding area. Several counties in Utah with or adjacent to national parks and monuments have had an increase in visitors but a decrease in population in recent years.

And I have attached a schedule for statistics, which I will not read.

Senator METCALF. But that will be incorporated in the record.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

(The schedule referred to follows:)

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES 1962 MANHATTAN, KANSAS

National park or monument	County	Visitor change 1952 to 1960, percent	County population change 1950 to 1960, percent	Comparison of percentage of property taxes paid in 1961 by—	
				Commercial and industrial property	State average
1. Capitol Reef	Wayne	+1,502	−21.6	36.8	54.8
2. Bryce Canyon	Garfield	+20	−13.8	32.4	54.8
3. Sevier County with 2 major highways leading to Bryce and Capitol Reef has had a population decline.			−12.5	36.4	54.8
4. Zion	Washington	+63	+4.4	32.9	54.8
5. Cedar Breaks	Iron	+92	+12.0	77.9	54.8
6. Dinosaur	Uintah	+939	+12.5	68.7	54.8
7. Bryce Canyon	Kane	+20	+16.0	46.9	54.8
8. San Juan County with many national monuments.	San Juan	+101–+3,043	+70.1	95.7	54.8
9. Arches National Monument	Grand	+146	+233.0	64.0	54.8

NOTE.—The gain of population in counties 5 through 9 can be traced directly to industrial activities. The decrease of population in counties 1 through 3 can likely be charged to an economy based mainly on agriculture. Therefore: A national park or monument though helpful does not insure stability or growth in surrounding areas.

Mr. ROGERS. (*b*) Many people and businesses in a considerable radius may be helped by the creation of a park, but not to the extent that might be realized if certain principles were followed. These are that service facilities for catering to visitors should not be constructed in the park, in competition with private ones that are, or could be made available outside the park boundaries.

(*c*) This would reduce the commercialization, mainly beneficial to a few, that is evident in many of our national parks today. It would

spread it over a wider segment of competitive private enterprises in areas less important in esthetic values.

(*d*) Where distances from park boundaries to major points of interest require service facilities within the park, they should be constructed, owned, operated, and improved by private enterprise, to reasonable specifications and regulations set by the Park Service. They should be leased to the Park Service for sublease as deemed advisable to insure proper management of the facilities. This would negate any detrimental aspects of private ownership within the park.

2. (*a*) The savings to taxpayers of construction costs of service facilities by private enterprise can either be a net savings or used to expedite additional or earlier construction of other visitor facilities such as roads, trials, etc.

(*b*) The property tax that would be collected from private enterprise would help replace any potential resources locked up in areas reserved for park use only, and help maintain local county services.

(*c*) Most important of all, it would eliminate Government competition, which is entirely unnecessary, in this type of business.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Rogers. I think the thing that you've recommended here about having private enterprise operate the concessions is the way the park, the national parks, are operated now.

Mr. ROGERS. True.

Senator Moss. And so you believe that should be assured here?

Mr. ROGERS. That should be assured. However, quite often the property itself is owned by the Parks Service, rather than by private business, which in some cases would be detrimental if the property was managed wrongly by a private owner, but if it in turn must be leased by the Park Service, they could in turn pick their own rentors or lessees to manage these facilities.

Senator Moss. In either event, they would choose the operator, wouldn't they? If the Park Service actually owned the facilities?

Mr. ROGERS. True, if they owned them. But I say they shouldn't own them.

Senator Moss. I see. You want them private only in the park?

Mr. ROGERS. That's right. So they will pay their taxes and be in fair competition with other businesses.

Senator Moss. I see.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Rogers, I want to comment that this committee, the Interior Committee of the Senate, and also of the House, have jurisdiction over the National Park Service and over these concessions, and the 10 years that I have been in Congress, that's been under continuous review, and there has been some change to take care of changing conditions. The concessions at Yellowstone and Glacier were referred to me when I was a Member of the House and a member of the House Interior Committee, and they have grown from park ownership to an expanded concessionnaire to take care of changing conditions. I believe that it's the attitude of this committee that there should be private enterprise and that this should not be developed by the park itself, and that also there should not be a monopoly in the park or in any park unless conditions are such as grew out of the historic development in Yellowstone Park and Glacier, where the rail-

roads had to take over the concessions. But the attitude that I've observed from the committee has been along the lines that you have suggested, and as I say, we're under continuous review at all times.

Mr. ROGERS. That's a good thing.

Senator METCALF. And this is helpful testimony, not only for the benefit of the bill that is before us at this time, but I appreciate it for general policy in respect to administration of the park, which is also one of our duties.

Thank you very much. Any other questions?

The next witness is Mr. Melvin Dalton, State representative.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Dalton, we're glad to recognize you.

Mr. DALTON. I didn't realize I was going to make a statement.

Senator METCALF. You may go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF MELVIN DALTON, STATE REPRESENTATIVE FROM MOAB, UTAH

Mr. DALTON. Now, this statement was written by part of the Democrats that got together after Senator Moss was here last Friday, and pretty well expresses the view of how the Democrats feel, at least the ones that we've been able to talk to, and the Democratic Party of this county wish to go on record to support the proposal to create the Canyonlands National Park.

We believe that the area in question is worthy of national park status and recognition as an attraction to millions of visitors in future years. What has been seen by relatively few persons up to now, because of its remoteness and inaccessability, should be opened to modern means of conveyance and the ingress of the general public.

In general, we wish to support the idea of a large single park, contiguous in area, and under the control and jurisdiction of a single national park headquarters.

We wish to support the idea of multiple use to permit continued grazing practice where feasible, and to permit mineral development where such can be practiced without interference with the basic plan of national park purposes.

We wish to support the idea of wildlife conservation and control in the Canyonlands under the regulation of experienced game department officers of the State of Utah and the Federal Government.

We wish to see provisions for boating, horseback riding, hiking, jeep tours, camping, and other forms of outdoor recreation included in the plans for development of this park.

We believe the establishment of the park would provide a great boost to the economy of the communities of this area. We further believe that income derived thereby from tourism would greatly offset any loss foreseeable from Federal control of mineral development or grazing in the park area.

We, who live near the monumental wonders of the Canyonlands, believe that it is an attraction worthy of the price of Federal development. Not only will this area reap enhancement by creation of the park, but will the rest of the citizens of the rest of this country share in its significant recreational value.

We respectfully recommend to the members of the committee, the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Dalton.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Mel. We appreciate the statement. That ought to be obvious.

Mr. DALTON. Our only concern, Senator Moss, and we hope that you've cleared it up to our satisfaction, was the future development of mineral rights and grazing rights in this area. That seems to be a concern to everyone in the area.

Senator Moss. Well, the bill that we now have before us does provide that grazing will phase out after 25 years or after the lifetime of people who presently hold the permits or members of their immediate family, which does look to a phaseout, but on mineral development the bill proposes that that will go on, subject only to this regulation that you mentioned that it not be destructive of the park values.

Mr. DALTON. That was one thing we were concerned with was this regulation might be so strict that it would stop it. Other than that——

Senator Moss. Well, some of the witnesses yesterday in testifying about this pointed out that down around Mexican Hat they had had an oil boom 30 years ago or so. It was all over, and they defied us to find where the wells had been drilled, which it seems to me is proof that you could have drilling so long as it's done in an area that doesn't destroy the formations or do things that would mar the park, and it can be done in an inobtrusive way, or if it's a dry hole it can be plugged and the area put back in shape so you would hardly know that they'd ever been there.

Senator METCALF. I have been at times critical of some of the oil-leasing policies on our wildlife refuges, and some of the game ranges. But I want to point out there, too, we have different circumstances and different regulations. I have seen on one of the game ranges a buffalo scratching his back against an oil rig. On another, where we have waterfowl, you wouldn't want to have the same privileges or the same oil-drilling and oil-leasing control. So each of these things have to be worked out in light of the local situation. And as I heard the testimony here, I'm becoming more convinced that perhaps this grazing proposal which Senator Moss has is something that would be desirable in this park, and maybe we could go into perpetuity, instead of phasing it out.

Your testimony has been very helpful. Thank you.

Senator BENNETT. May I make a comment, Mr. Chairman?

Senator METCALF. Certainly.

Senator BENNETT. In the beginning of your statement, you indicated you were speaking for the Democratic Party of Grand County. Is it your intention by that kind of a statement to make this a political issue?

Mr. DALTON. No.

Senator BENNETT. Was any attempt made to seek Republican bipartisan support for such a statement?

Mr. DALTON. No.

Senator METCALF. We would be glad to hear from a representative of the Republican Party. [Applause.]

The next witness will be Mr. Philip Lindstrom.

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, before the witness comes up, I think the people who applauded will be interested to know that in San Juan County yesterday, a witness was very careful to explain

that the only people who were making political hay out of this bill were the Republicans, Senator Bennett and Governor Clyde. So I get some satisfaction in having a witness come up today to identify himself as a representative of the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

Senator METCALF. I think we'd better have a little more order. Thank you, Senator Bennett. I want to say that if there is a park, I hope that it will be enjoyed by both the Republicans and the Democrats.

Senator BENNETT. And I, of course, welcome the opportunity to make clear to this group, as has been made to the other group yesterday, there is no opposition to the creation of a park. There is a difference of opinion, maybe within your committee, as to the conditions of the park. And I was sorry to see the political issue raised yesterday, and then again today. I think this is the wrong approach.

Senator METCALF. Will Rogers once said, you know, that it takes a lot of nerve to be a Democrat, but it takes money to be a Republican. Speaking for Montana, we welcome those Republicans who come up to Glacier, because they leave a little more money than the Democrats.

Senator BENNETT. Well, this is an interesting exchange. Apparently, if it takes money to be a Republican, the people of this part of the country are hoping for tourists who will be Republicans.

Senator METCALF. Yes, indeed. Mr. Lindstrom, I'm sorry we kept you waiting. We're glad to have you here this morning, and we have a copy of your testimony. So you may sit down and proceed.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP LINDSTROM, MINING ENGINEER

Mr. LINDSTROM. Mr. Chairman, and Senator, ladies and gentlemen, before I read this prepared statement, I would like to just say one thing briefly, that is not included here, that I am a mining engineer. I've lived here for 5 years. It's a little difficult to live here much longer than that, because about 12 years ago there were 1,200 people here, and now there are 6,000. So a lot of us had to be newcomers.

I am testifying in favor of a Utah Canyonlands National Park.

After hearing the testimony in Monticello yesterday, there appears to be a difficult choice or position. The majority favored or endorsed multiple use, and many doubted that this would be secured by enactment of S. 2387, because national park policy is directed toward scenic, scientific, and recreational values, while management of basic economic values is prohibited or restricted.

Let us examine some of the facets of the problem.

National land use goals: Should not our goal be the full use of our land, managed with economic and esthetic consideration? It is evident that our Nation's security is paramount, as evidenced by the great congressional appropriations for defense. Utah's contribution to basic national strength is production of raw materials from the earth, water, and atmosphere. Let us not weaken that strength one small fraction by needlessly isolating from future use our raw material heritage. Production from the earth should be encouraged in every way, so that an abundance may be had for all.

Multiple use: S. 2387 attempts to provide for more complete land use than is usual in a national park. Game management and managed grazing (for a limited time, unfortunately) is considered in

the bill. Senator Moss and the committee is to be commended for their effort to legislate provisions for mining. Under the headings that follow, I would like to point out several thoughts that should again be considered before a park is established.

Mining: The bill recognizes that only "the valid rights of locators, entrymen, and patentees under the mining laws of the United States, and of permittees and lessees under the mineral leasing laws, existing before this act takes effect, shall be recognized." (S. 2387, Apr. 16, 1962, p. 14.)

Senator Moss. May I interrupt? That is paragraph (b) of section 4, whereas paragraph (a) of section 4 is the one that is to provide for continuing exploration and production. The section is broken into two subsections, you see: (b) reserves the existing ones, the ones existing, but (a) provides that they shall now be subject to location, entry, and patent under the mineral leasing laws of the United States and shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, and so on.

Mr. LINDSTROM. And then nullifying this on page 14, it seems to me, is part (b) that says, and I call it the phase-out provision:

> Within the Canyonlands National Park the valid rights of locators, entrymen, and patentees under the mining laws of the United States, and of permittees and lessees under the mineral leasing laws, existing before this act takes effect, shall be recognized.

Now, this could very well meet perpetuity by deleting just a few words: "existing before this act takes effect."

Senator Moss. I would have no objection to taking it out, but the point I was trying to make is that the legislative effort was made to discuss two particular sections, one of continuing exploration and production, prospective; the other being sure to preserve whatever is there now.

But your suggestion is good, and certainly the committee will consider that to make sure that we're not limiting it. My intent as the author of the bill is to protect the rights that are there now, but also to provide that there may be continued exploration and production under regulation.

Mr. LINDSTROM. Very good.

Senator METCALF. I think you've made a real contribution here by at least pointing up a potential ambiguity that will certainly be considered by the committee and clarified either in the legislation or in the accompanying report.

Mr. LINDSTROM. Glad to hear that.

As I wrote, this provision effectively prohibits any mining location after the act takes effect.

Those mineral deposits subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and those minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws that have existing rights may be mined except—

> that the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area.

This is on page 13.

In this case the Secretary will certainly be "wearing the hat" of the Park Service and can forbid efficient helicopter use, demand that all waste rock removed from workings be hauled to places many miles

away, and prevent extraction of minerals from beyond the claim boundaries under park ground or prohibit staking of the adjoining ground. All of these restrictions have been placed before mining by the Park Service in recent years.

When this Nation was in desperate need of uranium, I know of none that was available from national park ground. Effective prospecting is very difficult in national parks, so that those areas are in effect sterilized, even in case of national emergency, and I liken it to national self-inflicted injury, rather than attack from an enemy. These are strong words.

It would take an act of Congress to unlock the minerals in a park, so their accessibility should not be jeopardized. Evaluation of geologic studies and scientific prospecting methods often take years of testing before becoming effective. Witness that the full development of uranium mining in the United States has taken 20 years.

If an emergency arises for immediate mineral needs, it is too late to plan development and mining in a park, because exploration and development takes years and should be a continuing effort.

I do not advocate mining at the present time in park areas of outstanding beauty unless prior rights exist. However, surely there are many nonscenic areas in national parks where mining could now be conducted for the benefit of all and with no harm to the park.

Tourism: Some people justify a park on economic community benefits to be derived from tourism. This is all right for those areas that can secure this extra income from travelers, but what kind of a nation would we have if all were trying to live on tourism? While tourism may be a basic industry to an area, it is not a basic industry to the nation. The smallest part practicable should still provide for tourism and leave more room for basic industry development and provide a broader tax base.

Water: Water conservation and development is vital to this country. Dam construction in parks is extremely difficult and gives another good reason why park size should be carefully controlled or provision be made in the bill for water development as the primary use.

Park size: If the park is to be about 500 square miles (30 miles long and about 10 to 20 miles wide), would not this be a huge wall barring future powerline or gas- and oil-line construction? Can the elimination of this wall be provided for in the bill? The traditional exclusion of powerlines in parks is another reason for minimizing park size.

Roads: I hope that provision will be made for reasonable access to park roads outside the park boundaries.

Senator Moss. May I interrupt to say that this is in the bill, authorizing the building of access roads outside of the park, as well as inside the park.

Mr. LINDSTROM. What I have reference to, Senator Moss, is private roads ranches may build. If they are excluded from entry only at certain places. It may be an undue fear of mine.

Senator METCALF. We were talking about Federal construction of a limited access road?

Mr. LINDSTROM. That's right.

Senator METCALF. I see.

Mr. LINDSTROM. The fear may be completely groundless.

Considering park area, there are three primary areas of unusual scenic beauty. They are separated by two rivers and cannot be readily connected by roads, so that three separate access roads must be built. Why must the areas be contiguous? Administration and management will be less costly with less area. Surely the park can be named Canyonlands Park or Canyonland Parks and more assuredly insure maximum land use by avoiding use conflicts.

Conclusion: Because of conflicts between scenic and economic use, it is imperative that park areas be kept to a minimum, isolating only enough outstanding and unusual scenic, scientific, and recreational areas to balance with other land uses. Now we come to the big question: "What is this balance?" In the case of Canyonlands Park, is it likely that the National Park Service will recommend a withdrawal compatible with multiple use? I suggest that the subcommittee select a committee to make a careful evaluation of the ground and who will include only the areas needed for the park and with traditional park policy maintained.

Senators, I hope that you do not consider the foregoing statements presumptuous, but only the thinking of a citizen allowed to testify before you, each of whom must use the wisdom of a Solomon in reconciling Utah's rights to that of the Nation.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Senator METCALF. Senator Moss.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Lindstrom.

Senator METCALF. I have let the applause go along, but really, under the rules of the Senate and the rules by which we operate the committee, I hope that demonstrations will be kept to a minimum. Thank you very much.

Go ahead.

Senator Moss. The points that you raise are many that were considered during the day yesterday when you attended the hearings in Monticello, and I appreciate having your viewpoint here to be put before the committee to be weighed. Thank you.

Mr. LINDSTROM. Very well.

Senator BENNETT. No questions.

Senator METCALF. You have been a very helpful witness and have raised some of the questions that are going to have to be considered by this committee, and you've also raised some questions about the bill that we're going to have to clarify when the bill is marked up and if it's adopted. So I appreciate your testimony very much. Thank you.

Mr. LINDSTROM. I appreciate the opportunity.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. LaVaun Cox, executive director of the State petroleum council.

We're pleased to have you with us, Mr. Cox, and we're pleased to have your testimony. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF R. LaVAUN COX, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UTAH PETROLEUM COUNCIL

Mr. Cox. Mr. Chairman, and representatives of the committee, I represent the Utah Petroleum Council, and the brief statement prepared has been endorsed by the Petroleum Committee of the Utah Chamber of Commerce. There will be four petroleum groups appear

before this committee, one more today, and two in Salt Lake City, so that our testimony is brief and limited as to fields so we don't conflict or become repetitious.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, and we're looking forward to it.

Mr. Cox. I was hired, retained by the Utah Petroleum Council last July. Now, this was the same time the trip down the river was taken by Members of Congress, State leaders. Later that month there was an article appeared in the Denver Post, a full-page spread, and it indicated the beauties of the park, which we of course have realized for many years, and it also made a sugggestion that the oil people were the only ones who had any opposition to the park. It further went on to say there were places the landscape had been marred by exploration crews, and it was my privilege, one of my first items on the job, to express our regrets at the unauthorized—to apologize for the marring of the landscape by these crews.

In this respect, I would say that the ethics committees of the Petroleum groups, the associations, have been most active the last 2 or 3 years to see that these things do not happen.

Now, in answering this, and the Denver Post was very generous and used our entire statement, we did not oppose the park, and we have never opposed the park. We believe that dual development in the park area will give ultimate use. It was pointed out in testimony yesterday that mining and oil and development of natural resources do play out and are sometimes there for a limited period of years. This we admit, but as Aneth oilfield goes down, we do not write off southern Utah as a potential field of Utah.

We would also point out that tourism has its ups and downs. The great Yellowstone Park is closed part of the year. Bryce, which is my favorite park at present, is closed part of the year, although there's a limited amount of winter activity there.

So we suggest that these activities would complement one another, that there would be a year-round activity in mineral development, and that it would help to offset the seasonal play in the tourist field.

Now, some oilmen feel a bit insecure as they look toward a large investment and development in this park area. In the Salt Lake hearings there will be testimony presented by Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association, wherein they will make suggestions for limited additional wording which they feel will give them more security in exploring and having rights to the claims they now have.

We would say that this is not brought about by any distrust of any of the Park Service, the Secretary of the Interior, or anyone else; but this is new, and we feel that further identification of the intent of the bill may give greater direction and help to spell out and protect these rights.

We believe that roadways should be established early and that in establishing roadways we should remember that today's tourist is perhaps a lazy tourist, and a great many of them will never leave their cars, or certainly will not venture far from their cars as they view the park. So that we would urge these facilities that you will allow within the park and the access roads to the park be outlined to allow for orderly development of the facilities necessary for a touring public.

We also endorse a system of roads which would connect with other parks; as Senator Bennett has suggested, a national parkway. There's

been a talk of a golden circle. We make no choice. We suggest this would be a very fine plan, would give added tourists an opportunity to visit all of the parks.

Now, the marketing division of the petroleum industry views this as a potential great market, because if people travel this vast area, they'll burn vast amounts of petroleum products. We also anticipate that most of the roads will be built with asphalt. The need for raw material with which to open up with these products might be seen on the last page of the statement. Utah soared to almost 40 million barrels of production in 1959, and down to 33 million barrels 2 years later. We would suggest this is added reason the park area and all other areas of the State be left open for exploration that we might maintain an adequate source of raw material for petroleum products.

Now, if you will refer to page 3, I would like to read section 2.

We resent the attitude of those who reject the multiple use concept and attempt to identify natural resource industries as opponents of the vacationer desiring to visit this or any other park. We regret that the creation of a park has become a battleground for partisan politics.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it's been a privilege to appear here. As I said, three other petroleum groups will make testimony concerning the park.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Cox. Your statement will be incorporated in the record in its entirety; and if the three statements that follow you are as beneficial and helpful as yours, we're going to get a great deal of benefit from the testimony of the petroleum industry.

Senator Moss. I have no questions. Thank you, LaVaun. Very good.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

(The complete prepared statement of Mr. Cox follows:)

STATEMENT OF R. LAVAUN COX, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UTAH PETROLEUM COUNCIL

The Utah Petroleum Council recognizes the need for recreational facilities in a great and growing nation and endorses the move to preserve more of the scenic wonders of southern Utah in a national park. Few persons are qualified to comment on the proposed park from personal experience in the area, but the plendors of the park are very evident through pictures and accounts of visitors.

In endorsing the park, we urge that specific study of the area be extended to all surrounding lands to insure inclusion of worthy features, while excluding any inaccessible lands which will not add materially to the value of the park.

This organization recommends that surveys for road purposes begin immediately upon the establishment of the park. We feel the location of roadways within the park and access highways to the park be of prime importance. It should be remembered that most of the modern-day tourists seldom leave their automobiles as they view an attraction, and when they do alight from their vehicles, venture very short distances.

The Utah Petroleum Council endorses construction of a highway system which will make the Canyonlands National Park accessible to the motoring public. The council further suggests that this park be linked with other parks and scenic areas in Utah and neighboring States by adequate highways. We suggest that these routes be established as soon as practicable, so that installation of eating houses, motels, trailer camps, service stations, culinary water supplies, and other services for the touring public may be developed in an orderly and well-planned manner.

We are pleased that Secretary Udall has altered his stand concerning multiple use of the park area. He was quoted late last year as saying there will be no multiple-use activity in the park. Last month he was quoted as saying there will be no flat prohibition of oil and gas development in the areas which are set up as part of the new national park system. The statement was qualified and did not offer full multiple use for park areas.

We urge persons who have mellowed the Secretary's stand to this point to continue to expound the advantages of full development so that complete multiple use will be possible. We compliment the author and supporters of the bill for a new concept in parks and their bold step of including section 5(a) in the bill.

We specifically request them to take another bold step to spell out the multiple use privileges they intend for the park. An oil leaseholder might rightly feel very insecure if he is faced with operating for an undefined period of time under an indefinite attitude of a Secretary of the Interior and under the immediate direction of a park administrator yet to be named.

The Utah Petroleum Council firmly believes exploration and production of minerals can be carried out in conjunction with the activities of a park without being a deterrent to the splendid scenic attractions or to the comfort and enjoyment of the tourists. This will allow the most complete development of the park area and will offer maximum possibility in other fields.

We believe the stability of the economic community in the area of the park will be substantially increased if new mineral deposits can be found and developed. Such an occurrence could mean an improved tax base, an expanding population, and a business climate which will not have the great fluctuation of an economy based solely on tourists. This dual development will certainly overshadow any advantage available through single development of tourism or natural resource capabilities of the proposed park.

We resent the attitude of those who reject the multiple-use concept and attempt to identify natural resource industries as opponents of the vacationer desiring to visit this or any other park. We regret that the creation of a park has become a battleground for partisan politics.

The accompanying graph illustrates the importance of oil production in Utah, especially during the past 4 years. Since most of this production has been achieved in southeastern Utah, we submit that this must be classed as potential production land and every consideration given to keep the lands open for exploration and production. The drop in production in the past 2 years shows up the need for greater effort by exploration units, from whom no great tracts of land should be withdrawn.

We believe the ultimate use of the lands for the proposed park will be to see tourists driving on good asphalt roads, powering their automobiles with fine petroleum products while the raw material for these products, if present, is extracted from the depths beneath the park. Such ultimate use must also include the advantageous use of other natural resources as may be available in the park.

We firmly believe tourism and the development of natural resources will complement each other and will prove reasonable companions under a specific multiple-use plan.

Utah Petroleum Council appreciates the opportunity to appear at these hearings and extends thanks for the courtesy of the invitation. We further express thanks for the courtesy shown in furnishing our office with information and material concerning the proposed park.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. Walter Weid, La Sal, Utah.

Mr. Weid, we're glad to have you with us.

Mr. WEID. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. And we hope that you will go right ahead with your testimony in your own way.

STATEMENT OF WALTER WEID

Mr. WEID. My name is Walter Weid. I live in La Sal, Utah. I hold to the belief that in general the primary use for a given tract of land should be its natural resource development, either agricultural or mineral. Whatever scenic values the land possesses is a bonus, but of secondary nature. I am going to leave the substantiation of this fact to others. I know that a great many statistics have been compiled to show the tremendous economic benefits derived from relatively small areas as compared to the more moderate benefits gained by tying up huge tracts of land in the national park system. In support of S. 2387, Senator Moss cites many statistics also. For instance: "This (area) amounts to less than three-fifths of 1 percent of Utah's 54.3 million acres." I feel it proper to mention that this being so, then the wheelhorse industry of the State of Utah, the Bingham Copper pit, occupies less than six-thousands of 1 percent of Utah's 54.3 million acres.

While unique areas of natural beauty and interest may rightfully be included in national parks and monuments—and I already established that I am for a park—the preponderance of the 332,000 acres included in the proposed bill, S. 2387, is in no way unique. It is quite typical of the entire Colorado Plateau area from Vernal, Utah, to Gallup, N. Mex., and from Gunnison, Colo., to Grand Canyon, Ariz.

This land included in the proposed Canyonlands Park bill contains some features which may well merit national park status, but the vast majority of it should be left for its primary use—natural resource development. The means for accomplishing this end are obvious: create a park area small enough so the question of multiple use need never be raised; or as a less satisfactory alternative, change the wording of the Moss bill to provide for mandatory use, rather than the present permissive multiple use.

Senator Moss maintains that he has provided for natural resource development of the area in the multiple-use clause of his bill. A great many people in Utah, desiring combined industrial and scenic development of the Canyonlands area, have expressed righteous skepticism toward the dictatorial powers which the bill invests in the Secretary of the Interior. After providing for mineral development, the bill adds:

> *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of the activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area.

Presumably every future Secretary of the Interior will be all knowing, all seeing, and all wise, so that he may fairly decide which development detracts from the scenic beauty and which does not.

Throughout recorded history there is ample evidence that civil leaders have been less than perfect. Even leaders of the great religions have had to battle with their own human frailties, and the battle was not always won. History also tells us that during the past 186 years

this Nation's Presidents have not all been equally prudent, wise, or competent.

The founders of our Nation foresaw this. They knew their history, and they knew about tyrants. The memory of George the Third was fresh in their minds. For this reason they drew up the constitutional documents to provide for a government by law, and not by men.

A balance of power between the executive, legislative, and judiciary branches of our Government was long recognized as being the bulwark of our freedom. Only in the past 30 years has the executive branch succeeded in vastly increasing its powers at the expense of the legislature.

The inordinate controls which have been granted to officers and departments of the executive branch the last three decades is exemplified by the discretionary powers invested in the Secretary of the Interior in bills such as the one now under consideration.

Here we have an area of approximately 500 square miles which will play an important part in the economic future of Utah. But under the Moss bill the economic development of this area would be entirely dependent upon the discretion of one man. Even if it be granted that Secretary Udall has the wisdom of Solomon in his administration, what of his successors? Perhaps the next Secretary would make a quick end to whatever mineral development Secretary Udall had permitted. And the third Secretary of the Interior might decree that even Druid Arch was expendable if there were a ton of ore underlying it.

As a real-life example of what we can expect from discretionary multiple use, we have only to look at Mount McKinley National Park. This park, you remember, is cited by proponents of S. 2387 as a shining example of how well mining and prospecting can proceed within the boundaries of a national park.

While prospecting and mining are permitted by law in Mount McKinley National Park, no mining has been carried on in the park, although the geological possibilities are very good. Ore hauling on park roads has been denied, necessitating the building of a State road outside the park paralleling the original road. Aircraft, including helicopters, are prohibited to land except in a few designated areas. Since helicopters are the primary means of prospecting in remote areas, this rule effectively curtails serious prospecting. Roadbuilding and timber cutting may be done by permit only, and these permits are not always available.

Another reason why true multiple use in a national park seems doubtful to many of us is that the attitude of the author of S. 2387 toward multiple use seems questionable. While with due respect for the desires of the local residents he has inserted provisions for mining and petroleum extraction in his bill, he has also referred disparagingly to the normal byproducts of these industries as "* * * the despoiling of the natural wonders * * * by oil derricks or slag heaps." This seems curious—yes, we can have oil drilling and mining, but no derricks or dumps.

82324—62—pt. 2——10

Senator Moss also stated that he would probably still support a large (332,000 acres) park, even if the multiple use clause were eliminated in senatorial debate. Nor did he supply a direct answer when asked if he would amend his bill accordingly if the present hearings indicated a strong sentiment toward either mandatory multiple use or a smaller park.

In summation, I believe that many residents of Utah are fearful of the area under consideration becoming a multiple-use park in name only if S. 2387 is passed as it now reads, and if these fears are well founded it would definitely cramp the economic future of Utah.

The alternative solutions: Either provide for mandatory multiple-use with the exception of certain designated highlight areas in the park, or reduce the size of the proposed to an absolute minimum, leaving the surrounding areas open to normal development.

I do not regard the National Park Service contention that convenience of administration is a valid premise for including large tracts of land with high mineral potential and mediocre scenic value in Canyonlands Park. I maintain that the primary consideration of locating park boundaries should not be the convenience of the Park Service. The Moss bill provides for the park to be administered according to its natural divisions—the Island in the Sky, the Squaw Springs Headquarters, and the western "least accessible" portion. What difference then whether the areas in between are national park or not? Certainly no tourist is concerned. When he admires the view from an overlook point, he neither asks nor cares where the park boundaries are. As for mineral development spoiling the view, I have not ascertained by what method the view from, say, Grand View Point, could be spoiled. A shining steelhead frame or oil derrick below would only serve to spark a tourist's interest, if indeed such things were not simply swallowed up in the scenery.

I took a couple of pictures in the Lisbon oil field. I don't have enough prints to go with the papers. I was wondering if I should pass those around. Are you interested?

Senator METCALF. You may file one set of them for the information of the committee, and they will be put in the permanent file; or you may just pass them around to show them, or any way that you want.

Mr. WEID. Well, you can keep them if you want them. I wanted to point out——

Senator BENNETT. Why don't you sit here and show them?

Mr. WEID. We have a producer right here [showing pictures]. We have a producer right down here. You can see the tank a little bit. There is a producer right up here. And I'm not sure whether it's a producer or not here. There was a hole drilled over here.

That's simply an indication that they don't necessarily spoil the scenery.

Senator METCALF. These prints cannot be printed in the record, but they will be kept in the file of the committee for reference when the portion of your testimony is printed.

Mr. WEID. All right. The Park Service also maintains that a large continuous park is needed for ample protection of the tourists. Actually, the mere fact of being in a national park is no safety guarantee. There are many recorded fatalities in our national parks, as well as hikers who will probably remain on the missing list forever. Neither is a person simply written off if he becomes lost outside of

a national park boundary. Throughout the southwest, search and rescue organizations have been formed to provide hope for persons lost in the wilderness. As soon as a person is reported missing, the civil air patrol, river boat patrol, jeep patrol, and horseback riding clubs swing into action. These voluntary organizations, together with local law officers, have been the primary means for locating missing persons in the past and will continue to be in the future, national park boundaries notwithstanding.

I do favor a national park in the Canyonlands area to enhance the economic stability of San Juan County.

Senator BENNETT. What about Grand County?

Mr. WEID. Also. I happen to live in San Juan County, so I'm centered around that a little bit.

However, I tend to discount a good many of the esthetic values attributed to national parks.

When I hear that the crowded conditions which many people live under are going to destroy our spiritual life and diminish us as a people, I think of the Dutch and Belgian people. Those little countries have a population density of nearly 1,000 people to the square mile; and from what I gather, most of them are pretty much home bodies. Yet, in what way are those people mentally or physically inferior to us? I feel that a very poor case can be made for the physical and moral degeneration of people simply because they do not have wide open spaces to enjoy.

For those of our people who truly enjoy hiking and exploration of the open spaces, national parks actually decrease (through regulation) the range of activities available.

But to return briefly to economic values, I want to point out that countries and States are no different than countries when it comes to industrial development. The foreign aid which our Government now supplies on a continuing basis is made possible by our industry; and a large portion of this aid goes to countries which have managed to preserve 99 percent of their wilderness areas.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Weid, did you have the benefit of the latest committee print when you wrote this statement?

Mr. WEID. This is just one I picked up. I don't have it with me. It was not on the table yesterday. Is that right?

Senator METCALF. And you've read the latest bill, Committee Print No. 1? That was the one that was distributed in Monticello.

Mr. WEID. Yes.

Senator METCALF. I asked that because I hope that you will point out for the committee the language you feel should be amended, and if you can make some suggestions as to the mandatory multiple use language, in the same way that Mr. Cox suggested that amendments were going to be offered in the testimony at Salt Lake City.

Mr. WEID. Well, I'm not a legislator by any means.

Senator METCALF. I understand.

Mr. WEID. And I have indicated that I thought mandatory multiple use would be a second and poorest choice between that and a smaller park.

Senator METCALF. Well, and you've made the point very clear on that, and I appreciate it. Senator Moss?

Senator Moss. I think I have no questions. I've discussed this with Mr. Weid at different times. He and I do not agree as to

whether all of that area is worthy of park preservation, and that's about all. I appreciate your testimony, Walter.

Senator METCALF. Senator Long? Senator Bennett?

Senator BENNETT. Well, I have not discussed this testimony with Mr. Weid. I just met him yesterday for the first time. I have one question. Are you a lawyer?

Mr. WEID. No.

Senator BENNETT. Are you a rancher?

Mr. WEID. No. I'm a mining engineer.

Senator BENNETT. You're a mining engineer. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. I didn't expect you as a witness to do the legislative drafting. Not even the members of this committee, who are lawyers, do legislative drafting in the final analysis. We leave it to experts in this line, but I hope that the language that can cause misgivings would be pointed out, if you wish, or you would suggest something that would clarify it.

Mr. WEID. Of course, the provision I have harped on here quite a bit is the provision for discretionary power of the Secretary of the Interior as being the thing that left the whole thing open to question.

Senator METCALF. Yes. I think you've made that point very well. Thank you, Mr. Weid.

The next witness is Mr. C. L. Stewart. Mr. Stewart?

Mr. Stewart apparently has stepped out. The next witness will be Mr. Rowley and Mr. Farnsworth, who are representatives of the Five County Organization of Southwestern Utah.

Mr. KNELL. Mr. Farnsworth must not have notified you that he was unable to come, and he called me and asked me if I would come.

Senator METCALF. Will you identify yourself for the reporter?

STATEMENT OF RAY KNELL

Mr. KNELL. Ray Knell. I guess you could assume that I am representing the Five Counties Organization, because I was sent here from that group.

Senator METCALF. Do you wish to testify?

Mr. KNELL. Well, yes. I would like to make a statement as long as I'm here.

Senator METCALF. Would you come forward and make a statement, then, because we do want to hear from this Five County Organization. We're glad to have you.

Mr. KNELL. Ray Knell.

Senator METCALF. And where do you live, Mr. Knell?

Mr. KNELL. Cedar City, Utah.

Senator METCALF. Fine. You do not have a prepared statement?

Mr. KNELL. No, I do not have.

Senator METCALF. Well, you may go right ahead.

Mr. KNELL. Because I was just called in a hurry. I'm sorry, because I didn't really know I was supposed to testify.

Senator METCALF. Well, the committee understands, and we're very pleased to have the benefit of your help. You go right ahead.

Mr. KNELL. Due to the fact that there are a lot of controversies in this proposal and all, I did talk to the chairman of our Five County Organization last night before I left. He informed me that we defi-

nitely should not take a definite stand. However, he felt that we should be here to represent our Five County Organization. And I'm very happy to be here. We feel, or I feel, I'll put it that way, I feel that there definitely should be a park here, and I also feel that a great deal of time has been spent and will be spent to make wise decisions as to how and where and the scope of this thing, and I'm sure whatever is done will be done for the best interests of all concerned.

I don't believe I should commit myself as representing the Five County Organization in making too many statements, definite statements. However, I don't believe I will be criticized if I will make this one in behalf of the Five County Organization. That is this, that when this park becomes a reality, and I'm sure it will, and I hope it will, then of course naturally we would like to see this park connected by a good highway with the parks over on the other side of the river. We feel—and I'm sure that the Five County Organization would not criticize me for making this statement, I'm sure of that—that the time, we hope, will come in the not too distant future after this park becomes a reality that steps be taken to connect this park with those beautiful parks that we have over there. Everybody would be benefited. The tourists who would avail themselves of these facilities would be greatly appreciative of this highway connecting through there. It isn't impossible.

So I believe that's all I have to say. I'm very happy to be here. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Knell. For the record, will you tell us the names of the counties that are represented in this Five County Organization?

Mr. KNELL. Yes. There is Beaver, Garfield, Kane, Washington, and Iron.

Senator METCALF. And now for my benefit, since I'm not familiar with this area, just where are those counties?

Mr. KNELL. Those are in the extreme southwest corner of the State of Utah.

Senator METCALF. Within this area?

Senator Moss. Within this area are both Zion National Park and Bryce.

Mr. KNELL. I should have mentioned that previously, that these parks that I'm speaking of naturally, of course, are Bryce Canyon National Park, Cedar Breaks, Zion National Park, and, of course, immediately to the south is Grand Canyon National Park, all in that same vicinity. I should have mentioned that earlier. I'm sorry.

Senator METCALF. And you're especially interested in having——

Mr. KNELL. Connecting roads.

Senator METCALF. Access roads connecting?

Mr. KNELL. And I'm sure you will agree with us when this is done, that should be done.

Senator METCALF. Absolutely. I feel that this entire beautiful area should be open to——

Mr. KNELL. Yes, connected together. So I'm sure I won't be criticized severely by our Five County Organization by encouraging that highway through there.

Senator METCALF. I doubt it.

Senator Moss. I'm sure that you won't.

Senator METCALF. I don't think Senator Bennett will criticize that.

Senator BENNETT. No indeed. I am the sponsor of such a parkway bill, which is before this subcommittee.

Senator METCALF. Any questions? Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. KNELL. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. R. L. Healy. Mr. Healy is representing the Utah Association of Petroleum Landmen.

Mr. HEALY. I have a very short statement.

Senator METCALF. You have a lot of statistics here that will be entered in the record, and you may testify about them in any way that you want.

STATEMENT OF R. L. HEALY, UTAH ASSOCIATION OF PETROLEUM LANDMEN

Mr. HEALY. Right. Mr. Chairman, I'll summarize the statistics. These were prepared by the association showing the expenditures by the industry in the past in the area. Approximately about a million dollars has been spent on seismograph and gravity work, and about a million on acquisition of leases, maintenance of leases, and about a million dollars has been spent for wells.

Senator METCALF. May I interrupt? When you say in the area——

Mr. HEALY. Within the outline of the park, yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. That is the area you meant?

Mr. HALEY. Yes. Just within the area.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

Mr. HEALY. This of course is past expenditure, but I think it points out that the industry is anxious to develop the area and wants to. Within the recommendations I have also on the last page, we are a little concerned with the possibility that multiple use might not really be multiple use. And so we made a couple of suggestions, which are on the last page:

Provide for the amendment of general park regulations to afford to bona fide oil and gas explorers, prospectors, and mineral claimants the right of reasonable access to areas of interest, the right to use forest roads and to construct necessary new roads, the right to use motorized equipment and aircraft, and the right to utilize such other means and methods as are normally employed in prospecting, mining, and oil and gas exploration on the public domain.

Senator BENNETT. Don't you mean the right to use park roads, rather than forest roads?

Mr. HEALY. You're correct, sir.

Senator BENNETT. I didn't see any forests as I went over the park.

Mr. HEALY. I'm ashamed.

Senator MOSS. But the forest does come close to the southern boundary. There may be a time when you wanted to use forest roads.

Mr. HEALY. Yes, sir.

Senator MOSS. But of course the Secretary of the Interior doesn't have jurisdiction.

Mr. HEALY. Yes. And then on to (b):

The power of the Secretary to prescribe oil and gas mining regulations should be restricted by language clearly indicating that he has the duty to balance conflicting interests in a reasonable manner consistent with the expressed intent of Congress to protect legitimate mining and oil and gas activities in the area.

Senator BENNETT. You still have another recommendation.

Mr. HEALY. The third recommendation is that the size of the park be kept to a minimum.

Senator METCALF. I know that all of us will be grateful for these suggested amendments. Speaking only for myself, my study of the bill, if we're going to provide for what Senator Moss calls primary and secondary uses, and Congress passes such legislation, I want to be sure that the Secretary carries out the will of Congress; and I'm convinced that Congress can pass such legislation, and if passed, the Secretary will carry it out.

And so some of the most beneficial points that have been brought up in this hearing have been this doubt that some people have about present language of the bill, and we want to be sure that that language is clarified to carry out the will of the man who introduced it in the subcommittee.

Mr. HEALY. Right.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

Senator BENNETT. In the middle he says, incidentally:

A wildcat well is drilling in the center of the proposed area at the present time.

Can you locate it on the map?

Mr. HEALY. Well, sir, I must admit to this degree, the location has been staked, roads have been built, but they will not move in for another 50 days, so they are not technically drilling at this moment.

Senator BENNETT. But if it has been staked, can you locate it on the map?

Mr. HEALY. Yes, sir. And it will be drilled. It would be in here.

Senator METCALF. That's the area where the word, "Sky," appears.

Mr. HEALY. Right on the "k."

Senator METCALF. Out of the "Island in the Sky."

Senator Moss. Is it up on top or down?

Mr. HEALY. Senator, I cannot say for sure.

Senator Moss. I see.

Mr. HEALY. I believe it is on top; but I—Pan American is drilling it, and I would hate to—I'm not that positive or exact. I have the location by legal description, which is 28, 17, section 12, northeast, northwest. But probably I should check that, too.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Healy, in part 1 of the original hearings, on page 117, a map of the proposed park was put in. I wonder if you could indicate on the map where——

Mr. HEALY. Yes, sir. It would be about——

Senator METCALF. Just a little bit to the left of that oil well, 24, that was being drilled by Shell?

Mr. HEALY. Right. About 2 miles northwest (marking).

Senator METCALF. Do you have any more questions?

Senator BENNETT. No.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Healy. I particularly appreciate this suggestion in (A–2)—(A–1) it is—because like you, I'm concerned to know that these regulations will be such that we can actually operate under them.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much. You've been very helpful.

Mr. HEALY. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. D. L. Taylor.

We welcome you to the committee, and look forward to your testimony. The members have a copy of your statement. You may go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF D. L. TAYLOR, PRESIDENT, SOUTHEASTERN UTAH CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. TAYLOR. Maybe I should first clear up a point. I'm here representing the Southeastern Utah Cattlemen's Association today.

Senator METCALF. Fine. And this statement that you're making is on behalf of the Southeastern Utah Cattlemen's Association?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. Well, let me begin by making it clear that the cattlemen of southeastern Utah are not opposed to a Canyonlands National Park, nor do we ask for the exclusive use of any area of public land. My purpose for appearing here is to question the size of the park as proposed in Senate bill 2387 as revised. I feel that the 332,000 acres presently called for is larger than is necessary for a park in this area. It would exceed by some 14,000 acres all the parks, monuments, and historical sites in the State of Utah combined. There would be large areas not served by the proposed roads, that would never be seen by tourists and therefore should be left open to multiple use.

Roads are the key to attracting tourists, and I would strongly urge that more consideration be given to joining small areas of true park stature with protected roadways such as proposed by Senator Bennett in Senate bill 2616. If there is a strip of protected land adjacent to these roads, then for all practical purposes the tourist is in a park of vast dimensions.

I do not feel that the multiple-use provisions as written into the revised Senate bill 2387 would offer sufficient protection to the economic interests of the citizens of Utah. It leaves too much to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. It is particularly weak concerning grazing. I will admit that the 8 men grazing 683 head of cattle and 5,629 head of sheep in the proposed park area don't make up a large portion of the economy of our State, but the loss of this grazing land to these men would seriously affect their operations. The proposal to allow grazing to continue for 25 years or until the death of the present operator is of little real value. It merely delays the inevitable. If the rancher wants to sell his holdings, his grazing permits will be canceled, and he will receive only a small part of what his ranch would have brought had it remained an economic unit complete with grazing permits.

If this proposed park is actually larger than is necessary—and many people agree with me that it is—then it would seem to be an injustice to ask these ranchers to make this sacrifice, even though they are few in number.

Much has been said about tourism being a nondepletable asset. Grazing, if properly managed, is also a nondepletable asset. Another point I'd like to bring out concerning tourism is that it makes its greatest impact on the economy during good times. It is classed as a luxury activity, while grazing and mining continues to support the local economy during times of war or depression.

I'm also concerned with the exclusion of other industries from the park, such as mining and oil exploration. The area has been reported

to have good mineral potential and these industries help us pay our taxes and support our schools.

I believe it is possible to have a very desirable national park which will attract many tourists without including the entire 332,000 acres as proposed. Gov. George D. Clyde has advocated creation of a national park of some 102,000 acres with an additional 208,000 acres of recreational area, which would appear to offer a reasonable compromise, and I would favor something along these lines.

In closing, I want to emphasize this one point. I can appreciate that the population of the United States is growing by leaps and bounds and there is an ever-increasing need for recreation facilities. At the same time, our increasing population will have a growing need for food, fiber, minerals, petroleum products, and jobs; and I firmly believe that we can no longer afford the luxury of a single-purpose use of large areas of our public lands.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Taylor. This is largely for my benefit, because I'm not as familiar with the areas as the others. Where is the Southeastern Utah Cattlemen's Association located?

Mr. TAYLOR. It's comprised of Grand and Emery Counties.

Senator METCALF. How many members do you have?

Mr. TAYLOR. There are about 60 members at the present time.

Senator METCALF. And are these men who would lose their grazing permits at the end of 25 years, the men who are now grazing in this proposed——

Mr. TAYLOR. Only two of the individuals involved are members.

Senator METCALF. The other—how many did you say?

Mr. TAYLOR. About 60.

Senator BENNETT. You said Grand and Emery. You have no members in San Juan?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Senator METCALF. Senator Moss?

Senator Moss. The only thing I was concerned about here, Mr. Taylor, is in your statement you say you are concerned with the exclusion of other industries from the park, such as mining and oil exploration. Are you familiar with the provisions of the bill that would permit these to continue?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, Senator. I thought I pointed out that I don't trust this discretion of the Secretary of the Interior; and that's what I meant by the possible exclusion of other industries. And I also pointed out it was particularly weak concerning grazing, because it singled it out as the one industry that you intend to phase out.

Senator Moss. Well, you and your members graze your cattle on the public domain now; don't you?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Senator Moss. Under the BLM?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Senator Moss. Don't you get along with the Secretary of the Interior pretty well there?

Mr. TAYLOR. Fairly well.

Senator Moss. Fairly well. You have been able to live with his regulation there?

Mr. TAYLOR. But you're making it a matter of law in this bill that the grazing would be phased out in 25 years.

Senator Moss. I concede that point. The bill does say that within 25 years, if the permits are now transferred, they will expire, or within the lifetime of the holder if he continues to keep his permits, or the lifetime of members of his family, immediate family, that they will phase out; but I was talking really about this other regulation that you seem to worry about the Secretary of the Interior not permitting things to go on in there.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do, sir. I think it was pretty well elaborated on by some of the previous speakers that they think it should be a matter of law, rather than with the discretion of the Secretary.

Senator Moss. All right.

Senator METCALF. The grazing, in any event, will continue under the terms of the bill, as I understand it, for 25 years?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Senator METCALF. Even though grazing permits are transferred from the present owner to others.

Mr. TAYLOR. That isn't my understanding.

Senator METCALF. Well, that is——

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that——

Senator Moss. That's what the bill says.

Senator METCALF. That's what we hope the bill says. We want to be sure it says that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can I ask a question? Senator Moss has made the statement here today that an oil rig can be made nonoffensive in this area. What makes livestock more offensive than an oil rig at the end of 25 years?

Senator METCALF. May I answer that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish you would, please.

Senator METCALF. I come from an area where there's considerable grazing, too; and as I've heard this testimony and been in the park, I am becoming more convinced that perhaps it would be good to stretch this period out and agree with you that here is a use that is not incompatible with park use. And the fact is, as I travel around the city of Washington and talk to people, they are just about as much interested in seeing some Hereford cattle as they are in seeing a deer or some elk. And I think that strong testimony has been made here for taking this grazing provision out. May I ask you, are you familiar with the Taylor Grazing Act?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Senator METCALF. Now, isn't it true that under the Taylor Grazing Act there is more power vested in the Secretary than in this bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. I couldn't say for sure.

Senator METCALF. Some of the language in this bill as to the power of the Secretary is taken directly from the Taylor Grazing Act. But some of us from Western States are critical, as you have indicated you are, of some of the activities of the Bureau of Land Management. We feel that some of the appeal procedures in the BLM are very awkward.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are, too.

Senator METCALF. And unfair. But by and large, we've gotten along pretty well with the Secretary of the Interior and his administration of the public lands, and he has a great deal more power and more discretion in administering that area than has been given to him

in this bill. Speaking as one legislator, I have the same confidence that the Secretary of the Interior, no matter who he may be, will be able to administer the provisions of this law with the same equity that he administered the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, if I might make one more statement, I was more concerned with the Secretary's discretion concerning the other industries. He has no discretion in this bill. It's written in the law that it will be chopped off at 25 years or the death of the present operator. So I'm not concerned about his discretion there, because he has none.

Senator METCALF. He has some discretion——

Mr. TAYLOR. With respect to livestock, yes.

Senator METCALF. He has some discretion with respect to livestock, just as he has on other parts of the public domain.

Mr. TAYLOR. He can limit it, if he feels it's damaging to the park principles.

Senator METCALF. And he can limit it if he felt it were damaging the grazing area itself.

Mr. TAYLOR. True, I wouldn't argue with that.

Senator METCALF. No. None of us will argue with that.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Senator BENNETT. May I just make one brief comment?

Senator METCALF. Surely, go ahead.

Senator BENNETT. I'm interested in your comment about your trip in the park day before yesterday. I was in a different jeep, and we came out, and all of a sudden we came around a corner, and there were two cows; and this added a lot of interest to the picture to see something living in this area. The only other comment, and this should be off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator Moss. While we're on cows, may I say that certainly I would favor a continuing use of grazing, as long as it's practical, in the park. Now, some of the reasoning behind this phaseout period is that as the park is developed and as these little meadows which are mostly the places, as I understand it, where the grazing occurs, down in the Needles area, as they become occupied with campsites and with administration headquarters and with other things that go on in the park, the conflict will become greater between having the cattle in there and having the people in there. And the thinking behind it was there might come a time when this conflict was so great that perhaps the cattle would have to give way. But I certainly would not object to, and I'd be very interested in discussing a provision where cattle grazing could go on and not phase out in the lifetime of the present owners, so long as it, again, was the secondary use, the primary use of the area being for a national park, doing what you do in a park, and to the extent possible the secondary use of grazing to continue.

Senator BENNETT. Well, Senator, maybe we should train the cattle like the bears in Yellowstone, to come around and beg from the tourist, and this would add a great added interest to the park.

Senator METCALF. You know there's a dairy in Washington that advertises on the radio and TV as "The Dairy With Cows." And so many of the easterners have never seen either an elk or a bear or a cow.

Mr. TAYLOR. True.

Senator METCALF. And I think a strong point has been made in the course of the last 2 days for grazing in perpetuity for park purposes, as well as to preserve the economic resource.

Thank you very much.

Senator LONG. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make the comment, incidentally put in a plug for Hawaii, if you wish to see the largest herd of purebred Herefords, you don't go to Texas. You go to the Parker Ranch on the big island in the State of Hawaii, approximately 45,000 head. Now, I mention that because among those who visit Hawaii, there is as much comment on the Parker Ranch as almost any other phase, unless the volcano is active. Our people dwell in cities today. Our children do not see animals. And I am in complete sympathy with the statements made that we do not want to deny them the privilege of seeing horses and cattle. Certainly we can't make a national park into a ranch.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate the opportunity to appear.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much. The next witness is Mr. Glen Blake.

Mr. BLAKE. I don't have extra copies of my statement. I don't have a secretary. I'm my own secretary and merely a small businessman. I can leave this one with you if you'd like, when I'm through.

Senator METCALF. You leave it with the reporter when you're through. Very glad to have you, Mr. Blake, and you go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF GLEN T. BLAKE, AMATEUR PHOTOGRAPHER, RICHFIELD, UTAH

Mr. BLAKE. Gentlemen, in all the discussions about this Canyonlands National Park, the opinion seems to be that the Government has plenty of money to develop a great national park here regardless of size or costs. We all know that all of the national parks need far more money than they are now getting. Year after year I have seen the campgrounds overcrowded. Time after time I have seen families come in late at night, tired, the children restless or crying, and no place to camp. Even with the large new campgrounds now being built in many national park areas, they will be overcrowded by the time the Mission 66 program is completed. They are like the southern California freeways. As soon as they are opened, they are already overcrowded.

I would like to, if time permitted, I would like to talk more to this, specifically for Arches and Capitol Reed National Monuments.

We all know that a national park of 330,000 acres will require more money than one of 200,000 or 100,000 acres. Will there be enough money to develop all of it, or would it be better to use the available money to develop a smaller park?

The matter of roads connecting the parks is just as important as the parks. Roads also cost money. We all know that most tourists will not travel over dirt roads; and we know that most tourists travel on a limited time budget. The time it takes to travel from one national park to the next one determines how much time they will spend in Utah and how much money they will spend in Utah.

At the present time, for a tourist to travel from the Canyonlands and Arches to Bryce Canyon over oiled roads requires traveling clear up to Price and then to Bryce Canyon, a distance of about 360 miles. And bear in mind that there is no national park or monument along the way. Interstate 70 will reduce this by only about 60 miles, but still will not take in any national park or monument, although it will open up some wonderful scenery.

When the oiling of State Highway 24 is completed, the distance will not be much shorter, but will take in Capitol Reef National Monument, which, by the way, has far more terrific scenery than many national parks. And there are immense areas right next to Capitol Reef that are just as grand that should be joined to Capitol Reef and all made into a national park, without impairing grazing rights. I honestly believe Capitol Reef to be more worthy of national park status than any area in the United States not now a national park.

Recently some tourists decided to take the road from Blanding to the Natural Bridges National Monument, then on to Capitol Reef by way of Hite, and from there to Bryce. But when they got to Hite, the ferry was not operating. They had to backtrack to Blanding, then go to Price, at which point they decided to go to San Francisco. They missed seeing the southern Utah parks.

Senator Bennett's bill, S. 808, will provide a highway connecting Canyonlands, Arches, Natural Bridges, Capitol Reef, Bryce, Zion, Cedar Breaks, Glen Canyon, and Lake Powell recreation areas, Monument Valley, and others, the greatest concentration of scenery in the world by all odds. And what is more, it will open up a tremendous scenic area that is now almost unknown; great arches and natural bridges, deep gorges and petrified forests. It will reach a mountain of ancient seashells, the largest that I know of that have been found in our country, thousands of feet above sea level. Here is a sample [handing]. It will pass close by a scenic area that rivals Bryce and Capitol Reef. I have sent color slides of that area to both of our Senators and a few to our Congressmen. Here are a couple of slides and a viewer that can be passed around, if you're interested [handing].

All proponents of the Canyonlands National Park, regardless of which view they take, have talked about the value it will have in tourist dollars to our economy. We must not forget that this value is high, because there are other national parks and monuments in Utah, and to get the most value out of them they must be connected with good oiled roads. Not one of them would be of great economic value without the other. Senator Bennett's parkway, it seems to me, would best fill this need.

I am a photographer by hobby. I know that I speak for most tourists, because most tourists now take pictures. Some livestock grazing in a canyon or meadow increases the value of color pictures tremendously, and I acknowledge the fact that this has been brought out before in this hearing. No one wants uncontrolled grazing, but controlled grazing does not injure a national park. There is a difference, too, in the matter of rights of the people, between grazing rights which have been established for many years and other multiple uses which are based on possible future findings. I am speaking here on the basic rights of the citizens, and not on economic values. I speak on the matter of grazing, because this does not mar the scenery; and the depriving of the livestock people of their grazing rights is un-

American and wrong, and there is no injury to the public involved.

This sacred cow of the Park Service does need to be reconsidered. To allow grazing for only 25 years in Canyonlands is only a salve. It does not right a wrong.

I leave the other multiple-use questions to others more qualified to discuss them than I am.

One more thought. You are not making decisions that will be permanent for time and all eternity. No matter what you decide, it won't be perfect. Those who oppose Senator Moss' park bill as it now stands still owe him a debt of gratitude for working on it as he has done and for arousing all this interest and activity. We all want a national park, and we want it badly. From a selfish viewpoint, I and others like myself would rather keep things merely as they are; just give us dirt roads into the remote area that are now inaccessible, including the Needles, Land of Standing Rocks, Rainbow Bridge National Monument, and in other areas. We are torn between two desires. We would selfishly keep these wonderful scenic areas from the masses, so they would remain natural and untrammeled, but we also love it so much that we want to share it with others and to teach them to appreciate it and protect it and to love it as we do.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Senator Moss?

Senator Moss. No questions. Thank you, Glen. Mr. Blake is, as he says, an amateur photographer; but he's one of the best that there is. He could well be a professional. He has sent me slides over a long period of time and has a great interest in the scenic areas of our State and has been a constant advocate of improvement of access to these areas. So I think it's very commendable of you, Glen, to make the trip. It's quite a little drive from Richfield, as you pointed out, to get around and into Moab. So you've come a long ways to testify for this committee, and we do appreciate your coming to testify.

Mr. BLAKE. Thank you. I'll say selfishly that I didn't come entirely for this. This was the main reason, but the demand——

Senator Moss. You took some pictures on the way?

Mr. BLAKE. The demand for my pictures is becoming so great that I just can't keep up. And yesterday, you know how the wind was blowing, so we're hoping this clears up so we can get them some more up here. All of the ones from Arches that I have, I've either sent to you or given them away.

Senator Moss. We've got the weatherman going for you.

Mr. BLAKE. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Blake.

The next witness is Mrs. L. E. Ottinger.

Mrs. OTTINGER. You can call me Marian, if you'd like.

Senator METCALF. We'd be very glad to.

Mrs. OTTINGER. I typed these myself, so if you can't read them, you can blame me.

Senator METCALF. We'll be glad to listen. We all have copies. You go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF MRS. L. E. (MARIAN) OTTINGER, BUSINESSWOMAN, MOAB, UTAH

Mrs. OTTINGER. I really don't have anything much now to say. It's just a little personal experience of mine.

My husband and I came to this area in September 1956, and at that time he went to work for George Bittle Trucking, who was building a road into the Needles area for an oil drilling company, actually from the Dugout Ranch into Squaw Springs. And I was told that our Buick was the first passenger car back into that country. We were 6 weeks in that area, and we camped in a cave adjacent to Cave Springs; and we came to admire the rock formations in that area. It was really different.

We're from the west coast, and of course it was very, very different. The cave we camped in had Indian writings on the wall, and among them were 13 handprints in red clay; and we took a short tour down into Horse Canyon, which I understand is to be part of the proposed Canyonlands; and I was amazed to find all of those Indian ruins. I had never seen anything like that, and it's really loaded with them.

Right next to our little cave we found a rock with three matates in the top—you know, where they ground their corn. And I could just picture the Indian women sitting around gossiping and grinding their corn.

When we returned to the area a year or so later, we were interested in seeing how the country still looked; and we went into Cave Springs, and someone had had a caterpillar tractor in there and turned it over—the rock that had the matates—over, and they were no longer visible. The cave we were in had had a fire right under the handprints on the wall, and they were no longer visible. They were well smoked out.

I tried rubbing a little smoke off, to no avail. And this is one reason that I personally feel very strongly about Canyonlands. I think that things like this shouldn't be allowed to happen. I think that that should be for everyone to see, whenever they feel like going down there to see it. I think they should be able to view the things that I saw. And it hurts me quite deeply.

Since that time we've gone into business here in Moab as Moab Rock Shop; and in dealing with the tourists we discovered a need for our service back into some of the areas of this country. So we started the Southeastern Taxi & Scenic Tours, and we take people into the remote areas of this country, especially people from out of town, and I find people from back East that are real interested in something like this. They want to go out in the wilds, so to speak, where no one has been, and we've received many satisfied customer letters. And some of them even go so far as to send us pictures back that they have taken while they were here.

I think the testimony of people like our customers that are so satisfied with this country and they are so thrilled with the views, such as the Valley of the Standing Rocks and Grandview Point, I think that this should be available to everyone and accessible, which

it isn't now. I mean, people from back East are real reluctant to get off the pavement, I find. And when I see the wonder in the eyes of the people, I recall the thrill that I had when I first viewed the many scenic wonders around here and also the Indian ruins and writings down in the Needles area, and I also feel the sickness that I felt when I discovered that the things I had seen and grown to know and love were destroyed by somebody's thoughtlessness.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mrs. Ottinger.

Senator Moss. Thanks, Mrs. Ottinger.

Senator METCALF. Mrs. Ottinger, we realize that even park or monument status and all that cannot prevent vandalism——

Mrs. OTTINGER. Yes.

Senator METCALF. But it is our hope that we can at least prevent some of it.

Mrs. OTTINGER. A lot of it, yes. I think so.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

Is Mr. Stewart here? Mr. C. L. Stewart?

(There was no reply.)

Senator METCALF. Well, that concludes the list of witnesses this morning. We have had 14 witnesses testify on various phases of Canyonlands, proposed Canyonlands park. We've had a wonderful hearing here today. It's been a very fine audience. You have demonstrated your enthusiasm for this kind of a development, and I for one want to express my appreciation to Senator Moss for introducing this bill and giving me an opportunity to come out and see this very wonderful area. This is the first time I've been in this particular area, and I want to express my appreciation to both Senator Moss and Senator Bennett for their helping conduct this hearing and teaching me a good many things about your area, and to the people of this area of Utah, whose hospitality is superb.

Senator Moss?

Senator Moss. Well, I echo what the chairman said about the hospitality of the people. I tried to say a little something about it at the beginning; but every time we come in here with guests from Washington, the local people have always come to our aid and been up to take us in their jeeps or their cars, to provide us with the food when it was lunchtime on top; and the same people have done the same down in San Juan County, too, and it has made it delightful to come back here again.

I was very anxious that as many of my colleagues as possible come out and actually see the area, because it's hard to describe in words what we have in this area that we've been talking about by way of scenery, and a person who has once seen it then carries an impression that stays with him permanently.

I think Mrs. Ottinger, who testified last, was quite a moving witness as she talked about the beauties of the area and what it meant to her and her concern about whether it should be protected as well as made accessible to many people. And that's the thing that we've been trying to work out.

Now, we've been going through the legislative process in holding these hearings, and I greatly appreciate the cooperation of all the people of our area. This committee has the responsibility of considering the bill that is before it, of trying to reconcile all points of view,

with the ultimate purpose of serving the public interest of the people of Utah and the people of the United States; and I'm sure that you who have sat through this hearing recognize the sincerity and dedication of the men who sit on this committee and who will consider it.

I might point out that all of the testimony that we've taken today will be printed up in a little booklet like this. This is the testimony that was given in Washington, and those of you who would like a copy of that may have these, as far as they'll go. I don't know whether we have enough to go around entirely, but if you'd like a copy of what was said at the hearings there, you can get it today, and when these hearings have been printed in little booklets, they'll be available to you. You simply have to write a note and say you'd like one, and I'll send it out to you, so that you'll have a complete record of everything that was said here, as well as in Monticello, and what will be in the hearings in Salt Lake City on Monday.

I'm grateful, again, and I'm just happy that my colleagues could see some of our gorgeous State.

Senator METCALF. The witnesses who have testified today will automatically receive copies of the printed hearings as soon as they are available from the committee.

Senator Long?

Senator LONG. I would just like to again express my great pleasure Mr. Chairman, in being at these meetings in Utah. Hawaii, like each of the other States, has a history; and in that history there are many chapters that appeal to us and to our friends. There are two States that played an unusually important part. During the long years that I was working for statehood, if I were talking to a Congressman or a Senator from Massachusetts, I appealed to him to support statehood, because in a very real sense, Hawaii is an extension of Massachusetts. The old SS *Thaddeus*, 162 days out of Boston, sailed into Lahaina Harbor in the year 1820, and of the 22 men and women aboard, 19 of them were from Massachusetts and 3 of them from Connecticut. That was the beginning of America in this beautiful little area in the middle of the Pacific.

Now, so far, all States played an important part, but in our history and in our tradition and in our religions and cultural life, we're very much aware of the fact that another group came in the year 1850. A great deal was made of that 10 years ago. That was the first group that came to what was the Kingdom of Hawaii from the State of Utah, and you are very familiar with that story.

I do not need to stress it, but in our schools and in every phase of our life we are indebted to the people from Utah. We have a special interest in this State. I feel that you have a special interest in our State.

We came here to get your views. I'm just as certain as you are that this bill in some form will pass. These wonderful sights that we have seen, and that the world will increasingly become aware of, must be made available—I almost said preserved, and that would have been a mistake, because one of the witnesses said yesterday that it makes no difference what you do, this beautiful scenery is going to be here for all time. And it is.

What we're interested in is making it available, but let's say, first to the people of Utah, because they should have the privilege of knowing their own State—especially to the people of Hawaii, the people of

America, and of the world. I'm confident that when we look back to this chapter, we'll feel the right thing was done.

Senator METCALF. Senator Bennett.

Senator BENNETT. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Bible, and to the acting chairman, Senator Metcalf, for permitting me to sit in on these hearings. I'm not a member of the subcommittee or of the full committee, and therefore I'm here in my responsibility as senior Senator of Utah on my own motion, and it was a great privilege to be allowed to sit at the table and question the witnesses as though I were a member of the committee.

Senator Moss and I have a different approach to the solution of this particular problem, and I don't think we have any difference in our ultimate objective, that this great natural resource shall be developed in the way which will be most effective for the people of Utah and the United States, both today and in the long years to come. And these gentlemen who are here on official business have been very gracious to permit me to join their party, and I also enjoy coming into this part of the State. I'm glad to have another excuse and opportunity.

Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. Senator Bennett, we've been delighted to have you with us, and you've been most helpful in our study of this problem, and all of us are more than ever convinced that this superb scenery must be available to all the people of the United States. Uncle Sam has a chunk of real estate there that has to be developed and improved and shown to the rest of the people of our Nation. You've been very helpful in our examination.

The witnesses have all been wonderful. You've been a great crowd.

I again thank you all, and unless there's something else to come before the committee, the committee will be adjourned, to meet again at 9 o'clock in Salt Lake City on Monday. [Applause.]

(Whereupon, at 11:25 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene Monday, April 23, 1962.)

PROPOSED CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK IN UTAH

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1962

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., in the Federal Building, Salt Lake City, Utah, Senator Lee Metcalf presiding.

Present: Senators Metcalf, Moss, Long of Hawaii.

Also present: Senator Bennett, Representatives Davis S. King and M. Blaine Peterson; Benton J. Stong, professional staff member, and Allen Mitchem, minority counsel.

Senator METCALF. The hearing will come to order. This is a hearing by the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee. The chairman of this committee is Senator Alan Bible of Nevada, who was unable to be here this morning and he has asked me to preside.

This is a hearing on S. 2387, introduced by Senator Moss, a member of this committee. S. 2387 has been amended by Committee Print No. 1 and the hearing today is being held upon the latest committee print, Committee Print No. 1, which is the latest revision of Senator Moss' bill.

I have with me this morning participating in the hearing Senator Moss who is author of the bill and a member of this subcommittee; Senator Long of Hawaii, a member of the subcommittee; and our colleague from the Senate who is not a member of the committee but the senior Senator from Utah, Senator Bennett.

We also have representatives of the Interior Department and members of the Senate committee staff and I noticed in the audience that Congressman King of Utah is here and Congressman King, would you come up and sit with the committee, if you will?

Mr. KING. I would be happy to.

Senator METCALF. We have had hearings for 2 days in Washington on this bill. They are published as part 1 of the hearings and so are still available for those who want to see them. We have also had hearings in Monticello and Moab where we heard local witnesses and members of this committee have been in the field by jeep, by helicopter, and by airplane to view the proposed Canyonlands National Park.

I want to express my own appreciation for the courtesy and hospitality that I have been shown and the members of the committee have been shown while we have been in Utah and I know that my colleagues will also want to do so and so now, for further remarks, I am going to call on Senator Moss.

Congressman Peterson has just come in. Congressman Peterson, would you come up and sit with the committee?

Mr. PETERSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to. Good to see you.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Chairman Metcalf. I will not take any protracted time to say anything this morning because I see before us a long list of witnesses that we must hear today and we want everyone to have his chance to have a say as we go forward with this hearing but I did want to express my gratitude to Senator Metcalf and Senator Long and Senator Bible, who were with us for the field trip and for the hearings in Monticello, for coming to Utah at this time to hold the hearings on the Canyonlands National Park.

I think we all recognize that this is right around the Easter weekend and these Senators have given up any chance they had to have a little holiday with their families in order to carry on these hearings which had to be done at this time because of the press of other business that we have in the Senate.

I am very grateful to these men for doing it. They certainly have seemed to enjoy visiting our rugged canyon country down there and viewing it and the people of the State of Utah have indeed been most hospitable and helpful to the committee, have done everything they could to make the visit pleasant.

I am also happy that my colleague, Senator Bennett, was able to join us in the State at this time of these hearings and to be with the committee both in the southern part of the State and during our visit to the area as well as today, and also today we have an extra bonus in that both of our Congressmen from Utah are able to sit with the panel and to hear the witnesses.

We all know every bill that goes through Congress has to go through two houses and we are concerned now with the Senate side but the same bill or something akin to it will be considered in the House and the Congressmen that are here getting the benefit of the testimony of the people of Utah will certainly be better prepared to shepherd legislation through on the House side if we attain our goal of creating a Canyonlands National Park and let me just say a word about these gorgeous paintings that are displayed behind—displayed not too well because they were hurriedly put up at the last minute. They are painted by Lynn Fausett, who is one of our gifted artists of this State, one of the greatest that we have, and Lynn has long been one of the prime advocates of a park in this southern Utah area.

A month ago when we were holding the hearings in Washington I asked Mr. and Mrs. Fausett if they wouldn't provide some of these paintings for a showing back in Washington. I obtained permission from the Architect to have the showing in the old Supreme Court chamber of the Capitol Building, the Nation's Capitol, and for a week—as a matter of fact for about 10 days because it went over into the following week, there was a showing of paintings of Lynn Fausett, about 25 of them on display in the old Supreme Court chambers. All of the Congressmen and Senators were invited to come and most of them paid us a visit. Cabinet members and others in Washington. I talked with the Architect right after the showing who told me that to his knowledge this is the only time we have ever had a complete showing by a single artist in the Capitol of the United States and I think that is a great honor to come to Lynn and certainly it is an

honor to come to Utah, but he did this, he and his wife, voluntarily and at their own expense, simply because they were so interested in the subject that we are discussing today and this morning.

The reason the pictures were put up very hurriedly is that they just returned to Salt Lake City last night and got the word only this morning and had to rush in with some of the paintings and as you can see they are such valuable and gorgeous paintings that it is remarkable that they will haul them around with such short notice and put them up even though they are not displayed to their fullest advantage.

I wanted Mr. Fausett, who is standing over by that map on the south wall, to know how much I appreciate the efforts that he has made in getting this matter before the people who have to consider the Canyonlands Park and his wife, Mrs. Fausett, who works right along with him and as hard as he does. If you had seen those people on the job every day, greeting folks who came to see these pictures, you would have been very proud of Utah and what they were able to present for our State back there in the Nation's Capitol.

Well, I will not discuss the bill, Mr. Chairman, it is before everybody. We are here to learn. This is the legislative process to have the Senators who have the ultimate responsibility of reporting out a bill hear everyone on all sides of a proposition and that is what we want to do and we must move along of course rapidly because we have many people to hear.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator METCALF. Senator Long.

Senator LONG. I have nothing to say, Mr. Chairman, except that of the considerable number of hearings that I have been privileged to attend, I think I was more impressed by the two down south in this State than by any others and I am looking forward with a great deal of interest to hearing the testimony that will be presented here today.

Senator METCALF. Senator Bennett.

Senator BENNETT. I appreciate the opportunity I have had to join this committee, both in the hearings in southern Utah and again today.

Though I am not a member of the committee I am a member of the minority party which has members on the committee, none of whom could be present at these hearings so the chairman has been very gracious in giving me the opportunity to represent the minority and I'm grateful for the privilege and look forward to the hearings today.

Senator METCALF. We also welcome, of course, Congressman King and Congressman Peterson and I want you both to feel free to participate fully in the hearings and to interrogate the witnesses or make any comments just as if you were members of the committee.

Mr. PETERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KING. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. We are very grateful to Judge Ritter for the use of his courtroom and grateful to all the staff for their assistance.

We have, according to my schedule, 48 witnesses to hear today. All of us have other commitments tomorrow and so we will go forward just as rapidly as possible and I know that we will have the same cooperation that we have had in the other hearings from the witnesses to summarize their statements if they are longer than three or four pages.

Now in the hearings in Washington we were honored by having Governor Clyde testify and again today the committee is honored by opening these hearings by having George Clyde, your Governor of Utah, as our first witness. Governor Clyde, we are glad to have you with us.

Governor CLYDE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

May I preface my remarks by expressing to you my sincere appreciation for your invitation to join you at Canyonlands. I spent the day down there and enjoyed it very much. I want to express for the people of the State and myself our sincere appreciation that you and your committee could come out here and hold these hearings in Utah. This is a problem of major importance to the people of the State and I am sure we all want to get all of the facts that are possible to assemble to consider this problem.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE D. CLYDE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF UTAH

Governor CLYDE. Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, as you pointed out, I recently testified before your honorable body on the subject of S. 2387 at hearings held in Washington, D.C. I shall not take much of your time today but there is one point or two that I would like to clarify. I have no change to make in the position which I took when I appeared before you in Washington, and which I now reaffirm, namely:

That there should be created in the Canyonlands area, a national park encompassing for single purpose or selective use the superb scenic and scientific values; that this area should be limited in size to meet these requirements and that the balance of the proposed area be managed, explored and developed for multiple use of all the resources it contains. That S. 2387 as now revised does not adequately provide for such multiple use because such use would be totally dependent upon approval by the Secretary, and that new legislation should be drawn providing for joint Federal-State selection of land to be zoned for park purposes and other areas to be zoned and developed for recreation and multiple use.

There is, however, one point which stands in need of some clarification, which is my principal reason for appearing before you today.

Near the close of my Washington testimony, I placed before the committee two photographic enlargements, one showing the structure in the Canyonlands known as Upheaval Dome, and the other identified as Squaw Flat.

These pictures had been prepared for me by members of the fish and game department and identified by them. I subsequently found that the second picture shows an area outside that known as Squaw Flat, although the country is so markedly similar as to make it difficult to distinguish between the two areas.

I shall not further discuss the technicalities, but should, at this time, like to ask Mr. Harold Crane, director of the Utah Fish and Game Department, to take the stand and introduce photographs of the actual Squaw Flat area—an area which I believe you all saw on Thursday and should readily recognize.

So, Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to ask Mr. Crane to clarify that point on the photograph and that will complete my testimony.

Senator METCALF. We would be happy, very happy to call Mr. Crane. Mr. Crane, go right ahead and testify.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD S. CRANE, DIRECTOR OF THE STATE OF UTAH DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Mr. CRANE. I think this will just take a moment. I am scheduled to testify later on the proposals but a matter of clarification on this picture the Governor presented in Washington.

This is the picture that we had given to him and identified as "Squaw Flat." This is a picture of Squaw Flat with proposed boundaries. As you see——

Senator Moss. Does it show the double Sixshooters?

Mr. CRANE. The Sixshooters both show in this one; and having recently been down there you will recognize it, and I think you see the similarity in the overal pictures—very little difference, actually, in the terrain.

Senator METCALF. Very well, Mr. Crane, the pictures will be made a part of the file for reference by the committee.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, sir.

Senator METCALF. Were you through, Governor Clyde?

Governor CLYDE. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator METCALF. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much, Governor Clyde, we were delighted and honored to have you with us.

The next witness will be Mr. Steve Smoot. Do you have a prepared statement, Steve?

STATEMENT OF STEVE SMOOT, CHAIRMAN, UTAH STATE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, and Senator Bennett, as the State chairman of the Democratic Party, I am appearing before this committee this morning to briefly state for the record of this committee the position taken by the Democratic Party of the State of Utah at its State convention held on April 21, 1962, in Salt Lake City.

By unanimous vote of approximately 1,200 delegates from every county in the State of Utah, the convention, through resolution, commended the endorsement of Senate bill 2387, as amended, by its author, Senator Frank E. Moss. We believe that passage and implementation of such a bill by the Congress of the United States will open up to the citizens of this State and Nation one of the most unique and magnificent scenic attractions in the world.

We feel that it will have a beneficial impact on this State's economy and will provide a very important addition to the national park system of this nation. We feel that a large, contiguous single park under

the supervision of the National Park Service is a realistic approach toward proper supervision and control.

We are in accord with the concept of providing multiple use to permit mineral development where such can be practiced without interference in preserving the scenic values of the park and to permit continued grazing practice where feasible.

We support also the idea of wildlife conservation and control in the Canyonlands under the regulation of experienced game department officers of the State of Utah and the Federal Government.

We greatly commend the Kennedy administration for having initiated the canyonlands proposal, and we respectfully urge that the members of the committee act favorably on establishing the Canyonlands National Park on such a basis as that which is proposed in the Moss bill.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Smoot. Questions?

Senator BENNETT. May I just raise one question. In the hearings in Monticello on Thursday, a witness accused Governor Clyde and me of making this a political issue, saying that the Democrats were carefully keeping it out of politics. Now I notice that there are five witnesses scheduled today who are officers of the Democratic Party in Utah. Would you like to say for the record that you think this should be a nonpartisan problem and that you do not feel that the five appearances of five officers of your party makes this political?

Mr. SMOOT. May I say this: The purpose of the committee, of course, is to attain the facts and sentiment among the people here in Utah. The Democratic Party represents a very substantial segment of the population, and, last Saturday at the convention, the delegates from the party throughout the State assembled and expressed their feeling as to their convictions; and I think this is certainly proper and every part of the American system, but had there been any sufficient ground swell of opposition to this bill, I am sure that in an open convention such as this, it would have been well expressed; but such was not the case. They feel quite well about the proposed bill, and, because of this, we feel that it is certainly our prerogative to assert the party's unanimous position regarding the proposal by the Senator.

Senator BENNETT. You don't quite answer my question. Do you feel it would be well to develop a nonpartisan solution to this problem, or are you hanging on the idea that this is a solution which the party has approved and therefore the party will stand by it regardless of any possible future development?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I think that the party has to assert itself, the will of its people, and this is certainly in order. I would certainly commend and would be interested to see what the Republican Convention would do next week in exposing this bill to the Republican Party as a whole as to whether or not they woulld be unanimously behind it as the Democratic Party.

Senator BENNETT. If the Republican Party comes up in its convention with the support of Governor Clyde, would you think that that would throw the issue into partisan context?

Mr. SMOOT. I think there would be some differences of opinion in this sense that would largely develop upon partisan lines but at least we would know essentially where the feeling and the thinking of the people would be.

Senator BENNETT. Well, I still am left with the feeling that as an officer of your party—and this is an honor, and you do your office honor—that the appearance of yourself and the other four officers of the party tends to make the approach to the solution of this problem partisan; and I would hope that we could find another solution.

Senator METCALF. May I make a comment first.

This is a factfinding committee. This committee is out here to get as much information as possible. We welcome the testimony from the Democratic Party. We welcome testimony from the Republican Party. If there is a resolution from the Republican Party in favor of the proposals that Governor Clyde outlines in his testimony, we would welcome that. We welcome testimony, as I look down here, from the steelworkers, and we don't regard that as an employee-employer controversy. We want every group to have an opportunity to come here and to testify, and, Senator Bennett, if there are officials of your party who want to come here and testify, this list is open and we will be glad to hear them.

Senator BENNETT. Well, it is my impression that if the Republican Party should take a similar position next Saturday, this will be hailed as proof of the fact that this is a partisan problem, and I hope that we won't for that reason.

Senator METCALF. As I indicated at Moab, a national park is not a partisan problem. This is land of unique and superb beauty owned by the Federal Government; and our job here is to find out about what the people of Utah want to do and help them utilize our real estate down there at its highest possible use. If the Democratic Party or the Republican Party, if the steel companies or the steelworkers, or the University of Utah want to testify, we welcome their ideas.

Senator Moss. I would like to comment, Mr. Chairman, simply to say that this represents a considerable initiative on the part of the political party to which I belong. All of these people that are on the list have asked to testify. They have come in and asked to have their views put on the record and I think this is a real exercise in government out here and I would hope, Senator Bennett, that the Republicans would resolve on it. I would hope, of course, they resolve for the Moss bill, but whatever their resolution would be it would certainly be welcomed by the committee and would be considered fully by the committee.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Smoot.

Mr. SMOOT. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. Miles P. Romney.

While Mr. Romney is coming forward and I welcome him as a witness, he has testified before committees upon which I have served many, many times and, at the time I was a Member of the House of Representatives, testified both on mining and labor and educational matters and always has given us good testimony. This is the first opportunity officially as a Senator that I have had to welcome you, Mr. Romney, and I am looking forward to your testimony as it has always been good.

Mr. ROMNEY. Thank you, Senator. I had understood that I was going to be about 10th on the list so I was just sitting in the back of the room relaxing when you called my name.

STATEMENT OF MILES P. ROMNEY, MANAGER, UTAH MINING ASSOCIATION

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. Chairman, honorable gentlemen of the committee, I have a statement which is fairly lengthy. It is too long to read in the limited time——

Senator METCALF. It will be incorporated in the record.

Mr. ROMNEY. I have a number of tables attached thereto. I will speak briefly from some notes that I have made.

It is the position of the Utah Mining Association that lands selected for national park use and status should be set aside exclusively for such purposes. It is further our position that lands which lie outside of the park area should be left free for normal public domain uses under present statutes and regulations. The lands selected for parks should be selected on the basis of their predominant and outstanding scenic, scientific, and historic values. We feel that to lower the standards of national park lands invites inclusion of more land than can be justified on the high basis of park lands.

We further feel in regard to this position that multiple-use provisions in national park lands are not practical. I read carefully the testimony in Washington and have observed that the major portion of those testifying there from public status—the Wilderness Society, the American Forestry Association, the National Wild Life Federation, the National Parks Association—all unqualifiedly opposed multiple use in the parks.

Secretary Udall made a statement that I feel puts his feelings in proper record as to the continuity of multiple use in national parks. He says, and I quote:

> I recommend that the valid existing rights to minerals and oil and gas production be protected, but that the park itself not be left open to indefinite exploration.

I think this is a clear indication that the Secretary feels it may be necessary to write the multiple-use provision into the law but it is his idea that the park itself not be left open to indefinite exploration.

We have regulations existing for one national park and three national monuments in which multiple use has been provided. Those regulations have been published in the Federal Register and have been set forth in part 1, chapter 1, title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations covering the National Park Service and it lays down the general regulations under which these multiple-use provisions may be carried on, naming the three monuments and the park as the Mount McKinley Park. Then the same code carries specific regulations applying to McKinley Park as it does for the other areas in which these uses have been employed.

We feel the experience under these regulations has been such as to discourage the hope that multiple use can be carried on practically in the areas where such multiple-use provisions have been employed. I refer particularly to the Mount McKinley National Park.

I took it upon myself to write to one of the officials of the State of Alaska to ask concerning his experience of their State with respect to multiple use in the Mount McKinley National Park. I have a 2½-page letter reply, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to introduce for the record. I would like to read one brief paragraph.

Senator METCALF. If no objection, the entire letter will be introduced at this point. Is this a copy?

Mr. ROMNEY. This is a copy.
(The document referred to follows:)

STATE OF ALASKA, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
DIVISION OF MINES AND MINERALS,
March 8, 1962.

Re national park restrictions on mining.

Mr. MILES P. ROMNEY,
Manager, Utah Mining Association,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MIKE: You came to the right man. I am glad that you did. I welcome the opportunity to expound on the subject of the U.S. Park Service restrictions and to be able to warn you against them. Your feeling that mining will be nullified by restriction is correct. No mining, to the best of my knowledge, has been carried on in McKinley National Park, though the geological possibilities are very good. A road running through it to the Kantishna mining district has been repeatedly denied to miners for mine hauling. The State is now building a long parallel route to the Kantishna outside of the park only because of the unavailability of the park road to the miners. I published this fact in my monthly bulletin sometime ago, and there was not a murmur of disagreement from the Park Service on it.

To save a lot of dictating, let me quote from a letter I wrote to Senator Bartlett in 1959 with information for basing protests against the proposed withdrawal of the 9-million-acre area for the Arctic Wildlife Range where mining was intended, by wording of the bill, to be allowed under certain restrictions—I presume you know that Bartlett was successful in getting the bill defeated, so the Secretary of the Interior went ahead and withdrew the area anyhow, and mining is prohibited:

"First, we quote from a portion of the law which created Mount McKinley National Park (16 U.S.C. 350a): '* * * *Provided*, That no resident of the United States who is qualified under the mining laws of the United States applicable to Alaska shall be denied entrance to the park for the purpose of prospecting or mining.'

"Yet, in spite of the above law, regulations such as the following (36 CFR 1.61, as lately amended) have been promulgated which effectively do deny persons the right to prospect and mine in the park: '(a) No person shall land aircraft on land or water or any federally owned area within any national park or monument, other than at one of the following designated landing areas: (1) Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska: McKinley Park Station Airport, located in sections 3 and 4, township 14 south, range 7 west, and sections 33 and 34, township 13 south, range 7 west, Fairbanks meridian.' On the basis of this regulation, a prospecting party was, in fact, denied entrance to the park last summer because a helicopter was one of its necessary prospecting tools. We need not dwell on the importance and necessity of helicopters and other aircraft in modern prospecting and mining.

"There are further restrictive regulations such as the one prohibiting the building of roads to service a mining property unless a permit is obtained, and we know that these permits are not always obtainable. Also, the park superintendent shall designate which timber may be cut on a mining claim, and how any cuttings or debris shall be disposed of by the prospector or miner.

"Then, concerning Glarier Bay National Monument, in addition to the Executive order mentioned above leaving it open for mining, we have chapter 700 of the 74th Congress (49 Stat. 1817) saying as follows: '* * * in the area within the Glacier Bay National Monument in Alaska, or as it may hereafter be extended, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States shall be, exclusive of the land containing them, subject to disposal under such laws * * *.'

"Here again, though, we have a regulation (36 CFR 1.61 as lately amended) saying that aircraft cannot land as mentioned above in (*a*) except: '(3) Glacier Bay National Monument, Alaska. The entire water area of the monument, except Adams Inlet and any of the lakes of the monument; provided, however, landings and take-offs shall not be made on beaches or tidal flats or within one nautical mile of any tidewater glacier in the monument. If authorized by the Superintendent, helicopters may land at selected sites where deemed essential in the conduct of prospecting and mining activities.' Though a bit more lenient than the McKinley regulation, this one will still be instantly recognized as severely restrictive of an effective prospecting program. Roads, timber cutting, etc., are restricted the same as in Mount McKinley, and the

regulations containing these further restrictions are found under 43 CFR 69.11. One prospecting party in the monument was informed last summer that if they did not start reporting their every move, and shape up in other ways, they would be forbidden to prospect there. I, personally, was told by the Superintendent that if it ever looks as if an open pit operation might be started, '* * * we will get a law passed to prevent it.'

"Because of all the above, we have learned that though the passers of a law to withdraw an area may have the intent that the area be kept open to mineral entry, it just does not remain that way. The bureaucratic urge to keep an area under its jurisdiction closed to all but its own functions is too strong."

The prospecting party mentioned in the above quoted letter was that of Phelps Dodge who were denied entrance if they were to use their helicopter. You can check on this, if you care to, with Ray Ludden or Red Maillot at Douglas, Ariz.

In 36 CFR 1.27 under the heading of "General regulations for all parks," it says: "The use of the Government roads in any park or monument by commercial trucks, when such trucking is in no way connected with the operation of the park or monument, is prohibited." The term "commercial trucks" is defined in same regulation as trucks "used in transporting movable property for a fee or profit."

In 36 CFR 7.44 is laid out a form which a prospector must fill out and have approved by the Park Superintendent before he may enter McKinley National Park, and it also includes other restrictions similar to those in 43 CFR 69.11 or Glacier Bay National Monument, a photocopy of which we enclose for your further information.

I think by now you have the picture. Don't let them do it to you.

Most sincerely,

JAMES A. WILLIAMS,
Director, Division of Mines and Minerals.

Mr. ROMNEY. I quote:

No mining, to the best of my knowledge, had been carried on in McKinley National Park, though the geological possibilities are very good. A road running through it to the Kantishna mining district has been repeatedly denied to miners for mined hauling. The State is now building a long parallel route to the Kantishna outside of the park only because of the unavailability of the park road to the miners. I published this fact in my monthly bulletin sometime ago and there was not a murmur of disagreement from the Parks Service on it.

The gentleman who supplied this letter is Mr. James A. Williams, director, Division of Mines and Minerals of the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Alaska. Now we just feel practical about this, gentlemen, that if there is great difficulty in realizing practical access to the lands under which multiple use is provided, then we are applying a pig in a poke to accept the multiple-use principle in this area or in others where they are proposed. We feel that it simply opens the way for inclusion of more lands than is necessary without furnishing the right to do the things and to perform the exploratory and development functions that the law as proposed would provide.

So therefore we feel that it is practical to make it black and white, set aside the park, leave the rest of the area unrestricted for multiple use development.

Now one more point, I am going to get going a little faster here. I have touched a little long on this one. One point I would like to touch on very briefly is that I feel this park is separated by nature and man can't do anything about it. It was separated by nature into three distinct areas, the Needles, Standing Rocks, and the Island in the Sky areas.

I have a little map on the back of my statement here, the last page, which shows the distances that both tourists and administrators will have to travel to get from one point to the other. Now these distances are rough because I had to lay them out on a small scale map and with a ruler. I think they are very close.

Chesler Park to Grand View Point, 140 miles; Chesler Park to Standing Rock, 246 miles; and Grand View Point to Standing Rock, 185 miles.

For a tourist to come to Monticello, go into Chesler Park, go up to Moab and into Grand View, then to Green River and back down to Standing Rock and then back to Highway 70 will prove just about 550 miles. I feel that nature itself has provided this area as three distinct areas, both for tourist visitations and for administration and we feel that the careful selection of the most appropriate lands in those three areas will interfere with neither the tourist visits nor with the administration of the park areas.

I know you all know that country probably a little better than I do, but I feel that a hundred mines and a thousand oil derricks could be placed around in the areas outside of these specifically beautiful, scenic areas and one would hardly ever be noticed.

I would like to call attention to the fact, gentlemen, that this mineral area is just 10 years old. In the last 10 years we have had developed one of the Nation's outstanding uranium producing areas. We have established a very fine oil producing district. Two or three smaller ones have been found in very recent years. Those more recently found have been much closer to the park, one producing well within the park and it has been excluded, I appreciate that, Senator Moss, and potash has been discovered in the last 10 years or so, within the last 10 years, and now a development there is spending $30 million in development before they will turn a wheel and this does not include the railroad or the highway.

I have a letter from the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. outlining their employment, their expenditures, and I would like to submit that.

Senator METCALF. No objection, that will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

TEXAS GULF SULPHUR CO. INC.,
Moab, Utah, April 20, 1962.

MR. MILES P. ROMNEY,
Manager, Utah Mining Association,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MR. ROMNEY: In answer to your letter of April 11, 1962, requesting certain information regarding our potash mine and plant now under development and construction near Moab, Utah, we are pleased to send you the following estimates:

Total investments in development and plant prior to commencing operations: $30 million.

	Initial operation at 4,000 t.p.d.	Expanded operation at 8,000 t.p.d.
Persons employed	250	350.
Total payroll	$2,000,000/yr	$3,000,000/yr.
Power consumption	20,000,000/kw.-hr./yr	120,000,000/kw.-hr./yr.
Gas	210 MMc.f./yr	450–650 MMc.f./yr.
Materials bought locally in Utah	$1,000,000/yr	$2,000,000/yr.
Production rate in tons of muriate annually	550,000	1,100,000.

Long-range program: It is our plan to develop our potash properties at Cane Creek and Seven Mile as rapidly as market conditions permit.

With best regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

F. E. TIPPIE,
Project Manager.

Mr. ROMNEY. Now I would like to refer briefly and finally to comparative economics. We have read the University of Utah economic report with considerable interest. In my opinion the University of Utah economic study overlooks the finest laboratory we have in this State for the evaluation of mineral resource values and tourism.

I have no intention in presenting the figures that I have put together to discredit tourism to the benefit of resource development. I agree with the statement in the report 100 percent that we should have both and we should balance the consideration of both in the selection of the lands that we are going to set aside.

I think we should have both but I think we should get some things in a little better perspective and I would like to use the two-county area of San Juan and Grand and the three-county area of Wayne, Garfield, and Washington, relate some of their basic economics with respect to the fact that Wayne, Garfield, and Washington have two parks and one monument. We have a record there of visitors. We have a record of their increase of visitors. We have two monuments in the two-county area, arches and the natural bridges and we have a record of their tourist visits.

On page 5 of my report I have shown 1940, 1950, 1960 for those years the combined attendance or visitor registration in those park areas and you will notice in 1960 there were 950,000 visitors in the parks and monuments in the 3-county area and there were 78,000 in the 2-county area. This was an increase over 1950 of 410,000 visitors; 411,000 rounded out in the 3-county area. In other words, an increase of approximately 60,000 in the 2-county area.

Now the University of Utah used certain figures of $7 a day at 1.42 days of stay and this meant a gross gain of a little over $4 million for the 3-county area; about $587,000 for the 2-county area. This converted to direct personal income at 27 percent, which was also taken from the University of Utah reports, meant personal income gain of $1,100,000 for the 3-county area and $158,000 for the 2-county area, representing if you say the annual average wage was $3,000, 368 employees were directly employed in the 3-county area and 53 employees in the 2.

Now the population figure shows an overall decrease of about 8 percent in the three-county area and a population gain of 127 percent in the two-county area. As to personal income, the only data that I could get was from a study prepared by Prof. J. W. Hanks of the University of Utah and that was for the years 1954 to 1957 only. In those 4 years, it shows a gain of personal income in the three-county area of a little over $3 million or about 23 percent of the 1954 base and it shows a personal income of $13⅔ million in the two-county area over the same period of years.

Going quickly to employment which is nonagricultural employment. We all know that agricultural employment has been going down markedly in both of these general areas. This nonagricultural employment is generally industrial type, retail or service type of employment. The three-county area gained 163 percent in 1960 over 1950 and the two-county area gained 646 percent in the same period.

Now the percent of population employed in nonagricultural jobs in these areas I think is very interesting. In the three-county area in 1950, 6.6 percent of people were employed in nonagricultural jobs. It was 18 percent in 1960, undoubtedly showing some impact of tour-

ism. In the two-county area it was 7.7 percent in 1950, almost the same as the three-county area. It went to 27 percent in the two-county area.

Now the claim was made in the University of Utah report that practically all of the increase in tourist-oriented types of industry were due to tourism in the two-county area.

I was able to get a leading motel down there to give me a summation of his occupants for the year 1961. Of his total occupants numbering 8,500, 72½ percent were commercial; 22⅘ percent were tourist, and 5 percent were movie people. We felt that the increase in eating houses and in gas stations and in motels in the Moab and Monticello area during the mineral development period was very largely due to people who were going there seeking opportunities to develop or were seeking opportunities to sell supplies and equipment and were going there to seek jobs.

Now mind you, again to refer back to the parks visitor increase, there were 59,000 increases only in 10 years where over in the three-county area there was 410,000.

The University of Utah report claims that there were 437 direct jobs created by tourism in the two-county area and only 771 in the three-county area. This I cannot understand in view of the relationship of the number of registered visitors in the parks in the two-county area. True, there were other tourists in the area but if they didn't visit these fine places they were just going through.

The assessed valuation figures were quoted to you previously. I am not going to go through those in detail. I would like to add simply that by taking the mining assessed valuation out of the total assessed valuation in these areas, I note that property, other than mining property, the increase in valuation was only $3.8 million in the three-county area in the last 10 years whereas the increase in property, other than mining, in the two-county area was $21 million in the last 10 years.

The increase in other properties in the two-county area was 50 percent greater than the total assessed valaution in the three-county area.

Now I want to repeat, I am not discrediting the impact of tourism. I think if it weren't for tourism in these three counties and the extent to which developed, we would not have figures as favorable as we have. I am simply trying to say that these resource industries have been the root of this development.

Now just one final set of figures and I will quit.

I took upon myself the task of finding what comes to the State from property tax and from occupation tax. The occupation tax, for you gentlemen who are not acquainted, is 1 percent of gross tax which goes to the State on metallic minerals and a 2-percent tax on the gross oil production, oil and gas production, which goes to the State.

I have summarized this income plus the consideration of the money that the State sends back to the uniform school fund and I find that in 1950 in the two-county area—in the three-county area, I am sorry—in the three-county area in 1950 those three counties contributed $77,000. They received $622,000 from the uniform school fund or a net minus position on the basis of the property tax and occupation tax of $545,000.

In the two-county area the picture was almost the same; $60,000 contributed or a net gain from the State of $167,000. In 1960 the three-

county area contributed $87,000. They received $1,200,000. Their net deficit position, so far as property tax, occupation tax and uniform school fund was concerned, was $1,100,000.

In the two-county area they paid $856,000 directly to the State from property tax. The spillover—I am not going to go into this complicated formula—but a fixed levy is applied in each area and that which is collected over their school needs is contributed to the State. The spillover was $663,000. The occupation tax was $2,400,000. They received $160,000 back. Their net position was $3,755,000. Add that to the deficit on the other side and you have got close to $5 million.

Now, gentlemen, this does not include the rentals and royalties that came from leasing of Federal lands nor does it include the rentals and royalties that came from State lands. I could not get the breakdown, county by county, on the State lands but I could get it for Federal lands and I find that in 1960, the income from rentals and royalties from the two-county area was $803,000 as compared to $360,000 in the three-county area giving another surplus of about $500,000, so the difference between the contribution to the State, most of which entered into the school systems of the State, the difference in 1960 was over $5 million.

Now I have not attempted to tabulate this through the period of 10 years. I think it would show some very interesting totals. I think that the opportunity to continue to develop this sort of resources that make this sort of contribution to the State and to the country should be continued. I think we should bend every opportunity to develop all the tourism potentialities we have in the area, too. I simply appeal to you, look very carefully to the lands that are selected and the provisions that are made so that the opportunity to develop these resources is not unduly compromised.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Romney.

Senator Moss. Miles, I gather from your testimony that it is a fine thing to have a Big Indian or an Aneth oilfield in your county.

Mr. ROMNEY. It is fine and it is good for the State.

Senator Moss. Now you say you believe in a black-and-white park where you won't let anything go on except look at the scenery and the area outside where you let everything go on in the way of exploration and mining. Have you an opinion what size park, if any, we should have then?

Mr. ROMNEY. Senator, I haven't a fixed opinion on it. I would say that the Governor's committee evaluation might well be within the realm of practicality.

Senator Moss. 102,000?

Mr. ROMNEY. Might be a little too low and might be a little too high.

Senator Moss. And the 208,000 that would be the recreation area, you would have them completely out?

Mr. ROMNEY. I think they should continue under present status and regulations as they are under the public domain management and development at the present time.

Senator Moss. Now you were reading about the motels and what they did down in the two-county area. I believe you were in Monticello and you heard Mr. Strong testify, didn't you, down there when he talked about what had happened in the two-county area that we are talking about.

Mr. ROMNEY. I heard it, I don't recall the specific detail.

Senator Moss. One little paragraph I would like to read. Mr. Strong says:

"When I moved to Monticello in 1955 the town was on a boom, jobs were plentiful, business was good and it was almost impossible to find a vacant apartment or even a trailer space. But now, 7 years later, business is poor, jobs are scarce, vacant houses and apartments are numerous. In 1956 I had six men working for me in the plumbing and heating business but now I do not have enough work for myself and there is no other plumber here," which he completed to say that if you have a business, tourist business or a motel and business depended on a mining boom, that it goes up and down and we must recognize that in this two-county area we are going downhill pretty fast as far as business in the town is concerned; is that right?

Mr. ROMNEY. I haven't checked the statistics individually of Moab and Monticello. I simply took the two-county area and this one motel that I cited, the 8,500 people who were occupants during the year. I checked back on percentage of capacity and this represented about 78-percent capacity for the year around. Now it may be that Moab is weathering this. I don't call it a slump, it is a tapering off.

We all know that the Government for the time being has decided that an advantageous thing to do is to cut down on uranium as far as practical. We know that oil properties in going into operation use lesser employees than they do in exploration but this one case that I cited shows close to an 80-percent occupancy for the year, which I think is pretty good.

Now taking a motel in Monticello, you might get substantially less occupancy. I think this has a bearing, Senator, on the fact that in any tourist-oriented business, there is probably 3 to 4 to 5 months of the year that are peak and the rest of it drags and I think that anyone in the audience who is associated with that sort of business will testify to that and if you have got a 50-room motel you are going to have at least 5 or 6 or 7 months out of the year where your occupancy is way low. I don't like to put the two against another and I hope that I haven't made that impression. I think that we ought to get the fullest benefit of both, Senator.

Senator Moss. Your feeling that this black and white distinction be made is based primarily, I take it, on the Mount McKinley letter that would indicate that they had unduly restricted mining.

Mr. ROMNEY. That and a number of other things, Senator. I think we can look at our whole public lands policy and we can see that there is a continued pressure for restriction of use in the public lands. I could go into the interpretation of discovery and I could go into the difficulty we are having with an administrative decision with which you are familiar because of legislation that you have sponsored which we have talked with you about.

I think the attitude is changing. Now I frankly—I got letters from people who were working and familiar with the Organ Pipe Cactus and with the Death Valley area and they felt that things had been going along fairly well but that the administration of mining was started early and a precedent was set and they had no real gripes about the way things had been arranged in Mount McKinley and the Glacier Bay. The attitude was, the reaction of the miners up there was, "We might just as well forget about it."

Senator Moss. May I put in the record a telegram from Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Public Park Service, concerning the

regulation of mining in Mount McKinley. I won't read it except to state that as far as his Department is concerned mining is going forward, he thinks, without undue disagreement.

Senator METCALF. If there is no objection to the telegram, it will be received in the record. Senator Long?

Senator LONG. No objection.

Senator METCALF. No objection.

(The telegram referred to follows:)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 20, 1962.*

MAX EDWARDS,
Care Western Union, Moab, Utah:

Reur telcall today concerning mining in Mount McKinley and Glacier Bay we feel the regulations adopted by Department pursuant to authorizations contained in the legislation relating to these parks have been reasonable. We have no evidence that they unduly restrict the mining operations conducted pursuant to these acts. In authorizing the regulations Congress apparently considered that within park areas some control of mining activities to avoid unnecessary damage and disturbance of landscape and scenery is needed. Regulations promulgated by the Secretary have been designed to carry out these objectives. Such regulations have been carefully reviewed in each case from a legal viewpoint and determinations made that they do not detract from the prospecting and mining rights contemplated in the legislation. Indeed regulations which did conflict with the prospecting and mining rights would be legally invalid. As far as we are aware prospectors and miners have been able to carry out their operations in Mount McKinley and Glacier Bay to the extent necessary to fully exercise their rights including reasonable means of access and surface use.

WIRTH, *National Park Service.*

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Romney, for very helpful testimony.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Romney is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MILES P. ROMNEY, MANAGER, UTAH MINING ASSOCIATION, ON CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK BILL

I would like to make it clear that we do not oppose the establishment of a Canyonlands National Park nor do we demand unlimited and unrestricted opportunity to develop all the resources in all the land area involved. We do, however, hold that lands to be dedicated to national park status and use should be carefully selected after full appraisal of their predominant scenic, scientific, and historic value. We further hold that (1) lands selected for park status should be specifically reserved for recreational use and (2) that adjacent lands, not so selected, should be free for normal public-domain economic development. There should be a clearcut separation of land uses based on predominant value.

As a second and related matter of interest, the economics of tourism and of resource development at the local and State level are of sufficient importance to justify fullest possible review. This review should not seek to justify the elimination of the opportunity to develop either tourism or natural resources, but should be made to insure proper balancing of the opportunities for both. The University of Utah report of March 1962, attempted to discuss such matters. We feel that one of the best laboratories for research on the economics of tourism in Utah was neglected in that report. The communities and general areas in which Utah's present national parks and monuments are located is a most practical laboratory for that purpose. Data on trends of population, employment, tax revenue, in relation to tourist visits, etc., are all available for study. Some of these data are presented in tables attached to this report and are summarized later in our statement.

We favor a Canyonlands National Park to be formed from lands of predominant and outstanding scenic and recreational value. We believe that the scenic and recreational value of much of the proposed park area would rate only as average for southeastern Utah scenery.

Basically, there are three outstanding general areas in the proposed park. The so-called Island in the Sky, of which Grand View Point is the spectacular area, is one. The Needles area, including Chesler Park, Druid Arch, Angels Arch, etc., is another. And the Standing Rocks area west of the river is the

third. In our opinion these three areas could be carefully boundaried to individually include the truly spectacular scenery in the same pattern which was apparently used in defining the area of Arches Monument.

Those three areas were divided into individual areas by nature, for each is separated from the other by an abrupt and rugged canyon a thousand feet deep and from a half to three-quarters of a mile wide. The present road and trail connections between these areas are on approximately the route which any access roads would follow. The road travel distances between the three points are about 140 miles from Chesler Park to Grand View Point, and about 245 miles from Chesler Park to Standing Rocks on the west side of the river. From Grand View Point to Standing Rocks is about 185 miles. The areas, by nature, are effectively separated for tourists as well as for park administration officials.

In our opinion, the public domain surrounding these three areas could and should be left open for normal public-domain development under existing statutes and registrations. This could be done without impairing either scenic qualities or administrative efficiency.

The present bill—S. 2387—provides for mineral development in the park under the Secretary of Interior's regulations.

Other proposals would have smaller park areas of exclusive recreational use status, surrounded by recreational areas, or buffer areas in which economic development would be permitted and protected by regulations. It is proposed that such regulations would be fully stipulated in the authorizing legislation.

We do not support either proposal in full. As to multiple use; i.e., including mineral prospecting and development in the park area, we believe that this is neither attainable nor practical. We note that the preponderance of witnesses at the recent Washington, D.C., hearings on S. 2387 unqualifiedly opposed the multiple-use concept for national parks. They included representatives of: The Wilderness Society, the American Forestry Association, the National Wildlife Federation, and the National Parks Association.

Secretary of Interior Udall stated at those hearings:

"I recommend that the valid existing rights to mineral and oil and gas production be protected, but that the park itself not be left open to indefinite exploration."

This is clear and specific indication that if any provisions for exploration and development are included in the park legislation there is no intention that they be permanent. We simply contend that if such provisions are not to be permanent and are not protected against arbitrary control by regulations, then they are meaningless. So why include them? Their inclusion in the bill probably eases the way for approving lands for park inclusion on a much looser appraisal of their relative scenic and economic value.

Administration of existing regulations controlling prospecting and mining in national parks and monuments where multiple use was provided, has not encouraged the mining industry to support such provisions in future parks and monuments. I would like to quote briefly from a letter on that subject from Mr. James A. Williams, director, Division of Mines and Minerals, Department of Natural Resources, State of Alaska, under date of March 8, 1962. I had written to Mr. Williams to learn of the experience of miners in the Mount McKinley National Park and Glacier Bay National Monument.

Mr. Williams stated:

"No mining, to the best of my knowledge, has been carried on in McKinley National Park, though the geological possibilities are very good. A road running through it to the Kantishna mining district has been repeatedly denied to miners for mine hauling. The State is now building a long parallel route to the Kantishna outside of the park only because of the unavailability of the park road to the miners. I published this fact in my monthly bulletin sometime ago, and there was not a murmur of disagreement from the Park Service on it."

I would like to submit a full copy of his letter for the record of the hearings.

To reemphasize our position, we strongly urge that lands for the park be selected for their predominant scenic, scientific, and historical value and that the adjacent lands be left open for normal economic development under existing statutes and regulations.

The communities affected by the proposed park, as well as the State, should have an important voice in the selection of the lands to be included. It is recognized that both tourism and economic developments on public lands are beneficial. Both benefits can be realized and both developments should be encouraged, but, as outlined above, we do not feel that national parks can be used for

both purposes. Therefore, a careful analysis of the benefits to be gained is helpful.

We have assembled economic and related pertinent data from available sources on two areas of the State—one in which tourism facilities dominate, and the other most important for its resource developments.

One is the three-county area in which Zion National Park, Bryce National Park, and Capitol Reef National Monument are located—Garfield, Wayne, and Washington Counties. The other is the two-county area consisting of Grand and San Juan Counties, where the Arches and the Natural Monuments are located, but where natural resource development has been the major economic activity in the past 10 years.

The years 1940, 1950, and 1960 were taken as base years. In the 1940's and 1950's, agriculture and tourism were the principal economic factors in both areas. This continued to be true of the three-county area in 1960, but major developments in uranium and gas and oil production occurred in the two-county area in the decade from 1950 to 1960. Potash developments are now in progress toward productive operations. Tables are attached showing the data in detail, so it will only be summarized here.

Comparison of economic factors in 3-county area—Garfield, Washington, and Wayne—with 2-county area—Grand and San Juan

	3-county area	2-county area
Reported number of visitors to national parks and monuments located in each:		
1940	270,391	3,413
1950	539,444	18,480
1960	950,270	78,038
1950 versus 1960	+410,826	+59,558

These park and monument visitor counts are considered to be a reliable measure, or comparison factor, of the relative number of tourists visiting each area. Of course, other tourists passed through the areas, but their failure to register at the parks or monuments indicates that they were just passing through.

	3-county area		2-county area	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Gross expenditures represented by increased number of visitors 1950 versus 1960 at $7 per day per person and average stay 1.42 days:[1]				
Gross gain	$4,083,610		$587,037	
Direct personal income at 27 percent of gross income:[1]				
Gain	$1,102,575		$158,000	
Jobs at $3,000	368		53	
Population:				
1940	16,916		6,782	
1950	16,192		7,218	
1960	15,576		15,385	
1960 versus 1940	−1,340	8	+8,603	127
Personal income:[2]				
1954	$13,536,307		$13,776,732	
1957	16,690,169		27,442,691	
1957 versus 1954	+3,153,862	23.3	+13,665,959	99.2
Employment—Nonagricultural (Utah Department of Employment Security):				
1940	[3]		[3]	
1950	1,065		554	
1960	2,806		4,135	
1960 versus 1950	+1,741	163	+3,581	646
Percent of population employed in nonagricultural jobs:				
1950		6 6		7.7
1960		18.0		26.9

[1] Factors used in "Economic Study of the Proposed Canyonlands National Park," March 1962.
[2] Prof. J. W. Hanks, report, September 1961.
[3] 1940 not available.

There is no reason to doubt that employment in the types of industry which cater to tourists has shown a substantial increase, but we claim that the major portion of this increase has been due to commercial visitors engaged in mineral exploration, promotion of enterprises, land acquisition activities, sale of supplies and equipment, etc. As a measure of the use of tourist-catering types of industries by commercial visitors, we were given a summary of occupants at one of the two-county area's leading motels for the year 1961.

Occupations at a leading motel in 2-county area in 1961

	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Total occupants	8,510		Tourist occupants	1,910	22.4
Commercial occupants	6,169	72.5	Movie troupe occupants	431	5.1

Of combined commercial and tourist occupants, 76.5 percent were commercial and 23.5 percent were tourist. It seems logical to assume that patronage of eating houses, gas stations, and other tourist-oriented businesses in the same area would be approximately in the same proportion.

	3-county area	2-county area
Total assessed valuation of property:		
1940	$6,439,838	$4,718,640
1950	10,892,419	7,550,217
1960	14,772,364	145,144,987
1960 versus 1950	+3,879,945	+137,594,770
Assessed valuation of mining property:		
1950	44,000	206,000
1960	131,000	116,010,000
1960 versus 1950	+87,000	+115,804,000
Assessed valuation of other property:		
1950	10,848,000	7,345,000
1960	14,642,000	28,828,000
1960 versus 1950	+3,794,000	+21,483,000

Income to State from property tax and from occupation (severance) tax and State payments to counties

	3-county area	2-county area
1950:		
State school equalization	$76,617	$60,779
Occupation tax		845
State payments to counties from uniform school fund	621,929	167,922
Balance to State	−545,312	−106,318
1960:		
State school equalization	87,157	856,355
Spillover from county school taxes		[1] 663,954
Occupation tax		2,394,772
State payments to counties	1,190,535	159,931
Balance to State	−1,103,378	[2] +3,755,150

[1] This was spillover for fiscal year 1959–60. Spillover for fiscal year 1960–61 was $1,026,472 and is estimated by the State school department at $1,358,424 for fiscal year 1961–62. Thus the figures shown are conservative.
[2] This sum does not include the State and county share of rental and royalty payments from Federal mineral leases, nor does it include income from State mineral leases.

The above data show that employment, personal income, assessed valuation, and tax revenue to the State for school and for general fund purposes have increased far more in the two-county area than in the three-county area, particularly in the 1950–60 decade. Although there was a modest increase in accountable tourist visits to the two-county area, it is obvious that the economic gains have, in major proportion, been due to natural resource developments and to the related economic activity which those developments stimulated.

Again I wish to repeat that we do not seek to discredit the economic benefits of tourism by presentation of the above data. We hold, however, that the economic benefits of both tourism and resource development can be continued and further developed on the most practical and long-range beneficial basis through careful selection of the land to be devoted exclusively to the promotion of tourism.

It has been argued by some that because mineral resources are a depleting asset, tourism should take precedence in land-development plans. Any mine is of course exhaustible, but mineralized areas have potential far beyond the life of any one mine. Even a cursory review of any of the major mining camps and oilfields demonstrates continuity far beyond the life of the originally developed deposits or of any individual deposit. This will be true of the Grand-San Juan County area unless needless restrictions are placed on the opportunity to explore for such deposits.

We respectfully call your attention to the fact that the mineral developments around the proposed park area have taken place in the last 10 years. In light of the expericene in other major mineralized areas, the surface has barely been scratched. We urge that the lands considered for the Canyonlands National Park be fully appraised by competent people, representing all the public interests concerned and affected.

TABLE 1.—*Park visitors, 1940, 1950, 1961*

	1940	1950	1960	1960	
				Increase over 1940	Increase over 1950
3-county area:					
Zion	165,029	323,402	575,814	410,785	252,412
Bryce	103,362	212,976	271,963	168,601	58,987
Capitol Reef	2,000	3,066	102,493	100,493	99,427
Total	270,391	539,444	950,270	679,879	[1] 410,826
Cedar Breaks (in same general area)	15,762	37,120	115,822	100,060	78,702
2-county area:					
Natural bridges	901	2,223	6,499	5,598	4,276
Arches	2,512	16,257	71,539	69,027	55,282
Total	3,413	18,480	78,038	74,625	[2] 59,558

[1] 410,826×$7.00×1.42 days=$4,083,610 gain in tourist gross expenditures.
[2] 59,058×$7.00×1.42 days=$587,037 gain in tourist gross expenditures.

TABLE 2

ASSESSED VALUATION

	1940	1950	1960	Increase, 1960 over 1940	Increase, 1960 over 1950
3-county area:					
Washington	$3,766,439	$6,909,176	$9,306,868	$5,540,429	$2,397,692
Wayne	888,320	1,372,813	1,685,970	797,650	313,157
Garfield	1,785,079	2,610,430	3,779,536	1,994,447	1,169,096
Total	6,439,838	10,892,419	14,772,364	8,332,526	3,879,945
2-county area:					
Grand	3,411,369	4,906,713	12,661,202	9,249,833	7,754,489
San Juan	1,307,271	2,643,504	132,483,785	131,176,514	129,840,281
Total	4,718,640	7,550,217	145,144,987	140,426,347	137,594,770

PROPERTY TAXES CHARGED

3-county area:					
Washington	$109,821	$350,759	$619,475	$509,654	$268,716
Wayne	30,702	56,099	95,740	65,038	39,641
Garfield	76,559	131,942	220,356	143,797	88,414
Total	217,082	538,800	935,571	718,489	396,771
2-county area:					
Grand	107,228	179,584	786,277	679,049	606,693
San Juan	50,306	123,093	4,317,215	4,266,909	4,194,122
Total	157,534	302,677	5,103,492	4,945,958	4,800,815

POPULATION

3-county area	16,916	16,192	15,576	−1,340	[1] −616
2-county area	6,782	7,218	15,385	+8,603	+8,167

[1] St. George, Washington County, gained 568 in 1950–60 period. Thus total loss to balance of area was 1,284. All other communities reported losses except Henrieville, Garfield County, which gained 38 (114 to 152).

ASSESSED VALUATION AND TAXES CHARGED PER CAPITA

	1940	1950	1960	Increase, 1960 over 1940	Increase, 1960 over 1950
3-county area:					
Assessed valuation	$381.00	$669.00	$948.00	+$567.00	+$279.00
Taxes charged	12.83	33.07	60.06	+47.23	+26.99
2-county area:					
Assessed valuation	696.00	1,046.00	9,434.00	+8,738.00	+8,388.00
Taxes charged	23.22	41.93	331.72	+308.50	+289.99

TABLE 3.—*Assessed valuation—Mines and other property by counties and county areas*

[In thousands of dollars]

	1940			1950			1960		
	Total assessed valuation	Assessed valuation, mines	Assessed valuation, other property	Total assessed valuation	Assessed valuation, mines	Assessed valuation, other property	Total assessed valuation	Assessed valuation, mines	Assessed valuation, other property
3-county area:									
Washington	3,766	29	3,737	6,909	28	6,881	9,307	40	9,267
Wayne	888	1	887	1,373	----	1,373	1,686	12	1,674
Garfield	1,785	6	1,779	2,610	16	2,594	3,780	79	3,701
Total	6,439	36	6,403	10,892	44	10,848	14,773	131	14,642
2-county area:									
Grand	3,411	89	3,322	4,907	99	4,808	12,661	709	11,952
San Juan	1,307	9	1,298	2,644	107	2,537	132,177	115,301	16,876
Total	4,718	98	4,620	7,551	206	7,345	144,838	116,010	28,828
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ASSESSED VALUATION									
3-county area	100	0.56	99.44	100	0.4	99.6	100	0.89	99.11
2-county area	100	2.08	97.92	100	2.73	97.27	100	80.1	19.9

TABLE 4.—*Uranium mines, Utah and Big Indian district, assessed valuation, employment and payrolls, 1956–61*

TOTAL STATE

Operating year	Tax year	Gross value of product [1]	Assessed valuation [1]	Occupation tax [1]	Number employed [2]	Payroll [2]
1955	1956	$18,348,576	$8,310,661	$141,829	2,063	$9,377,937
1956	1957	24,772,755	15,210,211	194,603	2,012	10,144,366
1957	1958	35,693,914	24,502,913	287,971	2,229	12,355,382
1958	1959	44,534,673	33,947,514	348,861	1,843	11,169,491
1959	1960	46,008,445	42,122,232	323,049	1,707	10,493,815
1960	1961	38,290,277	34,361,515	253,744	1,525	9,756,913

BIG INDIAN DISTRICT, SAN JUAN COUNTY

Operating year	Tax year	Gross value of product [1]	Assessed valuation [1]	Occupation tax [1]	As percent of State total		
					Gross value	Assessed valuation	Occupation tax
1955	1956	$11,053,857	$5,436,181	$96,909	60.0	65.4	68.3
1956	1957	14,881,053	10,603,180	130,071	60.0	69.7	66.8
1957	1958	26,276,640	19,436,116	217,555	73.6	79.3	75.5
1958	1959	32,483,719	28,619,910	273,281	73.0	84.3	78.3
1959	1960	36,273,430	35,873,882	256,462	78.8	85.2	79.4
1960	1961	27,776,253	28,005,352	181,239	72.5	81.5	71.4

[1] From reports to Utah State Tax Commission.
[2] Utah Department of Employment Security reports.

TABLE 5.—*Employment, covered employees (total nonagricultural)*

	1940	1950	1960	1960 compared with 1940	1960 compared with 1950
3-county:					
Washington	N.A.	810	1,802	N.A.	+992
Wayne	N.A.	33	167	N.A.	+134
Garfield	N.A.	222	837	N.A.	+615
Total	N.A.	1,065	2,806	N.A.	+1,741
Percent					+163
2-county area:					
Grand	N.A.	246	1,718	N.A.	+1,472
San Juan	N.A.	308	2,417	N.A.	+2,109
Total	N.A.	554	4,135	N.A.	+3,581
Percent					+646

PERCENT OF POPULATION EMPLOYED

	1940		1950		1960	
	Population	Percent employment	Population	Percent employment	Population	Percent employment
3-county area:						
Washington	9,269	?	9,836	8.24	10,271	17.5
Wayne	2,394	?	2,205	1.50	1,728	9.7
Garfield	5,253	?	4,151	5.35	3,577	23.4
Total	16,916	?	16,192	6.6	15,576	18.0
2-county area:						
Grand	2,070	?	1,903	12.9	6,345	27.1
San Juan	4,712	?	5,315	5.8	9,040	26.7
Total	6,782	?	7,218	7.7	15,385	26.9

PERSONAL INCOME [1] (1954–57)

	1954	1955	1956	1957	Increase, 1957 over 1954
3-county area:					
Washington	$8,040,041	$8,777,316	$9,327,504	$10,258,676	$2,218,635
Garfield	3,574,455	3,946,762	4,055,586	4,228,155	653,700
Wayne	1,921,811	2,187,653	1,985,570	2,203,338	281,527
Total	13,536,307	14,911,731	15,368,660	16,690,169	3,153,862
Percent					+23.3
2-county area:					
Grand	5,496,312	7,468,984	8,622,475	8,931,472	3,435,160
San Juan	8,280,420	12,212,247	13,457,168	18,511,219	10,230,799
Total	13,776,732	19,681,231	22,079,643	27,442,691	13,665,959
Percent					+99.2

[1] Source: Prof. J. W. Hanks, University of Utah, September 1961.

TABLE 6.—*Distribution of property taxes charged and occupation (severance) taxes charged*

	State general fund	State school equalization	Local school district	Total, schools	County purposes	Occupation tax	Total to State	Received from uniform school fund [1]	Spillover into uniform school fund [1]
Grand County:									
1940	$3,070	$21,321	$40,254	$61,575	$36,843		$24,391		
1950		39,499	59,617	99,116	65,259	$174	39,673	$45,844	
1960		74,701	417,820	49,521	186,753	8,557	83,258	132,768	
San Juan County:									
1940	1,177	8,170	17,779	25,949	18,629		9,347		
1950		21,280	53,267	74,547	33,044	671	21,951	122,078	
1960		781,654	2,715,918	3,497,572	771,056	2,356,215	3,137,869	*27,163	[2] $663,954
Totals, Grand and San Juan:									
1940	4,247	29,491	58,033	87,524	55,471		33,738		
1950		60,759	112,884	173,643	98,303	845	61,604	167,922	
1960		856,355	3,133,738	3,990,093	957,809	2,364,772	3,221,127	159,931	[2] 663,954

[1] Fiscal year basis.
[2] Fiscal year 1959–60. The "spillover" for fiscal year 1960–61 was $1,026,472 and is estimated at $1,358,424 for fiscal year 1961–62.
*Social security and teachers' retirement payments.

TABLE 6–A.—*Distribution of property taxes charged*

	State general fund	State school equalization	Local school district	Total, schools	County purposes	Occupation tax	Total to State	Received from uniform school fund [1]	Spillover into uniform school fund [1]
Washington County:									
1940	$3,390	$23,540	$65,029	$87,569	$49,717		$26,930		
1950		55,619	111,100	166,719	99,147		55,619	$348,232	
1960		54,911	325,740	380,651	129,365		54,911	702,542	
Wayne County:									
1940	799	5,552	10,660	16,212	12,303		6,351		
1950		11,051	28,074	39,125	13,179		11,051	87,557	
1960		9,947	59,009	68,956	17,956		9,947	166,035	
Garfield County:									
1940	1,607	11,157	26,776	37,933	26,330		12,764		
1950		21,014	61,684	82,698	28,715		21,014	186,140	
1960		22,299	128,504	150,803	32,126		22,299	321,958	
Totals for the 3 counties:									
1940	5,796	40,249	101,465	141,714	88,350		46,045		
1950		76,617	198,183	274,800	130,282		76,617	621,929	
1960		87,157	513,253	600,410	179,447		87,157	1,190,535	

[1] Fiscal year basis.

TABLE 7.—*Number of occupations and nature of their business from records of a motel in Moab for year 1961*

	Rooms available	Number of rooms occupied			
		Commercial occupants	Tourist occupants	Movie troupe occupants	Total occupancies
January	930	540	41	----------	581
February	840	484	59	----------	543
March	930	462	111	----------	573
April	900	483	106	9	598
May	930	581	206	14	801
June	900	382	265	199	846
July	930	406	272	209	887
August	930	550	315	----------	865
September	900	628	216	----------	844
October	930	623	200	----------	823
November	900	581	70	----------	651
December	930	449	49	----------	498
Total	10,950	6,169	1,910	431	8,510
Percent of total rooms	100	56.3	17.4	4.0	77.7
Percent of total occupancies	----------	72.5	22.4	5.1	100

Senator METCALF. Mr. Romney has presented testimony as secretary of the Utah Mining Association and I have let him run along, but here it is, we have been here almost an hour and only heard three witnesses. I don't want to cut anyone off but let me admonish both the succeeding witnesses and my colleagues that we have 48 witnesses to hear today and we want to give everyone an opportunity, so I hope you will summarize.

The next witness will be Mr. Ralph Rasmussen, and he will be followed by Dr. Woodbury. Mr. Rasmussen.

STATEMENT OF RALPH H. RASMUSSEN, STAFF REPRESENTATIVE, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. RASMUSSEN. Senator Metcalf and members of the committee, it is an honor to appear here this morning. I will try to make my remarks as brief as possible.

We have a prepared statement here and I would like to say that we represent some 8,500 members of our union in the State of Utah.

Our particular concern in appearing here is simply that of preserving this great national resource for the benefit of future generations—for the use of Americans as an outstanding recreational area.

We would like to go on record as officially endorsing the Moss bill (S. 2387) to establish the Canyonlands National Park. Our primary concern in this matter is the preservation of this great resource of unique natural beauty for recreational purposes and for the edification and enjoyment of future Americans.

This area of natural arches, colorful spires, canyons, cliffs, and archeological treasures belongs to the American people to enjoy, not to any specific groups who may destroy the scenic irreplaceable beauty through indiscriminate search for and exploitation of possible mineral occurrences in the area.

America is not so resource poor that one resource of undisputed esthetic value need be destroyed in the search of petroleum, gas, and other minerals for commercial use. Is this not equivalent to selling an American birthright for a mess of pottage?

The need for recreational facilities has been expanding at a rapid rate in the recent past and from all projections made will continue even more rapidly in the future. Three basic factors contribute to this trend. First, is the population expansion. Second, is the gradual increase in real income and, third, is the increase in leisure time. It is expected that U.S. population will reach about 220 million by 1975. It will be even more concentrated and urbanized with nearly three-fourths of the people living in metropolitan areas. The West will experience an even more rapid growth rate than the Nation as a whole. The 11 Western States will have about 40 million people within 15 years. California alone will have an estimated 24 million people and Utah will have about 1.2 million.

According to present use patterns of national parks, it will be the people in the Western States who will make the most use of the Canyonlands National Park. The population factor alone would cause a doubling in national park use in just a few years. It is necessary, however, to consider the trend in hours of employment and the type of employment that is increasing. It is well known that the greatest employment increases are coming in the professional, technical and white-collar categories. As these increase and the outdoor occupational classifications decrease, an even greater demand occurs for outdoor recreation. According to a recent study by a bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission to the U.S. Congress and the President, it was noted that of all outdoor activities touring and sightseeing ranked among the most important. With the development of the Interstate System of Highways throughout the country, these will become even more important as means of outdoor recreation.

Along with a decrease in the hours of employment which we hope for and expect in the future, will be more leisure time. More people will have time to do the things that they desire to do. Second in importance to time in determining recreational patterns is the income level of the population. The level of real income has been rising in the United States at a rate of about 3 percent a year. Each year more of the people are able to afford the recreation that they have long desired. Each year tourists are traveling greater distances as the time and expense of travel are relatively reduced.

Suitable outdoor recreational areas must be preserved while they are still available. We consider the Canyonlands area to be one of the most suitable potential areas and one which if not preserved now may be so cut up with trails, exploration roads, bulldozer gouges, overgrazing, and soil erosion that its scenic beauty will forever be diminished.

Further, we object strenuously to any proposals to decrease the size of the park to an area smaller than the approximately 332,000 acres recommended in S. 2387, introduced by Senator Moss. The counter-proposal that the area be developed as three or four small parks with surrounding recreation area of about 200,000 acres is altogether too reminiscent of the "three runt dams" on the Snake River. We believe this is an unnatural division which would result in a hodgepodge of management difficulties and cause an irreparable loss in the potential that exists in a unified development.

While our main interest is preservation of the area for recreational purposes and not the income which may be generated for the State or individuals from the park area, and while we do not seek to profit in a monetary sense from our interest in this noble project, it is altogether possible that our members and their families along with other millions of Americans will be the most richly rewarded of all when this project reaches fruition. When this magnificent country is opened up for our enjoyment with good roads and other facilities in the true Mission 66 tradition, we will be well rewarded indeed.

The contention of the opposition regarding this profit aspect warrants a statement. It appears to us that arguments against the park on such a basis are without foundation.

The Moss bill, as we understand it, recognizes all existing rights, and leases and permits further exploration for minerals, because it is possible that mineral deposits of commercial value exist in the proposed park area. Such minerals, if discovered, may be developed but not on an uncontrolled basis. The only possible complaint is that developers and exploration parties would not be able to indiscriminately scar the area with careless methods which are now being used because they are perhaps less expensive.

The development would be subject to regulation and justly so in order not to destroy the scenic value of the park. This is little enough to ask in return for the supposed value of the minerals which the parks opponents claim exist in the area. If such great potential exists, a slight increase in development and exploration costs will certainly not hamper legitimate activities.

Grazing rights (actually grazing privileges) are also protected for the life of the owner after a period of 25 years. How can private groups without a twinge of conscience base their arguments on a claim that the State will lose income from such measures.

The truth of the matter is that all income that would come from the area in the absence of a park will likely still be forthcoming. In addition, a new source of income will be established by the development of the park. The National Park Service plans to spend $17 million for access roads and development of the area. Add to this the millions of dollars that will be spent in the State by tourists and the value to the State would be worth far more in economic terms over a period of time than the value of any minerals which may be in the area.

As previously stated, according to the proposed bill, it is not an either or case but rather a combination of both.

In summary, let me emphasize the position that we definitely want to go on record as favoring and supporting the Moss bill. We feel that the preservation of the Canyonlands area and the creation of a national park for recreational purposes are of primary importance. We also consider the multiple-use provisions now included in the bill to be the absolute limit consistent with the primary objective.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Dr. Woodbury and he will be followed by Mr. Jessen.

Dr. Woodbury, I see you have a prepared statement.

STATEMENT OF ANGUS M. WOODBURY, PROFESSOR EMERITUS, ECOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Dr. WOODBURY. It will make me about 5 minutes.

I regard the proposal to establish the Canyonlands National Park as a worthy step in the direction of providing suitable regulation and use of certain lands of superb value as scenic resources. I am convinced that there are few, if any, places in the world possessing the unique scenic grandeur found in the red rock rough country of the American Southwest. But I submit that in this region of erosional scenic grandeur, unlimited, the boundary for the proposed park encompasses only a small part of the areas which in coming time will be recognized as worthy of public attention for preservation of their inspirational values, especially for those who, excommunicated from wild nature, are being increasingly concentrated in our great urban centers.

Despite the outstanding value of these inspirational scenic areas, the other resources of minerals, water storage, powersites, industrial potential, ranges, wildlife, and other values, intermingled among these spectacular areas provide a puzzling maze to conservationists pleading to have lands devoted to their highest uses.

In my opinion, it is exceedingly important to provide adequate protection and regulation of these superb scenic resources as soon as possible to prevent despoliation and also to make their inspiring scenic values available for public use but I hesitate to lock up all the other resources that may be included without a careful assessment of those values to know what we are subordinating to this overwhelming scenic demand.

The provisions in the Moss bill for regulating mining, grazing, hunting and other activities represent steps in the direction of multiple use of these secondary resources, but I am wondering if these steps are adequately integrated into the national park ideals. Can the architects of such an important area ever plan accurately in advance for all the contingencies that are bound to arise in administration? Would it not be better to provide these proposals as temporary arrangements pending a decade of study by independent experts working on committees appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to examine all of the lands not only in the proposed park but also in surrounding areas of outstanding scenic significance and bring to the Congress reports and recommendations upon which final commitments could be made? Nearly every national forest, national park, and national monument that I have worked with has needed additional adjustment after it was established, and I have had a good deal of experience on that.

This scenic region of the American Southwest is so rough that it was largely avoided in the great westward migrations of the previous century and did not receive the attention it deserved until the westward-moving human tide was stopped by the Pacific Ocean and backed up into the interior. But even yet much of the region of canyons, mesas, and mountains is still impenetrable to all except the most hardy

who are willing to face the rocks, sand and dust of dirt roads to explore for themselves the maze of sinuous canyons, flat-topped mesas, and upthrust mountains of that outstandingly colorful and dissected region of which Canyonlands is only a small but significant part.

I have a map here of some of the Western States, showing in red the location of good surfaced highways from both east and west, coming across from Missouri, and southern Kansas, southern Colorado, and ending here at southern Utah, near Blanding; good, surfaced highway which could form a part of a transcontinental highway coming from Los Angeles.

We have another one that ends over here past Zion, Bryce, and ends at Escalante. Between the two, this yellow strip, is a gap which if filled could make a transcontinental highway across through the heart of the scenic area of Southwestern America that would open up these tremendous areas of scenic significance.

This is Canyonlands here [witness indicates]. This is Zion, Bryce here. Here is Glen Canyon. Here is Natural Bridges. Here is Capitol Reef and there is Mesa Verde, all of them within close proximity to such a highway.

Now I have a more detailed map here which shows the same situation only in a little more detail. Here is the paved highway in blue. The yellow represents the dirt road that cross the country over to Blanding—doesn't go quite to Blanding. The red strip here [witness indicates] represent areas that were needed to make it possible to think in terms of a cross-country dirt highway to connect those two. That gap that I pointed out on the other map, these two red ones here, are just shortcuts but this one here is a route around the Glen Canyon where the dirt road at present will be inundated by the water.

I have here a detailed map which shows——

Senator METCALF. Dr. Woodbury, would you identify the map that you have just testified from, that is Escalante?

Dr. WOODBURY. Yes; this is the Escalante section of the relief map put out by the War Department.

Senator METCALF. When we read this or "here" in the record, it is very difficult to identify just what it is.

Dr. WOODBURY. That is the Escalante section.

Senator METCALF. Thank you.

Dr. WOODBURY. And this one is an aerial photograph of the same region. Now remember that the road across Glen Canyon will be inundated at Hite Ferry by about 200 feet of water and the only way to get around it is to take this smooth route that is available here. This doesn't show quite all of it, but I am assured by the Utah State Highway Department, that it is a feasible route and can be prepared there eventually.

We should have a surfaced highway clear across.

Senator METCALF. Dr. Woodbury, pardon the interruption with another question. Both Senator Moss and I are also on the Public Works Committee which is the general committee that has jurisdiction over highways and pending before this committee is Senator Bennett's bill for the parkway so while you are testifying as to a very important feature of something that should be done, it is not presently provided in the bill that is before us.

Dr. WOODBURY. I realize that and that is why I am proposing some additional things beyond what is in the bill.

Senator METCALF. I want you to know that the Federal Government is working hard to cooperate through its public works appropriation for the construction of primary and secondary roads in the Interstate System to connect all of these things but that is a matter within the jurisdiction of another committee and another bill.

Dr. WOODBURY. Well, in summary, my proposal is—it is written here.

Senator METCALF. Please go ahead.

Dr. WOODBURY. First, set the boundaries as large as possible at the present time, with the expectation of adjusting them to fit suitable physiography at a later date. At best, they will be inadequate to include all of the worthy scenic areas.

Second, provide for a decade of study by experts on committees appointed by the Secretary to consider: (*a*) Revision of boundary locations to include, consistent with good administration, areas primarily valuable for scenic and scientific purposes and exclude areas primarily valuable for other purposes; (*b*) regulation of multiple uses in the park; and (*c*) suitable policies of proper park management and development.

And the third one, of course, as you have pointed out, is incompetent to this but it is a matter of connecting Canyonlands with these other areas.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Dr. Woodbury.

Senator Moss. Dr. Woodbury, I might point out that this bill does authorize the Secretary of the Interior to build access roads to the park and names Highways 160 and 95 and 24, so to that extent it has some roadbuilding in it, in that it makes the access to the park.

Dr. WOODBURY. That is what made me bring this into—the purpose.

Senator Moss. But it doesn't carry over beyond those established highways and I appreciate your testimony on this revision of boundaries. I think that we sort of automatically do that anyway. We just increased Zion, as you know, by congressional act here.

Dr. WOODBURY. That is why I suggest we take a decade of study to find it out.

Senator METCALF. Just a minute, Dr. Woodbury. I am somewhat in accord with you as to revision of boundaries too. I pointed out before that as we flew down to this area, there was Cleopatra's Chair that was pointed out; the various routes were pointed out; Sixshooter Peaks were pointed out and then when we got down there, all of those were out of the area of the proposed park.

Dr. WOODBURY. Yes, there are many areas outside of the proposed park that are of inspirational scenic value and the problem is how to get them in without taking in too much territory.

Senator METCALF. That is just the problem with which we are confronted as to how we can make the best use of that superb area down there and what should be put into the park and what should be taken out and some of us feel that some of the boundaries should be enlarged somewhat.

Dr. WOODBURY. Well that is the reason that I recommend that you take a little time because you can't determine it without investigation on the ground and have people expert in the field bring in their recommendations so that the final recommendations can be made.

Senator METCALF. Are there any other questions?

82324—62—pt. 2——13

(No response.)

Senator METCALF. Thank you for very helpful testimony, Doctor.

Senator LONG. Mr. Chairman, of course we all agree with the first statement made in the opening paragraph. It is a magnificent part of this earth. I particularly like Dr. Woodbury's next sentence:

> But I submit that * * * the boundary for the proposed park encompasses only a small part of the areas which, in coming time, will be recognized as worthy of public attention for preservation of their inspirational values—

and so forth.

I would just like to underscore that anything we give up now might be lost forever. If we are going to go either way, it should be on expanding it a little bit contrary to contracting too much.

(The following is that portion of the prepared statement of Dr. Woodbury not included in the previous testimony:)

I have a map here of some of the Western States showing in red the location of good, surfaced highways from both east and west that end at the edge of this great rough country in southeastern Utah. The one from the east following across Missouri, southern Kansas, and southern Colorado ends near Blanding, Utah, about 70 miles west of Mesa Verde National Park. The one coming from Los Angeles across southern Nevada passes through Zion and Bryce Canyon National Parks and ends at Escalante. Closing the gap shown in yellow between these two points would provide a new transcontinental highway that would pass through the heart of this great scenic region and open a southern approach to Canyonlands and a northern approach to Glen Canyon.

This gap can now be traversed by an exceedingly circuitous route on dirt roads by cars equipped to meet sand and high centers, but one part of the present dirt road will be inundated by Glen Canyon Reservoir when it is filled. I have here a plastic relief map which shows in blue the present surfaced highway ending at Escalante; in yellow the present dirt roads, some of them graded, extending across the rough country to the Natural Bridges National Monument about 50 miles west of Blanding; and in red three sections that need new roads to make it possible to think in terms of a continuing trip across the gap. The first two from the left represent short cuts but the third one is a substitute for the Hite Ferry road that will be oblitertaed by the Glen Canyon Reservoir. This section would provide an easy approach to the southwestern corner of Canyonlands.

Once this gap is made passable even on dirt formfitting roads, it will be bound to grow in popularity and develop a demand for a modern highway across it. The route could be vastly improved by an engineering study. This in turn would focus public attention upon additional scenic areas of the region worthy of status as national parks, national monuments, and State parks that should receive protective action before it is too late.

In summary my proposal is to—

(1) Set the boundaries as large as possible at the present time, with the expectation of adjusting them to fit suitable physiography at a later date. At best, they will be inadequate to include all of the worthy scenic areas.

(2) Provide for a decade of study by experts on committees appointed by the Secretary to consider: (*a*) Revision of boundary locations to include, consistent with good administration, areas primarily valuable for scenic and scientific purposes and exclude areas primarily valuable for other purposes; (*b*) regulation of multiple uses in the park; and, (*c*) suitable policies of proper park management and development.

(3) Develop interconnecting scenic parkways between Canyonlands, Bryce Canyon, Zion, and Mesa Verde National Parks; Glen Canyon Recreation Area, and Capitol Reef, Natural Bridges, Hovenweep, and other national monuments in the region.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. Kenneth C. Jessen. He will be followed by Dr. Stokes.

Mr. Jessen.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH C. JESSEN, CHAIRMAN, CONSERVATION COMMITTEE, UTE ALPINE CLUB

Mr. JESSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I am the chairman of conservation for the University of Utah Ute Alpine Club but I must express that this statement does not necessarily represent the viewpoint of the University of Utah.

One of the purposes of a national park is to preserve some of the natural beauty of this great country for our people to enjoy now and in years to come. This preservation includes wildlife, vegetation, and landforms. Another purpose of a national park is to give Americans a place to relax and forget about the worries of modern living. It is my sincere belief that allowing grazing, public hunting, and mining to take place within a national park are inconsistent with the very philosophy behind establishing national parks.

Why allow grazing in the proposed Canyonlands National Park? I am certain that the loss of this dry, eroded land will result in little economic loss to the sheep and cattleman. At the Moab hearings, according to the Salt Lake Tribune, it stated that "the limited number of livestock grazed in the proposed park area would enhance rather than diminish scenic values and tourist interest." I feel that many tourists will think livestock quite novel, seeing them for the first time. However, I believe that of far greater interest to all the tourists would be to see wildlife in its natural state rather than a herd of sheep clipping the grass to the roots and leaving little behind but dung. It is also a well-known fact that when livestock are introduced to an area, the wildlife is forced out. Is this what we want in a national park?

I propose that the present bill be amended so that all grazing rights expire in 25 years or less with no extensions.

My fellow members of the Ute Alpine Club and myself see many hunters in the forests surrounding Salt Lake City. The average hunter is well meaning but does not act much different than the average American tourist. The hunter, in many cases, leaves a trail of deer hides, tin cans, gun wrappers, orange peels, and empty shell cases. I know this for a fact; I have cleaned up after them. We cannot blame the hunter for being human but what is unfortunate is that he travels into the wilderness areas. Of course, the primary objective of the hunter is to obtain his deer or elk and not the preservation of the scenic beauty which surrounds him. I have also seen bullet pock marks in the beautiful sandstone cliffs in Snow's Canyon near St. George. I am opposed to seeing game reduction carried out by public hunting.

I propose that all wildlife management be left up to the people who are trained in this field and who have the best interests of the park at heart, the National Park Service. This does not exclude public hunting if the National Park Service thinks it is wise to do so but it will put the wildlife management in the proper hands.

After reading the statements made in the Washington hearings and after reading the economic study of the proposed park made by the University of Utah, I fail to see where setting aside this small area for a national park will affect the mining economy of the State. Ac-

cording to these studies, there are no producing oil wells, potash mines, uranium mines, or any other type of mine in the proposed park. Exploration for potash and uranium has been conducted but oil exploration has not been completed. These have been some 10 wells drilled all of which are nonproducing. Page 136 of the economic study made by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Utah reads, "Thus there is 1 chance in 2,836 that an exploration well would result in the discovery of an 'Aneth size field.'" Aneth is Utah's largest oil field. Nothing else has been found on this land and it looks like chances for finding oil are also slim. Even if there are minerals of great value in this area, what is wrong with saving them for some future need?

Mineral exploration and mining as I have seen it conducted throughout the West has done everything but enhance the natural beauty of the land. I propose that there be no mineral exploration or mining in this park.

The area of the proposed Canyonlands National Park has been reduced to the smallest possible size without eliminating important scenic features. This was pointed out by Mr. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, in the Washington hearings. The tourists want to see a single beautiful park and they want to be able to drive around in it and enjoy it. Tourists won't stop to see a bunch of patches of scenery mixed in with restaurants, bars, motels, and gas stations. Commercial interests and scenery do not mix. You can take note of how the National Park Service has intelligently placed it buildings and parking lots so as not to disrupt or interfere with the scenic beauty.

If the park is to be of any sizable economic value to the State of Utah, it must draw tourists. This $213 million estimated income to this State was not made on the basis of some chopped-up acreage but on the size of park as it is proposed.

I endorse the bill presented by Senator Frank E. Moss with the exceptions of allowing grazing, public hunting, and mining to take place in the park. I would like to thank him for the great work he has done in trying to preserve some of the scenic beauty of this country for future Americans and also for making Utah aware of some of its scenic resources. Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Jessen, and I respect your view on the national parks and how they should be managed. I know that many people hold that view but I would like to point out that with the growth of the park system and with the pressures there are on lands, that we have in recent years been permitting some secondary uses in our parks as we have created them and what I have tried to do in this bill, and what this committee must consider, is whether or not it will be possible to permit some secondary uses that do not degrade primary use.

Now you feel obviously that that can't be done and my position is that it can and that is what the committee must wrestle with. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Senator Long?

Senator LONG. No questions.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Jessen, you made a strong, clear point and the committee understands your position.

Dr. Stokes. [No reply.] We will come back to him. Is Dr. Murdock here? Dr. Joseph Murdock, pleased to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOSEPH MURDOCK, PROFESSOR OF CONSERVATION AND GEOLOGY, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Dr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I am a teacher of conservation and geology at Brigham Young University. I would just like to go on record as favoring the proposal as outlined in the bill. With this viewpoint in mind, I think we have missed one of the major comparisons that should be made.

We have heard much about the money value. We have heard much about the loss of dollars as far as restricting the mining interests, restricting grazing, and so forth and I feel that it is unfortunate that we can't place a dollar and cents value on something that is esthetic.

We are not able to evaluate what it means to us to view a good painting or see a good scene. I think we should all recognize the fact that this is a very important resource. It is a tremendous resource and I think that from my standpoint as an ecologist, where I would like to study more and more about desert ecology, that the use of this area will enhance my viewpoint in studying more and learning more concerning this resource.

I think that if the Nation is interested and knows more about our desert ecology, that this will actually stimulate and accelerate our understanding of this very important area and I would just merely like to say that I think that an enlarged, overall park has much to gain over small segmented areas. I think the administration and the handling and the supervision of these side interests will be secondary to scenic value but are still compatible in the framework of this bill. Thank you.

Senator BENNETT. May I just ask one question. We heard Dr. Woodbury, who is an ecologist from the University of Utah. Do you generally agree with his approach of requiring time to be taken to develop the potentials of this area?

Dr. MURDOCK. This is a very interesting approach to it and I would be much in favor of us knowing more about the actual boundaries before they are set definitely. I do not think that it should be so rigid that we can't with some future use, some future discovery of importance, change the boundaries.

Senator BENNETT. Well, for the record and I have just refreshed my own memory by a whispered consultation with the chairman, we frequently enlarge boundaries of parks but we never diminish them, so from that point of view, we might do well to start with a smaller boundary and be prepared to add to it. Once it is in there, if we should find it is not properly in there, you will never get it out.

Dr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Senator Moss. Dr. Murdock, I suppose you recognize that the National Park Service has been studying this area for many years and as a matter of fact presented a report on a large area that is shown

on the map on the south wall encompassed in the whole blue outlined area which encompasses roughly a million acres and as the outgrowth of that study, is where this has been distilled down some, as it were, to the 332,000, about 30 miles long and 15 miles wide. But the point I would like to emphasize is that there has been a great deal of boundary study. This just isn't a shot in the dark, that these boundaries have been drawn, sometimes a little agonizingly because the Sixshooter Peaks had to be left out and because Elaterite Butte had to be left out and because Cleopatra's Chair and Panorama Point and the Orange Cliffs, many things unfortunately have had to be left out in an attempt to contract this to an area that would be acceptable generally to the people of the State so that we would not feel that this was unduly expansive and I don't know whether you have seen this publication by the National Park Service. It is a discussion of this area.

Dr. MURDOCK. Yes. Could I say one more thing in regard to this, I feel like when we know as little as we do about the potential, for instance mining, and then for us to draw a boundary now and it being unflexible, that this approach would be better on a long-term study. I would say also in regard to grazing, that a definite boundary line many times does not fit the natural grazing boundary that should be proposed and ofttimes these things that are set by a line are not the best grazing boundary and so I think that it has to be flexible.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, could I ask just one question?

Senator METCALF. Congressman King.

Mr. KING. Well, Dr. Murdock, we have to have a starting point. Now I understand the purport of your testimony is that the Moss bill does offer us a pretty good starting point.

Dr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. KING. With the understanding that we may want to take in some other things or we may want to adjust, but that is a good starting point, is that the purport of your testimony?

Dr. MURDOCK. This is correct and I am in agreement that if it is, at its present size near 300,000 acres that it could be enlarged very handily and still be a workable good unit.

Mr. KING. You don't feel that the Moss bill as now constituted is too big, I take it from your testimony.

Dr. MURDOCK. That's correct.

Senator METCALF. Any further questions. [No response.] Thank you for very helpful testimony, Dr. Murdock.

The next witness will be Dr. McKnight. Is Dr. McKnight here?

Dr. MURDOCK. Dr. McKnight is not available.

Senator METCALF. Is Dr. Giddings here? The next witness then will be Dr. Giddings. He will be followed by Mr. Hyrum Tolley, who will be the witness after Dr. Giddings.

STATEMENT OF DR. J. CALVIN GIDDINGS, PRESIDENT, WASATCH MOUNTAIN CLUB

Dr. GIDDINGS. I appreciate the honor of testifying here on this important park proposal.

My name is Dr. J. Calvin Giddings. I am president of the Wasatch Mountain Club, and am speaking in behalf of that organization in this statement. The Wasatch Mountain Club was incorporated in

the State of Utah over 40 years ago; its members have been concerned since the beginning with the enjoyment and preservation of the State's scenic resources. It is our belief that the proposal to create Canyonlands National Park is based on sound principles and will be of maximum benefit to the State of Utah and to the people of the United States. We therefore, urge enactment of legislation to create such a park as proposed by Senator Moss in S. 2387, but without the multiple use provisions of his bill, as explained below.

The decision regarding Canyonlands must ultimately be based on a farsighted consideration of its potential resources and their impact on the economic and esthetic values of mankind. This being so, it must be determined which resource offers the greatest potential and the highest use. Then it must be determined to what extent the use of other resources is compatible with the highest use. I submit here the belief that according to any reasonable and long-range criterion, the scenic resource is, by a large margin, the greatest potential resource of the Canyonlands area. The extent to which this is true depends on how far we wish to extrapolate into the future; scenery is a non-exhaustible resource and the population is rapidly increasing. A far-sighted view clearly indicates that the use of Canyonlands in the traditional national park sense would be overwhelmingly more significant than its use of mining and grazing. I further submit that mining and grazing, especially the latter, have such a limited and short-term value, by comparison, and are so abusive to the land, the remaining vegetation, and the total scenic environment, that their use on these lands cannot be justified. These conclusions are substantiated in the following analysis of the two principal Canyonlands resources: scenery and mining.

First, the scenic wonders of the Canyonlands area are magnificent; in very few places can one find geological marvels on such a vast scale. To cut this area up into several smaller parks or reduce the area below 330,000 acres would greatly lessen the impact of its grand expanse and detract from its value as a national park. As time goes by, the population explosion and increase in leisure time will more than justify the use of this area as a national park. If a smaller park would suffice now, how long would it be before the larger 330,000-acre park would be saturated to a limit consistent with national park use? Forty years? Eighty years? The time will certainly come when this area is fully saturated, and the economic value of the park for its scenic resources will completely overwhelm its value for any other use. We can be thankful today that the planners of Yellowstone National Park were farsighted enough to realize that a mere accomodation to present needs is inadequate. If they had been like the small-park proponents are today, we would have perhaps three 50-acre parks surrounding some geyser basins rather than the magnificent expanse of 2.2 million acres.

Next let us examine the importance of the mineral and oil resource of the Canyonlands area. No one really knows the extent to which deposits exist. Taking even the most optimistic view, as does the University of Utah economic report, such deposits would, even initially, have an economic value of a magnitude no greater than that arising from the creation of a park. While the deposits were being drained, the park would increase in value into the indefinite future.

Thus any mineral consideration is at best a short-range consideration, and should not be given priority in deciding the ultimate disposition of these lands. The local mining interest and some public officials have, however, attempted to establish a priority for mineral development, leaving but a few fragments of the area for national park use. In view of their arguments, several specific points require mention.

Now, I would like to point out again the fact that the area proposed here is three-fifths of 1 percent of the land area of the State of Utah. It is not a big land withdrawal in terms of total area. I would like to point out that most of the public lands of Utah, that is on most of the public lands of Utah, mining and grazing are the predominant uses. There are very few areas where the enjoyment of scenery and recreation are the predominant uses. I think that it is not asking too much to set aside an area at a minimum of the type that is under Senator Moss' bill that Senator Moss has proposed for scenic and recreational use, and I think that we can ask that this land would be free of the mechanization and the marring of the scenery that you get from the conflicting uses.

1. The proposed land area is only three-fifths of 1 percent of the area of Utah. Compare the vast public land areas in which mining and grazing are the primary uses to that in which recreation and scenery are paramount. It requires a very high degree of self-interest to deny the public enjoyment of such a small area free from the mechanization of modern prospecting, drilling, and mining.

2. Park opponents who seek the public's sympathy with the worn-out and misleading argument about locking up resources forever have carefully bypassed any mention of the fact that Congress can unlock resources as well as lock them up. If in the past Congress has shown a reluctance to unlock the few existing restricted areas, it is simply because their resources have not been critically needed. Perhaps someday such needs will exist and this type of reserve will be invaluable to the Nation's welfare. In any case, the decision to use these resources can be made anytime by the people of the United States and their representatives. No one should object to that.

3. It has been argued that all mineral resources need to be exploited in view of this world's increasing demands. Dr. James Bonner, who is a native of Utah and now at the California Institute of Technology, has addressed himself to this problem in an essay entitled, "The Ultimate Limit of Our Resources," copies of which have been submitted with this statement. I hope that this can be included in the record; it is quite short.

Senator METCALF. Without objection it will be incorporated into the record by reference.

Dr. GIDDINGS. I thank you. I think it does bear on this matter of the mineral needs of the world, of the country.

Dr. Bonner points out the obvious fact that our practice of always using the highest grade ores has necessarily led to the use of progressively lower and lower grade deposits. He then takes a long-range view in saying:

> The time must inevitably come, therefore, when ores as such will no longer exist, and machine civilization, if it is to survive, must feed upon the leanest of materials, upon the rocks which make up the surface of our planet, the

waters of the sea, and the gases of the atmosphere. There is no reason in principle why we cannot obtain all of our metals from the rocks of the earth's crust.

Dr. Bonner concludes:

If the preservation of a natural area has esthetic, scientific, or other important value, then society is quite justified in such preservation. The amount of any material resource obtainable by the despoliation of a natural area today is insignificant in comparison with the future requirements of our Nation or of the world as a whole. To maintain a natural area in its native state will at the most delay but a second in time the amount when we must depend upon the lowest grades of materials anyway. Let us, therefore, resist these pressures for the despoliation of natural areas, pressures based upon the argument that the material resources which they contain are essential to the welfare of our culture. Let us maintain a portion of the surface of our earth in its original state.

I think this pretty well summarizes the conclusion of Dr. Bonner, but it does contain a number of facts that I think are quite important if we wish to consider the long-range view of what we are going to do in the following decades, perhaps a number of decades from now, perhaps a time when none of us are around but the things that will involve our descendants and those people that will follow us and have the heritage of this country.

Finally, in view of the overwhelming potential of the canyonlands area for its scenic as opposed to other resources, the arguments for multiple use are rather shortsighted. This area deserves the full protection and full status accorded any other national park area. In a land where vast panoramas unfold from nearly any viewpoint, and in a land so devoid of vegetation, the operations of mineral and oil industries would leave ugly scars in the landscape, visible to all for many miles and for many, many years to come. The short-term benefits—and even these are of dubious value—do not justify the desecration of this magnificant land. The same conclusion applies to grazing activities. The State of Utah is already covered with the erosion gullies of overgrazing. This abuse should be carefully limited. In conclusion, neither mining nor grazing may be considered compatible with the highest use of the canyonlands area.

As a consequence of the land abuse which accompanies mining and grazing, it is proposed that the Moss bill be amended so that grazing be completely phased out over a 25-year period and that further mining and prospecting be prohibited until such a time as they prove to be necessary to the welfare of the people of the United States.

That concludes what I have to say before the committee. Thank you.

Senator Moss. Now I appreciate your testimony, Dr. Giddings. I understand your point of view, and, as I indicated before, this is something we must resolve in this committee.

Dr. Giddings. I understand that.

Senator Metcalf. Dr. Giddings, I think you have performed a service for us here in pointing out that this is public land. The reason why this senatorial committee is here is because this is land that is owned by the United States and that most of the public land has a primary use of grazing or mining in the area—up in my area—also lumbering, and we have secondary uses of hunting and recreation and these other things that we devote our public lands to and that we are just changing a secondary use to a primary use if we create Canyon-

lands Park. I don't believe that that has been brought out often enough in the course of the hearings.

Dr. GIDDINGS. I wonder if I might make one point. It is not easy. I think, to have a secondary use—that is, mining and grazing—and have the primary use the scenic resources. The tourists I don't think are going to bother the sheep and I don't think they are going to get in the way of an oil well. But you can have perhaps a few oil derricks and roads that are necessary, various construction items that come along with that, and I think this may disturb what I would consider the primary use very much and so much that the scenic resources might actually become secondary as a result of this.

Senator MELCALF. I understand; you made a strong point, Dr. Giddings.

Dr. GIDDINGS. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. Hyrum Tolley. Is Mr. Tolley here? [No response.]

Then our next witness will be Mr. Raymond Wright. He will be followed by Mr. Earl Bunn.

Mr. Wright, glad to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND S. WRIGHT, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE BANK OF UTAH AND FORMER MAYOR OF OGDEN, UTAH

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, honorable members of the committee, Senator Bennett, and Congressmen King and Peterson, my name is Raymond S. Wright. I am vice president of the Bank of Utah and for 6 years served as mayor of Ogden, retiring in 1959.

I appear before you today, not as a technical expert on the resources of mining or oil potentials in the area that has been suggested as the Canyonlands National Park, for I am sure you gentlemen will hear much of this from qualified people. I have volunteered to come down from Ogden to stress the importance of more and more recreation facilities for our exploding young population.

Here in the arid intermountain area we haven't the great water resources to create unlimited park potentials like many of the States north and west of us. At the same time, we have a terrific population increase; and one has only to drive around in our limited recreation areas to appreciate the fact that the people are being greatly handicapped with limited areas for healthy vacationing. This great crying need, along with limited facilities, has starved this State and its adjoining areas from participation with many people from the country at large who drive through the West to enjoy such spots as Yellowstone National Park, along with Glacier National Park, and others. The short time they spend in Utah has been a great concern of our people for a long time.

Leaving human values and turning to the material things, in my estimation, Yellowstone Park alone has created and continues to create more tourist dollars than can be compared with uncertain revenues from oil and mines that have a background of restricted life. Mind you, gentlemen, this great wealth in human and material revenues from Yellowstone Park has a background of close to 80 years and each year substantially more of our people participate. Take the

Yellowstone-bound tourist off the highways of the intermountain West in the summer and the terrific loss of trade would, I feel sure, upset our economy.

These are material things that to me are important, but insignificant compared with the moral responsibility we have to set aside adequate areas and facilities to enable our people to enjoy healthy communion with nature.

Much will be spoken about the logical size for the development of this gorgeous part of the West but I am firmly convinced, gentlemen, that like all things in dealing with a dynamic growing republic, any area we set aside will someday be considered woefully small. This is the story of all things that have to do with our dynamic growth.

I am convinced that we can still have unlimited development in mines and oil resources as the land involved here is a small part of the total potentially rich areas; and even it is not outlawed for development, as I understand, by the proposed legislation.

I would stress the great cause of human values and I believe you will all agree with me that people as a whole lack well organized lobby groups to present their story, and from my experience as mayor of the second largest city in Utah, I would plead for more and more sites for our people who are fast becoming surrounded by urban problems.

From the literature I have read on the subject, it is my opinion that Senate bill 2387 providing for a contiguous area is the minimum that should be considered and that its provisions for recreation and facilities are on the conservative side. I would urge your serious consideration of this bill.

I am sure that we all want our people to have this heritage and I would exhort you to exercise great vision in solving this problem that is so close to the hearts of all of us.

Senator METCALF. Are there any questions?

Senator Moss. Mr. Wright, that is a very eloquent statement and I particularly underscore where you suggest that perhaps we are being conservative in dealing with the size here, that the history of so many things that we have done is that we have erred on the small thing all the time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Start out too small.

Senator Moss. And we recognize that we have that problem to wrestle with here. Thank you.

Senator BENNETT. May I make a comment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, Senator.

Senator BENNETT. Please understand that I believe we can have both types of development. I am interested in two statements in the first paragraph of your statement on page 2.

You say:

> Yellowstone Park has created and continues to create more tourist dollars than can be compared with uncertain revenues from oil and mines that have a background of restrictive life.

The State of Montana has the greater copper pit, the greater copper mine at Butte. It has Yellowstone. Which one do you think they would rather give up? If they had to have a choice, which one would affect their economy most?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think perhaps, Senator, that you are attempting to draw out from me the economic value of the two. I am not prepared to answer that but I do think that we should look at the human values also.

Senator BENNETT. But you made the flat statement——

Mr. WRIGHT. I said that is my opinion.

Senator BENNETT. In other words, you think they would do better to close the mine at Butte?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, I wouldn't say that. I would say that perhaps the tourist dollar that comes from Yellowstone would be greater than the tourist dollar that you would get out of the mineral development in this proposed bill.

Senator BENNETT. Then you are saying that the reason mining is going to be developed in this park is so that the tourist—to attract tourists to see mines.

Mr. WRIGHT. Not necessarily; no.

Senator BENNETT. Let me raise another question. You say:

> Take the Yellowstone-bound tourist off the highways of the intermountain West in the summer and the terrific loss of trade would, I feel sure, upset our economy.

The Yellowstone-bound tourists are not on the highways in the spring, the fall, and the winter. Does our economy go to pieces in those 9 months?

Mr. WRIGHT. Not necessarily, no; but I think it is a definite factor in our economy.

Senator BENNETT. Well, so do I, but I don't think it is so important that you can afford to risk the western mining development and you assume that when the tourist goes off the highway our economy is upset.

Mr. WRIGHT. I don't believe we are risking it with this bill.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Wright, I find myself in accord with you. I don't think we need to make the choice between that open pit at Butte and Yellowstone Park or Glacier National Park. You will recall that in 1872 when Glacier National Park was created or Yellowstone Park National Park was created, it was for the reason that they were starting to stake claims along that beautiful canyon of the Yellowstone and we decided, I think very wisely—Congress decided at that time to close that area to mining and so we made the choice. Our ancestors at that time made the choice that they didn't want mining at that particularly beautiful part of the West. They chose that they didn't want mining at Old Faithful Geyser Basin or mining up at Mammoth Springs but we did continue to develop the rest of our public lands so we opened the great area for copper mining that has contributed so much to Montana.

I think we can have both and that is the problem that this committee is confronted with as to the best and the highest use of our public lands. I want to say that what Yellowstone Park and Glacier Park have given to us in Montana has meant that the third largest industry is our tourism industry. If it were taken out and we did take those people off the highways, we would be in a much more serious situation and much more unemployment than unfortunately we have at the present time.

Senator LONG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief comment to that thought from the standpoint from my experience in the 50th State, Hawaii.

When I went to Hawaii 45 years ago we had a major industry that was sugar and a budding secondary industry, pineapple. The pineapple developed, as you all know into a major industry and those two industries combined were the source of our income. Now we have a tourist industry. I am not certain of the latest figures but I think it has now surpassed in importance either sugar or pineapple, not combined, but either of them.

The point I wish to make is this, the coming of tourism, tremendous building program on the beach at Waikiki and other evidences of expansion has not in anyway interfered with the production of sugar or the production of pineapple. It is a clearcut gain and that is what tourism is.

I think the thought that has been stressed here time and again of the value found in parks outside of the dollar should never be overlooked because it has a value beyond the economic impact that it has, but it certainly is an important source of income without in any way interfering with any established income.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I make one statement? I am sure the State of Utah wouldn't want to give up Bingham Canyon for the sake of a national park down there but I think we can have our industry and we can still have this national park that has been proposed.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Wright.

The next witness is Mr. Earl Bunn. Pass Mr. Bunn.

Mr. William Bruhn. He will be followed by Mr. Howells. Mr. Bruhn, we are very proud to have you with us today and go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM G. BRUHN, CHAIRMAN, CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BRUHN. Thank you, Senator. Gentlemen, it is with pleasure that I offer testimony today in the matter before your auspicious body. History is being made this day, and I am proud to add my voice and that of the Citizens for Canyonlands Committee to the chorus which you have heard and will hear favoring the establishment of this great new national park within the confines of Utah's boundaries.

To dwell on the beauties or the wonders of this Canyonlands area would at this point be folly, for you, gentlemen, have now had the opportunity to experience Canyonlands—and experience it one must to gain a proper perspective of what this wonderland has to offer. The citizens of our State shall ever be grateful to you for taking the time and interest to visit these wonders at firsthand.

It is difficult for me to avoid becoming personally involved in discussing this subject, and I have had the proud honor of serving as chiarman of a county commission in one of the counties here involved. The people and the economy of much of this geographical location have long been near and dear to my heart.

The committee which I represent was formed for a singular purposes: To advance the possibility of establishing a Canyonlands National Park. The committee has representation from all sections of

the State, and from all segments of our economy. May I make the point here that we have chosen the Moss bill as the vehicle for accomplishing this purpose. Reasons for this selection are many, the primary one being the flexibility offered by this legislation. The soundness of this position has borne out well.

Since accepting this assignment as chairman of this committee, I have had an opportunity of talking with many individuals and groups concerning this legislation. I have visited with nature lovers and geologists, with mining and petroleum representatives, and wildlife enthusiasts.

As a result of these conversations, it would appear that the arguments offered fall into two major extremes:

There are the purists, those who would allow no other use within the park boundaries than protection—pure museum pieces, if you will. Frequently among such representatives that opinion is voiced than 330,000 acres are not enough. Such people would, of course, shudder at the mere thought of contemplating such uses as hunting within a national park, to say nothing of the horror of permitting mining, grazing, or petroleum exploration within the boundaries of such a park.

Conversely, we have the representatives of other groups—those who would have little or no regard for the preservation of park areas; some who would indeed despoil the scenic values of Canyonlands for the possibility of mineral or other resources.

Perhaps these are oversimplifications of the arguments. I think not. I believe them to be fundamental. It is because of such extremes that we have endorsed the Moss bill. It is the safe middle ground. The language of this legislation delineates that the primary purpose of the area will be to protect it as a national park. Secondary to this are other uses such as grazing, petroleum, mining exploration and production, and hunting, insofar as they do not interfere with the primary purpose. We submit that this is sound legislation, that it does not compromise or jeopardize the concept of national parks, and that there is precedent for such secondary usage in other parks or monuments.

We know that we need not remind you, gentlemen, of the fact that we are not creating a vast new Yellowstone National Park. The time of availability of vast land expanses of national park caliber is past. If we are to expand the national park system, we must face creation of each new park area and its special problems as singular entities, as you have done in passing the legislation to create the Great Basin National Park with its secondary uses of grazing and mining, Point Reyes with its dairy farm, and the Everglades National Park with its petroleum exploration.

It has been my experience that most people upon reading or studying this legislation become converted to its soundness, especially when they find out what the bill really is—for much has been said about what it is not.

I have found groups shocked, for instance, to learn that this land is for the most part presently federally owned. Frequently in the press they have been told that this is a Federal land grab. They have been repeatedly told that 74 percent of Utah's land area is federally owned, yet they have not been told that this has nothing to do with Canyonlands—for with the exception of the State school sections,

and the river bottom lands, this land presently belongs to the Federal Government. The Moss bill seeks only to put this land to a greater and higher use.

Much has been said about locking up the area. Gentleman, I submit to you that this land has been locked up by nature for centuries. The sleeping beauty of Canyonlands has had few suitors, for few have known that she existed. She has had few love affairs, for even the hardy found it difficult to call court on her. No, to the contrary, our experience in southern Utah has been that when you build roads, when you develop trails, when you develop water and sanitary facilities, you do not lock up, but indeed you unlock an area, then you invite the world to share in this beauty.

Last week while in Moab, I had the opportunity to view the bronze bust of Dr. Williams, a Moab physician, who was instrumental in the establishment of Arches National Monument. The thought then occurred to me—what finer legacy could a man leave to his children, and his grandchildren, than this—the preservation of nature's wonders for generations yet unborn? Senator Moss has reason to be proud of his fight to leave such a legacy to our Nation.

If we as a people are slow to recognize the values of a national park, gentlemen, please grant us patience, for such is our tradition. When asked for help to build a road to the great Zion National Park upon its establishment, another Utah Governor told National Parks Service representatives; "We will build no roads to rocks." I would remind you, also, that Ebenezer Bryce, for whom Bryce Canyon National Park was named, recognized it only as a hell of a place to lose a cow.

In conclusion, may I leave you with one story. During the early years of settlement in southern Utah, a rich silver strike was established at Silver Reef, in Washington County. A community of some proportions and wealth arose around this strike. The community of Silver Reef became so rich, so powerful, and so populous that they challenged the city of St. George in an election for the county seat, and they almost won. Today, the silver is gone, there are but a couple of buildings left to remind us of the glory of the past, and yet thousands upon thousands of tourists pass by this spot each year on their way to visit nearby Zion National Park, and to spend their dollars with Utah businessmen. National parks are indeed renewable resources—no matter how many times we look at them, we do not take from them. They are there to enjoy throughout the years.

Again, gentlemen, our sincere thanks for your visit, and when you leave—please take with you the heartfelt thanks of many grateful Utahans. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. Any questions?

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to have you identify for the committee the Citizens for Canyonlands Committee. When we were in San Juan the other day, the committee was very careful to establish the authenticity of a spokesman who said he spoke for the San Juan Committee. Now who are the Citizens for Canyonlands Committee?

Mr. BRUHN. We have numerous members in San Juan. Mayor Bailey, of Monticello, is a member of our committee and Mrs. Frost and Mr. Frost are members. Paul Strong is a member of our com-

mittee. Frank Browning in Ogden is a member of our committee.

Senator BENNETT. Is this committee open for anyone to join? How were you elected chairman?

Mr. BRUHN. In a public meeting, Senator, held in the Newhouse Hotel, called for the specific purpose because we felt that there were so many dispositions on this subject and because this group did feel that this was the proper vehicle, that I was elected at a public hearing, sir.

Senator BENNETT. Has the committee financed itself?

Mr. BRUHN. The committee has financed itself, yes, sir.

Senator BENNETT. Are there any Republicans on the committee?

Mr. BRUHN. The mayor of Monticello is a Republican, sir. There are numerous other Republicans that I could mention. Yes, sir, there are.

Senator BENNETT. How many members are on your committee?

Mr. BRUHN. I would judge about 50, sir.

Senator BENNETT. You are speaking for 50 people?

Mr. BRUHN. Yes, sir; I am, as well as myself, Senator, as a long-time resident of the area.

Senator BENNETT. Well, may I ask you one more question. You have long since been associated with Bryce Canyon. The last time I was in Garfield, the cafe you owned was closed because during the winter there isn't enough tourist business in the Bryce Canyon area to keep it open.

Mr. BRUHN. That is an assumption on your part, Senator. The reason the restaurant was closed was not because the business was not there. That is your assumption, sir.

Senator BENNETT. Well, that is what the man told me who was leasing it from you.

Mr. BRUHN. Did you talk to the man who leased it, sir? I see, okay.

Senator METCALF. Are there any more questions? (No response.) Thank you, Mr. Bruhn, for a very eloquent statement.

I think at this time it would be desirable and about time to take our morning recess so we will be recessed until 5 minutes after 11.

(Whereupon, at 10:55 a.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 11:05 a.m.)

Senator METCALF. We will be back in order.

Someone told me that Dr. Stokes is now here.

Dr. STOKES. Yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. Glad to have you with us, Dr. Stokes, and go right ahead with your testimony.

STATEMENT OF DR. WILLIAM LEE STOKES, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Dr. STOKES. Thank you. Gentlemen, my name is William Lee Stokes. I am chairman of the department of geology at the University of Utah, and I am a resident of eastern Utah, having been born and raised in Emery County.

I have been through and over the proposed Canyonlands National Park many times. I am speaking mainly as an individual geologist with a recommendation for a study which might eliminate some of the problems of setting up this park.

To quote from my statement here.

It is my belief that more attention should be given to a scientific study of the scenic aspects of the proposed Canyonlands Park. Scenery is like art or music; it must be studied, and it can be appreciated fully only if explained and analyzed by those who understand it. This is nowhere better illustrated than in our great western parks. How much more we enjoy Yellowstone if we understand the rudiments of geology as applied to geysers and hot springs; how much better we comprehend the Hegben Lake earthquake area when we understand that the faulting there is part of an ancient, long-continuing pattern and not an unexplainable catastrophe. What would Dinosaur Monument be without the painstaking geological research that went into an understanding of the Age of Dinosaurs and the years of labor which put the skeletons on their feet for millions to see and admire? What would Carlsbad Caverns be without the geologist's explanation of the formation of stalagmites, stalactites, and other cave features? What would Yosemite be without the picture of the long-vanished glaciers which the geologist reconstructs to explain the awe-inspiring scenery? How much does an understanding of volcanoes add to a visit to the Craters of the Moon or Crater Lake?

The average persons wants to know what happened to create the landscape. He is eager to hear the explanations of the expert. Consider the publications in the gift and curio shops of our parks and monuments. They are mostly surprisingly technical and many are written by professional geologists. They sell by the millions and do much to educate people in a pleasant way about the earth we inhabit. And the more one knows the more one wants to know.

The writings of the geologist have probably done more to explain and popularize Yosemite Valley than any other single thing. Another geologist, Willis T. Lee, practically sold Carlsbad Caverns singlehanded. E. D. McKee's scientific and semitechnical papers on the Grand Canyon have been distributed by the hundreds of thousands of copies. What a debt of gratitude, generally unexpressed, the people of southern Utah owe to Herbert E. Gregory, whose masterful pen made the scenery of southern Utah, especially that of Zion and Bryce, come alive for amateur and professional alike.

If it weren't for the scientific studies of geologists in connection with our parks and monuments, I venture to say that most of the visitors would turn away disappointed and unsatisfied.

If we do not provide true geologic explanations for those scenic features that are geologic in nature, we are losing a tremendous opportunity. So-called Indian legends or nonsense Paul Bunyan-type explanations are about the only alternative. Truth is better than fiction here.

There are many features in the canyonlands area that are unique, and they are unique for geologic reasons. How many people know, for instance, that much of the scenery of the Needles is due to the fracturing and settling of the rocks due to the removal of salt by solution hundreds of feet below the surface? How many know that the walls of the Colorado appear to be shifting toward the river for the same reason? The problem is where to go to see these actions illustrated by good examples. We must know more about the details in order to pick and choose that which is to be included or excluded on a reasonable basis.

82324—62—pt. 2——14

I suggest that sometime very soon a thorough study of the physiography, geomorphology, structure, sedimentary features, paleontology, and stratigraphy of the proposed Canyonlands Parks be made. I have deliberately omitted economic geology as it has received sufficient attention already. Should the list of technical fields just mentioned seem unduly academic, I merely rephrase the statement by saying that a scientific study of scenery is very much in order, preferably before final boundaries are set up.

This study cannot be done from an airplane. It is a job for tried and true ground field methods. It is not a job for engineers, either. Who but a geologist could say whether a set of fossil footprints might be of the common everyday dinosaurs, or perhaps traces of animals otherwise unknown? Just where are the best arches, the most picturesque balanced rocks, the most highly colored walls or the most reliable springs? Offhand reports will not do. Maps, photos, and a black and white report are needed.

Here is an ideal task for local and national cooperation. Perhaps a team of geologists made up of members from the U.S. Geological Survey and from local organizations could be sent into the area to prepare a comprehensive report on the geology. Cooperative projects between the States and the U.S. Geological Survey have been operated successfully for years. This would help with the immediate problem of setting boundaries and would also have value for future planning. If this is not done now it seems certain that the boundaries will be unrealistic and in the end troublesome and controversial.

Senator METCALF. Any questions?

Senator MOSS. No, thank you, Dr. Stokes.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask one.

Senator METCALF. Congressman King.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the same question that I asked Dr. Murdock and that is presumably we have to have a starting point and I am just wondering if you feel that the Moss bill gives us an adequate starting point?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, without taking sides on the size of the park or the proposals.

Senator METCALF. Doctor, you do realize, however, that there have been more than just aerial surveys in the preparation of the Department of Interior report. They have men who have walked over the entire area and the Bureau of Mines is in a constant survey of mineral resources of the area and you have made an eloquent speech for another bill of mine which may be extraneous but provides for more money for authorizing a continuous survey by the Department of Interior, so all these things are going on, have gone and are going forward at the same time and while the committee only had time to go into the area with jeeps and helicopters, many other men have made a much more comprehensive survey.

Dr. STOKES. I realize that but eventually this detailed geology will have to be done so we might say why not now or why not soon.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Dr. Stokes. Thank you for a very helpful testimony.

Is Dr. McKnight here? (No response.) Is Mr. Rulon S. Howells here?

Mr. HOWELLS. Yes.

Senator METCALF. I see you have a prepared statement.

STATEMENT OF RULON S. HOWELLS, FORMER COMMISSIONER, UTAH TOURIST AND PUBLICITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. HOWELLS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to commend the committee for its painstaking work in going into something which to Utahans is of very great value.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you in support of the proposed Canyonlands National Park, located in southeastern Utah.

I was former commissioner in the Utah Department of Publicity and Industrial Development, which department was interested in and directly responsible for all scenic areas within the State of Utah. Nearly 20 years ago, after having first visited the area that is now being considered in the proposed Canyonlands National Park and other scenic areas adjacent to it, I predicted that southeastern Utah would some day be a greater tourist attraction than southwestern Utah, even though in the latter area were located, among other great attractions, Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon National Park, Cedar Breaks National Monument and with the added attraction of the Grand Canyon National Park close by in Arizona.

Several years ago the Utah Department of Publicity and Industrial Development sent a professional crew in the Canyonlands area to make a color film entitled "Land of the Crimson Cliffs" (16 mm. sound, 30-minute running) to bring this spectacular place to the attention of the outside world. I don't know whether this committee has seen that or not. I think Mr. Cannon of the publicity department would have a print available. Over a hundred prints of this film were made and have been in circulation throughout the United States ever since.

The proposed Canyonlands National Park, I believe, will be able to carry an even greater description than is given by the World Almanac about the Grand Canyon National Park; namely, "The greatest example of erosion and the most sublime spectacle in the world," even though the proposed Canyonlands National Park will encompass approximately 300,000 acres, as proposed, while the Grand Canyon National Park has an area in excess of 670,000 acres.

Utah is what is called a through State. Most tourists go through Utah on their way to some other point or points of interest, thus they pass by the greatest land of color in all the country. Canyonlands National Park, as proposed in Senator Frank E. Moss' bill (S. 2387), will not only attract great numbers of people to this area but will help keep them here a little longer to enjoy the wonders of nature the like of which cannot be found elsewhere.

Utah cannot afford, nor does it have the means to develop such an area as the Canyonlands. This tremendously scenic and fantastic land needs to be made available now to all who can drive, fly, or take a train or bus to get there. This is truly a national project. By far greater numbers of people from other States and areas will visit this land than Utahans.

I believe in the multiple-use of the land. In Senator Moss' bill, as amended, is the ideal program. It is up to Congress to say what and how the national parks system is to work. I am sure that the national parks system can, if needs be, adjust to administer a multiple land use program in a national park. With Senator Moss' amended bill all factions should be reasonably satisfied. No bill could satisfy everyone or every faction completely.

Some have said, to create a national park would have the effect of locking up valuable minerals, but if we don't get this area into a national park soon, we will in effect "lock up" the scenic values to all our people because they could not get to them and thus we would also be locking up tremendous tourist income.

The whole area encompassed in the Canyonlands National Park should be left as a unit or contiguous area and not cut up into several sections—this, because of administrative ease, economy, and unified control. Besides, who can say, in such an area, what should or shouldn't be left out of national park status.

Creating a national park in this area will help to satisfy the desire of millions of Americans who are looking for new places to see and explore. With the national administration now favorable to the creation of this park, all possible forces should unite in getting Senator Moss' bill through the Senate and Representative King's bill through the House so that our generation, as well as future generations, may enjoy the beauties of this area.

I believe that an airstrip, with an adequate airport, should be provided for within the boundaries of the park near enough to its main features so anyone desiring could see some of its grandeur in a much shorter time than is necessary by slower transportation. Thousands of people, especially professionals, could "break away" for only a couple of days, taste of the grandeur of the park and then plan to spend more time when it was available to them.

I appreciate the Park Service might frown on such a thing but it is a thought that I think that we are in a jet age and I believe it is coming.

Nearly everyone one says that we should surely have a national park in the designated Canyonlands area, but too many have reservations as to how it should be done. Nearly everyone who wants special features represents special interests. The general public usually lack an articulate voice, they must depend on their elected officials, such as yourselves, to make these wonders of nature accessible and available to them.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Howells.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Rulon, I think you are the first one that suggested that maybe there ought to be an airstrip in there and I can report that there is a little airstrip at Squaw Springs now. It has been dozed off and we saw it the other day. It is adequate to take small planes but your suggestion is indicative of the kind of development that could be made in these areas that are included in the park.

Now Squaw Springs is quite an open, meadowlike place and there is room there for an airstrip; room for an administration headquarters and camping grounds. There is an excellent spring of water there where we stopped on Thursday and all slaked our thirst at this spring, but this suggestion of an airstrip is a very good one.

Mr. HOWELLS. There are many mesas in that area, too, that this could be accomplished. Now I take the point that Senator Bennett made here awhile back in this hearing that we should start with a smaller area and go up. I think that 300,000 acres is a small area in this particular part of the State of Utah. We can go up from there and add to it later on.

Senator BENNETT. I would just make the observation that the airstrip to which Senator Moss referred was undoubtedly put down by an oil exploration crew. [Laughter.]

Senator METCALF. Let me suggest to you that you are going to have to stand in line for the airstrip until at least Senator Hayden gets his Grand Canyon strip and we get ours at West Yellowstone. Thank you, Mr. Howells.

Is Dr. Tanner here? Dr. Tanner.

The next witness will be Dr. Mulaik at the conclusion of Dr. Tanner. Dr. Tanner, glad to have you as a witness.

STATEMENT OF VASCO M. TANNER, PROFESSOR OF ZOOLOGY AND ENTOMOLOGY, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Mr. TANNER. Thank you, Senator Metcalf. My name is Vasco M. Tanner. I am professor of zoology and entomology at Brigham Young University, Provo. I appreciate the invitation from our distinguished Senator Frank E. Moss to appear before you and to express my views on the Canyonlands National Park legislation as proposed by Senator Moss. The statements I am about to make will be brief and to the point. I am speaking as the chairman of the Conservation and Forest Committee of the Provo Chamber of Commerce, for the Provo City officials, and as a citizen of Utah, who has familiarized himself these many years with our parks and monuments in this State and contiguous States. The point of view expressed here has been arrived at as a result of my familiarity with the establishment and development of the national parks and monuments in Utah. Zion (1919) and Bryce (1928) National Parks; Dinosaur (1915); Cedar Breaks, Timpanogos Cave (1922); Prehistoric Towers (1923); Natural Bridges (1908); Arches (1939); Capitol Reef (1937); and Rainbow Bridge (1910) National Monuments are unique in their own rights and have gained much favor from tourists who have visited them from our several States as well as abroad. These great natural attractions have brought millions of dollars into the State and will continue to do so. They are one of our greatest natural resources and it is most satisfying and fortunate that they will have perpetuity and have their uniqueness preserved, as a result of having been created as national parks and monuments.

We are going through many changes, nationally and internationally. Our population is increasing and is becoming more and more mobile. Through science and automation we are having more released time to spend in the great out of doors. Much of this time will be spent visiting the attractions of our various States. We here in Utah are beginning to hold an enviable position as a tourist center. We must not cease to do some long-range planning and in doing this, we must make sure that we utilize every scenic area we have. Utah in the near future will be known as one of the greatest scenic and recreational States of our Nation. With the already established parks and monuments, we will soon have added to these the great recreational area extending for 185 miles from Glen Canyon up the Colorado River, and in the Ashley Forest there will soon be developed one of the most

attractive recreational areas to be found in any of the forests of the West. These forested areas of the high Uintas will extend northward from the Flaming Gorge Dam into Wyoming. Within the past year 8 million people visited our national forests for recreational purposes. This, along with the million and one-half who visited our parks and the millions who will be drawn to the great recreation areas around the Powell and Flaming Gorge Lakes, should indicate something as to the income that may be derived from these parks, monuments, and recreational areas. Situated along the Colorado River about midway between the two great recreational lake areas mentioned above, is the proposed Canyonlands National Park. This area has all and many additional qualifications for a great national park and playground. Its accessibility, protection, and use can at this time, only be developed by our National Park Service. Because it holds such a unique position as a great erosional feature, and because of the archeological antiquities that have not been disturbed, this area should be made a park as soon as possible in order that it may receive the proper management and development.

As to the size of the park, I think that it should be large enough, between 300,000 and 500,000 acres, to make for the preservation of all the scenic features. In the past, our national parks have been well managed. They are managed by a trained personnel who have first and foremost an interest in the perpetuation of the flora and fauna as well as the topography and archeology of an area. We are, however, willing to support Senator Moss' bill which provides for some temporary multiple use of the area with the hope that as time goes on, this will be made an inviolate area except for cooperation in management of the big game of the park and contiguous areas. As to the mineral and oil wealth, they will not be used up if this area is made into a national park but may be an ace up our national sleeve for future development if we find it necessary to conduct a managed exploration of these minerals in the future.

May I parenthetically remark that there may be need for some looking into the future of our State resources. Many of us are aware that prior to the turn of this century the resources of our Nation were considered as inexhaustible. As a result of our use of these resources, we have become a powerful influence among other nations. This largely because of the unprecedented rate at which these resources have been developed. In fact, the American way is based upon a lavish use of soils, plants, animals, oil, and metallic minerals. For the past 50 years, however, we have had many leaders calling attention to the rapid dissipation of these capital assets. Since our high standards of living are based upon a continuance of the renewable resources and a most wise use of the nonrenewable ones, such as oil, coal, and minerals, we are called to work out means of conserving them. A natural resource, however, such as a national park or monument, is not used up if it is wisely managed.

The University of Utah economic report should amply demonstrate that this great scenic resource will bring to Utah millions and millions of dollars that cannot hope to be had if it is not developed as a national park. Last August 11, 1961, in the Rapid City, S. Dak., Daily Journal there appeared an article which pointed out the im-

portance of the tourist trade of that State. In 1960 their income was around $150 million from tourism. This was a great increase over previous years. A statistical study made by Mr. Hipschman estimated that due to the increased tourist business throughout the West that within the next 10 years the tourist business within their State would be worth $700 million a year. The University of Utah findings are in agreement with South Dakota's and many other State's findings in connection with the economic importance of tourist trade.

I am an optimist, at least to the extent that I believe that the people of Utah, including our leaders, will engage in some positive thinking in connection with the creation of this park, and ask for its establishment of it at as early a date as possible.

I have been informed by the officers of the Provo Chamber of Commerce and Provo City officials, and I concur in their recommendations, that we espouse a positive and definite program of support for our capable and hard-working Senator Frank E. Moss' bill which provides for the creation of a Canyonlands National Park.

We wish to thank you Senators who are giving unstintingly of your time in coming into our State to obtain firsthand information on this proposed park. My thanks for an opportunity to represent Provo City's interests. Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Dr. Tanner, for a very excellent statement. No questions.

Senator BENNETT. I would just like to thank Dr. Tanner, I would like to thank you for being frank with the committee and telling us that you are appearing here as a result of an invitation from Senator Moss.

Now I am sure Senator Moss has the right to invite all the witnesses he wishes but I am afraid that some of them, it seems to me, who have been invited by him, have come before us and said, "I am here as a volunteer," but I am glad that you have made the clear statement of the reason you are here.

Senator Moss. May I say for the record that I sent out 4,000 invitations throughout the State to oil interests, mining interests, to chambers of commerce, to everybody that I could possibly think of who might want to have something to say about this. In addition I gave a release to the press making it clear that any citizen of Utah is welcome to come. The fact that Dr. Tanner mentioned that he got an invitation from me would indicate that he fell somewhere within this 4,000 group that were invited.

Senator METCALF. Dr. Tanner, we are glad that Senator Moss invited you. Your testimony has been very helpful and we appreciate it.

Dr. TANNER. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. Now, neither snow, nor rain, nor senatorial committees halt letter carriers in their appointed rounds and so out of order we are going to call Mr. Paul Pearson. Mr. Pearson can only appear during his lunch hour because it might otherwise interfere with the mail, so we are glad to cooperate. Mr. Pearson, you are representing the National Association of Letter Carriers.

STATEMENT BY PAUL E. PEARSON, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. PEARSON. We letter carriers feel that we are quite close to the public. We are not expert when it comes to economics where possibly other people have other relations that would qualify them far better than we. But we do have a daily contact with the public and we do feel that we know what the average vacationer and the average person that is interested in this type of a bill feels like.

Many years ago Cornelius Hodges laid down guidelines for the creation of national parks. It came at a time when the discoverers of Yellowstone National Park were telling how they were going to exploit this feature or that of their many discoveries. I won't go into the whole story; it is a matter of history. But one man, bless his thought, arose and made a statement that has impressed me since I was a little boy, and impresses all of us now. He said, in substance: "Gentlemen, this area is too great for us to exploit. It should be held in trust for our children and our children's children so that they might see what we have seen." This statement was accepted by all those present and the National Park System was born. We are indeed grateful that we should have had such farsighted men in the history of our land that were big enough to give up material gains that they might receive in order to leave it as a trust for us. If it were not for these men how many of us would have seen the Yellowstone, the Grand Canyon, Bryce Zion's, the Yosemite, Mount Ranier and other magnificent spectacles that God has created that man might wonder and enjoy?

We are met today to discuss a possible addition to this system. The first question to be answered is whether this land is of such distinction that it may measure up to the principles of the National Park System. I think this may be answered in the affirmative. I don't believe I have heard any person who ever stated that this magnificent land of scenery was not one of the greatest and most beautiful places in our entire country. Even those who would restrict its size admit of the greatness and magnificence of the country. We letter carriers are not technicians. We have no way of measuring the economic value of the country. We only know that those of us who have been fortunate enough to see this beautiful country believe it is one of God's most beautiful, yet weird, places and hope that it will be made possible for others to see this area.

The second question is one of size. While the opponents to the Moss bill claim the whole area is too large and can be whittled down, we feel that due to the tremendous population explosion that is taking place in our country that the area may be too small, if anything.

I would like to interject here, I think the population of the United States is around 190 million now, probably in 50 years it will be 400 million.

Senator BENNETT. Just the other day it was 186 million.

Senator METCALF. While you have been testifying there are about 30 new ones. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEARSON. It is up to us to take care of the increase of population of 50 years from now when it will probably reach 400 million and the National Park System is already overcrowded.

With more and more leisure time, and more and more vacationers, it will be up to the States and the U.S. Government to provide worthwhile areas to please these vast millions, both present and future. Each park sees new attendance records set every year.

Gentlemen, I ask this question. Could we be true to the principles of Cornelius Hodges and others if we should rob our children and our children's children of this beautiful country in order to commercially exploit small corners of it? Are we of this generation this small? I hope not.

We don't believe this small area of only about 15 miles by 30 miles is going to vastly curtail the economics of this vast State if it is not exploited. Indeed, we invite all who would seek to whittle this to nothingness to read the story of the creation of the National Park System by some of the big men of the past and see if it does not make them feel small by comparison. We are also aware that there is no privately owned land within the confines of the proposed park, that all is either owned by the State or the U.S. Government, so there will be no problems of purchase of property.

With these thoughts in mind, this association of branch 111 of the NALC goes on record as being in favor of the Moss bill for the creation of this park.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Pearson, how many letter carriers are there in branch 111?

Mr. PEARSON. I am afraid—I used to be secretary, I am not secretary any more. I think it is in the neighborhood of 387 members in the letter carrier organization but I could not be exactly sure of that.

Senator METCALF. That is close enough. Are there any questions?

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Pearson, have you ever seen the park area?

Mr. PEARSON. Yes, I have seen it from the Colorado River and also contiguous points at Deadhorse Point which is a State park.

Senator BENNETT. Of course, you don't see much from the bottom of the river.

Mr. PEARSON. No, sir, you don't. However, I think that one of our letter carriers, who I have had a great deal of contact with, Al Morton, has taken films of it which I think this group saw back in Washington, D.C., which I feel probably is the greatest record we have at the present of the park system right now.

Senator MOSS. May I concur in that on Al Morton's film which he did send back for the committee members to see. It is one of the most beautiful celluloid records of the area that I suppose could be made. It is marvelous. We took it down to the Department of Interior and Secretary Udall and a number of people down there saw the film. It is just gorgeous.

Mr. PEARSON. I might say that from what I have seen I would welcome a little further addition to the park system along the Salt Creek area which I think is very beautiful and possibly more beautiful than—almost too beautiful to be left out.

Senator LONG. Mr. Chairman.

Senator METCALF. Senator Long.

Senator LONG. At different times, and now Mr. Pearson, there has been reference to the fact that this land is not privately owned in any instance at all but references have been made that it is owned by the

State or the U.S. Government. Does the State own any part or any considerable part of this 300,000 acres or is it all U.S. Government?

Senator Moss. May I answer that? The State does own a part of this. When Utah became a State, in the Organic Act, we, like other Western States, were given four sections in each township as school lands and those school sections are therefore scattered through this park area. They are not contiguous; they are scattered section by section and also the State of Utah was given the title to the river beds of navigable streams at the time of statehood. These two rivers, the Green and the Colorado, have been declared navigable through the area of the park and therefore to that extent there would be State-owned land within the park. The rest is all Federal land and the bill provides that the Secretary shall exchange lands with the State for State-owned lands within the park and, as you recall, the bill also sets a time limit on which the offer must be made because of earlier criticism that the exchange was a slow process and took years to accomplish. In order to move it along, the bill does call for making the offer of exchange within 30 days.

Now Senator Bennett has proposed an amendment which would name the area to be exchanged, the Lisbon oilfield to be exchanged for these State lands, and that will be considered also by the committee.

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, for the record about 36,000 acres, about 10 percent—a little more than 10 percent of the area belongs to the State of Utah.

Mr. PEARSON. May I make one further observation?

Senator METCALF. Certainly, Mr. Pearson.

Mr. PEARSON. I am wondering; like many people, I like to hunt deer too and I am just wondering if it would not answer the committee's purpose to notice that most of the deer that are in the area use it for winter headquarters and not for summer grazing grounds; and I believe that, just a personal suggestion on my own and not as a branch member, if it would be possible to hold an early deer hunt in the Henry Mountains which are contiguous to the lands, at a little earlier time before the deer gets a chance to get down into the park which is primarily a winter grazing ground.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Pearson, we have had considerable testimony in the area from people who have hunted and have been over the area and in the record which indicates that there really isn't very much deer in the park.

Mr. PEARSON. Except during the wintertime.

Senator METCALF. But we are going to have testimony from Mr. Harold Crane, director of Utah State Fish and Game Commission, and I hope that he will answer that question in the course of his testimony.

Mr. PEARSON. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Pearson. I hope you at least get a sandwich for your lunch.

We will go back to the regular order and Dr. Stanley Mulaik. Is Dr. Mulaik here?

(No response.)

Senator METCALF. Mr. Barlocker; is Mayor Barlocker here?

(No response.)

Senator METCALF. Chester J. Olsen.

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. Glad to see you again and have you appear before a committee of which I am a member. Haven't had you before me since I have been in the Senate, although we have been——

Mr. OLSEN. I have known you for a long time, Senator.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Olsen, you may go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF CHESTER J. OLSEN, CHAIRMAN, GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the committee today. I was invited by Senator Moss and Senator Moss knew full well when I came here I was not going to agree fully with his bill. He told me that I would have 5 minutes and, by golly, when we talk about the Canyonlands in 5 minutes, it is like trying to swin the English Channel in 2 hours; it can't be done.

My name is C. J. Olsen, of 935 Taylor Avenue, Ogden, Utah. I am chairman of the State committee appointed by the Governor to make a study of the several Canyonlands proposals to determine the economic impact of such proposals on the people of the State of Utah and to make recommendations following the study.

I am a fellow member of the American Institute of Park Executives, a senior member of the Society of American Foresters, and a member of several other scientific organizations and recreational associations.

I am a retired regional forester and I was, for 3 years, 1957–60, the first director of the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission. I have had more than 40 years' experience in the management of natural resources, including recreation in its many and varied forms.

During the 3 years I was director of the State park and recreation commission, I prepared, with considerable assistance from a small staff and many other cooperators, a long-range, comprehensive report and program on the great scenic, scientific, geological, archeological, and recreational opportunities in the State of Utah. My employment in the Forest Service—by the way, this is a copy of it and I am not going to ask that it be put in the record because it would be too lengthy but——

Senator METCALF. Do you want to leave a copy for the committee files to be used for reference?

Mr. OLSEN. I will be glad to.

Senator METCALF. Fine, it will be so incorporated in the file.

Mr. OLSEN. It is the only one I have left but I will leave it.

Senator MOSS. I can make it available to the committee; I have one in my office.

Senator METCALF. We will make Senator Moss' copy available.

Mr. OLSEN. Oh, let him keep it.

Senator METCALF. Thank you.

Mr. OLSEN. Now I want to say this; I hope that—I started to pray that we can keep this Canyonlands business out of partisan politics. Now, I am not making any charges as to who is to blame, but I think it is getting too political and I hope and pray that it can be kept out of politics because it is too important to the people of Utah, present and future, to let it continue to be a partisan issue.

Now, personally, for the benefit of the committee, swiping a phrase from my good friend Bruce Jenkins, here in Salt Lake County—first, let me say I have never been in partisan politics at all. I have been in Federal service and State service and could not participate in partisan politics; but, as I now stand, I am a free citizen, a freeman. I am a citizen of the United States of America. I am a citizen of Utah and a Democrat in that order.

The committee of which I was chairman, appointed by the Governor, made a report and you have copies of that, I think.

Senator METCALF. That is part of the file of the committee.

Mr. OLSEN. Fine, and will it be a part of the record?

Senator METCALF. It will not be a part of the printed record but excerpts from that report have been inserted in the printed record.

Mr. OLSEN. Thank you. Now the committee's recommendation and conclusions are based upon the facts as we saw them. In my own case they are based on personal, firsthand knowledge of the area, on a basic appreciation of our great scenic, scientific, geologic, and recreation resources and upon the free exercise of conscience. I am not seeking a political office, real or implied.

The State of Utah, of course, in making this report which I just gave the staff member had hoped to have Congress transfer, without cost, the lands under the Bureau of Land Management for this State park program transferred without cost. This would amount to some 2 million acres out of a total of 24 million acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management and, incidentally, Senator Metcalf, Utah got four sections out of each township when it became a State, sections 2, 16, 32, and 36. Alaska got 102 million acres.

Senator METCALF. Montana got two sections. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLSEN. And Montana got two sections.

Senator LONG. Hawaii didn't get any. We got cash in lieu of it.

Mr. OLSEN. You got cash in lieu of it; well, that is pretty good, too. But I just wanted to make that point. Alaska got nearly twice as many acres as there is in Utah, entirely, of the total acreage.

Now the State park commission has done a pretty good job—have done a very good job—with the resources it has had and I wanted the committee to know that the State has been aware of the scenic and other great recreational values of this area as well as other areas in other parts of the State.

Now, incidentally, I want to say something about S. 2387. I want to make some recommendations here in a moment in line with this report. I don't want to take up too much time because I know you have got a lot of other witnesses, Senator, but I urge the committee to amend the bill, Senator Moss' bill by changing the name of the proposed area to the "Canyonlands National Park and Recreational Area," the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior to be given administrative control of the area; about one-third of the area to be zoned and administered under traditional national park standards—the standards established by Stephen T. Mather, the father of the National Park Service who sponsored the congressional act of August 25, 1916, and as later amended, creating the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior; the zoned areas within the separate units to be connected where this is feasible by roads which would serve as corridors.

At least two-thirds of the area proposed in S. 2387 should be managed as a national recreation area with multiple-use provisions which would provide for prospecting and mining, oil and gas exploration, fish and game and other resource use, and developments within the area. By this zoning method, the National Park Service could preserve the high standards established for national parks within the zoned areas. On the buffer areas established as a national recreation area there should be multiple use as herein defined.

I am not going to read the multiple-use definition because it is already in the report which you have.

Now I don't think I need to say any more about the restrictions on mining. I have a copy of the letter that Mr. Romney read to you this morning which indicates that there are problems in Mount McKinley National Park in mining and by this method I think, gentlemen, that we can have our cake and eat it. We can have a national park and we can have a national recreation area which I am sure will serve the purposes of all of us here.

Prospecting, mining, oil and gas exploration, and many forms of recreation area not compatible with national park standards and should not be conducted within a traditional national park. I am surprised and disappointed to learn that apparently the National Park Service seems to be in the process of diluting traditional standards established 46 years ago by Stephen T. Mather, the father of the National Park Service.

This philosophy, like the Constitution of the United States, with minor exceptions, is just as sound today on relatively small areas as it was when it was written.

Either the National Park Service by accepting multiple use is deliberately misleading the mining people and the sportsmen or it is attempting to dilute the traditional high standards established for national parks, or both.

Senator Moss. May I interrupt, Chet, to say that it won't be the National Park Service that does it if it is done, it will be the Congress of the United States. It depends on what the Congress writes into the law.

Mr. Olsen. Well, Senator Moss, I feel strongly that we can have these zoned areas and keep out of all these things that are not of comforming use. To have this recreation area where boating and stores and motels and hotels and mining and grazing and all of those things are nonconforming uses.

Senator Moss. That is a hard thing for me to understand in the approach that you take, Mr. Olsen. You say: "Here is this vast beautiful area. Now we'll have some national park areas and they will be inviolate, and you can't walk in there with a rig or do anything in it except use it for scenery"—the traditional single-purpose use, but we'll have around it an area still administered by the National Park Service and we'll say to those fellows: "You go ahead and regulate some mining and some grazing and some other things in this surrounding area," and I don't see how you have accomplished anything different from saving in the first place, this is the part to be administered by the National Park Service. You set the standards as to where you can have these other secondary uses without destroying the principal function. How does your approach differ any from that?

Mr. OLSEN. Well, it differs quite a bit, Senator. In the first place, I am one of those fellows that thinks a national park ought to be a museum and I think there are millions of people in this country that think so.

Senator Moss. And yet you think in part of the area there can be some other uses?

Mr. OLSEN. I do, and certainly—but these pictures that you have here, all of these pictures that are shown of the Canyonlands country, I believe this one—but all of these pictures would be within the zoned area where you wouldn't have any oil wells or any development. You shouldn't have it there. Those are beautiful.

Senator Moss. Now, Chet, you take this picture of Grandview Point, you can see clear to the La Sal Mountains. You can't say that that's all the zoned area.

Mr. OLSEN. No, but Senator, you can't take all that in, that is 5,000 square miles. The La Sal Mountains are part of the national forest or part of the Navajo Mountains.

Senator Moss. Well that is exactly what I was pointing out, that your statement is not correct then that all of this is in the zoned area.

Mr. OLSEN. Well I say the zoned area is on top there but what you look at is completely—well it is partly in and mostly out, you see, mostly out. The area that you see from Grandview Point and from Deadhorse Point, at least 5,000 square miles, most of it is outside of the area entirely.

Senator METCALF. Of course, Chet, that is what some of us were noting when we were in the park, that some of those beautiful cliffs that you see from Grandview Point are out of the area and they are tremendous scenic attractions and Senator Long and I both agree that they should be preserved.

Mr. OLSEN. Well, Senator, if that recreational philosophy could be adopted, then I wouldn't be opposed to enlarging the area, I wouldn't be opposed to it at all. There are parts in Salt Creek and Davis Canyon down there that I don't know how the National Park Service left it out, it is beautiful country.

Senator METCALF. I don't either.

Mr. OLSEN. Maybe they are scared.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may ask a question?

Senator METCALF. Surely.

Mr. PETERSON. In connection with that extension, would you say that would extend to the million acres?

Mr. OLSEN. Oh, no, I don't think so.

Mr. PETERSON. Well where would you draw the line then, Mr. Olsen?

Mr. OLSEN. The committee recommended that these areas be zoned on the ground. I don't think there is anybody expert—I have been over this area and I probably know it as well as anybody, the whole area. I don't know parts of it as well as other individuals, but the whole area I probably know as well as anybody in the State. I don't think there is anybody that could sit down on a map and put these areas—zone them out. You have got to do it on the ground. It has got to be done by a team on the ground. I don't believe you can do it any other way.

Now I am taking up too much time here, I realize that, but I want to—I am going to skip over the oil and gas and the uranium and the

potash because they'll be handled, I assume, and have been handled by other folks so I will——

Senator METCALF. Your complete statement will be incorporated in the record.

Mr. OLSEN. Thank you, Senator.

Now I want to make one other point here. In the fine report put out by University of Utah, on page 173 they show that by 1968 there will be 1,200,000 visitors to the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area which is now under the process of being developed and that they will stay there a day and a half or spend about $12,600,000 and on page 17 that reports shows that by 1968, considering that the Canyonlands bill is passed, and they say nothing about acreage in the report, that if the Canyonlands bill passes there would be 120,000 visitors with an estimated expenditure of $1,680,000.

Senator MOSS. Just to correct the record, the report does say roughly 332,000 acres.

Mr. OLSEN. But they didn't make any particular support of an area. They mentioned the area that was in the bill, Senator.

Senator MOSS. But they were basing their computations on roughly 332,000 acres, more or less.

Mr. OLSEN. My point is that the recreation area—they estimate that the Glen Canyon Recreation Area will attract more tourists or 1,200,000 compared to 120,000 by 1968. I raise that point——

Senator MOSS. That's good, isn't it?

Mr. OLSEN. Well, sure it is good. I have all of it in my remarks here. I didn't want to read it all because I didn't want to take your time.

Senator METCALF. Well, fine.

Mr. OLSEN. Now I want to make one further statement here. Gentlemen, it is not the size of a national park that determines its visitor appeal, it is the quality of the area.

For example, Bryce Canyon, one of our popular national parks—and I think Bill Bruhn will agree with me that it is one of our most popular national parks—contains 36,010.38 acres. Now there is one other thing that I would like to suggest that there should be an amendment or a separate bill introduced repealing the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, so far as it applies to Utah. National monuments in Utah should be created by Congress the same as national parks.

Just one more statement. I was intrigued this morning by the young man, Mr. Smoot, who appeared before this committee and reminded that Senator Reed Smoot, of Utah, former Senator Reed Smoot, was a stanch supporter of the law of August 25, 1916, creating the National Park Service and of the Mather Standards for National Parks; superlative scenic areas of national importance to keep them inviolate.

In this age of technological advance and rapid increase in population and concomitant need for about 60,000 new jobs per week in the United States, we should—we must—adopt a wise public-land-use policy in this and other areas which will provide short-term jobs in the tourist and recreation industry and yearlong jobs to fill the needs for development and use of other resources.

Senator MOSS. I appreciate your testimony, Chet, and even if I did invite you to come. [Laughter.] And I might say that I think that Mr. Olsen is well qualified or perhaps better qualified to talk about the

scenic areas of our State than any other person, he having been the chairman of the State park and recreation board.

I was quite interested in looking again at this report which was issued by the State park and recreation commission in 1959 and turned to the map in the center page and see how very similar to the Moss bill the outlines of the area proposed by the State for a park at the confluence of the river would be; and then I turned over and I made a computation of the recommendations of the commission at that time, that there be set aside for State park purposes 153,000 acres in the Deadhorse Point area; 229,760 acres in the Needles area; 115,200 acres in the Land of Standing Men which is across the river, which totals 497,960 acres, roughly 500,000 acres and then a recommendation that 75 miles of the river between Moab and the junction be also taken into the area.

It seems to me that the State recreation commission may have preceded this a little bit and had boundaries a little wider than in the bill.

Now I recognize that under the State Parks Act, certain other uses are permitted in the State park and that is exactly what we are talking about in this bill, that there shall be a primary use as a park, and secondary uses will be permitted to the extent they can be permitted compatible with the basic park principles. So really what it comes down to, isn't it, Chet, that you plead that the Federal Government, when it has a park, have it for a single purpose, but if the State has a park, that it have it for multiple purposes?

Mr. OLSEN. Senator, there is a lot of difference between a national park and a State park. A State park generally is a place for mass recreation and in the case of Utah there are provisions for multiple use in the area in the park, genuine multiple use, not the kind that might be regimented or seriously restricted with only reasonable rules and regulations by the commission while a national park should be an outdoor museum like you see up here where you don't have uses of this kind. I am not opposing the park proposal at all, I am just pleading for something that will be practical and something that we can retain the value of these areas and still have the use on this recreational part of it. You will still be under the National Park Service which is different to some of the other recommendations.

Senator Moss. Well, that is, of course, where I can't see why when you just name it something a little bit different, that it suddenly takes off this magic cloak of a national park. Of course, you recognize, Chet, that in the last few years Congress has passed a number of bills creating national parks and national seashores where we have provided for secondary uses and that is the present trend of legislation in the Congress because——

Mr. OLSEN. Well, I think it is wrong, Ted, on national parks.

Senator Moss. You are certainly entitled to your opinion.

Mr. OLSEN. I think it is wrong on national parks. National seashore areas are entirely different, and, of course, the Great Basin bill has passed the Senate and not the House yet.

Senator Moss. It hasn't come out of the House yet, but it did pass the Senate.

Mr. OLSEN. Yes.

Senator Moss. And, of course, we passed the Everglades with the oil drilling in it.

Mr. OLSEN. Well, of course, there was a limitation on the drilling there, a time limit on it.

Senator MOSS. Time limit on that but on Padre Island no limit on time, continuous production, and exploration.

Mr. OLSEN. But, gentlemen, you have heard here—I am not promoting any particular interest except the people of Utah. You have heard the value of the economic benefits of these other things to the State of Utah and to the Federal Government, incidentally, and with this recreation idea, you can have that without violating these standards that I say are inviolate.

Senator MOSS. I understand your position as you have expressed it. I just can't comprehend why one part be named something and another part named something else in order to accomplish the same thing.

Mr. OLSEN. Senator Moss, it just happens to be a national park which has been over the years one of the fine things of our country and I am for them.

Senator MOSS. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. Chet, you have been testifying before committees on which I have served for many years. I think we have been working together on conservation and resource management in all that time, and I have a high regard for your opinion. As I say, we have worked together on many issues and I am delighted to learn that you are a Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLSEN. I think it is a wonderful thing that we can come here before a committee of this kind and testify even though you disagree with my good friend, Senator Moss. I can come here and feel perfectly good about it, because I couldn't come here and do anything else. I would never be able to look myself in the mirror if I didn't testify according to the dictates of my own conscience.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. C. J. Olsen is as follows:)

My name is C. J. Olsen of 935 Taylor Avenue, Ogden, Utah. I am chairman of the State committee appointed by the Governor to make a study of the several canyonlands proposals to determine the economic impact of such proposals on the people of the State of Utah and to make recommendations following the study.

I am a fellow member of the American Institute of Park Executives, a senior member of the Society of American Foresters, and a member of several other scientific organizations and recreational associations.

I am a retired regional forester and I was, for 3 years, 1957–60, the first director of the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission. I have had more than 40 years' experience in the management of natural resources, including recreation in its many and varied forms.

During the 3 years I was director of the State park and recreation commission, I prepared, with considerable assistance from a small staff and many other cooperators, a long-range, comprehensive report and program on the great scenic, scientific, geological, archeological, and recreational opportunities in the State of Utah. My employment in the Forest Service and the Utah State Park Commission brought me in close contact with the great undeveloped recreational potential of Utah. I appreciate the privilege of expressing my views to you who have the very great responsibility for Senate action on any Federal proposal.

What I have to say today I am doing so as a freeman. The committee's recommendations and conclusions are based upon the facts as we saw them. In my own case they are based on personal, first-hand knowledge of the area, on a basic appreciation of our great scenic, scientific, geologic, and recreation resources and upon the free exercise of conscience. I am not seeking a political office, real or implied.

You have already received a copy of the report made by the State committee on the Canyonlands proposals. The comprehensive State park and recreation commission program referred to previously was completed and approved by the Governor and the legislature in 1959. The State of Utah has made a pretty good start on the program but there was insufficient funds to proceed with as bold a program as was envisioned by the commission.

The commission had hoped, in vain, that the Congress would transfer, without cost, the lands under the Bureau of Land Management needed by the State park commission in this great program. This amounted to some 2 million acres of a total of over 24 million acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Utah.

The Canyonlands proposal, S. 2387, covers parts of three geographically separate areas which were included in the long-range State program. Several sections of land were acquired by the commission in one area. One 640-acre section on Dead Horse Point was acquired and donated to the State park and recreation commission by the county commissioners of San Juan County. In this area, the State park commission has been and is now in the process of installing facilities and making other developments.

The area embraced in S. 2387 as it is now drawn would take parts of all three of the separate geographical sites away from the State park program and make it into a national park. There is a major difference between a State park in Utah and a national park. A State park is generally a place for mass recreation with provision for other uses while a national park is an outdoor museum such as exemplified in Bryce Canyon and Zion National Parks in Utah.

I wanted the committee to know that the State has been aware of the scenic and other recreational values of this area as well as areas within other parts of the State.

Incidentally, the State park law provides for multiple use with only reasonable rules and regulations by the commission to preserve the scenic, scientific, archeologic, and other recreational values.

Multiple use as envisioned by the committee is defined as follows: "Multiple use as we envision its application to the Canyonlands area is a balanced and integrated use of all the resources (including scenic, geologic, scientific, and recreational in its broadest conception, fish and game, mining and nonmineral, oil and gas, grazing, water and power development)." It does not necessarily mean that all uses will be realized in the same location at the same time. However, uses which do not conflict may be realized simultaneously.

In its application, it provides a proven method for the harmonious blending of the various resource uses into a practical, workable pattern of protection, management, and development of the resource potential in an orderly and conservation manner.

It is opposite to single or limited purpose use as applied to the Canyonlands area.

It may change in response to the discovery of new ideas or new resources, or the development of old ones. Adjustments also may result from reconciliation of conflicts.

I cannot, in the few minutes allotted to me, give you more than a very brief outline of amendments to S. 2387 I feel are essential and the reasons therefor. The details are included in the report already mentioned, copies of which you have received. I request that the report of the committee and my statement here today be included as a part of the record.

I urge the committee to amend the bill by changing the name of the proposed area to the "Canyonlands National Park and Recreation Area." The National Park Service in the Department of Interior to be given administrative control of the area.

About one-third of the area to be zoned and administered under traditional national park standards—the standards established by Stephen T. Mather, the father of the National Park Service, who sponsored the congressional act of August 25, 1916, and as later amended, creating the National Park Service in the Department of Interior. The zoned areas within the separate units to be connected where this is feasible by roads which would serve as corridors.

At least two-thirds of the area proposed in S. 2387 should be managed as a national recreation area with genuine multiple-use provisions which would provide for prospecting and mining, oil and gas exploration, fish and game, and other resource use and developments within the area. By this zoning method, the National Park Service could preserve the high standards established for

national parks within the zoned areas. On the buffer areas established as a national recreation area there should be genuine multiple use as defined herein.

An amendment to S. 2387 as indicated above is entirely feasible. It is practical. It makes good sense and should be adopted.

There are several other amendments to the bill which, I believe, should be made:

Notwithstanding the somewhat limited-use provisions in S. 2387, the restrictive rules and regulations of the National Park Service could and most likely would render impractical, if not impossible, the use and development of other resources. For example, I quote from a letter of March 8, 1962, from James A. Williams, director, division of mines and minerals, in Alaska:

"Re national park restrictions on mining.

"You came to the right man. I am glad that you did. I welcome the opportunity to expound on the subject of the U.S. Park Service restrictions and to be able to warn you against them. Your feeling that mining will be nullified by restriction is correct. No mining, to the best of my knowledge, has been carried on in McKinley National Park, though the geological possibilities are very good. A road running through it to the Kantishna Mining District has been repeatedly denied to miners for mine hauling. The State is now building a long parallel route to the Kantishna outside of the park only because of the unavailability of the park road to the miners. I published this fact in my monthly bulletin some time ago, and there was not a murmur of disagreement from the Park Service on it.

"Because of all of the above, we have learned, though the passers of the law who withdraw an area may have the intent that the area be opened to mineral rights, it just does not remain that way. The bureaucratic urge to keep an area under its jurisdiction closed to all but its own functions is too strong.

"I think by now you have the picture. Don't let them do it to you."

The above letter is a lengthy one and only the pertinent parts are quoted because of the time element.

Prospecting, mining, oil and gas exploration, and many forms of recreation are not compatible with National Park standards and should not be conducted within a traditional national park. I am surprised and disappointed to learn that the National Park Service seems to be in the process of diluting traditional standards established 46 years ago for national parks by Stephen T. Mather, the father of the National Park Service. This philosophy, like the Constitution of the United States, with minor exceptions is just as sound today on relatively small areas as it was when it was written.

Either the National Park Service is deliberately misleading the mining people and the sportsmen or it is attempting to dilute the traditional high standards established for national parks, or both. I believe we should prevent the National Park Service from committing this gross error by making the amendments suggested here and in the report of the State committee.

The National Park Service should not attempt to include large areas with known and potential mineral resources and large game herds within a national park.

I suggest cutting out all of section 3 and substituting an amendment which would give to the State land board in lieu of the State lands and riverbed lands within the area acre for acre in the Lisbon oilfields which is only a few miles to the east of the proposed area. In view of the potentially mineral rich area within the proposal, this is, I believe to be a reasonable request.

Section 5 would not be needed but there should be in the national recreation area specific provisions for prospecting, mining locations under the mining laws, materials leasing, oil and gas exploration, management of fish and game by the Utah State Fish and Game Department, and provisions for application of other State laws within the buffer areas.

Under sections 3 and 6 there should be no provision for condemnation procedures except for road rights-of-way. Section 6 and part of section 3 are not compatible with multiple use. The National Park Service would hold a threat over legitimate mining operators. Under the national recreation area designation this would not be needed and since there would be no private lands within the areas zoned for national parks, there would be no need for such a provision in the bill. The mining laws already provide for location by legitimate owners. The only non-Federal land in the area is State land. There is approximately 36,000 acres, over 10 percent of the area, to which the State has a legal right and should have something to say about what is done with the area.

Section 7 should be approved as it is to be operative only on the lands zoned for administration as traditional national parks. On the buffer area to be administered as a national recreation area, the State fish and game department should administer the fish and game resources. Other State laws should be applicable just as they are on the Glen Canyon recreation area, on the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, and the national forest administered by the Forest Service.

There should be joint field determination between the State, representatives of the county officials, and the National Park Service of the areas to be zoned as national parks.

It is of the greatest importance to the people of Utah that the members of the congressional delegation forget about partisan politics and attempt to work out a sound solution to this problem. If I can be of any help in this effort, I should be pleased to do so, for I am vitally interested in seeing that we have sound and wise development of our recreational resources without unnecessarily interfering with other resource use and development.

GEOLOGY

Dr. William P. Hewitt, director of the Utah Geological Survey, who is familiar with the area and has had access to the bulletins of the geological survey says the whole area is "potentially mineral rich." He has submitted evidence to prove his point. According to Dr. Hewitt, the entire area is underlain with salt deposits 7,000 to 14,000 feet thick. Within this deposit are rich beds of potash, especially under the northeast area included in S. 2387.

POTASH

The Texas Gulf Sulfur Co. has a mine and a mill about 5 miles to the east of the proposed area. The company is spending, according to officials, $30 million developing a mine, mill, and 32 miles of railroad. They are presently employing 665 men and will permanently employ 400 workers as production reaches its capacity. It may employ as many as 600. The State and the county will realize nearly $2 million in annual revenue from this operation in addition to other obvious economic advantages by the permanent employment of 400 people at good salaries. Among other advantages, Moab will have a railroad. Grand and San Juan Counties will have a new tax base.

This area could very well become the potash-producing center of the world. The product is rich in quality and extensive in area. Much of the high quality potash is under the north quarter of the area proposed in S. 2387.

OIL AND GAS

In 1960 the State received, in direct income from the oil and gas industry, $11,583,935. The industry spent approximately $141 million in Utah during 1959. Substantially all of Utah's oil and gas production is obtained from a land area of about 120,000 acres.

I am informed that about 170 dry holes were drilled in the Greater Aneth field only a short distance south and east of the proposed area at a cost of between $17 and $20 million before the oil basins were proved.

There is one oil well within the area proposed by S. 2387 and three adjacent to the area on the north. Other drilling is in progress now within the proposed area.

It is theoretically possible to discover 120,000 acres of productive oil and gas lands within the Canyonlands proposal which, in fact, does have very promising oil and gas possibilities. If this should occur, the income to both State and Federal Government would be tremendous. Under a national recreation designation this use could be conducted in an orderly fashion under multiple-use provisions. It would not be compatible with national park standards.

URANIUM

A total of 79,000 tons of uranium ore have been produced in 24 mines within and immediately adjacent to the area. It has good prospects for additional production of uranium.

The Big Indian Uranium District is located 25 miles to the east of the proposed area. There are 14 mines with an area of about 4,000 acres. This district alone produces, according to the record, 65 percent of Utah's total uranium

output. Total returns in the form of taxes and wages for uranium are estimated at about $58 million. The atomic energy people at Grand Junction, Colo., stated that by about 1970 we will be using uranium commercially and then we will need all the uranium we can get.

RELATIVE ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF THE NATIONAL PARK VERSUS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

According to "An Economic Study of the Proposed Canyonlands National Park and Related Recreation Resources" prepared by the Bureau of Economic and Business Review, University of Utah, in March 1962, on page 173 is a discussion of the expected use of the Glen Canyon recreation area. Briefly, it estimates that there will be 750,000 visitors by 1966, a million visitors by 1967, 1,200,000 by 1968, and thereafter an increase of 5.2 percent annually with no limitations on the estimated use. It is also estimated in the report that a visitor will stay 1½ days in the area and spent $7 per day per visitor. Accordingly—

1966, 750,000 visitors	$7,875,000
1967, 1,000,000 visitors	10,500,000
1968, 1,200,000 visitors	12,600,000

On page 17 it is estimated for a Canyonlands National Park (there is no indication of the size) by the fifth year, 1968 (assuming the park is established by 1963), there would be 120,000 visitors with an estimated expenditure of $1,680,000. This estimate indicates that the Glen Canyon recreation area will be more popular than a Canyonlands National Park.

With an amendment to S. 2387 providing for a national park and recreation area, we can establish both a sound and profitable tourist business and a thriving industrial economy as well as an important fish and game resource.

I sincerely urge the committee to make use of the report by the State committee in revising S. 2387.

If he could do so, I am sure Stephen T. Mather would rise up in his grave and attempt to stop this "monkey business" with national park standards.

It is not the size of a national park that determines its visitor appeal, it is the quality of the area. For example, Bryce Canyon, one of our popular national parks, contains only 36,010.38 acres. Zion National Park contains only 143,254.06 acres, some of which is State school land.

There should be an amendment or a separate bill introduced repealing the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1960 (16 U.S.C. 431–432), so far as it applies to Utah. National monuments in Utah should be created by Congress the same as national parks.

In my opinion, it is wrong to include large areas, much of which is not national park quality, which is rich in minerals and other resources, within a national park where the use and development would be subject to regimentation and restrictive rules and regulations and could, and no doubt would, render their use and development very difficult, if not impossible.

It is equally wrong to permit prospecting, mining, and oil and gas exploration on relatively small areas of superlatively scenic and scientific value of national importance. These areas should generally be kept relatively small and should be administered as outdoor museums.

Parenthetically, former Senator Reed Smoot, of Utah, was a stanch supporter of the law of August 25, 1916, creating the National Park Service and of the Mather standards for national parks.

In this age of technological advance and rapid increase in population and concomitant need for about 60,000 new jobs per week in the United States, we should—we must—adopt a wise public land use policy in this and other areas which will provide short-term jobs in the tourist and recreation industry and yearlong jobs to fill the needs for development and use of other resources.

Senator METCALF. At this time we will take a recess until 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the subcommittee was recessed to reconvene at 1:30 p.m., Monday, April 23, 1962.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator METCALF. We will be in order.

This morning we handled 14 witnesses. I now have a list of 52. This hearing is going to have to close at 5 o'clock because I am due in

the morning at a Montana normal college for a meeting with the students up there. Anyone who wants to file their statement will be permitted to do so and will be welcome if they would do so. It will be printed in the record as if given.

I am going to try to accommodate as many as possible and again I admonish everyone that we have many witnesses and we want to give everybody an opportunity to be heard.

Dr. Mulaik will be the first witness. Doctor, we are delighted to have you.

STATEMENT OF DR. STANLEY B. MULAIK, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ZOOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Dr. MULAIK. I am Stanley B. Mulaik, associate professor of zoology at the University of Utah and I feel that I have tried to approach this subject of our national resources in a rather impartial way to meet the needs for my classes in conservation and natural history.

My intention is to speak for myself as a citizen of the State and not for any one of the groups with which I have worked, though several have asked me to do so.

I have memberships in a number of organizations, Natural Resources Council of America, the Wilderness Society, the Nature Conservancy, the Conservation Education Association, the American Nature Study Society, Sierra Club, Utah Conservation Education Council, the Utah Nature Study Society, and numerous others.

Now many problems of interest in the national parks convinced me of the immense value of parks to the American people. These areas have significance to them because of the impact the park has on them. Present national parks are extremely inadequate to accommodate the millions who visit them and to see a little of the primitive and to attain some sense of solitude.

The crowding at Yellowstone, Bryce Canyon, Grany Canyon, the Smokies, and others which I have experienced defeats the major purpose of the parks to give people a sense of wilderness, solitude, and unhurried peace which they look for. Many centuries of man's close relation to the fields, woods, streams, and lakes has built a psychological base unsuited to the very recent urbanization as we see it manifesting itself.

Man has found that the ills of urban living are not easily erased by tranquilizer pills or the psychiatrist's couch but we know that an hour or a day or a week in the woods really does something for people and we need national parks.

The proposed Canyonlands National Park would add a much-needed facility to give many people an opportunity in part to satisfy the urge that I mentioned. We certainly need something that has significance and I do not agree that three little parks or little tokens such as proposed by Senator Bennett and Governor Clyde would satisfy the need.

I have recently seen arguments in the newspapers about cows adding something to the park. This is a fantastic argument because the great majority of people come from areas where cows are plentiful. People in Florida, where they raise cows that probably number 10 times as

as many as in Utah, will wonder why we have cows out there without the humane society getting after those who released them on that desert country. [Laughter.]

Senator METCALF. You agree with Ebenezer Bryce. [Laughter.]

Dr. MULAIK. Dr. Ruth Hopson, of Portland, Oreg., has proposed to Secretary Freeman that a series of national farms be established very much as we have national parks. Here would be the proper place to see a cow. [Laughter.]

Furthermore if the cattle industry is so impoverished that it cannot stand to eliminate the few cows involved then the State is in bad shape and I think we need to look into the situation. The permits to run cattle on these lands is a permissive privilege, not a right in any case and I would like to point out that there are only somewhere around 500 or 600 cows in that area and that is less than eighty-four one-thousandths of 1 percent of the cows of Utah. Figure it out, there are 790,000 cows in Utah approximately and the proportion for the United States is infinitely small.

Now there is zoning needed and I would like to comment with respect to game, that the provisions in the Moss bill for the control of native animals which conceivably might become too abundant for their own welfare, are modern aspects which national parks must face. The proposed methods of determining if they have become too numerous and the methods of their control must be in the hands of those who are qualified to evaluate the animal situation both for game and national park purposes because those animals serve a double function.

Zoning is regulated and certainly the multiple-use bill is a zoning control and I do not see where those people who feel that we have to have every use on every acre when you consider that the park takes less than a half a percent of the area of Utah and certainly a very microscopic part of America which the park would serve.

There are a number of provisions in the Moss bill which meet certain objections as compromises. To have any more compromises to be submitted, I think, would be carrying the idea a little bit too far so that I feel that we need very definitely to have a park and as close to a national park in its true meaning as is possible. Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Doctor. Any questions?

(No response.)

Senator METCALF. The next witness will be Mr. Steve J. Diamenti.

STATEMENT OF STEVE J. DIAMENTI, PRESIDENT, HIGHWAY 50 FEDERATION

Mr. DIAMENTI. Mr. Chairman, honorable gentlemen, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed a privilege to be here today. I speak here today as president of the Highway 50 Federation representing all the people on the Highway 50 route from the Colorado State line to the Nevada State line and also as a former past chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Carbon County and a resident of Carbon County for 50 years.

Senator METCALF. We will want to know how many people are in the Highway 50 Federation and so we might just as well get it in the record right now.

Mr. DIAMENTI. Pardon?

Senator METCALF. We will want to know how many people are in the Highway 50 Federation.

Mr. DIAMENTI. Well it represents all the business people in the entire area between the Colorado State line and the Nevada line, sir.

Senator METCALF. Along Highway 50?

Mr. DIAMENTI. Yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

Mr. DIAMENTI. I believe that in the economy that we have in our county, which has been declared a distressed area, that we believe that this bill as proposed by Senator Moss—and I am in complete unity with that—I have discussed it with the members of the board of directors of the Highway 50 Federation and they are in complete unity on it.

We believe that this bill will greatly increase the economy of our county through the people visiting this park and therefore they will get on Highway 50 and visit other sections of the State.

We think that this is a great economy for the whole State as a whole and if it is cut in any way, we believe that this would make it so that it wouldn't have any significant value as a park. Other than that, I believe that I can see no reason why there should be any changes or this thing should be cut in any way and we wholeheartedly endorse Senator Moss' bill. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Diamenti.

The next witness is Dr. McKnight. Is Mr. Tolley here? [No response.] After Dr. McKnight, the next witness will be Harold Crane.

Glad to have you with us, Doctor.

STATEMENT OF DR. KENT H. McKNIGHT, PROFESSOR OF BOTANY, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Dr. MCKNIGHT. I am Kent McKnight from Provo, Utah, and a professor of botany at Brigham Young University. I am here representing myself.

I believe most of the visitors to this park will be representing themselves so perhaps it is apropos for an individual to speak.

I did not bring a prepared statement but I would like to ask about the propriety of submitting a statement made by Mr. Sigurd Olson, a lecturer of Provo, some years ago which is appropriate to the subject.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Olson is a very good friend of members of this committee and if no objection it will be incorporated in the record at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

THE MEANING OF WILDERNESS

(By Sigurd F. Olson, president, National Parks Association)

An address to the 50th anniversary general session of the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, May 3, 1958, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah

Members of the academy, friends and students, I am very happy to be here this morning, particularly happy because I am in a beautiful place and surrounded by beauty ever since coming to Utah 3 days ago. As I look around me,

however, I wonder how anyone can do any really hard scientific work with all of this to feast one's eyes upon. But hearing of the accomplishments of academy members last night, both seniors and juniors, I realized that possibly this very beauty is a spur and an inspiration to accomplishment.

I want to talk to you this morning about the preservation of wilderness, about certain aspects of the preservation of wild, natural areas that are beyond economics, intangible things that are not to be measured in the ordinary scales on which things of value are weighed. I want to try to give you some of my feeling about the importance of wilderness regions. I've spent most of my life in wilderness country all over this continent, and early in life was a guide to expeditions of various types, most of which were in the Canadian North. I traveled many thousands of miles and am still traveling thousands of miles. Within a year I hope to explore the Copper Mine River to the Arctic coast ending at Coronation Gulf, Northwest Territories which are a long way from here.

So my interest has stayed with me, but early in life I became impressed by what wilderness does to man. I was too young then to realize what was behind the deep feeling of people for natural areas and wilderness experience. But as the years passed, I began to probe my own mind and the minds of others. I began to try to crystallize early ideas, and develop some sort of basic philosophy. I have decided finally that the preservation of natural areas is more than rocks and trees and lakes and wildlife. It has a far more fundamental significance than any physical attribute any area might have. It is concerned with broad social values—values that have to do with human happiness, deep human needs, nostalgias, values that may be a counteraction to the type of world in which we live.

If it was only a matter of saving representative areas, I would have given up my interest long ago, and a lot of other people would have given up theirs. Without the recognition that there is something deeper behind all of this, there would have been no sustained efforts to preserve natural areas anywhere.

Natural area preservation is only one facet of the broad conservation picture, a facet which is very important. As we think of the definitions of conservation, we can see, however, how closely it ties in to the field of humanitarian values. Aldo Leopold's famous dictum that "conservation is the development of an ecological conscience" of this pattern. What did he mean by an "ecological conscience"—the development of a land ethic, a feeling of morality toward the earth, reverence, and love, a feeling deep within us that we are responsible for whatever we do to the earth. Leopold was right when he said, "Conservation is the development of an ecological conscience."

I like Sterling North's definition, too, and how it ties into the general premise of broad social values. He said, "Whenever I see a muddy stream, a dust bowl, or an eroded gully, I see the passing of American democracy." He did not say he saw the passing of so many tons of soil, the loss of humus, and of lifegiving qualities of the earth, nothing said about destroyed watersheds. What he did say, thinking in broad social terms, was "I see the passing of American democracy." Henry Clay said, "The greatest patriot is the man who stops the most gullies." Analyze that statement in the light of patriotism. It's all involved with the feeling of people for the country they love.

This is the 50th anniversary of the functioning of this academy. It's also the 50th anniversary of conservation At the Governor's Conference called by President Roosevelt in Washington, D.C., just 50 years ago, a man made a speech worth remembering. After the lengthy proceedings, the long discussions about conservation, the need of setting up a Forest Service, and a National Park Service, and other agencies of Government that would have to do with natural resources, J. Horace McFarland said one of the most telling things that came out of the conference. "The true glory of America rests," he said, "not on its material resources, but on the love of country, a love excited by the beauty of the country. For a hundred years," he continued, "we have done our best to make America ugly. Let us resolve now and for the future to make it a beautiful country because our economy and our future prosperity depend on the love and feeling our citizens have for that country."

You see, then, how the great thinkers of conservation tie their thoughts and efforts into the matter of broad social values. Some of you have been in the Near East through the Mesopotamian valleys, where all has been lost because of poor conservation, but what is lost is more than water and fertility. What those people lost is dignity—a gracious way of life—opportunity, things that we take for granted here.

Paul Sears, head of the conservation department of Yale, gave a definition of conservation which also belongs to this concept. "Conservation," he said, "is a point of view—a point of view involved with the entire concept of freedom, human dignity, and a good way of life." They all talk about human dignity, about freedom, and broad social values when they think of conservation of natural resources.

One of the reasons I feel we must preserve natural areas is because as a people and a race we have not yet gone far enough in our development to ignore our primitive past. We are still, as the historian Travalgan says, "children of the earth," still very close to primeval beginnings. I don't know how many of you have read Harrison Brown's book, "Man and His Future," but there is the interesting thought that man is so close to the earth he cannot forget, physiologically or psychologically, his long inheritance. Brown says that the earth is possibly 3 billion years of age. Reducing this timespan to 365 days, man and his million years has been on the earth only 3 hours, but a million years, he says, is not the kind of man we are talking about, possibly a hundred thousand since homo sapiens really arrived—only 20 minutes out of this timeclock, only 20,000 years, possibly not more than 10 or 15 since man evolved from Paleolithic cultures—2 minutes of the timespan, and only a hundred years since he changed from a purely hunting, fishing, and agrarian sort of life close to the earth, regulated by seasons, and by primitive conditions, adjusting himself to the various vagaries of climate and challenge that the earth involved. Only a hundred years since we left most of that—a second out of man's long history.

What does this mean? Simply that man does not evolve or change swiftly, any more than any other animal evolves or changes. I am a biologist, and know or at least I think I know, that animal adaptations take a long, long time—eons of time—thousands and thousands of years, not a couple of generations, not a hundred years, or a thousand years—perhaps 50, a hundred thousand, or several hundred thousand years. Man, looked at from a purely ecological standpoint, is close to his past—so close that he cannot and has not made the adjustment, in spite of the fact we are probably the most adaptable creatures on earth. We shall make the adjustment, but in the process of making it strange things go on within us. We have frustrations, nostalgias, try to live according to the pace we have set, but find it difficult. The great psychiatrist, Karl Menninger, said, "In spite of the fact we are—supposedly the happiest people on earth, in spite of the fact we have the greatest comforts, the greatest security, the most delightful living conditions, the most freedoms, the most of everything in this world of ours, we still consume 40 million tranquilizers a day," which indicates to a man like Menninger that something is radically wrong if we have to take sedatives in order to keep our balance. We have to do all sorts of things to forget the supposedly happy life we are thrown into and acquire the calm and serenity our forefathers used to know. Where does this tie-in to the preservation of natural areas? Simply in this way: We need to preserve a few places, a few samples of primeval country, so that when the pace gets too fast we can look at it, think about it, contemplate it, and somehow restore equanimity to our souls.

Last year, 55 million people visited the National Parks. Some 35 or 40 million visited the recreation areas of the national forests. Those are elastic figures. you can argue about them, but the fact remains that a lot of people went to these areas. Some went to get stickers on their windshields, or so they thought, or bring home a collection of good kodachromes, or to pick up one of those beautiful velvet pillows you can buy in Yellowstone with the adage on it, "I've been in Yellowstone." But as I watch these people I know they are getting far more than kodachromes and velvet pillows or stickers on their windshields. They stop at the lookouts and gaze over the mountain peaks and canyons. They stand on the porticos of their chalets or motels or leave their cars, may even hike the enormous distance of nearly a hundred feet to get to a view. They stand there, take a swift look as one man did last spring when I was at Grand Canyon and, after glimpsing the south rim and its changing shadows and colors, after 5 minutes said, "Well, Mom, this is it. Let's get out of here."

Don't make fun of those people. They're in a hurry—we're all in a hurry. That man was probably driving from Grand Canyon to Salt Lake that day and wanted to get there, wanted to go through the Mormon Temple grounds before knocking off. Nevertheless, something happened to that man when he took that swift look at the Grand Canyon—something he would remember as long as he lived.

One of the criticisms of the National Park Service program is that most of the National Parks are preserved as wilderness, 90 percent of them being in this category, 10 percent sacrificial areas where all the hotels are located as well as all facilities. Some people say, "Why save that back country? Why not open it all up?" The point is that the 90 percent of the parks that is in wilderness gives significance to the small developmental areas and the people who come there and most go nowhere else, very few on pack trips, or hiking trips, where they must exert themselves in any way. The people as a whole get their sense of the primeval by an occasional look or a glimpse. But in such glimpses they capture something satisfying that stays with them a long, long time, something that brings them back to the National Parks time and time again. They may think they go for the stickers and the kodachromes, but they go to satisfy something deep within them.

I was talking to a sportsman the other day, a duck hunter, and I asked him how many ducks he killed last year. He couldn't remember; then he told me how he felt one morning out in the marsh as the sun was coming up and how the sounds of the wings was in the early morning. Put a price tag on his duck hunting and he would have to evaluate those intangible values. The actual kill and the hunting were immaterial for he had caught something beyond price.

There was an editorial in the New York Times not long ago regarding the preservation of a wild area. The editor who write it must have known the wilderness because his title was "Tranquillity Is Beyond Price." He said something important there, for many things are beyond price—most of the ones that make life worthwhile. These natural areas are beyond price because they do things to you which you cannot explain, that you cannot weigh, that you cannot put a price tag on.

Galsworthy, in one of his novels, said, "It is contemplation of beautiful visions which has, generation after generation, lifted man from the primeval." I wonder how many of you read that article in the Saturday Evening Post last week, Loren Bislay's "An Evolutionist Looks at Modern Man." He said, "The greatest explosion was not the first atomic bomb, the first fission, but a silent explosion in the brain of primitive man in which brain cells began proliferating that made man the first equating animal—a creature who could weigh things, evaluate, who could begin to look forward and backward. All of man's history has been an attempt to develop that potential in weighing of values, weighing the material against the intangibles. What makes man a different animal than most is the very fact he has this ability to look at his earth with new eyes, with appreciation and understanding, with love and reverence."

I wonder if any of you remember in Dostoevski's novel "The Brothers Karamazov," the old monk was expressing his philosophy of life and said, "Love all the earth, love the whole of it, every grain of sand in it, every leaf, every ray of God's light. If you love the earth enough, you will become aware of the divine mystery and if you become aware of the divine mystery you will develop a love for all mankind and all the earth."

Joseph Wood Krutch of Arizona said recently that conservation is not enough—that we can conserve rocks and trees and soil and water and all of the natural resources we have, but without love, without a deep feeling for the earth, without an ecological conscience all of this actually means little.

Albert Schweitzer coordinates all of these things in his philosophy of reverence for life; love for all living things; understanding of the earth; a deep feeling within people of the intangible values encompassed by the broad term "conservation". Those are what really count.

There are many other reasons for the preservation of natural areas. One of these reasons is scientific. Scientific reasons are coordinated with broad social values, because they too have to do with social welfare. I don't have to tell an erudite group such as this why the preservation of natural areas as norms is important to modern scientific research. It's as important to have natural unchanged areas for comparisons and checks in the study of range ecology, in the study of behaviorism of animals, in the studies of all things that have to do with living and growing as it is for a doctor (in the strictly medical sense) having only sick people to work with and not knowing how normal people react. This is a great subject and worthy of lengthy discussion, but I simply want to say that the preservation of natural bits of terrain is very important to our economy—so important that without them we cannot arrive at correct answers when confronted with situations where man has invoked change.

Another reason for the preservation of natural areas is to give people a sense of history. This morning in Salt Lake City, I saw a picture of the Hotel Utah

in 1890—an old wooden frame building with lots of gingerbread around. Young people don't know what gingerbread is, but the oldsters do. In its time it was thought attractive, but they don't make it any more. The thing that impressed me was that here on that site was Hotel Utah, a modern building where just 70 years ago was a little frontier town with very few facilities. In less than three-quarters of a century, Salt Lake City has grown up into a modern community. Utah is really very, very young.

I live in a wilderness country too, much like this. The town I live in was started in 1884. It's hard to realize what has happened in less than 70 years. And I feel that the preservation of natural areas is worth while for that reason alone—to give young people today a chance to see the road over which we have come. There is no substitute for such experience. You take a pack trip back in one of these canyons or do the unheard-of thing in Utah—go in on foot—and you will learn something you did not know before, the feeling of what the wagon trains ran into when they came through the passes, what the mountain men saw, and the Indians, and you'll have more respect and understanding of Utah as a State and of the whole West than if you just read about all of this in history books. I know, because I have done that sort of thing many times myself, and I recommend it to all of you.

I think that we in this generation have no right to deprive the young people of the future of the opportunity of primitive experience; getting the companionship, the sense of history, getting the feeling of the country, the feel that you can only get by living in it and traveling through it, by primitive means.

We have a responsibility, and I doubt very much whether we have the right to say to generations still unborn, "You are not going to be able to do the things that we did. You must get your sense of the primitive through history books. You are not going to have a chance to live that sort of life, or even to get a hint of what your forebears knew."

There are a great many problems in the preservation of natural areas—serious problems. One of the great problems is the pioneer concept which most of us still have. In spite of your beautiful campus, in spite of your remarkable facilities, and your comforts, and the progress you have made, you still have a certain heritage of this pioneer feeling. I speak with knowledge, because I too live in a pioneer community with the feeling we are in a world apart, that national parks and forests belong to us; that outsiders have no right to tell us what to do. I know, for I live in the same atmosphere. My country is a couple of thousand miles from here to the northeast, but it is still a pioneer community and close to the past. I don't say "pioneer" because of lack of facilities and developments which compare with the best in the United States, but I mean in state of mind.

I was very pleased yesterday to see a chapter of the Nature Conservancy formed here with its affiliations in Washington which will give the people here the chance to compare notes with what is going on in the rest of the United States and get the benefit of their experience. I think this chapter can do a great deal of good.

The preservation of wilderness is jeopardized by something over which we have no control at all—and that's the population explosion. I don't have to give you figures. You know them as well as I. Anyone who has traveled and seen the urban sprawl, as we call it—the spreading out of the cities into the countryside—has no doubt. We know that the population which is now 172 million will reach, according to the best predictions, 227 million by 1975, 250 million or even 300 million by the year 2000. There is nothing we can do about it, for the explosion is the result of good living conditions and security, an aftermath of two wars. But it's going to affect our lives. It's going to affect Utah in a way you people cannot see or comprehend. Where are these millions going? They're not going to stay in the East because the East is crowded now. They're going to head for the West, will fill up these valleys, probe the back canyons, and get into places that until now have been sanctuaries ever since discovery. We accept these figures; they are coming, and with them is coming an industrial expansion to keep pace with the rising population. The city planners in the country are worried. They've been behind the eight ball now for 10 years. They realize that they have not done the job they should be doing. They say, "If we had only known what was going to happen to our cities, we would have set aside breathing spaces for those developmental projects before they began. We should have set aside parks, natural areas within reach, because we realize now that human happiness in cities is more than being crowded between walls of brick and steel, that people must have places where they can get their feet

on the ground and get a whiff of fresh air once in a while, see natural growing things and scenes that have not changed." They recognize the broad social implications involved and the need of providing such spaces and are trying desperately now to undo what has happened, and finding it very, very difficult.

I have been engaged in several surveys in the East in the last 6 weeks, one off the southeast coast of Georgia and the other off the coast of Massachusetts. There people know that the opportunity of acquiring natural areas for the benefit and pleasure of the people is disappearing so rapidly that possibly within a decade the opportunity will be gone. On Cape Cod, one of the areas I surveyed, real estate prices are going up at an average, on that particular stretch of beach, of half a million dollars annually and soon will be beyond reach. In Utah you still have lots of open country—Federal land most of it. In that ownership lies a great opportunity. Knowing that the Federal holdings are large, you should invoke all of the influence that you have on the Federal agencies to set aside and protect these breathing places, as we call them—these natural wilderness regions wherever they may be before the population invasion makes it impossible. You have an opportunity now. You may think that I am a visionary looking into a nebulous future, but I believe sincerely that if you neglect your opportunity now, within a couple of decades they will be gone. And when those opportunities are gone there will be little space, little chance for solitude, or the kind of inspiration that comes from open vistas. Human beings need that kind of inspiration.

Surely we can live without it—can live under almost any conditions, for we are very inventive and ingenious. We can produce food to feed a billion people on this continent. We can produce building materials, fuels, in order to keep a much larger population going, but the question is always there: "Is that enough?" Is it enough to live just on an existence level? Does not man require more than food and fuel and housing? Does not life, if it is to be a happy one, necessitate space, living room, human dignity, the intangible values that give people happiness? Isn't this after all what really counts? The Prophet Isaiah said a long time ago: "Woe unto them who build house to house and lay field to field lest there be no place where a man may be placed alone in the midst of all the earth."

Dr. McKNIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I might point out that some comment is in order on that lecture. It was given at the meeting of the Utah Academy of Arts, Sciences, and Letters and is addressed to them but the concepts which he presents are applicable here. His lecture was on the subject of wilderness and I am well aware that this is not the wilderness bill hearing but I would like to point out that——

Senator METCALF. The wilderness bill has passed the Senate. If you are on wilderness you would address the Congressmen. Go ahead.

Dr. McKNIGHT. I would like to point out that in the large national parks, if the park is large enough, we can have many of the features which are needed in wilderness areas in the park and for that reason I support in general the bill which Senator Moss has proposed. As a matter of fact I would like to see it come closer to the size of the park which was proposed by the Secretary of the Interior and I would prefer to see it have less restrictions also.

The main subject to which I wish to speak was the concept of multiple use which I think is often misunderstood. I understand that you have used that term quite a bit in these hearings and I think, however, that it has been used in many cases by people who are not fully informed on the meaning of multiple use, sometimes for political or personal gain. Actually, multiple use, when we hear the term, may imply that this will do everything for everybody and every type of use will be accommodated and this is the fallacy in the term.

I would merely like to point out in some specific detail certain types of things which are excluded by the type of multiple use which is practiced in the Forestry Service and other public lands.

Senator Moss. May I interrupt to say the terminology that I like is to talk about primary use and secondary use and I have been trying to get the discussion on that point.

Dr. McKnight. I think that would be a much better use of it.

In the national park situation, very often we think of a park area, an area which is worthy of being a park so designated because of its scenic value alone but in the earlier testimony there has been particular reference to this but there are other bases, I think, for an area to be included in a park than the scenic value alone.

One basis for this, and one reason for including an area in the park I think would be that it would preserve some of the features there of scientific value and make possible further scientific exploration and study in a background which could not be effectively done otherwise. I believe that it was Governor Clyde who pointed out earlier in the testimony that the exploration for mineral and oil in this part of Utah has occurred mostly in the last 10 or 15 years and I would like to point out that we are far behind this in our scientific exploration of the biological potential of this area.

If we are 15 years behind, perhaps, in exploration for minerals and oil, we are 50 or 100 or merely back in the Dark Ages as far as our scientific exploration is concerned and it is my feeling that this would be facilitated better if the area is administered under the national park status as Senator Moss has proposed rather than under some of the other agencies.

Now we have had very good cooperation with the Forest Service and other areas for research purposes but I believe that the national park administration would provide better administration for it in this way.

I would like to emphasize, as has been done earlier, the necessity of areas to be set aside for scientific studies for control. I think an excellent analogy was given here at one time that the study of areas which are overgrazed is like a medical researcher who has only sick people to study. We need healthy areas to study also and I believe the park administration will quicker allow areas of it to come back to a natural and healthy state.

Important in this also is the concept that if the larger park, which Senator Moss has proposed, is actually adopted if his bill is passed, then this will provide the study of areas, natural areas, and wilderness areas in it, making unnecessary the withdrawal of other areas elsewhere in the State. These could then remain in multiple use and I think that in this way the term of "multiple use" the so-called greatest good for the greatest number of people, could be better handled. Actually, when we say "the greatest good for the greatest number of people," I think this needn't necessarily imply that every area has to be managed in the same way. It seems to me that there must be some areas which are managed in a restrictive way and some areas which are managed in a multiple-use way and this would provide more likely the greater good for the greater number of people.

Actually, the amount of area which is involved here is very small, as you have heard a number of times, compared with the total area of the State, less something in the order of six-tenths of 1 percent of the total area of the State, and I think this is very, very small to be set aside for this purpose when we consider it in relationship to the total amount of federally owned lands in Utah. According to Gov-

ernor Clyde's figures, this amounts to eight-tenths of 1 percent so Senator Moss is asking that we have then these restrictive uses in eight-tenths of 1 percent of the Federal land in the State of Utah and multiple use on 98.2 percent in the land of the State of Utah.

If we had a park of the larger size, which the Secretary of Interior recommended, it would still be only 2.4 percent of the total public land in the State of Utah, which I think is very small. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Dr. McKnight.

Senator BENNETT. May I just make one comment that there is a great deal, 74 percent of the Federal land in Utah which is already so restricted, there can be no multiple use. We don't leave 98 percent or 74 percent open to multiple use. No multiple use is permitted on military reservations. There is very limited multiple use permitted on the national forests with respect to some of these things, so that it isn't true that we have 98.2 percent of our Federal land still available for multiple use.

Dr. MCKNIGHT. I believe you are right, Senator Bennett. I wish we know the exact figure that would be available for multiple use. Do you have that?

Senator Moss. It is more like 94 percent.

Dr. MCKNIGHT. Ninety-four percent instead of ninety-eight.

Senator BENNETT. I think it is probably much less than that but I don't know.

Dr. MCKNIGHT. Very likely it is less but it is still a very high percentage.

Senator BENNETT. And then the other point is that if we could be sure that all the other Federal land in Utah was underlaid with the mineral values which probably underlay this land, then I think the point could be made that we could afford to give up this much because the other land is all of equal value but I am afraid that isn't the case.

Dr. MCKNIGHT. May I make a statement to clarify my position on that. I think it would be error to eliminate the development of oil and mineral resources eternally from this. I like generally the provision which Senator Moss has proposed that it could be developed and should be developed. I think there might be wisdom, Senator, in delaying the development of them until such time that it is paramount in the Nation's interest that they be developed. At this time there could be doubts but I am perfectly happy with the proposal which Senator Moss has.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Dr. McKnight.

The next witness is Mr. Harold Crane, director of the Utah State Fish and Game Department.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD S. CRANE, DIRECTOR OF THE STATE OF UTAH DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Mr. CRANE. Gentlemen, I appreciate very much the opportunity of testifying here. I have a prepared statement but for the sake of time I will just highlight it.

Senator METCALF. The statement will be incorporated into the record.

Mr. CRANE. I have very carefully read the testimony of the hearings in Washington and also sitting in the meeting in Monticello and insofar as the wildlife picture of the area, I think it has not been covered and I think the committee has received much information that is not actually true so I think some of these points would be best if I brought them out and some questions that you may have.

Senator METCALF. We anticipate your testimony because we have had considerable testimony in the Moab and Monticello area about the wildlife situation and we are very glad to hear what you have to say.

Mr. CRANE. I would like to start with to submit some additional pictures. Now you gentlemen have all recently been in the area, but I think that quite often we can get the wrong interpretation of what the area actually is if we just see these beautiful pictures of Mr. Fausett and some of the more scenic aspects of the area.

I might submit this, for example, which is the southern boundary of the area.

Senator METCALF. I wonder if we can start numbering them. This is No. 1.

Mr. CRANE. Here is another print of the same thing to show that this is the area of prime deer winter range and you see from the photograph that the area inside is almost identical to the area outside.

Senator METCALF. Well there is a lot of the area outside that is lovely and superb scenery.

Mr. CRANE. Very definitely. I might observe that there are several other areas of almost equal value scenically within a hundred miles of this that are not even related to this.

Another point, the river system—I will touch on this—is of extreme importance from a wildlife standpoint. I submit these pictures to show that this is taken from Deadhorse Point, No. 2, but it merely shows the stream side vegetation.

Picture No. 3 here is the same type of a picture. That is in the area of Upheaval Bottom. It shows the extremely fine wildlife habitat that does abound throughout the river system.

This next picture is a panoramic picture taken from Grandview Point looking straight to the west showing Soda Basin, a vast area within the park which is of not especially scenic grandeur so that it is not all——

Senator METCALF. Now is all of this No. 4 within the park?

Mr. CRANE. Yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. All of it is within the park.

Mr. CRANE. And this last one, an area I am sure you have seen, the Standing Rock Basin which is an extremely scenic area but a rather small area within the total area. And two others that I have here I would just like to quickly bring your attention to, a blowup of the Squaw Flat area showing the vegetation. Now you were all there the other day so you saw it firsthand.

Senator METCALF. It will be No. 6.

Mr. CRANE. But it is actually a very good game habitat, and this is taken up in Grey's pasture on top of Grandview Point and that is the type of habitat that is on top of the mountain up there. So they will be submitted for the record.

Senator METCALF. These pictures will be incorporated into the file of the committee for the use of the committee.

Mr. CRANE. I might say that I was very much heartened by comments made by all of the members of the committee at the Monticello hearing wherein they felt that possibly it is time that we take a new look at new segments of the national park system and I think that generally is the basis of my testimony because the situation 50 to 100 years ago was such that regulations were established then, and I think we need not entirely look on the same regulations and possibly we are going to have to consider some other items.

Now I will skip through the first part of my testimony and on this matter on page 3, I would like to outline the hunting and fishing in the area so that the committee does have a true picture of it. Fish—I mention here briefly that although the river system currently is not too important from a fishery standpoint, with the increased population undoubtedly it can become a very important factor.

Now of course I realize readily that the national park does allow fishing. I just point out that it is something that isn't utilized especially at the present time.

Mule deer—there has been a lot of testimony concerning the mule deer. As has been pointed out the southern portion of the area is part of the winter range of the Elk Ridge deer herd. We haven't had a serious problem in this area as yet. I won't say that definitely that we will have, but I predict we will have if this it put under the administration of the National Park Service. I think we will have a buildup of deer in the area and very likely a serious deer problem unless some arrangement is made for the management of that deer herd in that area.

The other important portion of the area, as far as deer is concerned, is the complete river system. There are a lot of mule deer on the river system. Here again the kill hasn't been large but it hasn't been necessary to go to that much trouble to get a deer, although in recent years it is becoming more and more popular to float down the river or go down in a boat and hunt along the river system.

Senator Moss. Well, Harold, if the deer winter in this area, wouldn't the place to harvest them, to keep them balanced then be on the Blue Mountains or on the Henry Mountains where they are in the late fall—summer and late fall?

Mr. CRANE. For the sake of the record they don't get there from the Henrys. That is across the river. The deer herd comes from the Abajos and the Elk Ridge area. It is true, and I think generally we can handle it from the migratory herd but there are a number of resident deer in the area. I think testimony has been given that there is no water in the area. As one of you pointed out this morning, there is a fine spring at Squaw Flat and there is another at Elephant Hill. At Salt Creek there is water off and on or in different areas up and down the canyon.

So there is considerable water within the area and I anticipate a very definite possibility of a buildup within the area of resident deer. I have been there throughout the summer, I am well acquainted with the area, and there are deer in there year around, throughout the area.

Senator METCALF. Well, now, our testimony at Monticello was that most of the deer were in the Needles area and as water went down, they came down into Beef Basin which is outside of the area of the

park and most of the kill and most of the hunting and most of the deer in hunting season is down in Beef Basin, is that correct?

Mr. CRANE. Well, actually Beef Basin is straight to the south of boundary.

Senator METCALF. Outside the park.

Mr. CRANE. Well there are also deer within the park boundary, but there have been no roads there and no access to hunting them within the area. Now, Senator Moss points out, it is true that generally we can harvest the bulk of the deer herd outside of this area. Certainly if it were expanded as the original proposal, then it would be a real serious problem because then it would take in the entire winter range. This way most of it is excluded but still we could and very definitely have a deer problem. We have a bad one at Bryce Canyon where we just have a narrow rim of summer range.

Senator METCALF. Well neither Senator Long nor I propose to incorporate Beef Basin in the park.

Mr. CRANE. To continue by saying that hunting on the rivers is becoming more and more popular and with our increased population we are going to need places to hunt—and I will get into that a little later.

Mountain sheep—there are mountain sheep in the area, not in large numbers. It is another resident game species that are present within the area. We have never hunted them. It is doubtful if they would ever need hunting but there again, if they should build up, then some means is necessary to insure proper management.

The northern area is a possibility of antelope. Beaver are present, of course, in great numbers throughout the river system and I think the testimony in Washingon indicated that we anticipated planting birds. They have been planted. I just want to point that out chuck and partridge are quite numerous throughout areas of this park now, or this proposed park.

I think that presents the wildlife picture, and now in summary, if you will turn to page 5 I will just hit the high points that I have in my presentation.

First, and something that I haven't seen in the testimony and I think is of paramount importance, No. 1, the ownership of all resident wildlife species rests with the State of Utah and the administration and regulation of these resources should be accomplished by the State to existing State regulations. I feel, and it has been determined by the Supreme Court in many cases, that actually this resource, even though it is on public land, Federal land, the resident species are still a State resource.

Second, the anxiety of this department is not concerned with old and established national parks but with new units of the National Park Service such as proposed. It is on these new units that the Park Service would restrict hunting on Federal, State, and private lands currently open to public hunting. Now I think this is an important thing that this entire area, although it has been Federal land, has been open to public hunting continuously and I think that puts it in an entirely different category than old parks such as Yellowstone which has many times been mentioned which were established before this use was made. So it would be preventing, or stopping, a use that has been

going on for many years and public hunting will not interfere with such units but will actually enhance them by keeping the flora and fauna in proper balance.

Now, you know—well, I will just go on, I think the next point covers what I was going to say.

Third, the need for management of the wildlife resource is apparent and recognized by the National Park Service. Now in my presentation I have presented recommended wording by the International Association of State Fish and Game Commissioners which, as the title indicates, all of the fish and game people of the country and their recommendation on this matter and this wording proposed by the international, will allow the Secretary to fully protect the area where and when necessary, yet will allow management where it is necessary or advisable. In other words, it would give the Park Service the same rights and authority that a private landowner has. If he has an area that he doesn't want hunting, he can close it to hunting; and I think certainly in Chesler Park, around these very scenic areas, that there shouldn't be any hunting at any time, but if you do have a problem develop, you still would have a vehicle on which to take care of the problem and I think we will all agree and even the Park Service agrees that this is necessary.

Fourth, Congress has recognized other uses on national parks and particularly on other lands administered by the National Park Service. I think it paramount that the name doesn't necessarily change the status or the management of the land. Call it a park, a recreation area, or whatever you call it, the same management is necessary and whether it belongs to the Park Service or Forest Service or whomever it may, if you are going to properly manage the area then the name is not necessarily so important, and as I pointed out before, I think that we must recognize these things.

Fifth, future hunting in the Canyonlands Area will materially increase with the advent of accessibility of the region to the public. On this photo No. 1, as I pointed out, it has got Beef Basin and Ruin Park on the south of the line which is open and accessible. There are thousands of hunters that go into that area. It is identical on the other side of the line but there has never been a road into it. This has been the primary difference. Unless provisions are made for wildlife management, overpopulation and resultant damage to flora as well as fauna can be expected.

Sixth, and I think the telegram that you received at Monticello from Assistant Secretary Carver indicates the attitude of the Secretary. He is against this provision, what is No. 6 now which was spelled out in his telegram and I want to quote here:

> We cannot agree with the National Park Service's policy, our denial of public hunting as expressed.

And this is taken from a statement by the Park Service issued last September:

> Public hunting is neither the appropriate nor practical way to accomplish national parks and national monument management objectives.

I might just digress a minute and say that they agree that it is necessary on national recreational areas:

> Recreational hunting, however well justified and appropriate in other places, in irreconcilable to national park and national monument purposes.

I think with that, my concern, and we work every day with Federal agencies on a very amiable relationship and cooperative program, but my criticism of this section 6 is that with this attitude of the National Park Service, I do not think they would go half way in trying to work with us and I think this as well as that telegram would express it. Maybe it could be written into the law that this would be carried out. Certainly I would encourage or recommend that.

I think that in summation is—I might just comment on one other point. Seventh, contemplated the river system is primarily recreational, boating, fishing, hunting, water skiing, camping, and so on. Consequently, they are secondary uses as far as the National Park Service is concerned unless the designation is, "national recreation area." I think that speaks for itself and it has been pointed out from the aspects of the National Park Service itself that this use would be primarily recreational use on the river and I think that we need to face these issues realistically and honestly and times have changed, we need to face them as they are facing us today and I think this—certainly the approach to multiple use, which doesn't mean the use of everyone at the same place at the same time but proper and balanced use is a necessary item.

One other item I meant to mention in Mr. Wirth's testimony. He stated that there were 40 deer killed in the area last year. Our organization has never been asked what the kill was and that is our business. We have men in the area that spend full time in the area, several men during every hunting season for many years, but I think that a check will indicate, or I am sure we could prove that there is many more deer harvested in the area currently than this testimony in the hearings give.

Senator METCALF. We want to know how many, if you have it, and if you don't have it and can obtain it, I hope that you will supply it for the record.

Mr. CRANE. Well, as I said, I was in Monticello the other day. I checked with our field men, two long-time field men who have worked the area. Their estimates, the best estimates they can give, is somewhere in the neighborhood of 300 to 400 deer last year from within the proposed boundaries.

Senator METCALF. Well, if you have any additional information on that and want to submit additional information that you obtain for the record, the record will be left open for a short time in order to get it.

Senator Moss. Harold, do I understand then that you do approve of the provision of the bill in section 6(a) and 6(b) providing for the harvesting of game within the park on a cooperative arrangement by Utah hunters?

Mr. CRANE. I don't approve of it to the point where—as I say, the Secretary has so expressed in the telegram that you received at Monticello that he is opposed to it and in essence will not cooperate with it. The policy of the National Park Service is against it so I would rather have it written in by Congress and not left to the Secretary.

Senator Moss. Well, that is exactly what we are talking about, whether Congress should write a bill like this, saying, "At least once a year, between February 1 and April 1, the National Park Service shall submit its recommendations, together with recommendations made by the Utah Fish and Game Department, for the management,

protection, and control of wildlife for that year," and so on, whether you think this language that makes it mandatory upon the Department to do these things would accomplish what you say should be accomplished in the management of the game in the area.

Now the Secretary can express his opposition to having something written in the bill but if the Congress writes it in and it became the law of the land and he no longer has any discretion, he has got the law to obey.

Mr. CRANE. If that is written with that provision, then I would be perfectly satisfied with it but this says that the Secretary and the Governor, for their joint approval and I just merely point out to what they have expressed, they are against it from the start, so how can we expect any cooperative approach to it.

Senator Moss. Well, he has expressed his opposition and would assume for that same reason he has opposition to Grand Tetons and yet it is carried on there. There are some questions about whether the area should be wider and whether or not it should be more than elk and things like that but nevertheless it is being carried on because the law says that it shall be carried on.

Mr. CRANE. The way it is written is far better than the Grand Teton; it covers all species in the entire area but that is an apprehension that we have on the thing and another point that Chairman Bible mentioned. I wish he were here because I wanted to address this to him, that he had asked the National Park Service for a full survey of the wildlife situation in the national parks. I suspect that you would get an entirely different report from the State game departments involved than you would from Mr. Wirth's office.

Senator METCALF. Senator Bible will read the record just as will many other Members of the Congress. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Harold S. Crane is as follows:)

In approaching the proposed Canyonlands issues we desire to clarify the position of the Utah State Department of Fish and Game to note that we are not opposed to the establishment of national parks and in this instance, the proposed Canyonlands National Park, provided adequate safeguards are enacted to properly manage the fish and game resources in perpetuity. The salient feature which must be incorporated in this proposal is that the administration of the fish and wildlife resources should rest with the State.

By legislative mandate the Utah State Department of Fish and Game is charged with the responsibility of propagation and management of fish, game and furbearing animals. The department is likewise concurrently charged with the responsibility of providing maximum recreation to the public consistent with the proper management of the individual game and fish species involved.

The weight of responsibility to meet future hunting and fishing demands rests heavily upon departmental administrators' shoulders. In the short span of the next 18 years our State population will conservatively approach 1,500,000 people. A brief insight into what this means in terms of recreational demands upon but one wildlife resource is noted. Thus, we must provide for at least 250,000 deer hunters annually by the year 1980.

If we are to discharge this responsibility to any degree of adequacy, we must not only constantly improve our technology and management, but purchase and develop critical game habitat and continue cooperative range rehabilitation projects with Federal and other agencies. In addition, we most assuredly oppose any laws or regulations which curtail hunting opportunities such as occur under present National Park policy. Furthermore, we must place greater reliance on areas which currently have but limited use. In the case of the area under discussion this is chiefly due to inaccessibility. In addition, in the face of future hunting demands it does not appear justifiable to lose public hunting on these same lands now open merely because another Federal Agency takes control.

Over the years of the existence of our Nation tradition and basic philosophy have effected the realization that the ownership of game belongs to the individual State. Supreme Court rulings have further legally amplified that the ownership of game is vested in the State in its sovereign capacity. These particular points are highly significant in the establishment of Canyonlands National Park since they clearly point out that ownership of the wildlife species is in the charge and management of the State agency so designated, and not the Federal Government unless this right is relinquished.

We fully recognize the economic and esthetic values of the proposed Canyonlands National Park and believe that its scenic values in strategic areas truly merit park status. However, we maintain public hunting is consistent with the formation and operation of such a national park and is in fact in conformity with a basic premise of original national park and is in fact in conformity with a basic premise of original national park legislation relating to enhancing the preservation of natural flora and fauna. Even the National Park Service has belatedly recognized that hunting was the only practical method to protect the basic wildlife and vegetative cover. Thus, in Yellowstone National Park during the past winter park personnel removed approximately 5,000 head of elk.

The philosophy that hunting is a necessary management tool and should be a legitimate recreational use of the national park is not a singular position of the Utah State Department of Fish and Game, but is a philosophy internationally acclaimed by responsible conservation agencies.

Hunting and fishing is traditional in the United States. In early years it was a necessity and in later years became a form of recreation important to the economics of the Nation and the social, moral, and physical well-being of our citizens. The right and authority to manage resident species of wildlife, including game and fish, is recognized as a basic State responsibility. State game and fish agencies through research and management experience have kept pace with wildlife environment changes, due to both artificial and natural causes, and consequently are best qualified to manage the renewable natural resources.

These land and water areas to be established and administered by the National Park Service are to be withdrawn or acquired from public and private holdings that are now subject to State laws and regulations, wherein fish and wildlife management is concerned. This present relationship is completely compatible and is serving the best interests of the public.

We are apprehensive of transferring any new areas to the National Park Service unless proper safeguards are assured. The concern is apparent for the following reasons:

(1) The failure of the Park Service to properly manage wildlife populations to the extent that even the primary reason for the establishment of the park is destroyed.

(2) The announced park policy which states, "Public hunting is neither the appropriate nor practical way to accomplish national parks and national monument management objectives. Recreational hunting, however well justified and appropriate in other places, is irreconcilable to national park and national monument purposes."

We believe public hunting, properly controlled, will not detract from a national park, but will actually enhance it by keeping the flora and fauna in proper balance. In order to accomplish this the International Association of State Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners have proposed that the following wording be included in all new legislation involving units of the National Parks Service: "The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing within the area in accordance with the laws of the State or States. The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting may be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use, and enjoyment."

Federal legislation relating to hunting on lands administered by the Park Service has already been utilized in such regions as national recreational areas to provide the annual harvest of game through hunting administered by the respective State game agency. It should also be noted that the visitor use of national forests and public domain lands is of considerable magnitude. Surely public hunting has not adversely affected these uses.

Our congressional delegates are cognizant of these wildlife problems within existing national parks, both in and out of our State. They genuinely realize the necessity for a legal vehicle to provide for hunting in the proposed Canyonlands National Park.

We are indeed appreciative that these men, together with our congressional delegates, see the desirability and need for public hunting in new national parks.

Additional features should be added to these bills in order to effectively manage the species and provide necessary future hunting opportunities. Since present bills restrict all hunting to big game only, there is decided need for an extension to include hunting of all game species. Further, the State of Utah should maintain jurisdiction over the hunting since resident game is a basic State resource. Thus, the final decision of hunting would rest where it currently does, with the respective State agency rather than the Secretary of Interior.

Basic hunting provisions in a proposed Canyonland National Park bill are patterned after those of the Teton National Monument in Wyoming. It should be noted for valid reasons that the Wyoming State Game Commission is not satisfied with the Teton arrangement. (S. J. Jiacoletti, Wyoming State Fish and Game Commissioner—letter dated March 5, 1962.) Their extensive experience with these hunting regulations should be utilized to maximum benefit in the proposed Canyonlands Park situation.

What is the status of the wildlife resource in the proposed Canyonlands area? While a brief current status is herein presented, we view the future with optimism if hunting is continued and when additional access is affected.

FISH

Fishing within the area is not important at present although there are excellent populations of channel catfish and other warm-water fish throughout the river system. Proposed upstream impoundments coupled with the expanding human population should result in a very important fishery in the future. Proposed developments on both the Green and Colorado Rivers above the Canyonlands area will greatly improve the water quality for future boating and fishing uses.

MULE DEER

There has been considerable misunderstanding of the status of deer within the proposed Canyonlands area. Although deer occur throughout the Canyonlands, the southern portion and Colorado and Green River bottoms are the areas of most importance. The southern portion of the proposed Canyonlands is a winter range for portions of the San Juan deer herd unit. In addition to the migratory herd there exists a resident deer herd, principally in the Salt Creek area. Deer also abound along the entire river system and represent a substantial resource.

Though both resident deer and some migratory deer have been located within the proposed canyonlands area during the past hunting seasons, poor access has limited the harvest. Hunter access is a vital necessity and is a tool long recognized to accomplish management objectives. In fact, in the Henry Mountain area, approximately 50 miles west of this area, practically the entire 1,000-head, annual deer harvest can directly be attributed to access road programs.

The canyonlands will thus provide significantly more hunting as accessibility is improved. It should also be noted that the use of boats to hunt deer along the Colorado and Green Rivers is becoming an increasingly popular form of hunting. A continuance of this hunting will both provide increased recreational use and an adequate harvest of deer to the proper use of the available habitat.

MOUNTAIN SHEEP

Although not numerous, and never having been hunted, these animals also occur throughout a sizable portion of the area. Potentially, huntable populations could occur which would necessitate proper management.

ANTELOPE

Although not presently found within the area proposed, there are portions that are excellent antelope habitat. These are primarily the mesas, north of the confluence between the Green and Colorado Rivers. Antelope were originally native to the area and with proper management could be reestablished.

BEAVER

These are abundant throughout the river system. Continued harvest of beaver will keep them in check with the available food supply and will provide significant esthetic and economic returns to the public.

UPLAND GAME BIRDS

Within the proposed site are several areas containing substantial populations of chukar partridge. These are: Lower Indian Creek, almost the entire length of Salt Creek, Lockhart Basin, and the Colorado and Green Rivers both above and below the confluence. Currently they are spreading into new areas within the proposed park area. Actually, because of the remoteness of the area the total possibilities have never yet been fully investigated. With the advent of additional access into the area, increased hunting opportunities can be effected and more intensive management can be practiced. Such management facilities as artificial water developments will extend the distribution of upland game birds.

In summary the following major items are basic to the proper management of the wildlife resources in the proposed Canyonlands National Park area:

(1) The ownership of all resident wildlife species rests with the State of Utah and the administration and regulation of this resource should be accomplished by the State through existing State laws and regulations.

(2) The anxiety of this Department is not concerned with old and established national parks but with new units of the National Park Service such as proposed. It is on these new units that the Park Service would restrict hunting on Federal, State and private lands currently open to public hunting. Public hunting will not interfere with such units but will actually enhance them by keeping the flora and fauna in proper balance.

(3) The need for management of the wildlife resource is apparent and recognized by the National Park Service. The wording proposed by the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners will allow the Secretary to fully protect areas where and when necessary; yet will allow management where it is necessary or advisable.

(4) Congress has recognized other usese on national parks and particularly on other lands administered by the National Park Service.

(5) Future hunting in the Canyonlands area will materially increase with the advent of accessibility of the region to the public. Unless provisions are made for wildlife management, overpopulation and resultant damage to flora as well as fauna can be expected.

(6) We cannot agree with the National Park Service's policy of denial of public hunting as expressed: * * * "Public hunting is neither the appropriate nor practical way to accomplish national park and national monument management objectives. Recreational hunting, however well justified and appropriate in other places, is irreconcilable to national park and national monument purposes."

(7) Contemplated use of the river system is primarily recreation, i.e., boating, fishing, hunting, water skiing, camping, etc. Consequently, they are secondary uses as far as the National Park Service is concerned unless the designation is "National Recreation Area."

It is our desire that Congress will see the need for incorporating features herein expressed by this Department and other conservation agencies in this and all new National Park Service units. Current and future issues must be faced honestly and realistically. Decisions must be faced on facts and not sentiment.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. William A. Barlocker. Mayor Barlocker.

Again I hope that some of your people will see fit to turn your statements in to the reporter or to Mr. Strong; because time is running, and we are going to have to cut somebody off at 5 o'clock.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM A. BARLOCKER, MAYOR OF ST. GEORGE, UTAH

Mr. BARLOCKER. Ladies and gentlemen, I want you first to know I am Mayor Barlocker from St. George; and we are the poorest school district in the State, I believe, since San Juan hit oil. In fact we are so poor in St. George we have been having some people down

there asking us to secede from the Union and ask for foreign aid, but, nevertheless, we are here; and our tourist trade in the area is one of our paramount businesses, and we would like to express ourselves on this level.

May I first give a summary of results of the St. George Highway survey conducted by the St. George Chamber of Commerce and the Bureau of Economic and Business Research of the University of Utah. I quote:

During the last 2 years, the merchants and citizens of our city have worked together in cooperation with the University of Utah Bureau of Economic and Business Research, under the direction of Dr. Harline, to try to find out how important to our area the visitor or tourist industry is. Over a period of 18 months almost every businessman in town on four different survey dates stopped customers coming into their stores and had them answer a number of questions. The wholehearted cooperation we have received from almost every business in St. George is, I think, an indication of the importance with which they regard this business of tourism which outside visitors bring to our city. From this survey, which is currently in the process of being published by the University of Utah, two important conclusions emerge: (1) visitor expenditures in St. George are vital to the economy of St. George, and (2) it is important to future welfare of St. George that our city, in cooperation with neighboring towns, as well as the State and Federal Government, work to increase the magnitude of visitors' expenditures. We believe that the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park would accomplish this objective.

Of the out-of-State passenger cars traveling on the highway during the survey date, 71 percent stopped in St. George.

Of the persons who stopped and were questioned by our merchants, 51 percent were in St. George for "this trip only." Of the total who stopped, 45 percent stayed 4 hours or less. Of those who stayed overnight, ate, or bought gasoline in St. George, a significant proportion had stopped previously in Panguitch or Kanab, the cities which are the gateways to national parks.

During the survey, our merchants kept track of the proportion of their business which could be attributed to persons outside the St. George area who stopped in St. George for various reasons. (Persons who came to St. George from neighboring communities or who came to the city on business or to visit friends or relatives were excluded). We found that about half of the business of our restaurants and service stations was due to stops by persons traveling on the highway. Two-thirds of the total business of motels was from these persons and almost 10 percent of the total business of the rest of our retail stores was highway oriented. Altogether it appears that about 20 percent of the economic base of our community is due to expenditures by persons from outside our area who now stop in St. George. If we include all visitors who travel the highway and who for any reason stop, the figure rises to 26 percent. Not all of these persons are so-called tourists, but most of them are.

St. George has grown during the last decade, and Washington County has experienced a population increase. We think the Canyonlands National Park will help us to continue this growth.

We have further documented evidence by the University of Utah that tourists in the area of Canyonlands National Park will spend $220 million in the next 25 years of operation. If we were to visualize the amount of money spent in the area in the next thousand or so years by tourists, it would be rather stupid to assume that any commercial development would have one-hundredth the impact as far as economics is concerned. I do not believe that we should hinge our entire judgment on economics alone, inasmuch as the national park would be used and seen by millions of people and by many generations to come and give people access to areas of beauty that money cannot buy.

I would like to quote from the May 1962 National Geographic magazine the following paragraph by W. Robert Moore in connection with his views of the area:

> On and on it stretched beneath our wings—a vast city of towering skyscrapers, massive domes, and bridges beyond an architect's dreams. Yet it was a city without a blueprint, the work of nature, not of man, and it had taken hundreds of thousands of years to build. The only thing missing is the people, I thought. They'll come someday—thousands of them—to see these sights. Sandstone colossus hewn by rain, frost, and wind, Druid Arch derives its name from a striking resemblance to England's Stonehenge, popularly associated with druids. Here in southeastern Utah's canyonland, a magnificent scenic wilderness awaits congressional sanction as a new national park.

This park has been discussed pro and con for a number of months and it is my humble opinion we would be cheating ourselves and our posterity to not make the park at least the size that is being recommended under the Moss bill. I firmly believe that, if anything, we should make the park larger—probably in the neighborhood of a million acres, rather than making it a pint-sized park. If the park was made larger we would have many advantages of advertising plus keeping the land intact in one large and beautiful park.

We have those who maintain that it would "lock up" and not permit multiple use such as grazing and mining operations and may I point out that in my opinion there is not enough grass growing in the 320,000 proposed acres to handle one good cow herd on a profitable level. It is my understanding that the dues collected by the Bureau of Land Management, under the Taylor Grazing Act, from the cattle growers, amounts to only around $2,700 per year from the entire area of the proposed park, which would further substantiate my statement. So I believe we can leave grazing in the bill as nature will take care of the problem.

I am sorry this park has been thrown into a hassle because of those who would like to hold it up for political reasons rather than reasons of good, sound judgment and using these flimsy justifications for their arguments.

It is my firm belief that if this park had been proposed some 4 or 5 years ago, the people who today are against it would be waving their arms high in favor of such a magnificent and scenic park, but it seems that they have changed their position from being against the park to deciding that it is too large only because they felt that it is not politically wise to agree at any time with the opposite political party. I believe that our two-party system in this country is a wonderful way for us to keep our freedom. It is also used to elect people with particular viewpoints, but I believe after an election is over we should work for the good and betterment of all the people and be able to class ourselves as good Americans rather than smart politicians.

Inasmuch as southeastern Utah is one of the most sparsely populated regions in the country, with very few permanent inhabitants in the area and no private lands to speak of within the portion of the country proposed for the park, and that only about one-ninth of the land is State land, I believe that it would be appropriate for our Federal Government to include, in the proposed park, ample roads.

Senator Moss. You referred, Bill, to the article that is in the Geographic for May of 1962.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY JUL 19 62 MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Mr. BARLOCKER. Yes.

Senator MOSS. Since you made reference to it, I thought I would make reference also to this article which contains some most remarkable photographs of the formations down there in the area and if anyone would like to examine this book during the hearing, they will be welcome to come up and look at it. It should be in the mail for all Geographic subscribers now.

Mr. BARLOCKER. It is a very well-worded article, and I thought it apropos to use it at this time.

Senator BENNETT. Well, Mr. Barlocker, as the one Republican in the room, I was interested in your last page and a half. It is too bad you weren't here this morning when I pointed out that we are having a procession of witnesses today who all identified themselves as officers of the Democratic Party. Now if you had been present at all the hearings, as I have, maybe you could answer this question. Do you know of any witness who has appeared before the committee objecting to the formation of a park?

Mr. BARLOCKER. No, I don't. I believe that everyone wants the park.

Senator BENNETT. Well then——

Mr. BARLOCKER. It seems to me that I have an article in my file quoting you from the Tribune some 6, 8 months ago, where you were against it.

Senator BENNETT. Well, if such an article was printed, it was printed in error because I am the first man who introduced legislation to set aside this area for the benefit of the people. I wanted to set it aside as a recreation area. Later it was raised up to a park status but in the bottom paragraph on page 3, you say—and this is the sort of thing that bothers me:

> It is my firm belief that if this park had been proposed some 4 or 5 years ago, the people who today are against it would be waving their arms high in favor of such a magnificent and scenic park.

Do you know of anybody who is today against it?

Mr. BARLOCKER. Well, it seems to me that the people who are against the size of it are really against it, Senator, because as soon as we start cutting down the size of this park, we are going to lose its magnitude, we are going to lose the spirit in which the thing is being created—because we want this to be one of the great parks in the world and it has to be of a size and nature that it will be and the scenic attractions are there, you have to agree that they are, and just by cutting the size of the park down isn't going to cure our problem.

Senator BENNETT. Do you know what the first size recommended for the park was?

Mr. BARLOCKER. Over 2 million acres, wasn't it?

Senator BENNETT. One million acres.

Mr. BARLOCKER. One million acres. I was thinking it was about the same size as Yellowstone Park.

Senator BENNETT. Well, it was a million acres and the first bill introduced was 330,000, so there was the first cut in size and this was accomplished by my friend Senator Moss and I agree that he did the right thing so I don't think we have reached the point yet where we can say this is exactly the right and optimum size. The Senator had

a bill in for 300,000 acres. He just raised it up to 332 by a new amendment. We are still working on the question of size.

Mr. BARLOCKER. Well, we appreciate that. I think that we are reaching for strings and straws and everything else to even fight it at all. It seems to me we all ought to be on the same battleship here. For example, with Mr. Crane's testimony ahead of me, worrying about 400 deer. I wouldn't worry about the deer if there were 4,000 deer down there because it is still immaterial compared to the impact of a national park of this size and I think nature will take care of that problem, too. I don't think he has to worry about the Park Service having to eliminate them and in the first place I don't believe the Park Service is completely irresponsible. I believe they will take care of their own problem. They did in Yellowstone Park last year. I believe they had an elimination up there, did they not; wasn't it a year or 2 years ago?

I might be wrong on my timing but I know that they do take care of these problems and I don't believe Mr. Crane is the only person in the world that knows how to control deer.

Senator BENNETT. Let me take you back to your original statement. Will you agree with me that there is no one around against the park?

Mr. BARLOCKER. That's true.

Senator BENNETT. OK, that is just the point I wanted to make.

Mr. BARLOCKER. We won't get the park if we can find things that are wrong with it, Senator.

Senator BENNETT. Well, Senator Moss has amended his bill twice now because he found things that were wrong with the earlier versions and don't you think this process can continue? I think eventually we are going to come to a common understanding and I think that some of the information that Governor Clyde and his committee have been able to develop will in the end be useful in the development of that.

Mr. BARLOCKER. Well, Senator, let me remind you that there are eight proposed parks in the hopper right now in Congress and now that we have had this thing discussed pro and con for a number of months, we are going to be way down the line and it is not going to get to the Congress this year and if we have done nothing else, I think we have stopped it for a couple or three years and 2 or 3 year's time to our people in my end of the State is dollars and cents.

Senator BENNETT. Let me ask you this question——

Mr. BARLOCKER. If everyone had come out for the park, I don't care if it was 2 million acres, it would have made everyone in this State money.

Senator BENNETT. You say there are seven or eight parks ahead of us?

Mr. BARLOCKER. Yes.

Senator BENNETT. And we are now going to be delayed, do you know of any proposed park bills which were introduced after this bill was introduced which have passed along ahead of us?

Mr. BARLOCKER. No, I don't.

Senator MOSS. Well, may I say while we are discussing whether everybody is for the park or not, that there are quite a number of witnesses against the park and you, Senator Bennett, filed a state-

ment on the first day of our hearing in Monticello saying you had objections to many things.

First of all you said:

> The increase of the acreage is objectionable. This is an increase of over 10 percent and since the State agency committee and I both object to the previous size, the increase makes the bill even more objectionable.

Senator BENNETT. Is that an objection to a park per se?

Senator Moss. Well, it is an objection to the bill we are talking about.

Senator BENNETT. That's right.

Senator Moss. To the park we are talking about. Well, if you want to go over of course to talk about the three spot parks, I think that is in opposition to the bill and I think there are opponents to the bill.

Senator BENNETT. The point I must make and this is a good place to make it, is that one of the factors in this situation which is developing into a political football is the charge that anybody who does not agree completely with the Moss bill is quote, against the park, end quote.

Now I don't think the Moss bill identifies itself as the sole and only answer to this situation and I am sure the Governor and I are just as anxious as Senator Moss to solve this problem in the best possible way. We have a slightly different point of view. We have a different approach but I don't like to be accused of being against the park and then be accused of making this thing a political football because my testimony and evidence in this hearing, in the Washington hearing and in the material I put in the other day begins with a statement that I am in favor of a park.

Mr. BARLOCKER. My personal opinion was just this, Senator, that it seemed that everyone had been trying to think of something to—it looked like they were reaching for something to find against the program. Some of the things that came out were completely ridiculous in my opinion and I can't agree with you when you ask for the three little parks down there. From a man who is supposed to be a student of economics like you are and have been studying these things and cutting taxes all the time, that three parks you know would cost us about three times as much overhead to run as it would run one park. It seems to me you were just trying to find some political advantage with those little bits with the people down there.

Senator BENNETT. As you say, what I suggest tends to seem ridiculous to you and I am not going to turn that sentence around in this particular case.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman.

Senator METCALF. Congressman King.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask one question of Senator Moss. I ask it because one statement was brought out here that gives rise to this question.

There has been an inference that perhaps this hearing is a parade of Democrats and I would like to set the record straight on that point. I would like to ask Senator Moss—or first, you made the statement this morning that 4,000 invitations were sent out to every conceivable person in this State, or anywhere else who might have an interest in these hearings and then that a blanket invitation was published in the newspaper. Now I would like to ask the question, Has anyone

who has shown any interest in testifying at these hearings, has anyone been turned down or refused an opportunity to make himself heard?

Senator Moss. No, I can answer that categorically. Not only has everybody been permitted to testify but we have sought testimony from all different groups and people with different points of view and as a matter of fact we have been so successful in getting people to come and testify that we are now up against the gun of getting through this hearing on time. No one has been excluded at all.

Senator METCALF. May I again admonish my colleagues that time is running out and we have an opportunity——

Mr. BARLOCKER. May I say one closing statement?

Senator METCALF. Just a moment. We have an opportunity to speak among ourselves at some later date and let's hear these witnesses. Mayor Barlocker.

Mr. BARLOCKER. One of the reasons I am here, and I had not been asked by Senator Moss or Congressman King or Peterson or anyone else, but this problem has been brought up in our chamber of commerce in St. George of which I am a member and contributor, and the question was raised and the chamber of commerce of St. George went on record in supporting Senator Moss' bill and the bill proposed through the Department of the Interior through Senator Moss, I should say, and because of political pressure, and they admitted it, they reversed their action after I had left the meeting because there were three people who voted against it and who happened to not be of the same political faith as I am and because of political pressures put on them, they changed their decision and said, "All right, we will not testify, we will just stay status quo."

Senator BENNETT. That is an interesting and serious charge. Will you name the people who put the political pressure on the people in your committee?

Senator METCALF. I hope that we will decide this question of the size of the park, multiple uses, secondary and primary uses on the basis of objective facts and not get into a political controversy. Thank you, Senator Bennett. Thank you, Mayor Barlocker.

The next witness is Mr. J. R. Williams. Mr. Williams will be followed by Stewart Campbell.

STATEMENT OF J. R. WILLIAMS, VICE PRESIDENT, ROCKY MOUNTAIN OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. WILLIAMS. My name is J. R. Williams. I am here representing the Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association. Our association has 2,300 members comprised of companies and individuals in seven Rocky Mountain States engaged primarily in the exploration, production, transportation, and refining end of the industry. I do not intend to follow my prepared statement, I would like to make this briew.

Senator METCALF. The statement will be incorporated in its entirety into the record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am a resident of Salt Lake City and an independent oil man and a nonsalaried vice president of the association representing the State of Utah.

It is the desire of the association today to convince this committee that multiple use or primary and secondary uses are necessary, feasible, and desirable and to show you that although statements have been made that the amount of oil to be found in this area has no practical aspect, it is impossible to make that statement with any degree of accuracy at this time since we have many geologic time periods, rocks of these time periods which underlay the proposed park area and since these rock periods are present and have been found productive in other areas in the State of Utah, we feel that there is a very great possibility that in the future oil or gas could be found in the proposed park area.

We have today brought a diagram which we would like to show you. Smaller copies of this diagram will be made available to the committee for the record. The colors shown on the diagram have no significance other than to distinguish or differentiate the various formations within the various periods. Shown here are the three productive periods, three other productive periods which underlay the park, Pennsylvanian, Mississippian, and Devonian. The Devonian is the deepest and the oldest of the periods and therefore has had the least drilling. There is the McCracken sandstone of the Devonian period which is productive at Lisbon.

For the benefit of you Senators from out of State, Lisbon is in San Juan County, near the Colorado border.

The Mississippian period has two formations which are productive in other parts of the State, the Ouray, productive at Lisbon, and Leadville productive in Lisbon and in the Big Flat area. Big Flat is the unit immediately north of the northern boundary of the proposed park area.

Within the Pennsylvanian period we have the Paradox and Salt formations. The Paradox has several zones which are productive at Aneth. The Salt formation has recently been found productive in the Cane Creek marker or zone. At the Southern Natural Gas No. 1 U.S.A. well is on the very extreme northeast edge of the proposed park area and was originally included in the park area. There is also production in the Salt formation at Pure No. 5 Big Flat which is about 8 miles north of the proposed park area.

I believe the diagram has served its purpose.

As we mentioned, there are smaller copies of this diagram which also have been colored and not all colored the same. I wish to call to your attention that the colors have no meaning and therefore if one is colored differently than the other, there is no significance.

Senator METCALF. We can put the diagram in the record without the color so it will appear in black and white.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Fine, sir. We wish to remind you that these recent discoveries by two different companies in two different areas approximately 10 miles apart, give the oil industry a great deal of faith in the fact that we might be able to find oil in the proposed park area. We cannot accept the theory that any given number of oil wells condemn an area. There were almost 200 dry holes drilled at Aneth before it became the State's most productive area. We cannot go along with these people who indicate that they should lock up the oil resources or mineral resources in this area and bring them forth at a later date.

Who among us is sufficiently omnipotent to decide at what time we should unlock these resources and we will have to admit ourselves that we are only presuming the reservoirs are there and we have to find them yet and although I would not advocate that you lock up productive areas, if you sincerely desire to save reservoirs and reserves for the United States in the future, you should first find those reserves and then lock them up rather than lock them up prior to exploration because none of us know how long it will take for us to find oil in this area or any other area. Not only should I say if we start tomorrow because we have started, we have been working in the area for some time and I believe it was mentioned in one of the hearings at the southern part of the State that a well will be commenced or has been in the very last few days.

Senator Moss. Mr. Williams, are you then in favor of the secondary use provisions of the bill permitting the continued exploration and production of petroleum?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We definitely are, sir. We feel that these new techniques which permitted the discovery of these two wells in the last 6 months, make it possible for companies to go back into the proposed park area and possibly find oil very close to where dry holes have been previously drilled.

We would like to mention that we are accustomed, in the oil industry, to working under the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. All of the leases that we get are issued pursuant to his discretion. This is an established concept and it is one that has been worked out on a day-to-day relationship with the Bureau of Land Management.

We should like to mention that the concept of primary and secondary uses in national parks is a new concept, one that doesn't have this day-to-day relationship background and one which we feel perhaps should be spelled out a little better than it is in the bill.

We would like to bring to your attention that within the bill under section 5(a) and (b), there seems to us to be a slight ambiguity. Section (a) indicates that other uses of the land are possible under general regulations the Secretary may prescribe. In subsection (b) would indicate, it seems to me definitely that leases will be permitted to continue and be validated if possible but it is not specific, as I see it, as to future leases, the issuance of such.

We would like to suggest some specific language to insert into the bill——

Senator METCALF. Will you pardon me, Mr. Williams, but your statement is not directed to the committee print, is it? It is directed to a former——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should have mentioned that the print I directed to is the only one that I have had available is the most recent, that is the amendment of February 7, 1962.

Senator Moss. No, there is a committee print that is later but——

Senator METCALF. So that section 5(a) has now been numbered as section 4(a) and so your suggestion to the amendment would be directed to section 4(a) rather than 5(a).

Senator Moss. But other than that the language is the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir, we would like to make certain that what we are discussing is in the record.

Senator METCALF. We can interpolate, just so we understand that you were talking about the former bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, the one printed February 7, 1962.

In Moab, the Utah Association of Petroleum Landmen gave a number of statistics and listed in No. 2 of their presentation several recommendations. We endorsed these recommendations, and, while those are general in effect, we would like to make this specific suggestion for an amendment.

To include an additional provision which will be inserted after the word "which," on line 5, page 1, and will read as follows—this again refers to the print of February 7, 1962.

Senator METCALF. It is the same as on the amended bill, so go ahead.

Mr. WILLIAMS [reading]:

subject to the multiple mineral development under the existing mineral leasing and mining laws, and further subject to other valid existing rights, shall comprise the following generally described lands:

It is the feeling of the legal committee of our association that this would be a little more clear and specific.

We also wish to suggest a recommendation, an amendment to section 5(a) on page 5 of the February 7 print.

Senator METCALF. That would be section 4(a) of the committee print.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unfortunately I am not sure then of the line but if we refer back to the other print, we would like to say——

Senator METCALF. The legislative counsel and our counsel for the committee will be able to put this in its proper place.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Fine. Referring again to the February 7 print, it would be amended to read in part as follows, commencing on line 15 after the word "minerals":

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe general regulations for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area which regulations do not otherwise substantially impair the rights of locators, entrymen, and patentees under the mining laws and the rights of applicants, offerors, permittees, and lessees under the mineral leasing laws—

and striking the present language after the word "minerals" on line 15 and all of line 16 and 17 and on line 18 to the word "the".

Senator MOSS. Doesn't that turn it around though and make the mineral leasing the primary use and the scenic, scientific, and recreational values the secondary use?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was not our intention that this should be so, sir.

Senator MOSS. Well, if I followed it, you said that the language would be that the Secretary would prescribe general regulations for control as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area provided these do not impinge upon the rights of permittees and lessees—well, I haven't all the words but it seems to me you take it right away from him saying he can't make any regulations that are going to impinge on these fellows, and I think it has to be the other way. He must make a regulation to preserve the scenic value of the area and as long as that is done, then these other things are permissible—production and exploration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is our opinion that under this new concept, if you gentlemen in Congress do not specifically indicate that the rights of the various people we have named here, locators, permittees, lessees, and so forth, could not be substantially impaired, that chances are

82324—62—pt. 2——17

that they may be, sir. You have the National Park Service was not used to this concept. They are going to implement this concept insofar as you spell it out very specifically, and we would like to see it done specifically rather than generally.

We understand that the Secretary could say to a person or a company getting ready to drill a well that you cannot drill right here because you will impair the scenic value of this particular place. We suggest you move your rig whatever degree of distance might be necessary because in the oil business we have proven now that we can have slant drilling from quite some distance away and while this may increase our expenses, the industry is certainly willing to go along with it in order to achieve the desire of a park.

Senator Moss. Well, the thing I was concerned about is whether your language so restricted the rights of the Secretary in his regulations that actually he couldn't do what you say. He couldn't say, under a general regulation, there shall be no drilling in certain specified areas, because in so doing he has impaired, as it were, the right of the lessee who holds the lease on there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That wasn't our intention to go that far, sir. We want to make sure that that lessee has the right to drill, but not necessarily in any given spot his geologist might pick.

Senator METCALF. I think Mr. Williams has made his point; and we will refer this language to our legislative counsel; and I think you have made it clear what you are seeking to accomplish.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We wanted to mention that the production in the State of Utah in 1959 was 40 million barrels of oil and 2 years later in 1961 it has decreased to 33,070,000 and we would like to make sure that we do have primary and secondary uses in this proposed park in order to make certain that we are able to keep this State—production in this State on an increasing level rather than on a decreasing level. We very much appreciate the opportunity to appear here.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Williams, we appreciate the testimony that you have presented here on behalf of the petroleum industries and it is going to be very helpful in our consideration of this legislation.

Any questions? [No response.]

(The prepared statement of Mr. J. R. Williams is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF J. R. WILLIAMS, VICE PRESIDENT, ROCKY MOUNTAIN OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION

It is the position of Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association that the area for the proposed Canyonlands National Park can best serve the people of Utah if it is encompassed in a full multiple-use program. This concept, if adhered to, will allow full enjoyment of the scenic features of the park while allowing the development of mineral contents; the continuation of grazing and controlled hunting.

Multiple use has been known to the people of this land since the earliest oil wells were brought into production. Today we find oil and gas being produced in areas where forests, grazing, wildlife, and marine life go unmolested. Producers of petroleum have gone to great lengths to assure the welfare of other natural resources in given oilfields.

Many examples of successful multiple use are a matter of record and a matter of pride to the oil producer. Fish and game officials report the moose herd on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska has actually doubled since 1946 and has no apparent objection to the oil production being carried out. The California Department of Fish and Game not only gave offshore drillers a clean bill of health but said they had "served to enhance the habitat" of marine life over the 2½ years their operation was studied.

In Midwest States it is common to view great fleets of grain harvesters at work alongside wells drawing oil and gas from the earth. Grass and timber areas often hide the presence of oil wealth, as the modest well structures and the pipelines taking the petroleum to market are soon hidden by new growth where the landscape has been disturbed. Throughout our Nation there are many examples of herds and flocks grazing literally within the shadows of oil derricks and aboveground structures of producing wells.

To exhibit the determination and desire of the petroleum industry to respect the lands they explore, we offer copies of permits which the Bureau of Land Management has suggested be used to engage in activities on the land and explore for oil and gas with geophysical instruments. We ask you to note the conditions on the reverse side of the agreement which pledge the permittee to abide by many courtesies and respects for the land involved. Our association is but one of many which has an active ethics committee anxious to insure full compliance with such agreements. Our industry is already cooperating with other agencies of the Federal Government; the Forest Service and Indian agencies, for example, in securing seismic permits.

Having reviewed incidents of multiple use as it relates to our industry, we should now like to explain our views on multiple use for the proposed park.

We cannot accept the theory that any given number of dry holes in an area determines the absence of oil or gas. Almost 200 dry holes were drilled in the Aneth area before it was established as Utah's major oil pool. It should be noted that the area of the proposed park remains under lease for oil and gas and holders of these leases have seen fit to spend thousands of dollars on access roads, seismic work, and drilling despite the failures of the past.

Parties with a financial investment in the park area are apparently not discouraged at the lack of production in the wells drilled to date. Oil men view each dry hole as an aid in gathering accurate information for their next venture in the same area, as long as formations are known to be present which are productive in other areas.

I mentioned earlier that I would explain the diagram on the board, copies of which have been given to the members of the committee. This is a diagram of the gross geologic time units or periods with the various formations or groups represented within each time unit which underlay the proposed park area. The three major geologic time units or periods are the Pennsylvanian, Mississippian, and Devonian.

The Devonian is the oldest in time of the three periods and therefore is deeper. Only a few wells in the general area have been drilled to this depth. The Devonian is presently producing in the McCracken sand in the Lisbon field, located in San Juan County, Utah, near the Colorado border.

In the Mississippian period the Ouray and Leadville formations underlay the proposed park area. The Ouray is presently producing at Lisbon and the Leadville is presently producing in both the Lisbon and Big Flat fields. The Big Flat unit lies immediately north of the proposed park area.

Within the Pennsylvanian period we have the Paradox and Salt formations. Several horizons or zones of the Paradox are now producing at the Aneth pool in the Four Corners area of San Juan County, Utah. Within the Salt formation the Can Creek marker or zone has only recently been found productive in two separate wells by two different companies approximately 10 miles apart. One of these wells, the Southern Natural Gas No. 1 U.S.A., is on the land originally included in the proposed park area, but which now has been excluded and is adjacent to the northeast corner of the present outline of the proposed park. The second well, Pure Oil Co.'s No. 5 Big Flat, is approximately 8 miles north of the proposed park outline. These wells were drilled by new technological developments and achieved discoveries near previously drilled failures. This development gives the oil industry new hope that other discoveries may be found in this same general area—including lands within the proposed park outline not only in the Salt formation but in the other formations and periods previously enumerated.

This would seem to be good evidence that the concept of multiple use should be viborously defended in the proposed bill in order that the people of Utah could have both the benefits of tourists and of increased oil production.

Operators in the oil industry appreciate the fact that much of their activity is currently carried on at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. Many of these activities are carried out daily in well-established relationships, gained through years of activity and cooperation.

The oilman also appreciates the fact this bill offers a continuation of his leases in lands to be encompassed by the proposed park, together with an opportunity to continue exploration activities at the discretion of the Secretary. This, however, is a new concept, a new procedure and does not enjoy the established background and understanding of an activity such as leasing.

For this reason we deem it absolutely essential to have the multiple-use principle spelled out in the bill creating a park. It is not unrealistic to suggest that present oilfield operators, the current Secretary and any given park director may be succeeded by a new personnel before development of an oil deposit can be completed. With such a possibility the only means of preserving the investment of the exploration firm and of avoiding possible misunderstanding among the parties involved is to insert specific multiple-use guarantees into the bill.

We endorse the "Recommendations of the Utah Association of Petroleum Landmen," listed as No. II in their presentation, as they appeared before this committee to comment on the proposed park.

While these recommendations are general in suggesting that the right to develop the minerals under the mineral leasing acts be specifically protected, we would like to suggest that S. 2387 be amended as follows:

Include an additional provision which will be inserted after the word "which," on line 5, page 1, and will read as follows: "subject to the multiple mineral development under the existing mineral leasing and mining laws, and further subject to other valid existing rights, shall comprise the following generally described lands:" and strike the present language after the word "which" on line 5 and all of line 6.

Section 5A, page 5, would be amended to read in part as follows commencing on line 15 after the word "minerals": "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe general regulations for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area, which regulations do not otherwise substantially impair the rights of locators, entrymen, and patentees under the mining laws and the rights of the applicants, offerors, permittees and lessees under the mineral leasing laws", and striking the present language after the word "minerals" on line 15 and all of lines 16 and 17 and on line 18 to the word "The."

It is the opinion of the members of this association that these additional provisos would in effect specifically insure further multiple mineral development of the lands and further insure the present and future holders of mineral leases the right to devlop the minerals granted thereunder without fear of confiscatory or prohibitory regulations by the Secretary.

The adoption of these or other specific guarantees of multiple-use privileges within the park will also guard against possible punitive action by any future Secretary of the Interior or Park Director who might prove unsympathetic toward the concept of multiple use as expounded by the sponsors of this measure. We believe the sponsors of this legislation have the backing and support of the people of Utah when they seek full multiple-use provisions for the park.

Utah has found much of its past wealth in minerals and it is not unlikely that the wealth of the future will also come in large measure from such natural resources. The discovery of an oil pool or gas field in the Canyonlands National Park would prove to be a major source of revenue to the counties involved and to the State as a whole.

Should the concept of multiple use fail to be properly spelled out in the creation of the Canyonlands National Park, it might well result in a lockup of the vast, unexplored region through future action by a Secretary of Interior or Park Director.

Utah produced almost 40 million barrels of oil in 1959, but produced only 33,072,000 in 1961. If this State is to maintain her position in the ranks of oil-producing States, she can ill afford to have large sections of potential production lands withdrawn from exploration activities.

We visualize no greater future for the proposed Canyonlands National Park than to have hundreds of thousands of tourists enjoying the scenic splendors of the surface while modern equipment draws from the wealth of minerals which may lie below the surface.

We believe these activities to be perfectly compatible. We pledge our efforts to the end that all exploration and development activities carried on by the petroleum industry will be accomplished with complete respect for the wondrous scenic values of the park and with full consideration for the value of other resources.

We very much appreciate the committee affording to us the opportunity to appear at this hearing.

(The exhibit accompanying the prepared statement is as follows:)

OPERATIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR GEOPHYSICAL EXPLORATION

1. Before the permittee begins any seismic operations on lands owned by the United States the surface of which is leased by the owner, he shall advise the District Manager, Bureau of Land Management, in which the lands are situate and furnish said manager a statement (or plat) showing in general the course and plan permittee intends to follow in exploring lands described above.

2. All shot and core holes shall be substantially and safely plugged and the surface of the land restored to its original condition as near as practicable.

3. All shotholes shall be capped at all times when not in use.

4. All paper, cans, wire, dynamite boxes, and other refuse shall be removed.

5. All gates shall be left open or closed, as found.

6. All operations shall be conducted in a fair and reasonable manner, and all necessary precautions shall be taken to avoid any damage, other than normal wear and tear, to gates, bridges, roads, culverts, cattle guards, fences, dams, dikes, or other stock-watering facilities. All damage in excess of ordinary wear and tear to the above-named facilities shall be reported to the owner within 24 hours and shall be repaired immediately as nearly as possible to the condition existing prior to such operation. Any public hazard, such as a damaged bridge or culvert, caused by operations of permittee, shall be marked or barricaded and proper steps taken for the repair thereof.

7. Water shall not be taken in any amount except by specific permission of the owner and shall be taken only from wells or tanks designated by the owner.

8. Under no conditions will it be permissible to drive a vehicle of any type over any net wire fence.

9. No powder charge shall be exploded within one-eighth mile of any water well, spring, reservoir, dam, or dwelling, except by special permission of the owner.

10. Speed of all vehicles shall be held down to a reasonable rate, and extra precautions taken when in the vicinity of livestock.

11. Bulldozers shall not be used without special permission from owner. Bulldozing which would cause gullying or create a bog must be avoided at all times.

12. When important alterations have to be made to the land surface (i.e., filling in of a drainage ditch), the owner shall be first notified and the land shall be returned as nearly as possible to its original condition by the permittee immediately upon the completion of the need of such alteration.

13. No member of the crew will be permitted to carry firearms, nor will they be permitted to fish on the premises covered by this permit during the field operations.

PERMIT FOR EXPLORATION FOR OIL AND GAS WITH GEOPHYSICAL INSTRUMENTS

_____ of _____, hereinafter referred to as Owner, who owns or leases the surface rights of, the below designated interest in the following described lands: and _____ of _____, hereinafter referred to as Permittee, who desires to explore the above described land for the purpose of locating favorable drilling sites for oil and gas or other minerals, in consideration of one dollar ($1.00) and other valuable consideration paid by the Permittee, hereby agree as follows:

1. Owner hereby gives permission to Permittee to explore with magnetometer, torsion balance, seismograph and/or other geophysical instruments or core drills on the above described lands. The permission granted shall, unless extended by Owner, expire upon _____.

2. Attached hereto is a statement (or plat) showing in general the course and plan Permittee intends to follow in exploring the above described lands. Permittee shall advise Owner of any substantial deviation from said course of plan before making such change.

3. Upon request, the Owner shall be entitled to the location of each shot hole, core hole, the total depth of each hole drilled, the water sands encountered and estimate of the amount of water, if any, in each hole drilled on Owner's owned or leased lands.

4. Permittee shall be responsible to Owner for all damages done to houses, fences, gates, livestock, tanks and other improvements, and pasturage or crops of Owner on the above described land and shall pay Owner for all such damage within thirty (30) days after the completion of work hereunder. In the event that all or any part of the above described lands or the surface of such lands are leased by Owner from the State of _____ or the United States of America, as above indicated, Permittee agrees to indemnify and hold Owner harmless against any claims by the State or the Federal Government, as the case may be, arising out of operations conducted on such lands by Permittee.

5. Permittee agrees to abide by the operational instructions set forth upon the foregoing exhibit entitled "Operational Instructions for Geophysical Explorations."

6. In the case of failure of Permittee to abide by the terms of this permit or said operational instructions, Owner shall have the right to withdraw the privileges granted under this permit.

Dated at _____ this _____ day of _____, 19____.

_____
Owner

_____
Permittee

Senator METCALF. Again we have about 4 minutes per witness and we have some 30 witnesses left. I urge you to be short and summarize.

The next witness is Mr. Stewart Campbell and he will be followed by Mr. R. S. McKnight.

Mr. Campbell?

(No response.)

Senator METCALF. Mr. McKnight. Mr. McKnight will be followed by Professor Nelson.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD S. McKNIGHT, VICE PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Mr. MCKNIGHT. I am Richard S. McKnight, vice president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America. I am afraid I can't answer how many or tell you how many members there are in the IPAA, however, it is several thousand.

I had planned on giving this——

Senator METCALF. You may read this entire statement.

Mr. MCKNIGHT. As representative for the Independent Petroleum Association of America, I wish to express our desire to cooperate in the forming of a Canyonlands National Park. We firmly believe that the oil industry can operate under multiple use within the boundaries of such a park without affecting its scenic value. This is not just a hopeful conclusion, but based on the fact that since the first oil well was drilled, oilmen have been drilling wells successfully on lands that were being used for other purposes. The independent as well as the major oil companies have worked in harmony with the farmer, rancher, National Forest Service, private estates, and city and county municipalities, to name a few. It is for this reason that we feel we are qualified to operate under multiple use.

We consider the Canyonlands National Park area to have great oil and gas potential and it is very possible that one or more fields exist within its boundaries. This statement becomes more realistic when

you consider the fact that a major portion of Utah's production comes from formations underlying the park area. The United States can ill afford to give up this possibility, as well as approximately $150,000 a year they are receiving from oil and gas lease rentals.

In reviewing the bill, there is some question in our minds as to whether or not future oil and gas leases will be issued and if so, how marketable they will be. It is of little value to have a lease within the park if that lease is so burdened with special provisions as to make it impossible to develop. The bill, as it now stands, gives little assurance to the lessee that this will not be so. It is our opinion that it would, indeed, bar the independent oil operator from drilling in the park.

Therefore, it is the recommendation of the Independent Petroleum Association of America that any Canyonlands National Park bill provide for the issuance of oil and gas leases with full multiple-use status after its enactment date.

Mr. METCALF. Professor Nelson. He will be followed by Mr. George Frost.

STATEMENT OF CLARON E. NELSON, PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Mr. NELSON. Gentlemen, my name is Claron E. Nelson. I am appearing as a professional economist trained at the University of Utah and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

My particular interest in terms of training and work are in the areas of regional economics and statistics. This is what I teach at the university. I am also engaged actively in research work pertaining to this area of regional economics which includes resources.

In the interest of time I should like to briefly summarize some of my points, Mr. Chairman, if I have your permission and submit the longer statement for the record.

Senator METCALF. It will be received for the record.

Mr. NELSON. All right, thank you. More should be said about what can be done in terms of the development of the Canyonlands area. To me this disposes of a lot of wishful thinking and we can develop a lot better perspective as a result of objectives feasibility analysis as opposed to a lot of this what should be done or what we like. The desirable national park features are obstacles to other types of developments, mineral development, and so on.

I should also like to call attention to the difference between an occurrence and a resource. A resource is a relative concept both physically in either the present or modified form and economically capable of satisfying a want. It must physically and economically be capable of satisfying a want, some desire or some function as needed by man. It changes over time in terms of—it changes in taste or technology.

The location influence is also an important factor in determining what is a resource and what is a mineral occurrence. An alternative site for example may be much better than a site in a relatively inaccessible area.

There are, as I see it, four essential elements to the development of resource, I should say resource-based economic development. One, a commodity must exist. Two, there must be a demand for the com-

modity and by commodity I mean a mineral, and aesthetic resource, grazing or so on. Three, it must be economically accessible; and four, the expected return must cover development costs plus risks.

Now I would like to say just something about expected return. A businessman would not think of paying more than, say, $50 for the opportunity of making $100 if he has only a 50–50 chance of making the $100. He would not be willing to pay more than $1 if the odds were one in a hundred, and so on. The probable anticipated return for the development of a resource must more than cover the costs of exploration. Now we can compute expected success and expected return. I am using the term "expected" in the statistical sense, in other words, what we anticipate.

Just as a businessman can say if the odds are 50–50 in favor of a certain development, then it is worth one-half.

I have gone ahead and I am not going to take the time in this brief summary to detail how it has been developed. I am perfectly willing to defend my statistics. I have checked them out with experts in the field of geology, in the field of taxation, but the expected gross return from drilling a new field wildcat in a promising Utah site, based upon the Aneth recovery rate, is about $164,000; about $255,000 based upon what a U.S. Geological Survey geologist told me was a reasonable 45-percent recovery rate. The Utah average cost of drilling, based upon a statement given to me by the head of one of the operating companies, for wells in the 7,000- to 10,000-foot depth category, which is the necessary depth for this Canyonlands area, is around $200,000.

Now based upon an Aneth recovery rate this does not look very good. Based upon a reasonable rate, quotation marks around reasonable, this looks a little bit better.

Now going on one more step. Considering the cost of drilling and the taxes, taxes in addition, the depletion allowance, it appears to me that based upon the Utah experience and all of these facts that I can support, that there is about $23,560 as I have estimated here, based upon a ratio of successful wells to unsuccessful wells in Utah or about 48,000 based upon the U.S. success ratio. Now this is a cost cushion in a sense when you are talking about an area where there are difficulties with respect to hauling water, difficulties with respect to getting labor, relatively economically inaccessible, and so on.

The benefits to Utah—and I would like to read this one paragrah so that I will get through it effectively and as exactly as I mean, on page 8:

> As to the economic value of a potential oil field to the people of Utah I merely want to cite the total expected benefits figure of $4,400,000 reported in the Bureau of Economic and Business Research report. This represents the "bird in the bush" value of a potential oil field the size of Aneth in the proposed park area. In other words $4.5 million is what a rational businessman would pay for the rights to the hoped-for oil field.

Now I consider the data used in this reasonably high. I developed the initial thing. I should have said for the record—excuse me, one digression—that I am not representing the Bureau of Economic and Business Research although it is listed in the schedule that I do. I am a member of the department of economics. I am sorry, I overlooked saying that earlier and I don't want Dr. Harline or the Bureau held responsible for this since he did not even see this until this morning. But I submitted the earlier figures and John

Evans of the Bureau staff took them on to a little more detail but I said I considered the data used reasonably high, however, even multiplying the results by a factor of 4 only exceeds the National Park Service planned development expenditures for access roads, campgrounds, and so forth, in the proposed park by $600,000, multiplying the 4.5 by a factor of 4.

With respect to other minerals in the area, we have made a comprehensive analysis or inspection of the investigation of what is available there. Only 54 claims to date are still active. I believe Senator Moss cited this in an earlier speech in Congress and on the floor of the Senate. This to me is an indication of lack of interest on the part of these people in developing the area.

To cut off with respect to the other minerals, there are lots of problems in terms of hauling charges. They can become very significant. I have talked with companies engaged in hauling, they run to $2, $3, $4 per ton in Utah. Ore prices run from maybe $7 to $30 per ton and I can detail these out out if desired.

Ohio Copper, operating in the Big Indian District of San Juan County, has had to close down because of problems in terms of development. Potash could have significant potential were it not for alternative sites. Again back to the factor of economic accessibility and alternatives that are quite obvious—have quite obvious advantages with respect to depth and thickness.

New exotic materials are an unknown factor. I have called attention to those in there and I would briefly like to read my statement of conclusions on page 10.

An economic evaluation of the overall expected benefits accruing from alternative resource developments in the Utah canyon country clearly indicates that the economically rational course dictates park development. The marginal or "bird in the bush" aspect of the other economic activities of mining, grazing, and so forth, should relegate them to a position of secondary weight in planning and implementation. Also, considering the irreversibility of esthetic resources once they are damaged, provision should be made now to at least protect for future development all worthwhile features not only in, but also contiguous to the proposed park including, for example, the Panorama Point area.

There are obvious areas of conflict in the use of the same land for different types of economic use. Certainly an oil rig, a mine dump, or a sign indicating the location of a company operation are not congruous with a picturesque view of Angel Arch, for example. Also, there is some question about the compatibility of tourist scenic drives and large ore trucks, particularly where the road appears dangerous to the driver not used to the rugged country. On the other hand, in some selected places exploration and development activities may actually add interest for some visitors. In other sections the vast panoramas would effectively swallow up properly regulated activities.

As a regional economist, I am particularly interested in as much economic development as may compatibly be undertaken. However the first and foremost consideration must be the protection and development of the nonrenewable unique and economically valuable aesthetic resources of the area. Let me emphasize, when conflict occurs, the

economic "expectations" associated with mineral and grazing activities warrant only secondary consideration. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Any questions?

(No response.)

Senator METCALF. Thank you for a very helpful statement.

(The prepared statement of Claron E. Nelson is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF CLARON E. NELSON, PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

A great deal has been said and is still being said about what should be done in developing the Canyonlands area near the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers. It appears to me that the question of what can be done deserves at least equal billing. The "can" approach immediately disposes of considerable wishful thinking. Also, some facets are brought into better perspective by an objective examination of the feasibility of specific developments. In this relatively brief statement, I shall raise some of the questions that appear to have significant bearing on any decision relative to the Canyonlands development.

The same features that make this canyon area attractive as a potential national park serve as obstacles for other types of development. Historically, the negligible amount of activity in most sectors of the area and none in other segments substantiates this observation. A general feasibility analysis of the role, present and potential, of this canyon country requires that one investigate the question of specifically how do the extremes in local relief, the wilderness character, the distance from existing centers of population, etc., affect economic development.

First, it is essential that a distinction be made between an "occurrence" of a mineral, or a unique feature with esthetic value or grazing land, etc., and what may be economically classified as a resource. A "resource" is a relative concept which is properly assigned to something which, in its present or modified form, is both physically and economically capable of satisfying some "want" (gives pleasure, performs a useful function, etc.). Since man's needs or desires are altered by changes in taste and technology, the commodities classified as resource will also change.

Location of a nonunique mineral, for example, will also have tremendous influence upon what is really a resource (ore) as opposed to simply a mineral deposit. Given two or more development sites, each with equal endowment as to size and value of the mineral deposit, the one in relatively close juxtaposition to population will be developed if the market warrants it, while the more remote deposits will likely never be used or at least not until the commodity at the relatively accessible location has been exhausted.

Therefore, there are several essential elements that must be present before resource-based economic development will take place. These include: (1) a "commodity": whether mineral, recreational, or grazing land must exist; (2) there must be a demand for the "commodity"; (3) the "commodity" must be economically accessible (including adequate size of deposit grade or value sufficiently high, technology available, etc., to justify development); and finally (4) the "expected return" must cover development costs-plus risks including those associated with exploration activities if the deposit must be located.

GRAZING DEVELOPMENT

Certainly a land-ground cover resource for grazing does exist in parts of the proposed park area. However, the "resource area" varies from year to year because of the lack of water and the necessity of relying upon precipitation and the "pot hole" water trapped on the slick rock. Some of the areas are used regularly, and other such as the Maze are definitely not resource areas. While historical use has been relatively minor,[1] future use without any modification of grazing rights, appears likely to be of even less importance for sheep in particular. Television and other "comforts" of a technically advanced society are dissuading potential sheepherders so, as I understand it, there is the necessity of either increasing pay beyond economic limits or of fencing so that the sheep-

[1] See R. R. Edminster and O. L. Harline, "An Economic Study of the Proposed Canyonlands National Park and Related Recreation Resources," Bureau of Economic and Business Research, College of Business, University of Utah, 1962, pp. 124–128.

herder will not be needed. Considering the sparse vegetation and hence low range carrying capacity, by no stretch of the imagination could the return from grazing in the area justify a fencing operation of the magnitude necessary. Thus, the demand for this grazing land commodity may largely disappear because of technological obsolescence in many parts of the area.

MINERAL DEVELOPMENT

Before actual development of a mineral deposit will be undertaken, it must be ascertained that both capital expenditures (purchase price, preliminary development, cost of plant and equipment) and operating cost (development, stoping, transportation, treatment, administration at mine maintenance, city office expense) plus usually a "margin of safety" will be covered by the expected return. This in turn means that the four elements previously mentioned must be satisfied.

Note particularly that as part of the risk consideration, a rational businessman (as distinguished from a gambler) will never pay more for a potential "opportunity" than he "expected" to receive as return on his investment. Thus, if there were a 50–50 chance of making $100, he would not pay more than $50 for the opportunity; if there were 0.01 (1 chance in 100) of making $100, he would pay a maximum of $1 for the opportunity; and so on. A rational company, therefore, gives up money, which they have (certain), for exploration only when there is a probable anticipated return ("excepted return") that more than covers the costs of exploration. This "expected return" is computed by jointly considering the return if successful and the probability or risk or being successful.

To date, oil has proven to be the most promising of the mineral potentials in the area since there is one producing well inside the proposed park near the northern boundary. Also, there are a large number of favorable geologic structures which could contain oil and gas. One basic question appears to be, however: Will the area be explored and can it be done economically? "Expected" success and "expected" return from this type of wildcat exploration (drilling in an unproven area) can be computed. Unfortunately, there is not enough available data to calculate this for Utah alone. However, the accompanying tabular presentations detail these "expectations" using a combination of the U.S. and specific Utah experience.

"Expected" ultimate reserve discovered by successful new field wildcats, United States, 1954, 1956, 1960 combined [1]

Ultimate field reserves (barrels)	Number of successful wells (total=1934)	Proportion successful	Average reserve size per group (barrels)	"Expected" reserve (barrels)
50,000,000 or more	2	0.00103	1,000,000,000	1,030,000
25 to 50,000,000	5	.00258	37,500,000	96,750
10 to 25,000,000	38	.01965	17,500,000	343,875
1 to 10,000,000	213	.11013	5,500,000	605,715
Less than 1,000,000	1,350	.69803	500,000	349,015
Abandoned	326	.16856		
Total "expected" ultimate reserves per discovery well				2,425,355

[1] Source of data: "Petroleum Facts and Figures," 1961 ed. (New York: American Petroleum Institute, 1961), pp. 12–17. "A symposium of the Oil and Gas Fields of Utah" (Salt Lake City: Intermountain Association of Petroleum Geologists, 1961).

"Expected" reserves per successful wildcat (barrels) 2,425,355
Producers per new field wildcat drilled in Utah, 1960 ..... 6 out of 70
"Expected" ultimate reserves per new field wildcat drilled in Utah (barrels) 207,887

Recoverable reserves:
Aneth experience (29 percent): 207,887×0.29=60,287 barrels.
"Reasonable average" (45 percent): 207,887×0.45=93,549 barrels.

"Expected" gross return from drilling new field wildcat (promising Utah site): 60,287×$2.73=$164,583; 93,549×$2.73=$255,389 ($2.73 represents weighted average wellhead price in Utah).

The "expected" gross return from drilling at a promising Utah site, which has not been adequately explored, appears to range from about 170,000 to $260,000

per well. In other words, the average return from a number of wildcat wells is likely to be approximately $170,000 to $260,000 per well. A large operating oil company in Utah has suggested that a Utah wildcat costs on the average about $200,000 when the depth is between 7,000 to 10,000 feet, which is consistent with the requirements in the canyon area. Overall, one has to accept the "expected" return and cost values, based upon actual experience as the best indication of future experience. However, there are a number of factors for specific operators and specific areas that may alter these return-cost relationships. For example, a large integrated oil company using extensive geophysical investigation may be able to reduce the ratio between wildcats drilled to successful wildcats from the 11.67 to 1 of the Utah experience to possibly 8.83 to 1, the U.S. average for 1960, or there may be some reason for anticipating a higher "expected" return in a particular area.

On the other hand, difficult drilling or deeper drilling than anticipated can significantly increase actual costs over "expected" costs. Starting at about 5,000 feet, the U.S. average cost of drilling an additional 100 feet increased from $1,600 to about $4,000 by the time a 10,000-foot depth was reached. The rugged character of the proposed park area, the necessity of hauling large quantities of water relatively long distances for most potential drilling sites, the distance (particularly as measured by time) from existing population centers, the high cost of road construction because of cliffs and drainage problems, and so on could certainly result in much higher than average "expected" drilling costs. The accompanying summary of "expected" net new field income for the large, prosperous company that can fully utilize the benefits of the depletion allowance show only an "expected" profit (cost cushion) of $23,560 per well based upon the Utah experience, or $48,111 based upon the U.S. pattern of success.

"Expected" profit from oil exploration activities including tax considerations

"Expected" field income:		
Gross income from the property, 2,425,335 barrels times 0.45 recovery times $2.73 per barrel sale		$2, 979, 549
Less depletion allowance (27.5 percent), adjusted field income for tax purposes		819, 376
Total		2, 160, 173
Less "expected" field development costs:		
Wildcat drilling, Utah 1960 experience, 11.67 wells, at $200,000 each	$2, 334, 000	
Field development wells, minimum of 5 wells, at $143,000 each (U.S. average for depth)	715, 000	
		3, 049, 000
Taxable income		888, 827
Taxable income		—888, 827
Corporate income tax (52 percent), credit to other income		+462, 190
"Expected" field income after taxes		—426, 637
Depletion allowance, nontaxable income		819, 376
"Expected" net field income		392, 739
"Expected" net profit per well drilled, 16.67 wells		23, 560
"Expected" field income (adjusted for depletion)		2, 160, 173
Less "expected" field development costs:		
Wildcat drilling, U.S. 1960 experience, 8.83 wells, at $200,000 each	$1, 766, 000	
Field development wells	715, 000	
		2, 481, 000
Taxable income		—320, 827
Corporate income tax (52 percent)		166, 830
"Expected" field income after taxes		—153, 997
Depletion allowance, nontaxable income		819, 376
"Expected" net field income		665, 379
"Expected" net profit per well drilled, 13.83 wells		48, 111

These "expectations" seem generous since they were computed using a 1-billion-barrel ultimate reserve as the average for the two wells discovering a field of "50 million barrels or more" as reported by the American Petroleum Institute. Also, they assume 45-percent recovery although Aneth total recovery is expected to be about 29 percent. It appears that for the rational businessman wildcatting in the Canyonlands area is likely to be quite marginal.

As to the economic value of a potential oilfield to the people of Utah I merely want to cite the total "expected" benefits figure of $4,400,000 reported in the Bureau of Economic and Business Research report.[3] This represents the "bird in the bush" value of a potential oilfield the size of Aneth in the proposed park area. In other words, $4.5 million is what a rational businessman would pay for the rights to the hoped-for oilfield. I consider the data used reasonably high, however even multiplying the results by a factor of four only exceeds the National Park Service planned development expenditures for access roads, campgrounds, etc., in the proposed park by $600,000.

Known minerals, excluding hydrocarbons, of potential resource value in the area are almost negligible. Interest seems to point up the difficulties of development in this area. In checking all San Juan County mining claims either located or for which assessment work was done during 1960 and/or 1961, only 0.5 percent (54 claims) of those identifiable by specific location (10,770 claims) are in a "park" or continguous township.

Regardless of mineral, development in most sections of the area will be seriously hampered by a number of factors. Few, if any, places in the area appear to possess the minimum requirements essential to the development of population centers without significant expenditures on the part of the developer. Also, the more remote and primitive the location, the higher the labor costs. Almost certainly only minimal extractive facilities would be feasible at the mine. Therefore, ore would have to be transported over the circuitous routes, which must be followed because of the terrain, to centers such as Moab or Monticello where a mill could be constructed. A check of the map indicates that hauling distances could easily amount to 30, 40 or 50 miles just to reach the proposed park boundary. Since a good uranium ore haul, 75–80 percent on paved road with predominant downgrade for the loaded haul, costs a minimum of 4 cents per ton-mile, the transportation charges may be $2, $3, $4 or more per ton. Road construction costs may be as high as $80,000 per mile for a good all-weather road in some sections.

As to specific mineral occurrences, uranium is one of the most prominently mentioned in the discussion of park resources that will be "locked up." Note, however, it has been impossible for new producers to sell uranium ore since November 1958. Base metal ore prices in Utah range from about $7 per ton at Bingham to approximately $30 at New Park (high cost mining operation). A mill close to a population center has had to shut down operations with ore valued at $17 to $18. Ohio Copper with a good assay at the Big Indian Mine, San Juan County, operated on a marginal basis but finally shut down because of recovery problems. The mining of low-priced Utah ores such as iron at $7 to $8 per ton, phosphatic shales at $6 to $7, and the wide variety of building materials appear pretty much out of the question in this area. Potash could have significant potential were it not for alternative sites that enjoy quite obvious advantages including depth/thickness of the formation, closeness to population centers, etc. Now "exotic" materials are an unknown factor, but even if some were located in the area the problems of development are usually significant. Beryllium, for example, in eastern Nevada and western Utah is faced with special milling problems and a very uncertain market, which the new deposits could easily flood.

CONCLUSIONS

An economic evaluation of the overall expected benefits accruing from alternative resource developments in the Utah canyon country clearly indicates that the economically rational course dictates park development. The marginal or bird-in-the-bush aspect of the other economic activities of mining, grazing, etc., should relegate them to a position of secondary weight in planning and implementation. Also, considering the irreversibility of esthetic resources once they are damaged, provision should be made now to at least protect for future development all worthwhile features not only in, but also contiguous to, the proposed park including, for example, the Panorama Point area.

[3] Op. cit., table 5.6, p. 135.

There are obvious areas of conflict in the use of the same land for different types of economic use. Certainly an oil rig, a mine dump, or a sign indicating the location of a company operation are not congruous with a picturesque view of Angel Arch, for example. Also, there is some question about the compatibility of tourist scenic drives and large ore trucks, particularly where the road appears dangerous to the driver not used to the rugged country. On the other hand, in some selected places exploration and development activities may actually add interest for some visitors.

As a regional economist, I am particularly interested in as much economic development as may compatibly be undertaken. However, the first and foremost consideration must be the protection and development of the nonrenewable unique and economically valuable esthetic resources of the area. Let me emphasize, when conflict occurs, the economic expectations associated with mineral and grazing activities warrant only secondary consideration.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Frost has filed his statement, and it will appear in the record.

(Mr. Frost's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF GEORGE T. FROST, CHAIRMAN, WEBER COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

It is the very carefully considered opinion of the commissioners of Weber County that the Moss bill to establish the Canyonlands National Park is sound and fair to all concerned, and we wholeheartedly support it and urge the Department of the Interior to establish it as presented.

We feel it would be unwise and would accrue to the disadvantage of the State of Utah and to the Nation to make it smaller. It would not take its rightful place as one of the truly great parks in the world if it were to be confined as proposed by its opponents.

As to the economic benefits that would accrue to the State of Utah, it is our opinion that the added tourist interest that the larger park would incite would be far more advantageous to the State than any minerals that might be developed in the area. Particularly is this true in light of the fact that these minerals could yet be developed if found and deemed worth while.

As for the grazing value of the area, all of us are well familiar with the fact that very few head of stock can be sustained thereon. This we feel has such little value that it hardly seems wise to even consider it.

The entire State has for many years hoped and dreamed that that area would be set aside and developed into a major attraction for all the world to see. To make it smaller than the bill prescribes would be a mistake, in our opinion. The size of this great park could well be reflected in the attitude of the people about the land who might be considering coming to see a good sized park or a series of little ones.

A perfect example of this is Yellowstone. Certainly much of the timber or meadow areas between the major points of attraction there could not be construed as being worthy of park status per se, but certainly they do lend an air of contrast and beauty separate and apart from the other points of interest that warrant their inclusion in the whole park.

We honestly feel this opinion is shared by the majority of people in the State.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Fowler will be the next witness, followed by Dr. Harline. Glad to have you appear before the committee, Mr. Fowler.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM G. FOWLER, ATTORNEY

Mr. FOWLER. I am grateful to have the opportunity to appear here today and speak upon an issue of vital State and National interest.

So often in hearings of this nature, those who offer testimony are paid lobbyists, or others representing interests which are obscured by their titles. Their failure to disclose their employers, special interests, and other matters affecting their testimony causes concern and often distrust. I wish to state that I represent no client here today; I am not a lobbyist; I represent no wildlife or conservation group; I have no mining or mineral connections; I hold no public office, nor am I seeking any.

I speak today, because I have an abiding interest in the welfare of the people in Utah and in the future of our Nation. That we may know at the beginning and avoid any speculation on this subject, I am a Democrat. I appeared earlier this morning when our State chairman, Mr. Smoot, testified; and his interest in these proceedings evoked some controversy from among the members of the panel, and I am sure mine will do the same.

All of the material statistics and facts have been presented to you as to the merits of the park proposal of Senator Moss. I can offer nothing new on that score, but I do wish to offer my evaluation of the evidence from the point of view of persons who do not seem to be too well represented.

To state my position briefly, I favor S. 2387, as drafted by Senator Moss. The bill is a carefully worded, conscientious document fully embracing an area of true and unrivaled natural beauty, and taking into account all of the various uses which properly can be permitted in a national park. Unfortunately, and perhaps even fatally to the bill, misunderstandings, disagreements, more political than sincere, have crept into these hearings. To give undue weight to the carping and captious attacks upon segments of the bill is to convey to a disinterested bystander the impression that Utah cannot agree upon the park, hence nothing should be done. To say that politics have not entered this arena is to ignore the plain facts. It is no coincidence that this magnificent area was given national prominence for the first time by Secretary of the Interior Udall, proposed by President Kennedy as a national park, and supported throughout these hearings by our Democratic Congressmen and officers of their party, while being opposed in its form by Senator Bennett, Governor Clyde, and spokesmen representing them, as well as special economic groups who look to the public domain for their own enrichment. They now endeavor to propose a potpourri of mixed legislation, which no prudent Congress could ever accept. Governor Clyde tells us that much of the area is not of park caliber; the experts disagree. Senator Bennett talks of island areas surrounded by recreation areas and connected by highways. No one expects that suggestion to get good mileage.

It is odd to me that almost all of those opposing the bill agree that if the bill were enacted it would fill all of their needs. The provisions give ample protection for grazing, mineral and oil development, and fishing and wildlife. They indulge in a rare contortion of logic to presuppose that the bill will not pass, or, indeed, should it pass, the park will be unlawfully regulated. These suppositions are at odds with history and good sense. They create a smokescreen of confusion sought by its opponents, and which have caused our two major newspapers here in Salt Lake City, both politically oriented, to seek a moritorium on the legislation. As you gentlemen are aware, the positive way to kill any legislation is to refer it back to committee for further consideration. This attitude is a disservice to the people of Utah.

Governor Clyde, in an effort to buttress his own opposition to the Canyonlands National Park, as described in the Moss bill, appointed a special committee to study the proposal of Senator Moss and make its recommendations. The result was foreordained in opposition to the Moss bill. But, who constituted the committee? Five political appointees of the Governor, and the sixth member draws his salary from

State funds. In short, all are on the State payroll and hardly inclined to disagree with their boss. The data contained in the report is highly speculative and conjectural, the economic estimates are defective, and the conclusions barely related to the actual facts.

One overriding consideration most often ignored, except for D. James Cannon, our director of the tourist and publicity counsel, and Dr. Osmond L. Harline, of the University of Utah's No. 1 industry is tourism. Yet Utah lags behind every adjacent State in average time spent here by each tourist. Another dominating factor often overlooked is that Utah is a depressed-income State, having an average income per capita ranking with the poorest Southern States. Canyonlands National Park will bring a tremendous economic windfall to Utah. It will be serviced by counties which, for the past 10 years, have been losing population and suffering hardships which no amount of grazing, mining, or oil can alleviate. You have at your disposal the economic study prepared by a truly impartial business group at the University of Utah, which justifies the park from an economic point of view.

If I speak for any group here today, I should like to be identified with the vast number of small businesses and their employees, who cannot afford the high-paid lobbyists and other special-interest groups who have and will testify today. They are the unrepresented people who will be benefited the most from this bill. The park will bring tourists, tourists will provide jobs and opportunity, tax rolls will be enhanced, and Utah will preserve for itself and the Nation an area of perpetual recreation.

Even if the multiple-use features were deleted from the bill, as Governor Clyde and Senator Bennett so greatly fear, the importance of the park, as it is presently contemplated, exceeds a hundredfold any loss to the State in terms of revenues from mining, oil development, grazing, or hunting. When Senator Bennett so ingraciously calls the bill an "unqualified disaster for schoolchildren of Utah," he has not bothered to inform himself as to the facts and is endeavoring to raise a specter of fear. When Senator Bennett proposes legislation to exchange the affected State-owned lands for the Lisbon oilfield, he indulges in fantasy. Such is not only illegal, but only generates more smoke upon the real merits of the bill. All of these special economic interest groups, which Senator Bennett has represented so faithfully, are not entitled in fairness to the weight their testimony has been accorded. The facts are these:

(*a*) Oil: There are no producing oil wells in the area of the proposed park.

(*b*) Minerals: There are no operating and commercially feasible mines in the area of the park.

(*c*) Grazing: Only a handful of sheep and cattle, along with 18 horses, enjoy grazing in this arid region, producing income under $3,000 per year to the Federal Government and under $300 to the State of Utah.

(*d*) State lands: The only other income to the State comes from oil and gas leases which produce only 50 cents per acre per year; and, these lands are all exchangeable for similar land.

Weighed against these considerations are the vast and measurable economic values which will realistically flow to our State. That each of you gentlemen has come here with your staff to hear us today gives

us faith that Congress does want to know the facts and, I hope, preserve to all of us, whatever our point of view, this splendid national park.

In conclusion I urge that every effort be made to cut through the fog of division to a solution which is manifestly fair to everyone, giving to each the just consideration which is due, but not allowing any one group to so obscure the real issues as to jeopardize this vital legislation.

I urge the enactment of the Canyonlands bill as proposed.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator METCALF. Any questions?

Senator BENNETT. Well I just want to thank you, Mr. Fowler, for tearing off the mantle of assumed nonpolitical point of view that his party is supposed to have been approaching and I am very grateful for his statement.

Mr. FOWLER. Well I would like to add, if I may, and treat your statement as a question, that there are people represented in the Democratic Party interested in this legislation as a tribute to the Party because the Democratic Party has historically represented the interests of the people and all of the people. They do not represent and special interests or economic groups and I think it behooves every political party to come forward and voice its views so that they can be measured in the light of their own proclamation.

Senator BENNETT. I think this last little bit was left over from last Saturday night's meeting [laughter] and I am glad you had an opportunity to get it in.

Mr. FOWLER. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Dr. Harline and he will be followed by Dr. Brimhall. Dr. Harline, we are looking forward to your testimony because we have the report that you helped make.

STATEMENT OF DR. OSMOND L. HARLINE, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Dr. HARLINE. Thank you. In the interest of time I think it would be better if I just summarized this statement rather than read it.

Senator METCALF. I would be pleased if you would.

Dr. HARLINE. I did assist in the preparation of this report. It was actually under the immediate direction of Prof. Robert R. Edminster who is out of the United States and therefore cannot appear.

First I would like to say that, because of the nature of the assignment, it was necessary to make estimates. There are limitations to the data which we had to use and I think this is best illustrated by the fact that a recent report, "Outdoor Recreation for America," prepared by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, emphasized this point, in at least two sections of their report issued in January, and that is that there is a notable lack of data designed to show economic impact of tourism and the benefits to be derived to an area and to an individual from recreational resources.

In spite of the fact that there are limitations to data which we used and the data which we had to develop, it seems to me that several conclusions emerged and I would like to refer to what I think are three of the most important conclusions of my report and if there are any questions I would be happy to answer them.

82324—62—pt. 2——18

Senator METCALF. You know, of course, that four members of this committee, including the chairman of the full committee and the ranking Republican member, were members also of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Dr. HARLINE. I am aware of that, yes.

I think the first conclusion that emerges is that the park will bring visitors. This visitors will spend money and the expenditures of the visitors will have a beneficial impact on the area, the surrounding areas. Now admittedly our estimates of future tourist visitors—our estimate is a judgment. In spite of that fact we tried to make that judgment very carefully. We examined just as many series as we could. We tried to take everything that we possibly could into consideration.

We believe that the estimate which we arrived at was made carefully and is a realistic one. However, I will be the first to admit that it is a judgment. Some might think that it is too high, others might think that it is too low.

In connection with this estimate of tourist visitors to the park, we made one additional step which I think is not generally understood. Many people think that if you take total visitor expenditures to an area that this is a measure of the economic impact on the area. That is if the visitors come and spend $10 million, that is a good indication of economic impact which it will have. We did not make that mistake. We did not take gross expenditure. We took net expenditures and the figure we arrived at was 27 percent of the total so it can be stated that if visitors will come and spend $10 million in the area, we assumed that the economic impact on the area, that is the total which would result in personal income, was not $10 million but was rather 27 percent of it or $2.7 million. I think that is the first point.

The second point has to do with this question of other economic values which might be derived from the resources in the area. Now much has already been said in the hearings on this point. I think perhaps the most important economic value that people have referred to is potential oil and gas in the area. You have the reports on this and I think these reports can best be evaluated by a geologist, a mining engineer, a scientist trained in geophysical and geochemical areas. I can just state that as far as the persons working on the report are concerned, some of us tended to evaluate the evidence in different fashions.

For example, some indicated that the probability value of these resources were not great. I personally, and I am speaking for myself here and not for the report, I am of the opinion that we cannot afford to minimize the value to the State of possible future mineral development. The very fact that the entire area is under oil and gas leases; the very fact that something like $2 or $3 million has been spent in exploration, would seem an indication to me that we can't afford to minimize the possibility.

The very fact that provisions for this are included in the bill would seem to me to indicate that you gentlemen also are concerned with this and have not attempted to minimize it.

Now the third conclusion, as far as the report is concerned, that I would like to refer to as stated in the report, it is something like this manner: The optimum economic benefit to local and State areas

would result from both mineral development and the park if neither one decrease the economic value to be derived from the other.

These then, I think, are the major conclusions that I would like to refer from the report. If there are any questions I would be happy to stand ready to answer them.

Senator Moss. I have no specific questions. I have read the report rather carefully and I consider it to be most helpful and provides this committee with information that we need in order to make judgment on the legislation before us and I appreciate your coming to testify personally, Dr. Harline.

Senator METCALF. Dr. Harline, I want to compliment you too and concur with Senator Moss on a very excellent report. It is going to be not only helpful in the committee's consideration of this legislation but in general help the committee in consideration of much of this resource legislation.

Dr. HARLINE. I will pass that on to our staff.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Osmond L. Harline, is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. OSMOND L. HARLINE, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Chairman Alan Bible and honorable members of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you.

I have been asked to review very briefly what I believe to be the major conclusions of a report prepared by the University of Utah at the request of the National Park Service. The report has already been made available to the subcommittee and is entitled "An Economic Study of the Proposed Canyonlands National Park and Related Recreation Resources." It was prepared under the immediate direction of Robert R. Edminster, who is a member of the faculty of the economics department of the university and who is at present out of the country on a 6-month research assignment and cannot therefore appear before you. I assisted in the preparation of the report. A number of other individuals, who are named in the preface of the report, also assisted or acted as consultants. The major purpose of the report was to determine as nearly as possible the effect which the establishment of the proposed Canyonlands National Park would have on the economy of the surrounding area.

Let me first state that such an assignment—to determine the economic impact of a recreation development—is not a simple task. There is a notable lack of primary data on the tourist industry in most of our States including Utah. At best we have only rough estimates of a number of vital statistical series such as the number of visitors to a region, reason for their presence in an area (whether for tourist purposes or for business), type of purchases, length of stay, etc. This lack of adequate information has been noted often. One of the most recent comments appears in the excellent report released in January 1962, after several years of intensive research, by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission entitled "Outdoor Recreation for America." At least two sections, one beginning on page 184, indicate the general lack of information available with which to measure the economic benefit to be derived from public recreation, both by a community or area and by an individual.

Because of this lack of existing information and because of the very considerable time and cost involved in collecting primary data, alternative methods had to be pursued in the preparation of our report. However, in spite of the limitations of the data to which we had to resort, it would appear that several major conclusions emerge from our research efforts. I would like to call attention to what I personally believe are three of the most important conclusions and discuss each briefly.

First, it seems certain that the proposed Canyonlands National Park, if established, will have great visitor appeal. Persons visiting the park will spend dollars in the area, which will have a beneficial effect on the economy of the surrounding region. Admittedly the estimate of the magnitude of the number of visitors and the amount of their expenditures is partly a matter of judgment.

In forecasting future park attendance we examined carefully as much information as we could obtain both from published sources and by discussing the subject with knowledgeable individuals.

The sources of information studied and the assumptions made are outlined in detail in the report. Briefly summarized, the more important factors which we concluded would influence park attendance included the following: Drawing power of the name, "national park"; intrinsic scenic, scientific, and recreational quality of the area to be designated a park proposed developments within the new park; existing travel patterns of tourists and other travelers in the region; number of visitors to existing parks and monuments; expected future road developments, particularly the scheduled interstate highway to the north of the park and the new road developments which would improve ease of access from the south; other new outdoor recreational developments in the area, particularly the Glen Canyon Recreation Area; past growth of visitors to national parks and monuments and expected future growth; expected increase in population of the United States, particularly the rapid increase in the number of persons living in Western United States; past growth in the demand for outdoor recreation and the forecast of sizable growth in future demand.

Of course, the most important of the factors to be considered are the assumptions that the park will be established; that the National Park Service will recommend and carry out the extensive developments as planned; and that Congress will in fact authorize the necessary money for the roads, other capital facilities, and for annual operating expenses.

We concluded, in making our estimates of future economic benefits which the park would bring to the area, that there would be fairly small numbers of visitors during the first few years while roads and other facilities were under construction. Visitors would increase substantially after the area was opened up. After about the 9th year of establishment the rate of visitor increase would level off so that attendance would continue to grow at much the same rate as other parks and monuments of the Nation.

After projecting future attendance, we estimated that visitors to the park would stay within the park or within a 100-mile radius of the park for an average of 2 days and spend an average of $7 a day.

It was in the foregoing manner that we arrived at estimated total gross expenditures in the area which visitors to the park would make.

The next step we took was very important and has, I believe, not been generally understood. Frequently gross expenditures of visitors are used as a measure of the economic impact on the local economy of visitor spending. This, of course, is incorrect; a net figure must be derived. We in our study, on the basis of our research, estimated that only 27 cents of a visitor dollar would result in personal income for individuals or business owners of the local areas. Thus, if $10 million a year were to be spent in some future year by visitors to the Canyonlands National Park, our study assumed that not $10 million but rather 27 percent of the $10 million or $2.7 million would be added to the local income stream and have an impact on the local economy. The results of our estimates are summarized in the attached table.

In summary, the estimate of the number of future visitors to the park was made after careful examination of as many relevant factors as possible; a net, not a gross expenditure figure was calculated in determining local economic impact; the net figure will in time grow to a sizable sum; the entire analysis is a judgment which was carefully made and is, we believe, a realistic one.

The second major phase of the report to which I would like to call attention had as its aim the evaluation of present and possible future economic returns from uses of the resources of the area other than for recreation. Most of the matters referred to in this section of our report have already been brought out by the testimony of others. This includes such topics as land ownership, the problem of hunting in connection with wild life management, the present extent of grazing, and, perhaps most important, present mineral production within the area and possible future mineral potential. As must already be evident to the committee, the available facts, especially on the subject of mineral potential, are capable of varying interpretations and therefore of different conclusions.

This field is the province of mining engineers, geologists, and specialists in geophysical and geochemical analysis. As an economist I do not feel that I have any particular claim to expertness in critically evaluating the evidence available. Moreover, I think it safe to say that those working on our report hold different views regarding the value of potential minerals within the park. Some have concluded that the value of the probability of mineral development

within the park area is not high. I personally am of the opinion that we cannot afford to minimize the value to the State of possible future mineral development. We need only look at the great economic benefits which have been derived from Utah's coal and iron resources, our copper deposits, and our potash, phosphate, petroleum, and uranium reserves. The committee already has available the reports and the testimony of many experts to help them evaluate future mineral potential within the park. The fact that most of the area within the proposed park is under oil and gas lease and the fact that several million dollars have been spent in oil and gas exploration indicates that some individuals think the existence of minerals and the future development of those minerals constitute a good bet.

With regard to the future development of other economic values, our report has the following to say, which I regard as the third major conclusion of the report; namely, the optimum economic benefit to local and State areas would result from both mineral development and the park—if neither one decreases the economic value to be derived from the other.

These, then, I would say are the three major conclusions of the report: First, and most important, the park, if established, will have a sizable beneficial economic impact on the region; second, there is probably mineral potential within the park area, although the future value of this potential is capable of varying interpretations; lastly, the optimum situation from an economic standpoint is to have both park and mineral development providing that one does not detract from the other.

TABLE 1.—*Number of visits, estimated expenditures of visitors to Canyonland National Park, and personal income [1] created for the 5-year construction period and the 1st 20 years of the operation period*

Year	Number of visits (thousands)	Percent increase over previous year	Estimated expenditures	Personal income [1] (thousands)		
				Created by tourist expenditures (27 percent of col. 3)	Created by MPS construction and MPS wage and salary payments	Total personal income created
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
5-year construction period:						
1st	10.0	----------	$140.0	$38.0	$354.0	$391.8
2d	20.0	100.0	280.0	76.0	301.3	376.9
3d	40.0	100.0	560.0	151.0	608.5	759.7
4th	65.0	62.5	910.0	246.0	410.5	656.2
5th	120.0	84.6	1,680.0	454.0	487.0	940.6
Total 5-year construction	840.0	----------	3,570.0	965.0	2,161.3	3,126.3
Operation period:						
6th	250.0	108.3	3,500.0	945.0	[2] 200.0	1,145.0
7th	350.0	40.0	4,900.0	1,323.0	[2] 250.0	1,573.0
8th	437.5	25.0	6,120.5	1,652.5	[2] 250.0	1,902.5
9th	503.1	15.0	7,043.8	1,901.8	[2] 250.0	2,151.8
10th	553.4	10.0	7,748.1	2,092.0	[2] 250.0	2,342.0
11th	592.2	7.0	8,290.5	2,238.7	[2] 250.0	2,488.7
12th	627.7	6.0	8,787.9	2,372.7	[2] 250.0	2,622.7
13th	659.1	5.0	9,277.3	2,491.8	[2] 250.0	2,741.8
14th	692.1	5.0	9,688.9	2,616.0	[2] 250.0	2,866.0
15th	726.7	5.0	10,173.2	2,746.8	[2] 250.0	2,996.8
16th	763.0	5.0	10,681.8	2,884.1	[2] 250.0	3,134.1
17th	801.1	5.0	11,215.9	3,028.3	[2] 250.0	3,278.3
18th	841.2	5.0	11,776.7	3,179.7	[2] 250.0	3,429.7
19th	883.3	5.0	12,365.5	3,338.7	[2] 250.0	3,588.7
20th	927.4	5.0	12,983.8	3,505.6	[2] 250.0	3,755.6
21st	973.8	5.0	13,633.0	3,680.9	[2] 250.0	3,930.9
22d	1,022.5	5.0	14,314.7	3,865.0	[2] 250.0	4,115.0
23d	1,073.6	5.0	15,030.4	4,058.2	[2] 250.0	4,308.2
24th	1,127.3	5.0	15,781.9	4,261.1	[2] 250.0	4,511.1
25th	1,183.6	5.0	16,571.0	4,474.2	[2] 250.0	4,724.2
Total, 1st 20 years of operation period	14,938.5	----------	209,834.9	56,656.1	4,950.0	61,606.1
Grand total, 1st 25 years (combined construction operation periods	15,828.6	----------	213,404.9	57,619.3	7,101.3	64,732.4

[1] Wages and salaries, rent and profit of unincorporated enterprise.
[2] Arbitrary estimate.

Source: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Utah.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Dr. Dean Brimhall. He will be followed by Mr. Cannon.

STATEMENT OF DEAN R. BRIMHALL

Dr. BRIMHALL. My name is Dean R. Brimhall. I am a retired psychologist. The last job I had was Director of the Research for the Civil Aeronautics Administration out of the Federal Aviation Agency. Since my retirement I have been entertained more by the land largely involved in the proposed park than anything else.

I am probably a little unique in the fact that all of my entertainment comes from visiting this particular area that is talked about, particularly the western section. I am going to make the time limit I think, Mr. Chairman.

Senator METCALF. Yes, you are.

Dr. BRIMHALL. I have 12 lines to read.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Moss bill for establishing of Canyonlands National Park has my commendation and approval. However, as a frequent traveler, by Jeep and by walking in the proposed western section, I strongly believe that the Orange Cliffs should be included. I do not think that this western section can be adequately administered or opened for visitors if the Orange Cliffs are not included.

It may be recalled that Secretary Udall stated in his report to you at the Washington meeting that the western section is "the wildest and least known section" of the entire proposed area for the Canyonlands National Park.

Now it looks as if first I say I commend and approve the bill and then deny it here, but I don't. I am willing to accept the bill, but I am offering this as a suggestion, and I will take about 2 minutes to show you from the map.

Senator METCALF. Yes, will you show us on the map over there.

Dr. BRIMHALL. I would like to show you here.

Senator METCALF. Can you show it on the map that is showing on the wall?

Dr. BRIMHALL. Well, this is much better. The other map doesn't show you what I want to.

You see, here is the line of your park coming down like this. [Indicates on map.] Now all in here includes such things as the Elaterite Butte, Oregon Butte over here, and Bagpipe Butte down here and in here is a vast area of pinnacles and over here is the Maze.

Now this green section down here is an elevation from 5,000 to 7,000 feet high.

Senator METCALF. Does that have a name?

Dr. BRIMHALL. It is called—down at this end it is a spur. You are only seeing one part of it. It starts way down here and runs like this, but this part is very dramatic.

Senator METCALF. That would be just west of the confluence of the river, a little north and west.

Dr. BRIMHALL. Well, no, it is about at the confluence. Here is the confluence and up here this is called the Spur running down like this for almost the full length of the proposed park. Now this is from 5,000 to 7,000 feet high. You drive out here. You can drive in a car along this. This is fairly level all the way along. You get out of your car and you look down several thousand feet anywhere.

You only have to walk a little way. You can even find some places that are almost as narrow as that neck to Deadhorse Point where you can look down into the canyons on the other side and down into this Big Basin.

Now this is a nice place to camp. Down in the bottom here, this is pretty hot in the tourist season, very uncomfortable. It is not only a nice place to camp but you walk out here or ride out here, this is about 9 miles out and you look right down on Anderson's Ranch or—what do you call it—Anderson's Bottom. Now this is just as if you were on a rampart.

All the way along you look over here and see all this country. It is just built to order.

Now the only way you can get in there, to get into this country, is by coming around here to Hite and going up this way or coming over this way from Hanksville and drop down over these ledges. There is one little place there you can drop down.

Now I don't see how visitors can enjoy this area over here. You get an airplane's view; and it is a camping and a cool area without having this accessible, but it is outside of the proposal. Now you are not very far from the edge here. In places it goes about 3 miles up to about 10 miles, but I don't see how you can operate the thing to get in and out and to camp at night unless you have that—what do you call it—the Orange Cliffs Ridge to camp on. It is a beautiful place up there.

Senator METCALF. How many acres would your proposal add?

Dr. BRIMHALL. I don't know. In the first place, this is narrow, I mean there is not much land involved up here. The acreage would come in this dead land down here that doesn't even serve a rabbit. This is really very dry and burned up and it's just—all you have got is scenery there. You don't have any foliage in these canyons and in Millard Canyon, but in these spurs up here you have some tree life and I think that some provision ought to be made.

Now I think it is very well handled right now by the Bureau of Land Management. They have done, I think, a good job. I know that they make the oil well people clean up after they drill a well there and if it is a dry well, they go in and—now in 2 or 3 years you don't even know where they drilled; but my point is that, somehow or other, they ought to cooperate with the parks and use this as part of the administrative area.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much. Questions?

Senator BENNETT. I have just one question. You have been in there a great deal, Dr. Brimhall, you say that the summer months are hot months when you get down off the high plateau?

Dr. BRIMHALL. July and August are pretty uncomfortable down in there. Of course you see I don't know much about the east side. Now even there I think it is quite attractive up at the higher elevations, but on the west side of the river it is pretty uncomfortable in midsummer.

Senator BENNETT. And I wonder if it isn't about the same on the east side of the river. This is a problem nobody has raised in the hearings.

Dr. BRIMHALL. Well, it is a very important problem for tourist use, and I mean, after all, you will want a comfortable place at night; and it just happens that this ridge is really quite comfortable; and you

have a full view of the whole country, an almost incredible view for over 30 miles.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Dr. Brimhall.

Mr. Joseph H. Weston is our next witness.

You may proceed, Mr. Weston.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH H. WESTON, DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. WESTON. My appearance before this committee is purely political. I leave the matters of technical significance to the technical experts.

In the course of a very vigorous campaign for the U.S. Senate in Utah which I have been conducting in person since June 1, 1961, I have visited in the houses of nearly 3,000 local political leaders, mostly at the precinct or grassroots level, in all parts of the State of Utah. The debates on Canyonlands Park proposals have proceeded steadily during several months of these visits, and in every instance formed part of the political conversations which I held with these leaders.

In the original proposal for this park, as submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, I found the people of Utah had a genuine fear of too large and dictatorial a role being placed by the Federal Government.

The vigorous debates aroused by Senator Wallace F. Bennett and Gov. George Clyde served a useful purpose in forcing the redrawing of the bill along compromise lines.

However, I find that it also is the general feeling at this time that a level of compromise has been reached in this bill that approximates the best park bill that can be obtained under existing political conditions.

Therefore, as I sense the feeling of so many people of Utah, it would be foolish and ridiculous for the Republican opposition to continue to attack the bill or to push substitutes for it beyond this point. The opposition has contributed its best, and I am sure the people of Utah are grateful for their efforts. All of their recommendations that could possibly be accommodated for the improvement of the bill have been used, with the exception, perhaps, of some minor points that might have been disclosed at this final day of hearings.

Someone has to carry the ball. And inasmuch as Senator Frank Moss has brought it thus far, I would advise that all elements in our State call a halt to carping and criticism for its own sake, and unite in their support of him to go ahead, with the assistance and advice of this committee conducting these hearings, to finish the job, wrap it up, and put it through the Senate.

Speaking for myself, and for the large part of the Democratic party in Utah that seems to be inclined toward following my recommendations, I say unqualifiedly that we can express our full confidence in Senator Moss' handling of this matter, and of the Canyonlands bill that he has so painstakingly wrought together for the benefit of all the interests of Utah and the Nation, and that we hope for its early passage in essentially the same form in which he has now written it.

And I say, further, that if the job still cannot be finished by the time our new Senator assumes office in January, I will help him finish it, if I should happen to be that Senator. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Weston.

The next witness will be Mr. D. James Cannon, director of Utah Tourist and Publicity Council. Mighty glad to have you with us, Mr. Cannon.

He will be followed by Max Gardner.

STATEMENT OF D. JAMES CANNON, DIRECTOR, UTAH TOURIST AND PUBLICITY COUNCIL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very brief statement. It was passed by the Utah Tourist and Publicity Council at its February 27 meeting. In view of the fact that it is short and that we have an audience here, I would like to read it.

Senator METCALF. I wish you could.

Mr. CANNON (reading):

(1) We are wholeheartedly in favor of a Canyonlands National Park.

(2) We are opposed to any conflict with scenic areas but make the following provision: That the State of Utah, in cooperation with the agency which administers this park, will have authority to determine areas of scenic values, and areas suitable for multiple or secondary use.

(3) We believe that multiple use should be allowed or secondary use should be allowed, wherever there is no conflict with scenic beauty. This to be determined as noted in No. 2.

I wouldn't attempt to begin to answer the many statements made by Mr. Fowler, the many wild statements issued by him. I would like to clarify that the committee appointed by the Governor, and incidentally this statement is included in that report, first of all the members of the committee were not appointed by the Governor. I mean, their positions—for example, in my case my appointment is not by Governor Clyde. My appointment is by a bipartisan council at the present time made up of four Republicans and three Democrats.

Senator METCALF. Your point is that members of the committee held office as ex officio members because of the position that they held in the Governor's administration.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct, and the same would go for Mr. Crane and Mr. Gardner and Mr. Hayward. These men were all appointed by their councils or commissions and their appointment simply confirmed by their council or confirmed by the Governor. I would like to say further that at no time in our study of this matter did the Governor enter into the picture at all. He never directed us on one thing.

So the report submitted by the committee was after a very careful study, and I would like to suggest to this committee that they take full cognizance of his report because it was very carefully prepared.

Senator METCALF. The report has been submitted. It is a part of the record and some of it has been copied in the record of the first hearing.

Mr. CANNON. Now may I just add one concluding statement.

I suggested to the chairman of the committee that the procedure we follow on this—and please do not conclude that I am taking a pride in this statement and that I am trying to say that I am right and he is wrong—but I would like to suggest that what my hope was on this report was that it be submitted to the Utah congressional delegation as a report of a Utah Study Committee on this matter of a park.

Senator METCALF. I would hope that it would be utilized even more widely and examined by not only members of this committee but other interested Members of Congress in passing upon this problem.

Mr. CANNON. Thank you. I want to make clear that I too am disturbed about the fact that politics has entered into this thing, partisan politics. I felt for a long time that the subject of the tourist business with which I am mainly concerned is not a political matter. It shouldn't be bandied about as a matter of whether the Democrats are doing it or the Republicans are doing it.

Senator METCALF. Let me allay some of your fears. This committee is reasonably familiar with politics and the members of this committee know a little bit about politics, too, and so I don't think that you need to be concerned about partisanship entering in here because we live with it all the time.

Mr. CANNON. May I just suggest one other thing, Mr. Chairman?

Senator METCALF. Surely.

Mr. CANNON. We were very closely engaged with Mr. Olsen a few years ago on the preparation of this State park report that he referred to this morning. I am very concerned about many other areas in Utah that are deserving of park status and when I say that, I don't mean just national park, monument, or State park but of protection by some government agency. I would hate to feel—now we talked about the matter of a million acres and so on. I am opposed to that idea in principle or even extensive enlargement of this particular area for the simple reason that I think it will militate against future areas being designated as park areas and being considered.

Senator METCALF. Designated as national parks.

Mr. CANNON. Probably national park areas. I am thinking, for example, that there are areas on the Colorado Plateau that haven't even been mentioned here and rightly so because of the limitation of time. We would like to suggest to you that these areas are deserving of consideration by National Park Service and I would hope that after all the hue and cry is over on this matter of the Canyonlands National Park that we won't find that we have nullified future efforts for protection of such areas as Goblin Valley, Kodachrome Flats, Grosvenor Arch, the Escalante River, Sego Canyon, Fisher Towers, and other areas that are deserving of consideration. Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Jim, that is a good statement. Your suspicion that there might be a little politics in this causes me to read the first paragraph of an AP story that appeared on March the 9th. It is headed, "Moss Stubbed Toe on Park Plan, Clyde Scoffs," and it is an AP release and says:

> Gov. George D. Clyde says Senator Frank E. Moss, Democrat, of Utah, is hurting on the Canyonlands Park issue because he is championing an unpopular cause "in his attempts to give away our heritage."

Now I know you charged Mr. Fowler with making some wild statements and I don't necessarily subscribe to all he said but you must acknowledge that there has just been a lot of criticism laid on me, charging me with trying to give away Utah's heritage, participating in a land grab and doing all sorts of things on this park and then Senator Bennett says at this table that everybody is for a park and we shouldn't say people are against a park. Now there is politics in it of course. They have been after me because I proposed this bill and you acknowledge that, don't you? [Laughter.]

Mr. TANNER. I would like to say, Senator, that the matter of a park in this area has been under consideration for some time and I think you should be commended for entering a bill proposing a Canyonlands National Park. I think this is the thing that has brought it to a head but I certainly wouldn't go so far as to say that you are the only one that has advocated a park study and park areas in this general section of the State. The State park study that was referred to this morning had some very interesting reports to make on this area that is under consideration.

Senator Moss. That's true, proposed 500,000 acres.

Mr. CANNON. I echo the sentiments of Senator Bible, if he was reported correctly in the newspaper, that I think we are closer to an agreement on this thing than we imagine and I certainly would like to say that the tourist and publicity council is fully in favor of a national park and know that it will do a great deal of good. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. You know that section 1 of Senator Moss' bill describes the proposed area to be taken for the park by metes and bounds and that is the area that is enclosed in the black line on the map over there. Now as I read your second proposal you disapprove of that description of metes and bounds and want the Governor's commission to meet with somebody from the Secretary of Interior and select the area for a park.

Mr. CANNON. Well, we didn't spell out in our brief presentation whether we were for Senator Moss' proposal, exact proposal, or not. The thing that we wanted to stress there is that we feel that the area of the park should be cooperatively arrived at in cooperation with the National Park Service and the State of Utah.

May I just say, Mr. Chairman, that the National Park Service——

Senator METCALF. May I interrupt? Our colleague, Senator Long, who has been with us all this time is now having to return to Washington so we are saying goodbye. Go ahead.

Mr. CANNON. The National Park Service has demonstrated a very cooperative attitude for example with our State park commission and we have so many scenic areas in the State, I hope this matter of cooperation between the two would continue and we simply say there that we feel that there should be this kind of cooperation in the study of the Canyonlands National Park. As has already been brought out, there have been amendments to the original bill by Senator Moss and undoubtedly there will be others before this bill has been passed. I am sure that there will be and we would like to suggest that the State has a real stake in this thing and would like to assist on further studies being made.

Senator METCALF. And that is why we are here and why we hope to continue to hear from your State's witnesses.

Do you have any questions?

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, can I just make a statement?

I would like to commend the distinguished director of the Utah Tourist and Publicity Council. I have known of the good work that you have done in putting Utah on the map touristwise and I know of the work that you have done in trying to bring to the attention of the Nation not only this Canyonlands National Park area but the other areas in this State that you have referred to. I would like to associate myself with your remarks with regard to these other areas and assure

you that none of my efforts on behalf of Canyonlands is to be construed as a diminution of my efforts on behalf of these other areas and I commend you for what you have done on their behalf and I hope that we can move ahead and take care of them.

Also I would like to say, you made reference to the report of Governor Clyde, this written report that was submitted to the congressional delegation. I think that it was a very fine statesmanlike document. I have read it very carefully and was very impressed with its contents.

Mr. CANNON. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Ethel M. Spilsbury, of Salt Lake City, is our next witness.

STATEMENT OF ETHEL M. SPILSBURY

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am grateful for this opportuntiy to appear today. I am here mainly as a mother and a housewife.

I am an urban housewife and one that feels the need to take my family from the crowded urban areas out to the open spaces. It is a known fact that the areas were fairly close once where one could seek and find seclusion. But these areas are rapidly becoming extinct with the ever-increasing population, even in Utah.

There once was a king who ruled proudly over his people. His was a happy land, much like the other kingdoms which were in his section of the world. And yet, this king had a problem. Unlike the other kingdoms, his land did not have the unusually high influx of visitors and commercial travelers that kept the other rulers materially strong. Oh, it wasn't that the good king's land lacked the attractions of the others. On the contrary his kingdom contained a remarkable saline pool, quite different from any other. But the good king used it only for his own bathing, unaware of the potential drawing power of a well-kept pool. However, this story does not deal with the king's unawareness in this matter, but rather of his unawareness of his really great tourist attraction. You see, this king had in his possession a crown, not an ordinary crown, but one such as has never been seen before. And although I never saw the crown, there are people who claim to know of it. They say it had great gold spires which looked nearly blood red in the sun, and some say it had glimmering rivers of ruby and emerald. Some say it had great arches and spires of ruddy gold were irregular and unsymmetrical yet reflected a pattern seemingly hewn by unseen hands. It was said that the king oftentimes retreated to an unknown enclosure where the crown was kept and gazed for hours at the wonder and specter of its majesty.

Somehow over the years, the king came to believe that this crown held in its power the secret of eternal life. He was sure that someday fountains of youth would spring forth and then he would be able to share this heavenly wealth with all his subjects. This fantasy led him to the policy of keeping the crown from any public viewing. So, while his subjects lacked the necessities of life, the crown was kept hidden, and the king was seemingly unaware of the visitors who would have otherwise come to the land to see the crown if it had been for public display.

It was said that the king died clinging to his crown, a thing of beauty, lost somewhere in his castle. Life went on in the kingdom, but soon the youth of the land left in search of riches elsewhere. The king slept in death somewhere in his castle. Meanwhile the villagers bathed in the saline pool as the king had once done.

Now isn't this likened to our situation of the Canyonlands. If we do not display these splendors we may well lose the chance of bringing visitors and may well lose the chance of having well-cared-for recreation lands.

Thank you very much.

Senator BENNETT. I have just had handed to me by the minority counsel the statement which is already in the record of Joseph H. Weston, Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate and praising Senator Moss. It has a few kind words for Governor Clyde and for me but the key is in the first sentence:

> My appearance before this committee is purely political.

[Laughter.]

Senator METCALF. The next witness will be Mr. Max Gardner, director of the Utah State Land Board and he will be followed by professor Beyers.

STATEMENT OF MAX C. GARDNER, DIRECTOR OF THE UTAH STATE LAND BOARD

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I have a written statement and I think it is short enough to get within the 5-minute allotment.

My name is Max Gardner. I am director of the Utah State Land Board. I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear and testify before the distinguished members of this subcommittee on behalf of the Utah State Land Board.

This is broken down on an exhibit which accompanies the statement. I would like to have that incorporated in the record if I may.

Senator METCALF. It will be incorporated at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

EXHIBIT B

School sections and State-owned riverbed lands in the proposed Canyonlands National Park

	Acres
Surveyed school sections to which State title has not attached since they were withdrawn by the United States on the date of the approval of survey	9,198.93
Unsurveyed school sections—acreage from Bureau of Land Management protraction diagrams	8,968.00
State-owned school sections	17,794.00
School sections where the surface is owned by the State park and recreation commission and the mineral rights by the State land Board	3,253.36
Riverbed lands from the mouth of Cataract Canyon to the north boundary of the park on the Colorado and Green Rivers	[1] 4,000.00
Total	43,214.29

I, Donald G. Prince, economic geographer, Utah State Land Board do hereby certify that the above information is correct to the best of my knowledge.

DONALD G. PRINCE.

[1] Approximate.

Mr. GARDNER. Under Utah law, the land board has direction, management, control, and responsibility of all lands heretofore or hereafter granted to Utah by the U.S. Government or others, except lands used or set apart for public purposes or occupied by public buildings. The land board is bipartisan. It is composed of the State superintendent of education or such other person as shall be designated by the State board of education, and five other members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the senate. Not more than three of the appointed land board members shall belong to the same political party.

There are approximately 43,214.29 acres of Utah school sections and State-owned riverbed lands within the proposed Canyonlands National Park. These lands account for between 13 and 15 percent of the entire area. The land board is vitally concerned that provision be made in any legislation creating the Canyonlands National Park to insure that the State receive fair compensation for the State lands taken for park purposes.

After careful consideration of the provisions of S. 2387, the Utah State Land Board at its regular meeting of March 7, 1962, on motion of the superintendent of Utah State Department of Public Instructions, seconded by Mr. Walter G. Mann, unanimously passed the following resolution, all land board members being present and voting:

It appears that a proposed Canyonlands National Park bill would include approximately 43,214.29 acres of land that the State of Utah either has a present ownership of or the right to the ownership of said land, all of which acreage was intended to be used for school purposes. At the present time, we have more children in school per capita than any other State in the Union. We have a very enviable position, but we cannot maintain it if we do not carefully protect our school land grant allotments, even though we are spending a greater percentage of our individual income for education than any other State.

It appears that in the past the State lands which have been included in other Utah national parks have had no value to our school system due to the fact that we have been unable to exchange the same. As a result the advantages that should have accrued from the State school lands have not been realized.

It also appears that it would be to the best interests of the school system of the State that before and if any Canyonlands bill is enacted into law, the United States should be required to exchange and designate the land that will be given to the State of Utah for the State lands that would be included in any Canyonlands National Park.

It further appears from studies to date that in addition to the scenic and recreation values, a substantial part of the area to be included in the Canyonlands National Park is underlain with extensive mineral and oil deposits, and that such lands are within and contiguous to known mineral deposits.

Consequently, I hereby move that we, as the land board, petition our representatives in Congress to take whatever action necessary to see that proper provisions are made for exchange of our State interests with the proposed Canyonlands National Park so that we, in advance of any legislation enacted in regard to it, receive in exchange, acre for acre, an area of equal potential. We suggest that a fair exchange for this acreage would be the Lisbon oilfields and lands adjacent thereto.

Now, gentlemen, there has been a lot of testimony to this committee about the value of this land for park purposes. I urge and in all sincerity and with all seriousness that if these lands are tremendously valuable for park purposes that includes State lands, why shouldn't the State be compensated by the Lisbon oilfields?

Senator METCALF. Let me make a statement here. I have every sympathy with the State and their ownership of land and have

worked a long time to expedite an exchange of land in Glacier National Park but the official title of the members of this committee is U.S. Senators. We are Senators for the United States of America. We represent our States but we also have a trust to take care of the land, the public lands, the Federal lands for the benefit of the Nation and as far as one member of this committee is concerned, it is out of the question to take a proven oilfield and exchange for river bottom on a land that is only classified as mineral. Now I want to give the State of Utah the benefit of every doubt just as I would want Senator Moss and Senator Bennett to give the State of Montana such benefits, but I would seriously object to the inclusion in the bill of putting a—exchanging Federal lands in a proven oilfield for this unproven land.

Mr. GARDNER. Well, would the chairman favor the United States designating in the bill the lands that the State is to get and that the bill actually effects the exchange?

Senator METCALF. Well, I would hope that we would be able to designate in the bill—I am not going to say to you what has been said dozens of times to the members of this committee that I would distrust the Governor or the officials of the State of Utah and say that because they are not completely in favor of some of the portions of this bill that we would suggest that they would veto any provision by adopting your suggestion that the lands be agreed upon before any bill passed because I think that I have enough confidence in our elected, appointed officials of either party that I believe that they would go ahead and try to carry out their official duty and if this bill would go over to another year it might be possible to designate them in the bill but if it is necessary to get this bill passed this year, I would say that perhaps it isn't possible to list the land in the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Well, Senator, don't you think that it is the obligation of Congress to pass on the land being of equal value rather than leave that to the Secretary of the Interior? Isn't this the procedure that is followed in exchange with the Navajo Tribe of Indians?

Senator METCALF. It is not and it has not been. It has been the traditional way—I just talked about a land exchange of Glacier National Park within the park for equal value of lands outside the park. It was only consummated this year as a result of negotiations between the Secretary of Interior and the National Park Service and the Montana State Land Board and as far as I know the traditional way is to delegate this responsibility to proper Federal officials and have them conduct negotiations with the proper State officials.

Mr. GARDNER. Senator, may I say this, that the State of Utah has filed or made selections for land in the Lisbon oilfield. Now these selections were filed in the early part of 1960. At that time there was one well that had been drilled. Now what happened on those selections is this, by the time they were considered by the Bureau of Land Management the land had become proved under the law, at that time, we are not entitled to the land. It was a matter of cold, practical fact, Senator. The land board now has over 200 applications of the State of Utah to select. There is a great deal of delay in these selections.

In 1959 the State of Utah canceled four selections that have been pending for 21 years.

Senator Moss. Have you read the committee print of the bill that requires the Secretary to transfer the lands within 30 days of the day following the day of enactment?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, sir, I am, and I would like to read my comments on that, if I may.

Senator Moss. All right, go ahead.

Mr. GARDNER. Insofar as State lands are concerned, the bill has been improved in two respects:

(1) The Secretary of Interior would be required to offer Federal lands for transfer within 30 days from the date of enactment.

(2) The bill would expressly authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept riverbed lands and State-owned school sections, where formerly there was some question as to whether the State's ownership of the riverbed lands would be recognized and that they would be included within an exchange.

However, from our standpoint, the amended bill still retains most of the objectionable features of the original bill. First, we presently have absolutely no idea what Federal acreage the Secretary intends to offer the State in exchange for the State lands, absolutely none.

Senator Moss. Doesn't the State make the selection of land that they want; isn't that how this proceeds on the exchange of lands; the State says——

Mr. GARDNER. Ordinarily the State would file the application to exchange and then there would be a field investigation and so forth. Secondly, we presently have no idea as to what value the Secretary will ascribe to the State lands.

Senator Moss and Senator Bennett are familiar with the problems that we have under these selections. It is illustrated by the fact that the State heretofore made application for land in the Lisbon oilfields and we were turned down even though the Federal lands applied for were not proved when the State filed for them. If this application had been expeditiously processed, we would have acquired the Lisbon oilfields. The land appeals office of the Bureau of Land Management held in part that in effect the State has no right by reason of these applications. We are in the position that we merely make the application. They can consider it if they wish and if they don't want to give it to us, they don't.

He held in part, and I quote:

> As to appellants' contention that determination of structural status of selected lands must be as of the date of selection, Public Law 85–771 provides that determination of the character of the base lands must be as of date of selection but does not so provide as to selected lands.

That does not so expressly apply to selected lands. Consequently they say that it doesn't expressly say so. Then we determine that anytime up until the time you're—and he goes on to say:

> In fact, it has long been recognized that the filing of an application to select entitled the applicant to nothing more than to have the selection considered.

I frankly cannot understand the reluctance of the Interior Department to specify the Federal lands which will be granted to the State in the Canyonlands exchange. In all sincerity, it seems to me this is a matter which should be settled now, as it undoubtedly would be if Indian or privately owned lands were involved, rather than to be

left undone and to be forgotten as it has been done in the past after the Canyonlands National Park is established.

Senator METCALF. Senator Bennett.

Senator BENNETT. Just to express my appreciation for this testimony which points out how the Lisbon lands got into the picture and why the responsible officials of this State felt that they had some sound foundation for their approach. Actually I think the amendment which I offered to the bill embracing the desire of the State to select—to receive the Lisbon lands, may serve—if they don't actually get the lands themselves—may serve either to speed up the process or maybe to increase the value of the lands that may finally be selected.

Mr. GARDNER. I would also like to go on record, Senator Bennett, as indicating that the land board unanimously supports the amendment that you introduced. They urge very seriously that this committee report favorably on it, in all sincerity and all seriousness.

Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Gardner.

(That portion of the prepared statement of Max C. Gardner, director of the Utah State Land Board, not previously given, is as follows:)

I have petitioned all members of the Utah delegation in Congress in accordance with this resolution, and I understand there has been proposed to the subcommittee, by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, amendments to the Canyonlands bill which would make possible the land exchange which the Utah State Land Board has unanimously recommended. Needless to say, the Utah State Land Board strongly favors these amendments and urges this subcommittee to report favorably on them.

On Thursday, April 19, 1962, I received from both Senator Wallace F. Bennett and Senator Frank E. Moss a copy of Committee Print No. 1. On April 19, 1962, I mailed the attached letter to Senator Bennett and to Senator Moss which contains my personal views of section 2 of the committee print. I have attached a copy of this letter to my statement as exhibit A and ask that it be incorporated in the records of this subcommittee.

The Utah State Land Board is not opposed to, but favors, the creation of a Canyonlands National Park. The board's primary concern is that the State receive fair compensation in the acquisition of Federal lands to replace the State lands which are taken for park purposes. While the land board will not have proprietary responsibilities with respect to lands included within the park after the State lands are exchanged, a majority of the land board does favor multiple use within the park so that all resources, scenic as well as mineral, can be fully developed. A majority of the land board believes this can best be accomplished by restricting the size of the park to lands having demonstrable national park-type qualities.

Senator METCALF. The next witness will be Professor Beyers. He will be followed by Jack Allshouse. Mr. Beyers.

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. BEYERS, LOGAN CITY DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN, AND ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BEYERS. Honorable Chairman Metcalf and members of the committee, the Cache County Central Committee of the Democratic Party, in its meeting of April 10, 1962, voted unanimously in favor of supporting Senate bill 2387, otherwise known as the Moss bill, which provides for the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah. The central committee requested that, in my capacity as Logan City Democratic Chairman, I testify in support of this bill. This is a task that I am but too happy to fulfill.

82324—62—pt. 2——19

In order to acquit myself of it, I would like to make the following points:

(1) There is absolutely no question about the scenic beauties of the proposed Canyonlands National Park. Words are hardly adequate to describe its majestic splendor and rugged beauty. We feel strongly that this area, which at present is practically locked up, be unlocked and made accessible to the many Americans who enjoy getting away from the often humdrum routines of daily life in order to find both spiritual and physical refreshment among the scenic grandeurs of nature.

(2) We are in wholehearted support of the Moss bill, since it will give Utah a national park where people would want to vacation and relax, rather than a few vantage points to drive into, take in with a quick look, and drive off again. We feel, too, that the Moss bill faces up quite honestly and fairly to the mining, hunting, fishing, and grazing interests. Furthermore, it is our contention that this bill is in close agreement with the philosophy and intent of the National Park Act. May it be pointed out here, however, that the counterproposals of Utah's senior Senator leave much to be desired; it is almost impossible to evaluate them completely, since they seem to change from week to week. Certainly, we cannot go along with his proposal of three spot parks surrounded by a so-called recreation area. Even if these three spot parks took in the highlights in scenery, the danger would still exist that possible blighting of the surrounding area would seriously affect the esthetic enjoyment of these scenic areas that a person might otherwise have.

It is seriously doubted that Congress would approve Senator Bennett's proposed three spot park bill, because its idea seems completely unlike those set forth in the National Park Act.

(3) Much of the criticism of this bill in Utah has come from the mining interests and persons representing those interests. May it be further pointed out that when the mining interests talk so loudly about alleged infringements on their freedom of operation, we have never once heard them mention their responsibilities to protect the scenery, rather than marking it with unsightly scars.

Bert Hanna, a Denver Post staff writer, who was fortunate enough to accompany Secretary Udall and party into the Canyonlands area last summer, said in an article on the proposed national park:

> In consideration of multiple use, there is one thing the park and Interior Department officials will insist upon. That is the removal of unsightly scars left by mineral explorations and operation in such areas. In this connection Udall denounced irresponsible bulldozing operations of oil seismographic crews exploring on the public domain. These have marred much of the scenic beauty and created erosion.

Senator METCALF. May I interrupt there. Yesterday at Moab we had testimony from Mr. Cox who corrected that article that said for the committee that the damage was not done by oil seismographic crews and he has filed a letter with the committee which demonstrates that the oil people did not do some of the damage that had been criticized in the course of these hearings.

Mr. BEYERS. Again we feel that the Moss bill meets the mining interests more than halfway, making sure, however, that those interests should live up to their responsibilities toward the American public in general, and to the tourists in particular.

(4) Finally, I would like to close my testimony with a personal note. I happen to be a native of the most densely populated country in the world, the Netherlands. At present the population in that country is 866 people per square mile. Before coming to this country, of which I am now a citizen, I saw the effects of the population explosion. Gentlemen, I can only say that I was but too happy that in Holland we had still some small national reserves where we could get away for a few hours from the severe demands placed upon us by living in large communities. It is for this reason that I feel that the Moss bill is forward looking. We, too, expect the population explosion to take place in our country. We are, therefore, deeply grateful that we have leaders with enough foresight to make sure that our generation and the generations unborn will have some havens to visit in order to seek rest and recreation through the enjoyment of nature's wonders. For this reason we urge that some of our citizens stop quibbling about who regulates what, and that instead they face up to the responsibility that we have to our own and future generations. When this bill will be passed into law, we are sure that all citizens of this State will be lastingly grateful to its author, Senator Frank Moss. We hope that this session of Congress will see fit to pass this bill into law as soon as possible. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

The next witness will be Jack Allshouse, president of the Utah Wildlife Federation. He will be followed by Mr. C. E. Bauer of the Western Outdoor Clubs.

STATEMENT OF JACK ALLSHOUSE, PRESIDENT, UTAH WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. ALLSHOUSE. Thank you, gentlemen. I have this prepared statement which I think in the interest of time I should read.

I am speaking today on behalf of the delegates representing our affiliate groups in the Utah Wildlife Federation.

I might say on the side that we have 26 organizations running anywhere from 50 in number in the membership to around 500.

Two weeks ago, on April 7 and 8, our organization met in annual convention at the Newhouse Hotel in Salt Lake City, Utah, at which time we were very thorough in our investigation and discussion of the proposed Canyonlands National Park. After listening to the Honorable George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah and the Honorable Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah, the following resolution was written and adopted unanimously by the delegates:

Whereas the scenic attractions of southern Utah have long been recognized as being outstanding in the United States; and

Whereas this area should be unlocked for the benefit of the people as a whole; and

Whereas the economic value of this area, to the State of Utah, will greatly be enlarged if we open this entire area to the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Utah Wildlife Federation, at their annual convention of April 8, 1962, concur with Senate bill 2387 if amended to permit State control of hunting and fishing; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of the Utah Wildlife Federation notify our delegates in Congress of this decision.

Our main reason for adopting this resolution is that we recognize the tremendous scenic attraction which we in Utah are lucky to have in our State and sincerely do believe this land of grandeur settings should be opened for the enjoyment of the 180 million citizens of the United States. We are aware that we might in the future find resources within this area which might be of great value to the people of this country but it is also our belief that Senate bill 2387 is looking forward to that time and providing ample means to harvest these resources along with protecting the people now using these resources.

We are greatly concerned about the harvest of game within this area as we have seen what has happened in many places where we, the people, have taken it upon ourselves to let mother nature take care of the surplus animal life. This is a very cruel and harsh method which many people fail to realize and is the main reason we are asking that the State fish and game with their staff of well-qualified biologists be permitted to determine the amount and type of hunting and fishing which should be done in this national park. We understand this is against all principles of national park management as has been set forth in previous years but as time goes on we find more and more changes taking place which prove to be better than some of the older methods. This may be one of those times.

Let me thank you for the opportunity to appear before you to express the thinkings of the people I represent and in closing I would like to reaffirm our position that Utah and the United States needs the Canyonlands National Park.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Jack.

Mr. ALLSHOUSE. If I could digress from this for just a minute, I would like to express my own personal opinion in just 1 minute's time.

Generally I find myself speaking for the multitudes and not myself. This time I would like to speak for myself. I am not a native of Utah. I adopted Utah 13 years ago as my State. Since that time I have done quite a bit toward promoting the interests of Utah and have served not only as president of the Utah Wildlife Federation but have served on the Big Game Board, the Uintah National Forest Advisory Council for the Utah County Watersheds Committee and was a member of the Governor's first committee that was set up to study the wilderness bill and the Canyonlands Park bill.

I will say this, I was the only vote of the committee which was opposed to the resolution that they sent back to the delegates in Washington and since that time have heard no more from the committee.

I am now a member of the Canyonlands Park Committee. That is the one for the Canyonlands National Park and I am a nonpartisan member. I would like to make that very clear because some of the people whom I represent think that I am getting into politics when I have come into that committee. I am a nonpartisan member of that committee and am not in favor of the Canyonlands National Park just because it is sponsored by a Democratic Senator. As a matter of fact I will say this, that a year or so ago I was just as strongly against a bill that Senator Moss presented which was your Great Salt Lake National Park bill as I am right now in favor of the Canyonlands National Park and I thought for the record I would like to make that clear.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Allshouse.

The next witness is Mr. C. E. Bauer of the Western Outdoor Club. He will be followed by Dr. Harold Lamb of the Utah Audubon Society.

STATEMENT OF CARL E. BAUER, UTAH VICE PRESIDENT, FEDERATION OF WESTERN OUTDOOR CLUBS

Mr. BAUER. Chairman Metcalf, members of the Committee, Congressmen King and Peterson and ladies and gentlemen.

It may not be wise to inject another element of political persuasion into the discussion but I would like to register as an independent and I am afraid I should also have Democratic leanings.

Although I represent the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, because of the lack of adequate collusion, I shall speak as one two-hundred-and-eightieth part of 1 percent of that organization.

The canyonlands country is more than the center of controversy concerning purpose and size, and with a kindly destiny might exert profound influence far beyond the most extravagant boundaries.

Destiny has already shown some disposition toward kindness for the region. With a combination of relative inaccessibility, and other more tempting bait, recognition of its outstanding character has circumvented private infiltration.

The growing demand for recreation, and public awareness are forcing the opportunists into ostentatious devotion for "multiple use." It is reasonable to assume that genuine sincerity toward this concept would carry over into comparable activity that is free of the restraint of allegedly "bureaucratic" control. An unbridled example of such freedom involves patented mining land, where soulless ownership may indulge any whim.

Conscience, which is supposedly an adjunct of multiple use, was nonexistent in the planning of a massive, open-pit mining operation in a local area of superlative beauty and recreation potential—the very heart of Brighton. To some of the finest skiing terrain in the country was to be added a Paul Bunyan sitzmark.

In repudiation of any Christian attribute, health regulations for the watershed supplying the culinary needs for the massed populations of Utah's central valleys are still violated by livestock interests which lease the grazing rights of mining land.

With commercial ore deposits in short supply, the stockholders may still be placated by the mining of browse plants and trees. There may be a lack of spirit as well as unanimity in the interpretation of multiple use.

Erosion control and flood prevention made necessary by generations of range abuse are popularly regarded as watershed restoration and conjure visions of verdant mountainsides. In reality, such costly stopgap effort, especially on steep slops, is little more than contour trenching of the raw gravel remaining, and seeding with grasses which would probably grow on a tin roof.

Senator METCALF. I wanted to mention that it is too late for erosion control down in Canyonlands. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAUER. Nature permits no infringement on her patent for topsoil restoration for which the mass production rate is approximately 2 inches per muzzled cow millennium.

The corollary of desert terrain is desert climate and the testimony of many thousands of square miles of once verdant, and then overgrazed land bordering the Mediterranean, throughout the Near East, and in Asia is that with this added complication, restoration becomes virtually impossible. The naive justification of the peoples of these remote lands was not "development" but "population pressure". We of a more favored era and clime are well on our toward a similar "achievement," and that without an assist from any such justification.

Senator Kerr sounds an ominous warning with these words:

> We must achieve virtually complete storage of river flows in most of the country to meet the water needs of this century.

The semiarid West can expect no such generous period of grace. Nor is storage of itself enough, especially when the Colorado system is concerned, for its reservoirs would ultimately become silt-filled quagmires with stream control analogous to that of tubs of water dumped down the basement stairs. Furthermore, no self-respecting hydraulic turbine would be expected to operate for long on such a fluid as quicksand.

The Williams doctrine of the Soil Conservation Service is the simple truism: "Water management begins with land management." Where might we more logically begin than in a national park? The rejuvenation of plant life would be relatively simple in the canyon bottoms and basins of Canyonlands, and then we might turn to the desecrated Kolob Plateau west and north of Zion Canyon.

Surely these small tortured areas can be spared from immediate material exploitation in an economy as robust as ours. The inheritance of coming generations will be little apart from rock, sea, and air—and much of that is contaminated. We have good reason to expect that their technology will be less wasteful than ours and their management more idealistic, but their problems will still put ours to shame.

Canyonlands National Park may be the threshold of our new destiny. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Bauer.

The next witness is Dr. Lamb. He will be followed by William Hewitt.

Dr. Lamb.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD B. LAMB, M.D., CHAIRMAN OF THE UTAH AUDUBON SOCIETY

Dr. LAMB. I am Dr. Harold Lamb, and am chairman of the Utah Audubon Society. I am speaking here as an individual and also representing my society.

Prior to the question being asked, we constitute approximately 90 members. We are an affiliate of the National Aububon Society which with its affiliates constitutes approximately 240,000 members.

Public approval for the establishment of a national park suitable to represent the wondrous scenery of the canyonlands of Utah is an accepted fact. Controversy has stemmed from differences of opinion as to size, location, and the private and public prerogatives to be permitted within the boundaries of the proposed park.

The Utah Audubon Society approves the present recommendations for location and size of the park area but disapproves of the sections of the bill that provide for the continuation of commercial development and exploitation of the area. S. 2387 as presently proposed really defines by law a "multiple use area" that would be little different from a national forest or from the present public-domain status of the lands involved. Almost by definition this bill would establish a national park that would be a national park in name only.

Our society agrees that established grazing privileges should receive temporary recognition and protection after establishment of the park. A change to national park status of the lands concerned would otherwise enact a hardship on the private interests involved. It should be made abundantly clear, however, that section 4 of the bill does not constitute recognition of grazing as an appropriate national park use. Elimination of grazing permits within the park after a period of 25 years would represent a more than adequate period of adjustment. A better solution, if practical, would be prompt cessation of grazing within the park in exchange for equivalent permits and facilities outside park boundaries.

Mining activities within the proposed park have been primarily of an exploratory nature. At the present time there is no production within park limits of either potash or uranium, or other minerals, except one producing oil well, which I understand has been capped. It is true that exploration has determined that there may be significant mineral deposits within park boundaries. Economic dividends derived from potential mineral production might be significant but would, in the overall point of view, represent relatively short-term benefits as compared to more reliable and long-term benefits of national park recreational and educational use. It would also seem reasonable to assume that as our population increases, the demands on the park as a natural scientific and scenic attraction would increase and that previously acceptable defacement of areas by mining operations would subsequently prove to be detrimental to the esthetic values of the park. The Utah Audubon Society is, therefore, of the opinion that future or continued development of mining interests within the proposed park would create conditions not in keeping with the national park concept.

Section 7 of the bill calls for the controlled management of wildlife for the prevention of damage to the soil, plant life, or wild or domestic animals dependent upon the land comprising such a park. The overall goals of this philosophy are desirable provided the decisions relative to and management of this aspect of the park remain in the control of the National Park Service which has managed these problems above reproach with dedication and efficiency for 46 years. Section 7 would attempt to usurp from the National Park Service the right to determine the need for and methods employed in the control of ecological problems arising from imbalances produced by the existence of the national park. Such dilution of the authority of the National Park Service by local fish and game department officials would destroy the national park's autonomy and introduce the noxious influences of local special-interest groups and maneuvers of local political expediency. This intrusion could, in the long run, produce only a corrupting and demoralizing effect on future administration of national parks.

In summary the Utah Audubon Society is in favor of establishing a Canyonlands National Park of the presently recommended size and location. We are opposed to the continuation of commercial exploitation and development within the bounds of any national park. Proper concern should be given to the financial protection of private interests in the form of monetary reimbursement and/or permission to develop similar adjacent properties of equivalent value. If S. 2387 is enacted we believe it will have built-in areas of conflict and dissatisfaction. Private interests will interpret any restriction on their activities as unwarranted, arbitrary, and possibly predetermined. The National Park Service could not but pursue and maintain previously established national park policies, but would be hindered in their efforts by other newly constituted authorities. Conservation purists will never accept the philosophy of multiple use within a national park and will continually strive to annul or repeal any such agreements. Such an atmosphere of bickering and malcontent by almost all participants cannot help but be detrimental to the administration of a successful national park.

Senator METCALF. Any questions?

(No response.)

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Dr. HEWETT. He will be followed by John Schone.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM P. HEWITT, DIRECTOR, UTAH GEOLOGICAL AND MINERALOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. HEWITT. Mr. Chairman, Senator Moss, Senator Bennett, Congressman King, and Congressman Peterson.

I have prepared some posters here which are enlargements of these maps which I have included in my testimony and with your permission I would like to talk from the posters because it might be easier to do it.

Senator METCALF. You may present your testimony anyway you think you can help us best.

Mr. HEWITT. Thank you. Now I would like to make one point first and that there is very little known about this proposed park. It has only been in the last 10 years that it has become accessible; that even the writings of the U.S. Geological Survey are sparse, but from what we know we have every reason to believe that it is mineral rich and this series of posters has been prepared to explain what I mean.

Now on all of these posters I have shown the outline of the park and it is colored in pink as originally proposed by Senator Moss.

Now subsequent modifications of this don't alter the text of what I am saying because I am talking about this region, not about detailed boundaries.

Now first of all, I have here a poster which shows the great regional structures which are trending into this area. Now these structures are like—are the waves or folds into which the rock formation have been—they are comparable to the swells on the ocean and these solid lines represent the crest lines of these swells and the rock strata dip gently away from the crest on either side. Now such areas are intensely interesting to those who seek oil and gas. I cannot say that these extend through the park. I cannot say that they contain oil and gas but I

can say that the very fact that they are there is extremely significant.

Now on this same poster I show the great oil-producing areas of southern Utah. Down here is Aneth with all its complex satellites, the Aneth field in general. I might say that Aneth, which is the greatest oil-producing field in Utah, was discovered only in 1954 after 50 years of assiduous effort and many dry holes.

Now earlier in the afternoon Mr. Williams spoke about some geologic names. I would only mention here that when Aneth was discovered it represented the deepest and oldest formation that was producing oil at that time. Since then there has been a widening area of these discoveries in this formation which is known as the Pennsylvanian and Aneth, mind you, was discovered as the result of just one producing well despite years of discouraging effort.

Now in 1959 Lisbon was discovered. Lisbon produces from formations which are millions of years older than those that are found here at Aneth and just as the Aneth discovery resulted in a widening circle of Pennsylvanian production, so the Lisbon production from Mississippian, an older strata, is now resulting in Mississippian discoveries of importance at Big Flat and up here at Salt Wash which I do not have on the map.

I might say also before I leave this that Lisbon also produces from an even older horizon, the Devonian which is some—well, it makes no difference. What difference does age make when you are dealing with rocks. Just suffice to say that it is much older.

Now on this poster I show the great uranium-producing areas of Utah. Over here is the Big Indian district and I might remind you from the historical standpoint that it is the Big Indian district and Mr. Steen's discovery which alerted the world to the importance of Utah's uranium. This did not outcrop.

Over here is the San Rafael swell with this great complex of properties, Temple Mountain and many others, and down here is White Canyon, the Red Canyon, and the Elk Ridge group. Now none of these are in the area of the park but the important thing is that these all occur in one specific geologic horizon and that same specific geologic horizon occurred here in the northern, shall I say, a little less than a quarter of the park. Now this has not had any important production but it has had mineralization and has had minor production and if there is any important production here, it will be deep. It will be 1,200/1,600 feet beneath the surface and up to the present time it simply hasn't been of economic interest to try to develop such possibilities.

Might I say that Professor Nelson spoke about rational businessmen. There is no such think as a rational prospector but even the prospectors have shunned that one for the time being.

Now I would also say there is no such thing as a rational mineral deposit because all mineral deposits are freaks of nature.

Now I turn to another subject and that is the potash and magnesium. In this area which is outlined by yellow, from here to here, we have the dessicated arm of an ancient sea. This is an area which is underlying by thousands and thousands of feet of salt and related saline rocks. These by themselves are of no actual importance. They might be of importance from the standpoint of subsidiary structures,

that is oil structures, salt domes, or things like that. I am not talking about that. I am talking about the economic importance of these salines.

Now in this park which is underscored in lavender and which includes the northeast part of the park, we have potentially the richest and the thickest potassium fields in North America. Now these fields were first—the first discovery which was made back in 1924, something like that, and yet it has taken almost 40 years of interpretation before it was finally realized that here in southern Utah is the greatest potassium-magnesium area of North America. I might add that the first shaft to exploit these is now being sunk by the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. and their Cane Creek shaft is approximately—and it will be approximately 3,000 feet deep.

I would like to turn now to oil and gas exploration for a minute. This is not an area where we can turn around three times and stamp our feet and produce a gusher. It simply isn't that type of geology and to indicate what I mean, I have prepared a cross section from a field that is just outside the park. This is the Lisbon field but which applies equally well to anything within the park. Now the great surficial structure, this structure here which indicates that the crest of the fold is over in this area but please note there is no oil production beneath the crest of that fold. The oil production is over here in a buried fold which undoubtedly was the parent from which this other gold grew but here is the oil production down here and it took Pure Oil, the discoverer of Lisbon, 10 years of very hard and difficult and assiduous geophysical exploration and geological interpretation before they got their first productive well in this area.

Now I would like to turn for a moment to what has actually been produced within the park. This was correct as of this morning but as of this morning it has changed slightly. There are some 17 wells shown both within the park and immediately adjacent to it. Now if these wells were to be distributed equally throughout the park, that is about one well per every 28 square miles but they are not equally distributed. Of these 17 wells—these 18 wells, 2 of them are still drilling right here. We have no data on them because they are active at the present time. Seven of them have produced shows of oil and gas; nine of them have been blanks. Now that is a terrific ratio, seven shows of oil and gas to nine blanks.

In addition I have shown which are blanks and which have shows, these symbols which are found here and are the same symbols which are—one of these is a productive well right there. It just came in about a month, 2 months ago. By colors I also show the depth to which they have drilled. Now I don't mean the actual depth in feet from the surface but I mean the depth to the horizon to the time at which these rocks were laid down and this is Pennsylvanian. There are one, two, five—there are seven wells that have tested the Pennsylvanian. This is the Mississippian, that is still older and this was the horizon that was discovered only in 1959 and mind you, there are one, two, three, four, five wells which have tested the Mississippian and of those five, one is an important producing well.

Now at Lisbon there is production from the still more ancient Devonian and this is shown in green and there have been one, two, three, four wells which have tested the Devonian so all I can say is

that most certainly this area has not been tested completely; that the tests that have been made have been most encouraging.

I would like to digress for a minute and explain to you what minerals mean to this State of ours and I shall compare two figures, 1940 and 1960, and these figures are shown on page 8. Now in 1940, 20 years ago, the total value of all minerals produced in Utah was slightly over $104 million. In 1960 this had increased to over $431 million. Now then the important thing in this is that the standard metals which we think of the precious metals, gold and silver, lead, zinc, and copper, had doubled from about $88 million to 175 or $176 million but all others—all others now, mind you, let me talk about them for a minute.

In 1940 there was no iron production in Utah. There was no uranium production in Utah and yet in 1960 these two items alone had a value of over $51 million and in 1940, oil, petroleum, mind you, had a production value of just $3,000 and in 1960 it had increased to over $100 million which was almost as much as the total of all the production of 1940.

What I am getting at here is the importance of the unexpected because every one of these things that have been discovered, have been unexpected. You would need the wisdom of a serpent and a good pair of dice to go out there today and say that 10 years from now this will be important or the other thing will be important because you simply can't tell the way modern technology is changing and while I am talking about that, I can say that I believe that one of the changes that will occur in the next 20 years—because we can certainly expect this trend to continue—will be in potash and I feel that I would be most remiss if I failed to mention that it might be here; it might be helium and helium is becoming increasingly important to our missile effort. I can't say that there is helium in this park but there is helium to the south in Arizona and there is helium to the north at Woodside. There is substantial amounts of helium at Lisbon and there are traces of helium at Salt Wash. There is no reason why it shouldn't occur right here.

I have heard some statements made today about the importance or the lack of importance of this oil—let's just take oil. I was going to say minerals but let's just say the oil industry to the State of Utah. In 1960 the oil industry alone paid $3,500,000 in rent and royalties and taxes to the Utah schools; $3,500,000 to the Utah schools from an industry which in 1960 amounted to $3,000.

Senator BENNETT. 1940.

Mr. HEWITT. Thank you, Senator, $3,000 in 1940. On that basis I might say that I stand here as the director of the Utah Geological and Mineralogical Survey and that I report to the University of Utah. I cannot conceive of it being in the interests of the University of Utah or of any public school in this State to withdraw 330,000 acres of potentially mineral-rich land from the heart of one of our great Paleozoic basins—that is a good geologic name—one of these great basins, for if they are withdrawn or put under the hands of a single individual of the Secretary of Interior for administration under his discretion, without specifically authorizing him to allow the free development of the mineral resources of that area——

Senator Moss. Dr. Hewitt, you are familiar with the language of the bill that does permit the continued exploration and production of

minerals subject to a general regulation to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreational values. Now in your opinion is that inadequate to do what you think should be done here?

Mr. HEWITT. Yes, Senator, I feel very strongly that it is inadequate.

Senator Moss. Well, would you prefer that it just remain under the Bureau of Land Management, the Secretary of the Interior working through the Bureau of Land Management then rather than the Secretary of the Interior working through the Parks Service?

Mr. HEWITT. I would like to see him specifically instructed to allow the bona fide development of mineral resources. Now this was brought out by Mr. Williams. I haven't talked with any lawyers about it.

Senator Moss. I have.

Mr. HEWITT. I am at a bit of a disadvantage on this but Mr. Williams very aptly demonstrated the fears of the mining industries, let's say, when he reversed this, this afternoon.

Senator Moss. Yes, he reversed it so that the Secretary, in making his regulations to protect the park, had to observe first all the other uses and——

Mr. HEWITT. And I believe everybody here would feel there will be no protection in that and that is the way we feel.

Senator METCALF. I think that you have given some fascinating testimony and I am impressed with the future of Utah as a mineral producer, both oil and other minerals, but I must as a legislator and a lawyer disagree with your distrust of the public officials in carrying out an act of Congress. We have already had some people testify that this committee and Congress can't write legislation that the Secretary will carry out.

Mr. HEWITT. When Congress cannot write legislation, there is something wrong. That is why I would like to see him specifically instructed.

Senator METCALF. Well, I think that—I thought Mr. Williams made a strong point. We have had several suggested amendments. I am sure that Senator Moss in drafting his bill is trying to do just exactly what you are talking about, trying to prevent the withdrawal of this perhaps minerally rich and significant land and certainly I think he can write legislation that will permit that.

Mr. HEWITT. I am sure it is possible.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much for a fascinating testimony, Dr. Hewitt.

(The prepared statement of Mr. William Hewitt is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM P. HEWITT, DIRECTOR, UTAH GEOLOGICAL AND MINERALOGICAL SURVEY

The area included within Senate bill 2387 is potentially mineral rich, but there is no accurate appraisal of its mineral content. Even the U.S. Geological Survey's published documents are extremely sparse.

Attached maps summarize available information. These—

Map No. 1—Structures and oilfields,
Map No. 2—Uranium occurrences,
Map No. 3—Salt-potash-magnesium occurrences,
Map No. 4—Cross section, Lisbon Valley,
Map No. 5—Oil and gas exploration—

except for No. 4, an illustration from outside the area, show the boundaries originally proposed by Senator Moss. Subsequent modifications do not affect the points herein presented, namely:

(1) The mineral potential, virtually untested, is seemingly important for uranium, oil and gas, potash, and magnesium. There is no way to predict the

volume of minerals that can be expected. There are reasons for hoping that they occur in substantial abundance, and that other items, such as helium, will be found.

(2) Utah's impressive mineral base is derived in great measure from minerals that were not produced, and were not known to exist in substantial quantities 20 years ago. Therefore, extreme care must be practiced, not only in selecting areas for withdrawal, but in administering affected areas.

(3) Utah's schools, from a single mineral industry that was unimportant and barely existent in 1940, received in 1960 a minimum of $3,500,000 in rentals and royalties from operations on State and Federal lands. Therefore, it is not in the interest of Utah's schools to withdraw large areas of public domain, or, where multiple use is permitted, to place its jurisdiction in single hands without definite instructions for the bona fide development of mineral resources. Nor is it in the interest of the State's finances, for in 1960, this same industry paid to the State some $11,583,935 in taxes, rents, and royalties derived mostly from State and Federal holdings.

(4) The points of superb beauty should be preserved. But outside such areas we should freely permit bona fide development of mineral resources and thereby add zest to the interest of the tourist, strength to the economy and growth of Utah, and additional stability to the Utah school system.

AVAILABLE INFORMATION ON MINERALS IN THE CANYONLANDS AREA

Structures and oilfields

Map No. 1 illustrates the broad surficial structures that are adjacent to the proposed park. These are the crests of great swells into which the rock formations have been distorted. A heavy line represents the crest of each swell, and the strata dip gently away from the crest in the direction of the arrows. To those who seek oil and gas, such structures are of considerable interest.

Two structures to the south trend northerly, one directly toward the proposed park. To the east, a series of structures trend northwesterly into the northeastern half of the proposed park. There is no assurance these will contain oil or gas, nor that they will continue across the proposed park, but their presence is highly significant and suggests that the area of the discussion is of potential economic importance.

Also shown are the oil producing areas of southeastern Utah: to the south, the collective area of the Aneth field and its group of satellites; to the east, Lisbon; to the northeast, Big Flat. Each of these productive areas draws oil from rocks of diverse geologic age. The Aneth region, discovered in 1954, produces from rocks of Pennsylvanian time. Lisbon, discovered in 1959, produces from strata of Mississippian and Devonian age, millions of years older than those at Aneth. Just as the Aneth discovery resulted in a widening area of Pennsylvanian production, so the Lisbon field is widening its area of new discoveries, and important Mississippian production is now obtained in the Big Flat field.

Uranium possibilities

Map No. 2 shows those areas that contain Utah's great uranium mines. To the east is the Big Indian district where Mr. Steen discovered the Mi Vida mine and aroused the world to the potential importance of Utah's uranium. To the northwest is the San Rafael swell. To the south is the Red Canyon-White Canyon-Elk Ridge complex or properties. None of these lie within the proposed area, but all occur in one particular geologic horizon. This same horizon occurs at depth beneath the surface in the northern portion of the proposed park and within the area indicated by crosshatches on the map. That this area is of possible merit is suggested by the numerous uranium prospects which have been located within the proposed park along the outcrops of this horizon. These prospects are indicated by open circles.

Salt-potash-magnesium

Map No. 3 shows the area of southeastern Utah that is underlain by salt. This, the dessicated arm of an ancient ocean that has been buried beneath thousands of feet of sediments, underlies the entire area of the proposed park. This salt, 7,000 to 14,000 feet thick, by itself has little actual importance. But, in this case, within the salt are such great thicknesses and areas of potassium and magnesium minerals that southeastern Utah may become North America's greatest source for these elements. This potassium-magnesium zone extends beneath the northeastern quarter of the proposed park.

The overall thickness of potassium mineralization approaches 42 feet and lies from 1,700 to 14,000 feet beneath the surface. Large segments of this thickness are not sufficiently rich to be commercially exploitable under present mining technology. However, some of the individual beds, thin compared with the overall thickness of potassium-bearing material, are of mineable thickness and exceptional richness. In the exploitation of these beds, nearness to surface is a critical factor. The first shaft to exploit them is now being sunk to a depth of 3,000 feet. It lies at the very edge of the proposed park.

Associated magnesium minerals, although not exploited, represent a potential asset of significant amplitude. Not only are they abundant, but they are richer and more concentrated than sources under actual exploitation.

Vanadium and copper

As to other minerals, uranium ores of the Big Indian and Temple Mountain districts contain as much as 1 to 2 percent vanadium. In the past, both radium and vanadium ores were mined throughout this general area.

Copper, likewise, is present. In the uranium mines to the south of the proposed park, it is an important byproduct. In addition to the copper-uranium ores, there are many bodies of oxidized copper deposits throughout the entire region. Known as "sandstone coppers," these bodies seldom have been operated successfully, but never so in Utah, except in those cases where they have been operated as a source of diluent for smelter feed. In these cases, the copper became an important byproduct. In Utah, when operated purely for their copper content, the largest of these, the Big Indian, merely traded dollars. At present they are academic curiosities; but, should a change occur in the technology of refining copper, these deposits could become economic assets. I have no idea whether they occur within the boundaries of the proposed park. I know they occur widely throughout the area, and I would be most surprised if they do not occur within the area of discussion.

Clay and gypsum

In a region as isolated as southeastern Utah, it may appear illogical to speak of such items as clay and gypsum. However, strata in which these minerals occur exist within the proposed park area.

Problems of oil-seeking

When it comes to exploration and the inherent difficulties involved, two additional maps, Nos. 4 and 5a, may prove illustrative. Map No. 4 is a west to east cross-section (view facing northerly) through the Lisbon oilfield. Concerning Lisbon, there are three important facts to note. First, the oil-bearing structure in the pre-Pennsylvanian rocks is not reflected at the surface; the apparently favorable surface structure does not exist at the horizons where the oil is trapped. Second, the location of such traps can be found only by expensive, time-consuming geophysical and stratigraphic studies. Pure Oil, the discoverer of the Lisbon field, spent 10 years assiduously studying these pre-Pennsylvanian conditions before making this important strike. Third, the Lisbon field is limited to about nine sections.

Oil and gas exploration within the area

Intensity of drilling.—The fifth map, Map No. 5a, located the areas that have been explored for oil within or immediately adjacent to the proposed park. There are 18 exploratory holes: if evenly distributed, 1 hole in every 18,300 acres or 1 in every 29 square miles. Two of these are drilling. Of the remaining 16, one is a producing well, 7 have shows of oil or gas, and 9 either were blank or no information has been released. In evaluating these results, remember that despite 50 years of effort, the first producing oil field in southeastern Utah was discovered only 10 years ago. Since then, the great Aneth region has grown from a single productive well. Concerning the Aneth region, shown on map No. 1, despite its apparent size, the overall productive area contains numerous nonproductive or dry holes. This simply is not a region where a person can turn around three times, say "Abacadrabra" twice, stamp his foot, and produce a gusher.

Target horizons.—Concerning the single producing well, its production is from Mississippian strata. It was less than 3 years ago that the first important Mississippian oil in Utah was discovered, and of the 16 holes, only 7 have tested

formations as old as the Mississippian. Moreover, at the Lisbon field there is important oil and gas in the still more ancient Devonian rocks. Within the proposed park, only four holes have tested strata an ancient as the Devonian.

It cannot be said that the drilling accomplished to date has condemned the area.

Helium

In speaking of these holes, I would be remiss if I failed to mention that a hoped for accessory to any hydrocarbons discovered in this area is helium. Helium is assuming a potentially important role in the U.S. misselry effort. Helium of importance is found to the south, in Arizona; and in Utah in substantial amounts at Woodside, 60 miles to the northwest, and in variable amounts at Salt Wash, 22 miles to the northwest and at Lisbon, 25 miles to the east. There is no reason why it might not occur in the area under discussion.

IMPORTANCE OF MINERALS TO THE STATE OF UTAH

Comparisons, 1940–60

At this point it is well to point out what minerals mean to the State of Utah. Two years are compared, 1940 and 1960. Thus:

	1940	1960	Ratio 1940–60
Precious and base metals	$88,585,000	$175,577,000	2
All others	15,808,000	255,819,000	16
Total	104,393,000	431,396,000	4

In 20 years, while the precious and base metals doubled their dollar value, the total increased fourfold from $104,393,000 to $431,396,000, and "All other" mineral products increased sixteenfold.

A further subdivision shows startling changes. Thus:

	1940	1960	Ratio
Precious and base metals	$88,585,000	$175,577,000	2
Coal	7,872,000	31,458,000	4
Natural gas	1,063,000	[1] 9,238,000	9
Asphalt and related hydrocarbons	776,000	[2] 12,535,000	16
Oil	3,000	[1] 100,455,000	33,000
Iron ore	([3])	23,862,000	----------
Uranium	None	27,843,000	----------
Others	6,094,000	50,428,000	8
Total	104,393,000	431,396,000	4

[1] Data from Utah Oil and Gas Commission.
[2] Approximation.
[3] None reported.

NOTE.—Unless otherwise stated, dollar values obtained from U.S. Bureau of Mines "Minerals Yearbook," vol. III, 1960, and U.S. Bureau of Mines "Minerals Yearbook," data for 1940.

In addition to the ninefold and sixteenfold increase of natural gas and asphalt-and-related hydrocarbons, note that oil with only $3,000 in 1940 now amounts to over $100 million, almost as much as the entire mineral production of 1940, while iron ore and uranium with a combined total of $51,705,000 were not recorded in 1940. If the "others" category could be subdivided, individual members undoubtedly would show similar trends.

Importance of the unexpected

The point to be made is that these great changes have occurred unexpectedly, unpredictedly; and on the basis of past experience, Utah, from currently unsuspected sources, will witness remarkable performance in the next 20 years. There is no actual means to predict what these will be or where they will occur, but we can hazard a guess that potash will be among them and that it will occur in part within the boundaries of the proposed park.

What these unpredicted, unexpected developments mean is further exemplified by the following figures. In 1960, the oil and gas industry paid $11,583,935 in taxes, rentals and royalties to the State of Utah. Of this amount—

Represents leases and royalties derived from State lands	$1, 046, 670
Represents leases and royalties derived from Federal lands	2, 729, 620
Derived from taxes of all types	7, 807, 645
Total	11, 583, 935

Since the $2,729,620 income from Federal lands is 37½ percent of the total royalty or rental paid on Federal lands, the actual total approaches—

State leases and royalties	$1, 046, 670
Federal leases and royalties	7, 278, 986
Taxes	7, 807, 645
Total	16, 133, 301

from an industry which 20 years ago had a total gross value of $1,066,000 (natural gas equal $1,063,000, oil equals $3,000).

Significance of the proposed park to Utah schools

Of the 330,000 acres included within this proposal, possibly 36,000 acres are State land.[1] The balance of 294,000 acres is federally owned, and of the gross royalty and rentals obtained thereon 37½ percent is returned to the State. Of the total royalty or rental received by the State, both from the State lands and the 37½-percent return from the Feleral lands 100 percent of the State-land revenue and 90 percent of that from Federal lands is allocated to Utah's schools. I cannot conceive its being in the interest of the University of Utah, nor of any school in Utah either to withdraw 330,000 acres of potentially mineral-rich land, of which possibly 36,000 acres belong to the State, or to place at the personal discretion of a single individual—the Secretary of the Interior— the jurisdiction over them without giving him specific instructions for their development. From the 1960 royalties paid by the oil and gas industry alone, Utah's schools received a minimum of $3,500,000 from a source that barely existed in 1940. Hence, the Secretary of the Interior should be instructed to freely permit the bonafide development of the mineral resources.

GRANDEUR OF THE AREA

Tourist interest

Before closing, I would like to digress from the mineral potentials and speak of the breathtaking beauty and sublime grandeur of this area. I can assure you, no one enjoys the vast expanse of these views more than the field engineer or the exploration geologist. These men are not destroyers of beauty. It is their trails that have made this country accessible, and as to whether their operations scar a country and drive away the tourist, what, I ask, is the present tourist attraction in the State of Utah? Bingham Canyon, if not the first, certainly does not repel the tourist.

I do not advocate the marring of superb beauty. These, preserve. But outside the limits of such areas, to me, a copper mine, a uranium shaft, or an oil field adds zest to the interest of touring, and their trails are not 1 one-thousandth as destructive as the highways that lead great hordes of people through some of our Nation's once lovely parks.

Vastness of the views

Another point: In this country where cliffs are measured in thousands of feet, and where virtually every sheer-walled canyon leads to another, the magnitude of a view from a lookout point is so vast that the dump from a mine or the 100-foot derrick of an exploration well recedes into obscurity. For example, at Dead Horse Point, in full view of every tourist who has visited there in the last 2 years, are two exploration derricks. How many tourists have seen them?

[1] From the testimony of Governor Clyde, p. 101, "Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs," U.S. Senate, 87th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 2387, Mar. 29 and 30, 1962, pt. 1.

Types of mineral development

It is said that no one wants a Signal Hill, with its ungainly forest of derricks, in a national park. Signal Hill belongs to the era that called forth the truly conservation-conceived parks—Yellowstone and Yosemite are among them. Today, according to State law, oil wells can be no closer than 1 in every 40 acres; by intercompany agreement at Aneth and at Lisbon, they are 1 in every 80 and 1 in every 320 acres respectively.

SUMMARY

To summarize, the mineral potential within the area of the proposed park, virtually untested, but seemingly important, includes uranium, oil and gas, potash, and magnesium. There is no way to estimate their magnitude, but we hope it will be sizable. If the past 20 years is a key to the future, Utah can anticipate unexpected mineral-industry developments that will return impressive sums to the school system. In 1960 one such industry returned some $3,500,000 to the Utah schools, whereas in 1940 its gross production amounted to a mere $1,066,000. There is no actual way to predict where such developments will occur, but we suspect that the area of the proposed park is favorably situated to be a potential candidate. To place the jurisdiction over such an area in the hands of a single individual, without instructing him to permit the bona fide development of mineral resources (adequate controls can be stipulated) is not, from my point of view, in the interest of the Utah school system, of which the University of Utah is part. Concerning the points of beauty, preserve them. Elsewhere within the area, encourage the legitimate development of the natural resources and thereby add interest to the tourist, strength to the economy and growth of Utah, and additional stability to the financial structure of our schools.

Senator METCALF. The next witness is Mr. John Schone and he will be followed by John Campbell.

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. SCHONE, PRESIDENT, UTAH AFL–CIO

Mr. SCHONE. Honorable Senators and Congresmen, I can't qualify as a geologist or an economist or a wildlife expert but I am here to express the opinion of the members of our organization in the State of Utah and with the permission of the committee I would like to read the statement that I have. It is a short one and I don't want to take up the committee's time.

I am John R. Schone, president of the Utah State AFL–CIO, an organization composed of over 40,000 working men and women in the State of Utah. I am appearing today upon instruction from the Utah State AFL–CIO Executive Council, the governing body of our organization.

We support Senate bill 2387, known as the Moss bill, and favor development of the Canyonlands National Park on an overall basis as outlined in Senate bill 2387. Our reasons for supporting this proposed legislation are as follows:

It is our opinion that an area of such marvelous and outstanding scenic wonders, also containing the historical remains of a vanished race of early Americans, can be properly protected for future generations only through inclusion of the entire area in one national park, thus assuring adequate supervision from the National Park Service.

Perhaps more than any other group, our organization favors industrial expansion, and we believe creation of new jobs is a vital necessity to the economic well being and continued growth of the State of Utah. It is the consensus of our organization that the establishment of the national park in the area as outlined in Senate bill 2387—I am now speaking of the substitute bill—would have little ill effect on industrial expansion, for section 4 of the bill as proposed protects

grazing rights now privately held in the area; and section 5 protects present holders of oil and mineral leases as well as permitting additional exploration and development under proper controls and conditions.

We believe that rather than deter industrial expansion, the establishment of the proposed Canyonlands National Park would actually stimulate growth and industrial expansion in the areas surrounding the park site, and would in effect create more jobs through the revenue derived from the influx of the tourist trade into the area.

Furthermore the size of the proposed park—roughly 500 square miles—is a minute portion of the land area of this State—totaling about 84,916 square miles. The proposed park size as outlined in Senate bill 2387 would encompass approximately three fifths of 1 percent of the land in the State of Utah. Taking into consideration the thousands of miles of uninhabited arid lands in Utah, the withdrawal of about 500 square miles of valuable scenic and historic territory seems to be amply justified.

During the past several years new national park development has not kept pace with the population growth in the United States. This is also true in the State of Utah where population increases certainly necessitate additional recreational facilities.

Automation in industry has created decreased daily hours of work and shortened workweeks for the workforce in Utah, and from all reports it seems there will be continuing increases in workers' leisure time. It seems evident that national parks and controlled recreational areas should be developed to their fullest to provide sufficient areas of relaxation and outdoor activity for working people during their leisure time. The proposed park would be a distinct advantage to people living in the more populous areas in northern Utah as it can be reached in 1 day driving, and the Canyonlands area, Bryce Canyon, Cedar Breaks, Zion National Park, and the Grand Canyon could all be visited during a vacation period of a few days.

We do not favor developing only three small scenic points as park areas. There likely would not be enough development in any of the specific areas to draw the number of tourists scenic and historical monuments of this kind with proper promotion would attract. If the area were not properly developed the value of the park would be immensely reduced. The proposal to spend about $17 million in developments such as museums, visitors center, adequate housing and eating facilities, would certainly enhance the value of the park and aid in its value as a major tourist attraction. There are several small parks and monuments in Utah and adjacent areas at present and none of them seem to provide the type of housing and eating facilities that tend to attract large numbers of visitors to the areas. Establishment of the Canyonlands National Park on an overall basis could also help to alleviate the crowded summertime situation in Yellowstone National Park.

Many union members in Utah hunt and fish for relaxation and are very interested in wildlife conservation. The control and preservation of fish and game seems to be well taken care of under section 7 of Senate bill 2387.

In summary, the position of the Utah State AFL–CIO on Senate bill 2387 is that its passage would be beneficial to the Nation as a

whole and to the State of Utah specifically. It is our opinion that establishment of the Canyonlands National Park as outlined in this bill would be a stimulus to industrial and business activity in the area and would create many jobs for presently unemployed persons.

Passage of the bill would greatly add to the recreational facilities in this State. It protects the irreplaceable, invaluable historical and scenic attractions and assures their preservation and availability to the future citizens of this country.

We therefore urge adoption of Senate bill 2387 establishing the Canyonlands National Park.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Schone.

The next witness is John Campbell, former Utah State Director of Publicity. He will be followed by John Wallace. Mr. Campbell? (No response.)

The next witness will be Mr. John M. Wallace of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. WALLACE, JR., REPRESENTING THE SALT LAKE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chairman, my name is John M. Wallace, Jr., and I am speaking in behalf of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce and its Recreation and Conservation Committee.

First, let me say that last spring I had the privilege of participating in the Canyon Country friendship cruise, which is sponsored by the Moab and Green River Chambers of Commerce, and can share Senator Moss' enthusiasm for the grandeur of the cliffs along the Green and Colorado Rivers. Also, I have flown over some portion of the area under consideration and can testify that it is an awsome sight to a pilot. We should like to thank Senator Moss and the subcommittee for the interest they have shown in this project.

The chamber of commerce is vitally interested, as its name implies, in the optimum economic development, and also the humanistic development of our area. We feel that these two masters can best be served by following, in general, the recommendations made to Governor Clyde by a special committee on March 14, 1962, C. J. Olsen, chairman.

Our committee also stated that multiple use of federally owned lands is becoming increasingly important as our population increases. No one has a crystal ball to tell us what mineral wealth lies beneath this area. We do not feel, however, that these two conflicts of interest can best be resolved by administrative action within a national park. Experience in Mt. McKinley National Park and Dinosaur National Monument has proven that this is not a workable solution. Those areas which are not absolutely essential to the preservation of historical and geological treasures should not be encumbered with national park status.

We also wish to go on record as stating that we do not see these issues as being political in any way. We hope that a workable bill can be drawn in both the House and the Senate which will have the full support of all of the Utah delegation. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

Miss Lucy Redd is the next witness.

STATEMENT OF MISS LUCY REDD, ATTORNEY

Miss REDD. The Canyonlands National Park proposed by Senator Moss in Senate bill 2387 is located in San Juan County, Utah where I was born and raised. My family, who were pioneers in the area, still live in Monticello. Though I have lived in Salt Lake City since college my business has constantly and continuously caused me to go to Grand and San Juan Counties. I have kept in reasonably close contact with the people and the area all my life. In fact, I have always considered and still do consider Monticello to be my home.

My appearance in support of the Moss bill before this subcommittee is due to a couple of reasons—my interest in the preservation of the natural scenic wonders of the area and the fact that I feel this bill provides the best opportunity Utah has to acquire a national park within its borders which in turn will mean considerable economic gain to both the local area involved and the State as a whole.

I have seen the economy of the area fluctuate up and down sharply due to development of natural resources. When the depletable natural resources are exhausted I am hopeful the tourist industry will be firmly established, for that industry, properly developed will never be exhausted but will increase continuously and be a stable base of our economy.

The scenery we are talking about today, as you gentlemen know, is uniquely spectacular and breathtaking. I have never heard one person who has visited the Canyonlands say otherwise. I have covered the entire area by jeep, foot, boat, horseback, and air, and have clients in the tourist business who do so repeatedly.

Utah is fortunate, in my judgment, that the proposal of this park comes at a time when there is a legislative precedent in the national park field for every secondary use the bill provides for. The bill, in my opinion, provides adequately not only for the primary use but also for Utah's secondary uses.

The bill affords a reasonable degree of protection for continued exploration and production of minerals in the area, if any there be, while still protecting the primary uses of recreation and park values.

Another thing I like about the bill is that it authorizes the building of access roads not only in the park but from three different sides of the park. This is of tremendous importance in this part of the country, as for most intents and purposes the magnificent scenic attractions have always been locked up. These roads will facilitate the highest use as a park and recreational area and certainly will make it simpler to conduct secondary uses. I do not know if any sort of count of visitors in the area has ever been taken, but the Rainbow Natural Bridge down below the park is a towering splendid tourist attraction. It has been a national monument for 40 to 50 years, but, because of the rugged, wild terrain surrounding it, accessibility is difficult, and not more than 200 or 300 persons a year visit it.

I am personally not aware of deliberate vandalism to any of the choice scenic attractions within the proposed park, with one or two exceptions; but I can tell you of deliberate destruction and marring of scenic wonders immediately outside its boundaries and in the general area. Newspaper Rock, in Indian Creek Canyon, has a huge display of animals, human figures, and symbols, presumably carved by prehistoric artists with hard stone. There is a picture of this fasci-

nating rock in the May 1962 edition of the National Geographic magazine, which carries a 23-page article complete with pictures on the area. On personal examination on the rock, one can see where vandals have deliberately carved and desecrated the artistic and unique work of petroglyphs. A few years ago the Goblet of Venus, located below the park area, was deliberately tipped over. This huge rock was very broad at the top and then came down like a goblet to the base, where its entire weight was supported by a pedestal only 12 inches thick at one place. The sight was almost unbelievable and tourists visiting San Juan always wanted to view this unusual phenomena. Investigators say that the vandals used a truck with huge logs protruding from the back and repeatedly backed into the delicate stem of the rock until finally it was toppled. This bill will, I feel, afford protection against this and other types of needless destruction.

A couple of months ago there was a great deal of misunderstanding about the provisions of this bill, but since that time there has been considerable clarification, so consequently I feel that many of the statements made back at that time no longer apply, and I feel that support for this bill has been constantly gaining.

Utah again is fortunate that the Moss bill comes before you at a time when the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the National Park Service all have recommended this park. I do not know when we might be fortunate enough to have this type of national support in the future and I therefore strongly urge for the benefit of the people of this State and Nation that you favorably recommend the Moss bill.

Senator METCALF. Any questions? (No response.)

Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Lucy.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Miss Redd.

The next witness is Mr. Harold Tippetts, Utah State Park and Recreation. If there is time he will be followed by William Revealey.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD J. TIPPETTS, UTAH STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Mr. TIPPETTS. If there is time, Mr. Chairman, our director of the State park and recreation commission is here and he has a statement, I believe.

I wish to express my appreciation in placing my impressions before your able committee this day in connection with the Canyonlands National Park proposal by Hon. Senator Moss of Utah. I should like to add my voice to that of others who sincerely believe the Canyonlands area of this great State of Utah deserves national park status and appreciation to those responsible for its consideration. I do not represent the State park and recreation commission in this statement, but speak only as a member of the commission.

The Bureau of Land Management, National Recreation Area, National Monuments and National Parks are entities of the Federal Government which administer areas, activities, and facilities which, with regard to policy, run the gamut from multiple purpose to single purpose and highest use concept. These are carefully considered and cautiously created agencies with excellent personnel and administrative and operation records of which each of us can be proud. The

Canyonlands National Park, as proposed, is presently administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The area will be adjacent to the great Lake Powell National Recreation Area, and considering the Canyonlands in its broadest concept, touches or actually would encompass several fine existing National monuments and State parks. Reported studies by the National Park Service and others substantiate that the Canyonlands merits national park status. With this I wholeheartedly concur.

The park bill under consideration, however, proposes a broadening of the use concept and if this be justified or necessary, perhaps administration as a national recreation area would suffice. It is my opinion, however, that the Canyonlands will qualify as a national park by any and every measuring device and merits all the stature, prestige, and enhancement that national park status will provide. I do not feel that the broader concept should be injected into the national park criteria and would desire to resist any change or tampering with policy, principle, or concept of national park standards.

In this the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission joins—

> the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission goes on record in support of the creation of a true national park in the Canyonlands area of southeastern Utah in keeping with the heretofore established principles and philosophy of the National Park Service prohibiting the intrusion of land uses hostile to the national park concept; that around that national park there should be established a large buffer zone recreation area in which economic development can be provided with due regard for its scenic and inspirational values; and that the extent and boundaries of the national park and of the buffer zone recreation area should be determined by a small, qualified, and impartial commission predicated on an intensive field study and having in mind the local, State, and national interests.

Where should the boundary be? I would hesitate to say even were I prepared, which I am not. The State park commission is not prepared to make a recommendation. There are many suggestions and recommendations. The people of the State, and perhaps the Nation, are justifiably concerned, possibly apprehensive, and quite possibly confused. I do not feel that these are the circumstances under which a wise decision can be made. We must proceed with caution.

Upon traveling the area, it is my impression to enlarge rather than reduce the considered area. The Sinbad, Goblin Valley, San Rafael Swell, Twin Six-Shooter Peaks, and many others too numerous to mention merit equal consideration. The area is enormous—what of the land running from spectacular to spectacular?

Minerals, petroleum, wildlife, and other natural resource statistics and potentials have been submitted by others far more qualifed—and this potential is recognizedly tremendous or we would not have any boundary problem.

The Canyonlands area is so large that many otherwise considered "foreign" activities would actually be lost. Few people realize that oil wells are active in the river canyon within sight from the Dead Horse Point overlook. The potash plant is also in sight, and to me these are no detriment. Actually a limited amount of such activity will enhance rather than detract. By this I mean to point out that humans use as a yardstick those things which are familiar such as the height of an oil derrick, the almost insignificant size of mining buildings against a backdrop of sandstone monoliths towering hun-

dreds of feet in the air, the width or tortuous winding of a ribbon of highway as it winds to the horizon, the portal of a tunnel or railroad trackage which speaks of the accomplishments of man and his technical accomplishments. This gives me a thrill and pleasure akin to that of an astronaut circling the earth. Realize that I am not proposing promiscuous manmade tampering in nature's wonderland. But I do submit that under certain situations, these otherwise encroachments in nature will actually assist the tourist to appreciate and begin to comprehend the vastness, the enormity of this fabulous land.

Certainly a decision must be made, but the circumstances are such that once the boundary is determined, the outlying areas are not gone forever. The land is presently federally owned and we are not faced with soaring land acquisition costs. Critical areas can be protected by the Bureau of Land Management, a fine administrative body. Initially created park areas can be enlarged as with Zion National Park. Initial access to the many areas can be provided which will be necessary under whichever administration is chosen in the final determination. This will require few delays and provide an interim wherein present economic studies and reports, which are only careful estimates or projects, can be supported or refuted.

In summary I should—

(1) Support and encourage the creation of a Canyonlands National Park.

(2) Oppose the change or broadening of the principles or philosophy of the National Park Service and the intrusion of hostile land use.

(3) Support the size of a park at a minimum size to encompass critical natural features and an area which is considered economical to administer—an acreage of approximately 100,000 acres.

(4) Recommend that the National Park Service "master plan" the entire region for a staged development. Extensive boundary studies which are already made will provide most of the necessary information.

(5) Based upon the master plan, areas that merit national park consideration which are outside of the initial park creation can then be "zoned or buffered" to temporarily limit "foreign" use. This is a common tool used in staging city and urban growth and development.

(6) The remainder or fringe should then be openly and actively encouraged in multiple-use benefit.

By this procedure, a final boundary can be established on the basis of actual support of findings and use, either to encompass the buffer area as national park or open it to economic development.

In conclusion, I can envision a region of grazing, wildlife management, mineral and petroleum activity in the highest degree of the multiple-use concept. Along with these activities I envision the creation of recreation areas and State parks, all oriented about a Canyonlands National Park that can be a testimony to man's ability to cooperate and integrate his interests in the accomplishment of the most beneficial use of a tremendously spectacular and productive area.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Tippetts.

I regret that the time for closing the hearing has arrived. You have been a very cooperative group of witnesses and even so we have been unable to accommodate, according to my list, seven—Mr. Frank

Memmott, H. C. Thomas, William Revealey, Wayne Carlson, Mrs. Margaret Piggott, Clair Rowley, L. Y. Siddoway, Mr. Colt, and Aldin O. Hayward. Those witnesses and any others may have permission to file a statement with the committee. We will keep the record open for 2 weeks from today and you may communicate with the chairman of the Interior Committee or with either of your Senators or your Congressmen.

Senator Moss. Mr. Chairman, let me say how much I regret that we could not hear orally all of these witnesses. I know, I recognize from seeing them in the courtroom here that they have sat all day waiting for an opportunity to appear and it just seems a shame that we haven't been able to hear them but we took on more than we could accomplish today I think. I recognize we started at 9 o'clock and cut the noon hour 30 minutes short in an attempt to get everyone in but Senator Metcalf must be on an airplane that has "wheels up" at 5:45 so you see that he has no time to spare.

Senator Long has already had to leave to catch his plane back to Washington and I have an appointment here in about 20 minutes that was made 2 weeks ago with people that I have to see so the committee has just come to the point where we can't stay any longer.

Statements, however, that are filed will appear in the printed record just as though they were given orally and I assure those people that they will receive every bit of consideration from all of the committee members that oral testimony will receive.

The whole testimony will be printed up in a printed booklet like this [indicating] which is the testimony of the first hearing in Washington. This will be sent automatically to everybody who testifies, whose name appears here as a witness but will also be sent to anybody else who is interested and would like to read the testimony of the hearings.

Now this is what the committee reads and decides when we sit down to mark up the bill and decide what we wish to report. I want to thank those people who have appeared and those who have stayed all day long and not been able to appear. I certainly want to thank my colleagues of the Public Lands Subcommittee who gave up their Easter weekend with their families to be out here in Utah. I think they had a good time but it was not as they would plan, I suppose, in the first place if this just hadn't been their obligation.

I appreciate the use of this courtroom. Judge Ritter made it available and as you know we had television in here part of the day which testifies to the great interest there is in this community on our problem and let me not forget to speak again about the Fausetts and the wonderful pictures that they brought here today. Anyone who hasn't looked at them may approach them and look more closely before they are taken down. Everyone certainly has cooperated to the fullest and I am grateful indeed to all of these people, Mr. Chairman.

Senator METCALF. I am grateful to you, Senator Moss and to you, Senator Bennett and Congressman King and Congressman Peterson and to the wonderful witnesses who have cooperated with us so well today and thank you.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, may I express my appreciation to you for the invitation. I found this most enlightening and I can see our work is cut out for us in the House.

Senator METCALF. The committee will be adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 5:05 p.m., the subcommittee recessed.)

(The following statements were subsequently submitted to the committee:)

STATEMENT OF WAYNE L. CARLSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The United States will continue to thrive and grow ever more strong as the needs and hopes of the people are provided for. In this day of great national growth and ever-increasing mibility of our populace, new needs are upon us. One of these needs is the preservation of open spaces and areas of natural inspiration. As our great new National Highway System grows nearer to completion it is imperative that action be taken to make some of our great natural wonders accessible to the public.

An area which until recent years was virtually unexplored wilderness is the Canyonlands area of southeastern Utah. This area has the potential of being the greatest scenic attraction in the United States. I feel that the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park as proposed in the Moss bill, would be one of the best accomplishments, on the domestic front, of our day.

In times where we face a Godless attitude on the international scene, areas of great natural beauty inspire men's lives to lofty heights. The following words of this Christian hymn help to express the uplifting effect of nature upon the soul of man:

OUR MOUNTAIN HOME SO DEAR

Our mountain home so dear, where crystal waters clear, flow ever free;
While through the valleys wide the flowers on everyside, blooming in stately pride, are fair to see.
We'll roam the verdant hills, and by the sparkling rills, pluck the wild flowers;
The fragrance on the air, the landscape bright and fair, and sunshine everywhere, make pleasant hours.
In sylvan depth and shade, in forest and in glade, where'er we pass,
The hand of God we see, in leaf and bud and tree, or bird or humming bee, or blade of grass.
The streamlet flower, and sod bespeak the works of God, and all combine,
With most transporting grace, His handiwork to trace, through nature's smiling face, in art divine.

Certainly the awe-inspiring, massive, natural wonders of the Canyonlands National Park area will be great memories to all who see them. It will exert a good effect upon their inner souls.

As chairman of the Salt Lake County Democratic Committee, with due consideration of the opinions and needs of the people of our county and Nation, I respectfully submit the following resolution:

"*Be it hereby resolved*, That we the people of Salt Lake County, do strongly support the Moss bill, for the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park and urge its immediate consideration and passage by the Congress of the United States."

We feel that no selfish local interests should stand in the way of such an uplifting fine project which will bring so many fine values to our people.

We stand firmly behind the proposition that an area of such great natural beauty and grandeur should be readily accessible to the people of the entire Nation.

We feel that as various areas make their contribution to the full picture which makes America great, that we as progressive citizens of Utah should rally in full support of many projects to make Utah truly the "center of scenic America."

We know that for the best interests of a strong intermountain economy we of Utah need to develop tourism through our scenic areas. Utah is an area of relatively low per capita income ($320 for Utah compared with $585 for New York) and it behooves all people with a genuine interest in the overall good of our State to support projects which will bring "new dollars" into our area.

We invite all those who have felt to delay or introduce views and attitudes of smallness in regard to this great American project, to reconsider their position in this matter.

We know that the great majority of our people stand in firm support of establishment of this park and in a big American way.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM L. REAVLEY, WESTERN FIELD REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman, the National Wildlife Federation has already submitted testimony that favors the concept of the Canyonlands National Park. Our statement suggests that if grazing is to be continued and if mining is to be provided for, then the Canyonlands area should be set aside under some designation other than a national park, such as a national recreation area. Other suggestions have also been respectfully submitted.

In view of this, my testimony will be in the form of a personal statement, not in conflict with that of the National Wildlife Federation. The present commendable and vigorous movement to set aside more areas for the enjoyment of the coming generations of Americans should be accompanied by wise planning and should consider the future more than the present. Making piecemeal exceptions to satisfy opponents in certain areas can, in my opinion, eventually lead to a great deal of confusion and can create problems we can well do without.

If multiple-use principles are to prevail on national parks why take certain segments of public land away from existing agencies of the Government, now presumably practicing multiple use and give them to an agency not as throughly experienced in multiple-use management? Having separate agencies of the Government all performing parallel tasks does not make a great deal of sense.

Undoubtedly there is merit in constantly examining the concepts and making changes in national park policy to more nearly conform to modern-day needs. Whatever name these areas might bear is not nearly as important as how well the administration is carrying out its mandate in the public interest.

It is clear that the National Park Service has admirably carried out its responsibilities to America with one major exception. This problem involves the destruction of vegetation and watersheds by overabundant populations of elk and deer. This problem has come close to being a national disgrace in Yellowstone National Park where eroded ranges are destroying the very purpose for which this great park was established. Studies show that the vegetative character of the parks in Utah has been vastly altered due to the heavy mule deer populations. These conditions create distrust and doubt by professional wildlife managers that the Park Service will be realistic about solving this problem elsewhere. Section 7 of S. 2387 will probably work provided all parties assume a positive and prudent approach. Whether laws can be written to overcome uncooperative officials in a situation like this I do not know.

The Senate and House committees and the Congress have a number of alternatives, most of them with attractive features, for the purpose of setting aside the great scenic area of the Canyonlands. I believe the language of the legislation should be somewhat similar for all of the areas now under consideration and should fit into a basic pattern based upon needs, purposes, and intent. Under no circumstances should abundant wildlife species be allowed to destroy the areas we all hold in such high esteem.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing here today.

STATEMENT OF ALDIN O. HAYWARD, DIRECTOR, UTAH STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION

I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity to appear before this Canyonlands National Park hearing to make a statement in this regard.

As a representative of the Governor's committee appointed to study the proposed Canyonlands National Park Area, as director of the State park and recreation commission, as a resident, taxpayer, and individual of the State of Utah, I would like to express my opinion for the record at this public hearing.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY MANHATTAN, KANSAS JUL 2 1962

The State park and recreation commission at its April 14, 1961, commission meeting adopted the following resolution:

"That the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission go on record in support of the creation of a true national park in the Canyonlands area of southeastern Utah in keeping with the heretofore established principles and philosophy of the National Park Service prohibiting the intrustion of land uses hostile to the national park concept; that around the national park there should be established a large buffer zone recreation area in which economic development can be provided with due regard for its scenic and inspirational values; and that the extent and boundaries of the national park and of the buffer zone recreation area should be determined by a small, qualified, and impartial commission predicated on an intensive field study and having in mind the local, State, and National interests."

There is a question in my mind as to whether State parks, with Federal assistance versus national parks has been adequately considered. This should have been done, but has not. Therefore, it should be done for future areas and for future programing and development of parks (particularly for the Western States) where the greatest historic, scenic, and recreational potential are prevalent.

There is much to be gained by establishment of a park or parks in the Canyonlands area as has been brought out vividly in the State park and recreation commission's State park potential inventory of the State of Utah in 1959.

There is also much to be concerned about in the establishment of a national park, particularly of too large a size since it might place valuable mineral assets, known and unknown, in a status outside exploration and development and adversely jeopardizing the development of the area and its resources. Let's take time to analyze it and do the proper thing for the best good for the most people and particularly for the State of Utah. I think there is no question as to the majority of the people who feel they want a park or parks, but there is some question in many people's minds that sufficient study has not as yet been made. I contend that the State park and recreation commission is set up so that with Federal assistance they could do the job more economically, as efficiently and as speedily as the national parks could do, in that I feel this is the direction that our Federal agencies should be interested in directing their efforts for the future. But inasmuch as the State park program is comparatively new and the national parks and congressional delegation feel this Canyonlands Park should be brought to its prominence immediately, due to the fact that our States does not minimize the value of tourist business and economically needs the tourist business, then I would recommend as a second alternative that we continue with the national park program and withdraw only the areas of scenic importance for national park status and that we encompass this with a recreational boundary area whereby a multiple-use concept can be carried out. I do not feel that we should take away the initiative of future generations to explore these areas and develop any other resources that would aid in the economy of future generations.

I think the rights of the State and its people should be considered, respected, and favored.

Though knowledge of mineral resources of the area is limited, there is sufficient known, and enough not known, to insist that major areas be kept open for a long, continued exploration, investigation, research, and development. The economic devolpment, both present and for future generations, is too necessary for the well-being of the State's growing population to slow, delay, prevent, or halt these mineral development activities. This must be the prerogative of future generations.

I am in support of national parks for superlative scenic value, of controlled size, which should be spelled out specifically in the initial phases of this program, but not to the exclusion of State park areas. I am not prepared to state what the size of the park should be, but feel that 100,000 acres could answer the needs and still leave the remaining lands for other uses.

To achieve the maximum benefit from our limited land area, the preservation of areas of choice scenic, historic, and scientific interest must by necessity remain small, surrounded by adjoining lands of sufficient size open and managed by the multiple-use (but not abuse) concept in establishment of a park and recreation program.

One thing certain is we should not lock up a vast area now and also leave the door open to continue expansion of this park area as has been the prerogative and practice of the National Park Service in the past.

I would like to ask the question, "How far off the trail do tourists get? What uses do we make from large acreages where no one ventures?"

I am not in opposition to tourist attractions in any manner. On the contrary I am working for every factor I see feasible to encourage tourists to Utah and Western United States.

There should be no limitation as to the time any exploration for the development of material and resources is undertaken. Again may I state the National Park Service by past precedence has continually enlarged park areas and I would recommend that the specific area should be spelled out in the establishment of this park.

May I state clearly for the record that as a member of Governor Clyde's committee appointed to study Canyonlands National Park proposal and laws—

(1) At no time did Governor Clyde indicate political implications to this committee.

(2) Members were of both political parties.

(3) Members were repeatedly advised by our chairman, Mr. Olsen, that we were on our own to say, state, and recommend facts as we found them without regard or consideration of affiliation to political party, Governor Clyde, Senator Moss, or anyone else. The meetings were all open to the public, the press, radio, and television.

(4) Therefore, I vigorously protest the claims, statements, or any indications of implications by anyone who ventures to tie our Canyonlands committee report as being political in nature or inspired by Governor Clyde's influence. Everyone knows this report recommends nearly three times the area Governor Clyde had ever spoken of previously.

In conclusion, I feel that Utah Canyonlands Committee, appointed by Governor Clyde, made a recommendation that is feasible, economically sound, and for the best good of the State of Utah and for future generations and would recommend favorable consideration be given to it.

We want—

(1) A park or parks (national);

(2) Confirmed multiple use except in designated and restricted areas;

(3) Tourism encouraged;

A. Facility development and expansion to merit and provide for a tremendous increase.

(4) State recognition in determination of size, policy, particularly on recreation or boundary area and expansion, now or later.

I appreciate the opportunity this committee has afforded me to register my opinion.

Supplemental Statement of Aldin O. Hayward

I am at a loss to understand why anyone will make derogatory statements to confuse the facts and make implications which are not true as were made by some such as are obtained specifically in the written report of Mr. William G. Fowler. I wish to register a vigorous protest to his misleading statements.

Statement of Margaret H. Piggott of the Sierra Club

Broadly speaking the formation of the Canyonlands National Park as proposed by Senator Frank E. Moss is supported by the Utah members of the Sierra Club. We feel that the concept of a large park is far superior to that of three smaller ones as proposed by Senator Bennett. The prospects of preservation of scenic beauty and uniqueness are immeasurably greater with this bill, which will go hand in hand with the added attraction of the traveling public on vacation to a large all-encompassing national park. We as a body, therefore, support this bill (S. 2387), but with certain reservations as set out below:

Mineral rights.—Whilst concurring with the recognition of existing rights on gas and oil leases, etc., we feel that no future application for prospecting or production of existing minerals should be honored. We feel that despite the conditions and regulations imposed by the Secretary of the Interior to preserve the scenic values and recreational purposes of the park, this will in time tend to open the door for exploitation of the area on a larger scale than would be beneficial. We feel this is contrary to the conception of a national park and that the trend will inevitably form the thin end of the wedge. If these concessions

are allowed, they will magnify with time and will be misused in the creation of future parks contrary to the philosophy and original conception of the formation and management of a national park.

The parks were formed originally to preserve the natural beauty of a wonderous area with its pristine qualities left intact, and to act purely as a national recreational area for those who enjoy the scenic wonders—in silence—afforded by the park created. We are, therefore, opposed to any mining development in the proposed national park, other than existing rights.

Grazing rights.—We are opposed in principle to grazing rights, and even though the rights in this case barely have any significance, we feel they should be phased out over a period of 10 to 15 years subject to strict controls on the amount of grazing allowed in the meantime.

Hunting.—The control of animals should be handled by trained park personnel rather than by designated hunters. This has been done successfully in other parks—especially in Canada—and is a far more efficient method of control to preserve the balance of nature.

Despite these reservations the Utah members of the Sierra Club support the Moss bill in formation of the large park of 332,000 acres. I feel, however, it would be in order to point out that the primary function of the park, as a recreational area for those who appreciate the esthetic values the park has to offer, is a long-term function. With the population increase the need for recreation areas is also going to increase proportionately, and these will bring prosperity into the area where the park is situated. While there is a population which is willing to escape from city life when it is able, I can see no end to the prosperity an unspoiled park will bring, whereas the dubious assets mining and grazing in this area will give Utah and the country at large are only short term. Mining (if the minerals do in fact exist in economical quantities) will be exhausted in a given number of years, and will leave irreparable scarring which will be a permanent fixture on a land devoid of trees; therefore easily seen.

It is surely far better for a park of this quality to be left untouched for future generations and future prosperity, than for it to be pitted and scarred by mining operations. Even if mining is controlled by the Department of the Interior there is a danger it will get out of hand. The mere fact that a park is there will be advertisement for potential miners and other exploiters, and access for this minority group will be made easier by the building of access roads for the benefit of bona fide tourists. It will in fact encourage explotation of the area; thus legislation is essential to prohibit this possibility. Another fact to be taken into account is that the area of the proposed park is infinitesimally small as compared with the area of Utah, and is therefore not likely to interfere seriously with the development of the State as a whole, by the prohibition of mining, grazing, and hunting.

This great Nation has a great heritage of beauty given to man by the powerful forces of nature. It has taken millions of years to acquire, and it only needs one generation of man to ruin. Isn't it far better to pass this gift to future generations? It requires men of great wisdom and vision to see beyond the superficial arguments of today, by those who wish to exploit an area one way or another, and see into the future.

This is the feeling of the local members of the Sierra Club, and reflects the policy of the club as a whole. It is thus that we present our case in support of the proposed bill S. 2387, with the provisions set down above.

THE CARBON-EMERY FISH & GAME ASSOCIATION,
Price, Utah, May 2, 1962.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senator, Chairman, Subcommittee of Public Lands, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: As chairman of the legislative committee of the Carbon-Emery Fish & Game Association, I would appreciate your including the following statement in the record of testimony of hearings on Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah (Senator Moss' Canyonlands bill S. 2387).

We take no stand regarding the size of this park as we are not qualified by lack of information and the scenic beauties within the area to do so. We do feel, however, that we should insist that the management of all of our wildlife resources remain with the Utah State Fish and Game Department without interference from Federal agencies. We also feel that the "no hunting" policy

now in effect in certain national parks is unrealistic and indefensible either logically or biologically. Of course, certain areas of the park should be "off limit" to certain hunting and other use. These should include camp grounds, scenic areas, headquarters, and other places of heavy concentrated public use.

Politics should not be an issue in the formation of any park. This, you are aware of, was done in some of the hearings held both in Utah and in Washington.

As an association, we have supported the Moss bill during the annual convention of the Utah Wildlife Federation convention in Salt Lake City, and we support it now, with the above reservations.

We would appreciate being placed on the mailing list for the written report of testimony received, regarding the canyonlands proposal.

Yours very truly,

Dr. F. A. MIGLIORE,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

THE DESERT PROTECTIVE COUNCIL, INC.,
Banning, Calif., May 8, 1962.

Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: The Desert Protective Council urges your committee support of the proposed Canyonlands National Park. We recommend it as espoused by the Department of the Interior rather than in the form of S. 2387, substitute, as espoused by Senator Moss.

Following are the aspects of S. 2387, substitute, which we take exception to:

(1) Hunting should be prohibited as incompatible with the long-established park standards. Partial control of wildlife management should not be turned over to the State of Utah in a national park.

(2) Provision should be made for the eventual discontinuance of all mining rather than permit not only continuance of present operations but further exploration and removal.

(3) Grazing should be discontinued within a shorter time than the extremely extended period possible under the present bill.

(4) The 300,000 acrs size provided in the Moss bill is not large enough. As suggested by the Interior Department, a considerably larger area warrants inclusion in the proposed park.

We should greatly appreciate your energetic promotion of S. 2387, substitute, as suitably modified, to secure its passage at an early date.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT G. BEAR, *President.*

WAYNE COUNTY,
Loa, Utah, May 7, 1962.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: A resolution was passed today in our regular meeting of the Board of Wayne County Commissioners, to thank you in behalf of the board of county commissioners and the people of Wayne County, for your sponsorship of the Canyonlands Park, and the efforts that you are making to help it become a law.

We are fully in accord with such a park, but we do feel that multiple use should be a must before its final enactment.

Your help is solicited, also, in getting a good approach road from Hanksville into the Canyonlands Park. This will not only add to our economy, but also it will create one of Utah's most scenic routes.

Thanks again for all that you have done in our behalf; we trust that you will be successful in getting this Canyonlands bill "ironed out" so that our livestock men, our mining men, and just men, will be happy with its final passage.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
VANCE TAYLOR, *Chairman.*
CARLYLE BAKER, *Member.*
WORTH SORENSON, *Member.*

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1962.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: On the occasion of my testimony on March 30, 1962, before your committee concerning the proposed Canyonlands National Park (Mr. Moss, substitute S. 2387 introduced February 7, 1962), members of the committee requested me to submit an opinion on the proposed amendment of Mr. Bennett of Utah to the Moss bill.

I have now read the Bennett amendment, which proposes to add a new section (sec. 3) to the Moss bill, to provide for an exchange of some 40,000 acres on a quitclaim deed between the State of Utah and the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the U.S. Government. Presumably the acreage which the State would exchange lies within the area of the proposed Canyonlands National Park.

Inasmuch as we have no knowledge about the Federal lands which the Bennett amendment would exchange to the State, we cannot offer any judgment as to their present or future value to the national interest, nor as to the equity of the exchange proposed.

We do feel that the Bennett amendment introduces elements not related to the merits of the Moss bill, and serves to obscure the essence of the Moss proposal. The purpose and value of the Bennett amendment may require long and careful study, and should stand on its own weight as an independent proposal. We object, therefore, to the Bennett amendment to the Moss bill.

We should like to take this opportunity to comment also on Mr. Bennett's S. 2616 which was introduced September 22, 1961. This bill proposes to establish three separate and noncontiguous national parks in the Canyonlands area of the State of Utah with a total of less than 12,000 acres in the aggregate. This compares with the Moss bill S. 2387 (substitute) which proposes a single national park (Canyonlands) of some 300,000 acres.

The Moss bill is to be preferred. It visualizes a park of dimension and stature which would perpetuate the most valuable, unique, and vulnerable features of the Utah canyonlands and would provide for a needed buffer zone for the protection necessary. A national park of the dimension proposed in the Moss bill would be responsive to the scale of grandeur of the region and attract nationwide interest and appreciation.

We therefore repeat our endorsement of the Moss bill. We again respectfully urge, as in our statement presented at the hearing, the elimination of sections 5 and 7, which, respectively, would permit mining and hunting, as inconsistent with the national park principle.

We appreciate the courtesy with which you and the members of the committee received our statement, and for your consideration in asking for this further comment.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL NADEL,
Assistant Executive Secretary.

○

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
JUL 2 19 62
MANHATTAN, KANSAS