

Y4
.In 8/13

10410

8844
In 8/13
F977

F 77 U FORT UNION TRADING POST

GOVERNMENT

Storage

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
S. 187

Barcode with number 520107 001025 and 11600 701025

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FORT UNION
TRADING POST NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, N. DAK.,
AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

AUGUST 2, 1963

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



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1963

88
1/2
1/3

10/8/13

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington, *Chairman*

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico | THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California |
| ALAN BIBLE, Nevada | GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado |
| FRANK CHURCH, Idaho | LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho |
| ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska | MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Wyoming |
| FRANK E. MOSS, Utah | E. L. MECHEM, New Mexico |
| QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota | PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado |
| LEE METCALF, Montana | |
| CARL HAYDEN, Arizona | |
| GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota | |
| GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin | |

JERRY T. VERKLER, *Staff Director*

STEWART FRENCH, *Chief Counsel*

BENTON J. STONG, *Professional Staff Member*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

ALAN BIBLE, Nevada, *Chairman*

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico | GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado |
| ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska | LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho |
| FRANK E. MOSS, Utah | MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Wyoming |
| LEE METCALF, Montana | |
| CARL HAYDEN, Arizona | |



CONTENTS

	Page
S. 187-----	1
Departmental reports:	
Bureau of the Budget-----	3
Interior-----	2
STATEMENTS	
Burdick, Hon. Quentin N., a U.S. Senator from the State of North Dakota-----	4
Wirth, Conrad L., Director, National Park Service; accompanied by Frank E. Harrison, Office of Legislation-----	7
COMMUNICATIONS	
Austin, Alvin E., chairman, Department of Journalism, University of North Dakota: Letter to Senator Quentin N. Burdick, dated April 17, 1963-----	34
Brynjolfson, E. S., Williston, N. Dak.: Telegram to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated August 1, 1963-----	27
Budd, John M., Great Northern Railway Co.: Letter to Senator Quentin N. Burdick, dated July 25, 1963-----	29
Connolly, James B., North Dakota Automobile Club: Letter to John B. Oakes, New York Times, dated December 12, 1958-----	31
Connolly, James B., secretary, Yellowstone-Missouri-Fort Union Confluence Commission: Letters to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 29, 1963-----	27, 28
Cranor, J. M., executive vice president, Greater North Dakota Association: Letter to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 31, 1963-----	28
David, Ray, International Parks Highway Association: Telegram to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated August 2, 1963-----	27
Elliott, R. J., Director, North Dakota State Parks: Letter to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963-----	23
Forseth, S. A., Williston, N. Dak.: Letter to Senator Quentin N. Burdick, dated August 1, 1963-----	31
Guy, Hon. William L., Governor, State of North Dakota:	
Letter to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, dated July 29, 1963-----	25
Telegram to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, dated July 30, 1963-----	21
Innis, Ben, regimental sergeant major, commanding, Fort Buford 6th Infantry Regiment Association:	
Letter to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963-----	26
Letter to Senator Quentin N. Burdick, dated June 23, 1963-----	30
Telegram to Senator Quentin N. Burdick, dated July 31, 1963-----	29
Jestrab, Frank F., Williston, N. Dak.: Letter to Senator Quentin N. Burdick, dated August 1, 1963-----	31
Johnson, B. G., master, Williston Masonic Lodge: Telegrams to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30 and 31, 1963-----	23, 28
Jorgensen, Clarke, executive vice president, Williston Chamber of Commerce: Telegram to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963-----	22
Neff, LaVern C.: Letter to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963 and containing House bill 744, North Dakota Legislature-----	23

COMMUNICATIONS—Continued

Palen, Zene, president, Williston Junior Chamber of Commerce: Letter to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963.....	Page 25
Piper, Fred R., secretary, Watford City Association of Commerce: Letter to Senator Quentin N. Burdick, dated July 26, 1963.....	29
Robb, W. C., general manager, Plainsman Hotel: Telegram to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963.....	22
Schubert, Mr. and Mrs. Stewart, Seibert Motel, Williston, N. Dak.: Telegram to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963.....	22
Torgerson, Cornell, Mels Motel, Williston, S. Dak.: Telegram to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963.....	23
Williston Motel Association: Telegram to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated July 30, 1963.....	22
Wirth, Conrad L., Director, National Park Service: Letter to Senator Alan Bible, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated August 8, 1963.....	19

TABLES AND CHARTS

Average cost of operating certain parks, 1962 and 1963.....	20
Cost details, Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site.....	20

MISCELLANEOUS

Fort Buford 6th Infantry Regiment Association historical sketch.....	26
House bill 744, North Dakota Legislature.....	24
Resolution of the Association of Commerce of Watford City, N. Dak.....	29
State Historical Society of North Dakota resolution favoring S. 187.....	30

FORT UNION TRADING POST

FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 1963

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11 o'clock in room 3110 New Senate Office Building, Senator Alan Bible presiding.

Present: Senators Bible, Anderson, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Jordan of Idaho, and Simpson.

Also present: Benton J. Stong, professional staff member.

Senator BIBLE. The bill before us is S. 187.

We shall make a part of the record the bill, and also make a part of the record the official report of the Department of the Interior dated June 5, 1963, as well as a copy of the report of the Bureau of the Budget dated May 23, 1963.

(S. 187 and the reports referred to follow:)

[S. 187, 88th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to commemorate the significant role played by Fort Union as a fur-trading post on the Upper Missouri River, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, the historic remains of Fort Union located in McKenzie County, North Dakota, and Roosevelt County, Montana, and such additional lands and interests in lands as he may deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 2. When the site of historic Fort Union and other required lands and interests in lands have been acquired by the United States as provided in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish such area or areas as the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer, protect, develop, and maintain the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

FORT UNION TRADING POST

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Your committee has requested a report on S. 187, a bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak., and for other purposes.

We recommend the enactment of the bill and we suggest two minor clarifying amendments.

This bill would authorize the Secretary to acquire the remains of historic Fort Union in North Dakota and such additional lands as he deems necessary to commemorate the significant role played by Fort Union as a fur trading post on the upper Missouri River. Upon acquisition of the fort site and other necessary lands, the Secretary is required to establish the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

Built in 1828, Fort Union was the principal fur trading establishment on the Missouri River and in the northern plains region for almost four decades. The early traders and trappers, responding to the demand in the East and in Europe for the furs and skins of animals, were the trailblazers of the white men in their conquest of the West. In their search for furs and pelts, they explored practically every stream in the trans-Mississippi West and found their way past every mountain barrier to the Pacific. The Upper Missouri River, with tributaries reaching into the beaver-rich northern plains region, became coveted territory by the many rival trading companies anxious for a share of the western fur harvest.

By the early 1820's, two of these companies, the Columbia Fur Co., and the western department of the American Fur Co., were able to force the most serious competition for Missouri River business aside. The Columbia Fur Co., organized by a number of former employees of the famous North West Co., was headed by Kenneth McKenzie, so-called king of the Missouri. To keep his competitors from moving up the river, McKenzie established several trading posts along the Missouri at the mouths of the Teton, Niobrara, James, Vermillion, and Big Sioux Rivers, and at Council Bluff. However, near each of these posts, the American Fur Co., also placed a competing trading establishment.

About 1825, the Columbia Fur Co., pushed its operations up the Yellowstone where there was no competition. There it reaped a rich harvest in furs, and the company, from 1825 to 1827, grossed from \$150,000 to \$200,000 annually. Seeing that there was no hope of crushing the opposing company, the American Fur Co., in 1828, finally negotiated for a division of the trade. Under the new arrangement the Columbia Fur Co., became a subsidiary of American, and took the name Upper Missouri Outfit. McKenzie remained head of the new subsidiary, which had as its objective the exploitation of the rich fur resources of the Yellowstone and the upper regions of the Missouri.

As one of the first steps toward these goals, the Upper Missouri Outfit decided to establish a trading post near the point where the travel of Indians and independent trappers on both the Yellowstone and Missouri converged. In 1828, the post—named Fort Floyd—was built at the mouth of the Yellowstone. The name was changed 2 years later to Fort Union. Although two more posts were built by the company farther up the Missouri, Fort Union became the base of its operations in the region.

With the decline of the demand for beaver, the fort declined in importance. In 1865 it was sold to the Northwestern Fur Co. The following year the Army established Fort Buford nearby, and in 1867, Fort Union was purchased by the Army and dismantled for building material. The great house once occupied by the "King of the Missouri," and the 16-foot-high timber pickets surrounding the 220-foot-square quadrangle were torn down. All that remains of Fort Union today are the remnants of the two masonry bastions and a tall flagpole.

The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at its September 1961 meeting, concurred in the recommendation by

this Department that the site of the trading post of Fort Union, N. Dak., be classified as of exceptional value (national significance) in illustrating and commemorating the history of the United States.

Studies made by this Department indicate that two parcels of land, aggregating approximately 380 acres, should be acquired to preserve adequately the Fort Union site and its environs. The first, comprising about 220 acres would include the 10-acre site of Fort Union, now owned by the North Dakota State Historical Society, and a representative strip of Missouri River bank and bench land above and below it. The second parcel, about 160 acres, is located about a quarter of a mile northeast of the first, and would be developed as a parking overlook from which visitors could obtain a fine panoramic view encompassing the Fort Union site and the sites of several other historic posts in the vicinity of the Missouri-Yellowstone confluence.

From the proposed overlook can be seen the sites of Fort William and Fort Mortimer, occupied by the American Fur Co. and Fox, Livingston & Co. during the period of competing interests on the Upper Missouri. The site of Fort Buford where, in 1881, Chief Sitting Bull surrendered with the last of his followers, can also be viewed from this location. The confluence itself, together with the sites of these historic forts, provides an excellent interpretive opportunity for portrayal of the Fort Union story.

If establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site materializes, this Department proposes to undertake archeological excavations of the fort area. These explorations should provide valuable information concerning the location of structures and an extensive collection of artifacts associated with the fur trade. It is contemplated that developments would consist of a modest visitor center, administrative facilities, and roads. Reconstruction of part of the stockade and the exhibit of features uncovered during archeological excavations would complete the display. We estimate that not more than \$570,000 would be required for development during the first 5 years, and that administrative costs would average about \$48,000 per year.

We anticipate that the 10-acre Fort Union site, owned by the State Historical Society, will be donated to the Federal Government if this area is authorized for establishment. The remaining lands, used for dry farming and some gravel-pit excavations, are estimated to cost about \$30,000.

The site of Fort Union trading post proper is located entirely in Williams County, N. Dak., but the additional lands contemplated for inclusion in the national historic site are located in Williams County, N. Dak., and Roosevelt County, Mont. Therefore, as a clarifying and perfecting amendment, we recommend that lines 7 through 10, on page 1 of S. 187, be amended to read as follows: "the historic remains of Fort Union located in Williams County, North Dakota, and such additional lands and interests in lands in Williams County, North Dakota, and Roosevelt County, Montana, as he may deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That the total area so acquired shall not exceed 400 acres." Consistent with this recommendation, the title of the bill should be amended to read: "To authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota and Montana, and for other purposes."

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.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to the committee's request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 187, a bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak., and for other purposes.

The report which the Secretary of the Interior is submitting describes the historical significance of the area proposed for addition to the national park system, suggests two minor amendments, and recommends enactment. The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of S. 187.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Senator BIBLE. I am very happy to first recognize the Senator from North Dakota on behalf of his bill.

Senator Burdick.

STATEMENT OF HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I would like to ask unanimous consent that my full statement be made a part of the record at the end of my oral comments.

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, that will be so ordered.

Senator BURDICK. I might also remind the committee that Mike Mansfield, the majority leader, is cosponsor of this bill. His name should have been on the bill.

Senator BIBLE. The record will show Senator Mansfield as the cosponsor, and in any future printings of the bill, his name will be contained thereon.

Senator BURDICK. I might say also that Senator Mansfield gave me carte blanche authority here this morning to speak for him.

The press of business prevents him from being here this morning.

Members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to preserve what is perhaps one of the most important historic areas in the West. Fort Union was established back in 1820, at the confluence of the Yellowstone and the Missouri Rivers. It became known as the gateway to the Pacific Northwest.

Many great personalities of the Old West passed through there. It is on the route of Lewis and Clark, who went through there a few years before the fort was established, guided by Sakajawea, the Indian maiden. The great bird naturalist, Audubon, did some of his studies there. As a fur-trading center, Fort Union served as an important means of transmitting the white man's culture to the Indian.

It played a prominent role in the opening of the Pacific Northwest for more than two decades.

As the demand for the beaver pelt declined, so did the importance of Fort Union. In 1865, it was sold to the Northwestern Fur Co., and a few years later, the timbers of the fort were used to provide building material for the new Army post, Fort Buford, just a short distance away.

It was there that the great Sitting Bull surrendered.

So this area, the confluence of the Yellowstone and the Missouri, is rich in western history. Historical societies in Montana and North Dakota have been trying desperately to preserve this history, and we think that this bill is a step in that direction.

Now, the legislation does not actually call for a reconstruction of the fort, and it is not a costly piece of legislation. What it really does is to identify the area—

Senator BIBLE. You say it is not a costly piece of legislation. Do you have a price tag on it, or would you prefer that the Director testify to this acquisition and maintenance?

Senator BURDICK. That phrase is relative. It may be costly to some people, but I believe the Park Service has a figure of about \$600,000.

Senator BIBLE. For acquisition?

Senator BURDICK. No, that is for everything, the interpretive centers, the roads, everything.

Senator BIBLE. We can develop that through the Director's testimony.

Senator BURDICK. Yes, we can get that from the Director.

Actually, the acquisition of land amounts to about 380 acres, including a 10-acre site of the fort, which is now owned by the North Dakota Historical Society.

The purpose, in addition to the acquisition of land, is to provide roads and an overlook over the Missouri and Yellowstone confluence.

Most of this land is lying along the Missouri River in North Dakota. A small portion of it is in Montana. We believe that the area is deserving in recognition by the Congress as one of the real historic points in the great West, and I ask the favorable consideration of this committee.

Senator BIBLE. Might I ask exactly what is there now? If you were to be at the site of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site today, what would we find?

Senator BURDICK. Right now, you would find 10 acres of land enclosed by a fence, and you would find a historical marker of the State historical society.

That is all you would find. There has been a designation by the Historical Sites Department, and judging by surveys and investigations, they believe that it contains significant archeological matter.

Senator BIBLE. Do we have any type of visitation—

Senator BURDICK. This is on the transcontinental highway, Highway No. 2. Highway No. 2 transverses North Dakota, Montana, and I think it goes into Idaho, does it not, Senator Jordan?

Senator JORDAN. Yes.

Senator BURDICK. It goes on to the west coast.

Senator BIBLE. I have no further questions.

Any questions of the sponsor of the bill?

Senator MOSS?

Senator MOSS. To what extent do these gravel excavations impinge on this area?

Senator BURDICK. As I read the report, and as I use my recollection, I believe the gravel areas are removed from the Fort Union site and are found in the Fort Buford site a few miles away.

Perhaps we could ask the Director.

MR. WIRTH. There are some old gravel pits, but they have not affected the site of the old fort, and they are not being used at the present time and have not been used for some time.

Senator MOSS. Thank you.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Jordan?

Senator JORDAN. I have no questions.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Simpson?

Senator SIMPSON. No.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Senator Burdick.
(Senator Burdick's prepared statement follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to plead the case for my bill, S. 187, for the development of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site. I am proud to say that Senator Mike Mansfield is a cosponsor of this measure.

Two years ago, the Secretary of Interior designated Fort Union as a national historic site. Further authority is now needed to preserve its historical values. S. 187 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the remains of Fort Union and such lands as he deems necessary to commemorate the significant role it played as a trading post.

With enactment of S. 187, the Interior Department has indicated that over a 5-year period it would make an archeological excavation of the fort area, construct a modest visitor center, administration facilities and roads, suitable markers and exhibits and possibly other developments as studies progress.

Fort Union is most certainly worthy of this attention. Located in Williams County, N. Dak., at the confluence of the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers near to the Montana border, it was for nearly 40 years the principal fur-trading establishment on the upper Missouri River and in the northern plains regions.

Studies by the Department of the Interior indicate that two parcels of land should be acquired to preserve adequately the site of the fort and its environs. The first parcel of about 220 acres includes the 10-acre site of the fort, which is owned by the North Dakota Historical Society. These 10 acres would be donated to the Federal Government by the historical society if S. 187 is enacted. The first parcel also includes a strip of Missouri River Bank and benchland above and below the fort site. The second parcel of about 160 acres is about one-fourth mile northeast of the first and would provide an area for development as a scenic overlook.

In the Missouri-Yellowstone confluence area, the Rocky Mountain Fur Co., in 1822, established a trading post, named Fort Floyd. The post was purchased in 1828 by the American Fur Co., and renamed Fort Union. Developed by Kenneth McKenzie, so-called King of the Missouri, Fort Union soon achieved a monopoly of the rich fur trade with the plains and mountain tribes that roamed the region now encompassing Montana, North Dakota, and part of Wyoming.

As a fur-trading center, Fort Union served as an important means of transmitting the white man's culture to the Indian. It played a prominent role in the opening of the Pacific Northwest for more than two decades, serving as a port of call for many world-famous personages.

As the demand for the beaver pelt declined, so did the importance of Fort Union. In 1865, it was sold to the Northwestern Fur Co. A year later, the Army established Fort Buford nearby, and in 1867, purchased Fort Union to provide building material for the new Army post.

Fort Buford played a role in the various Indian campaigns, culminating in the Battle of Little Big Horn in 1876. Many Indian prisoners passed through Fort Buford and it was there that Sitting Bull surrendered in 1881.

The States of North Dakota and Montana have endeavored to preserve and restore the confluence area, but they cannot do a complete job without the technical assistance of the National Park Service. S. 187 carries an endorsement from the Park Service, as well as the Interior Department.

The national importance and significance of Fort Union provides compelling reasons for enacting S. 187 to enhance understanding of the American past. I earnestly solicit the favorable consideration of the Senate Interior Committee and the Congress for this project.

Senator BIBLE. Mr. Director, would you give us your testimony on this legislation?

We have heretofore made the report of the Department a part of the hearing record.

STATEMENT OF CONRAD L. WIRTH, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK E. HARRISON, OFFICE OF LEGISLATION

Mr. WIRTH. I would like to read my statement. I believe it would be more helpful that way.

Senator BIBLE. Very well.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the bill before the committee, S. 187, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain lands and interests in lands which comprise the site and historic remains of Fort Union as a fur-trading post, Williams County, N. Dak., and contiguous lands in Roosevelt County, Mont.

The purpose of this bill is to commemorate the significant role in our Nation's history that Fort Union played as a fur-trading post on the Upper Missouri River.

The National Park Service has completed historical studies and a suitability and feasibility study concerning this site. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at its May and September 1961 meetings, evaluated Fort Union as being of exceptional value in illustrating and commemorating the history of the United States, and at its October 1962 meeting, gave further consideration to the site and recommended that it be established as a unit of the National Park System. The Board stated its view that:

Because Fort Union was the principal fur-trading establishment in the Upper Missouri River and dominated the strategic confluence of the Yellowstone River with the Missouri for almost four decades, and because it was also a principal focal point for dealing with the Northern Plains Indians, the Fort Union site is deserving of preservation and adequate commemoration and interpretation as a key part of our historical heritage.

From among the many companies engaged in the fur trade of the Upper Missouri River country in the years following the Lewis and Clark expedition through here and their discovery of the rich fur-bearing potentials of that region, the American Fur Co. emerged as the dominant force.

In 1828, the American Fur Co., headed by John Jacob Astor, negotiated a merger with its principal rival, the Columbia Fur Co. The latter as a subsidiary of the American Fur Co. became known as the Upper Missouri outfit. In 1828, the American Fur Co. selected a site where the travel of both the Indian tribes and the free trappers from both the Missouri and the Yellowstone Rivers converged, and there built a post named Fort Floyd.

Two years later the name was changed to Fort Union and that name remained throughout its long history. The site of the fort is on the north bank of the Missouri River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Yellowstone.

Fort Union became the base of the American Fur Co.'s operations in the Yellowstone-Upper Missouri region. Kenneth McKenzie, known as the King of the Missouri, was in charge of the post in its early period.

Fort Union was a 220-foot-square quadrangle, surrounded by a 16-foot-high timber picket palisade. It had two 30-foot-high masonry bastions at opposite corners. From this post, trade was carried on with Blackfeet, Crow, Assiniboine, Cree, and Chippewa, and from its subsidiary posts downstream with the Arikara, Mandan, and Sioux.

In 1832, the first steamboat reached Fort Union which for many years was the head of navigation on the Missouri. Almost every important western explorer, frontiersman, trader, soldier and traveler of the early 1800's stopped at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers and at Fort Union after its establishment. Included in this parade of notables were such men as Meriwether Lewis, William Clark, John Colter, Manuel Lisa, William Ashley, Andrew Henry, Jim Bridger, Jedediah Smith, Henry Atkinson, Stephen W. Kearny, Prince Maximilian of Wied, Karl Bodmer, John J. Audubon, Father Pierre-Jean De Smet, George Catlin, Charles Wimar, and John Mix Stanley.

In the vicinity, many famous artists of our early west, such as Catlin and Bodmer, did some of their best known work. Here in 1843 John J. Audubon made significant studies and observations on the wildlife of this vicinity.

There are no physical remains standing above ground today at the site of Fort Union, but the outline of the Fort's foundations, certain humps and mounds of earth, and depressions in the ground, mark the place and some of its structural features. If the site of Fort Union is established as a national historic site, one of the first things to be done in planning its development and public use will be a careful archeological excavation of the site.

It should be one of the richest in all the West for materials illustrating our early Western history.

Senator BIBLE. What might you anticipate that you would find? I am curious. What might you find there illustrating our early Western history?

Mr. WIRTH. Materials in our trading equipment and Indian relics, and things like that, in the trading, such as we dug up in the northern part of Minnesota in trading, too.

There are things buried in the ground there such as trinkets and clothing and articles of that sort that are important in interpreting the history of that section of the country.

Senator BIBLE. Very well.

Mr. WIRTH. Studies made by this Department indicate that two parcels of land, aggregating approximately 380 acres, should be acquired to preserve adequately the Fort Union site and its environs. The first, comprising about 220 acres would include the 10-acre site of Fort Union, now owned by the North Dakota State Historical Society, and a representative strip of Missouri River bank and bench land above and below it. The second parcel, about 160 acres, is located about a quarter of a mile northeast of the first, and would be developed as a parking overlook from which visitors could obtain a fine panoramic view encompassing the Fort Union site and the sites of several other historic posts in the vicinity of the Missouri-Yellowstone confluence.

We anticipate that the 10-acre Fort Union site, owned by the North Dakota State Historical Society, will be donated to the Federal Government if this area is authorized for establishment.

Senator BIBLE. Right at this point, is this an operational site at the present time that is maintained by the North Dakota State Historical Society?

Mr. WIRTH. It is not being visited or operated. They are preserving it, holding it, and have fenced it.

Senator BIBLE. There are no visitors there on an annual basis?

Mr. WIRTH. Well, they are not encouraging visitors at the present time. No doubt people go by there, but very few go in.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you.

Mr. WIRTH. The remaining lands, used for dry farming, grazing, and some gravel-pit excavations, are estimated to cost about \$30,000.

Senator BIBLE. Why do you need 380 acres to preserve this trading post historic site?

Mr. WIRTH. Well, to give us some atmosphere around the 10-acre tract. We intend to build a visitor center and try to preserve some of the Missouri River frontage and so forth that was there at the time of the fort. It would provide a feeling of what existed there at that time.

Senator BIBLE. My understanding is that it would cost you approximately \$30,000 to acquire the 380 acres?

Mr. WIRTH. That is our estimate, yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. After you acquire the 380 acres, is it going to cost you \$570,000 to develop it during the first 5 years?

Mr. WIRTH. That is our suggestion. That includes the archeological digging and so forth.

Senator BIBLE. Will that completely develop it?

Mr. WIRTH. Our estimates indicate that we are not going to restore the fort. What we are going to do is what we did down in Jamestown, try to expose the foundation, get all the artifacts out that we can, build a reasonable-sized visitors' center, in which we shall explain what took place there and, by using the relics, tell the story of Fort Union and the whole development of fur trade in that section of the country in the visitors' center, but not by reconstruction of the fort.

Senator BIBLE. After the first 5 years, do you contemplate further development?

Mr. WIRTH. No, we do not, because the first 5 years includes the parking area, the drive-in, the trails, and the building of the visitors' center.

I think our estimate on the visitors' center runs about \$125,000 of the total. The rest is in digging, and the trails and preservation necessary to preserve the old foundations.

Senator BIBLE. Do you have a detailed breakdown as to how you arrived at the figure of \$570,000? I was looking for it and I did not see it.

Mr. WIRTH. I can give you a detailed breakdown, because I do have it.

Senator BIBLE. I think it should be supplied for the record. The usual breakdown does not appear to accompany the letter of June 5.

So I would suggest a detailed breakdown as to how you arrived at the estimated cost of \$570,000 be made a part of the record at this point.

And likewise, your next sentence says, the administrative costs would be—would average about \$48,000 per year.

Would you tell us how you arrived at that?

Mr. WIRTH. We have that, the personnel and the reason, worked out, and we shall be glad to submit that.

(The information requested is printed on page 19.)

Senator BIBLE. How many employees will be there in the \$48,000?

Mr. WIRTH. By the end of the first year—this went through the superintendent, historian, clerk-steno, administrative aid, maintenance man, caretaker.

Senator BIBLE. Is this contemplated to be operational around the full year?

Mr. WIRTH. No, we do have what we call an interpreter or seasonal personnel for 1 year, but that usually figures on about three, because we hire them for 90 to 120 days in this 1 year, and approximately three men during the heavy travel season, and one ranger for half a year, and one laborer for half a year on maintenance.

Those are temporary.

Senator BIBLE. What are the seasonal aspects in this particular part of the country? Do many people travel through this particular area in the winter?

Mr. WIRTH. They will be traveling through that section because U.S. Highway 2 is open all the time, but the tourist travel is down considerably, and it would be mostly local conditions.

Senator BIBLE. What are generally the weather conditions? Is this a cold area in December, January, February?

Mr. WIRTH. I think I would like the Senator from North Dakota to explain that.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, of course it gets cold out in northwestern North Dakota in the winter, but there would be much more travel in the summer than in the winter. I think we should consider that we would not need as much staff in the winter as in the summer, spring, and fall.

I also should mention that the area is a short distance from Highway 85 coming down from Canada. It is almost at the crossing of an east-west continental highway, and also a north-south highway.

Senator BIBLE. The purpose of my questions about the weather in the wintertime is pointed to try to develop whether you intend keeping this open as a national historical site for 12 months a year, or 9 or 8 or 7 or 6. I want to know.

I do not know what you do propose.

Mr. WIRTH. We shall have to keep somebody there the whole year round.

We anticipate that we shall have to, and we shall try to keep the road open. You have Government properties there, buildings and so forth, that are to be kept open year round. But I would say 5 or 6 months would take care of our heavy visitation.

Senator BIBLE. My questioning was prompted by this recent very worthwhile trip we took to look at many proposed national park

areas, particularly Isle Royal. We flew over Isle Royal and it seems to me that you have a very expensive project there, to be operational for 3 or 4 months at the most during the year. Then you have a large staff of personnel employed, as I understand it. It is almost on a year-round basis. That is why I was trying to develop this as to what you plan to do year-round at this proposed historic site.

Mr. WIRTH. Well, I know the questions raised on Isle Royal. I shall not try to answer that here, but that is what our seasonal personnel is, in and out. We have even our winter personnel charged to this particular area, with the great amount of investigation we have to make on existing areas, and when we make a report to Congress, we use this personnel and move them around and do things in the wintertime, but not leave them out there. But we have no place else to do it, they have to be at this place, so they are charged to this area.

The historian in the winter will maybe do additional research or maybe help out on some other historic site in getting ready and preparing reports to Congress.

Senator BIBLE. How many months per year at this time do you contemplate opening the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site?

Mr. WIRTH. It would be open to the public any time they can get in there. No park is ever closed. But the main travel would be about 5 months.

Senator BIBLE. Is that a correct statement, that no park is ever closed?

Senator GRUENING. McKinley Park is closed in the winter.

Mr. WIRTH. Yes, the roads are not kept open, but if you want to get in the park, we have a Government investment there in headquarters. We have a Government headquarters, but if you want to go into McKinley Park on snowshoes, you are in.

Senator BIBLE. I meant as a going attraction, is Yellowstone open the year round?

Mr. WIRTH. You get in as far as Mammoth.

Senator BIBLE. But the average tourist is not going in under those conditions. I thought that you had a regular fall closing date and a regular spring opening date at Yellowstone.

Mr. WIRTH. We do not keep our roads open. But on the other hand, the Snowcap business going from West Yellowstone is acceptable to us for coming in on. We have a concession on it. We have properties there that have to be protected and people who do want to go in can go in by their own means.

Senator SIMPSON. Will the Senator yield?

Senator BIBLE. I yield.

Senator SIMPSON. Would not it be more protection for the park if you did have an all-winter road through the Yellowstone to show the wonders of that great park in the wintertime?

Mr. WIRTH. Senator, as you know, that has come up before, especially raised by the State of Wyoming.

Senator SIMPSON. Would it not be a good prospect?

Mr. WIRTH. About 4 or 5 years ago, we had a special park committee, with no Park Service people on it, made up of people from that area.

They came in with a definite recommendation that it not be kept open, and I think your own highway department of Wyoming was on that committee.

Senator SIMPSON. That is true, but that is not a correct statement, Mr. Wirth. They took in all the trails, they took in all the bypasses—yes, they did.

I have the report. Mr. Sutton, who I appointed—I was Governor at that time—I appointed Sutton and he gave the report in the matter that disclosed the excessive routes reported on by the Commission.

The question of keeping main avenues of traffic open in the winter-time, that would not constitute a great expense, would it?

Mr. WIRTH. It would to this extent, Senator, and the report—speaking from memory—did break down and go into all the roads and report on them separately, what ones could and what would be a logical time to open them up.

Their recommendation was that we should open them up earlier and keep them open later, and we have accepted that and kept it.

Senator SIMPSON. We are open now from May to November.

Mr. WIRTH. That is right. One of the main concerns on Yellowstone is the high storm conditions in the high plateau, but if somebody gets halfway across the park and a storm hits them—they do come up quite rapidly as you well know—we have people in there and there is no way of protecting them.

Senator SIMPSON. It is not germane to this, and I should not have injected it.

Senator BIBLE. It was properly raised.

Senator SIMPSON. But some day, I hope to get together with the Park Service and discuss whether the roads could be kept open.

Mr. WIRTH. Senator, may I say this? We want people to come to the park in the wintertime. They see an entirely different scenery, and it is beautiful.

A few years ago we opened at the Kings Highway between Sequoia and General Grant which, after getting a similar study, it was recommended that we do keep it open and try it out. It was in the trees, and we were not so subjected to these long stretches of wind.

Senator SIMPSON. You would not have any more difficulty than they do on Bertha and Rapids, and those are kept open the year round?

Mr. WIRTH. I am not an expert on this, sir. All I know is what the committee reported.

Senator SIMPSON. That committee report was open to much conjecture, as you know, because of the extent of the conclusions. It was never contemplated that it take in every access road. We would not want that on all the roads in Yellowstone.

Mr. WIRTH. We acted on each individual thing they recommended as to what ones could and which ones could not. That is what we asked. They were the professional people on it, and when you take the responsibility of people's lives on these roads, why, I think we have to listen to professional people.

Senator BIBLE. Mr. Wirth, this can be supplied for the record if you do not have it immediately available: How many national historic sites are within the jurisdiction of the National Park Service today?

Mr. WIRTH. We have a complete statistic book here on it. I think if we put them in alphabetically—

Senator BIBLE. I think the committee has the book to which Mr. Harrison is referring.

Mr. WIRTH. There are 15, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Fifteen national historic sites?

Mr. WIRTH. Yes, sir.

Senator BIBLE. Of that number, how many are historic sites similar to the fort proposed in this pending bill?

Mr. WIRTH. I would have to check that.

Senator BIBLE. That could be supplied for the record.

Will the annual maintenance cost of each of these national historic sites approximate \$50,000 a year? Is this about the average annual maintenance of a historic site?

Mr. WIRTH. That is about what they run, I think.

Senator BIBLE. What is the average annual attendance of these historic sites? Do you have figures on comparable sites?

Mr. WIRTH. No.

Senator BIBLE. They can be supplied for the record.

Mr. WIRTH. I might say this: travel last year jumped up close to 11 percent, and I do know this year, thus far, it is pretty close to 10 percent through the 1st of July.

We thought it would have a letdown, since—

Senator BIBLE. Travel to what, historic sites or national parks?

Mr. WIRTH. National park areas as a whole.

Senator BIBLE. I was wondering, I am under some pressure from my home State to introduce a bill to create a Fort Churchill National Historic Site.

I have some divided feelings about it, as to whether or not this is the attraction some of its sponsors think it might be, and I was just wondering what type of experience you have with these national historic sites, as to cost, as to maintenance, and as to visitation?

I think that can be supplied for the record.

Mr. WIRTH. Yes, sir, thank you.

(The information requested is printed on p. 20.)

Senator BIBLE. Did you have anything further to add, Mr. Wirth?

Mr. WIRTH. No; I think we have just about finished.

You jumped up to about \$570,000 and the \$48,000, and that is all in the record, so I think my statement is completed.

Senator BIBLE. The Senator from North Dakota?

Senator BURDICK. Coming back to the weather situation, this historic site is no different from the rest of the historic national sites in the country, is it?

Mr. WIRTH. No.

Senator BURDICK. I know myself that there will be possibly 4 months, maybe 5, when travel is reduced in that area. Do I understand your testimony to be that you will only need a skeleton force or small force during those months?

Mr. WIRTH. Well, we have listed here 2½ man-years of seasonal personnel. They usually come out for 90 to 100 days, so you have, say, three times that number. That is about six or seven.

Now, they disappear entirely in the wintertime. We have to keep somebody to maintain the buildings, and we have the superintendent, which we have to keep, and the clerical work plus the historian.

But he can be loaned out to other jobs, and as a matter of fact, we call on many of them to do other jobs on other things during the wintertime, the off-season time.

Senator BURDICK. Well, these personnel over and above the skeleton force for wintertime operations may be worked in other parts of the country?

Mr. WIRTH. Those seasonal personnel are usually local employees. We employ them locally. Some of them are college men that come out during the vacations, and things of that kind.

Most of them, like laborers and so forth, are picked up right in the surrounding country.

Senator BURDICK. One more question: You say that the fort could be prepared much like Jamestown?

Mr. WIRTH. We would expose the foundations and tell the story of the various buildings and how it was organized so that we can see it on the ground as much as we can, and then most likely in the visitors' center, we would have artists' sketches and diaramas so they can visualize the full structure.

I think you have a report on the Fort Union here with many pictures in it. I think they have been distributed.

Senator BIBLE. Yes; each member of the committee has one.

Mr. WIRTH. That gives you an idea of what the ground looks like at the present time, and what the fort looked like back in the 1800's.

Senator BURDICK. The reason I asked the question, I am very impressed with the way Jamestown is portrayed. I think that is an excellent job.

Mr. WIRTH. That is what we shall try to do. We have interpretive devices in which you press the button and you go around the fort; there is a record that gives the story of what that place was like and the trading there and so on.

Then a diarama will tell the complete story.

Senator BURDICK. I am very grateful for your testimony.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Jordan?

Senator JORDAN. No questions.

Senator BIBLE. Senator Simpson?

Senator SIMPSON. How much have you expended on this to date? How much has the Park Service expended on this proposal to date?

Mr. WIRTH. I would have to look that up for you, sir.

Senator SIMPSON. I think it is important, in line with what the chairman said. We are adding, at a rapid rate, these historic sites, and the maintenance cost runs into about three-quarters of a million dollars.

I am not inveighing against the park, because I have read about it in an interesting book by Dr. McCracken, and I think there are some reproductions in there of the old Fort Union site.

Mr. WIRTH. That is right.

Senator SIMPSON. But what is the expenditure you made originally on this to investigate it?

Mr. WIRTH. Here is the way it works, Senator: We have been getting money for planning and studies for a number of years.

Senator SIMPSON. On parks and historic sites in general?

Mr. WIRTH. That is right. There are a lot of bills introduced in Congress, and we have to investigate them and make a report, as we have here, whether we recommend it or not. But on our Mission 66 report, we put into that a complete analysis of the historic objects and sites of the United States.

And in those appropriations, we have, over the last 5 or 6 years, made what we call 22 theme studies, in which we take various phases of American history and try to run down what areas are left and what ones are worthy of national preservation, to tell the story of the development of America.

Senator SIMPSON. Do you go into the areas where these things are, Mr. Director, and ask the States to collaborate with you on the use of money to build these reports?

Mr. WIRTH. No, the State has not put any money in this, although I won't say, from the standpoint of North Dakota, they have a very good historical association, although, unfortunately, their chief historian, Mr. Reed, who was a very capable man, died a few months ago.

But they have, themselves, done what they can to preserve these areas that they think are important from the State standpoint, and they have cooperated and given us much of the material that we have in here.

Now, what they have paid and collected through the years is hard to identify.

Senator SIMPSON. How much of this in here is private land?

Mr. WIRTH. All except the 10 acres owned by the State.

Senator SIMPSON. I notice you have a condemnation feature in this bill. I am just wondering if you propose to use condemnation to acquire some of the land?

Mr. WIRTH. I suppose we would. There are no houses in here.

Senator SIMPSON. That is always anathema to the Congress.

Mr. WIRTH. I know it is.

Senator SIMPSON. I know it is to me. I hate it, especially acquiring lands for historic sites with this condemnation provision, especially in light of the fact that Park Service and the Interior have so many millions of acres of land they have not developed at all.

I always look, with somewhat of a jaundiced eye, on this acquisition by condemnation provision of the bill. I think we should avoid it as much as possible.

Mr. WIRTH. I will say this to you, Senator: I know this has been our policy. I cannot speak way back to 1950, but I can speak since I have been Director, and following the policy established before that.

We do not condemn any homes. We do not condemn land unless we get into a real jam, open land, where a person, because it has been the general policy that eventually the land within the boundary land approved by the Congress will come into the park, although we can afford to wait.

Only when there is a development coming along that would increase its value, like a subdivision or things of that sort, do we then try to proceed with condemnation.

We have never condemned any—well, one example I have always told where we did it was down in Yorktown, where a man owned

about 2 acres in the middle of the Yorktown battlefield, called Redoubt No. 9.

We tried for years to negotiate that, and the supervisor woke up one morning to find a bulldozer knocking it down to build a house; right in the middle of the Yorktown battlefield.

Well, we could not have that, and the only recourse we had was to condemn it.

We had one case in your State, which you know more about than I do, most likely.

Senator SIMPSON. I can understand there are instances like that. But the difficulty stems from the fact that you are notoriously wrong and not realistic in your estimates on the cost of acquisition.

We have discovered that in a number of instances, and I think you have to look at it because it is many times what you originally contemplated. That is another thing that has disturbed me in the approach to these problems.

Mr. WIRTH. Our problem on land acquisition, Senator, is this, and it is not stated as a complaint: but we get so much a year, or try to justify so much a year for certain acquisitions we know are coming up. We do not have any advance funds to go out and get definite appraisals so we can give the Congress a firm estimate. But a lot of times in our appropriations, these things are marked, so much for this piece of land.

Well, as soon as that is done, the question of negotiation is almost unctuous.

Senator SIMPSON. But is it not in the condemnation feature of the bill, because the national interest is at stake, and you can condemn, and you place your own price upon it, and then you place upon the people the burden of disclosing a price that is not realistic and that is the only alternative they have, a private sale.

When you are notoriously low, you frighten the people out of even thinking of selling it to the park, and you acquire it by a method of bartering or exchange.

Mr. WIRTH. We operate it this way as far as Park Service is concerned: We go out and get certified appraisers. We do not do any appraising ourselves.

We go out and hire appraisers for the appraisal of the property.

Senator SIMPSON. It is strange that they could be so far off.

Mr. WIRTH. We never get less than two outside appraisers, and if they are far apart, we get a third one. If it is a big purchase, we get a third appraiser.

That is whether we negotiate or condemn or anything.

In fact, we do not like to condemn any more than you would like to have us do, I can assure you. It is not a practice with us.

Senator SIMPSON. It is bad public relations, I am quite sure, and has proved so.

Let me ask you this: You say \$570,000 would be for the purpose of no reconstruction except, I take it, this building where you would house all the artifacts and the like is contemplated in that expenditure; am I right?

Mr. WIRTH. Yes.

Senator SIMPSON. And that takes into consideration excavation?

Mr. WIRTH. Those archeological works to be done. For instance, we have an entrance road, \$15,000; parking area and walks, \$20,000.

The second year, we have utility area roads, \$25,000, or a total of \$75,000 for 5 years for roads.

Then we have \$125,000 for visitors' center—

Senator SIMPSON. Excuse me, how much for roads?

Mr. WIRTH. The total is \$75,000 out of that \$570,000 for roads and parking areas.

Senator SIMPSON. On 380 acres?

Mr. WIRTH. That is right.

Senator SIMPSON. That seems exorbitant to me.

Mr. WIRTH. Most of it is in big parking areas for cars.

Senator BIBLE. This includes parking areas as well as roads; is that it?

Mr. WIRTH. Yes, sir, and walks.

Senator SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I hate to come to another bill with an open-end appropriation, which disturbs me, and in light of the testimony, it seems to me we could put a ceiling on section 4 instead of authorizing an appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Would the Director be averse to that?

Mr. WIRTH. No, this is our best estimate. If we can save some money, we will. If we have not made appraisals of property, if the appraisals are not correct, we shall have to come back to you.

We shall do whatever Congress wishes us to do. We are trying to give you a fair estimate.

Senator SIMPSON. These are difficult, these open-end appropriations, for any agency. I believe if you think you have really made a proper estimate, you should be willing to insert in the bill the amount of money to be appropriated through the Congress. I dislike very much this type of appropriation.

Senator BURDICK. Will the Senator yield?

Senator SIMPSON. Yes, indeed.

Senator BURDICK. I agree with you.

Senator SIMPSON. The Senator and I both agree on that.

Senator BIBLE. I might observe that insofar as acquisition costs are concerned, we have regularly and religiously written a ceiling into acquisition costs. We did this at Cape Cod, we did it at Point Reyes, and we did it at Padre Islands.

We have done it on practically all the bills as far as the actual acquisition costs are concerned. But I thoroughly agree, this should at least be an acquisition cost.

If the report says \$30,000, I think that is what it should say.

Mr. WIRTH. If I may say this, and I am trying to be helpful, we know that on our Mission 66, when we first started to put in certain estimates, the only thing we had to go with was the cost of construction as of that time.

We know that now, and Mission 66 was a 10-year program, and it went from one section or bundle of things in each area. Many of them have been completed now.

But from 1956 to the present time, there has been a steady increase in labor costs and material cost, so that our total cost is running 38 percent higher than it was in 1956.

Now, if this limitation, this \$570,000—and we tried to be reasonable on it, and we realize if we do not get out appropriation, we shall have to go back to Congress for another authorization—

Senator SIMPSON. That does not disturb me. Does that disturb you, the necessity of coming back to Congress?

Mr. WIRTH. No, sir. The only thing is, when we do come back they will say, "Why did you not give us the right figure in the first place?"

Senator SIMPSON. I think we are right in saying that.

Mr. WIRTH. But we cannot give you that.

Senator BIBLE. I think the Director recognizes the Congress will in this particular area, and we have regularly put ceilings—always on acquisition of land, I am sure.

But in certain instances, also on development. I think he well knew that.

Mr. WIRTH. I am not arguing against putting a ceiling on it, Senator. I am just saying that we do have those problems, and I am sure you realize that.

Senator BURDICK. I have no objection to a ceiling, Mr. Chairman, for a second reason. I know this land. I know it can be acquired for this amount of money.

I have an interest in 20 acres of land, a small interest, and I think it is a very fine place.

Senator BIBLE. Probably it is adequate to cover the acquisition cost. I do not know about the development.

Did you have anything more?

Senator SIMPSON. Will the record disclose that we are going to put a ceiling on this appropriation?

Senator BIBLE. The record is going to disclose—I think this is a matter for executive determination. I think you have to break this down; the author of the bill should consider whether acquisition and development are different problems.

Senator BURDICK. I shall yield on acquisition right now.

Senator BIBLE. I think both should be considered in the executive committee. I should think the acquisition—I am not quite as wedded to the idea of putting a ceiling on development, because that is subject to review for the committee. But I think one should be put on acquisition.

Senator SIMPSON. I do not want to be obtuse about these things, but we get these wonderful brochures that are very costly, very beautiful, and very well documented.

The Park Service has entered upon another phase in a library of some 15,000 books. I am reading them with great pleasure—my granddad appears in them. It is a marvelous book.

But by the same token, people inquire into who bears the cost of all this publication. I say occasionally, you pick the money from some poor, unsuspecting person who is willing to help out, and it is very good. You did it in the grassland area.

Mr. WIRTH. Let me tell you, that book—we did not pay a cent to get that printed.

Senator SIMPSON. It cost \$6.50.

Mr. WIRTH. We did not pay a cent to get that printed.

Senator SIMPSON. I think you should have something in the grasslands book to disclose that.

Mr. WIRTH. This company wanted to print it and try it out, and they gave us a thousand copies free.

Senator SIMPSON. You are a lucky guy; keep them coming.

Mr. WIRTH. That is why we sent each Member of Congress one, because we thought they would like to see it.

Senator BIBLE. I think we have a fine record for this particular hearing.

I do want to direct you, because I want it clear that Senator Simpson has asked you how much this brochure cost. I think that should be supplied for the record.

I also want you to indicate the sources of money—is it completely Federal, partly private dollars, partly Federal? Break it down and give us the cost of the brochure and the work that has gone into preparing this proposal.

Do we have further questions of the Director?

Mr. WIRTH. The time spent on making the study—

Senator BIBLE. I want some overall estimate of approximately the cost of the proposal—the working up and the cost—was it \$5,000, \$10,000, \$20,000, \$25,000? Whatever the figure is. And then I want a further breakdown as to sources. Was this entirely, 100 percent Federal dollars, partly Federal and partly State, partly Federal, State, and private?

You can supply that.

Are there further questions for the record?

(No response.)

(The information requested is as follows:)

AUGUST 8, 1963.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,
*Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: We are pleased to supply the additional information requested by the Public Lands Subcommittee on August 2 at the hearings on S. 187, a bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota, and for other purposes.

We were asked about the cost and the attendance at national historic sites similar to the proposed Fort Union Trading Post National Historical Site. For this purpose, we have selected Fort Clatsop National Memorial, Custer Battlefield National Monument, Fort Union National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. Because of its relevance to any comparison, we call you attention to the fact that the gross acreage of these areas is 125, 765, 720, and 90 acres, respectively. Enclosed is a tabulation of the annual operating costs of these sites during fiscal years 1962 and 1963, and a separate tabulation showing the number of visitors during the calendar years 1961 and 1962.

There is also enclosed a statement of the costs of the proposed Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site. This statement represents a breakdown and amplification of the cost figures supplied in the Department's report of June 5.

The committee also wished to know the amount spent on preparing the legislative proposal, including the cost of the brochure, "A Proposed Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site." The studies and writing required for this proposal cost approximately \$1,246. This includes the personal services involved in the field study, the cost of travel and per diem, and the cost of research and writing the report. Reproduction of the brochure was financed with funds appropriated to the National Park Service for planning activities and the cost totaled \$545.

Sincerely yours,

CONRAD L. WIRTH, *Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Statement showing average cost of operating certain parks during 1962 and 1963 fiscal years

Area	1962	1963	Average
Fort Clatsop National Memorial:			
Management and protection.....	\$25,527	\$31,810	\$28,668
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	7,458	10,750	9,104
Subtotal, Fort Clatsop.....	32,985	42,560	37,772
Custer Battlefield National Monument:			
Management and protection.....	30,392	34,272	32,332
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	25,103	28,543	26,823
Subtotal, Custer Battlefield.....	55,495	62,815	59,155
Fort Union National Monument:			
Management and protection.....	23,271	25,463	24,367
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	16,032	20,821	18,426
Subtotal, Fort Union.....	39,303	46,284	42,793
Fort Vancouver National Historic Site:			
Management and protection.....	26,497	33,210	29,854
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	11,965	18,130	15,048
Subtotal, Fort Vancouver.....	38,462	51,340	44,902
Grand total.....	166,245	202,999	184,622

	Visitation	
	1961	1962
Fort Clatsop National Memorial.....	69,000	70,500
Custer Battlefield National Monument.....	150,300	179,700
Fort Union National Monument.....	10,600	11,800
Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.....	28,300	51,400

COST DETAILS, PROPOSED FORT UNION TRADING POST NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

DEVELOPMENT

The Department's report of June 5, 1963, on S. 187 states that not more than \$570,000 would be required for development during the first 5 years. The following schedule, showing costs of proposed roads and trails and buildings and utilities totals \$565,000:

	Year and cost					
	1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	Total
Roads and trails:						
Entrance road.....	\$15,000					
Parking area and walks.....	20,000					
Utility area roads.....		\$25,000				
Overlook road and parking area.....					\$75,000	
Total, roads and trails.....	35,000	25,000			75,000	\$135,000
Buildings, utilities, etc.:						
Utility system, visitor center.....		50,000				
Visitor center.....		125,000				
Historic site, investigation and restoration.....	20,000	10,000				
Utility systems, residences and utility area.....	50,000					
Utility building.....	40,000					
Employee residences.....	40,000				40,000	
4-unit employee apartments.....		55,000				
Total, buildings, utilities, etc.....	150,000	240,000			40,000	430,000
Total development (1st 5 years).....						565,000

ADMINISTRATION

The Department's report of June 5, also states that administrative costs would average about \$48,000 per year during the first 5 years. This figure was obtained by dividing the projected costs of management and protection (totaling \$171,700) plus maintenance and rehabilitation (totaling \$65,900) by 5 for an average of \$47,520. The estimated yearly costs are as follows:

Year	Management and protection	Maintenance and rehabilitation	Total
1st.....	\$29,300	\$4,100	\$33,400
2d.....	29,300	4,100	33,400
3d.....	29,300	14,300	43,600
4th.....	41,900	14,300	56,200
5th.....	41,900	29,100	71,000
Total.....	171,700	65,900	237,600

These estimates are based on projected staff needs which are summarized as follows:

Position and grade	Year and number of employees				
	1st	2d	3d	4th	5th
Permanent:					
Superintendent, GS-11.....	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Historian, GS-9.....	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.....	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Administrative aid, GS-5.....				1.0	1.0
Maintenance man.....			1.0	1.0	1.0
Caretaker.....					1.0
Total permanent.....	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0
Seasonal:					
Interpreter, GS-4.....	.5	.5	.5	1.0	1.0
Ranger, GS-4.....				.5	.5
Laborer.....	.5	.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total seasonal.....	1.0	1.0	1.5	2.5	2.5

LAND

Our best estimate of the cost of the 370 acres of land which would have to be acquired for the site with appropriated funds is \$30,000.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Director.

At this point, I should like to read into the record a telegram from the Governor of North Dakota, directed to me, dated July 30, 1963:

I understand that S. 187 dealing with restoration of old Fort Union in northwestern North Dakota will be heard this week before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands. Restoration of Fort Union once a key trading post on the frontier is of a great interest and importance to North Dakota. We believe it will be an outstanding tourist attraction and a prime example of our colorful western heritage. For these reasons I strongly urge approval of S. 187.

(Signed) Gov. WILLIAM L. GUY.

I have a number of communications on this particular proposal. Without objection, they will be made a part of the record.

(The communications referred to follow :)

BISMARCK, N. DAK., July 30, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I understand that S. 187 dealing with restoration of old Fort Union in north-western North Dakota, will be heard this week before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands.

Restoration of Fort Union once a key trading post on the frontier, is of great interest and importance to North Dakota.

We believe it will be an outstanding tourist attraction and a prime example of our colorful western heritage. For these reasons I strongly urge approval of S. 187.

Gov. WILLIAM L. GUY.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., July 30, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Interior Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Please consider and pass favorably on Senate bill 187.

WILLISTON MOTEL ASSOCIATION.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., July 30, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee of Public Lands,
Interior Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We urge passage of Senate bill 187. Please acquire from State Historical Society, Fort Union.

Urge restoration and preservation.

Mr. and Mrs. STEWART SCHUBERT, *Seibert Motel*.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., July 30, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Interior Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

The Williston Chamber of Commerce, as an organization and its members through various committees and as individuals have long been interested and active in working for the preservation of the Fort Union historic site. Urge that your subcommittee favorably consider S. 187 which provides for National Park Service acquisition of site and its eventual partial restoration.

WILLISTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
CLARKE JORGENSEN,
Executive Vice President.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., July 30, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, Interior Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I sincerely urge your support for Senate bill 187 for committee of National Park Service to acquire from State Historical Society, Fort Union site and preserve same.

W. C. ROBB,
General Manager, Plainsman Hotel and Etrancho Motor Hotel.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., July 30, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee of Public Land, Interior Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We urge S. 187 be given favorable consideration. Please acquire from State Historical Society of North Dakota, Fort Union. We urge restoration and preservation of fort.

CORNELL TORGERSON, *Mels Motel.*

WILLISTON, N. DAK., July 30, 1963.

Senator BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate Public Land Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding Senate bill 187 up for hearing this Friday. The Masons and other citizens of this area ask that your committee give this bill favorable consideration.

MOUNT MORIAH LODGE No. 51,
WILLISTON MASONIC LODGE,
B. G. JOHNSON,
Worshipful Master.

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF NORTH DAKOTA,
DIVISION OF STATE PARKS,
Bismarck, N. Dak., July 30, 1963.

Senator BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: According to the Bismarck Tribune there is to be a Senate subcommittee hearing on the acquisition of the Fort Union site in North Dakota to be developed as a national historic landmark.

I want to take this opportunity to encourage the subcommittee to present a favorable recommendation that this project be authorized. We in North Dakota are very interested in seeing the development at old Fort Union. The State Historical Society which is the parent organization for the State parks division now holds the title to the immediate site of old Fort Union. The last session of the North Dakota Legislature authorized the State Historical Society to transfer this tract of land to the National Park Service for development of a national historic landmark. We concur wholeheartedly with this action and are looking forward to that development by the National Park Service.

The State parks division is at this time developing a small tract at the Fort Buford which is only about 2 miles from the Fort Union. It can readily be seen that one site will enhance the other site and it is felt that the development at these two sites will give a complete historical interpretation of the value of the confluence area.

You can be assured that the subcommittee and subsequent committees will have the wholehearted support of the State of North Dakota in this program.

Yours truly,

R. J. ELLIOTT,
Director, North Dakota State Parks.

BJELLA, JESTRAB, NEFF & PIPPIN,
Williston, N. Dak., July 30, 1963.

Re: Senate bill 187, Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Interior Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The 36th Legislative Assembly of North Dakota, in the year 1959, created by joint resolution the Yellowstone-Missouri-Fort Union Confluence Commission, composed of certain ex officio and appointed members and providing an appropriation with which the commission could carry forward its purpose from biennium to biennium.

Since its creation, the commission has worked closely with the National Park Service, to develop the national historical significance of this well-known site at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers.

We have followed with a great deal of interest the work of the National Park Service and, in particular, the theme studies conducted by the Service in which Fort Union was included. The designation of this site as eligible for national marker designation in two categories is certainly an indication of the great part which this site played in the development of the West.

The commission, at its last meeting, formally adopted a resolution urging favorable consideration of the passage of Senate bill 187.

This letter is intended to amplify somewhat the importance with which this site is regarded by the people of North Dakota, as indicated by the recognition which the State legislature gave to the site by its creation of the commission in 1959 and the encouragement it has given to the commission since that date.

I am enclosing a copy of H.B. 744 which was passed by the 38th Legislative Assembly of North Dakota, authorizing the State historical society to transfer the Fort Union historic site to the appropriate division of the Federal Government in anticipation of possible favorable consideration and passage of S. 187.

The transfer of this site to the National Park Service awaits only favorable consideration and passage of S. 187 and its companion bill in the House.

On behalf of the commission and as its vice chairman, I respectfully urge favorable subcommittee action for the passage of S. 187.

Very sincerely,

LAVERN C. NEFF.

HOUSE BILL No. 744

THIRTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA

A BILL INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE POLING

For an Act to permit the State Historical Society to transfer by deed and title the parcel of land known as Fort Union Historic Site

Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota:

SECTION 1. Authorization for the transfer by deed and title, ten and twenty-six hundredths acres, more or less of land in township one hundred fifty-two, range sixty-five, section seven, Williams County to that division of Federal Government, normally the National Park Service, Department of Interior with the understanding that they shall further develop the area as a National Historic Landmark.

SECTION 2. The parcel of land is further identified as follows: Beginning at the northeast corner of lot three, section seven, township one hundred fifty-two, north range one hundred four west, thence seven hundred feet in a westernly direction along the north line of lot three to a point; thence at right angles five hundred feet, more or less in a southernly direction to a point, thence at right angles seven hundred feet, more or less in a easternly direction to a point on the east line of lot three, thence five hundred feet, more or less in a northernly direction along this east line of lot three to the point of beginning said tract containing eight and twenty-six hundredths acres more or less. Also a right in the general public to travel over and upon the tract described as follows, which right of way is to connect the tract above described with the County road: Beginning at the southwest corner of lot two, section seven, township one hundred fifty-two north, range one hundred four west, thence north along section line a distance of nine hundred sixty and four-tenths feet thence east along county road and Great Northern Railway a distance of sixty-six feet; thence south to the one-fourth line, thence west sixty-six feet to the point of beginning; containing an area of one and four-tenths acres more or less and all lying in lot two of said section seven. Also, beginning at the southwest corner of lot two, section seven, township one hundred fifty-two north, range one hundred four west, thence east along the one-fourth line five hundred twenty nine and fifty-eight hundredths feet, thence south sixty-six feet, thence west five hundred twenty nine and fifty-eight hundredths feet, thence north sixty-six feet to the point of beginning; containing an area of eight-tenths of an acre more or less and all lying in lot three of said section seven.

WILLISTON JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Williston, N. Dak., July 30, 1963.

Re S. 187.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
 Interior Committee, U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The Williston Jaycees, as a local civic group, are very interested in the above Senate bill in that Fort Buford be transferred from its present State to the National Park Service.

Fort Buford and the history contained therein is a part of our early American heritage and we feel that making Fort Buford a national park would remind the youth of our Nation of the privileges and human rights that they have inherited.

We appeal to you to preserve the history of our Nation by making Fort Buford a national park. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ZENE PALEN, *President.*

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
 OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Bismarck, July 29, 1963.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
 Senate Interior Committee, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: Your committee has before you S. 1618, legislation of vital importance to the millions of Americans who desire to taste the raw beauty of some of our Nation's most spectacular landscape and at the same time sense the rugged western heritage which was a part of the dramatic history of the United States. The same subtle attractions of the West which brought Theodore Roosevelt to establish a ranch in the North Dakota Badlands country can still be felt by those who are able to venture back into the valleys and buttes of this Little Missouri River wonderland.

The Nation has already established for posterity the north and south units of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, but the Nation now on wheels, with more time and money for vacationing, should be allowed to travel the 70-some miles of distance between these two national parks. The ranch site of Theodore Roosevelt could be an inspirational point of interest to the young tourists who could observe what the rugged life an adversity had accomplished in shaping the character of one of the greatest Presidents this Nation has ever produced. People traveling this scenic highway would be following the old Chisholm Trail that brought the longhorn cattle north from Texas to its northernmost point in the upper unit of the Roosevelt National Park.

This highway is fortunately located so as to be accessible to one of the important east-west interstate routes, No. 94. We are already experiencing the rising influx of tourists eager to camp in and be a part of the old West. North Dakota has future plans of connecting a State scenic highway—from Garrison Dam south along the Garrison Reservoir and up to the north unit of the Roosevelt Park—with the proposed scenic highway in S. 1618. As you can well imagine, this would open up a vast area for recreation and travel not now available to the public.

We in North Dakota regard the connecting highway between the north and south units of the Roosevelt National Park as absolutely essential as the first step in providing not only the people of our State but also those from coast to coast with access to an area that deserves to be seen.

I hope you will not be swayed by opposition which might come from some individuals who might take a selfish point of view, with little regard for the needs of the general public of this generation and those to come.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY, *Governor.*

FORT BUFORD 6TH INFANTRY REGIMENT ASSOCIATION,
Williston, N. Dak., July 30, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
 Interior Committee, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: We are sincerely hoping that your committee shall see fit to report favorably on Senate bill 187 concerning the reconstruction of the Fort Union Trading Post.

Our efforts as an organization have been toward this end since our inception. (Please see attached historical brief.)

We believe that there is no other area of our country so deserving of national park status than the Fort Union site. This fact has been recognized for more than a quarter of a century. Now we hope to see the fruition of our efforts.

We respectfully request your sympathetic attention to this bill.

Sincerely,

BEN INNIS,
Regimental Sergeant Major, Commanding.

FORT BUFORD 6TH INFANTRY REGIMENT ASSOCIATION

Historical sketch, March 11, 1963

The Fort Buford 6th Infantry Regiment Association of Williston, N. Dak., was organized in January of 1962 and today the membership consists of 39 men, including the Governor of North Dakota as honorary commander in chief.

The twofold purpose of the 6th Infantry is to field an exhibition drill team and assist in the restoration of the Fort Union and Fort Buford historic sites, at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers, near Williston, N. Dak. The drill team appears at civic functions in the upper Missouri area and members also are required to provide part of the manual labor needed in the restoration of Fort Buford.

The 6th Infantry is completely independent of any other organization with the members being responsible for the purchase of their own arms, uniforms, and equipment.

The standard arm of the company is the 1873 model Springfield 45/70 caliber military rifle. The bayonets, cartridge boxes, swords, and pistols are also the original items issued to U.S. infantry troops in the early 1870's. Only the uniforms are replicas, and they are authentic to the last detail.

The fife and drums of the musicians are original instruments, dating from approximately the Civil War period.

On parade, the 6th Infantry carries a 36-star flag, the official U.S. colors of the 1870's.

Officers:

Regimental sergeant major: Ben Innis, commanding officer.

Regimental quartermaster sergeant: LaVern Neff.

Company quartermaster sergeants: John Brostnen and Henry Ford.

First Sergeant: Ray Atol.

Chief musician: Albert Borrud.

Ordnance sergeant: Russell Bartels.

Commissary sergeant: Irv Landes.

Hospital stewards: Dr. Gordon Ellis and Dr. Chester Borrud.

Pioneer sergeant: Elmer Skogen.

Drummer boys: Chris Chapman and Ricky Falstad.

The 6th Infantry was designated in May of 1962 as the honorary garrison troops of Fort Buford by Gov. William L. Guy of North Dakota.

The original U.S. 6th Infantry was activated in 1798 and was in Dakota Territory as early as 1823. During the Indian wars, from 1872 through 1880 the unit was headquartered at Fort Buford. Today the 6th Infantry is a part of the U.S. forces stationed in Berlin, Germany.

Fort Buford's construction as a military post was begun in 1866 and in 1867 the Government bought the materials of Fort Union, 3 miles downstream, for further construction of Fort Buford. In its earliest days, the post was under continual siege by Sitting Bull and the Sioux for a period of 2 years.

Many famous people knew Fort Buford, including "Yellowstone" Kelly, the scout, Col. Nelson A. Miles, General Hazen, General Pershing, Capt. Grant Marsh, and Lt. Col. George A. Custer. It was to Fort Buford that Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce Indians were brought after their surrender near the Canadian border; and Sitting Bull and Chief Gall of the Sioux surrendered there.

Fort Buford was finally abandoned as a military post by the Army in 1895 and brought to a close one of the most colorful chapters in American history that began with the construction of Fort Union in 1828.

The 6th Infantry considers it a duty to foster the restoration of these historic forts and refresh the spirit of patriotism that made our country great. It is well worth the personal effort of everyone to visit these monuments to American history.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., August 1, 1963.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate Public Lands Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Urgently recommend favorable action your committee Senate bill 187. Passage will preserve for posterity the early history of this area and enhance our much needed tourism.

E. S. BRYNJOLFSON.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., August 2, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee Public Lands,
Interior Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Our organization has recently taken action actively supporting Senate bill 187. Fort Union is part of our history for what America has to be proud of. We must do what is possible to preserve this location. Our highway from Mexico up through Canada has many historical sites as well as national parks. We feel Fort Union is as important as any on our route to date. Your consideration on Senate bill 187 will be appreciated.

INTERNATIONAL PARKS HIGHWAY ASSOCIATION,
RAY DAVID, *President*.

NORTH DAKOTA AUTOMOBILE CLUB,
Fargo, N. Dak., July 29, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Interior Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: Generally the National Park Service has accepted parks, historic sites, and other areas only because of congressional direction.

In a few instances, the Service has felt that an area is of such national significance that it merited inclusion in its system.

Such a site is that of Fort Union, at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers—a site which had a vital role in the discovery, taming, and development of the whole West.

The bill to acquire and restore Fort Union is supported by both Montana and North Dakota. The State legislature earlier this year approved transfer of State land, comprising the Fort Union site, to the Federal Government.

Favorable consideration of the Fort Union restoration bill is respectfully urged.

Sincerely,

YELLOWSTONE-MISSOURI-FORT UNION
CONFLUENCE COMMISSION,
JAMES B. CONNOLLY, *Secretary*.

NORTH DAKOTA AUTOMOBILE CLUB,
Fargo, N. Dak., July 29, 1963.

Senator ALAN BIBLE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Interior Committee, U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR ALAN BIBLE: It was with reluctance that the National Park Service accepted the administration of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park.

After a time, however, and with visitations by a series of specialists—geologists, historians, naturalists—the Service realized that here, in the Badlands of the Little Missouri, is a unique area, a worthy addition to its great national system.

The Service early recognized that the region merited preservation for the enjoyment and education of the public now and for generations to come.

Yet, the full development, utilization, and appreciation, must await establishment of a parkway to connect the three separate units, the north, south, and the Elk Horn Ranch site.

We urge support for Senator Burdick's S. 1618.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. CONNOLLY.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Chairman?

Senator BIBLE. The Senator from North Dakota.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection, I would like to have included in the record at this point the following communications, and I might say that this shows the tremendous and widespread support that the project has in the Northwest.

One is a telegram from the Greater North Dakota Association, in Fargo, N. Dak.; one is a telegram from Willison Masonic Lodge; one is a telegram from the Fort Buford 6th Infantry Regiment Association; one is a letter and resolution from Watford City (N. Dak.) Association of Commerce; and a strong letter of endorsement from J. M. Budd, president, Great Northern Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn.

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, the referred to memorandums, messages, and letters, will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The documents referred to follow:)

GREATER NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION,
Fargo, N. Dak., July 31, 1963.

Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
*U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.:*

Understand hearing on restoration of Fort Union at confluence of Yellowstone and Little Missouri Rivers to be held. This area played vital role in history of northwestern North Dakota serving as crossroads for missionaries, artists, fur traders, settlers and other early day pioneers pushing on through wilderness. GNDA believes this is true Americana and as such should be preserved. Therefore strongly urge support of the restoration and preservation of Fort Union and respectfully request that this message be read into the record.

J. M. CRANOR,
Executive Vice President.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., July 31, 1963.

Senator QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding your bill, S. 187, up for hearing this Friday. The Masons and other citizens of this area ask that you continue to give this bill your support.

MOUNT MORIAH LODGE No. 51,
 WILLISTON MASONIC LODGE,
 B. G. JOHNSON,
Worshipful Master.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., July 31, 1963.

Senator QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thirty-nine members, 6th Infantry, strongly urge passage S. 187. Refer my letter to you of June 23, 1963, awaiting orders to pitch in on reconstruction of Fort Union.

BEN INNIS,
Regimental Sergeant Major, Commanding.

ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Watford City, N. Dak., July 26, 1963.

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The Watford City Association of Commerce by action of the board of directors has adopted and directed to be forwarded to you, the attached resolution requesting that a national historic site be established at the original site of old Fort Union at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers.

Respectfully,

WATFORD CITY ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
FRED R. PIPER, *Secretary*.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Fort Union, established in 1828 as a trading post of the American Fur Co., was the key post of that company's upper Missouri outfit and one of the largest and most pretentious posts in the West; and

Whereas, in addition to its economic importance, Fort Union was a gathering place for missionaries, scientists, Indians, military expeditions, and covered wagon trains; and

Whereas, through two independent studies (the fur trade, military and Indian history), the National Park Service determined that Fort Union is worthy of designation as a national historic landmark; and

Whereas, at the request of the Department of the Interior, companion bills calling for the restoration of Fort Union have been introduced by the North Dakota congressional delegation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of Commerce of Watford City, N. Dak., That Congress be requested to approve the establishment of a Fort Union National Historic Site and restoration of the post which had such a significant role in western history; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to Senator Quentin N. Burdick.

R. R. SCHUR, *President*.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY Co.,
St. Paul, Minn., July 25, 1963.

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
U.S. Senator,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: It was pleasant to visit with you in your office in Washington the other day. I want to repeat our sincere interest in your bill, S. 187, authorizing establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak.

Our interest, of course, stems from the great historical significance of this location at the junction of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers. This point has been a landmark since shortly after the founding of this Nation. Lewis and Clark first passed here on their journey west in the early part of the 19th century, and, of course, on their return journey the two men came together near here, one following the Yellowstone eastward and the other coming back via the Missouri River. It became an important trading center visited by some of the early artists who have preserved the spirit of the West on canvas, on engravings and other forms of art.

In 1853 Col. Isaac Stevens, who was appointed the first Governor of Oregon Territory, was making a survey of railroad routes through the northern part of the western country. His report tells of stopping at this point and it is on the route recommended by his group as a result of the survey.

In 1925 the Great Northern sponsored a historical expedition through its territory. A conclave of Indians was held at Fort Union and there were appropriate ceremonies on this occasion. Our main line runs past this famous spot following almost exactly from there westward for many miles the route recommended by Colonel Stevens 110 years ago.

It seems particularly appropriate and timely to set this area aside before it is too late for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the whole United States.

Very truly yours,

JOHN M. BUDD.

FORT BUFORD 6TH INFANTRY REGIMENT ASSOCIATION,
Williston, N. Dak., June 23, 1963.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Eighteen months ago, we organized the Fort Buford 6th Infantry Regiment Association, here at Williston, with the basic purpose of promoting the restorations of Fort Union and Fort Buford. (See attached historical sheet.) Since that time, there has been a considerable resurgence of interest in these projects.

We are watching with a great deal of interest your efforts to bring the Fort Union site to the status of a national park. We wish to urge you to continue in your efforts in this area. On our part, we pledge you our cooperation in every possible way. Feel free to call on us for any support you may need.

We should like to request that you keep us informed of the current progress of the two bills concerning Fort Union now before the Congress.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

BEN INNIS,
Regimental Sergeant Major, Commanding.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Thirty-Eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota duly enacted House Bill No. 744, entitled: "An act to permit the State Historical Society to transfer by deed and title a parcel of land known as Fort Union Historic Site," which said bill authorized the transfer of 10.26 acres, more or less, of land in Section 7, Township 152 North, Range 103 West, Williams County, North Dakota, to that division of the Federal Government, normally the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, with the understanding that they shall further develop the area as a national historic landmark; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States, Senate Bill No. 187 and introduced in the House of Representatives, House Bill No. 5396, permitting the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the historic remains of Fort Union; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Directors of the State Historical Society of North Dakota, That we urge favorable committee consideration and adoption by the Senate and House of Representatives of said Senate Bill No. 187 and House Bill No. 5396.

Dated at Bismarck, North Dakota, this 18th day of July, 1963.

MARION PIPER SULLIVAN, *Secretary.*

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, duly elected secretary of the State Historical Society of North Dakota, certifies that the above Resolution was duly adopted by the Board of Directors of the State Historical Society of Bismarck, North Dakota, at a meeting of said board held in Room G-2, State Capitol Building, Bismarck, North Dakota, on the 18th day of July, 1963.

MARION PIPER SULLIVAN, *Secretary.*

Senator BIBLE. Without objection, the hearing will be closed, and the record will be left open for the furnishing of additional material from the Director.

(Whereupon, at 11 :30 a.m., the committee proceeded to other business.)

(Under previous authority, the following communications were submitted for inclusion in the hearing record :)

WILLISTON, N. DAK., August 1, 1963.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Please convey to Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands my urgent request that favorable consideration be given to Senate bill 187. Fort Union is an important historical landmark that must be restored and preserved for posterity and if this is not done now it may be too late.

S. A. FORSETH.

BJELLA, JESTRAB, NEFF & PIPPIN,
Williston, N. Dak., August 1, 1963.

Re Senate bill 187.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I understand that hearings on the captioned bill are to be commenced shortly. I would appreciate your submitting this letter and its enclosures to the committee chairman in support of this bill.

The point of greatest historical significance in the exploration and settlement of the Northwestern United States is at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers in extreme western North Dakota. Generally the area extends from Fort Buford west to include that portion of the old town of Mondak lying in Montana. The history of this section is the subject of an excellent short sketch in a letter written by Mr. James B. Connolly, executive director of the North Dakota Automobile Club, to Mr. Oakes of the New York Times. Mr. Connolly has authorized me to enclose herewith a copy of this letter.

In addition to the preservation and reconstruction of an hisotrical site of tremendous value to our country, the program I propose will be the greatest possible stimulant to tourist travel that western North Dakota and eastern Montana could receive.

We know that the importance of western North Dakota and eastern Montana as a tourist attraction has been greatly improved as a result of recent work in the Roosevelt Memorial Park in the North Dakota Badlands along the Little Missouri. Certainly an area of even greater importance is the area lying west of Williston and east of Culbertson at the point of confluence of these two great rivers.

Yours truly,

FRANK F. JESTRAB.

NORTH DAKOTA AUTOMOBILE CLUB,
Fargo, N. Dak., December 12, 1958.

Mr. JOHN B. OAKES,
The New York Times, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. OAKES: I was interested in your article on conservation in the November 30 edition of the Times, in which you point out the loss of scenic areas through overdevelopment.

Areas can also be lost through underdevelopment. A prime example is found in North Dakota at the confluence of the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers, southwest of Williston and near the Montana line.

Before the turn of the 19th century, the area was known to the Governments of Spain, France, and England; today a majority of the people in North Dakota itself don't know the location of the mouth of the Yellowstone.

Reaching the mouth of the Yellowstone was a highlight in the exploration trip of Lewis and Clark, and on the return,; when Clark went south to explore the Yellowstone Valley and Lewis explored northward, that point was designated as the place of rendezvous.

The following year, 1807, Manuel Lisa, St. Louis fur trader, "set poles for the mouth of the Yellowstone." Lisa, until his death in 1820, continued active in that vicinity, working through such organizations as the Missouri Fur Co.

When the first Yellowstone Expedition was proposed in 1818, one of the staunch supporters was President James Monroe. This expedition failed to achieve its original goal, however.

It was in 1822 that William Ashley, later to become a U.S. Senator, and Andrew Henry, formed the group that came to be known as the Rocky Mountain Fur Co. The partners established a trading post at the mouth of the Yellowstone.

Men associated with the enterprise included such fabulous characters as Mike Fink, who met his death at the Ashley and Henry fort; those greatest mountain men, Jim Bridger and Tom Fitzpatrick; Hugh Glass, famed because of the grizzly bear episode; Etienne Provot (Provo, Utah), explorer and trapper; William Sublette, one of the great names in the fur trade; Jedediah S. Smith, ranked with Lewis and Clark for accomplishments in the field of exploration; and others.

The Yellowstone Expedition of 1825 did get to the mouth of the Yellowstone—and beyond—again with the wholehearted approval of President Monroe. Its personnel included Gen. Henry Atkinson, Benjamin O'Fallon, Indian agent and nephew of William Clark, and Gen. William S. Harney.

The biographies of men like Toussaint Charbonneau, whose wife was Sakakawea of Lewis and Clark fame; John Colter, the discoverer of Yellowstone Park; Edward Rose, the mixed blood interpreter, Crow Indian chief, hero and scalawag (of whose exploits Washington Irving wrote so entertainingly), and others, are interwoven with these various up-river expeditions.

John Jacob Astor's ill-fated Astoria venture gave him an incentive to succeed on the Missouri and to oppose the powerful Canadian interests operating in U.S. territory. An opportunity came with his purchase of the Columbia Fur Co., formed by one-time Northwest Fur Co. employees who had become American citizens. Principal among these was Kenneth McKenzie, who was placed in charge of the American Fur Co.'s upper Missouri outfit and who in 1828-29 established the greatest post on the Missouri, Fort Union, located at the mouth of the Yellowstone.

McKenzie was the first American to establish a truce with the formidable Blackfoot Tribe. It was he, also, who had a part in initiating steamboat travel on the upper Missouri. It was McKenzie, king of the Missouri, upon whom the hate and fear inspired by the might of the American Fur Co. was concentrated.

When Bill Sublette and Robert Campbell late in 1832 established Fort William at the mouth of the Yellowstone, in opposition to the American Fur Co., it was McKenzie's tactics which led to an early abandonment of the new firm. There were other short-lived opposition posts established in the area, such as Fort Mortimer in 1843.

Fort Union always was a mecca for all sorts and conditions of men. In 1832 there was George Catlin, on the first steamer to reach the mouth of the Yellowstone, who soon was to gain international fame for his Indian writings and pictures.

In 1833 Prince Maximilian of Wied, world famed scientist and scholar, whose retinue included the Swiss artist, Karl Bodmer, came to Fort Union. John James Audubon spent a summer at Fort Union in 1843. Beginning in 1840 Fort Union was a port of call for the eminent missionary Father Pierre Jean DeSmet. Sir St. George Gore of Ireland spent a couple of years in the western wilderness indulging in the sport of hunting. It was to Fort Union that he came, with a retinue of some 40 servants, and it was there he disposed of much of his equipment.

In 1851 Fort Union was a gathering place for the railroad survey expedition headed by Gen. Isaac I. Stevens, en route to assume the duties as first Governor of Washington Territory.

And always there were Indians. Perhaps no other spot on the continent had as many Indians, from as many tribes, for as many years, as had the confluence of the Missouri and Yellowstone. There were Chippewa, Blackfeet, Crow, Sioux, Cree, Blood, Piegan, Assiniboine, Hidatsa, Mandan, Arikara, coming in in immense bands; but there were individuals from other nations such as Cheyenne, Iroquois, Flathead, Snake.

The Missouri, especially as steamboat traffic had been extended to Fort Benton in Montana, continued as one of the principal highways to the Far West. Another important route for immigrants was the northern road by way of Fort Union. Because of Indian treaties, by which lower forts were abandoned, the Fort Union route, either by water or land, became increasingly important.

It was in 1840 that Washington Irving, as had others, advocated establishment of a military post at the mouth of the Yellowstone. This did not materialize until after the Minnesota Massacre of 1862, with the first military stationed at Fort Union in 1864. It was 2 years later that Fort Buford was built. Establishment of this military reservation meant the end of Fort Union, but some trading still was carried on by post sutlers.

In the subsequent Indian campaigns, culminating in the Custer battle at the Little Big Horn in 1876, Fort Buford played an important part. It was to Fort Buford that prisoners of war were taken for later transfer to reservations. Chief Joseph, the Indian Napoleon, and his Nez Perce people were among the captives.

There were other such Indian prisoners as Chief Gall, and it was at Fort Buford in 1881 that Sitting Bull, symbol of resistance both for the whites and the reds, surrendered with the remnants of his followers.

In the area were the last great buffalo hunts, and in a few years this slaughter was to provide a source of income for the new settlers, the sale of bones. The areas saw the romance of the railroad, and the work of one of the most romantic of railroad men, James J. Hill.

A new area was born, and its principal product was beef. There were trail herds coming in from as far south as Texas, and other stock shipped in from the East by rail. There was a new breed of men—cowboys; and there were sheepmen, rustlers, vigilantes.

Among the ranchers were the fabulous Pierre Wibaux; the four-eyed dude from New York, Theodore Roosevelt; the distinguished and imaginative pretender to the French throne, the Marquis de Mores, who established a packing plant on the Little Missouri, 100 miles to the south.

The five greatest visionaries of the West, men who dreamed of empire, had some contact or connection with the confluence area. These were Astor, Ashley, Nathaniel J. Wyeth, James J. Hill, and the Marquis de Mores.

All aspects of the winning of the West were here enacted; exploration, fur trade, Indian relations, scientific jaunts, steamboating, and other forms of river transportation; the covered wagon, the pony express, the Indian scouts (including Yellowstone Kelly and Lonesome Charley Reynolds), missionaries, the gold rush with steady streams of mining equipment and prospectors going to Montana and of disillusioned or successful miners returning to the States; railroading, the cowboy, the homesteader, the buffalo hunter, the sportsman.

The area today is important. It is the heart of the oil-rich Williston basin which extends into four States and two Canadian provinces; it saw pioneering in the field of irrigation; it is at the upper edge of the 200-mile long reservoir behind Garrison Dam; it is in the area of great fields of lignite coal, of valuable clay deposits, and other mineral resources; the hunter here has one of the best game areas in the world, and fishing and other water sports are coming to the fore.

Yet, in large measure, as far as the tourist is concerned, the site is a victim of undevelopment. Fort Union now is a historic site of 8 acres. About all the material evidence of past greatness is a sign erected by the State Historical Society and a flagpole (in poor condition) erected in 1925 by the Upper Missouri Historical Expedition sponsored by several State historical societies.

Fort Buford Historic Site has 20 acres. The few buildings that remain are in deplorable condition; the military cemetery has been neglected.

I could write a book on it all. As a matter of fact, that is just what I am attempting to do.

But what is all this to you? Perhaps nothing. But in this area of overdevelopment, overcommercialization, overselling, and an overconsciousness of tourism, it should be refreshing to come across a spot like this.

It is quite possible that here is the most significant spot in the winning of the West; it is possible that more exciting history was here enacted than at any other place in the West. And yet, almost no one knows about it. It is not easy of access—there is a dirt road, lack of signing—and even when one arrives, there is little to see, no one to give an explanation, no comprehensive history available.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. CONNOLLY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Grand Forks, April 17, 1963.

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I have noted your efforts to bring about a restoration of old Fort Union in western North Dakota, and I would like to commend you for them.

This is a very worthwhile project, and I hope that you are successful because I know that the result will be a fine graphic addition to our rich heritage.

I am especially interested because it was at Fort Union that North Dakota's first newspaper was published, the famous Frontier Scout, a product of the cavalry troops. Next year, 1964, will be the centennial anniversary of the Scout, and I am hoping that this fact may be tied in, in some way, with your Fort Union legislation in the Congress.

Ellen joins me in sending our very best regards.

Sincerely,

ALVIN E. AUSTIN,
Chairman, Department of Journalism.

[The following text is extremely faint and largely illegible, appearing to be a carbon copy or bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. It contains several paragraphs of text, including a signature at the bottom that appears to read "LARRY H. CONROY".]

LARRY H. CONROY



