Y4
. In 8/13
L 63

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

1040

Y4
In 8/13
L63

GOVERNMENT
Storage

LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY WILDERNESS AREA, MONTANA

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETIETH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 1121

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CLASSIFY AS WILDERNESS THE NATIONAL FOREST LANDS KNOWN AS THE LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY, AND PARTS OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK AND LOLO NATIONAL FORESTS, IN MONTANA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

SEPTEMBER 23, 1968

A11600 702940

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
22-003 WASHINGTON : 1968

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Y4
.In 8/13
L63

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington, *Chairman*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho
ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
CARL HAYDEN, Arizona
GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
LEE METCALF, Montana

THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California
GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado
LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming
MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon

JERRY T. VERKLER, *Staff Director*
STEWART FRENCH, *Chief Counsel*
E. LEWIS REID, *Minority Counsel*
PORTER WARD, *Professional Staff Member*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho, *Chairman*

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada
ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska
CARL HAYDEN, Arizona
LEE METCALF, Montana

GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado
LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona

CONTENTS

	Page
S. 1121	1

STATEMENTS

Aldrich, Donald, executive secretary, Montana Wildlife Federation	73
Anderson, Forrest H., Attorney General of the State of Montana	26
Anderson, Horace G., Cascade County Wildlife Association	83
Ashby, Norma, hostess and producer of "Today in Montana," Great Falls, Mont	79
Ashby, S. C., Great Falls, Mont	154
Atwell, Gerry, University of Montana	105
Babcock, Hon. Tim, Governor, State of Montana	3
Baldwin, Kenneth K., president, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs	78
Baldwin, Mrs. Kenneth, Bozeman, Mont	77
Battin, Hon. James F., a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Montana	19
Bauer, Richard J., Missoula, Mont	63
Botkin, T. Sgt. Grover F., Great Falls, Mont	132
Clausen, William, Helena, Mont	90
Cobb, A. B. "Buddy," Jr., Montana State Farm Bureau Federation	51
Colwell, Bruce, president, North Idaho Forestry Association	61
Cook, Sherman S., Jr., Lincoln, Mont	97
Copenhaver, Howard W., Montana Outfitters & Guides Association	81
Cox, Royce G., chairman, Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee	58
Craighead, Dr. John J., as presented by Dr. James Brogger	116
Craine, James R., representing the Edward Hines Lumber Co	107
Crosby, Jack, Lincoln, Mont	151
Delaney, Donald L., Montana Lumber Sales, Inc., Missoula, Mont	63
Donnelly, Mr. and Mrs. Richard C., Great Falls, Mont	85
Dunkle, Frank, director, Montana Fish and Game Department	4
Dzivi, Joe, Flathead Wildlife Association	96
Edwards, Tom, owner, the Whitetail Ranch	36
Elk Studs Co., West Yellowstone, Mont	71
Erickson, Leif, Helena, Mont	49
Evans, M. Brock, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs and Sierra Club	64
Gabriel, Fred P., Helena, Mont	91
Gannon, F. M., executive vice president, Union Bank & Trust Co., Helena, Mont	25
Garland, Cecil, president, Lincoln Back Country Protective Association	9
Gordon, Dr. Clarence C., president, Western Montana Scientists' Committee for Public Information	113
Gray, Orville, attorney at law, Great Falls, Mont	54
Harris, Dr. John T., Lolo, Mont	103
Helding, Robert N., chairman, Montana Forest Industries Council	55
Henning, Dr. Daniel H., assistant professor of political science, Eastern Montana College	5
House, Virgil A., vice president, Rocky Mountain Industries, West Yellowstone, Mont	69
Hultman, R. H., president, Montana Wilderness Association	76
Johns, Willis M., Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology, Butte, Mont	38
Johnson, Brig. Gen. Walter M., U.S. Army (Retired)	106
Judge, Thomas, State senator, Helena, Mont	27
Kelleher, Robert L., Billings, Mont	28
Kesten, Norman, American Smelting & Refining Co	47

	Page
Kirkmire, Nicholas, Beaverton, Oreg	91
Knight, A. C., M.D., superintendent, Galen Hospital, Deer Lodge, Mont	152
Koessler, Dr. Horace H., president, Intermountain Lumber Co. & Tree Farms, Inc., Missoula, Mont	92
Kreck, Loren L., D.D.S., Columbia Falls, Mont	55
LaGrange, John, Bear Creek Mining Co., Spokane, Wash	42
Lambkin, Leonard, Lincoln, Mont	80
Lauckner, Mrs. William	149
Lauckner, William, Great Falls, Mont	148
Merritt, Clifton R., director, field services for the Wilderness Society	86
Metcalf, Hon. Lee, a U.S. Senator from the State of Montana	2
Meuchel, Joseph, Lincoln, Mont	150
Milner, Doris, Hamilton, Mont	145
Mitchell, Harry, State senator, Cascade County, Great Falls, Mont	137
Mulcare, Mrs. Ellen Lambkin, Lincoln, Mont	152
Neal, D. D., Great Falls, Mont	86
Nobis, Robert S., secretary-manager, Intermountain Logging Conference, Inc., Coeur d'alene, Idaho	82
Patton, Robert H., Spokane, Wash	44
Pengelly, Dr. W. Leslie, University of Montana, as presented by Dr. James Lowe	115
Pierce, W. R., professor of forest management, University of Montana	72
Polischuk, Mrs. Donna	90
Robischon, James A., the Anaconda Co., Butte, Mont	67
Rodgers, Livingston, president, Great Falls Chapter, Montana Wilderness Association	95
Romans, Doyle, Montana East Side Forest Practices Committee	70
Roos, Donald A., Lincoln, Mont	53
Rossmiller, Robert M., Great Falls, Mont	85
Rusoff, Anne C., Missoula, Mont	130
Rusoff, Lester R., professor of law, University of Montana	123
Sheridan, Dr. Richard, Missoula, Mont	105
Silverman, Dr. Arnold, Missoula, Mont	108
Smith, Dr. Eldon H., Bozeman, Mont	117
Smith, Dr. Elmer W., Lincoln, Mont	94
Smith, Elizabeth, Bozeman, Mont	121
Stone, Albert W., Missoula, Mont	129
Sullivan, Gene, Bigfork, Mont	90
Taormina, Ben, Great Falls, Mont	136
Teller, Otto, Hamilton, Mont	114
Van der Sande, Prickly Pear Sportsmen's Association and Sportsmen's Association of Montana	68
Verstegen, George and Joan A., Vaughn, Mont	86
Vinyard, Lucille, Bigfork, Mont	133
Wallace, L. A. "Polly," Great Falls, Mont	29
Walker, G. E., American Metal Climax, Inc., Denver, Colo	101
Weintz, Robert, Great Falls, Mont	100
Weisel, Dr. George F., University of Montana	110
Witter, R. N., land supervisor, Timber & Western Lands Division, Northern Pacific Railway Co	31
Woolsey, O. D. and Helen, Cascade, Mont	85

COMMUNICATIONS

Anderson, G. A., M.D., Deer Lodge, Mont.: Letter to Hon. Lee Metcalf, U.S. Senate, dated September 17, 1968	154
Halterman, Joe M., president, Montana Wildlife Federation: Letter to Hon. Quentin Burdick, chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, dated June 4, 1968	129
Hummel, J. George, president, Western Montana Fish & Game Association: Letter to the Public Lands Subcommittee, dated September 25, 1968	127
Kendall, R. C., major general, Montana National Guard: Letter to Hon. Lee Metcalf, U.S. Senate, dated September 18, 1968	145
Miller, H. R., president, Montana Wildlife Federation: Letter to Livingston Rogers, Great Falls, Mont., dated June 3, 1968	129
Oos, Evelyn and Vincent: Letter to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated September 11, 1968	149
Oos, Thomas L., Great Falls, Mont.: Letter to the Senate Interior Committee, dated June 8, 1968	149

Quie, Hon. Albert H., a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota: Letter to Hon. Lee Metcalf, U.S. Senate, dated June 6, 1968 ..... Page 157
Rieffin, A. L., Missoula White Pine Sash Co.: Letter to the Subcommittee, dated September 19, 1968 63
Romney, Miles, publisher, the Western News: Letter to the Senate Interior Committee, dated June 6, 1968 156
Schmidt, Christopher J., Department of Geography, Indiana University: Letter to Hon. Mike Mansfield, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., dated September 19, 1968 18
State Senators of Montana: Letters in support of S. 1121 139–144
Stewart, E. K., secretary, district 1, Montana Wildlife Federation: Letter to the Montana Wilderness Society, dated June 6, 1968 129
Waggener, Dell E., Associated Logging Contractors, Inc., Lewiston, Idaho: Letter to E. L. Shults, Missoula, Mont., dated September 19, 1968 63

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

"Back Country Management," from the Great Falls Tribune, September 19, 1968 131
"Scenic Road Plan for Lincoln Area," from the Missoulian, Sept. 10, 1968 130

APPENDIX

Statements

Barmore, William J., Yellowstone Park, Mont 161
Berg, Russell L., Bozeman, Mont 162
Berthelson, E. M., secretary, Northern Continental Conservation Committee 160
Blixrud, Charles, packer, guide, and outfitter, Choteau, Mont 167
Cooney, Bob, Montana Fish and Game Department 159
Curtis, A. B., mayor, Orofino, Idaho 168
Delaney, Ella M., Missoula, Mont 173
Disque, Neil E., Ames, Iowa 168
Galusha, Hugh D., president, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Minn 164
Gleason, K. H., packer and outfitter, Choteau, Mont 173
Gratton, O. C., president, Chinook Rod and Gun Club 161
Hoeffner, Kenneth, K., Lazy Three Ranch, Lincoln, Mont 174
Hummel, D. M., Jr., president, Billings Chapter, Montana Wilderness Association 164
Krueger, Erick S., Billings, Mont 164
Luebeck, Al, Butte, Mont 159
McDowell, Howard G., district forester, Western Woods Products Association 174
Messelt, Tom, Sr., Great Falls, Mont 167
Meuchel, Joseph, Lincoln, Mont 171
Robischon, James A., The Anaconda Co 170
Shults, Edward L., vice president, Tree Farmers, Inc 175
Smith, Dwight and Jessie 176
Valiton, Don, Deer Lodge, Mont 165
Vollstedt, Francis A., president, Yamhill Lumber Co., White Sulphur Springs, Mont 172
Wurl, Louis W., Deer Lodge, Mont 167

Communications

Adams, Margaret E., Great Falls, Mont 277
Afdahl, John, Hammond, Wis 282
Ahlgren, Ivan E., Hamilton, Mont 213
Aibiston, Bonita L., Lincoln, Mont 363
Aleksich, Lou O., Jr., Billings, Mont 316
Allaire, Helene T., Great Falls, Mont 229
Allgaier, Vivian, Helena, Mont 266
Alm, Russell C., Helena, Mont 264

	Page
Alt, Doc and Pauline, August, Mont	360
Amberson, Max L., Montana State University	188
Amport, Robert J., Los Angeles, Calif	281
Anders, Gerald L	249
Anderson, C. B., Anderson Grain Co., Great Falls, Mont	193
Anderson, Donald D., and Crider, Jack G	248
Anderson, W. R., Ronan, Mont	238
Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. Edward, Bemidji, Minn	317
Antonick, Pat and Bob, Helena, Mont	302
Armstrong, Jane, Helena, Mont	362
Arvidson, Alfred C., Bigfork, Mont	372
Ashcraft, Basil C., Helena, Mont	253
Ashcroft, Marshall S., Las Vegas, Nev	371
Ashton, Douglas S., Helena, Mont	329
Austin, Albert C., Cloverdale, Mont	287
Austin, Clara R., and John C., Hamilton, Mont	220
Ayers, Joe C., and Hazel L., Hamilton, Mont	212
Aylesworth, Art, Ronan, Mont	371
Baden, John A., Bloomington, Ind	239
Backeberg, Lloyd D., Helena, Mont	248
Bakke, Maurice and Jill, Great Falls, Mont	250
Balestiere, A. L., Rochester, N.Y	294
Barmeyer, Dorothy D., Missoula, Mont	273
Bartlet, Charles L., Fort Shaw, Mont	257
Bascom, Joseph H., St. Louis, Mo	295
Bastine, P. W., U.S.F.S. Retired, Hamilton, Mont	224
Beatty, Ross J., Chicago, Ill	297
Beaudette, Don, Helena, Mont	265
Beck, Ronald J., M.D., Tacoma, Wash	319
Beebe, S. Kyle, Libby, Mont	287
Belenger, Leo J., city planner, Butte, Mont	190
Bell, J. Frederick, M.D., Buenos Aires, Argentina	205
Bell, Michael F., Spokane, Wash	205
Berry, Carl D., M.D., La Grange, Ill	342
Berry, Carl D., Jr., M.D., Hinsdale, Ill	283
Best, Thomas	357
Beyer, Norman S., Kalispell, Mont	255
Bick, Clarence P., Ronan, Mont	341
Bies, F. Roger, Jr., Chester, N.J	334
Billings, Samuel, Hamilton, Mont	184
Billquist, Axel H., Lincoln, Mont	368
Birkner, David, Seattle, Wash	304
Bishop, Bill, Polson, Mont	232
Bjork, Tile B	361
Black, Robert G., and Roberts, Goldie S., Grangeville Chamber of Commerce	332
Board of County Commissioners of Flathead County, Lake County, Lincoln County, Mineral County, and Sanders County	181
Bosshardt, D. E., M.D., Choteau, Mont	303
Boveng, O. M., Kalispell, Mont	250
Bowler, Bruce, Boise, Idaho	326
Brandborg, G. M., Hamilton, Mont	211
Brent, Mrs. Clement, Helena, Mont	256
Brewer, R. I., Helena, Mont	247
Brogger, James N., DVM, Missoula, Mont	341
Broome, Anne, Knoxville, Tenn	280
Brouelette, W. A., Missoula, Mont	276
Browman, Ludvig G., University of Montana	186
Brown, A. P., Missoula, Mont	276
Brown, Dorothy M., executive director, Camp Fire Girls	187
Brown, Iris, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	290
Brown, J. M., Jr., Sandpoint, Idaho	316
Brown, Raymond D., dean, St. Peters Pro-Cathedral, Helena, Mont	268
Brown, Robert C., Jr., Missoula, Mont	225
Brutto, Frank and Sallie, Hamilton, Mont	212
Buechler, Mrs. R. Lee, Morrisville, Pa	256

	Page
Bugni, Tom, Butte, Mont	366
Buker, Emery O., Hamilton, Mont	217
Burkhardt, William A., Minister, Helena, Mont	211
Burkholder, Bob L., Lewistown, Mont	275
Burr, Richard M., Bigfork, Mont	325
Butler, Ernest, Lewiston, Idaho	338
Butts, Roy R., and Betty J. Kalispell, Mont	253
Byers, C. R., Missoula, Mont	285
Canton, Janie, Stevensville, Mont	213
Carlson, R. C., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	327
Carlson, Roger C., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	289
Carroll, Robert E., Helena, Mont	262
Cash, Frank, Hamilton, Mont	213
Casler, Frank B., Bozeman, Mont	285
Cass, Mr. and Mrs. Pleon, Toston, Mont	307
Caswell, Dorothy, Denver, Colo	307
Chapman, Tom N., Helena, Mont	266
Chase, P. W., Bend, Oreg	304
Childs, Glen T., and Elsie F	242
Ciak, Josephine E., North Arlington, N.J	335
Clare, Ralph W., Montana Highway Commission	177
Clark, C. J., Sun River, Mont	303
Clarke, Mr. and Mrs. Ted R., Kalispell, Mont	236
Close, Victor A., Spokane, Wash	293
Clouse, Phyllis, Helena, Mont	262
Coe, John E., M.D., Hamilton, Mont	199
Coffey, John D., Missoula, Mont	244
Coffey, John D., and others, Missoula, Mont	258
Cole, Gordon H., Pioche, Nev	346
Collins, Vernon L., Colville, Wash	241
Cooper, Gerald L., and Prudence M., Helena, Mont	246
Cornforth, Leslie M., Colorado Springs, Colo	335
Cotner, Robert B., D.D.S., Columbia Falls, Mont	254
Courtney, James R., Butte, Mont	270
Cox, Martin E., and others, Great Falls, Mont	360
Crane, Ray, Corning, Calif	330
Crassley, R., Missoula, Mont	300
Crebo, Robert Q., Helena, Mont	255
Creecy, Audrey, Great Falls, Mont	262
Crosby, Jake, Lincoln, Mont	291
Culver, Franklin D., Bozeman, Mont	331
Cunningham, W. A., Billings, Mont	258
Dachs, George R., Kalispell, Mont	236
Darkenwald, Austin, Billings, Mont	234
Davis, T. H., Idaho Falls, Idaho	334
Delipdisch, Mrs. Arie, Great Falls, Mont	304
Dickinson, H. A., Great Falls, Mont	219
Didriksen, Robert P., Lincoln, Mont	244
Dinehart, Pearl, Hamilton, Mont	362
Doheny, Robert V., Laurel, Mont	271
Douglass, Patricia H., Los Alamos, N. Mex	342
Downing, Marilyn, Stevensville, Mont	333
Draper, Robert W., Great Falls, Mont	368
Drennon, Wayne W., Helena, Mont	342
Drynan, John J., M.D., Helena, Mont	263
DuBois, C. M., Kingston, Tenn	298
du Pont, Lit and Betty, Avon, Mont	230
Edd, Herbert A., Missoula, Mont	288
Edison, T. W., Missoula, Mont	234
Editorials	351–357
Edwards, C. P., E. Bollay Associates, Inc., Boulder, Colo	296
Egan, Nancy, Martinsville, N.J	325
Ehnes, Vic L., Great Falls, Mont	202
Eichner, Paul	307
Eklund, Dallas F., Kalispell, Mont	367
Elliott, Harvey C., Hamilton, Mont	358

	Page
Elser, Arnold and Thelma, Missoula, Mont	188
Engquist, Dale, Steamboat Springs, Mont	304
Erickson, Leif, Helena, Mont	264
Eudaily, Dr. Gary E., Missoula, Mont	233
Evans, Jack A., Hamilton, Mont	214
Evans, Keith J., Hamilton, Mont	206
Evans, L. Lloyd, Libby, Mont	334
Evans, Mark, Hamilton, Mont	208
Evans, Russell J., Havre, Mont	289
Evans, Willard and Wauneta, Lincoln, Mont	249
Fears, Lee, Billings Rod & Gun Club	183
Fisher, H. H., Lincoln, Mont	371
Fisher, Katherine, Bozeman, Mont	275
Fitzgerald, Richard D., Helena, Mont	333
Flint, Philip S., Palo Alto, Calif	347
Flynn, Calude J	307
Folsom, Roy R., Missoula, Mont	229
Ford, Farrell, J., Great Falls, Mont	311
Ford, Thomas A., Hamilton, Mont	209
Fouke, L. R., St. Louis, Mo	297
Frank, Mark, Brookfield, Wis	361
French, Lindol R., M.D., San Francisco, Calif	324
Friedman, Lillian, Bronx, N.Y	339
Gable, Mae W., and George H., Bozeman, Mont	233
Gabriel, Fred P., Helena, Mont	312
Galusha, Jean S., Wayzata, Minn	240
Gamwell, R. L., Helena, Mont	252
Gantier, Marion L., Lincoln, Mont	204
Garber, B. G., Waukesha, Wis	359
Garland, William, Aurora, Ill	370
Geary, Charles, and others, Ovando, Mont	366
Gebhart, Neill A., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	290
Geder, Joseph, Willow Grove, Pa	361
Gehring, Clifford, Jr	204
Gerloff, Robert K., Hamilton, Mont	198
Gerstung, Eric Robert, Carmichael, Calif	312
Gilboe, H. I., Great Falls, Mont	261
Gilboe, Ron, Great Falls, Mont	261
Gloege, George H., Billings, Mont	197
Goebel, Dr. Jack, Butte, Mont	341
Gogas, Marilyn M., Missoula, Mont	337
Goldberg, Caryll, North Valley Stream, N.Y	346
Goldberg, Mrs. Harold R., North Valley Stream, N.Y	345
Goldman, Fred and Esther, Cincinnati, Ohio	283
Gondex, Leonard, Missoula, Mont	192
Grantier, C. E., Jr., Lincoln, Mont	200
Graves, C. Edward, Carmel, Calif	334
Grosfield, Norman, Lincoln, Mont	237
Guelff, David R., and others, Missoula, Mont	243
Guile, Clark C., Great Falls, Mont	365
Guile, Mrs. Clark C., Great Falls, Mont	365
Guill, Lonnie, Fort Shaw, Mont	253
Gunn, Phil, Helena, Mont	264
Hackney, Glen, and Gebford, Ronald, Bitterroot Packers Association	210
Hagerty, L. E., Justice of the Peace, Lincoln, Mont	187
Haggerty, H. Earl, and others, Great Falls, Mont	260
Haines, Clifford E., county commissioner, Flathead County	179
Hames, Antone W., Helena, Mont	248
Hansen, A. P., Lewiston, Idaho	290
Hanson, Dean A., vice chairman, Montana Soil Conservation Committee	177
Harbough, Alice R., Hamilton, Mont	211
Hardebeck, Roget A., Great Falls, Mont	372
Harper, William, M.D., Helena, Mont	263
Harrington, G. L., manager, Idaho Pole Co., Bozeman, Mont	314
Hartford, Tom, president, Lewistown Rod & Gun Club	184
Hartse, Russell L., Missoula, Mont	272

	Page
Harvey, Mr. and Mrs. Allan, Scarsdale, N.Y.	331
Hass, Margaret, Outlook, Mont	232
Hastings, Russell, Philadelphia, Pa	274
Haverlandt, Otto, Great Falls, Mont	238
Hayes, Alma B., Hamilton, Mont	215
Hayes, Lowell S., Hamilton, Mont	214
Hayes, Sherman L., Hamilton, Mont	212
Hazeltine, Ben M., Polson Mont	230, 231
Heinecke, W. C. E., Kalispell, Mont	235
Heinrich Mrs. Janice, Billings, Mont	367
Heller, Harland, Stevensville, Mont	259
Hendon, Robert C., New York, N.Y	282
Hestekin, Bryan, Hamilton, Mont	216
Heyneman, John M., Fishtail, Mont	270
Hickey, Richard K., Seeley Lake, Mont	189
Hilde, Gracia, Great Falls, Mont	327
Hileman, Margaret, Bozeman, Mont	234
Hilliard, E. H., Jr., Englewood, Colo	318
Himmer, Gerald, Lincoln, Mont	359
Hines, Mrs. Walter, Dolores, Colo	364
Hoffman, Betty Lou, Helena, Mont	256
Hollar, Carol Ann, Spokane, Wash	284
Hollar, John E., Jr., Spokane, Wash	365
Hollar, Sandra Jean, Spokane, Wash	283
Hollenbeak, Loy O., Pollock, Idaho	202
Holling, Charles S., secretary, Townsend (Mont.) Rotary Club	228
Hollingsworth, V. C., president, Citizens State Bank, Hamilton, Mont	196
Holton, George D., Helena, Mont	335
Hoover, Elaine, Helena, Mont	257
Hopkins, Mark, Jr., Helena, Mont	247
Hornung, Robert, Hamilton, Mont	215
Horsky, Charles A., Silver Spring, Md	320
Houston, Fred G., Helena, Mont	325
Hubbard, S. Thatcher, Sr., Spokane, Wash	322
Hull, Roland H., and Betty Hamilton, Mont,	218
Hurrie, Mrs. Shirley A., Missoula, Mont	346
Huss, Bernard B., Jr., M.D. Minot, N. Dak	344
Hyneman, Charles S., Bloomington, Ind	239
Ireland, C. William, Rosemont, Minn	279
Jackson, Norman, W., Carter, Mont	229
Jacobs, Veda, Great Falls, Mont	261
Jank, Paula, T., Helena, Mont	367
Janson, Reuel G., president, Montana Chapter, Wildlife Society	321
Jasch, Laura, Chicago, Ill	319
Jelinek, Gilbert, Hamilton, Mont	208
Jellison, Dr. William L., Hamilton, Mont	360
Johnson, Avery A., Jr., Lincoln, Mont	241
Johnson, Avery G., Lincoln, Mont	241
Johnson, Carlene and Allan, Chicago, Ill	313
Johnson, Garry D., Kinston, N.C	281
Johnson, George M., M.D., Bismarck, N. Dak	310
Johnson, Harold A., and Vinie C., Great Falls, Mont	260
Johnston, Rosalynde, and Munford, George W	334
Johnstone, Robert E., M.D., Cincinnati, Ohio	306
Jolley, R. L., Jr., University of Oregon Medical School	335
Jones, Fred C., Jr., president, Optimist Club of Great Falls, Mont	222
Judge, Paul A., Ronan, Mont	343
Kahn, Melinda, Chicago, Ill	339
Kahn, Robert J., Philadelphia, Pa	315
Karlin, Rolland, Missoula, Mont	271
Kearns, Bill, president, Townsend (Mont.) Rotary Club	227
Keeton, Paul C., Lewiston, Idaho	322
Kelly, John T., Chicago, Ill	337
King, Bruce, Hamilton, Mont	205
Klimko, Ronald J., Ph. D., University of Idaho, Moscow	310
Knight, A. C., M.D., Deer Lodge, Mont	268

	Page
Knisley, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth, Kalispell, Mont	303
Koch, Mrs. Edwin G., Butte, Mont	338
Koch, Thomas P., Hamilton, Mont	219
Koerper, Rocky, Kalispell, Mont	250
Koser, S. E., Whitefish, Mont	254
Kosman, Curtis W	249
Kovar, Leonard J., Bozeman, Mont	230
Kowalsky, James E., Barbourville, Ky	340
Kramis, N. J., Hamilton, Mont	226
Kretzer, Mary L., Dillon, Mont	242
Krueger, Carl G., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	288
Kuglin, John, Great Falls, Mont	190
Kuzdas, Richard E., Milwaukee, Wis	369
Kyle, Monte, Helena, Mont	267
Lake, Leon L., Deer Lodge, Mont	251
Lang, Wayne H., Wellsville, N.Y	295
Lantis, George D., Lincoln, Mont	238
Larison, L. H., Helena, Mont	293
Lay, Presley E., and Bertha, Hamilton, Mont	219
Leland, Warren K., Helena, Mont	344
Lewis, George D., Missoula, Mont	276
Lidderdale, E. E., Three Forks, Mont	275
Liebson, John, Boulder, Colo	339
Lind, Carl V., Billings, Mont	314
Lindquist, George W., Mayor, city of Dixon, Ill	317
Lindquist, H. D., Seattle, Wash	331
Lindseth, Agnes, Chateau, Mont	274
Lister, C. R. B., Seattle, Wash	299
Logan, Frances D., Charlo, Mont	268
Logan, S. R., Charlo, Mont	269
Lupton, Verne W., Kalispell, Mont	236
Lydiard, Mrs. Robert E., Great Falls, Mont	309
Lydiard, Robert E., Great Falls, Mont	308
Lyon, David L., Mount Vernon, Iowa	323
MacBryde, Bruce, St. Louis, Mo	272
MacNab, Robin B., Bozeman, Mont	253
Mailliard, James, San Francisco, Calif	281
Martin, Flora, Helena, Mont	256
Martinelli, Bob	246
Marty, Marion, Lincoln, Mont	238
Mason, Homer A., Missoula, Mont	276
Mayger, B. S., Basel, Switzerland	306
Mayger, Mrs. William, Lincoln, Mont	299
Mayger, William M., Chicago, Ill	338
McCabe, James R., Helena, Mont	362
McCanlay, Carley, Great Falls, Mont	365
McCaulay, Jere C., and Carol M., Great Falls, Mont	278
McClure, Robert K., and Nana, Lincoln, Mont	368
McClymonds, J. D., and H. P., Fish Camp, Calif	325
McDonald, C. H., Stevensville, Mont	191
McDonough, R. M., Butte, Mont	275
McDowell, Fay L., Helena, Mont	249
McDowell, Mrs. Darline L., Helena, Mont	246
McGuire, George, Lincoln, Mont	363
McLelland, M. S., Kalispell, Mont	232
McMahon, John W., M.D., Helena, Mont	263
McNulty, Wilbur P., Jr., Beaverton, Oreg	342
McNutt, Guy E., Forest Grove, Oreg	336
McPherson, Benjamin, Friday Harbor, Wash	332
McPherson, Mary M., Spokane, Wash	309
McRae, Mrs. William J., Fairfield, Mont	243
McQuillan, John R., M.D., Lincoln, Mont	240
Mehmke, Carl, Great Falls, Mont	261
Meloy, Harriett C., Helena, Mont	265
Meochel, Joseph, Lincoln, Mont	300
Merrill, Marjorie, Helena, Mont	362

	Page
Micu, John, secretary-treasurer, Powell County Sportsman's Association	182
Mikesell, Richard and Rosemary, Hamilton, Mont	232
Miller, Bob, Bozeman, Mont	301, 357
Miller, Dennis R., Twin Bridges, Mont	242
Miller, Grace N., and Hymas, Ronald D., Bozeman, Mont	256
Miller, Mr. and Mrs. J. M., Fullerton, Calif	282
Miller, Robert, Chicago, Ill	313
Milligan, Jerry A., Hamilton, Mont	268
Mills, Ron, Wolf Creek, Mont	366
Missoula Chamber of Commerce	197
Mitchell, Jim, Kalispell, Mont	254
Mitchell, Ned B., Fort Collins, Colo	297
Monroe, Stephen L., D.D.S., Kalispell, Mont	255
Montagne, John, Bozeman, Mont	326
Moore, Anne and Harvey E., Seattle, Wash	333
Morris, Wells, Jr., president, Montana Chapter, and Shepard, Warren, president, Yellowstone Chapter, Trout Unlimited	195
Morrison, W. F., M.D., Missoula, Mont	276
Mortenson, T. E., Lincoln, Mont	249
Mostek, Raymond, president, Illinois Audubon Society	330
Munoz, John J., Ph. D., Hamilton, Mont	217
Murie, Margaret E. Moose, Wyo	279
Murphy, O. J., Paradise, Mont	285
Neidhardt, Henry G., Hamilton, Mont	221
Neitzling, Fred J., Kalispell, Mont	223, 224
Nelson, Bob, Missoula, Mont	301
Nelson, Mary J., Missoula, Mont	301
Nelson, Van Kirke, M.D., Kalispell, Mont	250
Neth, Floyd T., Pensacola, Fla	294
Neuberger, Chester R., Maplewood, N.J	293
Neufelder, Dorothy A., and Carl V., Hamilton, Mont	219
Neumann, Allan D., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	289
Newburg, Ira, Halispell, Mont	372
Nickerson, D. Roscoe, secretary, Skyline Sportsmen's Association	183
Nobles, E. Terrill, Corvallis, Mont	234
Noren, Mr. and Mrs. William, Helena, Mont	246
Norman, Wm., J., M.D., Missoula, Mont	201
Nowlin, Eva C	242
Oas, Mrs. Diane, Spokane, Wash	373
Oas, Robert V., Spokane, Wash	373
O'Connell, J. E., Helena, Mont	311
Oertli, Ivy, Hamilton, Mont	207
Oewarf, Leroy, Helena, Mont	371
Ogilvie, Shirley, Lincoln, Mont	242
Ohrmann, Bill, Drummond, Mont	295
Ohrmann, Jane, Drummond, Mont	321
Ohrmann, John, Drummond, Mont	277
Ohrmann, Mrs. Wm. R., Drummond, Mont	307
Ohrmann, Susan, Drummond, Mont	278
Olin, Ada, Helena, Mont	264
Olive, Max L., Hamilton, Mont	271
Ormsbee, Richard A., Hamilton, Mont	203
Ostrum, Paul, Elizabeth, Ill	281
Ough, C. D., vice president and general manager, Burkland Studs, Inc	181
Ouhoolen, B., Milwaukee, Wis	359
Owen, Cora Rust, Hamilton, Mont	216
Ozmnu, D. B., Chicago, Ill	283
Pallister, Philip D., M.D., Boulder, Mont	369
Palmquist, E. E., Helena, Mont	247
Parker, Charles D., Missoula, Mont	259
Parry, Norman G., M.D., Chicago, Ill	282
Partzahn, Allan P., Great Falls, Mont	369
Patten, Marc T., Gallatin Gateway, Mont	289
Patterson, James R., M.D., Spokane, Wash	309
Payne, Robert, Lincoln, Mont	245

	Page
Peek, Mrs. Tate W., Helena, Mont	255
Peterson, Ernst, Hamilton, Mont	210
Peterson, J. W., president, Olympia (Wash.) Audubon Society	327
Petitions	348–351
Petrie, Mrs. Alec G., San Jose, Calif	364
Petsch, Miss H. D., Portland, Oreg	299
Pitcock, Mrs. Bell, Helena, Mont	265
Plunkett, Robert T., Missoula, Mont	317
Polischuk, Donna, Helena, Mont	311
Polson Outdoors, Inc., resolution	272
Pontrelli, Al D., Missoula, Mont	198
Powell, Donald R., First National Bank, White Sulphur Springs	201
Powell County Board of Commissioners	182
Pyeatt, M. B., and Margaret, Dillon, Mont	242
Quincy, D. L., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	327
Quincy, Dorothy L., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	290
Quonde, Harold, Kalispell, Mont	255
Rabe, Fred W., Moscow, Idaho	313
Rademacher, Verle L., Meagher County Rod and Gun Club	329
Rasmusson, Rita, Helena, Mont	252
Rauch, George, Lewiston, Idaho	291
Raymond, Newman, and others, Deer Lodge, Mont	182
Reed, Waldo M., Edmonds, Wash	324
Renne, Polly, Washington, D.C	280
Reuterdahl, Barry	369
Richard, LaVern B., Hamilton, Mont	211
Richards, Belle C., M.D., Helena, Mont	368
Richel, George T., Brookfield, Wis	358
Ringold, Garry, Lewiston, Idaho	291
Robbins, Mr. and Mrs. Delas E., Missoula, Mont	298
Roberts, Arthur M., Western Forestry and Conservation Association	228
Robinson, E. L., Missoula, Mont	299
Rogers, Thomas H., Spokane, Wash	327
Rossmiller, Robert M., Missoula, Mont	273
Roth, Mr. and Mrs. James A., Hamilton, Mont	220
Rowe, R. D., president, The Falls Supply Co., Great Falls, Mont	191
Runke, R. C., Missoula, Mont	257
Rusoff, Lester R., University of Montana	345
St. Jermain, John, member, Board of County Commissioners, Cascade County, Mont	191
Saladen, Evelyn, Hamilton, Mont	214
Salansky, James M., Kalispell, Mont	235
Samsel, William K., Missoula, Mont	284
Samson, Bob, Helena, Mont	247
Samson, R. L., Helena, Mont	265
Samson, Sam, Boulder, Mont	305
Saunders, R. W., Minot, N. Dak	343
Sayre, Babe and Addie, Elk Creek Ranch, Augusta, Mont	189
Schafer, Art, Walla Walla, Wash	328
Schlanch, Max, Missoula, Mont	277
Schmautz, Harry, Kalispell, Mont	235
Schultz, Gerald D., Hamilton, Mont	210
Score, S. J., Helena, Mont	264
Scott, Charles E., and Bonita F., Kalispell, Mont	250
Scott, Palmer M., Helena, Mont	252
Scribner, Charles H., St. Maries, Idaho	203
Sebens, L. E. Verne, C.L.U., Great Falls, Mont	187
Secord, Reed, Reno, Nev	318
Shaner, David, Helena, Mont	372
Shankle, Harold, Chinook, Mont	230
Shaw, Oren V., Colorado Springs, Colo	337
Shepherd, Leo W., Kalispell, Mont	235
Shervey, Paul D., Omaha, Nebr	365
Shumate, Mrs. Roy, Helena, Mont	300
Simon, Marianne, Elkins Park, Pa	304

	Page
Simpson, Bob, Morehead City, N.C	284
Slethang, Olonder G., Bigfork, Mont	301
Slifka, Franklin, Toston, Mont	370
Smith, Bettye M., Hamilton, Mont	208
Smith, Lyle J. "Tuffy," Thompson Falls, Mont	240
Smith, Phil, Melrose, Mont	258
Smith, R. F., Hamilton, Mont	209
Smith, Samuel B., Hamilton, Mont	207
Smith, Walter M., Hamilton, Mont	207
Soderlund, A. G., San Diego, Calif	298
Sorenson, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew, Hamilton, Mont	220
Snyder, George, Helena, Mont	249
Sprinkle, Roger, Chinook, Mont	222
Stahl, W. Edwin, D.V.M., Missoula, Mont	244
Staff, Mrs. William, Hamilton, Mont	220
Stanton, Mrs. Amy, Hamilton, Mont	360
Stanton, Paul, Hamilton, Mont	218
Stapf, Wayne C., Izaak Walton League, Plainfield, Ind	324
Stark, John and Marie Laird, Seeley Lake, Mont	254
Stebbins, Rod, Milltown, Mont	230
Stefalo, Ed, Deer Lodge, Mont	223
Steffech, Joyce and Jim, Helena, Mont	366
Stephens, Jim, Kalispell, Mont	235
Stevens, Leyland E., M.D., San Francisco, Calif	324
Stevens, Mary Edna, Helena, Mont	267
Stewart, Robert L., Missoula, Mont	315
Stjern, Charles, Rhinelander, Wis	361
Stockton, Robert W., and Dorothy M., Helena, Mont	274
Stokes, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer W., Lincoln, Mont	372
Stround, Daryl, Cameron, Mont	364
Strnisha, Joe, Hamilton, Mont	199
Strizich, John W., M.D., Helena, Mont	263
Stump, Michael M., M.D., Minot, N. Dak	344
Sturts, Shirley and Keith, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	323
Sullivan, Gene, Bigfork, Mont	195
Sutcliffe, Richard P., Northbrook, Ill	293
Swanson, Bud and Opal	370
Swanson, Gene, Augusta, Mont	367
Sweeney, Fay, Helena, Mont	267
Sykes, Robert C., Judge of the District Court, Kalispell, Mont	194
Tanton, John H., M.D., Petoskey, Mich	318
Tarmina, David F., M.D., Hamilton, Mont	215
Taylor, Ted, Harlowton, Mont	259
Teall, Gardner F., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	289
Thieme, Fred E., Polson, Mont	302
Thisted, Carl E., Great Falls, Mont	296
Thom, Howard L., Laurel, Mont	321
Thompson, Dr. J. Nevin, Wolf Point, Mont	233
Thompson, Jessie M., Missoula, Mont	287
Thompson, John A., Lincoln, Mont	328
Thompson, Richard A., Lynnwood, Wash	359
Tingle, Eugene, Marion, and David, Stevensville, Mont	302
Tinsley, Arthur E., Lincoln, Mont	237
Towle, Norine, Helena, Mont	266
Trainer, Charles E., Corvallis, Oreg	337
Trapp, Betty E., Billings, Mont	278
Travis, Elsie A., Helena, Mont	262
Tremper, C. J., Polson, Mont	302
Trevor, Mike, Helena, Mont	247
Trenson, Roy O., Lincoln, Mont	237
Tunnicliff, Nancy W., Helena, Mont	267
Turner, Robert S., Helena, Mont	257
Tutjen, Fred, Lincoln, Mont	368
Urmasher, Walter A., Milwaukee, Wis	361
Urquhart, James C., Portland, Oreg	286

	Page
Van Deusen, Cora E	358
Van Gelder, E. R., Spokane, Wash	308
Vander Jagt, Arlee, Great Falls, Mont	363
Vander, Jagt, Bert, Fairfield, Mont	363
Vaughan, James H., Jr., Bloomington, Ind	243
Vetrick, Joseph J., Jr., Helena, Mont	269
Vinal, Dean L., and Virginia Y., Hamilton, Mont	216
Vinyard, Wm. C., Bigfork, Mont	226
Vorhus, Clarence	371
Waldum, Rev. H. Peder, Kalispell, Mont	236
Walicki, Joseph L., Glenside, Pa	299
Walker, Vernon M., Fresno, Calif	281
Waltner, Richard H., Billings, Mont	278
Ward, Bernt F., secretary, Sheridan County Sportsman Club	197
Wayne, Elsie M., Hamilton, Mont	332
Webb, Clyde S., Spokane, Wash	202
Weber, Miss Frances, Butte, Mont	297
Weber, Richard A., D.D.S., Glasgow, Mont	222
Weed, Ernest M., Bigfork, Mont	366
Weeks, Jean, Helena, Mont	266
Weeks, Martin, Vermillion, S. Dak	319
Wells, Darrell G., Brookings, S. Dak	300
West, Grace I., Hamilton, Mont	217
West, John J., Hamilton, Mont	221
Weydemeyer, Winton, Fortine, Mont	270
Wheat, James K., president, Helena Jaycees	329
White, Allen R., timber manager, Van-Evan Co., Missoula, Mont	178
White, Clara and Eldred, Hamilton, Mont	358
White, Joe W., Choteau, Mont	260
Wildey, Eldon, Hamilton, Mont	205
Willers, William B., Oshkosh, Wis	331
Willers, William, Ph. D., and others	313
Williams, Gerald O., Grand Forks AFB, N. Dak	336
Wilson, C. Vance, Helena, Mont	266
Wilson, Glenn R., Helena, Mont	263
Wilson, J. C., Madison, Wis	257
Wirt, H. F., and Joyce V., Superior, Mont	288
Wise, Lloyd, secretary-treasurer, Missoula County Trades and Labor Council	196
Wiseman, Col. Lee V., USAF, retired, Hamilton, Mont	206
Wiseman, Shirley B., Hamilton, Mont	204
Wolverton, Roy, Great Falls, Mont	364
Wood, Virginia C., Philadelphia, Pa	305
Woodhouse, Harold and Rosina, Power, Mont	292
Wright, A. T., Alexandria, Va	340
Wright, Gordon B., Madison, Wis	308
Wyatt, Nancy, Great Falls, Mont	245
Youderian, Gene and Martha, Lincoln, Mont	369
Young, Berta, Helena, Mont	221
Young Democrat Clubs of Montana, resolution of	216
Yunker, Conrad E., Jr., Hamilton, Mont	318
Zahniser, Edward, Greenbelt, Md	223
Zelinski, Mrs. Robert, Kasson, Mont	271
Zikmund, Mrs. Norma, Harlowton, Mont	362
Zinke, Roy	

LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY WILDERNESS AREA, MONT.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1968

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Great Falls, Mont.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9 a.m., in the Cascade County Court House at Great Falls, Mont., Senator Quentin N. Burdick (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senator Burdick, of North Dakota, and Senator Metcalf, of Montana.

Also present: Congressman Battin, of Montana.

Staff member present: Porter Ward, professional staff member.

Senator BURDICK. This is the time noted and set by the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee for a hearing in Great Falls, Mont., on S. 1121, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln back country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes. Approximately 240,500 acres of national forest land is involved. I direct that the text of the bill appear at this point in the record.

(The bill referred to follows:)

[S. 1121, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secreetary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to classify as wilderness those national forest lands containing approximately 240,500 acres in the Helena National Forest in Montana, known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests specifically described as bounded by a line on the southeast boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area at Deadman Hill running southeasterly to Bench Mark, then along the ridge of Wood Creek Hogback to the top of Crown Mountain and across Welcome Pass to the midpoint of Steamboat Mountain; thence running in a more southerly direction down the ridge between Milk and Pear Creeks, across the Dearborn River and up the Continental Divide to a point above Bighorn Lake; thence along the Divide and down the ridge northwest of Falls Creek, across Landers Fork to the top of Lone Mountain; thence in a southwesterly direction to Heart Lake Trail, westward to the top of Red Mountain; thence southwesterly to Arrastra Peak; thence along Daly, Iron, and Echo Mountain Peaks, and across Windy Pass to Mineral Hill; thence across the North Fork of the Blackfoot River at the Big Slide to BM 8320, northwesterly across Canyon Creek (excluding the upper Conger Creek timber stand) to the top of Canyon Peak; thence more westerly to the top of Omar Mountain, and northward along the ridge to the southern boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area on a ridge west of Danaher Pass, and thence along the southern boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area to the point of beginning. The Secretary of

Agriculture shall promptly after such classification transmit to the Congress a map and legal description of the wilderness area and such description shall have the same force and effect as if set forth in this Act. Upon its classification, such wilderness area shall be subject to the same provisions and rules as those designated as wilderness areas by the Wildernes Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890).

Senator BURDICK. We do not plan on hearing any of the Government witnesses at this hearing, but only the people of Montana and others interested in this magnificent mountain area. The Government witnesses will be heard later, when hearings are conducted in Washington.

To save time, I believe we should move directly to the witnesses, but first I believe we should have a word from your distinguished Senator, my colleague, Lee Metcalf.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEE METCALF, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, first I am very pleased, and I know we are all honored that you are out here to conduct this hearing for us. As Senator from our neighboring State we feel that you partly belong to this area, and we are very grateful that you take the time out to come here. I know you have to fly back to participate in a very important hearing tomorrow in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Mansfield and I propose to reintroduce this bill as early as possible next year. Under the rules of the Senate, for the information of the people who are attending the hearing, we don't introduce legislation in the Senate the first day. We wait until after the state of the Union message of the President. So about the 20th of next January, Senator Mansfield and I will introduce this legislation. But the benefit of this hearing is that we will have printed statements from these people who are testifying today as a preliminary so that we can go into early action and activity on the legislation next year. As you said, next year we will hear both witnesses from the Forest Service and from the bureaus and the Government agencies involved, and principal witnesses representing large groups of people such as the Wilderness Society, Isaac Walton League, and so forth, in Washington on the pros and cons of the new legislation. The second purpose of this hearing today is to note modifications of the bill that are necessary, or the suggestions that come forth, to be incorporated into the new bill that is introduced. Of course, no one knows what will happen to the two Congressmen involved, but Congressman Battin has introduced this bill. I talked a few minutes ago to Congressman Olsen, Mr. Chairman, and he is back in Washington working on the copper tariff, so he can't be here today. But he asked me to say, for the record, that he is wholeheartedly in accord with this proposed legislation.

I don't want to take any more time of these witnesses. These are all very distinguished, very important constituents, and each of them has a message for both of us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BURDICK. We have a list of over 82 people scheduled to be heard today. Naturally, we can't hear everybody at length before 5 o'clock this afternoon. All statements, in all events, will be made a part of the record in toto. In Washington we are accustomed to have witnesses summarize statements. I can say that it is appreciated by all

committees. But no one will be denied the right to give their statement as long as we will be here, and as long as we can end by 5 o'clock. So I urge you to be as brief as you can. Summarize as much as you can, and all those who wish to file statements later on this morning may do so. Your statement will appear in the record as fully as given here today.

Senator METCALF. May I also comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

I hope that you will follow the testimony as it is developed, especially in the opening statements of some of the early witnesses, and if there is matter that is repetitious in your statement, file that part of the statement. It will be printed and appear in the record. Really, the two of us are only hearing examiners for 98 other Senators who will examine and read this record if we can get the bill reported from committee. So you will have just as much exposure for your statement if it appears in the record as if you have given it in person.

Senator BURDICK. I feel at home back in the courthouse again. I want to say to any of you who are standing back there—I see two ladies—there are still some seats in the jury box.

The first witness will be James Patten for Governor Babcock.

STATEMENT OF GOV. TIM BABCOCK, PRESENTED BY JAMES B. PATTEN

Mr. PATTEN. My name is James B. Patten. I am executive assistant to Gov. Tim Babcock, who, unfortunately, cannot be here today. I want to make this clear, this is his statement. I am not speaking, this is his statement. On his behalf, I would like to make the following statement:

This hearing involves the determination of future use of a piece of Federal land. The Governor has consistently supported multiple use of public lands except in those circumstances where the land itself clearly indicates a single use. In the instance of the Lincoln back country, such single use is indicated.

If the proposal under consideration is controversial, it is because of the increasing demands upon public lands. Timber and the related wood industry is the fastest growing segment of Montana's economy. It is of significant importance to all Montanans, particularly those residing west of the Continental Divide. That industry is trying to meet an increasing demand for wood products from an ever-shrinking base of forest lands. Obviously, to ignore its views out of hand would well have lasting detrimental effects on this State.

Another important Montana industry is tourism. Despite tremendous investments by both public and private agencies, Montana is struggling to keep up with the demand for tourist accommodations, particularly for those tourists who want to get off the beaten track—those who make use of campsites and backwood areas. In the effort to meet that demand, the Forest Service is a partner of State government, and it has been a good one.

Unlike most other States, Montana has a unique opportunity to preserve wild and unused areas. Wilderness protection is now, and will certainly be in the future, of tremendous public benefit when applied to land which will yield its greatest value in such fashion. The base for wilderness is also shrinking and once gone will be lost forever. Fortunately, Montana possesses large areas that can and

should be used for commercial purposes and for mass recreation, many of which remain undeveloped.

The area under consideration will be described in detail by experts whose observations on the fragile characteristics of the Lincoln back country will be more meaningful than mine. It has never been much used by man; there are no roads through its interior, although there is a multitude of road access to its fringes; it has never been logged; there are no grazing permits on it; and though well explored in the past, there is no present commercial mineral production within its boundaries. In the hundred-odd years of man's development of the region, the Lincoln back country has remained a wilderness, used only by those who seek it as a wilderness.

Protection of the area is not a novel or new idea. It borders the Bob Marshall Wilderness, one of the largest in the Nation. The Montana Fish and Game Commission proposed that it be maintained in trail access status in 1953. In the intervening 15 years it has been much used by hikers and packtrain visitors. In the difficult task of assigning priorities, it is obvious that the area can be beneficially used for purposes other than wilderness. It seems clear, however, that to now remove the wilderness protection it has received in the past would sacrifice its present value without equal or greater gain. The Lincoln back country is worth more as wilderness, and should remain such.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Mr. Patten.

Mr. PATTEN. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. I thank you for your statement. I think your statement states the matter succinctly.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Frank Dunkle, director of the Montana Fish and Game Department.

STATEMENT OF FRANK DUNKLE, DIRECTOR, MONTANA FISH AND GAME DEPARTMENT

Mr. DUNKLE. My name is Frank Dunkle; I am director of the Montana Fish and Game Department. On behalf of the Montana Fish and Game Commission, I would like to present the following statement:

The Montana Fish and Game Commission has taken official action on three occasions, expressing its interest in the retention of the wild trail-access characteristics of the area under discussion today.

On December 16, 1953, the commission first went on record, passing a motion recommending that the Lincoln back country, the smaller segment of the present proposal, remain in trail-access status.

On January 7, 1965, the commission passed a similar motion to include the entire 250,500-acre Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

And most recently, on May 20, 1968, the Montana Fish and Game Commission clarified and supplemented its previous motions with the following statement:

It has been determined that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area (240,500 acres), including the original Lincoln Back Country, plus portions of the headwaters of the North Fork of the Blackfoot on the west side of the Continental Divide and portions of the upper South Fork of the Sun River, Straight Creek, and the headwaters of the North Fork of the Dearborn River on the east side, including Scapegoat Mountain, presents recreation and wildlife values of unusual quality.

It has further been determined that the present trail-access status of this area is essential to the preservation of these qualities, including protection of an environment essential to the survival of a grizzly bear population, a cutthroat trout population, and a back country type of big game hunting.

And further, its somewhat fragile, but scenic, terrain is not suited to heavy, mass-type recreation characteristic of road-access sections, but is most ideal for hiking and horseback travel and associated quality recreation.

The Montana Fish and Game Commission therefore wishes to reaffirm its interest in the area and to approve its classification to wilderness, as expressed in companion bills S. 1121 and H.R. 7148.

And further, the Montana Fish and Game Commisison wishes to express these views at the congressional hearing to be conducted in Great Falls, Montana on September 23, 1968.

The changes being recommended in management of the area by the Forest Service can certainly alter the environment of a number of fish and wildlife species and the human lives now associated with them. Consequently, the Montana Fish and Game Commission does strongly support wilderness classification for this area to protect it. Once an area is designated a wilderness it is still susceptible to future development should society need and demand it in the years to come. On the other hand, once you unleash the bulldozers, chain saws, and blasters, you will never in a million years be able to call them back.

Montana is entering a period of resource and industrial development that is precipitating confrontation after confrontation between its citizens whose interests vary. The process is wasteful, expensive, unnecessary, and becoming more bitter at each encounter. It is a process that sees resource developers mouthing the words "multipurpose" and "multiple use," then expressing amazement when the various interests protest their proposals. They stand in shock as their beautiful, expensive plans produce controversy instead of progress and generate heat instead of light.

Perhaps this is an oversimplification of the problem, but we have roads and mass recreation opportunities in quantity. Untouched and undisturbed areas for present and future generations are in short supply.

Mr. Chairman, the Montana Fish and Game Commission stands ready to furnish you and your committee any additional information you may desire now or in the future concerning the wildlife, fishery, or recreational resources of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Mr. Dunkle. Any questions?

Senator METCALF. No questions.

Senator BURDICK. We could expedite matters here today if you would get a copy of the witness list and hold yourself in readiness because I will take them very much in the order in which they appear.

Dr. Daniel H. Henning is next.

STATEMENT OF DR. DANIEL H. HENNING, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AT EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE, BILLINGS, MONT.

Dr. HENNING. My name is Dr. Daniel H. Henning, and I am an assistant professor of political science at Eastern Montana College, Billings, Mont. I am the official delegate to this hearing for three Billings organizations: Rocky Mountain College, Eastern Montana College, and the Billings chapter of the Montana Wilderness Associa-

tion. I wish to present selected excerpts from the faculty statements and Billings chapter letter. Two of the letters were previously submitted. I also wish to present a statement as an individual.

As a student of the public administration of natural resources with a special interest in wilderness recreation—my entire graduate program at the University of Michigan and Syracuse University was oriented to the above—I would like to present the following short paper entitled "The Administration of Wilderness in a Democracy: Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness." Modern public administration definitely recognizes the role of individual values and biases in interpreting and recommending policy. Everyone tends to interpret and/or observe things as "rational" within the limits imposed by his own mental picture of the world, the latter being based on experience, training, personality, and so forth. In R. W. Beham's case study, "The Lincoln Back Country Controversy," emphasis is given to the role of the individual values and biases of the U.S. Forest Service administrators in the determination of what should be done with Lincoln back country. Beham notes that early local Forest Service officials were for custodial and/or natural area values while later Forest Service officials concerned with the area were oriented to development values with management plans.

According to Yale Law School Professor Charles A. Reich's publication, "Bureaucracy and the Forests," professional managers and administrators, under the guise of specialization and professionalism, actually decide what the public interest and values are to be in numerous forest situations with Congress and the public having little to say. Reich also notes that many forest administrators are "unduly sympathetic" to the lumber industry. In my opinion, the persistence of development plans and values in the Lincoln Back Country is an overreaction to the "tying up land" myth which the Forest Service certainly has no justification to fear. Also, in operation, there is a false concept that everything must be managed and developed with a plan in order to be right and modern. One criterion for a sophisticated civilization and wise management might be the allowance of selected lands as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness to remain wild for their highest and fullest contribution to mankind.

Dr. James Gilligan, director of the Wildlands Research Laboratory at the University of California at Berkely, states that much of the wilderness remains today only because it has been uneconomic to develop until now or because mass recreational pressures have not been too great. However, the passage of the Wilderness Act requires a congressional decision for the legal and permanent reservation of potential wilderness as the Lincoln-Scapegoat area rather than waiting for mass recreational or economic pressures and values to remove it forever. Development values and biases as implemented in management plans could and would remove the wilderness character qualities which the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness now possesses. Development values and management plans are a necessary and wise measure under the multiple use for the 85 percent or more of regular national forest lands in Montana. But areas possessing wilderness character as the Lincoln-Scapegoat area are too scarce a resource for standard development.

The Bureau of the Budget did not recommend the passage of H.R. 7148 on the establishment of Lincoln back country as legal wilderness

on the major premise that it should be managed for economic and mass recreational development. Because of the Bureau of the Budget's policy criteria of numbers of people and amounts of dollars, I do not believe that it can give adequate consideration to intangibles versus tangible values and to quality versus quantity values in the formulation of the type of decision which the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness calls for. I do feel that the pragmatic and materialistic forces of our culture have a tendency to be over-emphasized by the Bureau of the Budget and other Federal agencies at the sacrifice of intangibles and quality which are just as important to the United States.

In my opinion, democracy revolves around the decisions and conflicts of values and the power to execute these values effectively. All interests, including Federal agencies, claim that their values are in the public interest. However, based on my 13 summers of discussions with visitors to national forests and national parks, I am convinced that there is a very strong public opinion to reserve as much wilderness as possible. Nevertheless, the public interest, based on my particular experience, is very hard to identify, particularly when it deals with intangibles. Therefore, I do not feel that economic and mass recreational values of agencies should be the only criteria for determining what the public interest is in relatively scarce wilderness areas such as the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness.

A complex and intangible issue as the preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as permanent and legal wilderness is and properly should be a value decision by Congressmen who are the representatives of the people and who can determine what the public interest is. Essentially, the value decision, in my opinion, calls for a recognition of quality recreation as opposed to mass recreation, of intangibles over materialism, of the reservation of natural space and beauty for its own sake as opposed to the pragmatic utilization of every square inch of our environment, and of the fact that a management development plan for the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness does not mean progress, but a step backward, for the lives and souls of many Americans.

I now wish to read two or three statements from each of the organizations I am delegated to represent. First is the Billings chapter of the Montana Wilderness Association:

> Prior to the hearing scheduled for June 11 a short statement was sent to the Honorable Senator Lee Metcalf. The Billings chapter of the Montana Wilderness Association would, however, like to use this opportunity to more fully express its views.
>
> Our organization does not endorse the philosophy that every acre possible should be designated a wilderness. But we do support such designations where wilderness values overshadow other uses.
>
> Briefly, we support the classification of the Lincoln Back Country as a wilderness area for the following reasons:
>
> Public recreation facilities can be developed in many areas, but wilderness remains where nature has placed it.
>
> The fact that nearly 12 percent of the National Forest Lands in Montana are in the primitive or wilderness areas is not a valid argument. This area can and is providing wilderness enjoyment for people from all corners of the United States. What percent of the United States is wilderness?
>
> As grizzly bear habitat dwindles each acre becomes more and more valuable. These magnificent animals must be protected from extinction. They also afford wilderness travelers a thrill, simply knowing the animals are in the area.
>
> Professional recreationists are increasingly aware that every area has a carrying capjacity beyond which the quality of the recreational experi-

ence and values diminish. In due time wilderness use alone will reach this point, without mass recreation.

According to an article in the September issue of the American Forest, in 1965, users of Northwest Wilderness areas averaged five trips of over 2 days length. This indicates an intense interest in this region.

This statement has been rather brief and has not touched upon such items as the fragile nature of the area, scars resulting from timber harvest and road development, increased fire danger of mass recreation and so forth.

Although brief, our concern for the area is no less sincere.

I thank you for the opportunity of presenting this statement.

Respectfully submitted by Dr. Daniel Henning, President, Billings Chapter, Montana Wilderness Association.

From Rocky Mountain College—incidentally, the president and deans of faculty of both these Rocky Mountain Colleges, among other faculty members, as well as Eastern, have signed the petitions. The faculty petition from Rocky Mountain College states:

We, the undersigned, members of the Rocky Mountain College faculty and staff, wish to submit our endorsement of the plan to establish a national wilderness in the Lincoln-Scrapegoat area. We feel that the preservation of wilderness is an important component of the total educational enterprise. Wilderness affords a unique teaching and learning opportunity through the preservation of a natural eccological system totally undisturbed by man.

Whereas we are in sympathy with the multiple use philosophy of the Forest Service we strongly feel that a proper balance between wilderness and national forest land is essential. For these reasons we urge you to support the proposed wilderness legislation.

Richard H. Ramsey, Dean; Larry Weirather; Lawrence F. Small, President of College; Robert H. Lyon; Philip J. Ganson; James R. Taylor, Deans of Admissions; Clifford H. Clark; John R. Bross; Clifford H. Murphy; Earl Hoerger; Thomas M. Dickens; Roger J. McCormick; Richard Watson; R. E. Morrison.

From Eastern Montana College they state:

We, the undersigned and members of Eastern Montana College Faculty, would like to strongly recommend the establishment of Lincoln Back Country, including the Scapegoat Mountain area, as permanent wilderness under the Wilderness Act.

We feel that the above area would best serve the public interest and wise conservation by being declared wilderness. It would provide an excellent area for one and two days on a family basis as well as taking away some of the recreation pressure on the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. However, the Lincoln Back Country is a very unique area of scenery and wild country, which we cannot afford to lose. It provides undisturbed habitat for the grizzly bear as well as other wildlife of a rare or endangered nature. Also, the area contains some of the best cutthroat trout fishing in the United States in its undisturbed water drainages. Possibilities exist for ecological research, but its main contribution would be that of quality recreation—which is extremely hard to find in our modern, developed world. The Lincoln Back Country is a natural and cultural resource and heritage which should be given legal establishment for the present and future generations of Montana and the United States. We request that the above statement be included in your official hearing on June 11, 1968.

Daniel H. Henning, William Plank, Stanley J. Hywood, President, William Davis, Josephine B. Self, Angie Ekstrand, L. W. Veraldi, Jeanette Biebe, Larry K. Hannah, (name unintelligible), Richard H. Walters, Wilson F. Clark, Harold McCleary, Dean of Faculty), Albert Hopkins, Robert M. Rodvey, Beal M. Mossman, William A. Garrison, William Layman, Gary Schumacker, Arthur E. Davidson, Roger H. Snow, Jr., Ralph L. Bingham, Robert N. Noyer, Maurice Evans, A. G. Simpson, David M. Barnhart.

I wish to thank the Senate committee for the opportunity to present the views of the three organizations for which I am the official delegate as well as my own views. I request that these statements be entered into the official records of this hearing. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Without objections, the statements are made a part of the record.

I just want to refer to one sentence you have in your prepared statement here. "Development values and management plans are a necessary and wise measure under multiple use for the 85 percent or more of regular national forest lands in Montana. But areas possessing wilderness character as the Lincoln-Scapegoat area are too severe a resource for standard development." Is this area a special type of area?

Dr. HENNING. I believe it meets the qualifications for wilderness in my particular opinion.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Henning. I know how dedicated and devoted you are to wilderness. I want to say, in justice to the Forest Service, that it is not always just the areas that are not fit for development. Some of the arbitrary actions and bureaucratic actions of the Forest Service you are talking about resulted in the creation of the primitive areas which provided for areas that we have now been able to absorb into the wilderness. Senator Burdick and I have gone through the wilderness struggle, and the primitive area, and I know that we would not have had some of those areas at all had it not been for the Forest Service activity in some previous time.

Dr. HENNING. I have a tremendous amount of respect for many Forest Service personnel who have a very sympathetic attitude.

Senator METCALF. In view of your statement I would like to clarify the point that we are not sitting here in condemnation of Forest Service.

Dr. HENNING. No, I certainly would not. In fact, I have worked with the Forest Service and have a tremendous respect for them.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Doctor.

The next listed witness is Rev. Riley Johnson, of Yakima, Wash., president of Outdoors Unlimited. Is he present?

The next witness will be Cecil Garland, president of the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association.

STATEMENT OF CECIL GARLAND, PRESIDENT, LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, LINCOLN, MONT.

Mr. GARLAND. These are statements, Senators, that have been given to me, unsolicited, and I would like them to be a part of the record [indicating].

Senator BURDICK. Without objection they will be a part of the record.

Mr. GARLAND. Just what I am talking about [indicating photographs].

Senator BURDICK. The photographs handed to me by the witness may be made a part of the file.

Mr. GARLAND. Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf, and ladies and gentlemen: Fifteen years ago, when I first brought my family to the community of Lincoln, I was told of a great wild country to the north known as the Back Country. They told me with awe in their voices of places called Ringeye, Scotty Creek, Lost Pony, Red Mountain, the East Fork, the North Fork, Parker Lake, Meadow Lake, the Twin Lakes, and an almost unworldly country called Scapegoat and Half Moon Park.

I longed to see that country, to know its wild beauty, to catch its fish, to hunt its game, and to climb its mountains.

Unusually wonderful, it was then, when the time came to pack our camp and move away from roads that led back to that world we call civilization.

We camped that first night on a small bench above Ringeye Falls. Taking down our tent from an old frame that the pack rats were using for a home, we made a secure camp, cooked our supper, fed our stock, and then turned our complete thoughts to our whereabouts.

We took from our duffle an old reed elk bugle and as the chill air fell with the sun we shattered the calm of that September evening with a blast from our elk call. Then almost as by magic, above us on Red Mountain a bull elk bugled his challenge that this was his territory and over on the Webb Lake Hill still another bull called back that this was his home. All through the frosty fall air the calls echoed back and forth and I knew that I had found wilderness.

I would not sleep that night for I was trying to convince myself that this was really so; that there really was wild country like this left and that somehow I had found it. But all was not at peace in my heart for I knew that someday, for some unknown reason, man would try to destroy this country, as man had altered and destroyed before.

That night I made a vow, that whatever the cost for whatever the reason, I would do all that I could to keep this country as wild as I had found it.

Today is the culmination of a long effort to keep faith with the promise made that night. Sleep came then and for 8 wonderful days thereafter I caught many trout, killed a big bull elk and whetted an appetite for wilderness that has not yet been satisfied. Never again would I be satisfied with my former home that had names like Elkmount, but had no elk, Deerfield, but no one could ever remember seeing a deer there, Trout Creek that had only minnows, Beaver Dam that had no beaver and East and West Buffalo that one could not even find the remains of an old skull. Panther Creek with no panther. Wolf Creek with no wolf and Turkey Ridge with no turkey. Never again would I be satisfied with hunting grey squirrel and cottontails, opossum, or raccoon. So today I want to defend wilderness in general and the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness in particular. May I then present my qualifications for the opinions I am about to offer and the judgment I'm about to make.

I was raised near the Smoky Mountains of Tennessee and North Carolina, an area better known as Appalachia today. That country was once one of the most verdant countries in the world, but my people had been careless with their land and water and wildlife resources, and we found that it could be destroyed. So it is now, that all the rest of our Nation must contribute to its restoration. I cannot forget that I hoed corn on 45-degree slopes and we hoped it would not rain hard for we knew where our cornfield would go, and the streams ran yellow with mud.

We dumped our sawdust into the river and the effluent from what was then the largest papermill in the world was dumped into the Pigeon River, so that the stream oozed a gray, sticky fluid and the air had a disgusting smell which was not fit to breathe. There was a tanning plant that dumped dark brown tannic acid into the Tuckise-

gee River, so that catfish could not live in it for many miles below. The story of waste is endless.

I attended a vocational agricultural school where we were told this abuse to land and water was wrong. We were also told of the inevitable consequences to man if he continued to destroy his resources.

In 1956 I went to work for the U.S. Forest Service under the naive assumption that at last I could offer some service to an agency who would be in the vanguard of conservation and carefully planned land management. The following 4 years was a period of great frustration, for I began to see the very agency that should have been a leader in conservation and preservation of this Nation's forests and land and water, change toward one of a self-promoting, self-perpetuating bureaucracy. In the following 4 years I was a smoke chaser, construction foreman on campgrounds, and I worked in all phases of so-called timber management. I cruised timber, scaled many million feet of logs at the local sawmills, and laid out timber roads.

At the same time my wife and I started a business in Lincoln, Mont., where I sell and service chain saws, sell logging boots, and most all other logging accessories; and, therefore, consider myself a part of the logging industry. I do not suggest the abolition of logging, but recognize it as a valuable tool in proper forestry management when used with prudence and commonsense.

During my employment with the Forest Service, I listened and learned from many capable foresters. I read the manuals and the handbooks which lay out clearly in most cases how carefully management should be undertaken. And at the same time I heard of the plans to build roads into the back country. For many hours and days I and others tried to reason with higher forest officials of the necessity of keeping the back country wild. Our words and efforts were wasted and the Forest Service, led by personally ambitious people, ambitious for themselves first and the resources second, continued to plan for the destruction of the back country.

The rest is now history, the bitter controversy between people and bureaucracy, and between conservation, preservation, and destructive exploitation. The U.S. Forest Service continues to push for the destruction of the Lincoln back country and within the last few months have issued two pamphlets of ill-conceived propaganda. The first called "Patterns for Management in the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area," and the second called "Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area—Management for People." Not management for watershed, or for soil, or fish and wildlife, or wilderness beauty, or for quality recreation, but management for people. Since these two pamphlets represent most of the things I find most alarming, I would like to deal with several points with which I take strong issue.

These two pamphlets, like a lot of fiction, are loaded with just enough truths so as to confuse the less knowledgeable people for whom they are intended. The pamphlets are full of half truth, insinuations, distortions of fact, vague ambiguities, and the withholding of truths.

First of all, the U.S. Forest Service pamphlets do not allow themselves to deal with the area known as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness or the two bills introduced into our Senate and Congress to protect these lands as wilderness. The U.S. Forest Service, therefore, shows a contempt for the Senators and Congressman who introduced

their bills and the due democratic process of government. This disregard for the people and our lawmakers is accomplished by stating, as in Pamphlet No. 2:

> The potential uses of this big area are so closely interrelated that it is difficult, if not impossible, to fully examine one use or one part of the area independent of the other portion.

If this were at all true, then the U.S. Forest Service could not manage the Bob Marshall Wilderness to the north because the same conditions of interrelated use exist there that also exist in the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness. Streams flow from both areas. Coniferous trees of one size or another exist in both of them. Wildlife and fish cross the external boundaries, not realizing that the U.S. Forest Service has drawn lines between them and people use both areas in the same way for the same reasons. Therefore, if the Lincoln-Scapegoat area cannot be managed as wilderness, then it must be reasonable to assume that no other wilderness area can likewise be managed. The Forest Service, in a deliberate effort to confuse as many people as possible, threw in a lot of extra land area and inventory not pertinent to the area to be classified under S. 1121. In another misrepresentation of the truth the Pamphlet No. 1 states:

> Except for roads to Gibson Dam and the Benchmark Airport and a few other roads that penetrate short distances into the area, access is available only by trail.

The truth is, however, dozens of roads penetrate to the very edge of the Bob Marshall on the west, and many more approach the boundary of the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness to the south. To name a few, there is a road up the Dearborn River, Alice Creek, Landers Fork, Copper Creek, Beaver and Arrastra Creeks, Dry Creek, the North Fork, and Monture Creek, making access to the areas in question available from all points.

Let us now discuss timber in the Lincoln back country. Regional Forrester Boyd Rasmussen, while in service in Missoula, and after a trip through the area, stated that the quality and quantity of timber was not significant. This understatement should have eliminated such statements made in Pamphlet No. 1:

> The time is rapidly approaching when either these stands must make their contribution or the sustained yield for the three forests be revised down.

Now to set the record straight, the so-called sustained yield figure for merchantable timber must be revised downward in any event. This necessity was brought about because of the inability of the Forest Service to properly estimate the timber volumes actually in existence. It is not common knowledge to the general public because of the obvious embarrassment to the Forest Service, but the timber people realize now that only about two-thirds of the sustained-yield figure is now possible. The obvious inference is that the inclusion of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as wilderness would cause a drop in timber harvest. The truth is, a substantial drop is necessary in any event because the timber is just not there as originally estimated on any of the three forests involved. To further confuse you, the Forest Service states in Pamphlet No. 1 that there is a total of 136,000 acres of productive forest lands. You must remember, however, that the figure refers to some vague area known as the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area and not to the acres in the proposed wilderness boundary.

Actually only 65 percent of the productive forest lands lay within the boundary and only about 50 percent of the timber volume. This means that only half of the estimated timber volume is in the proposed boundary area. We then must subtract 10 percent of this volume for water influence zone which leaves only about 7.9 million feet annual cut within the boundary.

It must be mentioned then here that no deduction is made for a travel influence zone as specified in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, region 1 handbook, called "Multiple Uses Management Guide for Northern Region," published in 1963. Herein the U.S. Forest Service is directed to "develop and preserve recreation and esthetic value." In its simplest terms, therefore, this means that there is about enough sawtimber inside the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness to run a small to medium size sawmill, about 3 or 4 months a year, providing two things hold true. No. 1 is that the above sawtimber estimates by the Forest Service are accurate and not exaggerated as in the past. No. 2, that all the sawtimber in the whole 240,000 acres could be brought to one sawmill.

One must then examine at what cost to the taxpayer this so-called recreation road would be. The roads through the Lincoln back country would cost an estimated $15 million. There is no question in my mind, having observed the U.S. Forest Service in action, that if the estimate is $15 million, the cost when completed will be well over $30 million. This is money that would have to come from Congress for the sawtimber values there would not pay 10 percent of the road cost. There are several more very expensive costs involved in growing timber on such a poor timber growing site. They are road location and timber appraisal, diseases and insect control, fire suppression, brush disposal, stand improvement, spur road construction costs, road maintenance costs, sales administration, plus the costs of erosion control and planting of new stock. Many of these costs must also be borne by the taxpayer. There can be no doubt that the present system of growing trees is a direct subsidy to the lumbering industry.

Simply, the timber people and the Forest Service would have you build a so-called recreation road so that whatever scattered small stands of timber that did exist could be taken out.

Let us now discuss some timber-growing problems. That the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness has trees growing on it does not point to the desirability or the economic practicability of continued growing of timber. Because of the shallow soils, the timber-growing potential for this high, rugged area is very low. There also has been no sound data offered for the sustained yield potential of an area inside the boundary. It must be assumed, however, that the cost of growing timber there will be very high. A clear distinction must be made between the harvesting of a crop of ready-grown timber, the accumulation of nature, and the undertaking of intensive management to grow more timber in the future on the same site.

Commercial timber volumes developed by nature over a great period of time on many sites on which regeneration is difficult and expensive have a strong possibility that these areas may not ever for any practicable purpose produce timber again. It is truly a tragedy of our time that the U.S. Forest Service is putting 75 percent of its road-construction dollars into building and supporting roads into areas that

have such low potential for growing timber. Whereupon, thousands upon thousands of acres throughout the United States that have a much higher potential for timber growing lie fallow and neglected. One can only conclude that building roads in such marginal country, without a reasonable prospect of breaking even, is a form of industrious stupidity.

Because of an almost infinite amount of so-called round wood volumes existing outside the boundary area with roads already built to it, I will not labor the subject, except to say that there appears nowhere on the horizon a market for the most of it.

Next is the most crucial subject of wildlife. In pamphlet No. 2, quote, "No reliable figures are available for wildlife population." Does it not follow a reasonable pattern of logical thought that if we don't know about the wildlife before we build a vast expensive system of road, that may be detrimental to the wildlife resource, that perhaps we should know more about the consequences. In a statement made by Harry R. Woodward, director of Colorado Game and Fish Department (1966), Mr. Woodward had this to say:

> Ecologically speaking, American elk is classified as a wilderness species, which means that wilderness is essential to the survival of this species in the wild state. Our records indicate that most of the elk harvested are reared in these remote, restricted areas. It is apparent that isolation, coupled with good food conditions, has materially contributed to the high productivity of the Colorado elk herds. There is no doubt that the primitive areas have been a major contributing factor to the well-being of this herd.

The same thing is unquestionably true to the much greater degree with the grizzly bear. This endangered animal demands isolation, and because of the absence of garbage cans in the Lincoln back country the incidence of grizzlies attacking people and their own consequential destruction remains almost negative in occurrence. Yet, the Forest Service casually dismisses the grizzly by saying, "No reliable estimates exist of the number of grizzly in the area nor of the relative importance of this part of their range." And again "Special effort will need to be made to protect the grizzly." The truth is, if this road is built, a hell of a lot of grizzly will get protection with a magnum rifle in the hands of some governmental employee attempting to guard campgrounds.

The pamphlets offer no evidence that the wildlife resources have received consideration commensurate with roads and timber cutting and references to the existence of a wildlife community, including several endangered species, is not a satisfactory substitute for precise plans for their perpetuation.

The same is true with the existing fisheries. To quote the pamphlets again, "Many streams were severely damaged in the 1964 floods and will require many years of extensive rehabilitation measures for recovery." Here the U.S. Forest Service appears to have borrowed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers scare tactics of floods and flood damage. I am happy to report that very little evidence of the 1964 flood is now noticeable. The 4-year period since the flood, a force so much more careful and ingenious in its rehabilitation abilities has been at work on the streams. That force is called nature and her experience and ability to repair her own damage is as old as this planet.

For the U.S. Forest Service to suggest that it can improve on the beautiful clear streams of the back country or that after they have built their roads and logged, that the streams will then be in better

shape, is an insult to the intelligence of those of us who have seen the North Fork of the Blackfoot and its Lake Creek tributary. Furthermore, there is again no evidence offered as to the cost envisioned in the proposed stream rehabilitation program and just where the money to undertake such a questionable job is coming from.

On water again I quote from the pamphlet, "No watershed management or rehabilitation measures have so far been undertaken although a considerable potential for improving stream conditions exists." There exists outside the boundary area many miles of streams that were subject to the same flooding. What has the U.S. Forest Service done for these areas and at what cost? I suggest that to turn the Forest Service loose along with the loggers would cause destruction and deterioration to the stream that would make the 1964 flood damage pale in comparison.

On the subject of recreation the pamphlet states, "The resulting back country recreation, including hunting and fishing, is enjoyed by those people who have the leisure time and physical and financial resources to traverse the area by foot or horseback." Does the Forest Service cast some sinister shadow upon those who have the leisure time and physical and financial resources to use the area?

This past summer, four friends and I spent 5 days in the back country. I am referring to you as friends.

Senator METCALF. Referring to my executive secretary, Mr. Reinemer.

Mr. GARLAND. Yes; and three more. Our food bill for the whole 5 days was less than $8 per person, and our equipment was backpacks and one old yellow mare worth about $85, canner price. I cannot conceive of a less expensive vacation, or one of higher quality. I hope I am borne out here. It should be brought out at this time that—Porter, would you hold this map up for me, please?

It should at this time be brought out that the potential for camping sites one may drive to outside the proposed boundary area are varied and many. We have prepared a map showing those sites, already close to roads, that have not been developed. These sites would be equal in quality to those inside the boundary, assuming that logging and access roads were built into the boundary.

There is a minimum of 32 sites——

Senator METCALF. Would you explain, or are you going to explain the markings on the map?

Mr. GARLAND. I would like to if I may, sir.

Senator METCALF. Would you do it now rather than later?

Mr. GARLAND. All right. The large black squares represent existing campgrounds already built, either by Forest Service or private people. As I said, I was a campgrounds foreman and laid out campgrounds and built them and know the area intimately well. I put the areas as the bare minimum of sites that could be developed that would be equal to those inside the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, assuming the roads were built there. This doesn't include Bureau of Land Management lands.

Senator METCALF. What are the stars?

Mr. GARLAND. The stars are fishing access sites by the Montana Fish and Game Department on Bureau of Land Management lands.

Senator METCALF. Are you through with the map?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

Senator METCALF. Would you put it up so the audience might see it.

Mr. GARLAND. The opportunity also exists outside the Lincoln-Scapegoat boundary area, near Lincoln, for ski developments. Here again, the choice is wide. These sites are Copper Creek off Red Mountain; Arrastra Peak, Stonewall Mountain; Lewis and Clark Pass, Crater Mountain; and the Caddotte-Rodgers Pass area. We don't have a shortage of snow up there.

Also, under so-called recreation, in the recent past there has been a rapid increase in the use of motor scooters and snowmobiles. It occurred to me that the U.S. Forest Service has sunk to a new low in its effort to drum up opposition to wilderness classification for the area. It so happens that I sell and service snowmobiles. My family likes to use and ride them, and they are a lot of fun. They are also noisy to the point of being deafening and they smell of gasoline, oil, and hot motor belts. However, the scooter people and we snowmobile people are not being deprived use of the National Forest because of the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness addition. There are 4,291 miles of roads on the three national forests adjacent to the proposed wilderness area, with 3,818 miles proposed to be built. This is enough to go across the United States several times. And there is a total of 3,644 miles of trail in the three forests, excluding the trails inside the wilderness areas. Do the scooter and we snowmobile people really need more?

Furthermore, on recreation, "The drive would provide many scenic vistas and viewpoints of the surrounding mountain," and in the very next paragraph, pamphlet No. 1 states, "In the lower timber country other temporary spur roads would permit logging where this could be managed or modified so that scenic and other recreational values along the drive would not be impaired." These two statements reach an obsolute apex in absurdity. By what miraculous feat of engineering is it possible to drive to the higher scenic vistas and look over the narrow valleys below without having to view clear cut logging with its associated roads and earth scarred erosion, and the giant cuts and fills necessary to build a major road throughout the back country? The Forest Service must consider us to be very stupid indeed, or at least hope that we will not notice the destruction to the esthetic values until it is done.

In its pamphlets, the U.S. Forest Service also mentions mining potential for the area. "We have no firm information on possible mineral development within the area. To those within the mining industry who will proclaim that every place on this planet is a potential mine, I cannot argue. However, how many places on this planet can now qualify as a true wilderness area? Please be reminded that miners and all of us alike must share this planet and what kind of a world that will be is up to all of us.

Again I quote, "The rural area around Lincoln is experiencing rapid growth—partly from increasing recreation use, but more importantly as a result of a mining activity." In a recent announcement by the Anaconda Co., they indicate that the Heddelston mining district near Lincoln is being held in reserve for the future.

Yet, our wilderness area is not in reserve, but is actively supporting our economy. Do away with our wilderness, and you will remove forever another element of diversification so vital to our being a well-rounded community. Without our wilderness and wildlife, we are at

the mercy of the ups and downs of both the lumbering and mining industries, and the accompanying labor strikes and disputes that have plagued both Butte and Anaconda.

Lincoln is already a jumping-off place for the back country. Does the Forest Service believe that a road which bypasses Lincoln from Great Falls to Missoula and destroys our wilderness area will be in our best interest? Commonsense must tell all of us that a feeder line from the main road would not be a true recreation road, or that people would be attracted off the main road to travel to Lincoln.

No, the U.S. Forest Service does not have Lincoln's best interest as a primary consideration, but its own welfare and its own empire building scheme is its first concern. What has gone wrong? Why does the Forest Service continue to press its case in the face of so much reason and opposition?

The answers are perhaps quite simple. It has been said that it is inherent with mankind that that which we are given to manage we come to assume we own. The managers of our national forest have come to look upon the resources as their own. There reaches a stage in the evolution of every bureaucracy when the promotion and building of the agencies itself takes precedent over the values it has been given to manage. So it is that the issue today, more than any other single factor, is whether we, the people, shall have a voice in the broad use of public lands.

In my long fight for the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness area, many more values have been opened up for my understanding. May I share with you a part of the understanding I have gained.

There is a tremendous problem facing the people of the world today and it will grow increasingly worse as time passes. It can be best expressed in a small news clipping I carry with me. It says, "This technology we enjoy today is little else but a widespread suicidal pollution. It is a blight affecting not only the air we breathe and the water we drink, but also the land we till and the outer space we hardly know," Oceanographer Dr. Jacques Picard, is quoted as saying he doubts man will survive the 21st century.

I cannot read this small warning without one other quotation coming to mind—one that I did not understand for a long time, and that is, "In wilderness is the preservation of the world."

Left to its own devices, the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness will contribute to the survival of another endangered species—one called man.

Th Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness will continue to provide fresh, clean streams flowing into our valley. A small portion of the earth's air will be cleansed as it passes over it and there will be no pollution added to it. There will be space, a commodity becoming even more dear to this country. And there will be wildlife to see and study and to know.

I hope there will always be a place called Sourdough with mule deer in it, a Meadow Creek with trout, and East Fork with beaver, Scotty Creek with grizzly, a Scapegoat with goats on it, a Middle Fork with mountain lions, and the angry, lovesick bugle of the bull elk may be heard above Ringeye. Montanans, when it is gone you will miss it.

Senators, I most respectfully urge the speedy passage of S. 1121 to make the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness a part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you for your very interesting statement. Have you any questions?

Senator METCALF. Senator Burdick, obviously Mr. Garland is very familiar with the area, and obviously this is the kind of testimony that we need to discuss and take back to Washington with us. In view of the fact that he did discuss erosion and fragility of the soil, I would like to have a letter from Mr. Christopher Schmidt, professor of the department of geology of Indiana University, which discusses fragility and the special and unique characteristics of this soil you mention, printed at this point. It calls attention to the fact that there is a high erosion potentiality in the area. You have been through and over it, and back and forth across it. You have been in other areas in the National Forest in the State of Montana. Do you agree with Mr. Smith that this has a special, thin soil that has high potentialities for erosion?

Mr. GARLAND. Precisely so, sir. This can be established beyond any question at all.

Senator METCALF. I would like to have this go in the record right after this statement.

Senator BURDICK. It is so ordered.

(The letter referred to follows:)

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY,
Bloomington, Ind., September 19, 1968.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Care of Judge Nelson,
Cascade County Court House,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: As a geologist, sportsman, and Montana resident, I wish to join the plea for the preservation of the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area in its wilderness state.

Until recently my acquaintance with this area was only through an occasional hunting trip. With the proposal of developing the Northern Lincoln Back Country for recreation and timber harvest, I have undertaken a study to acquaint myself with various aspects of the geology of the area, particularly soil conditions and stream gradients.

The tendency to overlook erosion potentialities through the stages of location and construction of roads is a serious problem, and comparatively little has been done to control soil washing along present Forest Service roads. Fills wash away as a result of gullying and sheet washing. Such man-induced changes hasten the flow of rainfall to the nearest drainage, to overload streams and to accentuate the flood hazard. The quality of the water itself is highly important to fish. The best game fish can live only in clear, cool water, practically free of silt or other pollutants. For fish (particularly the native cutthroat trout), silt is the most deadly of erosion products; it buries their eggs, clogs the gills of their young, and by occluding light, destroys acquatic vegetation and the plankton on which they ultimately depend for food. Fish inevitably disappear from a stream or pond well before the deposition of debris and the obliteration of the channel cause their actual physical destruction.

I have undertaken a study of geologic and topographic maps, and Geological Survey Reports, and in view of the shallow nature of the ponds in the area, comparatively slight stream gradients, and the thin, predominantly limestone-derived soil cover, there seems to me to be a potential silting problem that could result from casually planned roads. A road system in the vicinity of the East Fork of the Blackfoot River or Lake Creek, where stream gradients are quite low, and where morainal and outwash plain deposits form stream channels, could very easily produce just such a problem. In short, the potential danger of a system of roads, or even a single road, into the Lincoln wilderness area is enough to warrant a very careful consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of such a road or roads.

I do not wish to imply that a single road will produce the demise of the trout and those species that ultimately depend on fish for food. Most of the other

Forest Service roads throughout the state have produced no such effect, although some have. Although it is not definitely known that any species of animal or plant has been exterminated through the agency of erosion alone, it is a matter of common observation that the removal of topsoil by erosion has greatly altered and even rendered uninhabitable certain territory, although usually of limited extent. Are the possible consequences worth the risk of even a single road? If such roads were used extensively for logging, the erosion and runoff danger would, of course, increase considerably, and would destroy cover which many species need for survival.

For the past four years, I have been working as a geologist in the Tobacco Root Mountains, and have had occasion to observe the effect of increased use of the Forest Service roads in the area by campers and tourists. These roads have unquestionably increased recreational facilities for campers, hunters, and tourists. Perhaps this is, in itself, desirable. Yet certain effects of the increased influx are undesirable. Many ranchers and residents of the area, including myself, have noticed, within the past four years, a decline in the population of certain species of wildlife within the area, particularly deer, elk, and native brook trout. Whether the majority of this decrease has been caused by excessive hunting, or simply by the presence of large numbers of campers and tourists, is difficult to determine. Nevertheless, it seems fairly clear that the use of the roads has been a factor. While this is an inevitable outcome of extensive use of facilities, I am disturbed by the possibility of a similar situation developing in an area which, in my opinion, should be included in the wilderness.

Therefore, my plea, as a geologist, is for a careful consideration of the possible consequences of casually planned roads into the area. My hope, as a sportsman, photographer, and Montana resident, is for the passage of Senate Bill S1121.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER J. SCHMIDT.

Senator BURDICK. Congressman Battin has just arrived in the hearing room. If you will come forward Congressman we will hear you at this time.

Congressman BATTIN. Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf.

Senator METCALF. Congressman we are honored to have you here. The Congressman has sponsored H.R. 7148, a companion bill to the one we are hearing today, and has been working toward establishment of the Lincoln back area as a wilderness.

Congressman BATTIN. Welcome to my congressional district.

Senator BURDICK. We meet you over at the border.

Congressman BATTIN. I know. As a matter of fact, I was in Wolf Point earlier this morning, and knowing your busy schedules, as well as my own, I confirmed the fact on a North Dakota radio station you were here in Great Falls.

Senator BURDICK. I want you to know in a football game years ago between Williston and Wolf Point, I broke my arm.

Congressman BATTIN. Don't hold that against us.

Senator BURDICK. I don't. Proceed.

Senator METCALF. We won't hold that against your congressional district. That man just moved to South Dakota that broke his arm.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES F. BATTIN, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, STATE OF MONTANA

Congressman BATTIN. Senator Burdick, I would first of all ask unanimous consent that my prepared text be included in the record in full.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection, it is so ordered. We will place it at the end of your remarks.

Congressman BATTIN. And I will paraphrase from that, knowing the number of witnesses that you have to hear, and will be happy to respond to any questions after completing my testimony. It is going to be necessary that I do leave, but I very sincerely appreciate your being here and conducting this hearing. Therefore, I feel it has a great impact upon Montana and the wilderness of the country in general.

Without doubt I am here to testify in support of S. 1121, a companion to the bill that I have introduced in the House. A lot can be said, in fact a lot has been said, about the 240,000-plus acres that would be included in the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat area, adding that to the wilderness for its preservation. I have had a great deal of correspondence, both pro and con. As a matter of fact, the Forest Service did a study in 1968, this year, dealing with the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area, that perhaps at least in my mind left a bit of misconception as to what we were really talking about. As a result of that I asked them in a report, which I would like to also submit for the record, to do an overlay, which I have here(indicating) that would show the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area that the study was made, just what part of that would, in fact, be included in the area covered by Senator Metcalf's bill and by my bill. They are talking about in excess of a half a million acres, and we are talking about 240,000-plus acres. We are talking about entirely a different type of terrain. I would be surprised, indeed I believe I would even be shocked, if the Forest Service were to allow the development of the timber potential as limited as it is in this particular region because of the very narrow valleys and very high mountains. As far as soil and water conservation is concerned, and preservation of the soil in that area, to allow cutting of timber compared to the other areas that are accessible, seems to me would be very bad management practice. I can understand also the concern of those who don't want this area taken out because of the—well, let's say the supposed loss of timber. They are concerned because the formula that is used in determining what the allowed cut is going to be includes the 240,000 acres. Now, if that is take out—I am sure using the same formula—that is, there is going to be a reduction in the allowable cut in the total. For some months now—as a matter of fact for some years—it has been my belief and strong feeling that where an area is taken out and given a limited use that some adjustment, where possible, should be made in the formula of the allowable cut. I think that would solve some of the problems, and certainly some of the dilemma that confronts us today.

I have been into part of this country. I have never had the privilege, because of a time limitation, to go through all of it. I know many who have enjoyed the wilderness. I, for one, have been a very strong advocate of the multiple use concept on public lands. I think it is necessary that they be developed to their fullest potential. Yet, I can't help but quote from a Senate report that was developed in the 86th Congress, which I would certainly urge the committee to consider, where they deal with this question before the full committee. It is a Senate report entitled "Administration of National Forest and Multiple Use and Sustained Yield." It was published May 23, 1960. I would like to quote from that. In talking before the quote, the committee was talking

about a possible loss in any dollar use when you tie up lands. Directly quoting:

> The value of some of these resources may be expressed in dollars. The value of others cannot be realistically measured in dollars. Thus both tangible and intangible values influence combinations of uses, and determine it would best meet the needs of the nation.

I quote further from the report:

> It is recognized that the priority of resources will vary from locality to locality as the case may be. In one locality timber use will dominate. In another locality use of the range by domestic livestock. In another, wildlife and outdoor recreation, including wilderness, will dominate. Thus, in particular locales, various resources will be given priority because of particular circumstances.

May I inquire of the chairman whether or not you have had time to fly over some of this area, or weren't you able to do that because of time?

Senator BURDICK. The area will be viewed tomorrow by Senator Metcalf and his group. The Senator from North Dakota has to return to Washington to take care of a little matter of a judicial appointment.

Congressman BATTIN. I have heard something about that.

Senator METCALF. Perhaps the Congressman has a few of those in the pot right now.

Congressman BATTIN. I would also like to have permission, as the committee considers this further, to submit colored photographs of some of the things we are talking about so that the committee will have for its benefit actual scenes in the area so that I think it would more adequately describe it than words just basically what we are talking about.

Senator BURDICK. The photographs can be seen from the file. We can't receive them as a part of the official record, but they will be received for the file.

Congressman BATTIN. Thank you. It is my hope, with all of the conversation and testimony that you are going to take here, and realizing with every issue there are two sides, that the committee will take into consideration that in Montana alone this legislation has been endorsed by the Montana Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Association, the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association, the United Sportsmen of Montana, the Flathead Wildlife, Inc., the Polson Outdoors, Inc., the Cascade Wildlife Association, the Butte Skyline Club, the Montana Outfitters & Guides Association, and the Western Montana Fish & Game Association, together with a number of major newspapers in the area who have given editorial support to the concept of including this in the back country. Again, I would like permission, if Senator Metcalf has not already done so, to include those editorials as part of the record. I will have to get them for you. I do not have them with me, but would submit them for the record.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection they will be received and will be placed in an appropriate place in the record.

Congressman BATTIN. One of the animals that perhaps has gotten a lot of consideration in the recent years because of some very unfortunate incidents in Glacier National Park is the grizzly bear. The Forest Service, as well as the University of Montana, has done extensive

research dealing with the grizzly bear. Yet if the back country were to be developed by roads and access as you would find in Glacier National Park, or Yellowstone National Park, you would really find in the continental United States the last of the grizzly bear habitat being completely destroyed. Either their numbers would have to be reduced physically or in fact they would, as of necessity, just die out. I don't think anybody would like to see this species destroyed simply because perhaps one segment of the economic base in Montana and the Nation would be in some small way affected. You will hear testimony, I presume, I have seen some of it, dealing in the dollar value of this particular area as far as resource is concerned. I think that has to be kept in the context of whether or not in good management practice the Forest Service would in fact allow timber cutting in this area. Most of it is lodgepole pine, which so far hasn't found a real commercial value in the United States. There is some other timber in there, but, in my opinion, at least, and those who I have asked to give me their opinion, not of any great commercial value.

One of the reasons I hoped the chairman might have a chance to visit the back country itself is because it really is not explainable in words. Coming out on a plane from Washington I tried my best to put down on paper how you would describe this area to somebody who had never seen the ruggedness and the scenic beauty that is involved. One of the arguments is, of course, that not very many people are going to see the scenic beauty because it is going to be all locked up and only those who like to hike and ride horseback and take the time will go in. I would like to remind the committee that surrounding the area, and in the town of Lincoln and that close proximity, there are numerous areas where people can, in fact, camp, do the things that they would ordinarily as far as the popular concept of outdoor recreation is concerned, and if they would want to go into the back country, if they would want to walk in and enjoy an unspoiled section of the United States, they have that opportunity. But if we put roads back, nobody will have the opportunity. It will be forever lost to present and, of course, the future generations.

I am going to ask that my executive secretary spend the day here with your hearings in case testimony is delivered that should be refuted by me, or which I have information to refute, I would be hopeful that the chairman might either recognize him, his name is Mr. Aleckson, or allow us to submit for the record any rebuttal that might come forth where facts and figures could be developed in order to sustain the position brought forth by Senator Metcalf's bill and mine.

With that, Senator Burdick, I urge upon you and the rest of the committee, a favorable consideration of this bill. I think the concept is good. I don't think it violates the concept of multiple use, particularly based upon the language in the Senate report in 1960. It depends upon the locality, it depends upon what is there. And it is there. It is unspoiled and it provides a great recreation and outdoor potential for this and future generations.

Thank you very much, and I would be very happy to respond to any questions.

Senator Burdick. Inasmuch as we will have additional hearings in Washington to hear the Department witnesses, there will be ample time. Rebuttal statements we will be glad to hear at any time.

Congressman Battin. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Senator Burdick, I wonder if both Congressman Battin and Mr. Garland, and I imagine some of the other witnesses, are going to testify to the development patterns of management from the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide study that Congressman Battin referred to that comes from the Forest Service? Since the Department of Agriculture did not file a report on this bill, I wonder if we could ask that representatives of the Forest Service respond and answer some of the questions that are being raised here today, and get those in the record of this hearing rather than having to wait to file another report?

Congressman BATTIN. Senator Metcalf, do you have the overlay with that?

Senator METCALF. I don't have the overlay.

Congressman BATTIN. I will give you this copy that I have. It shows rather tactfully what I am talking about. This is the total area that involves this. This overlay fits thusly (indicating). In the black border is the Lincoln Back Country.

Senator BURDICK. It will show the reduced area.

Congressman BATTIN. I understand from Mr. Garland's testimony, he deduced that there are only about 8 million board feet of timber in the area, and only 35 percent of it productive timber. I think it is very important to know just what the Forest Service opinion is of this specific area rather than the whole study. I hope that before these hearings are concluded we will get a definitive opinion by the Forest Service, responsive to requests and to suggestions. The Forest Service has included in this study a much larger, more comprehensive and more determined area than we are considering.

Senator, I hope that either at this hearing or at the ones that will be conducted in Washington some dialog will be developed with the Forest Service as to how they determine the allowable cut in any given forest, or combination of forests, because I think that is one of the real big problems we are facing now. Where you are going to take out, as we are here, almost a quarter of a million acres, I would like to know how that affects the rest of the area which has been administered under the multiple-use concept and is now being reduced to a specific use. I am convinced that reasonable people can work out a formula to satisfy the needs of not only the State of Montana, but the country as a whole. If we can develop the dialog, as to why an adjustment can't be made when land is taken out for a specific purpose, then I think we might be heading for a better solution, or at least less of a conflict, not only now, but as far as the future is concerned. I would hope you would have an opportunity, if they do testify here, or in Washington, that this——

Senator METCALF. They are going to testify in Washington.

Congressman BATTIN (continuing). That this be developed a little further. My answer from them was, "No, they couldn't change it, this is the pattern." I know there are some good reasons, but how good are the reasons compared to the needs generally, not only from the standpoint of management of the forest, but from the tremendously increasing pressures from the recreational aspects. The more free time people have, the more pressure is going to be exercised on the recreational facilities of the country. I think very strongly we should be looking now to take care of the needs of the 1980's and 1990's and the next century.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Congressman. Your prepared statement will be included at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES F. BATTIN, A U.S. SENATOR IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA

Senator Burdick, I generally am a staunch supporter of the multiple use concept for management of public lands, but today I am compelled to support removing 240,500 acres from that use. The wilderness nature of the Lincoln Back Country is a fragile resource which must be protected. In its present roadless and primeval condition, this area provides a splendid habitat for a wide variety of wildlife species. It abounds with animals, fish, and birds in their natural setting. The balance of nature has been very little disturbed since time immemorial and with proper protection offered in the provisions of the Wilderness Act this land will be a deposit for the future generations of America.

All of the wilderness groups which study proposals such as the legislation that I and Senator Metcalf have introduced support this proposal. In Montana alone this legislation has been endorsed by the Montana Wildlife Federation, the Montana Wilderness Association, the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association, the United Sportsmen of Montana, the Flathead Wildlife, Inc., the Polson Outdoors, Inc., the Cascade Wildlife Association, the Butte Skyline Club, the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association, and the Western Montana Fish and Game Association. We also have support from every national wilderness group.

The region in past years has been used extensively and primarily for hiking, backpacking, horseback riding, fishing, and hunting. It is one of the few remaining natural habitats for the majestic grizzly bear. With the controversy involved with bear attacks in our national parks, this area may one day be the only remaining sanctuary for the grizzly. If this area is opened for mass recreation the grizzly population could become a major problem. Either the grizzly numbers would have to be reduced or the area would have to be as widely developed as Yellowstone or Glacier National Park and the necessary protection offered to tourists. Freedom of movement and a wild habitat are essential to the grizzly's existence and both of these conditions would be destroyed under any designation but wilderness. We could not be justified in sacrificing this valuable and majestic animal without proof of public necessity to open up this area. I do not believe that it is necesasry or advisable to build roads into this area because it is not suited to mass recreation.

In Lincoln Back Country we do not have the scenic vistas that have encouraged opening of other wilderness areas in this state. For example, the breathtaking beauty of the Cooke County switchbacks or the Going-To-The-Sun Highway would not be approached in any part of this area. The valleys are narrow and thickly overgrown with lodgepole pine. Any practical road would have to traverse these valleys and so would end up to be the same as many thousands of miles of roaded country in the Northwest.

Any roads through this country would immediately upset nature's balance and this area would soon become just another country road. Once a wilderness area is roaded or developed in any other way, it is lost for all time.

Roads of any construction are unfeasible in this area and they are also unnecessary because the surrounding countrywide abounds in sites for mass recreation. There are many sites outside the Back Country, and yet close by, which offer recreational sites near existing roads and highways. These areas are not even being used to their full potential and will serve this type of recreational need for untold time to come. By asking that this area be removed from mass recreation development, we are not stifling progress in this vital industry. I and the other supporters of this proposal recognize that recreation is a promising enterprise for Montana. We welcome that development because it is highly preferable to some other profitable industries that might spoil our landscape. Making Lincoln Back Country a wilderness will advance rather than deter the trend towards outdoor recreation in Montana. For in an area like this we truly develop multiple recreational use. In contiguous areas we have the developed areas where people can bring their campers, their gas cookstoves and enjoy the luxuries of outdoor living. In the Back Country they can come with horses and pack mules and enjoy the beauty of nature and the vigors of the trail. In effect, we are offering facili-

ties that will please anyone who comes to this area. But I think the important thing is that any state in the nation can provide developed camping areas, but few can offer wilderness areas and none outside of the Rocky Mountains can compare with Lincoln Back Country.

Timber in the Lincoln Back Country does not appear to be of sufficient quality or quantity to rule out a wilderness designation. The bulk of the land is on steep hills and the soil is sparse. The timber stands in the accessible portions are mainly lodgepole pine, a species that doesn't lend itself readily to commercial development, especially in an area such as this which will be hard to get into for timber operations. Should a commercial use be developed in the coming years for this variety of timber, there are thousands of acres of it along existing road areas and in far more accessible areas. There are a few stands of Douglas Fir in the designated area that are of poor quality and not of ready commercial use.

In setting the Lincoln Back Country and the Scapegoat Mountain area aside for wilderness use, we will literally bank a vast resource for future generations. We have an obligation to preserve areas such as this for our descendants and I urge your approval of this legislation.

Senator BURDICK. In view of the fact that one of the witnesses has to attend a funeral, we would like to call Mr. F. M. Gannon, executive vice president of the Union Bank & Trust Co. of Helena.

STATEMENT OF F. M. GANNON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, UNION BANK & TRUST CO., HELENA, MONT.

Mr. GANNON. Thank you, Senator Burdick. Thank you for calling me so I can have the opportunity to leave.

With your permission I would like to give a short statement in favor of S. 1121.

I am F. M. Gannon, of Helena, Mont. I am employed as executive vice president of the Union Bank & Trust Co. Since 1957 I have been secretary and ramrodder of the Helena Wilderness Riders, a group of men from all over the United States who spend a week each year on a pack trip into the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

I have known the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and the area under consideration in this hearing since 1938 when I made my first pack trip into the Big Prairie area to hunt elk. I have gone into this area almost every year since then with the exception of 5 years in the Army during World War II.

I have covered most of the area under consideration many times and know it well. This country in its wild and natural state is truly lovely. Scapegoat Mountain is tremendous in size and spectacular in every respect. Half Moon Park, which lies at the base of Scapegoat Mountain, is one of the most beautiful spots in the world. We have camped there many times.

There has been no grazing in this area for many years. Most of the timber is small in size and not too desirable for logging. A few lakes such as Meadow Lake, Heart Lake, Webb Lake, Parker Lake, and Twin Lakes are small and shallow and would not stand much fishing pressure. More and more people are visiting this area each year on foot and on horseback and are thrilled and refreshed with the experience.

In my opinion, building roads into this country would open it to the ravages of civilization which would soon ruin it. It will be far more valuable in years to come to be retained as a wilderness area.

I strongly urge that the committee recommend passage of this bill and support this legislation.

Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Fritz.

Senator BURDICK. Forrest Anderson.

Senator METCALF. Forrest Anderson is a longtime attorney general, and succeeded me as associate justice of the supreme court, and is our candidate for Governor.

STATEMENT OF FORREST H. ANDERSON, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. ANDERSON. Primarily why I wanted to come here was because when I was a young man I traveled over every inch of the country you are now talking about. Unfortunately I became, as so much of us have, busy and I haven't been in it lately. But I know every inch of it, I am sure of that—probably as well as anyone. I likewise know every inch of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. I have walked almost the entire area.

I can't conceive of how this land would be of any great value for industrial or timber purposes. It has great value for the purposes for which you now intend to change it; namely, for a wilderness value.

Looking forward for the next 50 years, if we don't do more in this sort of thing, we are not going to have a place left for people to go out and really see what I knew as a young man, and what many of us would like to know, even as an older fellow.

I have been on top of Scapegoat Mountain. I have been on top of Red Mountain. I have fished in Meadow Creek, and I might say this: I saw an article the other day where they have grayling in that area, and I will tell you that I helped plant the first grayling that were ever in that area. Old Tom Peasely and I took a bunch of grayling into Heart Lake, probaby 40 or more years ago. I was a very young man at that time. I would hate to see it destroyed by roads and by multiple uses. I think it ought to be kept so as other young men such as I once was, or even the older people, can enjoy it. There is going to be a lot more use of this country in the next half century than there has been in the last half century.

I can recall walking from the present Burns Ranch, up through Heart Lake and on over to Webb Lake and down to Meadow Creek and down the East Fork of the Blackfoot, crossing the North Fork and going up over Whiskey Ridge and down into the Danaher and down into Big Prairie, and coming back by way of Holland Lake or by way of the Augusta country. I know the country, and I think it ought to be saved. This is primarily why I wanted to come and say, "Hello," to you. Any questions?

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much. I know, too, that you extensively walked and hunted and fished the area.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am on another course now, Senator, and my legs are good.

Senator BURDICK. The next witness will be Thomas Judge.

Senator METCALF. I am glad these witnesses are here, Senator Burdick, as a representative of the Governor was here. The fish and game commission has testified, and, of course, this bill is bipartisan in nature as Congressman Battin told you. So here is also a candidate in the election for Lieutenant Governor. I think their testimony will dem-

onstrate that this rather effectually is taken out of partisan politics. Tom has been a friend of mine ever since he was a toddler in Helena, and I am delighted to have him before the committee.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS JUDGE, STATE SENATOR, HELENA, MONT.

Mr. JUDGE. Thank you very much, Senator Metcalf and Senator Burdick.

During the 1967 session of the Montana Legislature I was one senator, along with Senator Mitchell of Cascade County, Senator Bertsche from Cascade County, and Senator Hibbard from Lewis and Clark County, who sponsored a resolution to our congressional delegation, and I would like to enter in the record the resolution as my testimony. It is as follows:

MONTANA SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 32

A Resolution of the Senate of Montana to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Arnold Olson and the Honorable James Battin, Representatives from the State of Montana, Urging That Parts of the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain Area Be Enjoined With the National Wilderness Preservation System—Introduced by Mitchell, Judge, Bertsche, Hibbard

Whereas, parts of the Lincoln back country and Scape Goat Mountain Area lie within the national forest system and is in a natural wilderness condition at the present time; and

Whereas the area is presently being heavily utilized as a natural recreation area for horseback riding, hiking, fishing, hunting, camping, photography, and observation of wildlife; and

Whereas there is a growing population of Americans seeking high quality outdoor recreational opportunities; and

Whereas the Lincoln back country and Scape Goat Mountain Area—contains some of the most spectacular scenic and recreational opportunities to be found in the United States; and

Whereas these outstanding recreational areas, and the wildlife and scenic opportunities therein are of the highest value in attracting people to Montana for the enjoyment of these areas; and

Whereas Montana is one of the few states where this type of outdoor recreation containing a complete wildlife community in its' natural environment can still be enjoyed; and

Whereas the grizzly bear, the majestic elk, the native cutthroat trout, the Rocky Mountain goat and various other species, some of them endangered, abound in this area, and

Whereas these areas should be preserved and protected for the enlightenment, education, and enjoyment of future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, That the Senate of the State of Montana urges the United States government to take the appropriate action necessary to identify those parts of the Lincoln back country/Scape Goat Areas best suited to optimum recreational purposes and include them in the National Wilderness System; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is instructed to send copies of this resolution to each member of the Montana congressional delegation.

Mr. JUDGE. And, Senators, this resolution was passed without any opposition in the Senate of the State of Montana. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. I just received a telegram that confirmed the statement that this has been effectually taken out of party politics:

On behalf of our gubernatorial candidate, Wayne Montgomery, I wish to express strong support for wilderness designation for Lincoln Back Country.

MEYER CHESSIN,
Chairman, New Reform Party of Montana.

Senator BURDICK. The telegram has been made a part of the record. Robert Kelleher.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Kelleher is Democratic congressional candidate against Congressman Battin.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. KELLEHER, BILLINGS, MONT.

Mr. KELLEHER. Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf. Senator Metcalf has just pointed out, I think, this is probably the most nonpartisan issue in the State of Montana. I would like to recommend the reservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as a permanent legal wilderness under the Wilderness Act. I feel that it is definitely in the public interest for the people of the State of Montana and of the United States. Various pressures by the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of the Budget, and economic interest groups have opposed this reservation while national and Montana conservation organizations have strongly approved of it as a wise conservation measure. I definitely support the position of the conservations organizations. Potential Federal wildernesses, such as the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, make up about 2 percent of the United States. If action is not taken to preserve this wilderness, it will rapidly disappear to the loss of living as well as future generations of Americans.

Wilderness is a valid use of our public lands. I believe that the reservation of relatively small portions of wilderness on our public lands, such as the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, would serve to balance out the picture. Also I believe that we are not that poor or shallow as a people that we cannot preserve areas of our wilderness heritage which have contributed so much to the spirit and life of America, particularly for future Americans.

However, there is opposition to the permanent reservation of wilderness from factions who stand to benefit both economically and politically and who are without concern for the general public interest. These factions are in general opposed to the public ownership of public lands, and in particular to the setting aside of wilderness.

When I first came to Montana in 1952 it was as Assistant Regional Counsel for the Bureau of Land Management down in Billings, Mont., and I believe we covered at that time a seven-State area. That was at the beginning of the Eisenhower and Nixon administration, Mr. Chairman. I recall at that time that there was a definite policy of the administration to dispose of public lands, put them into private ownership. The argument was if we put the public domain on a county tax roll, that the counties in the States would benefit in the revenue they would receive from the plan. However, it is my best recollection, I think in 1953 and 1954, at that time I believe the Bureau of Land Management was returning something like $64 million into the public treasury. Of course, as the chairman knows, and Senator Metcalf, this money is returned, very much of it, to the States. Money that is obtained from grazing and oil and from the sale of timberlands.

But this past spring our own Governor, Governor Babcock, and recently Wyoming Governor Hathaway, have come out for disposal of public domain. To this I am violently opposed. A general argument for the above actions is that the public lands do not contribute to the tax base of the State they are in.

Not only does the Federal Government pay money back to the States, but it brings in a great deal of tourism. Tourism is very important, not just Lincoln Wilderness area, but all of our national parks in the State of Montana.

On September 19, 1964, the Congress set up the Public Land Law Review Commission, and very unfortunately this law provided not only that it is a policy of the Congress that the public lands of the United States shall be retained and managed, but disposed of, all in a manner to provide the maximum benefit for the general public. This indicates to me that there is a very strong lobby in the Congress to dispose of all the public lands. Although Federal ownership of our lands is over 185 years old, it is quite possible for private ownership factions to remove them from public ownership.

Another thing that bothers me, Senate Burdick, is that once these public lands do go into private ownership that there will be huge "no trespassing" and "no hunting" signs across the State of Montana.

One of the fine things about the last several Congresses, Senator Burdick, is the wonderful amount of legislation your committee has passed in the areas of natural beauty and wilderness and recreation. I am sure that you will continue to keep up this splendid record in setting aside the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

Last night I discussed this matter with Dr. Dan Henning, of Eastern Montana College of Education, who already testified, and one of his young students came over to our home. He is currently on active duty with the Navy, Senate Burdick, and he hopes to get out this winter so he can start up his studies in conservation and natural resources at Eastern Montana College down in Billings. He hopes at least to get into the spring quarter. He wrote a letter addressed to Senator Metcalf, and signed by Harry S. Tregger, and with the permission of the Chair, I would like to have it introduced in the record.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection it will be received.

Mr. KELLEHER. Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. The next witness will be Mr. John LaGrange, Bear Creek Mining Co., Spokane, Wash. [No response.]

Is Mr. I. A. Wallace, of Great Falls, Mont., here?

STATEMENT OF L. A. "POLLY" WALLACE, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mr. WALLACE. Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Wallace, better known as Polly.

I might say first we went to Oklahoma in 1900, where I grew up, and went to college in Iowa. I homesteaded in Colorado. I came to this country quite a few years ago, into Montana, when I noticed a few years ago there was a tendency to put roads and all into the fringe of the Bob Marshall area, where our wildlife and a lot of our native country would be abused with the impact of vacationers.

During the last year I have spent some time in South Dakota, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Virginia, Maryland, Florida, and California discussing some of these facts with the populace there. I know the political impact that is thrown against all of our Congressmen and Senators to have all of this country opened up for the traveling public on wheels, as we do at present. I am in sympathy and in accord with

that, but I will give my statement here because I think it covers most of what I had in mind.

Thirty-one years ago two other men and I took 27 Boy Scouts into the "wilderness area" to Murphy's Flats, which is about 28 miles from Benchmark. Most of this was done on foot, since there were only about eight horses for the food and all of our gear, including what tents we had.

Since that time there has not been a year go by that I have not been in the back country somewhere; that country which is reached only on foot or horseback. During those years our paths have led into many different sections of that beautiful and romantic country, mostly along the Continental Divide.

To those who have never made a trip into the remote areas, there are thrills and beauty ahead for them, and to those who make these annual or oftener sojourns, to miss one trip would be giving up something of life which we do not want to give up. When one has spent a week or more away from town and into God's unspoiled country, he comes back to civilization with fond memories and a new vigor.

A rifle is not a must, though many of us go hunting in those remote wilds, nor do we have to have a fishing pole or a camera along, though they do help to make the trip more enjoyable and the memories a little more vivid. There is a feeling which one gets from these experiences that can be had in no other way; by living awhile with nature as our good Lord created it. I might add that I have kept in fairly close touch with practically all of those Boy Scouts whom we had with us so many years ago, and I do not know of a single one who has turned out "bad"; I can point to many of them as leaders and a credit to the communities where they live. My grandsons are starting to enjoy those experiences with encouragement from their father and myself.

When reading history and hearing of the vast areas of the world where voracious man has taken over at the expense of animals and vegetation, wherever he has gone, it makes a lover of nature really shudder. Many species of plants and animals have been completely obliterated from all over the world. When Lewis and Clark traveled through our fair country, they found grizzly bear, sheep, elk, and many other species of animals in the plains country but man has pushed them into the less accessible areas for their survival. When improperly approached, some of these animals can be fierce, as is proven each year in some of our national parks, they are fighting for survival.

There is a tremendous and ever increasing need for recreation for the masses of people within the United States and with motor travel as at present many people are seeking out-of-door vacations but this does not seem to indicate that there is any practical need for cutting up the virgin territories and making speedways through them to satisfy a few whims. When I visit friends and others in the Midwest and East and have them say how beautiful they think Montana is with our mountains and streams, then when they tell me they saw Glacier and Yellowstone Parks as well as the rest of Montana in the space of 3 days' time, I get chills. We seem to think that it is necessary to spend a week or more in order to see Scapegoat Mountain, Halfmoon Park, and the adjacent areas where the South Fork of the North Fork of the Sun River, Straight Creek, the Dearborn, and the North Fork of the Blackfoot have their origin. These are questions of values.

Many people come from far distant sections of the United States to spend a week or more in the wilder areas of Montana; on occasions, I have seen friends of 50 or more years in the primitive country and that is a thrill. The revenue which the State receives from these many people is more than can be realized from the logging operations that can be developed. There is not a great amount of merchantable timber in any of these areas in question. I judge this from having been a lumberman and studying quite a little forestry in school and having covered most of this country. There does not seem to be any sizable amount of mineral deposits in the area, or over the last 100 years of prospecting there would have been some evidences of profitable activity.

The Lincoln back country as described in bills S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 surely does seem to answer all of the definitions and requirements of a "wilderness area" as described in the Wilderness Act. Roads and trails wide enough to permit the use of jeeps, and so forth, will certainly begin the deterioration of this truly primitive country, the obliteration of the vegetation, fish, animals, and other components which were put there by God. It does not seem that it was the intention of our Maker to have this destruction in order to appease the appetites of a few persons who do not consider the future. Another series of incidents as occurred in 1967 will cause enough pressure by the populace to have them demand that all grizzly bears in the national parks be eliminated. That will be hard on the Members of the Congress to withstand. The grizzly is a savage beast, and he is only fighting for survival; why should he not be allowed to live in his own element?

I am informed that the wolverine is nearly extinct in most of the United States and the last I have seen have been the the Elbow Creek area. Golden and cutthroat trout cannot stand too heavy pressure which comes with the impact of man. Goats, sheep, moose, elk, and many other animals need protection from their greatest predator, man.

I surely trust that the Lord spares me a few more years of health and ambition to enjoy nature as he created it and that man is not allowed to thwart the opportunities for others to do the same. There are many other scenic and beautiful areas which can be developed as parks and playgrounds. I thank you very much, gentlemen.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

Next witness will be Mr. R. N. Witter, land supervisor of the Northern Pacific Railway, Seattle, Wash.

STATEMENT OF R. N. WITTER, LAND SUPERVISOR, TIMBER & WESTERN LANDS DIVISION, NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

Mr. WITTER. I am R. N. Witter, land supervisor, Timber & Western Lands Division, Northern Pacific Railway Co. The Northern Pacific presents this statement, No. 1, as a landowner inside of the wilderness proposal described in S. 1121, and No. 2, as a major landowner involved with all facets of resource, management, including grazing, cultivation, recreation, industrial development, forestry, and minerals, and No. 3, as a major railroad to which forest products represent approximately one-third of all car loadings. In the wilderness planning field, the Northern Pacific developed long-range land consolidation plans in cooperation with the Forest Service several years ago. These plans considered areas where public and/or company lands should be

designated "wilderness" in the Forest Service's viewpoint, and further provided that where company lands were so designated that they be exchanged into public ownership. Company ownership in Yellowstone National Park, the Spanish Peaks, the Selway Bitterroot, Mission Mountains, Alpine Lakes, and Spirit Lake areas were so classified and are under active exchange programs. The Lincoln back country, covered by S. 1121, is not recommended for wilderness designation in current Forest Service plans, nor has the Government requested Northern Pacific to exchange its ownership. A current comprehensive study by the Forest Service of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area inventoried all resources, including those covered by S. 1121. It suggests a coordinated management plan, wherein recreation, including the nonroaded wilderness type, would be a primary management objective for the study area. It does not recommend legislative classification for any of the area. I suggest that the Forest Service study be made a part of this hearing record.

Senator METCALF. That study has already been testified to, and an overlay submitted by Congress Battin.

Mr. WITTER. It is my understanding that that is the preliminary draft of a more comprehensive study which is being completed at this time as a result of some 2 or 3 years of work on the part of the Forest Service prior to this hearing.

Senator BURDICK. No doubt it will be ready by the time we have the Washington hearing, and will be available.

Mr. WITTER. I believe that is correct. That is my understanding.

Senator BURDICK. If it is available at that time.

Mr. WITTER. That is my understanding.

No matter how cold reality is, I must profess bewilderment at the general rejection of professional land managers' recommendations in of massive preservation. Preservationists have emotionally incited distrust of the professional land managers' ability to zone and manage lands under the Multiple-Use Act in balance with public needs. The Forest Service has a commendable record of identifying and preserving suitable wilderness areas. The fact is that the Forest Service set primitive and limited areas aside from physical development and has subsequently proceeded diligently with their reclassification and recreation management programs. Now, preservationists, feeling they won this victory, have turned with renewed vigor to setting aside more and more acres. Acreage alone is no substitute for quality and balanced land use management. Considering balance, one must keep in mind that wilderness use represents less than 1 percent of all man user-days for recreational purposes on Federal land and that the average wilderness user is well above the average American in income, education, and available leisure time. He is a small, but privileged, part of the outdoor recreationists in our affluent society. I am a part of this group because of my recreational pursuits, but I am not able, as a professional land manager, to recommend significantly increasing that proportion of Federal land dedicated exclusively to wilderness use or further buffering the perimeter of existing areas. This would decrease the recreational opportunities for the other 99 percent of the American public.

As to the need for additional wilderness dedication, the record should show that there are 1,519,815 acres of national forest land set aside exclusively for wilderness within a 100-mile radius of the Lin-

coln back country and an additional 631,000 acres under consideration for addition to the wilderness system in region 1. Approximately 32 percent of the national forest area within the 100-mile radius is dedicated to wilderness without the Lincoln back country.

As you recognize by this time, I do not believe that dedicating the Lincoln back country as a wilderness area is a debate between commercial and recreational interests. It is a debate about whether resources, including recreation in all its facets, will be developed for 99 percent or 1 percent of our society. It is an important fact that this 1 percent already has over 12 percent of the national forest area in region 1 set aside for its exclusive use. I suggest that their pressure and numbers are relative to affluence rather than to their true relationship with the total public use of the forest. The Forest Service Blackfoot-Sun River Divide study shows that many times greater public benefits can be attained for all users under balanced development of the area. The Forest Service preliminary plan provides for intensive recreational development of the area, including a scenic highway connection between the Blackfoot River and the Sun River Basins. This road is unique in Federal recreation plans and would provide access development to the high country via a paved road for the general public. The Forest Service program does a commendable job of protecting the overall resources and initiating a flow of general public services from this stagnant area. The Forest Service plan is dynamic; that is, it can adjust to meet the challenge of changing public needs and improved resource management technology.

In contrast, unnecessary legislative dedication of land to limited use will restrict public land managers of the future from maximizing legitimate public objective made possible from improved technology. The record of the Forest Service deserves our continued trust in its ability to manage public lands with the public's interest as its primary objective under the Multiple-Use Act.

When comparing recreation as a resource and as an industry to other resources, it is important to remember that extractive resources create wealth at the bottom of an inverted pyramid in the economic system which multiplies throughout the economy. At the end, those of us who have an extra dollar recreate. A healthy and conservation minded extractive resource economy, that is, farming, ranching, timbering, mining, and fishing, are the only creative forces in any economy and the essential element to people in their struggle for a stable life.

In summary, the Northern Pacific Railway opposes S. 1121, the dedication of the Lincoln back country exclusively to wilderness, and opposes the inclusion of Northern Pacific land. The company believes that the Forest Service has, after years of study, recommended a multiple-use management plan for the area which will produce the optimum potential for the greatest number of people over the longest run. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Witter, were you in the hearing room when Congressman Battin testified?

Mr. WITTER. Yes, I was.

Senator BURDICK. Could you hear back there?

Mr. WITTER. Not very well.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Battin presented an overlay which showed this original study which began with 500,000 acres, was reduced to

240,500 acres which is now embraced in the bill. That is not the 500,000 acres.

Mr. WITTER. I understand that, Senator. Contrary to testimony which has been made here today, as a resource land manager I feel that the study of an area more inclusive in size more nearly exposes its potential to the general public. And in fact the lesser area proposed pretty well blocks the main part, as I see it, of the advantages that the Forest Service proposes to devise through their scenic road system for recreation for the larger public.

Senator BURDICK. I have the impression that the rugged area, the wild area, is a less productive area as far as lumber was concerned, whereas the more productive areas were eliminated. That was the impression I got.

Mr. WITTER. I believe the rest of the gentlemen would agree, probably, with the same point I will have to make in all honesty to you. I don't believe any of us here, with the exception of the Forest Service, which has done on-the-ground inventory work, can be very definitive as to the amounts of the various resources inside of either the area of the bill or the area of the Forest Service study. But notwithstanding that, I noticed this morning that, I believe it was Mr. Garland stated he thought the resources themselves were distributed roughly 50–50. If that is true, the point you make is relatively balanced.

Senator BURDICK. I don't recall what his testimony was, but I wanted to make the record clear.

Mr. WITTER. I recall that, I wrote a note on it.

Senator BURDICK. The present bill reduces the acreage is all I know.

Mr. WITTER. But I think that the emphasis I am trying to put on this is that the Forest Service program is primarily a recreational development program when you read it carefully. It is not primarily an extractive resource program. It proposes, among other things, development of a scenic road. Not a highway, not a 60-mile-an-hour highway. In fact, it goes to great lengths to explain that is not a 60-mile-an-hour highway. The whole idea is to get people closer to two things: the Bob Marshall for its heavier use, because it is not being used very heavily, and secondly, to get people who can only drive on a road in terms of their mobility or their leisure time, their affluence or their physical characteristics, up into the high country so they can see some of it, too. The real point of the Forest Service program is recreational development. That is the point I am trying to make here. Relative to the amount of land dedicated already under legislative status in Montana, the Forest Service is trying to consider these people in the management of their program.

Senator BURDICK. You can be sure the committee will carefully go over the reports, the ones that are filed and the ones to be filed.

Mr. WITTER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Witter, I want to compliment you on your testimony. It is to the point on this hearing, and I want to call my constitutents' attention as they testify—and time is running out on us—that this committee, the Senate Interior Committee, is the committee that just passed the redwoods bill. We are the committee that acted two or three times before the House acted and worked on the wilderness legislation. We are aware of the needs for recreation in the United States, and recreational development.

The question here was very succinctly put in Governor Babcock's statement when he said there are other beneficial uses. The question is whether or not we are going to sacrifice some of these other uses to make this a higher use of the wilderness and wilderness alone. And Mr. Witter has testified to that.

I want to call your attention that it has been said the wilderness user is well above the average American in income, and so forth, and this is a very privileged use, only for the affluent or people who are able to hike into a wilderness area. But isn't that the argument that all of you people brought back to us against any wilderness legislation?

Mr. WITTER. I believe that the argument that the people who were opposed to the wilderness bill were trying to make was that things should be in balance. There were a lot of terms that got to be catch phrases, and a lot of them misinterpreted. But I believe the point was made that relative to total public use, and I don't mean extractive use, but to total public use the acreages which were dedicated, being classified correctly and so forth, so the quality was here and there where it belongs, that it should be in balance with the use. I think this was the point people were trying to make.

Senator METCALF. I sat through many hours on hearings on wilderness legislation, and time after time people came in and said, "You are just giving a higher and privileged and special use to people and violating the multiple-use concept." I voted for the multiple-use bill. I believe I was one of the cosponsors of it. I believe in multiple use. I also believe that where there is a mining use, for example, which destroys the scenic value, destroys the recreation, if it is a necessary resource, that single use should be singled out. I believe that many areas should be logged off and timbered, and that sometimes, too, is a single use and destroys recreation. So the point we are trying to get here is just the point you directed your testimony to.

Whether the special quality of this area, the fragility of its soil, subject to erosion, the fact there are all these endangered species back in that one area, would justify to Congress to incorporate it into the wilderness system. We are certainly going to take full cognizance of testimony such as yours, and testimony such as the Forest Service, because the Forest Service, as far as the Interior Committee is concerned, are experts in their own right in working these things out. But we don't always follow their advice. This is the purpose of this hearing. I think that you made a significant contribution. Thank you.

Mr. WITTER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator BURDICK. The next witness is Mr. Tom Edwards, Lincoln.

Senator METCALF. Senator Burdick, Tom Edwards is one of our oldest conservationists. He has the Whitetail Ranch that you would have had a privilege to visit if you would stay here tomorrow. We would show you some colored slides. He has been a leader on conservation ever since I can remember.

When I went back to Congress, he was one of the men, or guides, that I followed in those early days. I am sure that his personal experiences here will be of great value to us.

Tom, my wife and I always appreciate those colorful cards you send us every Christmas. We look forward to having them for another half century.

STATEMENT OF TOM EDWARDS, LINCOLN, OWNER OF THE WHITETAIL RANCH

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you. Thank you, gentlemen.

May I preface the few remarks that I have to say by saying that I am not going to take up a lot of your time. I feel that there is one crux of this whole thing regardless of who is talking—one crux. I have seen it coming for years and years. That is mass recreation versus quality recreation.

In the particular instance may I say that among my dearest friends are the Forest Service. I think no citizens that are a part of the Federal agency have done more to earn their money than the Forest Service. But I think in this particular instance they are off base when they have brought into the Lincoln back country not the threat to us conservationists of the lumber or the threat of mining, Lord knows there is only a little bit in the south half. I stood with Dr. Dies a few years ago on that Lewis overthrust and he said, "There is the greatest desert for mining people in the world." But the threat to us fellows, and my livelihood, and this morning I am making this for the outfitter, this morning I am here only as a lone outfitter, but the greatest threat is at this time the Forest Service has seen fit to inject into this whole picture a thing that was not talked of when we had our hearing some years ago in Lincoln. That is that mass recreation is more important in this particular area than quality recreation.

Without belaboring the point, may I go ahead with my statement?

I am Tom Edwards, of Ovando, Mont. I have owned and operated the White Tail Ranch continuously since 1937. My sole income comes from outfitting into the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country and the Bob Marshall Wilderness areas. For over a quarter of a century I have virtually lived in these areas, especially the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country, from Decoration Day to Thanksgiving. I have been privileged to take guests from all over the United States and some from foreign lands into every crook and cranny of this marvelous wilderness. I love the high country and alpine meadows with a passion—it restores my soul and into this land of spiritual strength I have been privileged to guide over the years literally thousands of people, the old, many past 70, the young, the poor, the rich, the great, and small people like myself. I have harvested a resource of the forest of post importance. No one word will suffice but to explain this resource let us call it the "hush" of the land.

Fishing and hunting are superb, but this resource is not by any means the resource from which I gain my livelihood. Hunting and fishing may disappear from the land, but the "hush" will remain as an honest-to-God sustained yield resource unless the land is disturbed by man-made devices with its so-called progress and civilization. I take parties frequently into the great Chinese Wall country and the alps of the Flathead—the heart of the Bob Marshall Wilderness. I take the same people under the East Face and South Face and on top of Scapegoat, and I've heard them exclaim over and over, "This is the greatest wilderness of all." This is to say nothing of the importance of peaceful valleys, of lakes and streams, a perfect retreat for hiker and walking family groups. This gives high quality recreation of the first order.

First I wish to speak for the outfitters of this area who use the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country to make a living. There are 20 of us. I took the trouble and expense to contact these outfitters and found the gross income to be around $125,000. It is a common rule for us to know that these guests whom we take into this wilderness spend as much with outside businesses in Montana as they do with us. Thus safely I can say a quarter of a million dollar industry is at stake with the passage of these two bills. Montana wants industries—many agencies and cities give bonuses and financial inducements to have business start up in Montana. The Forest Service itself builds first class roads like the one up the Northfork of the Blackfoot to help the logger. The outfitter only wants to operate with as little financial help from the Government as possible. In fact, I believe the outfitter over the years pays his way and more in the trails he builds and maintains himself in the Lincoln back country. Remember, we, as outfitters, pay "through the nose" stiff fees for grazing permits, and special use camp grounds. Next year, if the present Forest Service plan goes through, my bill will amount to over $600.

While the proposed management plan of the Forest Service states that their plan will aid the outfitter, every outfitter in this wonderful back country knows that a highway up the North Fork, up Dry Creek to the door of the Danaher, up Dwight, and to the northeast up Cabin Creek to the very wall of Scapegoat simply means the end for outfitting as we know it. For the day rides and riding academy type of recreation, yes, perhaps, but certainly not for the high quality wilderness experience that now is expanding by leaps and bounds by not only the wilderness riders but also the back packers, the family hikers.

But in considering these bills, from my point of view anyway, it is selfish and unwise in the long run to consider the outfitter, for truly he is only a vehicle in the scheme of harvesting this wilderness resource. The real person who uses this resource and pays the bill is the public, the people he takes into this area. And what are these people buying—is it fishing and hunting? A thousand times no. I would have gone broke years ago if it had. As I said before, they are buying the "hush" of the land. I had three trips last summer, among many others, of approximately 20 in each ride. These totaled 34 days. There was a total of less than a dozen fishing rods used. These people were having very deep soul satisfying experience of finding their relationship with living things and the eternal mountains, a way of life, the fulfillment of knowing themselves better. It's a feeling of joining in with the ancients of the Bible who said "I will lift mine eyes to the hills from whence cometh my strength." Don't be fooled—these wilderness experiences are a far, far cry from what the Montana tree farmers call a "wilderness," a "playground for the rich." The hush, the serenity, the tranquility of a wilderness, the outfitters know and realize their terrific value. With the proposed road system of the Forest Service, there will be no Lincoln "back country." That back country, a magic word to thousands of people for the past many, many years, will be gone forever. The "hush," believe me, will depart from the land.

I know the plan well. I've read it and discussed it with its authors and proponents. They sincerely feel that "islands of wilderness" can be kept unsullied and undamaged. How can you stand on that great Scapegoat Mountain looking down at its foot at bulldozers, trucks and

cars, at the head of the Dry Fork, Cabin Creek, and Tobacco Valley, listening to the hideous noises of modern devices and kid yourselves that you are enjoying the wilderness and partaking of its goodness?

The opponents of these bills frequently use as a justification the multiple-use rule of the Forest Service. I like to use it also, but I like to use it in its entirety. It states, "the greatest good to the greatest number." Apply it to the field of Lincoln back country recreation. We have this mathematical formula greatest good $\times$ greatest number = units of recreation. Thus we readily see that if the good is large, then the number can be small and come out with the same units or value of recreation, $2\times4=8$, true, but 4×2 is also 8. I contend, the greatest good is so great in this magnificant wilderness to those who visit it that their numbers do not need to be so great to produce the same or greater amount of recreational value.

I also wish to represent an unseen audience that knows this very land well indeed. They are scattered all over the United States. They are not select people, they are plain American people who are doers of important work in our country: Around countless campfires they have requested me to represent them when and if the time ever came to save the Lincoln Scapegoat back country. From my file of a thousand or 1,500 names I selected around 400 and wrote to them of this hearing. The response overwhelmed me. The statements I have to present for them, each different, are so many that I was compelled to spend a couple of days categorizing them, and selecting perhaps a dozen or two which I sincerely hope will be placed on record and if at all possible the balance of these informative and sincere statements be placed on permanent file.

Honorable Members of Congress, if I may have 6 minutes more I would be glad to present and read a few representative statements from these people. Would you be interested in hearing them, or is our time up?

Senator BURDICK. I think the statements will speak for themselves.

Mr. EDWARDS. OK.

Senator BURDICK. They may be received and made a part of the record.

Willis M. Johns, chief of the geological division, Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology.

STATEMENT OF WILLIS M. JOHNS, CHIEF OF GEOLOGICAL DIVISION, MONTANA BUREAU OF MINES AND GEOLOGY, BUTTE, MONT.

Mr. JOHNS. I am Willis M. Johns, chief of the geological division, Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology, Butte, Mont. I am here on behalf of the bureau to testify regarding the inclusion of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area into the Bob Marshall Wilderness area as proposed. My statements and remarks are essentially concerned with the mineral potential of the area. I am an employee of a State public service agency established by law in 1919 to promote efficient development of Montana's mineral resources, including metals, nonmetals, coal, oil, gas, and water supply. The Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology is vitally concerned with anything that affects the future mineral resource development of the State, particularly when within the next several decades our Nation will be faced with de-

creasing mineral production and increasing demand from an expanding population that enjoys the highest standard of living in the world.

Within the southwest part of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area and near Mineral Hill are located the Klondike and Porto Rico mines, and 4 miles southeast of Red Mountain is Cotters mine and other properties developed primarily for copper and gold.

Senator BURDICK. May I interrupt? Will somebody who knows the area get a pointer or pencil and identify some of these?

(Whereupon, Mr. Cecil Garland designated the areas on the map to the committee.)

Mr. JOHNS. Production statistics were not determined for these properties. Placer gold deposits on Lincoln, Beaver, Stonewall, Liverpool, Keep Cool, and Seven-Up-Pete Creeks are peripheral to the south boundary of the proposed addition to the Bob Marshall Wilderness area, but the placer gold deposits in most of these drainages are believed to be derived from gold-bearing quartz lodes in the southern part of the proposed area (Red Mountain and vicinity). Lyden (Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology Mem. 26) reported about $7,025,000 of placer gold recovered from operations in Lincoln and Stonewall Creeks. Production figures from the other four drainages are not available but it is believed to be substantial.

Considering that the total placer-gold production from the peripheral area north of Lincoln exceeded $7 million and that this production is believed to be derived from Red Mountain and adjacent areas within the south confines of the proposed wilderness area, together with the exploration of a disseminated copper deposit by Bear Creek Mining Co. on Copper Creek and impending production from The Anaconda Co.'s development in the Heddleston district just southeast of the area, the mineral potential here is sufficient to justify the request that this part of the proposed addition be excluded, especially in view of the current critical gold situation. We need gold. This area proposed for exclusion is the area in townships 15 and 16 N., from the eastern border of the Blackfoot-Sun River area west to the North Fork Blackfoot River.

In the U.S. Forest Service report titled "Patterns for Management, Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area," hereafter referred to as the Blackfoot-Sun River report, a statement concerning minerals is as follows:

> Mineral occurrences are present but their extent and value are not generally known. Prospect drilling recently completed may reveal commercial deposits in the Mineral Creek, Red Mountain, Bugle Mountain, and Alice Creek areas.

About 8 miles southeast of the southeast corner of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area is the Heddleston district, where a large porphyry molybdenum-copper deposit is being explored. The possibility for the occurrence of similar deposits in the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area should be given very careful consideration, especially in view of Bear Creek's findings in Copper Canyon.

Melville R. Mudge and associates, of the U.S. Geological Survey, completed a reconnaissance survey of the southeastern Lewis and Clark Range during 1964–66, and during this investigation they used geological mapping and geochemical and geophysical methods to outline the South Fork thrust zone, within which are prospect areas that show anomalous amounts of lead and zinc. The width of the thrust zone

ranges from one-half mile to 3 miles, and trends from the junction of Falls Creek and the Dearborn River (east-central part of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area) northwesterly for a distance of 29 miles (to near the junction of the Sun River and the West Fork South Fork tributary). Anomalous metal values were determined in T. 18 N, R. 7 W.; NE¼ T. 18 N, R. 8 W.; SE¼ T. 19 N., R. 9 W., and in a zone extending from the southeast to the northwest corner of T. 20N., R. 10 W. In the U.S. Geological Survey 1967 open-file report by M. R. Mudge and associates, titled "Reconnaissance Geologic, Geochemical, and Geophysical Studies of the Southeastern Part of the Lewis and Clark Range, Montana," Mudge delineated a narrow northwest-trending belt about 30 miles long of lead-zinc mineralization. The distribution of prospects having anomalous amounts of lead and zinc seems to be spatially related to and controlled by the northwestward-striking South Fork thrust zone. All samples within the belt, however, contain anomalous amounts of lead and zinc.

In the final paragraph of the report, Mudge states,

> In conclusion, it seems worthwhile to review two of the many areas in this belt that may merit future exploration: (1) The area of the Wood Creek prospect. The float piece of stromatolite comprising 6 percent zinc and the 100 feet of soil samples containing anomalous amounts of metals indicate that the upper part of the Helena (Formation) contains anomalous amounts of lead and zinc. This upper part, about 550 feet thick, consists of dolomite beds with abundant stromatolites, especially in the upper one-third of the formation. Here almost all the Helena is concealed by dense forest and relatively thick soil. (2) The Elk Creek area, where the Devonial rocks may warrant deeper prospecting. There the badly fractured rocks are in a tight overturned fold. Prospecting at depth in the fold would penetrate fractured Cambrian carbonates, which should be equally good hosts for mineralization.

On the basis of this U.S. Geological Survey work and conclusions, it is requested that the N½, T. 18 N., R. 8 W.; T. 19 N., R. 9 W.; NE corner 19 N., R 10 W.; T. 20 N., R. 10 W., and the SW corner T. 21 N., R. 10 W., be excluded from the proposed addition to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

In support of the statement made in the introduction of this testimony concerning increasing demand and decreasing mineral production over the next several decades, I would like to quote from testimony given on March 21, 1968, by Dr. W. R. Hibbard before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Senator METCALF. You are quoting ourselves to us. This is the Senate Interior Committee to which Senator Burdick and I both belong. Go ahead.

Mr. JOHNS. Portions of his statement follow:

> I [Dr. Hibbard] appear before you today as your minerals adviser. My purpose is to draw your attention to a situation that is emerging which appears to threaten both the adequacy and dependability of our supply of minerals and mineral fuels. This conclusion has resulted from a long-range study which I initiated a year ago * * *.
>
> Our projections based on population growth indicate that by 1985 our mineral and fuel requirements will increase by about 50 percent on the average, and in some cases by as much as 100 percent * * *. Our capability to produce minerals from domestic sources may not only remain static but in some cases disappear.

Dr. Hibbard places new technological advances in the minerals and fuels industry as most important to meet our Nation's increasing

mineral demands in the future. In addition to technological advances, however, I believe that we must continue to practice the multiple-use concept and not withdraw from mineral exploration and development large acreages of the public domain that have potential mineral resources. Any one withdrawal certainly will not create a serious threat to the economy of the country 20 or 30 years from now, but an accumulation of land withdrawals with restrictions on, or the elimination of, prospecting certainly can have a deleterious effect on future domestic mineral production.

A report published by the U.S. Department of Interior, titled "Public Land Statistics 1966," gives the acreage of federally owned U.S. Forest Service land in Montana as approximately 16½ million acres. There are presently nine wilderness or proposed wilderness areas in western Montana. The area and acreage are as follows:

Name:	*Acres*
Absaroka	64,000
Anaconda-Pintlar	159,086
Beartooth	230,000
Bob Marshall	950,000
Cabin Mountains	94,272
Gates of the Mountains	28,562
Mission Mountains	75,500
Selway-Bitterroot	254,480
Spanish Peaks	50,000
Total	1,901,628

The addition of one-half million acres to the Bob Marshall Wilderness would bring the total acreage to approximately 2½ million, roughly 15 percent, or more than one-seventh of the total Forest Service land in the State. These figures would increase if additional acreage for the Absaroka and Beartooth areas, soon to be submitted for reclassification, is requested and approved.

In the U.S. Forest Service Blackfoot-Sun River report, the alternative possibilities for management of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area are (1) wilderness classification, and (2) coordinated resource management of the entire study area. The second alternative—coordinated resource management of the entire study area—would permit two scenic drives with short spur roads to camping facilities to be built through the area, managed logging operations in the lower timbered country, and snowmobile access and ski resort development in the higher country when this becomes desirable. It would permit development of the mineral resources in the study area.

The following statement is quoted from the Blackfoot-Sun River report:

> Adding another half million acres to the Bob Marshall Wilderness, already close to 1,000,000 acres, would not appreciably increase its wilderness character or its usability.

Because the addition of this acreage would place restrictions on mineral exploration and development and preclude the staking of mining claims after 1983, the Bureau is against the inclusion of this one-half million acres in the Bob Marshall Wilderness area, particularly the areas having substantial mineral potential.

Senator METCALF. I want to emphasize, if I may, Senator Burdick.

Senator BURDICK. Proceed.

Senator METCALF. I want to emphasize that last statement. Passage of this legislation would include this area as other wilderness areas, subject to the current Wilderness Act, and it would be open to mining exploration until 1983.

Mr. JOHNS. Yes, I understand that.

Senator METCALF. And it would be just as other primitive areas, and so forth, that have not yet been classified and acted upon by Congress. The passage of this bill will not alter the opportunity to explore, except by certain methods, for minerals until 1983.

Mr. JOHNS. Yes.

Senator BURDICK. Just a minute. I would like to ask a question. A former witness testified as follows on a subject you dealt with:

> Once an area is designated as wilderness, it is still susceptible to future development should the situation need it in the years to come.

There was nothing destroyed in the present wilderness, it was just locked up in a safe. It isn't gone; is that right?

Mr. JOHNS. Yes.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. LaGrange, I believe, is here now, of the Bear Creek Mining Co., Spokane.

STATEMENT OF JOHN LaGRANGE, BEAR CREEK MINING CO., SPOKANE, WASH.

Mr. LAGRANGE. I am Don LaGrange, senior geologist and land man, and speaking on behalf of Bear Creek Mining Co., which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Kennecott Copper Co.

The pending proposal to establish a wilderness in the Lincoln back country essentially eliminates any practical exploration or development of mineral resources in the area affected.

Senator METCALF. Now, wait a minute. The mining companies and the mining officials were before the committee before Congress in working out the Wilderness Act. A compromise was effected that I discussed with the previous witness, Mr. Johns, that wilderness areas would be opened for exploration until 1983. Maybe you are going into that. There are certain types of exploration that are not permitted in these wilderness areas. But that statement is not an accurate statement, "essentially eliminates any practical exploration."

Mr. LAGRANGE. I would like to say this for our purposes as a modern exploration company, we do not look to wilderness areas because of the stringent restrictions on motorized equipment and access, and for modern exploration it is not a feasible situation to explore the wilderness. This is why I made that statement.

Bear Creek Mining Co. opposes all such proposals and suggests that instead the area be left under multiple-use management supervised by the U.S. Forest Service.

A great deal of concern has been directed toward the ultimate problem of production of sufficient renewable crops to feed peoples of the United States. To date, the country has been eminently successful in this regard and has remained self-sufficient in feeding its peoples. The people and the Government of the United States have not shown the same concern for a continuing supply of mineral resources, without which the economy of the country would rapidly decline or be maintained only by importing raw materials from potentially unreliable foreign sources.

At the present time, the United States is by far the largest consumer of mineral resources of all the nations in the world, in many instances consuming one-third to one-half the world production of certain minerals. The United States has never been totally self-sufficient in its production of minerals, but the situation has never been as unfavorable in the past as it is at the present time. With the exception of coal and one or two metals, the United States is a net importer of most mineral commodities used in our industrial complex. The U.S. Bureau of Mines predicted that the mineral and fuel requirements of the United States will increase 50 to 100 percent in the next 15 years, making this situation even more critical.

Mineral deposits, by their nature, are nonrenewable and are highly restricted in the area of occurrence. Once mined out, they are gone forever. Established mining areas are, and will continue to decline in productive capacity. The search for new mineral deposits is thus moving to new areas where previous production is or has been minor or nonexistent. The proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness is one such area.

Mineral exploration has reached a high degree of sophistication, eliminating many of the poor conservation and restoration practices which prevailed 50 to 100 years ago. Vast areas must be explored in detail, in many instances for many years, in order to discover the isolated tracts of land which bear the requisite concentration of minerals. In most cases, these discoveries will be based upon what is considered uneconomic mineralization today. These undiscovered deposits will undoubtedly be the principal source of metals produced in this country in the future. If we are to maintain domestic sources of metals and avoid becoming unduly dependent upon imported metals to support our industrial complex, it is essential that sufficient lands be, and remain, available over long periods of time for mineral exploration and development by private industry. Exclusion of access to public domain where mineralization is present is comparable to restricting the use of fertile land for growing crops. The land held by the U.S. Government in its various capacities, represents the principal resource of the mining industry in its attempt to maintain sufficient domestic output of metals. It must be stated categorically at this point that the mining industry has to have access to a maximum amount of public land for exploration, development, and exploitation of mineral deposits which may be discovered, and it must have such access under conditions which will attract the large amounts of risk capital necessary to explore for, and produce, metalliferous minerals.

Bear Creek has spent considerable effort in reconnaissance exploration and drilling in the area now proposed as the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness. It presently has unpatented lode claims in the area. Industry and the U.S. Government has shown that the area has potential for mineral production. The U.S. Geological Survey has conducted geologic, geochemical, and geophysical studies in parts of the area. The results of this work are available in USGS Montana Open File Report No. 58. This work has shown several anomalous geochemical conditions and a large untested geophysical anomaly heretofore unknown. Further investigations into the potential of the area have been recommended by industry and government. Under the Forest Service plan of development, these recommendations can be fulfilled.

It is submitted that our natural resources can be best conserved for the greatest numbers of our public, not by locking them up in a

national wilderness, but by using them in a well-managed multiple-use program under the direction of the U.S. Forest Service.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you very much for your contribution.

Senator METCALF. Is the Bear Creek Mining Co., or the Kennecott Mining Co., conducting any exploration in the area at this time?

Mr. LAGRANGE. Not at this moment.

Senator METCALF. What is your understanding of a "trail use area" such as this is at the present time, and the difference between that and a wilderness area?

Mr. LAGRANGE. I don't know what the restrictions on this would be.

Senator METCALF. Can you go in there now?

Mr. LAGRANGE. Yes, we can.

Senator METCALF. And you can explore?

Mr. LAGRANGE. Yes, we can.

Senator METCALF. And you haven't done any of the exploration on the basis of these reports you made?

Mr. LAGRANGE. Oh, yes, we have.

Senator METCALF. I thought you weren't conducting any?

Mr. LAGRANGE. Right at this moment, today, we are not.

Senator METCALF. I mean in the general period of time, in the last few years?

Mr. LAGRANGE. Oh, yes. Last year and the year before we did exploration drilling, supported by helicopters in order not to drive a road into the area, and keep within its present state. We drilled several holes, and are presently still evaluating this information. We still consider that the area has potential for further exploration.

Senator METCALF. And you feel that if it were given wilderness status, you would be so handicapped in the use of these same methods of exploration that you would give up on exploration, or you wouldn't continue it?

Mr. LAGRANGE. We wouldn't be as inclined to look there as we would in open public domain where there wasn't wilderness. We would be inclined not to put as much effort in exploration in this area as other places, because of restrictions.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. Robert Patton, of Spokane.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT H. PATTON, SPOKANE, WASH.

Mr. PATTON. Senator Metcalf and Senator Burdick, I want to thank you very much for the opportunity to appear. I hope the absence of my placard on the vest does not indicate any preordained idea that I am not for wilderness, because believe me that is not it.

I am Robert H. Patton and I happen to live in Spokane, Wash., at the moment. I am a graduate forester from the University of Montana, and I should say right now that I am employed as a staff forester for the Western Forest Industries Association, but I appear before you today as a private citizen concerned about implication other than forestry and timber supply.

Senator METCALF. The members of the Western Forest Industries Association are not interested in logging or timbering this area?

Mr. PATTON. I would not make that statement, Senator Metcalf. I think some of them individually are.

Senator METCALF. Some of them will be interested?

Mr. PATTON. Yes, definitely.

Senator METCALF. And if they were interested, then you, in your official capacity, would be working to help them officially?

Mr. PATTON. By all means. I do want to suggest that I may have some credentials that may help to define my interest in other areas than timber supply and forestry.

You will hear or have heard already from a sufficient number of people who can emphasize the economic implications of timber supply in this area, and I am sure that their testimony is accurate and will receive consideration due it from your committee.

But now as to my credentials that may identify my other interests. I moved to Montana after World War II after carefully considering all the areas in the West where I really wanted to live. As most of you gentlemen know, a transplanted Montanan becomes most positive and jealous of the Treasure State in a great hurry. As John Steinbeck said in his book "Travels With Charlie," "I have a love affair going with the State of Montana." However, I found it impossible to remain in Montana due to lack of opportunity for gainful employment in my profession, so I settled in the nearest community where I could find such employment.

With that background, may I tell you about my credentials as a concerned citizen which occasioned my appearance before this committee today. During my years of residence in Montana I took every opportunity to enjoy the wide variety of wilderness areas in the State, and particularly the Bob Marshall wilderness which adjoins the area we are talking about today. Like most foresters, public or private, I took a busman's holiday at every opportunity and got back into the woods as far as I could go. During summer employment as a smoke jumper with the Forest Service I also had several opportunities to get into the Bob Marshall. I venture to say that I have spent as much time and probably more in these wilderness areas than any witness appearing here today. I hiked into the Bob Marshall on two occasions from the north up the south fork of the Flathead River, twice across Monture Pass, once across Pyramid Pass and once from the Sun River side. I have stood on the Chinese Wall and looked down and stood at the base of it looking up.

My great concern now is not for any suggested lack of opportunity for my children to enjoy these wilderness areas. They will have the same opportunity that I did, and they will likely find these areas in just about the same state as I found them 20 years ago. My concern is that I can no longer hike into these areas. I can no longer take the time required to either hike or pack into them, and I find myself in the strange position of wishing to enjoy these areas as much as I ever did, but unable to capitalize on those wishes. The next best thing for me and for millions of people just like me is to be able to get as close as possible as quickly as possible and enjoy the fringe areas.

I fully believe that the Forest Service proposal for the Lincoln back country would allow me to do this better than the inclusion of the area into a million acre existing wilderness, which, realistically, I am precluded from enjoying as I did in the past. There may be some shortcomings in the Forest Service proposal. Undoubtedly there

are. I certainly am no judge of the merit—or lack of it—of the proposed scenic highway through the area. I do know that the access provided in the Forest Service proposal is the only way I can realistically hope to enjoy the Lincoln back country in the future, and I feel strongly about my right to enjoy this area. I think it behooves this committee to give most serious consideration to the needs of myself and millions of people just like me who would fight anyone who derides our love of wilderness areas, but just cannot logically find the opportunity to enjoy these areas. We need these fringe areas as badly or probably more so as those who enjoy the opportunities I did 20 years ago need the wilderness areas. It seems to me this committee should analyze the needs of those like me, and the opportunities available to us to enjoy near wilderness, and compare them with the numbers who actually can enjoy true wilderness and the vast areas already available to them. When such an analysis is made, and I certainly hope that it is, I think it will be obvious to this committee that the Lincoln back country and other similar areas should be developed for multiple use, and that my particular use is just as important as that of the rare person who has the opportunity to get into the wilderness.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify.

Senator BURDICK. I just have one question. Do you really think if this area is opened up, your children and your grandchildren will see the same country you saw?

Mr. PATTON. Senator Burdick, I think very much so as far as the Bob Marshall, the existing wilderness, the million acres. Yes; I do, sir.

Senator METCALF. I think it was Congressman Battin in his testimony who pointed out that while many of us—and you have expressed much of the problem that I, too, have—stay around in Washington, every time I come out here to Montana I think, "You must have holes in your head to work so hard to get to Washington when you can live in such a wonderful State as we have here." But Congressman Battin says nobody will be able to enjoy this wilderness experience if we open it up to bulldozers and logging trucks and mining machinery. Nobody will have that experience that you had as a young man when you could hike 20 miles through the wilderness area. Our problem here today, as you have described it, is to ascertain whether or not this area is of wilderness value that should be set aside and saved; that is of such fragility that it is not susceptible to the kind of mass recreation that you suggest that we need. Believe me, this committee knows better than any group of people in America how badly we need vast recreational use where we can drive and have an afternoon picnic, where we can take our families on a weekend and such other benefits. But the allegations are continually made here today that this Lincoln Scapegoat Area is of such a nature that it couldn't survive that influx of weekend campers and Sunday afternoon picnickers. So in order to save the special and unique qualities that are alleged to be there, we have to set it aside as a wilderness. If the evidence shows and defends that there is that difference, wouldn't you suggest that this should be incorporated as a true wilderness and we look into some other areas of the national forest that are sturdier and more susceptible to the kind of use that you suggest?

Mr. PATTON. Possibly, Senator, my answer is selfish. And I think the interests of everybody testifying here are selfish to some degree.

Senator METCALF. I think there is some pretty biased and prejudiced testimony here.

Mr. PATTON. If I may comment on your question, Senator, I am looking at it in a little different context. I think the thrust of my statement is more to the effect that we have a million-acre existing wilderness to which it will be much more difficult to gain access, and which is not used anywhere close to the ultimate at this time. And here is a logical access with all the attributes of scenery, and all the things that go with it, and some of these attributes are certainly going to suffer from the remoteness of this area as we know it today. But as far as making this million-acre wilderness, the Bob Marshall, accessible, that is my pet project. That is why I say it is a selfish interest. I think that access is certainly going to suffer if this area which may be questionable as far as total wilderness value is included.

Senator METCALF. I think you have made a fine presentation, and we appreciate your interest in Montana and in your appearance here.

Mr. PATTON. Thank you, sir.

Senator BURDICK. Norman Kesten, chief geologist for the American Smelting & Refining Co., Wallace, Idaho.

STATEMENT OF NORMAN KESTEN, CHIEF GEOLOGIST FOR THE NORTHWESTERN MINING DEPARTMENT OF AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING CO.

Mr. KESTEN. Mr. Chairman, in addition to being chief geologist of the American Smelting & Refining Co., in Wallace, I also represent the Idaho Mining Association at this hearing. We didn't become aware that this hearing was going to take place until last Wednesday. Therefore, we haven't had time to do any research. I am going to confine my remarks to principles rather than detail.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Kesten, by this statement the clerk will be informed that at the next hearing you will have a special invitation for the Idaho Mining Association to appear.

Mr. KESTEN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator METCALF. And we will appreciate your specific comments.

Mr. KESTEN. Thank you. I would like to make the following points:

1. Mineral is where you find it; unlike some other natural resources, it cannot be transplanted at or diverted to some more suitable site.

2. Economic mineral occurrences are rare. If the American people are to continue to benefit from their mineral resources, the areas in which the search for mineral can be carried on must not continually be subject to restriction.

3. Mineral is not a renewable resource; it cannot be replanted after every harvesting. The appetite of the American people for goods produced from mineral resources is insatiable, and the mineral-producing industry is rapidly running out of both ore bodies and places in which to look for them.

4. Hurried studies of proposed withdrawal areas are by no means definitive. Not only does the mineral industry feel this way, but so do geologists in the employ of government. It has happened time and time again in the past that an area judged to have no mineral potential

has, 30 years later, become productive; and that a mineral judged to have no economic value has, 30 years later, become necessary to the economy. No realist with experience in the ways of administrative agencies has any hope that withdrawn areas, once locked up, ever will be reopened to multiple use unless the purposes of the agency concerned are served.

5. The mineral industry produces wealth which benefits the entire country. The mineral resources of the United States have been a primary factor in giving this country the highest living standard in the world. The mineral resources, managed scientifically and economically in the best interests of most of the people, will continue to be a primary factor in maintaining and raising even further that high standard of living. Without the wealth produced by the mineral and other industries very few people could afford to benefit from the recreational and esthetic values of the areas of our country which are remote and wild and which, by their very nature, must remain so without the need for legislative action.

6. The exploitation of mineral deposits need not despoil the beauty of any area, nor have any effect upon wildlife. A well-managed operation affects not only a small area and such an area can be returned to a natural state soon after termination of the operation.

I might interject here that rehabilitation has become a cost of production, and also it has become a cost of final product to the consumer.

Senator METCALF. Let me extend an invitation to have you come back and testify on the bill for restoration of strip-mined areas, and other such areas as that, too, to tell us about how we have restored some of these.

Mr. KESTEN. I didn't say it has been restored, I say it can be restored, and it has become an operating cost. In our calculations projected to the future we are figuring those costs. We have, too.

Senator METCALF. Then I am delighted that this is a retreat from the mining industry's position on the bills introduced to restore and recondition and rebeautify the areas that are strip mined.

Mr. KESTEN. In many instances, sir, we feel that the demands made by Government agencies for restoration are unreasonable.

Senator METCALF. You can tell us about that, too.

Mr. KESTEN. My last point is that to retreat from the multiple use concept in respect of any sizable piece of land is tantamount to robbing the great mass of our people of potential riches.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Mr. Kesten, and remember your standing invitation.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much for your appearance here. I want you to know that both members of this committee did support the mining industry in its compromise to have an opportunity to explore these areas until 1983.

Again, I don't thing anybody in America seriously thinks that if we get into a struggle with some other nation and a valuable mineral is found that is necessary to our national defense, or necessary to mine in the public interest, that Congress won't act promptly in opening that area up for the development of that mineral.

Mr. KESTEN. May I respond to that comment, sir?

Senator METCALF. Go right ahead.

Mr. KESTEN. The leadtime in producing minerals from a relatively unexplored area——

Senator METCALF. You are not going to have a mine in there anyway if you are talking about these things. I think we need something about the leadtime in Montana.

Mr. KESTEN. In Montana.

Senator METCALF. Yes. Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. I am happy now to introduce the North Dakotan who has been transformed to a Montanan, Leif Erickson.

STATEMENT OF LEIF ERICKSON, HELENA, MONT.

Mr. ERICKSON. Thank you very much, Senator, for that very pleasant personal introduction. It has been my pleasure, of course, to be acquainted with you for many, many years, as well as Senator Metcalf.

I think most everything I would say in support of the bill under consideration has been said by Mr. Garland and by Mr. Gannon and a number of others. I appear as an individual, although I am also a member of the Helena Wilderness Riders, and other groups that regularly use the Bob Marshall Wilderness. I just have a couple of things to say in connection with the testimony I have heard today, in the time I have been here.

Mr. Patton happens to be a very close, personal friend of mine, and his statement as to going back into the Bob Marshall 20 years later and finding it the same was averted by you, Senator Burdick, and raises the question that we have. Now, this area that is proposed to be added retains its wilderness characteristic. There aren't roads in there. There are some trails. It is of easy access, and I would suggest to Mr. Patton and others that the present trail into Heart Lake and Webb Lake, into the other lakes along that little valley going into Meadow Lake, are of easy access by people walking. It is a favorite trail for fathers and their sons in Helena to visit the wilderness. They see the wilderness the way it is. Now, if a road were built down through there, there would be very little scenic value to such a road, if it would stay in the valley where it would be practical. And, of course, there would be the end to the fishing that is now available in these small lakes; Heart Lake and Webb Lake and the other lakes down into Meadow Creek.

One of the things that concerns me most, I have been very closely associated in the logging industry and the lumbering industry, and I can remember when I first got into it. The "clear cut" was a bad word, and it was used when you referred to a private lumber company that was operating on its own land. It was held up as a terrible way of logging. Now, for various reasons the Forest Service has embraced the clear cut idea. I don't believe you can possibly find clear cutting compatible with a recreational use. I see it up and down the Swan Valley, an area I am very well acquainted with, and you can't have a scenic area and clear cutting at the same time. When you come out of the Bob Marshall Wilderness one of the roads brings you into Beaver Creek right above Lincoln. You come out, and I am not saying it isn't the proper method of logging, but you come into an area of absolute devastation. That is the way it is done nowadays. Now, I don't believe the Forest Service would have a different plan in this

area, were it opened up to logging, than it has everyplace else. Certainly the esthetics are out the window.

Now, one other thing along that same line, the concern expressed that it is too difficult to get into these areas because there aren't roads going up to the top, as it were. The Forest Service has, over the years, developed a very ambitious road program that now takes roads that are graveled to the very top of the Swan Range. You can go clear to the top. You can take out from there and go down into the Bob Marshall Wilderness without climbing up any distance, any steps at all. It is all downhill. All along that Swan Range, and also on the east side, you have that same access.

The idea that something would be given to people generally by building roads into this area, I think, has already been explored, and Senator Metcalf has used the words I would use. This area is so "fragile" that if roads were built into it, any substantial roads—and I have particularly in mind Halfmoon Park right under Scapegoat, the most beautiful spot in the mountains, without question—if a road were built in there and this little park, this alpine park, were enjoyed by people by the dozens, let alone the hundreds, the charm of Halfmoon Park would be gone. I do think we should have a little better trail into Halfmoon Park, but we are trying to get something here for the general public. I am not talking about the mining interests or the lumbering interests or anybody else, but if we are trying to get something for the public that are not able to walk into the wilderness area or able to hire a horse and ride in, or have a horse of their own, what we are talking about is a pure illusion; it wouldn't exist once the roads were built. I hate to say that in Montana even the citizens of Montana discard beer cans along the roads, and we know what the story is.

Then the other thing I would like to mention is that I cannot drive out of Helena, Mont., without driving through a beautiful scenic mountain pass., or through beautiful scenic mountain valleys. This is not a place that is just unique, this area in here. It is scenery. Unless you can ride to the top, it doesn't compare with the scenery coming through the Wolf Creek Canyon from Helena. Much more scenic. And any direction you go in Montana mountains, the scenery is there to be enjoyed, more spectacular than to be found in this area which is relatively foothill country going into the Bob Marshall area.

So it isn't a case of a small area near a great city where you need that sort of thing for people to enjoy. Unfortunately we see it all the time. People who come here to enjoy our scenery, so many of them are going through, and how many leave the trails at Yellowstone Park, how many leave the trails at Glacier Park—very, very few. I don't believe that if this matter is put on the basis of affording more people an opportunity to enjoy wilderness, that it would be accomplished by this.

Now, as to Mr. Patton's age, which is somewhat less than mine, we have been riding in that wilderness area, and we meet old-age pensioners going down the trail. I don't think it is so difficult to get in there. The lack of time is not always a problem; the old-age pensioner has a little more time. But I remember one party we met, a husband and wife, coming over Holland Pass. They had one pack horse and one saddle horse, and they were taking turns. I stopped and got acquainted with them. They were retired people. They were above 65, yet they

were able to go in there. I think anybody that really wants to, except for the limitations of time, can get there.

I sincerely hope the committee will recommend passage of this legislation.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

Mr. ERICKSON. Can't I get an argument at all?

Senator BURDICK. No.

Is Stanley C. Berger, executive secretary of the Montana Farm Bureau, Bozeman, Mont., present?

STATEMENT OF A. B. "BUDDY" COBB, JR., REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MONTANA STATE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. COBB. Senator Burdick, I am not Stanley Berger, I am A. B. Cobb, a rancher underneath Scapegoat Mountain. Mr. Berger couldn't be here, and he sent me in his stead.

I won't bother to read this whole statement, because the Farm Bureau is not for or against this. They sent me this statement to read, and it is not my statement. I am not in agreement with what they say necessarily. The crux of this report is that we recognize that some existing unreserved public lands are not economically feasible for private ownership.

As we are sure all of you who are here today are aware, the farmers and ranchers have a vested interest in what happens to our public lands. Many of us are users of public lands and must continue to do so in one form or another if we are to provide the food and fiber that is so necessary to a vibrant and growing country such as ours.

We also recognize that the people throughout the length and breadth of this great Nation are going to demand more and more recreational facilities as time goes by. It would appear to us that the best way the interest of the most could be served is by making more of our great country available for more people to see and appreciate. It does not seem to us to be in the best interest to prevent the majority of the people from going on our public lands. This, we believe, would be contrary to what the majority of all segments of our society has accepted when they agreed to the multipurpose concept which allows all interests to be served. It does not seem fitting, when there seems to be such a demand for more recreation areas, that more land should be set aside to serve any "special interest" group. Other interests, such as timber and mining interests must surely be considered seriously before the final judgment can be made.

It would also be contrary to our belief that is stated in our Farm Bureau policy book which is as follows:

> Federal land suitable for private ownership and use should be made available for disposal on terms and conditions that recognize the basic land use in the area, the historic land use patterns, economic value, and the vital relationship of the land involved to the farming and ranching operations of the established current user. We recognize that some existing unreserved public lands are not economically feasible for private ownership.

We are not attempting to determine at this time whether all of the land that is involved in this study would be suitable for disposition. It cannot be denied, however, that some of the land either in or near the perimeter of the study area is now being utilized by both cattle and

sheep producers. The question of future use will also be ever present for consideration.

In conclusion, we would like to emphasize what we believe to be the most important point of our testimony.

The main part of this statement, I think, is the farm bureau supported Federal legislation establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission.

Referring to our policy book again, I would like to insert the following for the record:

> We support Federal legislation establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission. We hold that a comprehensive review of administrative practices, regulations, policies, and statutes relative to public lands is vital to the sound and effective use of these resources. We recommend that, as this study is conducted, full recognition be given to established state water laws. The conclusions and recommendations of the Commission are of vital concern to farmers and ranchers. We believe Congress and all Federal agencies administering public lands should withhold any changes in basic policy, fees and regulations for use until the Commission has completed its report.

We believe that this would be a change of use, therefore we would urge that any change in the present usage be postponed until after the Public Land Law Review Commission has reported to Congress and the Congress has had the opportunity to review the changes they may or may not recommend.

We cannot overemphasize the fact that we are spending millions of taxpayers' dollars to carry on this comprehensive study. If, on the other hand, we do recognize them as a worthwhile Commission then we will want to deter any action until after they have had the opportunity to report their findings to Congress for its consideration.

We wish to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you on this very important matter.

Senator BURDICK. Your entire statement will be made a part of the record.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Cobb, I was one of the authors of the public land law review bill, and I supported the Public Land Law Review Commission. And you know, with your familiarity with the public laws, that we certainly need a Land Law Review Commission because of the disparity of some of the lands and the multitude of some of the acts involved in the past, one at a time and not connected with each other. But I had no idea when I sponsored that legislation that it would result in a call for cessation of any kind of change or improvement or differentiation of any of our public land policies until the Commission report. This about we shouldn't do anything until the Public Land Law Review Commission report comes up time after time after time. It came up in the redwoods, it came up at Point Reyes National Seashore. We shouldn't create a park, we shouldn't create a conservation fund. It is persuasive at times when there is a change in basic law, but at the present time it seems to me we are trying to apply basic law that won't be changed, as I know some of the people on the Commission, to a special situation here to ascertain whether or not there are wilderness values in the area. I didn't know we were just going to adjourn all resource development when we passed that Public Land Law Review Commission.

This is not your statement; it is Mr. Berger's statement.

Mr. COBB. I want to say, as long as you have touched on these, the Bureau has always informed the Commission and bureaus there should

be a time limit for them to operate or to bring in a conclusion so we can't go on and on spending their money. As it said here, millions of dollars has been spent on this Commission and you have yet to get any conclusions from them.

Senator METCALF. This is a very difficult subject, and complex. Our colleagues on that and the committee in the House of Representatives are serving part time on it. Various experts throughout the country are here trying to consolidate and correlate the various public land laws that are so complex and so complicated that it is going to take a while. But that doesn't mean that any resource development in the United States has to cease until that Commission comes in and reports and reacts on it.

Mr. COBB. This is the dilemma of the taxpayer when you see so many commissions working on the same thing.

Senator METCALF. That is what we are trying to cure.

Mr. COBB. That is what we would like to see you do. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. I look forward to Mr. Berger's testimony.

When I was a member of the legislature in 1937, I was the chairman of the Horticulture Committee, and the first legislative committee I participated in was a hearing in which the Farm Bureau appeared in opposition to a bill that everybody else was in favor of. I was in favor of that bill at that time. The Farm Bureau has consistently, I think without a single case, appeared in opposition, in all my legislative career, to every piece of legislation of which I have been in favor, and today they haven't broken the record. They have been consistent.

Senator BURDICK. I think we are reaching the time for noon adjournment. I want to say at this time that I think that the frame of the hearing has been more or less set. I think we know generally the position of the proponents, and I think we know generally the position of the opponents. I hope this afternoon, so we can speed this up, when the witnesses are called, unless they have a special reason, they would present new matter. In any event I said at the beginning of this hearing the statements will be taken in full. So we can avoid repeating the various contentions that have been made before, if we could tailor our statements first of all to a summary if need be, and just to new matter, I think we would get along quite well.

Now, if there are any here that have to leave and won't be back this afternoon, and have urgent reason to go, we could take your statements now and make them a part of the record.

STATEMENT OF DONALD A. ROOS, LINCOLN, MONT.

Mr. ROOS. My name is Donald A. Roos. I have lived at Lincoln, Mont., most of the time since 1931. I went to work for the U.S. Forest Service at Lincoln in the spring of 1947. That summer I cooked on a "show me" trip conducted by the U.S. Forest Service. They invited a group of influential businessmen on a pack trip into the Lincoln back country.

Representing the U.S. Forest Service on this "show me" trip was a Mr. Ryan from the Washington, D.C., office; a Mr. P. D. Hansen from the regional office in Missoula; Mr. A. D. Moir, forest supervisor of the Helena National Forest; Mr. Russell Fitzgerald, district ranger of the Lincoln district; Dan Lantis, packer; and myself as

cook. The businessmen included a group of influential men from Helena.

This trip was conducted by the Forest Service to "sell" these men on the beauty and solitude of the back country, to show them a part of the country that was as God made it; unspoiled, quiet. They did not want roads built into there and should keep it as it was. Dan and I were told to help get this across to these men so they in their contacts with the general public would in turn sell the idea to the people. Mr. Dan Lantis, who packed on that trip, is here in the courtroom and can verify this. As far as I know it was not until a few years ago that the feeling changed.

I worked for the Forest Service at Lincoln for almost 19 years, until I resigned this last June. I have made a great many trips into the area under discussion, and I feel that by permitting roads to be built into this area we will destroy something that we cannot repair or replace. Having seen what miles and miles of timber access roads have done to the area around Lincoln already, I sincerely hope that roads are not built into the Lincoln back country any further than they already are.

Recently we took a flight to Lewiston, Idaho. I was amazed to find the number of areas of clear cuts and roads that are already in that country. I would like to see one area that is as God made it; quiet and where you can go back and get away from the hubbub. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Now, you understand the enormity of the proposition. We have covered 18 witnesses this morning; we only have 70 to go this afternoon. That is why I am pleading with you to summarize and leave out repetitive material.

Do you have a short statement?

Mr. GRAY. If I could, sir.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Gray.

STATEMENT OF ORVILLE GRAY, ATTORNEY AT LAW, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mr. GRAY. Senator Burdick and Senator Metcalf, my name is Orville Gray. I was born and educated in Montana, and am a practicing attorney here. I presently am the U.S. referee in bankruptcy for the eastern part of Montana. I am past president of the Wilderness Association, and presently a member of the Governor's Committee on Outdoor Recreation.

I am not speaking for any organization at this time, but only as an individual. I have traveled excessively in the Bob Marshall for the past dozen years, both in the summer and during the hunting season. I know there is a rapidly increasing interest to use this area. Before long it will not be able to contain all the people, both inside and out of Montana that would like to enjoy the experience. Family backpacking is rapidly developing. There are only a few wilderness-quality areas left in the forest system, and those that are qualified should be included in time and before their fragile nature is destroyed.

I have not been in this area covered by this Senate bill, and cannot speak from personal knowledge of it. However, from what I have read, from talking to those who do know it intimately, and from map

and photographic study, I would support the bill in general. Whether the precise boundaries proposed are those that should be adopted, I would leave to the committee and those more intimately familiar with the area. With this qualification, I would urge your favorable consideration of this bill.

Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Anybody that would like to make a further statement before we recess?

STATEMENT OF LOREN L. KRECK, D.D.S., COLUMBIA FALLS, MONT.

Mr. KRECK. My name is Loren Kreck, and I live in Columbia Falls, Mont. I appear here as a private citizen in favor of Senate bill 1121 and House bill 7148.

Please permit me to formulate the first part of this statement into question form. I believe the answers will be self-evident, and allow the decisionmakers to provide their own conclusive answers. If we are to protect the resource from destruction, should we road up the high-quality heartlands for the highly motorized-oriented public? Haven't we yet learned the lessons of Yosemite, Yellowstone, and lately Glacier Parks? Has anyone seen survival of cutthroat fishery in a small, high-altitude lake when roads are run directly to the lake? Wasn't this a form of recreation? One of the multiple-use concepts was preservation of forage for benefit of game animals, but what use to the grizzly when the limiting factor is the reduction of a range, and he will be shot from a window of a pickup truck? Wasn't one of the multiple-use watershed conservation which is in this case draining into a known critical flood plain—will the roads slow the runoff? Will logging operations? Or do they speed the runoff? Does the public appreciation increase when they get easy access? Do motorboat fuels reduce water pollution—beer cans and bulldozers really improve the scenery and protect the resource? Will the cost of the road construction and maintenance be charged off to recreation and administration, which has been done so many times to logging roads that couldn't pay their own way that finally end up as a long-term maintenance debit to the taxpayers waiting for a 130-year-old regrowth to show up? Isn't there something strange about a quarter million acres that only promises 7.9 million board feet of timber return per year? This happens to be less than one-sixteenth of the yearly allowable cut in the Flathead district.

Sirs, I promised that you could make your own conclusion. I hope these points will be considered. I think they are a realistic appraisal.

Senator BURDICK. Any other short statements to someone who is leaving?

Mr. HELDING. I have about a 6½-hour drive ahead of me. I wonder if I could testify?

Senator BURDICK. If you make it short.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT N. HELDING, CHAIRMAN OF THE MONTANA FOREST INDUSTRIES COUNCIL

Mr. HELDING. I appreciate your indulgence, Senator. My name is Robert N. Helding. I am chairman of the Montana Forest Industries Council. On behalf of the forest industry we welcome the opportunity

to present our views in regard to S. 1121, commonly known as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal.

This industry is vitally concerned, as employers of people and citizens of Montana. We sincerely believe that the public forests of this Nation are for the use of all its citizens. When Congress established the national forests in the Organic Act of June 4, 1897, it stated its position as follows:

> No public forest reservation shall be established, except * * * to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States.

Throughout the years, various acts of Congress, such as the Sustained Yield Forest Management Act of March 29, 1944, and the Anderson-Mansfield Reforestation and Revegetation Act of October 11, 1949, have expressed congressional concern and desire that the public forests be maintained and that forest-using industries and the jobs they provide be preserved.

The sincere concern of this industry is that the rural economy of western Montana be preserved and that the jobs and associated businesses be sustained. In the immediate area of this proposal, which is to say western Montana, 10 sawmills are presently operating, employing some 1,500 employees on a year-round basis. Annual payrolls exceed $10 million, with millions more being generated in the form of goods and services. The U.S. Forest Service calculates that there is 12 million board feet of lots available from the area in question, that is to say, the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, on an annual sustained yield basis. In today's market, the average stumpage value is now $20 per thousand board feet. In an economic analysis of the value of timber sales, it should be constantly borne in mind that each dollar of stumpage value harvested brings $20 in gross national product. Therefore, if we consider an annual cut of 12 million board feet times the average value of $20 per thousand, we are conservatively talking about $4,800,000 of gross national product being generated each year. This, we believe, is in the public interest to all the Nation's citizens. By keeping this type of economy rolling, we believe that we are contributing significantly to the economic well-being of this Nation. We are also doing our part in providing jobs for rural people, thereby helping to alleviate the rising trend of people moving from the countryside to the cities.

In 1966, before the Business Council at Hot Springs, Ark., the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville S. Freeman, announced his rural industrialization program. He stated as follows:

> To keep people in rural America, opportunities must be created for them. Specifically, jobs must be provided.
>
> You who represent business and industry can provide these jobs and, at the same time, serve the best interests of your country by helping to cure both the ills of the countryside and the ills of the city.
>
> I have tried to spell out the advantages of industrial expansion in rural America, and our new departmental program to encourage rural industrialization will continue that effort.
>
> And we want you to know that all of the considerable resource assistance of the Federal Government is at your disposal in any effort you make to bring more economic opportunity to rural America.

The Secretary has thought so much of this program that he met with five other Cabinet officers—the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, Transportation, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Develop-

ment. All these men acknowledged that the mass migration of people from the rural areas to the cities is one of the most pressing problems facing this country today.

The U.S. Forest Service program for the multiple use of this Lincoln Scapegoat area will provide a most sensible and reasonable guide for the development of the area in question. It will sustain the rural timber economy, provide recreation use for the vast majority of the American public by the planned development of scenic roads and will also leave untouched those areas desired by those persons who seek the solitude of wilderness.

We wish to remind the committee that there are some 10 million acres in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho that are already in a reserved status, consistent of wilderness, primitive, and national park areas. In the western Montana and adjacent Idaho area, immediate to the working circle of the sawmills in question, we find the following:

	Acres
1. Bob Marshall Wilderness Area	950,000
2. Mission Mountains primitive area	74,000
3. Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area	1,238,000
4. Cabinet Wilderness Area	94,000
5. Gates of the Mountains Wilderness Area	29,000
6. Pentlar Wilderness Area	158,000
7. Glacier National Park	1,013,000
Grand total	3,556,000

We point out, therefore, that there is considerable forested lands already in wilderness or reserved category which does provide ample space for the preservation of wilderness values and for the use of tourists and others in the State of Montana who seek these values.

These 3,556,000 reserved acres are more than five times the area of the State of Rhode Island; or approximately three times the State of Delaware, or more than the entire State of Connecticut.

The Multiple Use Act of 1960 directed the U.S. Forest Service to manage the Nation's forests under the principles of multiple use. In accordance with this congressional mandate, therefore, the U.S. Forest Service has developed the patterns for management of Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area which encompasses the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal. This plan, we believe, protects the interests of the public and provides for the management of the area under the principles of modern forestry. It will provide for all the people, rather than any single interest.

The U.S. Forest Service states that presently this Nation consumes 13 billion board feet of timber from the Nation's forests, and by the year 2000, as the result of our expanding population, our Nation's needs will be in the vicinity of 20 billion board feet per year. This situation calls, therefore, for the wise use and development of this Nation's available timber supplies so that the needs of tomorrow's citizens can be met from the Nation's timberlands. Only under the principles of modern forest management will this be achieved.

In the words of President Theodore Roosevelt:

> The Nation behaves well if it treats natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, and not impaired, in value. Conservation means development as much as it does protection.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee, I would like to submit for the hearing record their statements, and

also on behalf of the Northern Idaho Forestry Association, their statement. There is a statement in here from Mr. Richard J. Bauer, Missoula, and White Pine Sash Co. Also the Associated Logging Contractors and Delaney Brothers in Missoula, if I may put them into the record.

Senator BURDICK. They may be admitted without objection.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Helding, do those statements come to the same conclusion as your statement on behalf of the forest industries?

Mr. HELDING. The statement, as well as my company, Senator, but they are in opposition to S. 1121 and favoring the multiple-use program as planned by the U.S. Forest Service.

Senator METCALF. Would some of them be interested bidders in logging this area if it were opened to multiple-use development?

Mr. HELDING. I would say yes.

Senator METCALF. They would be the ones that would go in and develop the region?

Mr. HELDING. Some of them, yes, in the Missoula area.

Senator, thank you very kindly.

Senator METCALF. I thank you very much, Mr. Helding.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF ROYCE G. COX, CHAIRMAN, INLAND EMPIRE MULTIPLE USE COMMITTEE

Honorable Gentlemen, as chairman of the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present a statement in opposition to S. 1121, a bill which, if passed, would classify into the National Wilderness System some 250,000 acres of national forest land in Montana known as the Lincoln Back Country.

Our committee is composed of professional land managers representing six forest conservation and development organizations in Idaho, western Montana, and eastern Washington.

Our committee has, for many years, supported and worked for the establishment and maintenance of a reasonable acreage of wilderness on federal lands, providing the needs of our local citizens for the other important multiple uses of these lands are not jeopardized. As evidence of this support, please note that we have, at various Forest Service hearings on primitive area reclassification, recommended a total of 1,346,000 acres of wilderness, including several hundred thousand acres of commercial forest land. Our recommendations covered significant parts of the Selway-Bitterroot, Anaconda-Pintlar, Sawtooth, Cabinet Mountains, and Spanish Peaks primitive areas.

Some of the commercial forest land is, of course, so remote and inaccessible by today's standards that it has low economic importance; however, in total it does make a generous contribution to the variety of vegetative types desirable in a wilderness environment.

Nevertheless, we are strongly opposed to S. 1121 because we are convinced it is unnecessary and not in the best interests of the majority of the citizens of western public land states.

Furthermore, we fully endorse the plan of the U.S. Forest Service for coordinated management of the multiple resources of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area, which, as you know, includes the Lincoln Back Country.

REASONS FOR OPPOSING S. 1121

Our principal reason for opposing S. 1121 is that it blankets into the National Wilderness Preservation System a large area of undeveloped federal land not having previous designation as primitive or reserved. This area contains too much land having primary value for other important uses, namely, commercial forest and high-quality recreational areas, both of which will be required to meet the future needs of our exploding population. We are convinced that, in this particular situation, these needs can be best met by the Forest Service plan.

Commercial forest.—In regard to the specific importance of the commercial forest included in the wilderness area proposed by S. 1121, the potential annual timber harvest is estimated at 15,000,000 bd. ft. To the nonprofessional this may seem to be rather insignificant. However, we point out that in terms of potential productivity under intelligent management and utilization, this 15,000,000 bd. ft. of annual cut could sustain a wood products industry which, in turn, could support a community of:

Homes	415
Population	1,660
Total payroll	$1,849,000
Taxable property	$9,383,000
Total income and property taxes	$504,000

Furthermore, the basic wood products industry could generate a total economic value, just to the point of retail sales, of $5,610,000 annually.

The above figures are based on the potential timber harvest of the proposed wilderness area, if it were utilized by an integrated forest products industry manufacturing wood and paper products. The figures would, of course, be somewhat lower for an industry manufacturing only lumber products.

This estimate of economic value is based on a 1961 analysis made by our committee for our study of the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area reclassification. (A copy of the 1961 report is presented for your reference.) We did not take time to update our data, so it is undoubtedly on the conservative side today. We present this information to illustrate just how important even a relatively small commercial forest area is to local communities, as well as to the nation.

De facto wilderness.—We are greatly concerned, too, that this is only one of many similar "de facto" wilderness areas throughout the West being proposed by preservationist groups. We have no estimate of the total potential timber productivity of these proposed areas, but we do know it is substantial. If all of the "de facto" proposals were reclassified into wilderness by federal law, a severe economic impact would eventually be felt by many communities dependent on commercial forest operations. In view of the large volume of commercial timber already made unavailable in the more than 10,000,000 acres of national wilderness areas, parks, and other restricted areas, any addition to the systems must be carefully weighed to avoid further unnecessary encroachment on the stability of our vitally important wood-based economy.

With respect to the Lincoln Back Country, we understand that under the Forest Service plan some commercial type forest would be excluded from harvest operations in the primitive type areas at the higher elevations, as well as in certain fragile soil types in the steeper valley walls. Thus, at least some virgin forest would be left undisturbed by man.

Recreation use.—In regard to balanced recreational use of the area in question, we especially note that the Forest Service plan for the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area provides for essentially primitive management of a large area of the scenic high country. This, in our opinion, is desirable. We feel the one road planned over the Continental Divide will not unnecessarily infringe on the primitive value of the area, but will, rather, serve several important uses. The road will make available some outstanding mountain scenery which would otherwise remain inaccessible to the average motoring public. The planned trails and camping sites made accessible by the road will provide a high-quality primitive type area for those of us who enjoy backpacking in for a short-term "wilderness experience" of one to several days. The planned trail improvements will also provide much-needed "jumping-off-places" to the southeastern boundary of the vast (950,000-acre) Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. We regard this as especially important because it will spread the growing use-pressure on the present limited wilderness portals, and thus minimize overuse of some of the more fragile high-country soil and vegetation types.

OTHER CONCERNS

We are told that many of the people pressuring for wilderness classification of the Lincoln Back Country are concerned about the effect of the Forest Service plan on the grizzly bear, the cutthroat trout, and the fragile soils of the area. We appreciate and understand these concerns and will comment briefly on them.

Grizzly bear.—With respect to the grizzly population, evidence seems to support the premise that these animals would not be too adversely affected by the

limited developments. Certainly the grizzlies would not be threatened by extinction in view of the large remote areas remaining in the Lincoln Back Country, the even larger Bob Marshall Wilderness Area bordering on the north, and the large areas of natural grizzly habitat included in the other national wilderness areas and national parks.

Fisheries.—With respect to cutthroat trout, this poses a special problem with the population declining regardless, as pointed out by the Forest Service report, whether the area is classified as wilderness or not. The only logical answer is better fisheries management through two principal measures—habitat improvement, and control of fishing pressure. While improved road access would naturally increase fishing pressure, this could be regulated through such methods as closed seasons, catch limits, and catch and release regulations. On the credit side, better road access would enhance the opportunity for more efficient habitat improvement work, as well as the planting of hatchery stock which is now becoming more feasible for the cutthroat species.

Fragile soils.—With respect to the threat to fragile soils from road development, the Forest Service report points out that extensive natural slides have long been a problem in certain parts of the area even without roads. Thus, road building would seem, at first thought, to complicate the problem. However, the Forest Service plan provides for avoiding critical soils and slide areas. Furthermore, with road access, slide-stabilizing measures are more feasible, and, if slide do occur, specialized equipment can be brought in to more quickly clear and restore stream channels.

Another source of excessive soil loss and stream siltation occurs from the huge landslides and gullies following the catastrophic uncontrolled fires which have historically swept through many of the larger inaccessible forest areas of the West. The threat from catastrophic fires can be greatly reduced by road access to the more hazardous fuel types, which makes possible the use of modern techniques employing specialized ground equipment.

Soils research.—For many years the Forest Service and other public and private agencies have conducted extensive research into methods of stabilizing roads and soils in logging areas. As a result, proven techniques have been developed which, though often costly, are effective.

One of the best current examples of watershed stabilization research is that started some years ago by the Forest Service in the Zena Creek watershed, a tributary of the Salmon River on the Payette National Forest in Idaho. I will not go into detail on the techniques which have been tested there. I raise the point only to emphasize a well-documented source of technical knowledge from which the Forest Service can draw in applying proven methods of watershed protection to the Lincoln Back Country.

Other sources of information are avaliable from other regions. For example, I refer to a publication of the California Forest and Range Experiment Station entitled "A Guide to Erosion Reduction on National Forest Timber Sale Areas". The date of this publication—1954—proves that the Forest Service, with the cooperation of the logging industry, has been working on soil stabilization research for many years. Though the publication is not up to date with respect to the latest techniques, it does give a good review of watershed problems and protection methods. A copy is presented for your reference, which describes and illustrates techniques to correct poor practices.

An entire day could be spent reviewing watershed protection research which has been conducted by public and private organizations all over the world, but the few examples I have given should suffice to explain why our committee has complete confidence in the Forest Service plans for protection of the watersheds and soils of the Lincoln Back Country.

INSECT AND DISEASE PROBLEMS

Another advantage of road access is that it makes possible much more efficient control of insects and diseases, which, if unchecked, can cause serious losses of timber growth.

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

One of the principal advantages of scientific timber harvesting is that it can be used to greatly improve the habitat of deer and elk by opening more areas to browse production. This is particularly important in critical winter range areas.

Timber cropping also improves habitat for several upland game bird species, especially if skid trails are seeded with certain legumes which are preferred food for the birds.

SUMMARY

Many people not directly involved in forest resource management are unaware of the tremendous advancements made in all phases of the science during the last 50 years as new knowledge has been steadily gained through research by both public and private foresters. This lack of specialized knowledge on the part of the layman frequently leads to understandable but often unfounded concern regarding certain forest management operations, such as the Forest Service program for the Lincoln Back Country.

Our committee feels the dedicated professional land managers in the Forest Service deserve much credit for the careful consideration and thorough planning devoted to all areas of public land under their responsibility. We have confidence they will carry out the best possible balanced management program for all of the important resources of the Lincoln Back Country.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, may I stress that our committee fully recognizes the values of wilderness for specialized recreation and spiritual stimulation for those of us who appreciate these values. However, we also believe the amount and kind of country set aside for wilderness must be kept in balance with our other needs for the material necessities of life.

Of paramount importance is the absolute necessity of protecting and developing the natural resources which sustain the basic industries of the West—agriculture, grazing, minerals, fisheries, and forest products. These industries form the foundation upon which rests all other social and economic development. This is especially important to those of us living in the public land states where such a large percentage of the needed resources are controlled and managed by federal agencies.

Our committee feels that a well-balanced, long-range, over-all program of integrated natural resource management must be developed, not only for the West but for the Nation. Although there are many complex problems, much progress has been made during the last half-century; even greater progress will be made in the next, if the individuals, organizations and agenices involved will dedicate their sincere efforts and cooperation to the cause.

Gentlemen, we appreciate your patience in conducting this hearing. You face a serious responsibility in making your recommendations on this vitally important legislation. We are confident you will employ your highest intelligence, logic and common sense in arriving at your decisions. Please enter this statement in the hearing record.

Thank you for your courtesy.

STATEMENT OF BRUCE COLWELL, PRESIDENT, NORTH IDAHO FORESTRY ASSOCIATION

Honorable Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, the directors of the North Idaho Forestry Association have requested me to present this statement in opposition to S. 1121, a bill to classify as wilderness the area in Montana commonly referred to as the Lincoln Back Country. In our opinion, this legislation is neither necessary nor advisable.

Our Association also wishes to go on record as endorsing the plan of the U.S. Forest Service for coordinated management of all the resources of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area, which includes the Lincoln Back Country.

We will appreciate your including this statement in your hearing record.

Your subcommittee deserves commendation for taking the time to hold this hearing close to the people who would be most affected by this proposed legislation.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement on behalf of our Association which is composed of thirty-five private forest land owners and resource operators who, in turn, represent a large number of wage earners and families whose livelihood depends on intelligent, sustained management of forest resources. The Association membership represents at least 75 percent of the forest products production in northern Idaho.

Our Association is one of the oldest conservation organizations in the West, having been formed in 1908. We have consistently worked for sound protection, development and wise use of natural resources by actively supporting research programs by public and private organizations, and in actually carrying out proven management techniques as they have been developed. The Association has also been a leader in working for sound state and federal forestry laws.

You might be interested in knowing that our Association has gone on record at many Congressional and Forest Service hearings in support of reasonable wilderness preservation. Of specific interest is the fact that we endorsed the study, report and recommendations of the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee pertaining to the reclassification of the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area. This report, presented in Lewiston, Idaho on March 9, 1961, contained a recommendation for an 862,110-acre wilderness area, but specifically excluded the Magruder Corridor which the Forest Service had justifiably reclassified for multiple use management. Our Association also endorses the statement presented to today's hearing by the Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee.

Your committee members may question the basis of our concern about S. 1121 since it pertains to an area which may not have appreciable direct effect on northern Idaho. The reason for our concern is that this legislation, if enacted, would set an undesirable and unwarranted precedent by placing in the national wilderness system a large area not previously classified as a primitive area, nor presently justified in its entirety for wilderness preservation. We are well aware of the strong pressures from preservationist groups who are working diligently to have other so-called "defacto wilderness", or undeveloped federal lands, reclassified into the wilderness system.

While there may be certain undeveloped areas which should be reclassified for primitive or wilderness type management, we strongly urge your committee to reject this specific and similar proposals for blanking into the wilderness system such unjustifiably large areas containing other vitally important resource values and potential uses.

In regard to wilderness preservation, of special significance is the fact that the Forest Service plan for the Lincoln Back Country Area provides for leaving nearly all of the high country unroaded and otherwise undeveloped except for improved trails and camping sites. Thus, for all practical purposes, most of the more remote sections of the area will remain in a primitive condition as part of the coordinated management plan.

We understand that some preservationists have expressed concern about the effect on soils of logging operations in the lower elevations planned for timber management. While logging roads may present special problems, it has been demonstrated that under modern techniques and equipment, logging roads can be located and constructed so as to minimize adverse effects on soil and water.

To those who are concerned about the effect of logging on trout spawning areas, we point out that the threat of excessive siltation from logging is not as great under modern techniques as that which results from the huge landslides and gullies often occurring in the vast primitive and wilderness areas following large uncontrolled fires. Improved access improves fire protection and tends to reduce the threat of large, soil-damaging fires.

The strongest reason for our confidence in the Forest Service plan is the fact that we have witnessed first hand the great progress which has been made during the last fifty years by all agencies, public and private. Nearly all of the N.I.F.A. membership is or has been involved in harvesting national forest timber sales, and we, more than anyone else, are aware of the careful consideration given by the Forest Service to multiple use values. Everyone can be assured that the Forest Service will employ all the proven techniques for soil and water protection, including: careful location and construction of roads, adequate culverts and other drainage structures, downspouts and spreaders on fill slopes to dissipate water properly, mulching and seeding of cut banks and fill slopes where required to minimize soil movement, seeding and "putting to bed" all spur roads not needed for regular access, application of sheet piling, construction of gabions and rip-rap, and any other practicable techniques available or which may yet be developed through further research.

In conclusion, I repeat that the North Idaho Forestry Association believes the Forest Service is to be highly commended on their integrated resource plans for the Lincoln Back Country. We are confident the dedicated professional resource managers in the Service will effectively protect and develop the water, soil, recreation, fish, wildlife, timber and mineral resources, and we strongly endorse and will support their program.

Thank you, gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD J, BAUER, MISSOULA, MONT.

Gentlemen, my name is Richard J. Bauer. My home is in Missoula, Montana and I have lived in Western Montana for twenty-nine years. I work in an optical shop and enjoy my work fully, but I also enjoy the outdoors with my family and friends throughout the entire year.

Working five days a week as the average person does, I don't have the time to take off from my job whenever I want. Therefore, my time is limited to how far and where I can go. Now the Lincoln Back Country is just the perfect place for me. After finishing a week's work I can leave on a Friday night and be there in a couple of hours with my family and station wagon.

Now the reason I am in opposition to the closing of the Lincoln Back Country is that in my opinion a selected few, namely commercial packers and guides, want this country all to themselves so they can make their living from it! They have the million acre Bob Marshall Wilderness Area they can use. Isn't that enough?

I want the Lincoln Back Country open to all for logging and camping and not just opened for those few who are in favor of having it closed.

MISSOULA WHITE PINE SASH CO.,
Missoula, Mont., September 19, 1968.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Our company consists of a millwork factory and sawmill with a working force of about 325 employees. We are dependent on Federal lands for most of our timber supply. Therefore, we are opposed to Sentaor Metcalf's Bill S. 1121 which would completely bar timber cutting in the Lincoln Back Country.

We favor instead, the management plan for this area proposed by the Forest Service. We believe if this plan was adopted, it would be more in keeping with the multiple use concept, while Senator Metcalf's bill would favor single use interests.

We would like to state that we are not opposed to the wilderness principle and we believe that areas that are most suited for wilderness should be set aside for that purpose. However, we also believe that conservation in its truest sense is the wise use, rather than limited use, of our natural resources.

Very truly yours,

A. L. RIEFFLIN,
Executive Vice President and Secretary.

ASSOCIATED LOGGING CONTRACTORS, INC.,
Lewiston, Idaho, September 19, 1968.

MR. E. L. SHULTS,
Missoula, Mont.

DEAR ED: This is a letter of authorization to you to officially register our protest to Metcalf's bill to classify the Lincoln Back County as a wilderness area.

Our Association, as you know, represents one-hundred fifty loggers in Idaho and Montana, and we cannot and will not agree to support anything that does not include the multiple use of our forests.

Respectfully yours,

DELL E. WAGGENER, *Executive Secretary.*

STATEMENT OF DONALD L. DELANEY, MONTANA LUMBER SALES, INC., MISSOULA, MONT.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Donald L. Delaney, I am the Vice President of Montana Lumber Sales, Inc. I reside in Missoula, Montana. I am a member of the Montana State Water Resources Board, a member of the Montana State Forestry Board, a director of the Timber Products Manufacturers Association and a former member of the Montana State Planning Board.

I have lived in Western Montana for the past twenty years and have become very familiar with the Lincoln Back Country. At this writing I am submitting my objections to Senate Bill 1121 and House Resolution 7148.

The Lincoln Back Country as proposed contains almost a quarter of a million acres. Its close proximity to the Bob Marshall Wilderness, containing one half million acres would mean a total wilderness area of over three-quarters of a million acres in the same general area. Take in consideration Glacier National Park further north and we would have a land area of wilderness larger than some four states in Western Montana alone. Just how much wilderness does this country need. Anyone acquainted with the so called Lincoln Back Country would immediately recognize that the area is best suited for multiple use. It is a know fact that more and more people are beginning to appreciate the joys of the great outdoors. This has been brought about by the use of campers, four wheel driven pickups, snowmobiles, motor cycles and etc. There is a great need for more campgrounds and land area for recreational purposes so that more people can enjoy the outdoors. The multiple use concept of our forest lands will not only alleviate this need but will create jobs and commerce in doing so. By removing more and more land from use by the majority of the recreationists and putting it into a restricted wilderness status is not solving the need for more recreational area, but creating a larger one. The number of persons who can afford the time and money for trips into a wilderness area are few indeed in relation to the total vacationing population. The number of families who can afford such trips are even less. Most of our vacationing public are of average means traveling by car, camper or trailers. They, in order, to get the most out of their money and to see as much of our country as in their limit must have easy access to our vacation lands. You must admit that a wilderness area is usually not very easily accessible. These large number of our traveling vacationers should not be penalized for the benefit of a chosen few who can afford a leisurely trip through the wilderness with a guide showing the way.

Furthermore, timber is fast becoming a scarce commodity. For every wilderness area set aside that means that much more is removed from the market. If the Lincoln Back Country is restricted as a wilderness area it certainly would affect our sawmill operations in Lincoln, Montana to the point where we may have to shut down because of a lack of timber supply. This would eliminate numerous jobs in the Lincoln area.

The person taking adventage of the wilderness area does not have any concern about the economy of Western Montana as he is primarily interested in "getting away from it all."

It is not as though I am against all wilderness areas, but I sincerely feel that we have enough land designated as such in Western Montana for our future generations. Therefore, I respectfully urge you disapprove the above Congressional Bills.

Senator BURDICK. The hearing will be in recess until 1:30.

(Thereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Brock Evans, of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

STATEMENT OF M. BROCK EVANS, NORTHWEST REPRESENTATIVE, FEDERATION OF WESTERN OUTDOOR CLUBS, AND SIERRA CLUB

Mr. EVANS. Thank you very much. My name is Brock Evans. I reside in Seattle. I am the northwest representative of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, and also of the Sierra Club.

These organizations combined have a membership of approximately 85,000 individuals in about 47 outdoor clubs in eight Western States. The federation is a regional organization with member clubs in Montana as well as in other Northwest States; the Sierra Club is a national organization.

Both the Sierra Club and the federation have strongly endorsed and support the position of the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association, and other Montana conservationists in their support of S. 1121 which would create a wilderness of approximately 241,000 acres in the famous Lincoln back country-Scapegoat area. It commends the distinguished Montana Senators, Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield, for introducing this bill, and commends the Senate Interior Committee for coming this far to hear the citizens speak.

Many of our members are familiar with this area and often have expressed concern about the protection of its beauty and wilderness quality.

It is the opinion of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs and of the Sierra Club that the factors which make Montana one of the most beautiful and remarkable States in the Nation are not its sawmills, its mines, or other works of man. Rather, it is reflected best in the motto of the State, "The Big Sky Country," and it is this sense of vast unbroken space, glittering mountains, deep forests, and innumerable lakes and streams, which not only draw visitors from all over the country, but also attract them as residents. In short, Montana is still fortunate to have in large quantities what most other States have long since lost, an unparalleled expanse of mountain wilderness. From the northern boundary of Glacier Park on the Canadian border, all the way south to the Bob Marshall Wilderness, the famous Lincoln-Scapegoat country, and on further down to Yellowstone Park on the south, respectively, is an unequaled mountain wilderness. Montana is fortunate indeed to have had the foresight to set aside good portions of this country long ago. Now we have an opportunity to add to this great system an area which should have been added long ago, and which deserves it.

The Lincoln back country is not only a friendly wilderness, of easily accessible terrain; it is a popular area. It also contains an environment essential to survival of an important segment of grizzly bear population and other big-game animals. Native cutthroat trout, an increasingly scarce game resource, is also found in large quantities here. The area has a long tradition of wilderness use, and has been so used for generations. It is accessible from at least nine major access points, and many others of a more minor nature. The values that are presently there would be in great measure destroyed by any program of roadbuilding or by timber cutting within its boundaries.

It is for these reasons that we strongly support S. 1121 and urge its consideration and passage by the Senate and the Congress. We believe it to be a very much needed addition to the national wilderness preservation system and one that would be cherished not only by Montana, but by all the Nation.

The contention has been raised that this area should not be classified as wilderness because a road system is planned to give "access" to it. Other persons have protested an alleged loss of recreational opportunities if the area becomes a wilderness, because the trails now there would be closed to motor vehicle use.

Table 1 [indicating] contains a summary of the results of telephone conversations with the Forest Service officials in the three national forests concerned and shows total miles of road presently built and planned for their respective jurisdictions:

TABLE I.—MILES OF ROAD BUILT OR PLANNED IN THE 3 NATIONAL FORESTS CONCERNED

	Road miles existing	Road miles planned
Helena	539	608
Lolo	2,500	2,650
Lewis and Clark	1,252	560
Total	4,291	3,818

Table 2 [indicating] illustrates the same thing as table 1, but for the ranger districts affected:

TABLE II.—MILES OF ROAD BUILT OR PLANNED IN THE 3 DISTRICTS

	Road miles existing	Road miles planned
Lincoln	155	12
Seeley Lake	360	27
Augusta	100	6
Total	615	451

Table 3 [indicating] contains information from correspondence with the supervisors of these respective national forests:

TABLE III.—MILES OF TRAILS THAT EXIST AND MILES OF TRAILS CLOSED TO MOTORIZED VEHICLES

	Miles of trails	Closed to trail vehicles
Lewis and Clark	1,842.3	338.6
Lolo	1,716.8	49.0
Helena	820.0	82.5
Total	3,638.1	430.1

These figures illustrate that there already exists an enormous amount of road miles in these national forests, and even more planned to be built. Only slightly over 10 percent of all of the existing thousands of miles of trail in the national forests are now closed; there are enough miles of roads and trails open presently and available for motor vehicle use to enable any motorbike rider to drive back and forth across the United States three times, in just these three national forests. The amount that would be closed further by S. 1121 is insignificant compared to what is already available elsewhere. It is for these reasons that we urge the enactment of S. 1121.

I would like to end this statement on a personal note. I was born and raised in the east. It was my privilege to discover mountainous country in the State of Montana, in your own State. Stepping off the train at Glacier National Park 8 years ago was like a lost course in the countryside. I tried to come back all I could. Montana is one of my very deep feeling places, so I have to add my own note.

Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. You visited the area itself?

Mr. EVANS. Yes, I have.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Evans.

Mr. Gordon B. Brox, on behalf of Mr. James A. Robischon, the Anaconda Co., Butte, Mont., has submitted the following statement:

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. ROBISCHON, THE ANACONDA CO., BUTTE, MONT.

My name is James A. Robischon. I am counsel for The Anaconda Company and appear on behalf of The Anaconda Company in opposition to the enactment of Senate Bill 1121 and its companion measure House Bill 7148.

The Anaconda Company opposes the enactment of the legislation which is the subject of this hearing on two grounds:

1. The enactment of this legislation and the subsequent classification of the proposed land area as "wilderness" is against the interests of the employees of The Anaconda Company in Montana.
2. The enactment of this legislation is not in the national interest.

The operations of the Anaconda Company in Montana are situated in geographical proximity to the area under study. The over 7,000 employees of The Anaconda Company in Missoula, Anaconda, Butte, East Helena, and Great Falls have, at the present time, convenient access to this area for recreational pursuits. Under the plan for management of this area by the United States Forest Service for multiple, unrestricted use, the employees of Anaconda will have greatly expanded opportunity for the recreational use of this area.

The employees of Anaconda, as would seem to be the case of all but a very few of the citizens of the United States, are limited in both the amount of money and the amount of time which can be devoted to the recreational enjoyment of an area such as this. Under the management plan proposed by the Forest Service, these limitations are taken into consideration. Under the legislation that is the subject of this hearing, the employees of Anaconda and presumably millions of other citizens will be effectively and permanently locked out.

The employees of Anaconda should have the same rights to the use of this land as do the handful of pleasantly situated people who can afford the outfitters and guides, and who are not limited in the amount of time which they can spend away from their employment. The same would seem to be true for millions of other Americans.

Additionally, The Anaconda Company opposes this legislation upon the ground that the addition of these lands to the already vast "wilderness" area in Montana is not in the national interest.

Very little is known of the mineral potential of these lands. The mineral value of this area would be devoted to the benefit of all of the people of our nation and to the enhancement of the economic strength of the nation itself. Under a "wilderness" designation or classification, as is proposed by the legislation which is the subject of this hearing, The Anaconda Company would be effectively prohibited from even the exploration or prospecting of these lands. The nation would be deprived forever of the knowledge of what mineral wealth lies beneath the surface of this area.

Parts of the proposed wilderness area are similar in geological environment to that of the Heddleston District and contain mineralogical, structural, geochemical, and geophysical features of sufficient interest to warrant investigation by The Anaconda Company. Copper occurrences are known to extend northwesterly from the Heddleston district along the south margin of the area. Additionally, a large zone of geochemical zinc anomaly, described in U.S.G.S. Open-File Report, "Reconnaissance Geologic, Geochemical, and Geophysical Studies of the Southeastern Part of the Lewis and Clark Range, Montana," dated 1967, is found within and adjacent to the northeast boundary. Impressive gravity and magnetic geophysical anomalies, some of which may relate to subsurface quartz monzonite intrusives similar to that from which the Heddleston ore deposit was derived, were also detected within the proposed wilderness area by the U.S. Geological Survey during the Lewis and Clark Range investigation (Open-File Report). These occurrences are located at or near the projected intersection of regional structural features, and the area overall appears to be favorable for the localization of ore deposits.

Extensive field exploration is planned to determine whether commercial deposits exist.

It is submitted that before a decision can be made by Congress as to where the national interest lies in the use of these lands, the mineral value of this area must be ascertained. The effective use of the land belonging to the United States requires that we have complete knowledge of the land's potential for its greatest national use.

As of December 31, 1967, 2,899,764 acres of Montana's mountains, forests, streams and lakes are classified as either "wilderness" or "primitive" areas. This would seem to be adequate recognition of the rights and interests of the very few who would benefit from the proposed legislation.

It is for these reasons that The Anaconda Company opposes the proposed legislation.

Senator METCALF. The next witness will be Mr. Stan M. Starr, secretary of the Richland County Sportsman's Club, Sidney, Mont. Is Mr. Starr here?

(No response.)

I am trying to get some of these club representatives.

Is Mr. D. D. Neal, president of the United Sportsmen's Association of Montana, present?

Mr. VAN DER SANDE. Mr. Chairman, Dan Neal's term of office has expired. I would like to speak for him if I may.

Senator METCALF. We would be delighted to hear you. Please come forward and give your name to the reporter. You are going to represent the United Sportsmen's Association of Montana?

Mr. VAN DER SANDE. Yes, I am.

STATEMENT OF JOHN VAN DER SANDE, REPRESENTING THE PRICKLY PEAR SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AND THE UNITED SPORTSMEN'S ASOCIATION OF MONTANA, HELENA, MONT.

Mr. VAN DER SANDE. My name is John Van Der Sande. I am the duly elected representative for the Prickly Pear Sportsmen's Association of Helena, and also president of the United Sportsmen's Association of Montana.

Senator METCALF. I wonder if you would tell us what the United Sportsmen's Association is for the record?

Mr. VAN DER SANDE. The United Sportsmen's Association is a collection of all the sporting clubs across the State of Montana. There is no distinction between the type of groups of that nature.

Senator METCALF. Every municipality that has a sportsmen's group of whatever nature is entitled to belong to the United Sportsmen's Club?

Mr. VAN DER SANDE. Yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much.

Mr. VAN DER SANDE. I am not a native-born Montanan. I was born and raised east of the Mississippi, but I moved here 5 years ago for a very obvious reason: Montana is the last frontier of the legitimate sportsman. I have been a resident of Montana 4 years. I was born and raised in Wisconsin. In areas I hunted and roamed as a boy a short 35 years ago you'll see now little but commercial complexes, rigidly enforced "No Trespassing" signs or immense wastelands of industrial junk. Thousands of acres of good small game cover have been turned over to business interests, seldom left open to sportsmen and if it were, yielded little or none of the sport it had a few scant years ago. Even the water was so polluted any surviving fish were unfit to eat. Dams were built, new roads blocked off small streams, swamps were drained, changing the ecology of the land drastically. Hunting and fresh water fishing in the eastern United States is mostly the expensive put and take proposition, due largely, of course, to limited areas and dense population, but again their hunting lands disappeared and fishing

waters were sadly polluted a little at a time. A fine example of the desecration of land is the strip mining in the Eastern United States so prominent in the news recently, and many of you have seen the ugly scars left by greedy dredges right here in Montana.

These encroachments on the sporting world were so gradual as to be unnoticeable until suddenly there was little land to hunt on and very little clean water to fish in. What remained supported little game or had become the property of private clubs.

The fish and game management agencies may err, they are not infallible, but their errors in judgment can be corrected, if we have land suitable for the transplanting of wildlife and the suitability of the land does not include roads, buildings, mines, or any other permanent evidence of man's inconsideration for the balance of nature.

With Glacier Park to the north and Yellowstone Park to the south for the automobile bound tourist, it is inconceivable that one area cannot be set aside for those who want to return to nature in its most primitive form. Any given area can be converted into a profitable business venture in a few short years, but it would take many life spans to return that commercialized area back to a wilderness area.

Keeping these evidences in mind, it cannot be overemphasized that the Lincoln back country must be preserved as a wilderness area so that those who follow in our footsteps can know the joy, the peace, and the relaxation that goes with communing with nature, so that they, too, can pass on to their descendants the awesome wonder of wildlife in its own natural habitat.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much for your statement.

The next witness is Mr. Doyle N. Romans. Mr. Romans, we are pleased to have you here.

Mr. ROMANS. I would like to present one statement for the record for Mr. Virgil A. House, vice president, Rocky Mountain Industries. In the interest of time, we will present this for the record.

Senator METCALF. The statement will be received for the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF VIRGIL A. HOUSE, VICE PRESIDENT, ROCKY MOUNTAIN INDUSTRIES, WEST YELLOWSTONE, MONT.

Members of the subcommittee, my business as vice president of Rocky Mountain Industries is tourism and recreational services.

I know that the type of facility needed by the mass of tourning Americans is not an expensive two-week pack trip or a vast area to play in. They need accessible camp grounds and a place for a short hike that is different from the paved sidewalks and streets of their cities.

They need wildlife which can be seen from a car window. I doubt that the entire Lincoln Back Country, as a wilderness, will afford more sitings of grizzly bear than West Yellowstone's city dump. The grizzly bear has increased in that area in conjunction with the high rate of tourism and in conjunction with timber harvest on nearby forest lands.

Classification of the Lincoln Back Country as a wilderness area will serve no purpose other than to waste the valuable land resources and to eliminate one of our state's potential tourist attractions.

The resources that are contained in this area will, if properly used, become the source of a large number of jobs that will contribute to our state and national economy, and will, at the same time, promote recreation facilities to meet an ever-growing need.

I urge you to retain the Lincoln Back Country in full multiple use management.

Senator METCALF. Now, Mr. Romans, proceed.

STATEMENT OF DOYLE ROMANS, ON BEHALF OF THE MONTANA EAST SIDE FOREST PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Mr. ROMANS. My name is Doyle Romans. I speak for the Montana East Side Forest Practices Committee which has the following membership: Idaho Pole Co., Bozeman, Mont.; Yellowstone Pine Co., Belgrade, Mont.; Elk Studs Co., West Yellowstone, Mont.; Magera Lumber Co., Helena, Mont.; Townsend Lumber Co., Townsend, Mont.; Yamhill Lumber Co., White Sulphur Springs, Mont.; Burkland Studs Inc., Livingston, Mont.; Corcoran Pulp Co., Bozeman, Mont.; Northern Timber Co., Deer Lodge, Mont.; Jones Lumber Co., Livingston, Mont.; 3–D Lumber Co., Maudlow, Mont.

We support the U.S. Forest Service proposal for multiple-use management of the Lincoln back country.

We believe that the management of this land for the production of all possible goods and services is in the best interest of our State and our Nation. We feel that some wilderness set-asides may be beneficial to our society; however, there must be a limit to the amount of basic resources that can be forfeited for such uses. We feel that that limit has been reached and we will stand against further set-asides in every possible way.

Above all, we are against the type of action which has been exercised by Congressmen of this State in moving, by legislative proposal, to set aside an area without first seeking the opinion of the people of the State, and without regard for the opinions of professional land managers who are being paid from our taxes to be informed on the management requirements of that area with regard to the needs of the people.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Romans. Actually your Congressmen here thought that by hearing these statements we would be able to ascertain the will of the people. That is the purpose of this record.

Mr. ROMANS. We realize that, Senator. Our thinking here was that the hearings should have preceded the legislative proposal.

Senator METCALF. Now do you think that when we created the Bob Marshall Wilderness we forfeited resources?

Mr. ROMANS. Yes, I do. This would be my personal opinion. Any time we set aside these areas, merely what you people are talking about, wilderness, then they will be most ntaurally preserved. I don't feel we need to legislatively set aside land for protection. We have land managers that that is their job, and I believe they are capable of doing it.

Senator METCALF. So you regard the creation of a special use such as the wilderness use, as a forfeiture of all other resources?

Mr. ROMANS. I believe that there are certain values involved, sir, that have to be considered. Through hearings of this type you will, of course, here those differences of opinion. We believe that the wilderness bill, in itself, provides a means to do this.

Senator METCALF. Thank you for your contribution.

Mr. ROMANS. I have also a statement of my own for my company that I would like to present for the record. I will summarize that statement saying we also are in favor of the Forest Service management.

Senator METCALF. Of the multiple-use plan?

Mr. ROMANS. Yes.

Senator METCALF. The statement will be received for the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF DOYLE ROMANS, ELK STUDS CO., WEST YELLOWSTONE, MONT.

Mr. ROMANS. Members of the subcommittee, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Doyle Romans, forester for Elk Studs Co. of West Yellowstone, Mont. I am a forestry graduate and have been associated for 12 years continuously with forest land uses in this region through employment by the U.S. Forest Service, State of Idaho Forestry Department, and by private industry. I believe that the people of the United States are entitled to a fair return from their property. If a few citizens desire to restrict usage for their own benefit, then they should pay for that use in an amount at least equal to the monetary losses sustained by the rest of the people because of the restricted use. These losses occur from the lost sale of goods, reduced tax potential, and lack of employment potential that not only reduces the tax income, but necessitates greater compensatory expenditures. The loss of recreation potential that can be gained under full multiple-use management cannot be measured easily, but should weigh heavily on any decision concerning the use of the Lincoln back country, as should the loss of renewable timber and other resources.

Under multiple-use management, such as that proposed by the U.S. Forest Service, the Lincoln back country will provide needed recreation facilities for a large number of people and the facilities can be adjusted to fit demand so that the land will be serving at full capacity at all times. At the same time, the area will provide wood, water, wildlife, and forage on a sustained basis and will be subject to increased management for production as the need grows. Water yield alone can provide adequate justification for retaining the area under management. One fundamental phase of watershed management consists of the manipulation of vegetation on the watershed to influence the quantity of water stored and the time rate of delivery of that water. H. G. Wilm has pointed out in the 1949 Yearbook of Agriculture: "Removing merchantable timber on each four to five acres of high-altitude watershed land—in certain parts of Colorado—should make it possible to irrigate another acre of valuable land in the valleys below. Not only that, but it will increase the capital value of the watershed land itself through a treatment which ordinarily pays for itself and almost always gives a profit to the landowner and the timber operator." Fairfield Osborn, as President of the Conservation Foundation, quoted the above statement in the foreword of "Vegetation and Watershed Management," while pointing out that water requirements could double within twenty five years. The removal of the Lincoln Back Country from management makes its forests more susceptible to epidemics of disease and insects and more susceptible to disastrous fires that can destroy the wildlife and fish habitats, waste needed wood and forage, create flood conditions downstream, and render the area practically useless to man for many decades.

I do not believe that our nation is so rich that it can ignore the benefits to be derived from good land management—wood, water, wildlife, forage, recreation, employment, flood control, tax base—all components of a healthy nation—all renewable. I support full multiple use management of the Lincoln Back Country.

(The following statement was submitted by Mr. Romans on behalf of his company, Elk Studs Co.):

STATEMENT OF ELK STUDS CO., WEST YELLOWSTONE, MONT.

One Million Feet, What Will it Do?

Just how much DOES the manufacturer of forest products mean to the economy?

Timber from the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands in western Oregon alone are expected to add $1.1 billion to the Gross National Product and to provide nearly 75,000 man-years of employment during the fiscal 1968.

Each million board feet of logs harvested adds about $800,000 to the GNP and supports *54 man-years* of private employment.

These figures were developed in testimony submitted to the U.S. Senate committee hearing on the budget for Interior & Related Agencies. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. The next witness will be Prof. W. R. Pierce, professor of forest management, University of Montana.

Mr. Pierce, we are delighted to have you here, and have your help.

STATEMENT OF W. R. PIERCE, PROFESSOR OF FOREST MANAGEMENT, UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

Mr. PIERCE. Thank you, Senator Metcalf, in considering me in this rather lengthy program.

My name is Bill Pierce, and I am professor of forest management at the School of Forestry at the University of Montana. I would like to make it clear that I am neither speaking for the university school of forestry, nor any of my colleagues. This is my personal opinion.

The students we turn out, the young men and recently young women that are going into this profession, we consider them land resource managers dealing with our forest resources, regardless of the use that may be set up, and the management that comes of this land. We want them to be able to retain the resource in the manner that people wish, under the use desirable, whether it be for economic support of our basic forest industries for research, for recreation, water, range, or wildlife. So if you will take my statement in that view, I would appreciate it.

Senator METCALF. We not only will take it in that view, we will take it with a great deal of respect for the position you hold, and your skill at the University of Montana.

Mr. PIERCE. Thank you. Please accept this statement as an endorsement for retaining the Lincoln back country under a flexible land management policy as provided under multiple-use management. My arguments for this request are as follows:

Our forests are the result of many years of ecological development under certain environmental conditions. We like what this produced and now seek to preserve it for our recreational use and the recreational use of future generations. But we are much too myopic in setting our course. The intent is to establish a wilderness area to save the resource from the depravations of man. But in doing this we are only preventing one of man's activities that changes a forest. We are overlooking what should be a very obvious fact, the environment that produced these forest no longer exists; we eliminate fire, introduce new diseases and insects, bring in many new species of plants, and inject a new mammal, man, in ever-increasing numbers. If we are going to preserve this or any other forest for future generations, we should be managing the unit to accomplish this goal. What is proposed in wilderness management could result in a more drastic change in the forest resource than the so-called economic activities such as logging. Just because the changes are slower doesn't mean they are less or better.

This statement is not necessarily an endorsement of the present multiple-use plan, proposed by the Forest Service, rather it is a request for the necessary freedom that the professional forester needs to do his job in forest preservation. Admittedly, mistakes have been made and many more will follow, but if the forester is not free to change with the environment and to seek and use new knowledge as acquired, the forest will not survive under the increased land-use pressures that are sure to come.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Pierce.

I feel that I should reiterate the fact that the members of this committee have the highest regard for the Forest Service and the admin-

istrators of our public land. We have a great deal of admiration for the educational institutions such as the University of Montana, and the splendid Forestry Department they have there. Every once in a while there is a disagreement between Congress, sometimes in the appropriation side and sometimes on the authorization side, and sometimes the professional foresters. Sometimes you have a disagreement among yourselves and you come in and testify.

But the purpose of this hearing, of course, is to hear such men as you, and to finally ascertain if this area which was left out of the wilderness bill because it was a primitive area or wild area should not be included on a special or unique use, or should be considered, continued and developed as our very respected Forest Service management suggests.

Mr. PIERCE. I think these diversions in views that my colleagues have within an educational institution is what makes it so attractive, to me, anyway.

Senator METCALF. Sometimes divergent views make it attractive to this institution, too.

Mr. PIERCE. What I was concerned with, when you set an area aside as a wilderness, that the people who are so doing this aren't fully cognizant of the problems they give the land use manager in maintaining this unit under the restrictions imposed upon it, and it is a very strict restriction. All these areas are very delicate areas.

Senator METCALF. As you know, it is my hope that there at the University of Montana in our forestry school we get a Federal research grant for research into wilderness use and wilderness practice. I have talked to the dean many times about it, and we have underway a study going that will use your skill and that of your colleagues.

Mr. PIERCE. I hope so. It is just getting started. I hope it continues to grow, because it is a very real need. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Donald Aldrich. It is great to have you here before this committee, an old friend and old schoolmate.

STATEMENT OF DONALD ALDRICH, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE MONTANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. ALDRICH. Thank you. I am Donald Aldrich, executive secretary of the Montana Wildlife Federation, a statewide, nonpartisan organization with more than 40 affiliated clubs representing a total membership in excess of 10,000. Our support of S. 1121 is an expression of our primary objective to prevent further degradation of our environment.

Our membership is open to any organization or individual interested in promoting the wise use of natural resources. We offer a forum for all concepts, a multi-interest sounding board, evaluation and medium of communication. We feel that we represent the finer instincts of mankind, present and future, in our efforts to insure all men a pleasant, healthful environment, not only for recreational pursuits, but for everyday living.

The Montana Wildlife Federation is one of the 49 State affiliates in the National Wildlife Federation, the largest citizen conservation organization in the world. It provides information, guidance and coordination for 2.5 million people throughout the Nation.

In considering the future, Thomas Kimball, our national executive director, said:

> In view of the mounting populations and despite other pressing needs for funds, it is essential that areas particularly suited for public outdoor recreation and for Nature education and appreciation be brought under governmental control, either through acquisition or easements. To provide Americans with the widest possible variety of high quality outdoor experiences, it is necessary and desirable that suitable resource be set aside as wilderness.

The conflict in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is between an ancient philosophy that can conceive no benefit from standing mature trees and a growing faction of our population who believes public land management must also provide quality recreation, clean water, and varied wildlife. In an attempt to counteract the numerical advantage of people who support our policies there has been an attempt to enlist the support of the snowmobile, motor scooter, and automobile interests with promises of an opportunity to visit an area exemplifying wilderness charms.

There are many things wrong with this approach, but the most obvious misrepresentation is that roads and motorized travel would destroy the wilderness quality which is being used as bait. Many areas in western Montana once provided the same serenity, wildlife, and recreational opportunity now found in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area before they were roaded to remove merchantable resources. If these areas are not now suitable for mass recreation development, if the scenery has been so impaired, why should we sacrifice another pristine environment for a temporary economic boon to a small segment of our population?

Those of us who have a long established need for wilderness and a history of using it do not feel that we are asking for another set-aside. These lands have always been managed as wilderness. They were the buffer zone for the Bob Marshall primitive area prior to its reclassification. They were considered inviolate until the management plan for the northern half of the Lincoln ranger district was circulated. These valleys have always and can continue to provide habitat for two of our most endangered wildlife species, the grizzly bear and the western cutthroat trout, and in addition, have provided water of unsurpassed quality and a type of recreation which is rapidly being lost. We believe this is multiple use. Certainly it provides multiple benefits, but because a segment of our people believe timber harvesting must be included in all multiple-use areas, we feel that it is necessary to provide the Lincoln-Scapegoat area wilderness protection.

At the present time conservation interests are making some last ditch stands. Either we take on and defeat the exploitive element of industry and Federal agencies or a few generations from now the people of the Northwest will be requesting billions of dollars to rebuild a livable environment.

Some of the unnecessary developments I refer to are Sun Butte, Castle Reef, Cow Creek, and Reichle Dams. Like the proposed roading and logging of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, these proposals have been assigned economic benefit ratios without consideration of the economic, social, and scientific devastation they would cause.

It will suffice for me to say that the removable resources of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area are not needed by society or of sufficient quantity or good enough quality to be essential to the timber industry.

Others better informed than I and more familiar with the language will substantiate these facts.

If I have expertise in any field it would have to be in the art of enjoying leisure time in environments unaltered by man's endeavor to hoard. On such occasions I have often thought that we may have missed the true moral in our great character-building story of the grasshopper and the ant. Of course, I know this philosophy is pure sacrilege in a society that does not consider it essential to leave man's habitat as good as it was found.

It is only since the last 1930's that I have known the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, but it has substituted capably for the open spaces of my childhood. I've spent many wonderful days fishing, hunting, and just hiking in this pristine land but to know the supreme satisfaction of these pursuits one must have children to share it.

This pleasure has been mine. I am convinced that though the Lincoln-Scapegoat area were knee deep with gold it would still be more valuable to humanity as a place for a man to teach his children the joys, challenges, and the skills of living comfortably with the ground for a bed, stars for a roof, dew for an alarm clock, healthy fatigue for a sedative, and an appetite that makes fried fish and huckleberry pancakes an epicurean delight.

Easy access, numerous trails with gentle grades and the opportunity to make short loop trips with a minimum of backtracking makes the Lincoln-Scapegoat country an ideal place for families with small children to test their ability, their choice of equipment, and their enthusiasm for wilderness travel.

To me this is the most important reason for putting a "save" sign on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. But it is also important that we don't sacrifice the scenic grandeur of Red Mountain, Halfmoon Park, Scapegoat Mountain, the North Fork Falls, and the many mountain lakes or the habitat for many wild creatures and the serenity of an undisturbed environment.

It is not our desire to deprive the motoring public scenic drives. Those who desire homogenized humanity and creature comforts should be provided for, but not at the expense of those who cherish solitude, silence, and opportunity to observe wildlife in a natural environment.

Much of western Montana's and northern Idaho's most beautiful scenery is contiguous to our highway system or within easy driving distance on roads already developed to harvest natural resources. An investment equal that required to develop roads and recreational facilities in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area could provide accommodations for 10 times as many people and better disperse the use of it were spent where road systems already exist.

Coming from another environment you may neither be able to match the exaltation I feel in a wilderness environment, nor experience the depression I feel on viewing a ravaged area, but I am sure you recognize the need to consider the diverse human interest and requirements in the management of our natural resources.

Short-term physical outputs are more obvious than long-term social utility, but we cannot continue to consider only engineering studies in arriving at resource policies.

Our remaining undisturbed environments deserve more consideration than they have had in the past. It is time we defined our objectives,

consider all alternatives, and reconstruct our formula for determining best longtime public benefits.

We thank you for taking time from your crowded schedules and many responsibilities. We are glad to have the decision in your hands, because you recognize the public's interest in their lands.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Aldrich.

Now we will hear from Mr. R. H. "Buff" Hultman. Mr. Hultman, we are very pleased to have you.

STATEMENT OF R. H. HULTMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HULTMAN. Thank you, Senator. My name is R. H. "Buff" Hultman. I am president of the Montana Wilderness Association. I have been asked also to represent the Montana Wilderness Guides Association.

Wilderness is economy to the State of Montana. Even though wilderness is a free commodity, and should be given freely, as any gift of God should be given, it must be judged by its dollar-and-cents value, therefore I will try to evaluate this industry using my operation as a commercial outfitter as a base of figures, and multiply it by the Big Prairie district statistics. The Big Prairie ranger district is a bit over 400,000 acres, the Lincoln back country about 60 percent as large.

Let us first remember that the benefit to humanity is immeasurable. How much is an extra day of life worth? I think doctors would testify that many days of life have been gained because of the time spent in the back country away from worries, tensions, smog, and other pressures.

Now to the commercial value: In the Big Prairie district there are 34 commercial packer campsites for fall hunting, some running 10 or more per campsite. We run a small camp, not over five per camp.

This fall we have 34 nonresident hunters who will pay the State $5,100 for licenses, pay $8,500 outfitter fees. Based on $100 per man, and this is low, they'll pay out $3,400 for tips, whisky, clothes, ammunition, car rentals, and many other items. The ones who are driving will spend $1,040 for gas, restaurants, and motels in Montana. This is based on 20 hunters we have who are driving and average three to a car. Fourteen hunters traveling by air will spend more than $2,800 for plane fare. This is approximately $200 apiece. This makes a total of $20,840. For the Big Prairie district packers this amounts to $708,560 on nonresident hunters alone. Add to this the pleasure many Montana residents have hunting this area with no commercial fees, but they too spend money on equipment, licenses, and so forth.

Very briefly, a résumé of summer use—we have a summer gross of $20,000. One other outfitter may take in as many people as we do and between us we probably take in half of the nonresidents who use the area. I am not bragging, just minimizing to be on the safe side. This would total $80,000 summer use with approximately 400 summer nonresident users, $4,000 in licenses, $40,000 in miscellaneous spending; again figuring $100 per person for fishing tackle, clothes, gifts, liquor, car rentals, and so forth, $40,000 plane and train fare, $5,200 for those who travel by auto. This is broken down to $30 for gas, $40 for motels

(2 nights), $64, meals (4 days), and four people per car. This totals $169,000 worth of summer use in the Big Prairie district and this 400 is probably one-third of the summer use in the area. The others are the do-it-yourself outfits and local people who can enjoy the area without large travel expenses, but they do spend a lot for equipment and clothing. Add to this the fees paid by the outfitters to the Forest Service for camp and horse feed.

The new rates proposed for 1969 based on a fee of $25 per hundred guest days, plus grazing fees, will cost me over $500 in forest fees. Base this on the 1968 summer figures it would mean over $5,900 for guest fees, plus $3,400 grazing fees, or a total of $7,300 for Forest Service fees in this district alone. An overall total of $880,960 for use of the Big Prairie district for quality recreation. And not one thing has been taken out of this area to mar its beauty, or that can't be replaced by natural proper management. No wood to cut or campgrounds to clean for these fees, as the outfitter must police his own area.

So if you figure the money spent by local enthusiasts who use this area, and the money spent with local merchants, I am sure it would be over $1 million.

I have eight people a year to help in the wilderness, some are college students who work for the summer, and three who work 6 months or more. There are probably over 200 employees in the outfitting industry in this area.

I repeat the true benefits of wilderness are not in dollars and cents. They are in physical well-being, natural beauties, spiritual uplift, plus the greatness of solitude. But if it must be broken down it can match dollars with anyone and will last forever if properly managed.

The Forest Service, the woods products industry, the mining industry, and many others, have projected their needs and uses into the year 2000. It is time we project our wilderness use into that time also. There are not many true wilderness areas left, and they must be protected. To paraphrase Julia Ward Howe: "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the creation of the Lord," but how many of yours and my grandchildren will be able to say the same if we do not plan for them now.

Please join the Montana Wilderness Association and other conservation groups in their support of Senator Metcalf's Senate bill S. 1121 and Representative Battin's House bill to make a wilderness area of the 240,000-acre Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Mrs. Kenneth Baldwin?

STATEMENT OF MRS. KENNETH BALDWIN, BOZEMAN, MONT.

Mrs. BALDWIN. Senator, I would like to present a statement from Kenneth Baldwin, who is president of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

Senator METCALF. Very well. The letter will be incorporated in the record.

Mrs. BALDWIN. My name is Mrs. Kenneth Baldwin, and I now live in Bozeman, Mont., but at one time I lived west of Great Falls. Throughout the years I have become fond of this unmanipulated country known as the Lincoln back country, which is described in Senate bill 1121.

In preparing notes the other day, I happened to abbreviate the Lincoln back country to just Lincoln, B.C. It was then that the thought ocurred to me that, of course, these mountain vistas, these lakes and streams, the flora and the fauna of the area may have been then, much as it is today. An old tree dies, another lives, but essentially the land is the same. Perhaps this is why the undefinable "call" of the wilderness is answered by the hordes of urban dwellers who hasten to leave behind every evidence of man and seek out silence and solitude. This is quality environment and it is my plea that it not be sacrificed to mass entertainment.

It is sad, but facts bear out the economic theory that humans have unlimited wants and limited resources. Wilderness at this time in history is very, very limited, yet mankind seeks unwittingly to elminate all of it. We need to keep such vital resource, that it may add to our lives some growth and satisfaction. By stretching our souls in God's country, away from manmade cement, steel, and asphalt jungles, we can find deep meaning, real joy, and personal fulfillment.

Is it any wonder that as prisoners of the economic, noisy world, we seek to break the bars that bind us and try to rehabilitate ourselves in a natural environment, every break we get? We all need a place where we can think and feel without being crushed to death by pressures. We all journey to fulfillment and we need to clarify and restate our goals.

Planners have produced much unsatisfactory recreation; fun for the moment but of no great value. Man lives daily on the brink of an abyss and the best soul-saving prescription is the good earth beneath his feet, the feel of the sun, the wind and the rain, undeflected. It will take him back to his beginnings and fortify him for the future. It results in mental health and a revived spirit.

In wilderness each human is an individual, while in congestion only an uncertain, unimportant, and invisible fraction of a dot. An individual we all desire to be. There is a shallowness to contemporary life and we become bored with current commonplaces. Hence the desire to seek out something on our own. In wilderness we can seek and we can find.

Blessings on the foresighted men who would set aside this small segment of unruffled earth from the inroads of misguided civilized men, who feel they can change everything and make it better.

Upon entering the Lincoln back country, I feel like saying, "Keep silence, friend, for some have come to cast their care on God today; and some to praise from thankful hearts; and some 'Thy Kingdom come' to pray. Keep silence. Let Him speak anew to every heart—perhaps to you."

Thank you for listening.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF KENNETH K. BALDWIN, PRESIDENT, FEDERATION OF WESTERN OUTDOOR CLUBS

Gentleman, the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs wishes to go on the record in favor of passing S. 1121 which would protect the Lincoln Back country under the Wilderness Act of Sept. 1964 with metes and bounds as outlined in S. 1121 by Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield and also in H.R. 7148 by Representative James Battin.

The FWOC represents 45 clubs with over 85,000 members in the West. Long before I was elected as president of FWOC I personally visited this area and have since made further studies as to its value as wilderness.

These visits to the Lincoln Back country have all been made on foot with backpack. Here is an unspoiled reach of mountain wilderness which is especially suited to both young and old who wish to have solitude just beyond the road end. There are many points of entry which put the rugged peaks, the jewel lakes, small streams and wooded valleys within an easy day's walk for Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls and others who choose to walk for recreation.

Each time that I have been in this area there have been parties along the clear streams and lakes. Here is a multiple-use area—recreation, wildlife, watershed, grazing. Yes, everything that the public land can provide except mining and logging of a marginal timber resource.

In the Lincoln Back country lives the flora and fauna that are studied and enjoyed by the aforementioned users. Mass recreation facilities and roads would delete the high quality uses. The invasion would also cut up the necessary habitat of several of the Nation's endangered species.

Therefore the FWOC asks that immediate steps be taken to enact S. 1121 and its companion measure H.R. 7148.

Mrs. BALDWIN. Thank you for listening.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mrs. Baldwin, for a very impressive statement.

Norma Ashby, I am delighted to welcome a former member of my wife's Campfire group. Norma, it is good to have you here.

STATEMENT OF NORMA ASHBY, HOSTESS AND PRODUCER OF "TODAY IN MONTANA," GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mrs. ASHBY. Thank you, Senator Metcalf.

I am in support of designating the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area as an official part of our wilderness system in America.

There are many reasons for my support but I think the primary one is the great need in our fast-moving society today for privacy. The Lincoln back country provides such privacy. In the summer of 1967 my husband and I spent 6 days together in the back country. I think I should say that we got in 1 day before the forests were closed because of fire danger. In all of that time we did not see another person. It was truly a back-to-nature experience and one we shall cherish our entire married life. My husband said "Honey, what would you have done if anything happened to me?" Since this was my first experience in the back country I said, "Well, I probably would have taken our roll of toilet paper and written 'help' across Meadowcreek and prayed that a plane going over would see it." The day we returned from our pack trip we visited with two families, one from Georgia and one from New Jersey. They had just spent 10 days together in the Bob Marshall Wilderness. They said to me, "do you realize what you have here in Montana? You have the greatest answer to many of the unsolvable problems in our society today * * * a place to be alone with your creator. This wilderness doesn't just belong to you folks in Montana, it belongs to the entire Nation. Don't ever let any of it be taken away. For our own survival there's got to be places like this in America."

These two out-of-State families put the argument for saving the Lincoln back country in its natural state much better than I ever could. I am a native of Montana, as a fourth generation Montanan, and sometimes it is tough for me to be objective about questions like this.

However, I appreciate the vision my ancestors had in building Montana and by the same token I feel a similar responsibility today in doing what I can to preserve a piece of Montana in its natural state so that it can be enjoyed by generations of Montanans and Americans in the years to come.

I encourage your support of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area as an official part of our wilderness system in America. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mrs. Ashby. I will tell my wife her Campfire Girl grew up in accordance with the tenets of that organization.

Next is Mr. Leonard Lambkin. Mr. Lambkin should probably be addressed as "Mr. Lincoln," because he is a representative of the town of Lincoln and the Lincoln area and is a distinguished resident of that area. We will be very pleased to have your testimony, which is expert and knowledgeable from years of living in that place.

STATEMENT OF LEONARD LAMBKIN, LINCOLN, MONT.

Mr. LAMBKIN. Senator, ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to have this opportunity to talk to you about a subject that is very much on my mind these days—the question of survival of the Lincoln back country as a truly primitive area; country such as lured me 50 years ago and still has its hold on me.

I moved to the Blackfoot Valley in 1919 to make a living and a home for my family. The country around Lincoln was as wild then as the Lincoln back country is today. When we bought our first property in Lincoln, that had previously been owned by Tom Danaher, there were other places and occupations available that would have provided an easier living.

Nevertheless, I moved there and brought my family, which then consisted of wife and baby son, because I dearly loved the mountains and I felt I could see a great recreational future for this particular area.

Our first business was called a dude ranch. The working season was from early June until Labor Day, with the majority of people who came as guests being from Helena. Later, I helped form the Dude Ranchers Association and then we began to reach people all over the eastern part of the State. We would care for their children while they packed into the back country or hunted and fished in the Lincoln area.

As time went on it became necessary to build more rooms and cabins. Mary, my wife, ran the hotel, kitchen, dining room and cabins. Her family style meals became famous all around the country.

There were not many people who stayed in the valley during the winter. The game we hunted in the fall carried us throughout the winter. But game was very plentiful then and we would pack into the back country during the wonderful fall weather staying 3 or 4 weeks at a time, hunting and fishing. It was wonderful to get away after a summer of hard work to enjoy complete relaxation of mind and body while setting on a hillside miles away from all worries and care. Here a man could think undisturbed by human elements or perhaps just sit and not think at all—but sit and drink in the marvelous aspects of nature that God gave us to protect and enjoy.

Gradually times changed, cars became more plentiful and travel easier. More and more people began to find our valley. We never believed in those days that the use of this country would grow to what it is now. We thought that there would be enough wild country for a long time to come.

However, people are coming in greater numbers than ever before so that it now appears that Lincoln and our valley are going to be known as the town near what was once the Lincoln back country. Surely something must be done to save some of it and the day is fast approaching when this may not be possible

Lincoln may soon become a town near a great mining development. This again will bring in more people and more pressure on the wild country near us. It only stands to reason then that some of the country must be kept as it was, otherwise the very thing for which many of us chose Lincoln as our home will be lost forever.

My greatest wish is that right thing be done by this area so that my granchildren and yours may know the fine times that we have known.

I have, therefore, urged my old friend, Senator Mike Mansfield, along with Senator Lee Metcalf, to hold this hearing and to listen carefully to all of you. It is my hope that some of the wild country that has always served us so well will be set aside to remain in its present state.

In closing, I would like to express my belief that Senate bill 1121 will be a good law and will preserve for all time the very things that gave our valley life from the beginning, and I firmly desire the area to remain a wilderness.

Now, I would like to say I was very much interested in this multiple purpose, multiple use of forest. I worked 3 years on the Helena National Forest for the forest, and I saw the day this change came about also.

I might say, too, that yesterday I celebrated my 84th birthday. We had a party, it was really something, given by my family and friends. I am not in too good condition to talk more.

Senator METCALF. The next witness will be Mr. Dick Lyman, of the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association, Missoula.

Mr. COPENHAVER. Due to an accident, Mr. Lyman will not be with us. I am a director.

Senator METCALF. Come forward, please.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD W. COPENHAVER, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS DIRECTOR OF THE MONTANA OUTFITTERS & GUIDES ASSOCIATION

Mr. COPENHAVER. Mr. Chairman, my name is Howard W. Copenhaver. I have been a director of the Montana Outfitters & Guides Association, and a guide for almost 40 years. What Mr. Buff Hultman and Mr. Tom Edwards said is almost completely the report the Outfitters & Guides Association wants to give, except for one thing. There is nobody can really appreciate, I don't believe, what this wilderness means to people unless you have taken the children, as I have, and other outfitters here, when they were in their teens, through this area, and then visit them or have them return with their grandchildren and have them explain to you what it has meant to them in their whole life.

Senator METCALF. Thank you, Mr. Copenhaver.

Mr. COPENHAVER. I wish to support wilderness classification of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. My reasons are very basic.

I have been an outfitter for more than 30 years taking people from all over the United States into the Lincoln-Scapegoat country as well as the surrounding wilderness areas and am very familiar with the country. The Lincoln-Scapegoat country is accessible to anyone on three sides from good roads. It is an area used by individuals, families, Boy Scouts and other groups, as well as outfitters for hiking or pack trips to gain a wilderness experience so beneficial to many people in this day and age.

It is so geologically located that it can be traversed in 3 or 4 days on foot by novice campers seeking fishing, hunting, and wilderness experience at little or no expense.

I feel the togetherness of a man and his son in the solitude of God's country for a few days, whether just a youth or a young man leaving for college or some war-torn part of the world, is of far greater value to our country than the commercial dollar values that can be set upon timber, minerals or access roads for management.

I do not see how we can build all weather roads and maintain them with taxpayer dollars when our country and people are so financially distressed and claim we are doing the best for the most. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. The next witness will be Mr. Robin B. MacNab, of the Montana Livestock Markets Association.

(No response.)

Is Mr. Robert S. Nobis, of the Intermountain Logging Conference, Inc., here?

Mr. NOBIS. I have never talked to a Senator before, and I am scared.

Senator METCALF. We are perfectly harmless. We are the ones in front of you. But I don't know about that group behind you, though.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT S. NOBIS, SECRETARY-MANAGER, INTERMOUNTAIN LOGGING CONFERENCE, INC., COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO

Mr. NOBIS. I am Robert S. Nobis. I live in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. I have had my own practice as a forest consultant since 1955. I received a B.S. degree in forestry at the University of Idaho in 1951. Between 1951 and 1955 I was employed as a forester for the Bureau of Land Management. For the past 5 years I have been retained on a part-time basis as secretary-manager for Intermountain Logging Conference, with which I know you are familiar. However, I am appearing here as a professional forester and an individual recreationist.

As a forest consultant my work brings me into Montana frequently. As a professional forester I see the great need to manage our public lands for the greatest use of most of the people in the long run. I deplore the sight of trees rotting on the stump, especially when we are told by Federal economists that in 20 years the demand for lumber probably will be doubled.

Consequently I am alarmed that a comparatively high percentage of the commercial public timberland in Montana has been reserved for single use. I strongly recommend that this request for additional wilderness area, the Lincoln back country, be disapproved.

As an individual recreationist, I resent additional wilderness areas. I am one of the majority of recreationists who cannot afford annual

trips into the wilderness by pack train. I must take my tent or camper which, of course, necessitates road access. To lock up some of the finest recreation areas in the Northwest for a limited few does not seem fair to me.

In your report and when the final decision on Senate bill 1121 is made by Congress, I hope that the desires and needs of the average citizen will be the controlling influence and not the pressures of small groups.

Also I implore you to consider the difference—and values—of conservation as compared to preservation. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. That was harmless, wasn't it?

Mr. NOBIS. Yes.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Dan Neal, president of the Cascade County Wildlife Association, Great Falls.

Mr. HORACE G. ANDERSON. Mr. Dan Neal could not be here and I am here to take his place.

Senator METCALF. State your name.

Mr. ANDERSON. Horace G. Anderson. I am a director of the Cascade County Wildlife Association. I have a statement for the association, and I also have some comments of my own.

STATEMENT OF HORACE G. ANDERSON, APPEARING PERSONALLY AND AS DIRECTOR FOR THE CASCADE COUNTY WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION

Mr. ANDERSON. The purpose of this hearing is to establish whether or not the Lincoln back country should be included into the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. As we already know the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area is one of the last true wilderness areas left in the United States that has the rugged beauty of Glacier Park without the roads and concentration of people.

The Bob Marshall Wilderness Area is attracting more people every year to its natural beauty and soon it is going to be considered crowded. Gentlemen, we need more room to spread these people out; in the Lincoln back country we have a wilderness area that can do this. If our future generations are going to enjoy this type of wilderness area we must act now to insure that they will have it to enjoy.

We feel that to enjoy wilderness areas there must be a feeling of quiet and solitude that can only be found in an area where there are no motorized vehicles allowed. We are not a group that is against motor bikes and that type of transportation but a true wilderness area is just not the place to use them. There are only 240,000 acres involved in the Lincoln back country and in Montana alone there is many times that number of acres where that type of motorized transportation can be used.

Some groups say that a wilderness area can only be enjoyed by the rich, but this is not true. People can travel the wilderness areas by back packing or they can rent horses without the cost being prohibitive.

For all of the above reasons the Cascade County Wildlife Association, with its 1,800 members, recommends that you do all in your power to annex the Lincoln-Scapegoat area into the Bob Marshall Wilderness area.

Now, as for my own personal comments. I pack and guide for an outfitter that goes into the Bob Marshall Wilderness. I returned late last night from that area on a fall hunting trip. There are a few comments that I have noted, and I don't have time to be repetitive here of things that have been said.

First of all, the Forest Service is a Government operation. The people do as they are directed to, and they are not always right. This is the time in the United States when we should bring the Government back to the people, and let the people decide what they want to do. In other words, at times we place all of this area in the hands of one man, and this is not wise I do not believe.

The cost of this trip into this area has been brought up many times here today as prohibitive to the average person. I have guided now since 1956, which is 12 years. I have guided my first millionaire on this last trip. The rest of these people, I don't think, were above average income, because they had to scrape up money. This was one trip in 5 years that they could probably go on, but they still managed to get money to go on this trip. It was said by a gentleman before me that he could not afford a trip like this. He had to have some place to take his camper. I have made many trips into the back country. I wish I could afford a camper to go on the road with.

It has always been said here that mining industry does not hurt an area as far as a recreation area. From a man from Wallace, Idaho, if a man has been to Wallace, Idaho, he knows what it looks like.

You cannot see a true wilderness area from a car, as would be proposed by the multiple use of putting roads through this country. The man who is driving had better keep his eyes on the road on a mountainous road. You cannot look around, you cannot enjoy the beauty. You cannot step off your horse and look around, or sit down with your back pack and look around you and see the things. I have made trips into the White River area in the Bob Marshall Wilderness. Every time I see something different, because I get a different view of it from a horse.

Also, I would like to bring out that it has been said here that bills on national forest usage, brought out in 1898, said this and that. The year 1898 is a long time ago, and we have many more people now to contend with. If we are going to turn this into a multiple-use area as the Forest Service recomends, I would like to know what they consider multiple use. I lived in California during my service career. I tried to go find a stream to go fishing with my family. If you didn't get there 15 to 20 minutes after the Fish and Game Department of California planted fish, you didn't catch any fish. If you did, they werent worth eating, anyway. You had no natural fish in this area.

Also, along with this multiple-use program, I didnt realize that this 240,000 acres of Montana was so valuable until today. I believe now that all the gold in Montana and all the timber in Montana is concentrated in this one area.

If we will take and look at magazines, books, pictures of China, we can see what multiple use has done there. There is not a tree left standing because they needed the wood.

This multiple-use recreation that the Forest Service is trying to put in there would mean thousands of people concentrated on that small area, which is smaller than Glacier Park. We can all see what

would happen. The beer cans would pile up. What type of recreation they could have, I don't know. There would be no fishing, there would be no hunting. As far as recreation, I guess it would be a picnic. There are picnic sites all along our interstate highways in rugged mountain country for this type of people that do not want to go into back country.

For these reasons it is my personal viewpoint that if our generations in the future, which has not been mentioned here—I don't mean in 50 years or 100 years, but if we can last as a Nation for 200, 300, 400 years—if we have this small area set aside where people can walk into, ride into, and see what it was like generations ago, they will thank us for preserving the country and establishing and bringing the Lincoln-Scapegoat country into the Bob Marshall area. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSON. I also have five letters from friends I would like to submit for the record.

Senator METCALF. They may be received for the record.

(The following comunications from: Mr. and Mrs. Richard C. Donnelly, Great Falls, Mont.; Robert M. Rossmiller, Great Falls, Mont.; O. D. Woolsey, Cascade, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. George Verstegen, Vaughn, Mont.; and D. D. Neal, Great Falls, Mont., were received for the record:)

STATEMENT OF MR. AND MRS. RICHARD C. DONNELLY, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

My wife and I wish to urge you to support the incorporation of the Lincoln back country into a Wilderness area.

We spend as much time as possible in this area, hunting, fishing and hiking. We feel it is especially important that this area be protected because of the recent mining developments in that area. If this area is lost to these mining interests, the city of Great Falls will lose its closest outdoor recreation area.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. ROSSMILLER, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

I am a student of wildlife biology from the University of Montana. Being a member of the Wilderness Society, I believe that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area is too precious to be destroyed by logging, roading, and other destructive development. Therefore, I am in favor of and support S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 which will protect this area.

STATEMENT OF O. D. AND HELEN WOOLSEY, CASCADE, MONT.

Channel 3 on television has explained very well what the bills, that will add a bit to the wilderness areas is. This being my home state, my wife and I return for five months each summer from St. Petersburg Beach, Florida, to enjoy all of Montana's natural beauty, its good fishing, and ideal climate. Please *do* preserve more land for future generations. In the past 20 years real estate developments have spoiled Florida's coast line for fishermen. Directly after the last big world war my wife and I ended up at St. Petersburg Beach. Several nights a week we joined another couple for fishing where the tide flows out to sea. The girls would only catch, with dip nets, the huge shrimp 5 inches long at least. We fellows used all we needed for bait and shrimp for cocktails and to be fryed were kept on hand. As every fisherman knows, fresh seafood surpasses any frozen or canned variety. These shrimp nature hatched out in the bays in shallow grassy flats and the outgoing tides took them out to sea. Now, after a 20-year period, so many land fills occupy the bays near St. Petersburg that the broad bays are like canals. The nearest live shrimp

are caught 50 miles north of St. Petersburg. Gone is one of West Central Florida's best tourist attractions—fishing and shrimping. Florida is gradually destroying what it has to offer its tourists. Gone are the shells and sea life that once was very plentiful. As your men on T.V. stated, we need some places in this good old U.S.A. where nature can be preserved—animals, minerals, fish, birds, natural terrain. Do place the names of us two Woolseys favoring your bills.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE AND JOAN A. VERSTEGEN, VAUGHN, MONT.

We offer our enthusiastic support of the effort to conserve the wilderness. We cannot be said to make the offer out of any political leanings, but only out of our sincere convictions.

We would be very glad to be of some material assistance—such as addressing and stamping a reasonable amount of printed material.

There may possibly be some other chore that willing and fairly-competent hands could do.

STATEMENT OF D. D. NEAL, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

I do "stand firmly in support of S. 1121" which would authorize Wilderness Classification for two hundred forty thousand five hundred acres of National Forest Land. That area which is more commonly known as the "Lincoln Back Country Scape Goat Mountain Area."

I am satisfied that the addition of this area to the present Bob Marshall Wilderness Area would be just another step in progress toward conservation of one of our most valuable, natural resources.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Clifton R. Merritt, from the Wilderness Society.

STATEMENT OF CLIFTON R. MERRITT, DIRECTOR OF FIELD SERVICES FOR THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. MERRITT. Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf, I am Clifton Merritt, director of field services for the Wilderness Society, with headquarters in our western regional office in Denver, Colo.

To provide more opportunities for other Montana citizens to testify here today, I would like to make just a few brief comments and observations at this time. I ask permission to submit for the hearing record a more detailed statement of the Wilderness Society later.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. MERRITT. As a native Montanan who is acquainted with the Lincoln back country, I am delighted that this hearing is being held today on S. 1121 by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield to make the Lincoln-Scapegoat area a part of the national wilderness preservation system.

Five generations of the Merritt family have used and enjoyed the Lincoln back country for quality recreational purposes. We have spent many pleasant days hiking and horsebacking riding on the trails. We have camped, fished, and hunted throughout much of the outstanding area. Many thousands of other citizens from Montana, in addition to countless thousands of people from more distant parts of the Nation, have used the area for quality wilderness recreation. The area supports a substantial guiding and outfitting industry which grosses about a quarter of a million dollars a year.

S. 1121 is not a proposition to create more wilderness. It is a proposal to protect by Federal law the wilderness, in fact, that the people of Montana and the Nation now have and have used and enjoyed for

several generations. Should public servants in the Federal Government tell the American people now that it is wrong for them to use this pristine wild country as wilderness, and that it must be taken away from them? I think not.

Besides the very important and growing use for wilderness recreation, proper land planning dictates that the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat Mountain area be retained in an undisturbed, natural condition. This is high, precipitous, fragile country along the Continental Divide where watershed values are paramount and commodity values are minimal. These watershed values can best be protected by leaving the land alone, free from a proliferation of logging roads, vegetational cover removal, and other manmade disturbances that could cause serious erosion problems.

I have a high regard for the capability of the Forest Service, and I count many of its employees as my friends. But I feel the Forest Service would be making a tragic mistake to road and log and otherwise develop the Lincoln-Scapegoat area—just as it would have made a serious mistake if it had proceeded as planned to road and log and otherwise develop the high country of the upper Selway.

You will recall in the latter instance how a Blue Ribbon Study Committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, after a thorough investigation of the matter, found that the upper Selway should be managed in a primitive condition. The two areas are similar in several respects.

Perhaps nowhere outside of a protected area today do we find so many species of wildlife endangered with extinction or which require essentially a wilderness habitat in which to survive as in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. Among these are the noble grizzly bear, bighorn sheep, mountain goat, wolverine, cougar, bald eagle, ptarmigan, black-spotted cutthroat trout, and grayling. Even the elk, which is the source of much quality hunting recreation in the Lincoln-Scapegoat country, is ecologically a wilderness animal. Game biologists have found that the elk does not prosper in the wild state without wilderness. Does it make sense to permit one agency of our Government, the U.S. Forest Service, to invest considerable sums of money for the development of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area and thus jeopardize so many endangered and wilderness-loving species of wildlife, when another governmental agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, is spending significant amounts of public funds to carry on an endangered species preservation program?

Some persons who testify here today will talk about wilderness being a "single use" and about "locking up resources." Some of these same people and the industries they represent opposed the wilderness bill 10 years ago. In their opposition to basic wilderness preservation legislation they used the same arguments 10 years ago. How fortunate for present and future generations that the American people and their representatives in Congress rejected these false arguments then. How fortunate, instead, that they pushed on to establish in the public interest the Wilderness Act of 1964. Wilderness is not a single use. On the contrary, it is definitely a part of the multiple-use concept, as was clearly spelled out in the Multiple-Use and Sustained Yield Act of 1960 which applies to the national forests.

Statements that so many million dollars, based on estimated timber volumes, are to be derived from roading and clear-cut logging the limited amount of timber in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area are largely speculative. According to all the evidence, the quality of the timber in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is inferior to that in the Pacific Northwest, including that in the Flathead area of northwestern Montana, and cannot be expected to command by volume similar prices. Investments in a permanent logging road system and in intensive forest management for the Lincoln-Scapegoat timber cannot be justified if the higher wilderness values of the land are considered. Among these higher values are wilderness recreation, scientific and educational uses, watershed protection, preservation of endangered and rare species of wildlife, and historical purposes.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area is heavily used for wilderness purposes by the citizens of Helena, Great Falls, Missoula, and vicinities, as well as by many other visitors from other regions. It is their wilderness. It should be retained for the public benefit in a wilderness condition.

The acreage of our public lands being dedicated to wilderness preservation in Montana are none too large when one considers that in 33 States, which contain most of the 200 million Americans, there is little or no wilderness left. The wilderness of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area admirably serves Montana and the Nation.

For those reasons and others which the Wilderness Society will submit for the hearing record in a more detailed statement later, I join with the many other Montanans, as well as with citizens from all over the Nation, in expressing my enthusiastic support of S. 1121 to give wilderness protection to the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat Mountain area.

Now, I also have four statements from Montana citizens, all of whom support the passage of S. 1121, and I ask they be made a part of the hearing record.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection they will be received.

Mr. MERRITT. Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you today.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

(The detailed statement of Mr. Merritt follows:)

DETAILED STATEMENT OF CLIFTON MERRITT, DIRECTOR OF FIELD SERVICES FOR THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

I am Clifton Merritt, Director of Field Services for The Wilderness Society, with headquarters in our Western Regional Office at 5850 East Jewell Avenue in Denver, Colorado. At the hearing of your Committee in Great Falls, I presented a brief statement in support of S. 1121 and requested and received permission to submit for the record a more detailed statement later. This statement follows.

The Wilderness Society is a national conservation organization of some 40,000 members who are actively interested in the preservation, for the use and enjoyment of the American people, of our disappearing wilderness resource. We greatly appreciate the efforts of Senators Lee Metcalf and Quentin Burdick and others in making this hearing possible.

I am a native Montanan who lived for more than a quarter of a century near the area being considered today for a wilderness designation. I have been in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Mountain area many times and am well acquainted with its characteristics and its resources. For several years, The Wilderness Society has sponsored annual trips into the area, and many of our members and cooperators are familiar with it.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area encompasses approximately 240,000 acres of incomparable mountain wilderness. It is located some 60 miles northwest of Helena, near the recreational community of Lincoln, and is contiguous to the southeastern side of the Bob Marshall Wilderness. Beginning in the middle 1800's, several generations of Americans have used and enjoyed the area for wilderness purposes. Yet, as a part of the general National Forest System, it has received no special protective designation. Consisting for the most part of high country straddling the Continental Divide, only its inaccessibility and lack of significant timber or other commodity resources have saved its magnificent and primeval qualities from development.

In 1963, the Forest Service announced plans to develop the Lincoln Back Country for timber harvest and intensive recreational use. The Montana Wilderness Association, the Montana Wildlife Federation, Outfitters and guides, the Montana Fish and Game Department, and many other concerned groups urged that the irreplaceable area be given wilderness protection. Developed recreation and timber harvest plans of the Forest Service call for the construction of a network of roads. The primary road system would include a scenic recreation road from Augusta to Ovando that would bisect the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

WILDERNESS VALUES

Evidence of man's activity is extremely rare in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. The most discerning wilderness sojourner may revel in solitude amid the exquisite natural scenery of high mountain snow fields, rushing streams, and narrow valleys which are richly carpeted with wildflowers. Scapegoat and Red Mountains, both of which rise above 9,000 feet, are scenically magnificent.

Abundant wildlife makes the area particularly attractive to recreationists. Bighorn sheep, mountain goats, grizzly bear, and moose range these mountains, along with elk, mule deer, whitetailed deer, black bear, and cougar. Other rare or unusual wild creatures that inhabit the area include the Montana grayling, wolverine, ptarmigan, and bald eagle. The area provides high quality wilderness hunting in season, as well as unexcelled opportunities to observe wildlife in undisturbed natural environments. Here, too, high in the headwaters of the Columbia and Missouri Rivers, is found one of the principal natural stocks of the endangered native cutthroat trout.

Much of the proposed Wilderness lies in high-area zones, with steep gradients and shallow soil, where protection of the watershed is of paramount importance. Five wilderness rivers—the East Fork, North Fork, and Landers Fork of the Blackfoot, as well as the Dearborn and the South Fork of the Sun River—flow from the area. These clear streams provide miles of spawning areas for the native cutthroat trout. Erosion from road construction and other man-made developments could seriously affect these valuable fisheries.

Complementing these wilderness values are several small natural lakes and many beautiful alpine and subalpine basins and parks. A large variety of wildflowers bloom in profusion throughout the area from June to September.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat country is one of the extremely few remaining haunts of the endangered grizzly bear within the lower 48 states. The grizzly requires wilderness to survive, and the preservation of this area is vital to the protection of its numbers in those few states where this magnificent wild animal still occurs.

Wildlife authorities point out that both elk numbers and the hunters' success ratio would decline significantly if logging road networks were constructed through the area.

The area has a long tradition of wilderness use for horseback riding, hiking, backpacking, camping, sightseeing, fishing, and hunting. Recreational use ranges from family hiking and camping on the valley floors to backpacking trips and horseback packtrips into the high country. Twenty licensed guides and outfitters conduct recreation-seeking guests on foot and horseback trips through the area, an industry which produces locally one-quarter of a million dollars each year. Roading and otherwise developing the Lincoln-Scapegoat area are totally incompatible with the maintenance and growth of this guiding and outfitting industry.

Although small and shallow, the natural lakes of the area provide visitors with opportunities for especially high quality fishing and camping experiences. However, they could not support intensive recreation use and would deteriorate rapidly if exposed to heavy fishing pressure from adjacent developed roadside campgrounds.

Foresters familiar with the timber in the proposed Wilderness find it poor in both quantity and quality. The area includes a few stands of inferior Douglas-fir, but most of the timber volume consists of lodgepole pine—a low quality lumber species which occurs throughout hundreds of thousands of acres in nearby roaded areas of the National Forest. If the higher wilderness values of the land are considered, investments in a permanent logging road system and in intensive forest management cannot be justified.

Mineral explorations to date disclose a low mineral potential for the proposed Wilderness. Water and forage values present no conflicts to a wilderness proposal. Grazing of domestic livestock, other than for recreational stock, does not exist in the proposed Wilderness.

A need for developed campgrounds and other intensive recreational facilities can be satisfied more appropriately outside the proposed Wilderness. Many excellent campgrounds and sites for their development exist nearby—along State Highway 200, the Blackfoot River, and in the rather heavily used Seeley Lake and lower Sun River areas—without destroying wilderness resources. Surely, Montana's 34 million acres of federal lands—in addition to many more millions of acres of state, county, and private ownerships—provide adequate sites for recreational development without sacrificing the irreplaceable wilderness and wildlife values of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. These values are too precious to Montana citizens and the Nation to allow their elimination by logging, roading, and other destructive development. Only a wilderness designation, as provided in S. 1121, will assure their protection.

The Wilderness Society joins the Montana Wilderness Association, the Montana Wildlife Federation, and other cooperating organizations in Montana and throughout the Nation in urging prompt enactment of S. 1121 for the classification of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as wilderness and its addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this statement.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF GENE SULLIVAN, BIGFORK, MONT.

This is in regard to the hearing that you are holding September 23, in Great Falls on S. 1121 to make the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat Mountain area a part of the Wilderness System.

I am a rancher and also do some guiding and outfitting. I have been in the Lincoln back country. It is a fine area of wild country that should be left undeveloped for wilderness use. Part of it can't be logged and a scenic road be put through it without ruining the whole area for guiding and outfitting purposes. More than 20 outfitters now make a living for themselves and their families taking guests into this area. They gross about ¼ million dollars a year. This important industry would be destroyed if the area is developed.

I support S. 1121 to make the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat Mountain a Wilderness Area.

STATEMENT OF MRS. DONNA POLISCHUK, HELENA, MONT.

Please put this letter in the hearing record on S. 1121, the bill to classify the Lincoln back country for wilderness purposes.

I am very much in favor of this bill by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield to make the Lincoln back country a Wilderness Area. It is very popular in its present condition to many people in Helena and vicinity who enjoy hiking and horseback riding trips in the area.

I hope that your committee will act favorably on S. 1121 and assure that we and our children, as well as theirs, will continue to enjoy this beautiful wild country.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM CLAUSEN, HELENA, MONT.

This is to express my strong support of S. 1121, by Senators Lee Metcalf and Mike Mansfield to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Lincoln back country as a Wilderness Area.

I have camped on Copper Creek and hiked into the Lincoln back country a number of times. It is a beautiful natural area that should be left as it is, undeveloped and wild.

I hope that it will always remain as wilderness and, to this end, I urge prompt passage of S. 1121.

STATEMENT OF FRED P. GABRIEL, HELENA, MONT.

This concerns your hearing before being held in Great Falls September 23 on S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield and Representative Battin, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Lincoln back country and adjacent wilderness lands as a Wilderness Area.

These bills have my wholehearted support, and I urge their prompt enactment.

I am 78 years old and have been engaged in the ranching business most of my adult life. I also own and operate a sawmill and have done considerable logging. During the past 35 years I have been in the area in question many times. I am familiar with the timber stands of the West Coast and Northwestern Montana. The timber in the Lincoln back country doesn't compare with the other stands. It is poor in quality, scattered, and strictly limited. In my estimation, it is not worth destroying all this beautiful wild country and the fine trail-type hunting and fishing and sightseeing that exists here.

If more places for campgrounds and other developed recreation sites are needed, they should be located elsewhere. There are better places for campgrounds along the Blackfoot River nearby and the highway, in the Sun River Country, and in the Seeley Lake and Swan Valley areas. I am against a high mountain scenic drive or other roads through the Lincoln Back Country. They would cut up the land and ruin the wild country for other uses.

I hope you will approve S. 1121 and make the Lincoln Back Country and the area around Scapegoat Mountain a Wilderness Area.

Please include this letter in the record of the hearing.

Senator BURDICK. Next will be Nicholas J. Kirkmire, Beaverton, Oreg.

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS J. KIRKMIRE, BEAVERTON, OREG.

Mr. KIRKMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I am Nicholas J. Kirkmire. I reside at 3065 SE. Cresmoore Drive in Beaverton, Oreg. I am here today because I am concerned about the future recreation opportunities for my two sons, age 7 years and 14 months, and my two daughters, aged 6 years and 3 years.

The wilderness system, as it is now being developed, is misleading too many concerned Americans. Areas that are being set aside exclusively for wilderness recreation are to be forever denied to the average family to use. We need roads and developed campsites. We need to have trees protected from insects and fire and disease. All of these things are compatible with other uses of the forest including watershed, fish and wildlife habitat, grazing and timber production.

Another thing that concerns me deeply is that this legislation, if enacted, would set an undesirable and unwarranted precedent by placing in the national wilderness system a large area not previously classified as a primitive area, nor justified for wilderness preservation in its entirety. As Senators, you men have the responsibility and the privilege of exercising great power over the things that are woven into the fabric of our everyday lives. You concern yourselves with the air we breathe and the water we drink, you also involve yourselves in our conditions of employment and the medical care and schooling available to us. In recent months you men have also approved legislation which withdraws large areas in California, Oregon, and Washington forever from multiple use. You further impose ever-increasing taxes on a tolerant electorate to pay for all these things. And you must also concern yourselves with the remaining in public office if that is your desire.

I particularly wish to direct my closing remarks to this last point. The Lincoln-Scapegoat area, in its present state, is used by relatively few people. But these are people of influence, and that is why I am here today to try to protect something that belongs to all the people for the use and enjoyment of all the people. Enactment recently of the legislation which established the North Cascades National Park and related wilderness areas and the Redwoods National Park has established several dangerous precedents. Perhaps the most distressing is that despite the cases made by sincere, well-intentioned people on both sides of the issues, the whole park and wilderness package was involved in voting on the Colorado River project. Who can define the boundary line between expedient political considerations and the true good of all the people? Perhaps we will know better on November 5.

I feel that land management decisions involving public lands are better left to the professional land managers in the employ of the Government of the United States. I hope that you will let the future of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be decided in this sensible, rational manner. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Do you represent any organization, or appear by yourself?

Mr. KIRKMIRE. I am appearing on my own behalf.

Senator BURDICK. What is your business?

Mr. KIRKMIRE. I am a professional forester.

I also have statements from several other people opposing S. 1121, which I would like to have entered in the record.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection they will be received for the record and printed in the appropriate place.

Dr. Horace H. Koessler, of Intermountain Lumber Co. & Tree Farms, Inc.

Senator METCALF. Dr. Koessler is one of our very distinguished people of the area. We are delighted to have him here.

STATEMENT OF DR. HORACE H. KOESSLER, PRESIDENT OF INTERMOUNTAIN LUMBER CO. & TREE FARMS, INC., MISSOULA, MONT.

Dr. KOESSLER. Thank you, Senator Burdick and Senator Metcalf. My name is Horace H. Koessler. I am president of Intermountain Lumber Co. & Tree Farmers, Inc. My place of residence is Missoula, Mont. I am a director of the Western Wood Products Association, the National Forest Products Association, and chairman of the Montana Forest Practices Committee; I am a director of the First National Bank of Missoula, Mont.; I have been a member of the Montana Stockgrowers Association for more than 30 years; I am a member of the executive reserve of the Department of Commerce of the United States. My formal education consists of bachelor of science degree from the University of Chicago (1930), and a M.D. degree from the McGill University of Montreal, Canada (1938).

Since 1946 I have been involved in the logging and lumber-manufacturing industry in western Montana. My first visit to the Lincoln area was in 1925, when my father purchased four saddle horses from Fanny Sperry Steele on Arrastra Creek, a few miles west of Lincoln.

Forest products appear essential in the economy of the United States. Not only do they include lumber and plywood, doors and

windows, toys and furniture, and, less obviously, paper and plastics, textiles and chemicals—the list totals more than 5,000 products. Between 25 and 30 percent of the national wood harvest comes from public lands; here in the West, it exceeds 70 percent. This production fills many important needs of our people and represents an important fraction of the national economy. Many communities, mostly somewhat rural in character, are wholly or largely dependent on the forest products economy; such communities are not confined to the Western United States, but are found nationwide. The U.S. Forest Service is keenly aware of their obligation to supply an important fraction of the raw material for this industry; indeed, their projection indicates that by the year 2000 they will be called upon to supply a much greater portion of our national wood supply than is the case today; their plans for improved forest management include meeting such demand.

Foresters, executives and managers in all facets of the wood industry are deeply concerned at the rapid and continuing erosion of the land base on which to grow the required raw material for this great industry. The set-asides for national parks and wilderness areas continue to take their toll, as do highways, powerlines, reservoirs, and the urban sprawl, itself. Today, 383 proposals for removing commercial timberlands from multiple-use management (which includes the orderly harvest of timber) have been counted in our Nation; these proposals are based on esthetics and recreation.

Now, there are more than 10 million acres in the States of Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana removed from multiple-use and timber harvest in national parks and wilderness areas. Much of these lands remain unused by the people. The State of Montana and our Nation simply cannot afford the further locking up of commercial timberlands and the loss of their contribution to our overall well-being.

It will be said that the 240,500 acres in question is an insignificant fraction of our public lands and, therefore, that there can be no valid objection to their inclusion in the wilderness. The fact is that this proposal is only one of hundreds today advocated in our Nation. The rule of thumb states that return to the overall economy is at least 25 times the selling price of timber, per thousand board feet. The U.S. Forest Service reports in Miscellaneous Publication No. 941, using the approximately 10 billion feet of Forest Service timber harvested in 1958 as a base, that the economic value of each thousand feet harvested in our Nation was $443.54. In view of inflation proceeding at 4 or 5 percent annually, that figure may well be assumed to be 40 or 50 percent higher today.

The proposed lockup in wilderness status of the 240,500 acres in the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area will not only eliminate proper forest management and silvaculture, resulting in the loss of an annual harvest of 16 million board feet and worth more than $8 million each year to the economy of Montana, but will also eliminate this entire area from mass recreation—the type of recreation more than 90 percent of our people seek, adjacent to their automobile.

Recreation and proper forest management, which includes harvest just as does proper management of hay fields or wheat fields, are thoroughly compatible. Big game animals have been forced into our higher country by encroaching civilization and require large openings.

These will be caused, either as they have been, historically, by wildfire in overmature, diseased, decadent trees, or through logging. Using a hundred-year rotation for annual allowable cuts in the Rockies can result in only a small fraction of the managed timberland showing scars of harvest.

The wilderness set-aside concept is a selfish, uneconomic one for the benefit of the very few who have the desire, physical condition, and time to visit these areas on foot or horseback. The recreational opportunities for the mass of our people, the stability of our timber-dependent communities, and the economic well-being of our Nation, all dictate that our forest lands be operated under multiple use, which includes the growing and harvest of successive crops of timber on our commercial forest lands. Public Law No. 86–517, the Multiple Use Act of June 12, 1960, was intended to insure such management.

Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Doctor.

Joe Dzivi, Conservation Committee, Kalispell.

Mr. LIVINGSTON ROGERS. Senator Burdick, Mr. Dzivi is sick. He will not be here. I have a statement for him which I can present when my turn comes if you wish.

Senator BURDICK. Fine.

Mr. Robert G. Kokoruda, president, Prickly Pear Sportsmen's Association.

Mr. VAN DER SANDE. Our organization has been represented, Senator Burdick.

Senator BURDICK. Dr. Elmer W. Smith, Lincoln, Mont.

STATEMENT OF DR. ELMER W. SMITH, LINCOLN, MONT.

Mr. SMITH. Perhaps my point of view is somewhat different. You have covered most of the ground of why we ought to try and preserve the Lincoln back country. I thought perhaps it might be an interesting idea, as to why we should try and preserve it for the wild inhabitants thereof.

Probably the greatest predator our world has ever seen has been mankind. The amount of killing we do is staggering among animals, among ourselves.

We import a great number of animals every year, and most of them die. We have 74,000 mammals last year; 203,000 birds, excluding parrots and canaries; 405,000 reptiles; 137,000 amphibia, and millions of fish, all brought in, probably most of them on a pet basis. Many of the pets can't possibly live. We have the spider monkey, you have the wooly monkey and squirrel monkey, so wily and hard to keep alive. You have an Indonesian fairy bluebird brought in, and dies almost as soon as it is sold. We have the three-toed sloth that can be bought on the New York market and many pet shops. Nobody has ever succeeded in keeping it alive in captivity.

Along medical lines, in 1967 we brought in 62,000 primates, monkeys and apes. In 1958, 1959, and 1960, we reached a peak of 223,000, 190,000 221,000, respectively. These were probably used mostly for polio research, but they were killed just the same. We are now using them to test diseases, for arteries, for transplants. A little better than bootlegging hearts. But there are 250,000 chimpanzees in the world, and they won't last very long. They are using, exclusive of cattle, sheep,

goats, and horses, 10 million pounds of undressed furs, 11 million pounds of undressed hides and skins.

The hunting is regulated somewhat in this country. In other countries of the world people simply hunt for food. The amount of killing is unknown.

In the United States alone we have provided 127 million acres of wet lands. Fifty million acres of this land has already been converted with express highways and so forth, destroying its usefulness.

Perhaps figuring that the Lincoln back country should be used to preserve your wild animals is an outrageous idea, but I think it should be considered. We have all enjoyed them. I think they have about as much right to live as many humans.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you very much.

The next witness will be Mr. Livingston Rodgers, president of the Great Falls chapter of the Montana Wilderness Association.

STATEMENT OF LIVINGSTON RODGERS, PRESIDENT, GREAT FALLS CHAPTER OF THE MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. RODGERS. I have been coordinating some of the efforts of some of the people who wrote letters in connection with this hearing. In this connection I did receive a statement from Mr. Joe Dzivi. I gave it to his son, because he was expected to be here, but I got a note this morning that he was ill, so I will just submit his statement and copies for the record.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection, so ordered. It will be printed at the end of your remarks.

Senator METCALF. Senator Burdick, before Mr. Rogers goes ahead, I want to say that we are very much indebted to him and members of the committee for efforts in coordinating and preparing and plowing the ground for this hearing before we came out. He has been of great assistance to me, to my staff, and to Mr. Porter Ward on the staff of the committee. We want to thank you publicly.

Mr. RODGERS. Thank you very much.

I received letters which were written to me to be handed in to the committee at this hearing. Some came before the June hearing, and then subsequently we have received other letters. Mr. Fred Hill, city clerk, when the original hearing was scheduled, received letters addressed to Senator Burdick. I do have some letters that came in, including letters received today. Of these letters I received a total of 20, and 19 were against Mr. Metcalf's bill. One is in favor of it. These were letters that were addressed to Senator Burdick at the Civic Council Chambers.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection they will be received and placed at an appropriate place in the record.

Mr. RODGERS. In addition to those letters, the ones that were received from different sportsmen's groups, I received a total of nine from Northern Continental Conservation Committee, Lewistown Rod & Gun Club, Montana Wildlife Federation, Hill County Wildlife Association, Skyline Sportsmen's Association, Powell County Sportsmen's Association, Upper Gallatin Conservation Association, Billings Chapter Montana Wilderness Association, and the Billings Rod & Gun Club. I will introduce those statements.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection they will be received.

Mr. RODGERS. Then, in addition to that, I received individual letters from 182 people in Montana in favor of Mr. Metcalf's bill. I received letters from 28 people in 14 States outside of Montana, from Mrs. Roland Renne, in Washington, D.C., to Hugh Galusha, in Minneapolis. So in addition to the 182 from in-State and 20 out-of-State, there are 210 letters in favor of the bill, which I will introduce.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection they will be received.

Mr. RODGERS. Then I also received group letters. Ninety-five citizens from Chinook, 30 members of the faculty of Eastern College, Mr. Henning spoke this morning, 10 from Helena, 16 more from Helena, 42 in Great Falls, 59 from Fort Benton, and 59 from Laurel, which is in all 314 signatures on these letters. Of course, they are in favor of the bill. Thank you.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF JOE DZIVI, FLATHEAD WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, Members of the committee, my name is Joe Dzivi and I am President of the Flathead Wildlife Association. Our Association and I strongly support passage of legislation to create the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area. I live in Kalispell, Montana and I have been a lifelong resident of this state.

During the 1930s I was employed by the U.S. Forest Service as a Packer and on game management. This job involved packing supplies into the remote areas by packmules and studying wildlife and its habitat in a large area of the Flathead National Forest, including portions of the present Bob Marshall Wilderness area. Part of the time while on this job, I lived year around in remote ranger stations accessible only by trail. In the past 40 years, I have hunted, fished, hiked, packed or camped in nearly every section of western Montana's forests and mountains including the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. I have been privileged to enjoy our great wilderness areas and I am concerned that unless we use the most perceptive foresight this privilege will not be available for future generations to enjoy.

The Forest Service has designated a 500,000 acre study area which includes the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area. The Forest Service has concluded that only two alternate possibilities for management of the study area exist. Either wilderness classification or development of a complex of roads for scenic drives, commercial development and logging. The Forest Service favors the latter proposal on the grounds it provides for a great variety of recreational opportunities not now available in the Region. They argue that development of a road complex in the entire study area would permit more ready access to primitive and wilderness areas for short term or short distance excursions.

I believe that the Forest Service's premise that there are only two alternatives available for management of the study area is erroneous. The proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat area involves only the most remote one-half of the 500,000 acre study area. If the wilderness area is created, the Forest Service plans for developing the study area could be utilized in the remaining 250,000 acres. This would permit realization of nearly every one of the Forest Service's stated goals and still preserve the beautiful wilderness area in its natural state.

The northern region of the Forest Service includes 16 national forests with a total area of 26,000,000 acres located in eastern Washington, northern Idaho, Montana and the western Dakotas. There are hundreds of areas and sites in this region which can and should be developed to encourage greater use by the motoring public. Anyone who concludes that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is the only or best area for such a development is not being realistic. This area is ideally situated for establishing a wilderness area. If the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is established, it will in effect extend the existing Bob Marshall wilderness area to a point where it is much more accessible to the casual or short term wilderness adventurer.

Our present wilderness areas may be ample for today's population but will they be adequate in thirty, fifty, or 100 years Once a wilderness area is destroyed it cannot be restored. Gentlemen, I respectfully urge you to give favorable consideration to this measure and assure to our grandchildren the

right to see and enjoy what our fathers found when they came to this great country. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Mrs. Harold Goldberg, New York.

(No response.)

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Sherman S. Cook, Lincoln.

STATEMENT OF SHERMAN S. COOK, JR., LINCOLN, MONT.

Mr. COOK. Senator Metcalf, Senator Burdick, thank you for the opportunity to appear here this afternoon.

My name is Sherman S. Cook, Jr. I have lived at Lincoln, Mont., for more than 15 years, and have been postmaster there for 10 years. By way of background, my formal education includes a year at the University of Montana as a forestry major. My practical experience includes more than 5 years as the owner and operator of a small wood-preserving plant and sawmill near Lincoln. I am vice president of the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association, and a charter member of the Lincoln Lions Club and the Lincoln Volunteer Fire Department. I am very much interested in affairs which concern the welfare of my community.

I have used wilderness on many occasions in the past and have found some of these trips among my most enjoyable experiences. I am no longer able to do so myself, but I would like to see enough such areas kept intact to provide for the needs of other Americans forever. However, this is not my principal reason for appearing here today. My chief concern is with the full extent to which opening the Lincoln Ranger District has affected Lincoln and all its citizens. By opening I mean the decision to commence intensive management for saw log production and other purposes. I am profoundly disturbed by what I have discovered.

To demonstrate my reasons for concern, I would like to draw a few comparisons between Lincoln and Augusta. Both are in Lewis and Clark County. Each has a population estimated at about 450, and the post offices of each serve an estimated 1,000 people. The two offices generate almost exactly the same amount of gross receipts. Here the similarities end. Taxable values in Lincoln School District 38 for fiscal 1968 are $855,000 while those at Augusta total $1,944,000 in round figures, or more than double the tax base at Lincoln. Augusta has many good, substantial homes. Lincoln has relatively few modern homes. Most of the land in Augusta School District 45 is in private ownership and is on the tax rolls, but most of the land in Lincoln School District 38 is Forest Service land. Augusta has a high school. Lincoln needs one terribly but so far has not been able even to consider financing one. A few years ago Augusta was able—barely, I am sure—to build a sewage system. Lincoln needs one even more but cannot hope to finance it under present circumstances.

One is impelled to question why two towns in the same county, and of almost identical size, should differ so greatly in their outward characteristics and in the relative sizes of their tax bases. How does it happen that Augusta can furnish some of the most essential public services and educational facilities, and Lincoln apparently cannot? An analysis of what constitutes economic base and tax base reveals the answers.

Since the principal factor in the economic base at Augusta is ranching, it follows that the economy is quite stable, encouraging permanent residents and businesses in the town serving the ranching community. This, in turn, encourages construction and purchase of permanent-type homes and commercial building, contributing materially to the tax base. As mentioned above, most of the land in the school district is on the tax rolls and contributing to the tax base. Lincoln, on the other hand, has, for the past 15 years, been heavily dependent on logging and lumbering and mining exploration activity for much of its economic base. A few modern homes have been built during this period, but more than half the population live either in trailer homes or in made-over summer cabins which cannot be considered anything but substandard housing. Accordingly, the tax base has not expanded in proportion to the increase in the population. We are critically short of rental housing but no new units have been built for several years. The result is a tax base within the town itself of only $246,445 taxable value, a base so small that we are unable to furnish our citizens with any essential public services, as is dramatically demonstrated in our need for sewage disposal.

In the summer of 1967, the Helena engineering firm of Morrison-Maierle, Inc., sent engineers out to Lincoln to look the situation over. Since no money was available to pay them to make a real engineering study upon which to base firm cost estimates, the best they could do was to give us a very rough, educated guess of $300,000 for planning and construction of a disposal system, a figure they admitted was very probably low. Considering that construction costs are rising very rapidly, a more realistic figure today might be $350,000. Assuming we might obtain maximum Federal grants totaling about $100,000, we would have to raise $250,000 ourselves. Unfortunately, the legal limit to which we could issue general obligation bonds for this purpose is only about $45,000 or less than one-fifth of what would be needed.

The pitcure is equally dismal in respect to our other critical need—a new elementary school and a high school. Our grade school is an outmoded firetrap, bursting at the seams. Our high school students must either live away from home or travel 60 miles to Augusta or to Seeley Lake daily. It is sufficient to say that for Lincoln to duplicate the Seeley-Swan High School would cost us very close to $300,000 but our bonding capacity to finance it is estimated at less than half that amount.

We must now inquire into why our capacity for public finance is so far short of our most pressing needs. I do not wish to anger anyone who works for the Forest Service or who works in the lumbering industry, but I feel compelled to recite here the harsh facts of our economic situation, since I am unaware that anyone else has taken the time and trouble to uncover them. The men who work in the woods and sawmills are hard-working people doing dangerous jobs. I have no doubt that Lincoln merchants deeply appreciate their patronage, but the inescapable conclusion which must be drawn is that, on the average, these people do not, under the conditions prevailing in their industry today in the Lincoln area, earn sufficient annual incomes to enable them to invest in homes and other taxable property which would make a fair contribution to the tax base. It is not their fault. It is the fault of a basic policy decision made many years ago by the

Forest Service when it decided to attempt to sell substantial quantities of marginal timber in the Lincoln Ranger District without giving adequate thought to the consequences. But this is only the lesser part of the cause of our troubles. The rest of it is almost unbelievable.

In 1967 Lewis and Clark County schools received a total of $9,393.06 from forest reserve funds. These are the moneys derived from the sale of Forest Service timber in the county and returned to the school districts in lieu of taxes which would have been paid on these timberlands had they been in private ownership. Of this amount, Lincoln School District 38 received only $286.43. If the national forest lands within our school district alone had indeed been in private ownership, they would have yielded our district $23,902 in taxes instead of the miserable pittance—$286—which we received. This won't even educate one child for 1 year in elementary school. Since nearly all the timber sales on the Helena Forest within our county are in the Lincoln Ranger District, our school should have received most of the $9,393 paid to the county school fund, but we get cheated out of even a fair share of that amount, which is at best only a fraction of what the timber harvest should yield to our school and road funds. Over the past 8 years, we have been cheated out of enough money to build and equip a high school. I think it is time to amend this unfair law to give communities like Lincoln something approaching a fair shake, both in the amount of timber sale money paid to their schools and in the manner in which it is distributed. I certainly do not propose that the public lands should be sold, but I do believe that if the timber harvested from them cannot yield enough money to pay at least most of the cost of educating the children of the workers engaged in logging it, then the timber should not be harvested until such time as it can yield enough, and also can yield those men a fair and adequate living.

Perhaps I am naive, but I can scarcely believe that the Forest Service men and the educated, informed representatives of the lumbering industry here today will continue to insist that sawlog production from the Lincoln area be expanded. According to figures contained in the management plan for the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide study area, if they are accurate, we could expect to have to provide facilities for up to 50 additional elementary school students. We would absolutely have to build a new school to accommodate them, but prospects are dim that we could do so without a direct and substantial subsidy from the buyers of the additional timber sold. As you can see, we simply cannot handle any additional population without triggering a financial crisis. Worse, it might trigger an epidemic of waterborne disease which would force closing of many of our businesses, resulting in an utter and complete collapse of the local economy. It seems incredible, but there are circumstances in which more jobs and more people are not good for a community, and Lincoln is in precisely that position now.

While the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat Mountain area admittedly would not be used as heavily in its present state as would be the case if road access were provided, it clearly is an asset to Lincoln if retained as wilderness. Just as clearly, if developed for timber production it will become a liability. I support passage of Senate bill 1121.

22-003—68——8

I might add just one more comment on the cost of wilderness use as I have found it. Some of my most enjoyable experiences have been in the use of the Lincoln back country and in the use of the wilderness parts of Glacier Park. I have a pair of boots I had made that cost me $50. I have walked those boots probably 500 or 600 miles, and I can still use them. The use of them has cost me about a cent a mile. The only other cost involved, because you have to eat anyway when you are out in the back country, has been the cost of the gasoline to get to the end of the road. Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

Farrell J. Ford?

(No response.)

Bob Weintz, former member of the Montana Fish and Game Commission.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT WEINTZ, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mr. WEINTZ. Senator Burdick, honorable members of the committee, and honored guests, my name is Bob Weintz, I am a farmer east of Great Falls, a director of the Cascade County Wildlife Association, a director in the Montana Arms Collectors Association, and am a former member of the Montana State Fish and Game Commission.

I ask the committee's support to include the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat Mountain area into the Bob Marshall Wilderness area. I will not describe the geographic features of this area, insofar as boundaries, square miles, and so forth, are concerned as this has been done by many others, I will only say that this is an area of virgin timber, scenic beauty, fresh air, and lakes and streams with clear water. It is one of the last strongholds of the grizzly bear. This area also is the home of the majestic elk, the mule and whitetail deer, the black bear, and the rocky mountain goat. It is also the home of the native cutthroat trout and other trout which abound in the area.

It is an area where man can get away from the ring of the telephone, the buzz of the loggers saw, the clank of the roadbuilding and mining machinery, and really get close to and enjoy nature as God made it.

There are those who say this area should be opened up by roads so that it may be enjoyed by all persons. I submit to you that if this were to happen, then this area would become just another mountainous area with a road through it and would lose all of its wilderness characteristics as well as having its wildlife species endangered. We already have thousands of miles in Montana as well as the rest of the Nation, of mountainous areas with roads through them. I would also like to add that in this business of opening this area up for roads for the public enjoyment would call for an additional entire complex network of roads to get to the area, because in the first place it is a remote area, it isn't along some major highway, so it would necessitate the building of a tremendous road network.

I have been a lifelong resident of this area and based on my experience as a sportsman, a member of the fish and game commission, and as a guide for outfitters, I have seen the ever-increasing number of people, young and old, rich and poor, who come to Montana from all parts of America. In the summertime as well as in the fall, to enjoy this wilderness area for just exactly what it is—a wilderness area.

I happen to be one American who doesn't believe we have to cut down every tree, dam every river, or level every mountain for this Nation to survive. I believe we can maintain a healthy and progressive economy and remain a powerful country and at the same time retain our wilderness areas.

With this in mind, I know that I speak for thousands of people, when I ask you to do whatever is necessary to include the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat Mountain area into the Bob Marshall Wilderness area so that it may be preserved for future generations to enjoy just as we in this generation are enjoying it. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

John A. Thompson, Lincoln.

(No response.)

H. T. Schassberger and G. E. Walker, American Metal Climax, Inc.

Mr. WALKER. My name is G. E. Walker, I am speaking for both of us.

Senator BURDICK. Come forward.

STATEMENT OF G. E. WALKER, REPRESENTING AMERICAN METAL CLIMAX, INC., DENVER, COLO.

Mr. WALKER. Senators, ladies and gentlemen, I will give this brief statement on behalf of American Metal Climax in regard to the matter at hand today.

The area known as the Lincoln back country now under consideration for inclusion in the wilderness system is the heart of an area studied by the U.S. Forest Service. The results of this study are given in a Forest Service report dated 1968 and entitled, "Patterns for Management, Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area; Lolo-Helena-Lewis and Clark National Forests."

This study is an objective appraisal of the present and possible future uses of the area and recommends multiple use rather than inclusion in the wilderness system.

American Metal Climax, Inc., supports the Forest Service conclusions and, specifically, multiple use including mineral development for the following reasons:

1. It would provide the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

2. The U.S. Geological Survey in an open file report dated 1967 and entitled, "Reconnaissance Geologic, Geochemical, and Geophysical Studies of the Southeastern Part of the Lewis and Clark Range, Montana," by M. R. Mudge, R. L. Erickson, and M. D. Kleinkopf, clearly shows geochemical and geophysical anomalies which indicate reasonable possibilities that major ore deposits may be found within the area. Although this is excellent work, it is nevertheless of a preliminary indicative nature. Not enough time has elapsed for interested people to do the followup work necessary to evaluate the possibilities. Generally many years are required from the discovery of the first indications of mineralization to the delineation of a viable ore deposit.

3. It is inconsistent to expend taxpayers' money for a survey of the mineral potential of an area and then include that area in a wilderness system without considering the result of such a survey or allowing sufficient time thereafter for followup work by the private sector.

4. Considerably more minerals will be required to meet the needs of our growing population and provide for a rising standard of living. To satisfy these needs we must be able to find and mine major mineral deposits not now known. The Lincoln back country offers promise of such deposits. This promise should not be ignored.

American Metal Climax, Inc., believes that areas such as this, wisely administered by the Forest Service, will retain much of their wilderness characteristics and at the same time serve to provide society with improved and expanded recreational areas as well as timber and minerals for a growing economy.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of presenting our views on this question.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

Senator METCALF. Just a minute, Mr. Walker; is American Metal Climax Co. doing any exploration or development in the area at the present time?

Mr. WALKER. Not in this specific area, sir.

Senator METCALF. But you are exploring an adjacent area?

Mr. WALKER. We have been increasing our activities in Montana now for several years.

Senator METCALF. I am very pleased about that, but you heard somebody from some mining company testify that they felt that there was not sufficient protection in the Wilderness Act, which permits exploration until 1983, to warrant them going in and exploring an area that is administered as a wilderness. Does your company have the same feeling?

Mr. WALKER. I would like to answer that question as a private citizen, if I can.

Senator METCALF. You can answer. We won't attribute it to the company.

Mr. WALKER. I think there is a certain scare factor, if you will permit the use of that word. For instance, we all like to make an investment. If we have to put out to make that investment, we are not going to do so, or we will be disinclined to do so if we cannot see reasonable certainty of capitalizing on a success of this investment.

Senator METCALF. So you want to be sure to check every modern technique before you open up an area to invest in?

Mr. WALKER. I would say we want to test everything before we try to invest in it. Yet if we make an investment, we would like to feel there would be a chance to capitalize on it.

Senator METCALF. Actually, you know, mining people came in and we tried to work out something satisfactory to them in the wilderness bill. It leaves some of this area which had, or which geologists felt had, mineral potentials which were undeveloped and unexplored, open for exploration. Now we are told by witnesses, such as the one that preceded you, that is all of no avail and that there is no use having such a reservation in there because they are not going to use it anyway. Perhaps I will introduce an amendment to strike that part of the bill and say there will be no mining exploration at all, because I see no reason for that kind of intervention if you are not going to use it.

Mr. WALKER. Perhaps I have been misunderstood, Senator. I wouldn't say that industry would not use it if they were given a chance to use it.

Senator METCALF. It still is a valuable tool for the mining industry available in a wilderness area.

Mr. WALKER. Exploration, sir.

Senator METCALF. Exploration as permitted under the Wilderness Act.

Mr. WALKER. Yes; as permitted until 1983. That is the way it reads right now. This is why I am talking as a private citizen and not as a company representative; what surety is there after 1983?

Senator METCALF. Well, the mining people told us that these potentialities could be carved out and discussed by then. Then, of course, we still have to approve the conversion of primitive area into wilderness areas, and we have to have an act of Congress for that.

I have been disappointed in the mining testimony today, that that tool we left with the mining industry has been unsatisfactory. And you tell us it is not going to be used—not you, but a previous witness.

Mr. WALKER. Sir, I can only speak for my own opinions. I cannot speak for the rest of the mining industry.

Senator METCALF. I think you have been very helpful. Thank you very much.

Dr. John Harris, Lolo.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN T. HARRIS, LOLO, MONT.

Dr. HARRIS. I am John Harris, Lolo, Mont. I also have another statement by a colleague of mine, Mr. Gary Atwell, of the cooperative wildlife research unit at the University of Montana, Missoula, Mont., which supports S. 1121. I would like to have it entered into the record.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection it may be made a part of the record at the end of your remarks.

Dr. HARRIS. I am a professional educator, speaker, and writer. My particular area specialty in the past 20 years has been as researcher in the field of wildlife and related natural resources. A good deal of my past field experience has been with game animals in wilderness and back country areas.

More recently I have become deeply involved and concerned with the total environment of both man and animals. During the last several months I have attended and participated in hearings which deal with all dimensions of our environment. We are continually hacking away at the living space of man and animals—both quantitatively and qualitatively—and recently at an unprecedented rate.

You don't have to read far in a modern day book of biology or ecology to see that everything which lives in a common environment such as the forest is interrelated. If people look long enough and hard enough they will find that certain things are in certain places for a reason. In game management we might term this "limiting factors." Some species are more adaptable than others in terms of environmental needs. Some can tolerate man and his works—others cannot.

In the case of the area in question, I would say that the basic resources are watershed, soil, and space with secondary resources such as timber and wildlife. Naturally these are all interrelated in that you can't have one without the other. Without the vegetation you couldn't maintain the soil, which in this area is of a particularly

fragile nature, and without soil no living community of either plants or animals can exist. The wildlife present in the area is there because of the type of food available and the manner in which the area has been utilized to date by man. We all know, and it will probably be pointed out here, that forage supplies for big game animals may be increased by various cultural methods in the forest, such as clear-cutting or burning. This is provided that the slope, exposure, and available seed source are of the right type. It further presupposes that the elevation is such that the game can utilize it. In other words, it's of no value if it is unavailable to game, particularly during the winter months. I believe that this would be the case in the Lincoln back country area. Even though the foods might be produced they would probably be unavailable, for the most part, during the times they are needed.

Some species need a certain amount of remote country in which to do well. Elk cannot tolerate man or his activities to the extent that deer can, for instance. The grizzly bear can tolerate man even less; and because of his particular aggressive nature, it would appear that man is not going to be able to tolerate him, even in some of our reserved areas.

I worked 6 years on elk research on the White River Plateau of Colorado. It was my observation that the secluded area of the central plateau was more important to the overall well-being of this elk herd than in the more heavily managed and well-traveled adjacent areas where there was possibly more forage available. Mr. Harry Woodward, director, Colorado Department of Game, Fish and Parks, in speaking of the White River elk herd, said: "* * * there is no doubt but that the primitive area has been a major contributing factor to the well-being of this large herd * * *." Woodward continued: "Ecologically speaking, American elk is classified as a wilderness species, which means that wilderness is essential to the survival of this species in the wild state. Our records indicate that most of the elk harvested are reared in these remote, restricted areas. It is apparent that isolation, coupled with good food conditions, has materially contributed to the high productivity of the Colorado elk herds."

With the exception of Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks, the grizzly bear is found principally in the Mission Cabinet, and Absaroka Mountain ranges, and the Bob Marshall Wilderness in Montana. With the exception of a few which range out of the Yellowstone Park to Wyoming, we can say that when we speak of the grizzly bear in Montana, we are speaking about the grizzly bear in the Nation. Judging from reports of people who regularly travel the Lincoln back country and the fish and game department's kill figures, it would appear that this area's contribution to the total range of the grizzly bear in the United States is a significant one. To me this reason in itself is sufficient to keep it inviolate.

The finite character of our world land base becomes more and more apparent with each increment in population. There remains a pitifully small percentage of real estate in this country where the heavy hand of man has not set foot. It is a fact of life and our society that the laws are made and broken by the needs of and demands of people. Even though we may set aside the area today there is no assurance, unfortunately, that it might not have to be exploited at some time in

the future. Since this is the case, and since it wouldn't appear, to me at least, that we need it immediately, let's leave it as it is.

In closing I would like to quote a statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman on May 17, 1968, concerning the Gore Range-Eagles Nest area of Colorado:

> We have all the land now that we will ever have. My decision is to preserve the Gore Range-Eagles Nest area by denying permission to build Interstate 70 over the Red Buffalo route. Through four decades, this Department has maintained that the national forest wilderness system should not be invaded—even for important purposes—if there is a feasible alternative. We held then, as we hold now, that economics alone is not a sufficient basis for determining whether wilderness shall survive or die.

Although this area has not yet been officially designated as wilderness—it is in fact and should remain so. I support Senate bill 1121.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you very much.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF GERRY ATWELL, WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST, UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

My name is Gerry Atwell. I am a wildlife biologist working with the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit at the University of Montana at Missoula. I have had professional experience with the state Fish and Game agencies of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Alaska. This experience has ranged from waterfowl and fisheries work to big game, small game, and furbearers. I have had responsibilities in wildlife research and management, along with public information and education duties. My most recent research has dealt with migration and movement studies of elk.

I have had the pleasure of traveling within the Lincoln Back Country which included a climb to its backbone—Scapegoat Mountain—and meanderings along the lush vegetation of Meadow Creek.

It is my belief that this area is not suitable for mass recreation and logging. Some of the wildlife species, such as grizzly bear, wolverine (which only in recent years has commenced to build up its numbers), lynx, and west slope cutthroat trout are in a precarious balance with their habitat. These forms of wildlife demand a wilderness environment for their existence and mass human use of any area they occur within means that at best only a remnant population will survive for a time, finally giving way to extirpation.

Other species such as elk, although more firmly established in the shadow of man, still need areas in which they can be somewhat secure during the hunting seasons. Those elk herds in western Montana that are dwindling (the Bitterroot animals for instance) may be doing so not only from overused range but also from excess access afforded to hunters by logging roads which have proliferated in the last ten years. Each year these elk have fewer isolated lodgepole "jungles" or similar retreats within which they stand a good chance to survive. Such a problem does not exist in roadless areas.

Admittedly I am no expert on timber harvest but from a layman's point of view I have seen only isolated pockets of what I would consider merchantable timber in the Lincoln Back Country. The greater percentage of timber cover was lodgepole pine and I am aware of no shortage of this species.

In summary, I believe that if this area is opened up for logging and mass recreation it would undoubtedly result in both an esthetic and biological degradation of what presently is, and can continue to be, a high quality environment for Montana and the Nation. Thus, I heartily support Senate Bill 1121.

Senator BURDICK. Dr. Richard Sheridan, Missoula, Mont.

STATEMENT OF DR. RICHARD SHERIDAN, MISSOULA, MONT.

Dr. SHERIDAN. I would like to first submit the statement to the Honorable Quentin Burdick, written by Brig. Gen. Walter M. Johnson. This will be unread.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection it will be received and placed at the end of your remarks.

Dr. SHERIDAN. I would also like to add my comments.

The Wilderness Act, in addition to provisions including recreation and esthetics, provides for areas to be set aside where basic research may be conducted on the natural, undisturbed environment. The research scientists, and their students working for advanced degrees, require undisturbed areas in which studies concerning the complex and dynamic interrelationships between organisms and their environment may be conducted. These studies provide data which contrasts, and thereby clarifies, studies on disturbed areas and projects dealing with pollution ecology.

Some of the questions covered in these studies are what are the rates of photosyntheses, respiration, and mineral recycling in the undisturbed environment in contrast to these rates in disturbed and/or polluted environment.

Under the example of the project to be conducted in areas such as Lincoln-Scapegoat will be: What is the effect of mineral content, temperature, and light on the phytoplankton of alpine lakes as contrasted to subalpine or the polluted valley rivers. Obviously, such a study concerning a primary producer, such as phytoplankton, is valuable in understanding the dynamics of the total acquatic environment.

These experiments are only an example of the type of work which depends on an undisturbed environment—many other studies in diverse fields are possible. These include the mammalogist, ornithologist, invertebrate zoologist, soil microbiologist, and geologist to mention a few. All attempt to provide information which will contribute to man's growing knowledge of ecology, physiology, and wildlife management.

It should be exceedingly clear that the activities of both the lumbering and mining industries are incompatible with research concerning ecology of the flora and fauna to the environment in the undisturbed condition. In fact, these industries have already provided an infinite number of study areas for the pollution ecologist and pollution engineer.

It is hoped that the committee members reviewing these hearings will have the wisdom of foresight to preserve these valuable and unrenewable study areas for further scientific exploration.

Thank you.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. WALTER M. JOHNSON, U.S. ARMY (RETIRED)

Mr. Chairman, the primary argument for roading and extensively "managing" the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area is the need for automobile-oriented recreation (see "Patterns for Management Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area, 1968"). I would like to point out that there are thousands of acres in Region One of the National Forest that are roaded but undeveloped for recreation. As an example, there is the country adjoining the western and southwestern borders of the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

With completion of a few miles of roads, there will be gravel highway from the North Fork of the Blackfoot to Holland Lake, a distance of approximately 50 miles, closely skirting the boundaries of the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

With the connecting roads planned and presently under construction, it will soon be possible to drive from the North Fork of the Blackfoot up the Lake Creek Road and down the McCabe Creek Road to Montour. From Montour one can drive to the Cottonwood Lakes Road which is completed to Morrell Creek. There is a road up Morrell Creek which in a short time will connect the Clearwater Lake and then to Holland Lake. Most of this roading is built to high specifications and has many feeder roads.

The country this road passes through is every bit as scenic as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area and the topography is such that it is much better suited for recreational development.

In this already invaded area, there are a number of lakes that are larger and deeper than any of the lakes in the Lincoln-Scapegoat country. These include Camp Lake, Lake Otatsy, the three Cottonwood Lakes and Clearwater Lake. Some of these lakes provide good fishing as do Morrell Creek and Montour Creek.

The Morrell Creek Road presently comes within two miles of Morrell Falls. These falls are as remarkable as the North Fork Falls. A road is being constructed up Montour Creek which will go nearly to Burnt Cabin. The beautiful Montour Falls will be close by this road.

The western boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness is the Swan Range. The present road along Morrell Creek is at the western foot of these mountains. There are wonderful vistas of Crescent, Matt, Sunday and Fisher Peaks. With the possible exception of Scapegoat Mountain, they are as spectacular as any of the mountains in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area.

The valleys of the presently roaded country of Morrell and Montour are broader and the hillsides less steep than in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area. There is ample room for construction of campsites along the lakes and creeks and the soil and watershed is not as delicate.

This system of forest roads is close to the highly developed recreational areas of Seely Lake and Holland Lake. They would probably attract as many if not more recreationists than would the Lincoln country.

With the innumerable possibilities the Forest Service has for developing presently roaded areas, it is inconceivable that they should want to develop an unspoiled piece of land which for many obvious reasons, including watershed protection, soil erosion, game and fish protection, and esthetic values, should become a part of our wilderness system.

Senator METCALF. James Craine, Laramie, Wyo.

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. CRAINE, LARAMIE, WYO., APPEARING AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE EDWARD HINES LUMBER CO.

Mr. CRAINE. Senator Burdick, thank you for this opportunity to briefly present some views on wilderness in general, and the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area, including the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in particular.

My name is James R. Craine. I am a graduate forester with a bachelor of science in forestry and a master of forestry degree. I have worked in various capacities for the U.S. Forest Service; for the consulting firm of Bovay Engineers; and for the Edward Hines Lumber Co., my present employer. I am a member of the Society of American Foresters, the American Forestry Association, and the Izaak Walton League. I appear here today from Laramie, Wyo., as forester for the Edward Hines Lumber Co., and as a professional forester interested in the wise use and progressive maintenance of our renewable natural resources.

I, along with many other industrial foresters of my acquaintance, recognize the need for a certain amount of designated wilderness area. There seems to be, however, some question as to how much that amount actually is. There will probably be some increase in demand in future years. Undoubtedly there will be substantial increase in demand for use of all other forest resources in the future; that is, wood, water, wildlife, range forage, developed recreation areas, and the necessary development associated with these other uses. I am deeply concerned over an apparent lack of direction and goals in the development of our wilderness system. We seem to be in a wholesale program of withdrawal with little or no idea of our actual future needs for wilderness acreage. I

believe we should pause and take stock of our future needs, meanwhile maintaining the multiple-use option on those areas highly suited to multiple-use management.

I am further concerned over public attitudes toward our professional managers in the field of natural resources. I refer not only to attitudes toward foresters, but to fish and game biologists, water experts, range managers, and so forth. We, the public, hire these men. demanding high levels of professional training and competence. We provide broad policy guidelines within which we would like to have management practiced. Then so often it seems we consider ourselves, the public, more competent to make decisions on details than are those men whom we are paying to make those decisions. I refer to such things as decisions on the location of wilderness area boundaries, on whether or not to have a designated wilderness in a particular area, on the degree to which multiple use will be practiced in a given area, and on which uses will receive dominant consideration in multiple-use areas.

The present existence of approximately 2½ million acres of classified wilderness in region 1 of the Forest Service attests to the fact that Forest Service managers are not, and have not, been blind to the need for wilderness. Their record indicates a strong understanding of this need. On the other hand, I do not believe there is a professional resource manager worthy of the name who is not at times alarmed over our predicted population explosion and the natural-resource-based raw materials it will demand, along with its developed, family-type, short-term outdoor recreation needs. Much of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area appears eminently well suited for this type of recreation development, if development is done in multiple-use harmony with development of all other resources as proposed by the Forest Service managers.

The conclusion to be drawn from the Forest Service report of this area is that it is an area exceptionally well suited to multiple use management. It would be a shame to withdraw the area from management, thereby depriving thousands of people of the use and enjoyment of the several resources which the area can produce on a continuing basis.

I wholeheartedly support the Forest Service proposal for multiple use management in the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area of the Lolo, Helena, and Lewis and Clark National Forests. As such, I am opposed to S. 1121 which would designate the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area as a wilderness.

Again thank you for allowing me to appear here today.

Senator METCALF. Dr. Arnold Silverman, Missoula.

STATEMENT OF DR. ARNOLD SILVERMAN, MISSOULA, MONT.

Dr. SILVERMAN. Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf, I am Arnold J. Silverman, associate professor of Geology at the University of Montana, a consultant for the U.S. Bureau of Mines, a member of the executive committee of the Montana Coal Resources Research Council, and hold membership in a number of national and international geological societies. This statement deals exclusively with geologically related problems in implementing a multiple-use plan for the Lincoln back country, the major part of which is included in the proposal for the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

The geologic setting of the Lincoln back country is generally well known. The lithified rocks consist of Precambrian Beltian strata of argillites, quartizites, and carbonates. These units have been intensely deformed primarily by faulting (thrusting) along the continuation of the Sawtooth Overthrust Belt. The Beltian rocks are badly shattered and, therefore, readily susceptible to mechanical weathering, which in this northern climate produces large talus deposits at the base of pronounced cliff faces.

The Beltian strata are mantled with Pleistocene glacial drift, which is especially thick and pronounced in the valley bottoms and lower to intermediate slopes of the mountains. The glacial drift is composed of unsorted and unstratified mud, sand, pebble, and bouldery material, all completely unlithified (uncemented). Much of the timber in the area is rooted in this material. Even on a modest slope this glacial drift can become very unstable, particularly during rapid snowmelt, after a moderate rainfall or after the harvesting of a timber crop. At such time the inhomogeneity of the draft can produce a pattern of subsurface water movement that promotes massive downslope sliding of the material. In addition, the soil cover in the area is very thin, averaging only a few inches, and is a very fragile resource.

The U.S. Forest Service multiple-use plan envisages the opening of one or more access roadways, through the Lincoln back country, for tourist, sportsman, and commercial use. Any proposed roadway will be cut primarily through the glacial drift mantling the valley bottoms and lower walls. Early in the summer of 1968 I had occasion to investigate the U.S. Forest Service access road along Lake Creek, on the western border of the proposed wilderness area. Geologically, the Lake Creek road cuts material identical to that in the proposed wilderness area. At the time of my investigation it had been raining for 24 hours and many of the features directly related to the immediate rainfall were superimposed on the normal erosion of the road banks in the 2 years since construction. A number of colored slides are included with this statement to illustrate the features discussed below.

The Lake Creek road was strewn with boulders eroded out of the glacial drift in the road cuts. These boulders are anywhere from a few inches to a few feet across and are a potential road hazard. Large sections of the glacial drift slope are undergoing sliding, both above and below the road level. In places large trees and soil are moving down over the road embankment, and in another place, where logging has occurred just above the Lake Creek road, the logged area has undergone massive slumpage. Undercutting this unconsolidated glacial drift during road construction produces a very unstable situation and sliding, slumpage and sloughing will continue to occur until the natural slope again develops by eliminating the road cuts.

In many places along the Lake Creek Road slumpage and sloughing from the road cuts have completely clogged the drainage ditch which should carry runoff water to the culverts. Under these circumstances, typical in areas of unconsolidated material, the runoff water carries over the road causing rapid erosion of the roadbed. This phenomenon cannot be prevented unless every road cut through the glacial debris is covered with a plaster or cementlike mask.

Where water does reach a culvert and is carried under the road bed to the valley side of the road, the unconsolidated debris around and

below the culvert is rapidly eroded. The water falls onto the glacial drift slopes below with enough energy to cause deep and rapid gullying, as large quantities of glacial materials are carried to the stream below.

In conclusion, the construction of an access road in the Lincoln back country would be relatively inexpensive, inasmuch as most of the road would cut through unconsolidated glacial drift. However, a number of disadvantages and potential dangers come readily to mind. Such a road will be expensive to maintain for it will be in nearly constant need of grading, clearing, and indeed in many places, actual reconstruction. It does not appear probable that such a road can be maintained without an abnormal financial investment. In addition, there will be an ever-present danger to travelers from sliding and slumping, especially during and shortly after, wet weather. Lastly, the increased erosion caused by road construction and timber harvest will have a very detrimental effect on the streams and lakes of the area. For these reasons I oppose a multiple-use plan for the area and support the proposal for the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

I would like to add one more comment. I listened carefully to the testimony of my good friend and colleague, Willis Johns. He very accurately delineated some of the more important matter in the large study area of the U.S. Forest Service. I think it pertinent to point out that the area described by Dr. Rogers and associates in the Geological Survey as a potential mineral resource lies outside, east of the boundary of the proposed wilderness area. I also might point out that the other warranted area delineated by Mr. Johns as one of potential mineral resource is the Red Mountain area, the whole southern slope of which is outside the proposed wilderness area.

Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Doctor.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much for a very informative statement.

Senator BURDICK. Dr. George Weisel, Missoula.

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE F. WEISEL, PROFESSOR OF ZOOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA, MISSOULA, MONT.

Dr. WEISEL. Senator, my name is George F. Weisel. I am a professor of zoology at the University of Montana with graduate and research specialty in fish. I am also well acquainted with the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat Mountain area, having packed into this country since the 1930's. I might add, I am not too affluent in packing, and at the present time I don't feel too particularly strong, either.

I am concerned about the overall ecological changes that will occur in the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat area, should it be invaded by roads, logged or used for mass recreation. I will, however, confine myself to the fishery.

The cutthroat trout is the only native trout in western Montana. The Dolly Varden (bull trout) is the only native char. Introduced rainbow trout and brook trout have largely replaced the native species in all but back-country areas of western Montana. Subspecies of the cutthroat trout have been placed on the endangered species list in

some Western States. Both the cutthroat and Dolly Varden are rapidly approaching this status in Montana.

Lander's Fork and the Middlefork of the Blackfoot abound with small native cutthroat trout. Few of these are over 10 inches in length. Meadow Creek and the East Fork of the Blackfoot above the falls were probably barren of fish until stocked about 50 years ago. These fish are undoubtedly hybrids and have some of the color characteristics of golden trout. None of the hybrids in the streams are large, but it is possible some may grow to several pounds in Meadow Creek Lake. Below the falls on the Blackfoot there are fair-sized cutthroat trout, and in the late summer large Dolly Varden are common in pools at the base of the falls.

During summer months whole sections of streams in this northern Rocky Mountain region become dry. Where the bedrock is close to the surface, there is surface flow, but where the bedrock is covered with gravel and boulders, the summer flow disappears underground. A notable example of this is the Dry Fork of the Blackfoot. At these times, the fish become concentrated in pools and are easy prey to predators, including man.

Heart Lake is the largest and deepest in the entire area. It includes 32 acres with a depth of close to 50 feet in a few spots. Planted grayling have successfully survived in Heart Lake along with the cutthroat. The next two lakes in size are Parker and Webb. They are 12 and 18 acres respectively with maximum depths of about 14 feet. These two lakes are actually beaver ponds with mud bottoms, but they support a fair cutthroat fishery. Other so-called lakes in the area are mere pot-holes, and some go dry in the summer. However, the two Twin Lakes, shallow and 7 to 9 acres in size, do have some cutthroats.

The Forest Service admits that the lakes are small and fragile. In their March 1963, long-range plan for the northern half Lincoln ranger district, they state, "the lakes will be left to as near natural a condition as possible. Because motorboats would conflict with the near-natural environment, powerboats will not be permitted on the lakes." I would like to add that the lakes would provide little water-oriented recreation and that at the present time they are being utilized to capacity. The campgrounds at Heart Lake are already barren and impacted.

The waters of the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat country are remarkably free of trash fish. Other than a few native sculpens, whitefish, and dace, they are essentially pure trout waters. These waters undoubtedly serve as important breeding grounds and recruitment waters for the lower Blackfoot River system.

The present fishery in the Lincoln back country is receiving close to its maximum utilization and the pressure becomes greater each year. One of the primary goals of the backpackers and horseback riders is to fish in the area, although there is as good or better fishing in some of the waters close to roads. There is more of a challenge and satisfaction in catching wilderness fish.

The fishery definitely cannot withstand the heavy fishing which would result in easy access by road. The streams and lakes are so small that fishermen would be shoulder to shoulder. The native fish certainly could not sustain a sport for long. An expensive "put-and-take" fishery of legal-sized planters would soon be necessary if there

were to be any fishing. Inevitably, this leads to the extinction of the native fish population. I seriously doubt that the Montana Fish & Game Department would consider planting the waters of the Lincoln back country. It is one of the least desirable types of habitat for this kind of fishery management. (The year-to-year cost of planting legal-sized fish should be considered in any cost-benefit ratio. See the investigations conducted by the Michigan Game Department on the effect planter fish have on wild populations.)

Aside from fishing pressure, alterations to the water runoff will degrade the water and adversely affect the fishery. For the past 2 years we have been studying the water quality of roaded and logged streams as compared to pristine waters in western Montana. This investigation is supported by a grant from the Water Resource Research Center. It is apparent from the study that there is increased temperature, increased siltation and turbidity, and less stability in waterflow in those streams with bordering disturbed land. (These findings are nothing new. See Bartsch, 1959, U.S.P.H.S., Taft Sanitary Eng. Center; Chapman, 1962, J. Forestry; Cordane, 1961, Calif. Fish and Game; Cormack, 1949, Canadian J. Res.; Ellis, 1936, Ecol.; Larking, 1959, Canadian Fish. Cult.; etc. We are conducting the research primarily to find out what untouched watersheds are like; there are not many left to study.)

Quoting again from the Forest Service long-range plan, 1963:

> The Landers Fork and, to a lesser extent, the East Fork of the Blackfoot drainages contribute heavy silt during spring runoff. The loose, glacial material in these drainages is subject to severe erosion. During summer months, all streams produce clear water.

Should roading or logging occur in the Lincoln back country, there will be a severe erosion problem. The terrain is steep and the hillsides are composed of loose glacial till. Shocking examples of what occurs when roads are built in this type of country can be seen in the neighboring Lake Creek and Copper Creek developments. The Forest Service has stated there is "heavy" siltation during high runoff. What will be the siltation problem when the unstable soil is disturbed? Will the Forest Service be guilty of not abiding by the new water quality standards set by the State and Federal Governments?

It has been amply demonstrated that increased residue and turbidity are injurious to a trout fishery. (Tebo, 1955, Prog. Fish-Cult.; Ellis, 1936, Ecol.; Shaw and Maga, 1943, Calif. Fish & Game; Wallen, 1951, Bull. Okla. Agric. & Mech. Coll. Biol.; etc.) The eggs and larvae are smothered; bottom insects, a main part of the trout's diet, are killed; and plantlife is injured by the reduction of penetrating light. Increased siltation will also hasten the aging and decrease the depth of the small lakes. Waters of the Blackfoot River outside the proposed wilderness will also be adversely affected by receiving degraded water.

The best and cheapest watershed and fishery management for the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat area is to incorporate it into a wilderness. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you, Doctor.

Dr. C. C. Gordon, Missoula.

STATEMENT OF DR. CLARENCE C. GORDON, PRESIDENT, WESTERN MONTANA SCIENTISTS' COMMITTEE FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION

Dr. GORDON. Before proceeding with my own testimony, I have some testimony here from Mr. Otto Teller, who is on the board of directors of Trout Unlimited, in support of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Senator BURDICK. It may be received and printed at the end of your remarks.

Dr. GORDON. The Western Montana Scientists' Committee for Public Information is a member group of the National Scientists' Institute for Public Information. The association is dedicated to providing scientific information relevant to social issues in the field of environmental contamination. The western Montana group is composed mostly of university faculty members and some local physicians. Some of its members have visited the Lincoln back country, and all of its members are familiar with the environment of western Montana.

As scientists, we are aware of the ability of our fellow human beings to alter the environment through technology. We are equally aware that these alterations can cause far-spreading and often destructive changes.

It is the considered opinion of the scientists' committee that the greatest long-range benefit for the people is to classify the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat Mountain area as a wilderness.

Our technology has outpaced our understanding of the best utilization of the land. Anyone familiar with construction projects in the mountainous portions of western Montana is aware of the deleterious and often irreversible changes that occur. After reviewing the physical and biological aspects of the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat Mountain area, it is obvious that this country will be even more adversely affected than most mountainous areas if roading or logging be allowed. The hillsides are friable and steep. Much of the clay and fractured rock is presently held in place by plant roots to a depth of a foot or less. Even a slight disturbance of the soil will start an eroded gully. Whole mountain slopes slipped into valleys and streams during the floods of 1964.

Development of the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat Mountain area will be disastrous; leaving it a wilderness will provide a unique and invaluable recreational and study center for generations.

I would like to talk for just a moment about my own profession. I am a forest pathologist, and I believe I am the only forest pathologist doing research on forest fungi in Montana. As a teacher I have to dig through the literature to find out what other people have done in this area, and I am quite surprised to find what little has not been done on forest fungi.

For this reason I am amazed when people talk about the ravages of insects and diseases which occur in unmanaged areas, or managed areas, and people here, or some people have inferred that if an area is managed, there will be no diseases in the area, or less diseases in a managed area than in an unmanaged are. This is quite untrue. There is absolutely no literature that would support these statements.

There is also a statement——

Senator METCALF. Do you know when the Forest Service dropped all that DDT on the Yellowstone River and killed all the insects? At least they got rid of all the insects down there. Of course, they got

rid of all the trout, too. That little experience started us in getting some research on effective pesticides in forest management.

Dr. GORDON. Right.

Senator METCALF. Because, as you say—just a trifle facetiously—we didn't know a thing about what was happening, either in managed or unmanaged areas.

Dr. GORDON. Well, this is what I am trying to get at, mature versus immature stands. A mature stand is where the annual growth—all the growth within the stands equals the amount of decay lost each year. There is no literature whatsoever on when this occurs in the Rocky Mountains. We just don't know what a mature stand is in this instance. We know what an immature stand is, but even a mature stand grows very vigorously. Anyway, this idea when people say this is older and mature, they have to substantiate that with some studies. There are no studies, and especially I asked the personnel of the U.S. Forest Service for this disease survey of the Lincoln-Scapegoat country, and there has been no published survey whatsoever of that area on insects or diseases. Well, so much for that.

Now, someone said something about the fact we have introduced new diseases. As far as the record shows, there is only one new introduced disease of any consequence into the Rocky Mountains. This is the white pine blister rust. We should say we spend somewhere in the neighborhood of $100 million over a long period of time trying to control this particular fungus, you Forest Service men, because it is not economically feasible for the lumber people to control anything, insects or fungi. Anyway, we were never able to control that particular fungus. We have never controlled the fungus in this area. So that if it's managed, it can be controlled, is ridiculous. We cannot control fungi. Fungi, really, even though I was trained to be the great killer of fungi, I decided that I will just enjoy it.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF OTTO TELLER, HAMILTON, MONT.

Mr. Chairman, I am addressing, respectfully, the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Hearing as both a Bitter Root ranch owner and a member of the board of directors of Trout Unlimited, a national organization dedicated to the perpetuation of trout fishing as a sport.

In my experience the only way to insure quality trout fishing is by protecting the watershed and seemingly the best way to protect the watershed is by insuring that it remains as untouched as possible. To quote a Forest Service sign I once saw, "He who rules the mountain, rules the valley."

Now in theory the Forest Service proposal to make the Lincoln back country a multiple use area sounds fine but as the poet T. S. Eliot once inferred there is quite a difference between the inception and conception of any plan. If T. S. Eliot had been a hiker, camper or angler and had seen a few of the regional multiple use programs in operation he would have used language inappropriate to any gathering including ladies to describe the difference between a Forest Service proposal and what is the end result of their plan.

It is accepted by many that the Lincoln area has thin topsoil and accordingly the growth rate of timber is long. If this growth rate is similar to the one in the Bitter Root high country then clearcutting spells the end of the Lincoln Country as it is known today.

The Forest Service argues that in a wilderness category the Lincoln area would have limited accessibility. Perhaps this is true but nonetheless with logging roads criss-crossing the countryside what recreationists would have access to is not what the Lincoln Country is today. It would just be another piece of chopped up Forest and we have plenty of that in this region already. Today this area is a unique geographic entity and we have too few of those.

The U.S. Forest Service supposedly administers public lands for the public of this country. It is not supposed to run a federally sponsored welfare program for the lumbering industry of western Montana at the expense of the public's land.

If the Forest Service and lumber interest have their way then the Lincoln backcountry will no longer be held in trust for all citizens. It will be squandered for the benefit of a special interest group. For if the thin topsoil of the Lincoln country gets eroded because of lumbering then every angler fishing every creek getting its basic sustenance from the Lincoln country will be reaping negative benefits from multiple use.

On the other hand if this area is left pristine then every bit of free flowing water which is a bit clearer and cleaner because of the Lincoln Country trees then the benefits for the public will be positive. Erosion and other destructive elements are too common a side effect of logging to deny. It has happened in the Bitter Root and will happen in Lincoln. The only way to protect a watershed is simple enough by protecting it and not selling it to a special group.

Senator BURDICK. Dr. James Lowe.

STATEMENT OF DR. W. LESLIE PENGELLY, PROFESSOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA, MISSOULA, MONT., AS PRESENTED BY DR. JAMES LOWE

Dr. LOWE. Senator Burdick and Senator Metcalf, I am associate professor of ecology at the University of Montana and a member of the governing council of the Montana Wilderness Association.

I am here for Dr. W. Leslie Pengelly. His letter is very brief, and I will not take the liberty to summarize, but read it in its entirety.

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am writing to you in your capacity as chairman of the Sub-committee receiving testimony on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Classification proposal in support of Senate Bill 1121. My name is W. Leslie Pengelly and I have resided in Missoula, Montana, for the past 14 years and in adjacent northern Idaho for six years prior to moving to Montana.

My profession is university teaching and my area of specialization is wildlife management with special emphasis on the effects of logging and fires on game range development. For nearly 20 years I have been engaged in studies related to big game and its habitat in western Montana and northern Idaho and I am acquainted with the Lincoln Back Country. While I am writing this as a private citizen, I cannot separate my private and my professional experience.

It is difficult at best to comment on the U.S. Forest Service plans for wildlife habitat enhancement in their long range plan for the Northern Half of the Lincoln Ranger District (USDA–1963), due mainly to the lack of specific delineation of Forest Service objectives. This, in turn, may be due to the lack of existing information or to the low priority accorded wildlife in current Multiple Use plans. The Selke Committee report on the Magruder Corridor plans early in 1967 pointed out this same shortcoming.

The conclusions drawn from the superficial and generalized accounts of these and similar recent plans (i.e. Magruder Corridor) point up the dangers of allowing an agency to make irrevocable decisions that are based neither on the long-range value of existing resources nor on the long-range public interest.

A more recent (1968) Forest Service handout of apparently limited distribution (Patterns for Management in the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area) is no more informative except perhaps for its more determined attack on the remaining wilderness.

In the Forest Service's 1963 report on the Lincoln Back Country there is the following quote: "As in the past, the Forest Service will continue to work closely with the Montana Fish and Game Department in wildlife habitat improvement and management." However, the Montana Fish and Game Commission has publicly opposed the Forest Service proposal to develop this area and since the Commission is the state agency responsible for wildlife conservation

as well as recreation, it seems obvious that its recommendations should carry considerable weight. This action may well provide a clue as to how the priorities for multiple use management are really set.

Several other generalizations appear in these sketchy reports: (a) that big game winter range is limited and this in turn limits game populations, (b) that logging will improve this condition by producing forage, (c) that the access roads will improve the hunter access and facilitate greater game harvests.

None of these statements is completely true nor automatically desirable. The far greater risks to fragile watersheds and rare wildlife species should indicate a need for extreme caution.

Logging does not always improve or create game range. This is a highly complex situation with only preliminary studies in other areas available as clues for future work—the research necessary to support this claim is not available. Fire could be expected to perform equally well, but no reference is made to this technique.

The improvement of conditions for hunters is also a highly debatable point. Excess access may provide a temporary rash of kills and it may not. If it does, the animal populations must be protected by further restrictions, due to public clamor rightly or wrongly, thus obviating the alleged benefits. Logging, debris, removal of protective timber cover, and a "surge" of human activities in the area may well promote the disappearance of game (common or rare).

As a professional wildlifer, I can see no advantages for wildlife that would outweigh the obvious disadvantages and, indeed, dangers in such a proposal. I request your support of Senate Bill 1121.

Respectfully yours,

W. LESLIE PENGELLY,
Missoula, Mont.

Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you for your statement.

Our next witness is Dr. James Brogger.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN J. CRAIGHEAD, AS PRESENTED BY DR. JAMES BROGGER, MISSOULA, MONT.

Dr. BROGGER. I am a private citizen residing in Montana. Dr. Craighead asked me to present his testimony in his absence. Because of the necessary changes in this hearing date, Dr. Craighead was unable to be here.

I do not wish to bore the committee with a lot of repetition. However, because of the prominence of this man in the field of national conservation, I do feel that it is essential to at least state a few of the comments from his testimony today.

Senator METCALF. You don't have to qualify the Craigheads for this committee. We are familiar with their work. They have testified before us several times on various other pieces of legislation, including the Wilderness Act.

Dr. BROGGER. Thank you. His statement follows:

I am Dr. John J. Craighead and I reside at Missoula, Montana. I am a professor of Wildlife Ecology, teaching and directing research at the University of Montana, Missoula. My present position is leader of the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit at the University. This unit is financed by state and federal funds and by federal and private grants. Staff members engage in research and studies in the field of wildlife biology, vertebrate ecology, and resource management. I personally have been engaged in a study of the grizzly bear, *Ursus horribilis*, for the past nine years and have made intensive studies of other wilderness wildlife species.

I am testifying here as a private citizen and the views I present are my own and should not be construed as representing the official position of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of Interior, or of the University of Montana.

For many years I have been interested in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area and have assisted individuals, groups, and organizations in attempting to preserve

it. I have also made a trip into the Lincoln Back Country and am familiar with its natural resources.

I strongly endorse the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal because I believe this area is ecologically fragile country that can not support intensive land uses without drastically altering the nature of the country and disrupting the ecosystem.

Roading and logging would be a direct threat to a small population of grizzly bears inhabiting the Lincoln-Scapegoat country. Survival of this population is dependent on preservation of its habitat since the grizzly does not readily co-exist with human beings. It is a large predator that under certain conditions does not hesitate to attack man or his livestock. Yet it is an endangered species and a trophy animal of high value. Each grizzly requires approximately 25 square miles of wild country in order to meet its biological needs. Thus extensive wild areas are necessary to ensure its preservation.

Reclassification and designation of this area as wilderness is necessary to maintain the high-quality recreation which has attracted people throughout the nation. Wilderness designation is also essential to prevent the adverse ecologic changes which studies indicate would surely follow in the wake of an intensive land use program. Only by incorporating this area into the National Wilderness Preservation System can it be preserved in its present condition for wilderness recreation, for preservation of a threatened species, and for watershed protection.

Dr. BROGGER. I would like to make one or two comments of my own as a private citizen.

Certainly we all heard many facts and figures here today. One figure that stands out in my mind that I heard mentioned several times before is this 99-percent figure which my good friends in the Forest Service have come up with as a percentage of the population which does want the mass recreation concept. Now, certainly I will grant you, undoubtedly the figure is weighted in favor of the automobile traveler, but I have been concerned over this figure. I am surprised that we haven't heard just what sort of study was undertaken to arrive at this type of figure. I am sorry we haven't heard some explanation of it. I was in hopes that perhaps we would at the hearing, because it is one that has been quoted several times before. I suspect perhaps this was based on an automobile count, and perhaps one factor was overlooked here. I wonder if the fact that the people who also utilize these back country areas, whether it was taken into account they must travel to the back country area in an automobile. I hoped that somewhere in the course of this some of our Forest Service friends would bring out just how some of these figures have been arrived at. Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Dr. Eldon Smith, Bozeman.

STATEMENT OF DR. ELDON H. SMITH, BOZEMAN, MONT.

Dr. SMITH. I am Eldon H. Smith of Bozeman. My professional training is in wildlife ecology. I have lived in Montana for 14 years, working as an extension-type educator in the field of wildlife management. My activities include participation as wildlife and recreation representative on numerous State and National multiple use advisory boards connected with land management and other natural resources agencies. I am also consultant or adviser to several private organizations concerned with various phases of natural resource management.

I speak in support of Senate bill 1121, which would classify as wilderness 240,500 acres of national forest land known as the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. I do so because such classification would constitute

a moratorium on plans for the area that may not be in the public interest and that are ecologically permanent and irreversible.

The special ecological characteristics qualifying this area for wilderness classification are testified to by others at this hearing. I will, therefore, restrict my comments to what can be designated a bureaucratic aspect of the subject. I think this subject I am going to discuss has not been specifically discussed here in this hearing, political acts preceding legislation. I believe, therefore, it follows that legislation for good or bad will reflect the objectivity and depth of the knowledge and source of public information available to the public.

In this context, and for the purpose of this hearing in mind, I would refer to what might euphemistically be called a public information program describing the advantages of a Forest Service plan—a plan for about 500,000 acres which include the 240,500 currently proposed for wilderness classification in Senate bill 1121.

This Forest Service information program has been conducted via lectures, press releases, and publication of two brochures: "Patterns for Management—Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area" and "Management for People." The plan, as described in the brochures, is aptly conceived to appeal to the desires of just about everyone. It provides for access roads, with scenic corridors. It provides for campgrounds. It It provides for streamchannel and streambank rehabilitation. It provides for geological study. It provides for improved wildlife habitat. It provides for stream-channel and streambank rehabilitation. It provides for sanitation facilities. It provides for winter sports. In short, reminiscent of a political slogan of past years, it provides for a chicken in every pot.

The description of the plan does other things. It smothers in generalities. It disclaims degradation of any portion of the ecosystem. In lieu of further analysis, it infers population growth, economic factors, recreation demand, and lumber requirements as justification for the plan itself. It gives options instead of alternatives. It uses standard economic jargon relating to ostensible benefits. It palliates with a slogan—"management for people." It obscures the basic issue. It misses the point.

I contend, as a matter of personal conviction and professional ethics as an educator, that any public information source must be based on factual information relating to all sides of any question; that these facts, all of them, must be subject to intelligent comprehension by the public; and that, once understood, they must provide sufficient justification for identifying bona fide alternatives leading to an acceptable decision. Any information program based upon material printed in the above-named brochures cannot meet these elementary criteria.

I will be specific. The plan, as envisioned in the two brochures, represents what might be called partial analysis, a simplistic interpretation of a complex ecosystem with numerous interactions. On page 10 of "Patterns for Management—Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area," we find a section headed "Facts and Assumptions Basic to Analyzing Management Alternatives." Here are such facts and assumptions as "records of recreation use show that among all recreation activities driving for pleasure and walking are the most popular" and (with completion of the Interstate Highway System) "more tourists will be traveling through Montana" and "the average tourist automobile

driver cannot cope with rough, narrow mountain roads" and "rapid community growth in the Missoula and Lincoln areas will continue to create increasing demands for a wide variety of recreation opportunities" and "present forest products mill capacity in the Missoula area exceeds the present sustained yield of tributary forests under present levels of management." Such generalities may indeed be realities, but only if placed in context with other interacting circumstances specific to the area in question. As objective, factual public information, they cannot stand alone.

Appropriately enough, the next section is headed "Conclusions From the Above Assumptions." (Evidently the facts begged in the previous heading have been ignored or forgotten.) Essentially, the conclusions drawn in this section faithfully reflect the deficiencies of the assumptions as a source of useful basic data.

The section following, headed "Alternative Possibilities for Management," should provide the public with some basis for free choice. The first alternative listed is wilderness classification. Except for one paragraph, which states that in a suggested proposal 250,000 acres would be classified as wilderness, discussion of this entire alternative is overtly negative. As presented, a wilderness resource in the area could not contribute so much as one credit to the public welfare.

In contrast to the first alternative, the second, and last, titled "Coordinated Resource Management of Entire Study Area," is given a completely positive presentation, with one marginal exception—the alternative would not, by itself, provide adequate protection for the grizzly bear and native cutthroat trout. This deficiency is rationalized by suggesting that interference with the two species would be avoided so far as possible by not concentrating use in the most sensitive areas.

This alternative concludes with the statement that "in the opinion of the Forest Service, the second proposal is superior to the first" and that "it makes a much better contribution to the needs and desires of the whole public than any other pattern of management."

This sequence of contents, proceeding from what purport to be facts and assumptions, through conclusions and alternatives, to the final conclusion, is not convincing. The presentation is, in effect, superficial and biased.

IT IS SUPERFICIAL

Example. Perhaps, as stated, available projections indicate increases in tourist numbers and local recreation demands. But the conclusion drawn is that the solution for meeting such demands in this region lies in additional access to mountain areas and in specific trail extensions.

Questions. Should we infer that wilderness classification for the Lincoln-Scapegoat area would prevent meeting this demand in the region? Is the public to conclude that all available access roads and trail extension potentials have been so exploited in this region that those "who want a taste of the primitive" cannot have it? Is the public to believe, even if such a remote possibility exists that the 240,500-acre wilderness proposal represents the limiting factor for satisfying such demands in this region?

Such implications stretch the credulity. I am one member of this whole public who would like to see the data.

IT IS BIASED

Example. The alternative of wilderness classification overly stresses the negative. Among the points given as negative factors are the following:

1. Such an alternative would prevent roadbuilding or the use of any mechanized equipment, consequently reducing the number of visitors.

Question. Is this inherently bad? If so, why?

2. No facilities or permanent structure of any kind would be permitted.

Question. Is this criterion necessary for the satisfaction and well-being of the whole public?

3. Physical practices for improvement of big game and fisheries habitat could not be undertaken.

Questions. Are such physical practices, whatever they might be, limiting factors to an optimum wildlife population in the area proposed for wilderness classification? Has the agency responsible for managing resident wildlife species, the Fish and Game Department, expressed a need for such physical practices in the area?

4. Wilderness classification would permit management of less than half of the entire area's commercial timber stands.

Question. What would be the diminishing marginal utility of that uncut portion of the timber when translated into net economic loss to the long-term future and well-being of the community and State? (Diminishing marginal utility is an economic concept recognizing the decreasing value of additional increments of products as the supply reaches or exceeds needs and demands.)

5. Wilderness classification would have no benefit for the short-range or short-time hiker over many other areas already available.

Question. Is this statement, recognizing that additional opportunities for the short-range or short-time hiker would be of more general utility, intended to mean that wilderness classification is consequently undesirable? What is the expressed demand of the whole public, projected or otherwise, that justifies this item as a factor?

I am one member of that whole public who would like to see the data.

The point missed in the two brochures is that the Multiple-Use Act provides "* * * that some land will be used for less than all of the resources." The basic issue obscured in the two brochures is objectivity—abrogated in obvious bias toward development.

Planning for forest management in the interest of the whole public was given direction by Congress in 1960 when multiple use forestry was officially declared to be a part of our national forest policy. But judging by the varied interpretations of the term, the meaning of multiple use has not been established, either by consensus of the public, by natural resource experts, or by legislative decree.

It is equally obvious that multiple use is not a cookbook-type formula wherein resource potentials, public demands, and so forth, can be thrown into a mixer and a single answer beaten out. Multiple use decisions affect the nature or quality of the products. Some products, or land uses, are essentially exclusionary—they will be destroyed if combined with certain other land uses. This means that multiple use becomes a problem of evaluating costs and benefits in terms of combinations that will best meet the needs of the American people, with such costs and benefits embracing ecological, economic, esthetic,

and social values. In short, multiple use decisionmaking means considering both tangible and intangible factors without necessarily giving priority to either as a matter of policy.

Consequently, formulation of a multiple use plan appropriate to the ecological, economic, esthetic, and social problems associated with the Lincoln-Scapegoat and contiguous area is extremely complex. It is an exercise that requires the skills and instincts of social scientists, lawyers, biologists, economists, psychiatrists, and philosophers in addition to those of timber and range specialists.

In view of this, it is unfortunate that the Forest Service chose to confuse the issue, and the public, with a public information program revealing so superficial an analysis of the problems and factors involved. It is unfortunate that the agency chose, in its plan for the area, to aline itself on the side of development based upon interpretations notable for their omissions rather than their objectivity.

This plan has placed a vast segment of the public in a defensive position against all the manpower, technical expertise, and financing of a generally authoritative and respected agency and its satellite commercial interests. It is unfortunate indeed that the Forest Service chose to disregard the fact that people who like both garlic and ice cream don't necessarily want them mixed.

The cover of the brochure "Management for People" carries a quotation. Out of context, the agency has President Lyndon B. Johnson adding authority to the plan's propensity for roadbuilding with his statement that "By making our road highways to the enjoyment of nature and beauty we can greatly enrich the life of nearly all our people in the city and countryside alike."

Senator METCALF. Didn't the President use that in the Billboard Act?

Dr. SMITH. Yes.

I am glad that the President rationalized his comment by limiting his summation to just nearly all our people. It allows a credibility gap for the rest of us people, who acquiese with his later statement, when, signing the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, he said "At last we are saving important land faster than the bulldozer can plow it under."

I respectfully request, gentlemen, your support for wilderness classification of Lincoln-Scapegoat.

Senator BURDICK. Elizabeth Smith, Bozeman.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH SMITH, BOZEMAN, MONT.

Mrs. SMITH. My testimony is brief, though I am not as good a hatchetman as my husband.

I am Elizabeth Hannum Smith of Bozeman. I have lived in Montana for only 6 years. Before then, most of my life was spent in large eastern cities—in Pittsburgh, New York, and Detroit.

I speak today, to this hearing, not as a writer and editor in the field of resource management and conservation, which I now am; not as a member of the Montana Wilderness Council, which I now am; but as an easterner, an urbanite, a product of the commercial and industrial centers of our Nation.

I left that noisy, crowded, mechanized world for the dignity and serenity of this land of open space and quiet mountains. I speak today

for those who cannot leave the cities except for brief moments, for those who invest precious time and money and effort and expectation in a vacation trip to our western wildlands. And I speak also for those who cannot afford even this much surcease from the noise and crowds and mechanization, but who hope to, and plan to, and may someday have the opportunity.

Today, specifically, I speak for some of the people I have accompanied into our wilderness areas: For the secretary from Philadelphia, the engineer from San Mateo, the doctor from Boston, the welfare worker from Chicago, the housewife from Salt Lake City, the food broker from San Francisco, and the schoolteachers from Los Angeles and Portland and Fort Wayne—for these and all the other city dwellers who in wilderness have found, in their words, peacefulness, release from pressure, time to think; who have had, in their words, a superb experience; whose lives, by their own statement, have been changed and enriched; who will return and return again.

I speak for the young sculptor from New York City, who found in this contact with nature a greater understanding of his own nature; for the systems analyst from Maryland, who came to criticize what he termed "the locking up of resources," but ended by advocating expansion of the wilderness system because "* * * setting aside these lands is like putting money in the bank." Perhaps his reversal of opinion was influenced by his 12-year-old son, who came with him. I speak also for that boy, who said that for him the best part of a wilderness trip was "* * * the quietness, the pure beauty, the difference from city life." And I speak for the woman from Illinois, who for the first time, she said, could hear the sound of the wind.

In promoting its plan to exploit and develop the Lincoln-Scapegoat area for logging, motoring, and road-access recreation, the Forest Service has published a booklet entitled "Management for People." I must ask the Forest Service—"What people?" Surely not the ones for whom I speak, and the thousands like them for whom wild country—a place to get away from it all—is the scarce commodity, the great adventure, the priceless resource.

Only a remnant of that resource is left to us. We have been passed by in most land-management decisions. In the sweep of exploitation and development, we have been given only a cursory nod.

There are so few places where we can still hear the wind above the screech and rasp of chainsaws, motorbikes, snowmobiles, bulldozers, and four-wheel drives; where we can still smell the freshness of air and grass and earth uncorrupted by gasoline; where we can still see a riverbank or a lakeshore uncluttered with structures and vehicles, a mountainside unscarred by roads and clearcuts; where we can still glory in a star-filled night unblotted by the glare of headlights and trailers.

These experiences may be taken for granted or even scorned by some of those who live close to our remnant of wildness and can make use of it when and as they will. But by the people I represent today, whose daily lives are filled with the screech and rasp and corruption and clutter and scar and glare of urban existence, these experiences are treasured.

The people I speak for ask why a public agency should show disrespect for a public treasure—why its appointed guardians should wish

to carry the scourge of exploitation and development into these last remaining sanctuaries.

The people I speak for know from experience that you can't get away from it all by taking it with you, that roads and logging, no matter how well planned and operated, mean the loss of the treasure, the end of the adventure, the death of the resource.

The people I speak for, who revere the mysterious world of a forest, who discover with joy and wonder its multifold life, cannot conceive of the back country forest land as a "big woodpile," as the Forest Service region 1 information and education chief describes it in his Great Falls Tribune guest editorial of September 19. These people do not view mechanized invasion of the quiet mountains as a reasonable management option, but as official vandalism.

The people I speak for are what management agencies term "a user group." It is difficult to think of these people, with all their spiritual and material investment in wilderness, as "users." It is hard to translate their ecstasy at first sight of a deer, their pride in new-found courage at negotiating a rough or precipitous trail, their intense delight in every growing, blossoming thing, as "using."

But we should remember that this user group, if such it be, is one which takes nothing from the land it uses; it does not pollute or disrupt or deplete. We should remember, too, that this group is a nationwide segment of the American public, not a local or a Montana interest.

Because Lincoln-Scapegoat belongs to the Nation, not to a local or a Montana interest, I ask the committee to give tangible consideration to the needs of this public segment—the people for whom I speak. I entreat you to enlarge their priceless remnant of wilderness; to protect Lincoln-Scapegoat by recommending its wilderness classification; to make it possible for more city children to know the pure beauty, and for that Illinois woman, and many more people, from many more places, for many more years, to hear the sound of the wind.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you very much for your statement.

Professor Rusoff, professor of law at the University of Montana.

STATEMENT OF LESTER R. RUSOFF, PROFESSOR OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA, MISSOULA, MONT.

Professor RUSOFF. Senator Burdick, I am here on behalf of several persons, including myself, in support of S. 1121. I am presenting here 30 copies of a statement on behalf of the Western Montana Fish & Game Association, and a number of other conservation organizations, including the Montana Wildlife Federation and United Sportsmen's Association of Montana.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection it will be received.

Professor RUSOFF. This is a statement I am presenting on behalf of myself. I would like to briefly summarize these statements, just to mention the points that they deal with. I will not try to read them. The fish and game association statements emphasize the present use of the area in question, the easy access to it, the existence of spawning ground for cutthroat trout, and of habitat for the grizzly bear. It mentions the relative lack of vista points from practical road routes; the availability of other roads and sites, or campgrounds for mass recreation; the slightness of timber value in the area; the fact that

wilderness recreation is scarce in the United States taken as a whole, and that the demand for such recreation is growing.

I also have a statement by a colleague, Albert W. Stone, who also teaches in the law school at Missoula, as I do. His field and professional interest is water law and resources. He teaches courses in that area, and a seminar in national resources, so that he has a serious interest in land uses. His statement is a statement in support of the Metcalf-Mansfield bill, S. 1121. I do not have 30 copies of the statement with me. I can produce such copies and send them in later.

Senator BURDICK. It will be received and follow the conservation statements you have submitted.

Professor RUSOFF. Further, I have a statement which I could take time to read because I am very pleased with the person who wrote it. This is my daughter, Anne Rusoff, an 18-year-old girl who has worked for two summers as a trail cook in the Bob Marshall Wilderness. Her letter discusses the delight of her guests and herself inside the Bob Marshall, close to the Lincoln-Scapegoat area where they saw a cow moose and a young calf barely able to walk; where this summer she had a young bull elk watch her cook breakfast early in the morning for about half an hour. She goes on to point out that if this area is eroded and a larger number of people are there, this type of experience will not be available. I will get the 30 copies of this letter later.

Senator BURDICK. It will follow the others.

Senator METCALF. You don't need to get the extra copies.

Professor RUSOFF. I also present a statement of my own.

I am Lester R. Rusoff, professor of law at the University of Montana, Missoula, Mont. I moved here in 1957 largely so that I could enjoy the forests, streams, and mountains, and have remained here for the same reason. The opinions made in this statement are, of course, my own, and not those of the law school or the university.

I have spent a week camping at Meadow Lake in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area and have ridden to the top of Red Mountain. On the basis of observations made on that trip, I believe that the best use of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area for the foreseeable future would be obtained through wilderness classification, and I support the Metcalf-Mansfield bill designed to establish that classification. The lakes and streams that I saw were small, shallow, and not suitable for mass fishing or for boating other than by raft or canoe. The value of my trip to the Lincoln-Scapegoat area lay largely in the sense of isolation I experienced there and the feeling of self-reliance arising from meeting the problems of existence without being able to jump into an automobile and go home.

In my opinion, the needs of the public for campgrounds and scenic views accessible by automobile can be met elsewhere than in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. There already are paved highways up the valleys of the Clark Fork, Bitterroot, Big Blackfoot, Clearwater, and Swan Rivers, and in the Flathead Valley. These highways offer magnificent views of the Bitterroot, Mission, and Swan Ranges. They provide access to large streams and lakes which can withstand heavy fishing pressure. Similar highways, scenery, and fishing are available in other parts of Montana and in the other Western States and Canadian Provinces. State and Federal agencies and private investors can and should meet our need for campgrounds by building them near existing highways and by our larger lakes and streams. Scenic views from

high altitudes are already available where existing highways cross passes; if a need for more such views is felt, it can be fulfilled by improvement of many existing roads, such as the Fish Creek Road, which runs between Lolo Creek and the Clark Fork River, and the roads which run from it along the high ridges. Any need for 1-day hikes can be met by providing access roads to canyons and by building trail-end facilities, such as those available at Kootenai, Bass, and Blodgett Creeks in the Bitterroot Mountains.

The existence of the Bob Marshall Wilderness does not justify destruction of the de facto wilderness of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. Some main trails leading into and in the Bob Marshall Wilderness are so heavily used that they are thick with dust or mud, depending on the weather. If the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is made unsuitable for extended backpacking or horseback trips, the use of the trails in the Bob Marshall Wilderness probably will increase and the condition of those trails will deteriorate. If the Forest Service is looking for a project, it could do a better job of clearing existing trails in the Bob Marshall. Such atmosphere of wilderness as there is in the Bob Marshall exists partly because other unroaded areas, like the Lincoln-Scapegoat, absorb some of the pressure. I do have some knowledge of the Bob Marshall, as I spent 11 days there this summer and my daughter has worked as a trail cook there both last summer and this summer.

Part of the idea behind the proposal of the Forest Service to build roads through the Lincoln-Scapegoat area seems to be that there should be a drive-in wilderness. The value of a wilderness, however, lies partly in its isolation—its freedom from the noise and debris of man. When the gasoline engine is introduced to an area—the chain saw, motor scooter, oversnow vehicle, and automobile, the quiet is destroyed and the trash is hauled in. Anyone who doesn't know this should travel the roads in Pattee Canyon and on Blue Mountain near Missoula and see the beverage cans and bottles, the broken glass, paper, and other junk which litters the ground in any place accessible by motor vehicle. I know from bitter experience that there are few places in the woods close to roads that one can exercise a hunting dog without risking serious injury to its feet from broken glass. The accumulation of junk seems to build up year by year despite the efforts of the Forest Service and private citizens. Formerly I carried a feedbag in my car and picked up bottles and broken glass, but the job became so great that I have largely given up. Restriction of the number of roads and the blocking of unneeded roads would protect the woods from trash better than building new roads through areas that now are relatively clean. It would be interesting to know how much money the Park Service spends annually to keep Glacier and Yellowstone Parks as clean as they are. I know that individuals in the Forest Service are concerned with the problem of trash in the woods, but so far the Service appears almost powerless to keep the woods along its roads even passably clean. The possibility and cost of clearing trash should be considered in deciding whether to build any new roads.

As to the scenic views, which can be presented where logging happens, I have a picture which I might like to have in the record. I cannot vouch for the authenticity of it, but I think it could be authenticated. It describes specifically in surveyor's terms the locations which

were photographed. If you would like to have it for the record I would be pleased.

Senator BURDICK. That will be received for the file.

Professor RUSOFF. As a member of various organizations, I can understand the desire of the Forest Service to expand its operations and its reluctance to abandon a position it has taken. For the future, the Service can avoid the face-saving probleb by consulting interested citizens before it decides to undertake a project; it appears that the Service is now trying to do this in fixing boundaries for the proposed Mission Mountains wilderness. As to provisions for growth of the Service, I am sure that many projects can be found to make the Service as big and as active as Congress will permit.

In summary, I submit that there is no adequate reason now for building roads through the Lincoln Scapegoat area and that it should be classified as wilderness.

There are a couple of other points I would like to mention just briefly if I may. One is the talk about the greatest good for the greatest number. This is a concept which Jeramy Benson publicized about 150 years ago. He was doing it in protest against aspects of the law which had no rationality, against a brutal useless principle. Jeramy Benson oversimplified it. All I think he was trying to say was that when we do something in the law we ought to measure it by what good it is going to do for somebody. This formula of greatest good for greatest number merely boils down to something like this: Philosophers for some time have pointed out, for a long time, there isn't any mathematical way that this formula can be applied. It merely represents in effect a general way of looking at legislation that ought to be good for people. We shouldn't have it here because it has always been there; we should judge it by what it is going to do. It does not have any mathematical accuracy. It is not merely a matter of counting noses. Those are the points I wanted to make.

I also have the clippings that Senator Metcalf asked me to produce in respect to activities of the Forest Service in opposition to S. 1121. Would you like to have those at this time?

Senator METCALF. I would like to have you submit them for the record at this time.

Senator BURDICK. They will be received.

Professor RUSOFF. This is not one [indicating] that was mentioned in my letter, but I think you will find it interesting. These are the two clippings I mentioned [indicating]. I can produce additional photographs of those clippings if it should happen to become useful.

Senator METCALF. Those will be satisfactory.

Professor RUSOFF. Thank you very much.

Senator METCALF. Senator Burdick, I think it should be noted that both Professor Rusoff and Professor Stone, who has a statement in the record, are outstanding law professors. I think we would be unable to keep them at the University of Montana if it were not for the fact we are adjacent to wilderness areas and they are devoted conservationists.

Professor RUSOFF. Thank you for mentioning that. I had hoped, and forgot to say, that many of the faculty, not just Al and I, treat the wild aspect of Montana as part of our salary. This is the way we lure new faculty here, I have helped to do it, by selling them on the wild country in Montana. This is the reason many of us stay.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you very much.
(The data referred to follow:)

WESTERN MONTANA FISH & GAME ASSOCIATION,
Missoula, Mont., September 25, 1968.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The attached statement was prepared by the Western Montana Fish and Game Association in cooperation with a number of other conservation organizations which are named therein. This statement, while prepared for a previous presentation, is nevertheless pertinent and relevant to the present hearing.

This statement sets forth the reasons leading to the decision of the Western Montana Fish and Game Association to request wilderness status for the Lincoln Back Country. The Association requests that this statement be made part of the record of this hearing.

Further, the Association requests passage of S. 1121, authorizing wilderness classification for 240,500 acres of National Forest Land comprising Lincoln Back Country and parts of Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests.

Very truly yours,

J. GEORGE HUMMEL, *President.*

UTILIZATION OF THE LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY AND SCAPEGOAT MOUNTAIN AREA

The Montana Wildlife Federation, the Montana Wilderness Association, the Wilderness Outfitters Association, the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association, the United Sportsmen of Montana, the Flathead Wildlife Incorporated, the Polson Outdoors Incorporated, the Cascade Wildlife Association, the Butte Skyline Club, the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association, and the Western Montana Fish and Game Association request the United States Forest Service to recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture that the north half of the Lincoln Back Country together with the contiguous Scapegoat Mountain area be designated as wilderness under the provisions of the Wilderness Act, Public Law 88–577.

The subject area comprises approximately 240,500 acres. Its boundaries are as follows: from a point on the southeast boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area at Deadman Hill southeast to Bench Mark, along the ridge of Wood Creek Hogback to the top of Crown Mountain, and across Welcome Pass to the midpoint of Steamboat Mountain; then down the ridge between Milk and Pear Creeks, across the Dearborn River, and up the Continental Divide to a point above Bighorn Lake; along the Divide from this point, down the ridge northwest of Falls Creek, across Landers Fork to the top of Lone Mountain, southwest to Heart Lake Trail, and westward to the top of Red Mountain; then southwest to Arrastra Peak, along Daly, Iron, and Echo Peaks, and across Windy Pass to Mineral Hill; from there across the North Fork of the Blackfoot River at the Big Slide to BM 8320 and northwest across Canyon Creek (excluding the upper Conger Creek Timber stand) to Canyon Peak; then westward to the top of Omar Mountain and northward along the ridge to the southern boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area west of Danaher Pass.

This region has been used in the past primarily for hiking, backpacking, horseback riding, fishing and hunting. It has served as habitat for grizzly bear, elk, and native trout. It is currently a primitive country with a highly diversified spectrum of recreational use ranging from family hiking and camping in gentle bottomlands to extensive pack trips into rugged mountain terrain. Although its natural features are generally indistinguishable from those of the southern portain of the Bob Marshall Wilderness, it is a wilderness entity in itself and offers important recreational advantages of its own. Many of its lakes, camps, and hunting sites are an easy half-day walk or ride from roadheads along the boundaries. The area has a long tradition of use by wilderness enthusiasts.

In response to proposed plans for developing the northern Lincoln Back Country for mass recreation and timber harvest, the undersigned organizations carefully studied the physical features of the area with a view to such use. Personal inspection trips and conferences with officials of the United States Forest Service were conducted, and additional information was obtained from outfitters and guides. The general conclusion is that the country concerned is fragile land unsuitable for mass recreation or logging.

The lakes in the area are small and shallow, most of them little more than potholes. They would provide insufficient water-oriented recreation for mass use and would deteriorate rapidly under such use. The camp grounds at Heart Lake are already barren and impacted. The same is true for Meadow Creek Lake. The other lakes are even smaller and less durable and would not furnish quality recreation for more than a few parties at a time.

The East Fork, North Fork, and Landers Fork of the Blackfoot River support natural trout populations but produce relatively few fish of catchable size. These small streams would be easily destroyed as trout producers if heavily fished or if altered by logging or nearby road construction. Under present conditions they provide many miles of excellent spawning grounds. The native cutthroat trout in particular would be adversely affected in these tributaries and in the Blackfoot River as well.

The grizzly bear is relatively abundant in the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area and could be a problem under conditions of mass recreation. Either grizzly numbers would have to be reduced or protection afforded tourists and campers as under similar conditions occurring in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks. The wild habitat essential to the grizzly's existence would in all probability be destroyed and this valuable bear eventually eliminated from another of its few remaining haunts. Such a sacrifice appears unjustified unless attendant public gains can be clearly determined.

With the exception of Scapegoat Mountain and Red Mountain, the country is scenically unspectacular. The valleys are narrow and for the most part contain thick stands of lodgepole pine. There would be few if any attractive vistapoints from any practical road route, which would be of necessity run primarily through the valleys and be similar to thousands of miles of roaded country in the **Northwest.**

To date, the economic advantages of any proposed recreational development of the northern Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area have not been established. It appears unnecessary and unfeasible to create sites for mass recreation in this area when there are many such sites near existing roads and highways that have not yet been exploited to their full potential and when already established campgrounds in this general region are not used to capacity. There are many scenic areas with natural water supplies close to highways along the east side of the Bitterroot Mountains, for example, and on both sides of the Mission Range. The west side of the Swan Range and the southern portion of the Lincoln Ranger District also offer a number of appropriate sites for mass-recreation development.

Multiple-use purposes other than rcreation should, of course, be considered. The bulk of this land has a steep gradient with sparse soil. In regard to timber, most of the stands in the accessible portions of the area consist of lodgepole pine. Should this species be of value in the future, there are thousands of acres of it as yet untouched in existing roaded areas. North of Meadow Creek Lake there is a small stand of merchantable spruce. The Forest Service does not consider this stand important, however, and has not included timber development of the Meadow Creek drainage in one of its long-range plans. The few stands of Douglas fir throughout the area are for the most part of extremely poor grade—rotted, with large butts and much taper. Timber in the northern Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area therefore seems of insufficient merchantable value to offset the cost of harvest and transport.

Recreation is one of Montana's growth industries with a promising future. The national trend toward more outdoor recreation will increase the value of this resource to the state. The maintenance of diversity of recreational opportunity is paramount to Montana and should be recognized in long-range state projections. The Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area constitutes a type of recreational resource unique to a few sections of the Rocky Mountains—many parts of the country can provide developed recreation, but few can offer a wilderness as well, and once a wilderness is roaded or otherwise developed, it is gone forever.

It is concluded that although there is a national need for mass recreation and timber, there is no foreseeable need for such in the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area, and furthermore this area is not suitable for such use.

The undersigned organizations are convinced that the interests of Montana and the nation will be best served by designating the subject area as wilderness. This can be accomplished under the Wilderness Act through process of public notice, hearings, review procedures, and Congressional approval.

In requesting a recommendation for wilderness designation for the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area, the undersigned further urge that the area be allowed to remain in an undeveloped state until the review procedures spelled out in the Wilderness Act can be implemented. Since the first procedure (P.L. 88–577) to bring additional units into the National Wilderness Preservation System is to give public notice of such intent, we, the undersigned, submit this as public notice of our intent and urge the United States Forest Service to publicly state its intent following proper administrative studies.

MONTANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Livingston, Mont., June 4, 1968.

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands, City Council Chamber, Civic Center, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The Southwestern District of the Montana Wildlife Federation is comprised of conservation groups affiliated with the Montana Wildlife Federation and located in the nine southwestern counties of the State. The District has been requested by its member clubs to formally go on record favoring the "Wilderness Classification" proposed for the Lincoln-Scapegoat area of the Lewis & Clark and the Lolo National Forests.

The Southwestern District believes that the unique values inherent in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area offer infinitely more to Montana and to the Nation than proposed commercial development whose value would not likely extend beyond material measurements.

It is only natural to like the things that make life easy but fortunately many Americans feel there is a much greater need for the things that make life worthwhile. The Lincoln-Scapegoat country abounds in qualities that, year after year, have made life more worthwhile for many, many people.

The opportunity to present the opinions of Southwestern and to have this letter become a part of the printed record of the hearing is appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOE M. HALTERMAN, *President.*

MONTANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Hamilton, Mont., June 6, 1968.

MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION,
Hamilton, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: District I of the Montana Wildlife Federation has supported the Lincoln Backcountry's attempt to create a wilderness area.

We would like to reiterate our support for this and urge all interested parties to do everything possible to see that the Lincoln back country becomes a wilderness area.

Sincerely yours,

E. K. STEWART,
Secretary, District I.

MONTANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Sanders, Mont., June 3, 1968.

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: We of the Montana Wildlife Federation believe that the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness should be retained in all its natural wild condition and therefor urge the support and passage by Congress of S. 1121 by Senator Metcalf and H.R. 7148 by Congressman Battin.

Sincerely yours,

H. R. MILLER, *President.*

STATEMENT OF ALBERT W. STONE, MISSOULA, MONT.

Gentlemen; my special field of professional interest is water law and resources, and I teach courses in that area as well as a seminar in Natural Resources at the School of Law at the University of Montana. Hence I have a serious

interest in land uses, particularly in this locality where my professional interest can be supplemented by personal observation and participation.

The Lincoln-Sscapegoat back-country area is one which is not well suited to multiple uses, easy access by automobile or mass recreation. Its lakes are mostly small and shallow so that they do not lend themselves to motor boating or water skiing, and they would be much more readily "fished out" than larger bodies of water.

On the other hand, if only because of its present remoteness, the area is suitable to high quality use as a wilderness area. The retention of such areas as wilderness provides a desirable variety in recreational activities which even the multiple use concept cannot attain. Persons who desire to remove themselves from the presence of the nearly almighty automobile should be able to find area where that desire can be satisfied.

There are already numerous scenic and recreational areas which have been made readily accessible; remote areas with their isolation, tranquility and naturalness are all too rare. This is one of the latter-areas, and should be preserved for the values that it presently affords.

So I join with those who support the Metcalf-Mansfield bill, and speak in favor of a wilderness classification for the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

STATEMENT OF ANNE C. RUSOFF, MISSOULA, MONT.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following statement for inclusion in the printed hearing record on S. 1121.

My name is Anne Rusoff; I am eighteen years old and am presently a freshman at the University of Montana. For the past two summers I have worked as a trail cook for an outfitter in the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

Although I have not spent very much time in the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area, each year I have made at least one trip through it. Each time I was impressed by the beauty of the country and the fragility of the balance between man and nature.

Both summers our second day camp was about one mile inside the Bob Marshall Wilderness from the boundary of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. Every year our guests and I have been thrilled by close views of large game animals.

This year a cow moose and a young calf, scarcely old enough to keep up with his mother at a walk, ambled across a hillside about fifty yards from my cookstove. This was in broad daylight. My own excitement and that of the Indiana doctors with me, is inexpressible.

The preceding year as I was cooking an early breakfast and talking with some guests a young bull elk rose out of a depression less than fifty feet from us. After peering at us for a few moments, he turned his back on us and began licking the ground which apparently was salty. Having satisfied his desire for salt, in about half-an-hour he leisurely left.

Neither of these experiences is an ordinary occurrence even in Montana. Anywhere that cars and hordes of people approach within hearing distance large animals such as moose, elk and deer are extremely timid and are seldom seen except occasionally at night. If there had been a road up to the boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness, i.e., through the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area, my guests and I would have missed these marvelous experiences and many more similar ones. Unless we are going to crowd our wildlife into the center of the Bob Marshall Wilderness, the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area must become a wilderness.

Will your children and mine be able to enjoy this area in its free, wild state, or will they see only another rest stop as they drive along a highway? The choice is yours. Please choose the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

[From the Missoulian, Sept. 10, 1968]

SCENIC ROAD PLAN FOR LINCOLN AREA

Construction of a scenic road across the Continental Divide to provide an alpine recreation route connecting Missoula and Great Falls is a prime part of a Forest Service proposal for management of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area described before Missoula Lions Club Monday in the Florence Hotel.

Supervisor John Milodragovich of the Lolo National Forest, in making an illustrated presentation entitled "Management for People," brought out that the road crossing the divide southeast of Scapegoat Mountain would have termini near Lincoln, Ovando and Augusta.

The proposed plan calls for building additional short, multi-purpose roads to provide access to interior recreation areas. Road-end facilities would serve as jumping-off points for wilderness and high country walks and rides.

The proposal Milodragovich outlined gave 10 other ideas as follows: 1. To protect nearby and distant viewing areas by scenic corridors along roads and trails; 2. To recognize that some roads would safely serve winter as well as summer visitors; 3. To build small campgrounds where needed as recreation hubs for visits to attractions throughout the area.

4. To manage the forest on about one-fourth of the area for sustained timber crops; 5. To continue commercial outfitting services on the trails and ways serving the high country and in portions of the lower area; 6. To study the Scapegoat Mountain country for consideration as a geologic area.

7. To improve wildlife habitat where it will aid in increasing forage supplies.

8. To restore damaged stream channels and stream banks; 9. To install sanitation facilities where public use requires; 10. To study the area potential for at least one major winter sports area.

Milodragovich brought out that the proposal does not envision any of the following: 1. New roads in the high country except for the one scenic drive, high zones continuing to be trail country; 2. A road through the Big Slide area; 3. Roads closer to streams and lakes than topography dictates; 4. Permanent logging spurs (after use they would be blocked) 5. Harvest of timber on steep slopes, unstable soils or "normal" harvest in recreation zones.

A pamphlet which Milodragovich used in his presentation emphasized on the inside cover that the Forest Service is dedicated to the principle of multiple use management of the nation's forest resources for sustained yields of wood, water, forage, wildlife and recreation.

Leading up to the Forest Service's plan for managing the Blackfoot-Sun River Area, which covers 491,000 acres, Milodragovich pointed out that public requirements now are placing heavier demands upon outdoor recreation, water, wood, forage, and wildlife in all national forests.

Whether the rising demand continues at present levels or accelerates, need has developed to look carefully at how this area can best serve people and communities, according to the supervisor.

The official listed the following as some of the local circumstances that have led to the decision to do so: 1. Actual and predicted population increases in Lincoln, Missoula, Great Falls and other nearby communities: 2. Rising summer and winter use of the area by riders, hikers and operators of motorized vehicles.

3. Increased demands for off-highway automobile travel routes by local and out-of-state visitors; 4. Realization of the need for more intensive development plans for key areas to permit thorough analysis of all possible alternatives for their management; 5. An early need for forest stands to contribute to the annual yields of wood from three national forests or a decision to reduce yearly harvests from these national forests.

Announcement was made that a Congressional committee will conduct a hearing on the proposal in Great Falls Sept. 25.

[From the Great Falls Tribune, Sept. 19, 1968]

Back Country Management

PATTERN MUST CONSIDER ALL RESOURCES

(The editorial below is by a guest editor. Opinions expressed are those of the guest editor)

During the past several years, all of us in the Forest Service's Northern Region have been asked for our thoughts on the long-range management of today's back country areas. Optional approaches to managing one nearly roadless tract are described in "Patterns For Management: Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area" and in a second illustrated booklet entitled "Management For People." As these recent Forest Service reports state, today's absence of roads leaves all of the management options open for consideration.

More than half of this country is high and rugged. The high elevation zones form an interesting pattern of peninsulas and islands throughout the entire area, rather than a solid block. Within the high zones little development other than trails and a few marked ways would serve riders and hikers, perhaps always.

Another option would be a single scenic road crossing through the alpine zone. Such a road would open its scenic views and colorful flora to many more visitors. With termini near Ovando and Lincoln on the southwest and Augusta on the northeast, the road could offer an interesting variety of through trips and loop drives.

Summer enjoyment of the high country could be supplemented by more nearly year-round recreation on the lower slopes and in the valleys. A limited road network here would offer skiers and snowmobile enthusiasts access to country as beautiful in winter as in summer.

Small campgrounds beside the roads could form recreation hubs from which visitors would walk short distances to scenic spots, streams and lakes. From roadends they could ride or hike chosen distances into the 950,000 acres of the adjoining Bob Marshall Wilderness. There is no hint yet that public demands for a variety of family outdoor recreation experiences are slackening.

Properly designed and located recreation roads could also provide transportation routes for forest crops. Wildland forests below the high mountain zones and away from recreation lands would yield sustainable harvests of about 16 million board feet a year now. Forest management could produce 30 million board feet annually from the best timber growing acres.

This big woodpile is difficult to visalize. Perhaps different terminology would help. Each million board feet can be identified with the roughly 7½-man-years work required to harvest, transport, process and sell it. Economists might add to this the man-years of employment required by industries and businesses providing auxiliary services.

There are other resources within the area—water, forage for cattle and horses, food for wildlife, fish habitat and minerals. Each must be woven into the patterns of management selected for the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Country.

KENNETH KEENEY,
Chief of the Division for Information and Education, Region 1, U.S. Forest Service, Missoula.

Senator BURDICK. Clifford Haines, chairman of the Flathead County Board of County Commissioners.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I have a telegram from Clifford Haines saying he was unable to be here, but will file a statement.

Senator BURDICK. Grover Botkin, Great Falls.

STATEMENT OF T. SGT. GROVER F. BOTKIN, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Sergeant BOTKIN. I am T. Sgt. Grover F. Botkin, attached to the 341st Supply Squadron at Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont. I would like to make it clear I am not speaking for any military aspect, I am speaking for myself. I am also a hunter safety instructor for the State of Montana and an active hunter, fisherman, and a firearms collector. While I am not a native Montanan, this is my second tour of duty here at my own request. I like this State and am seriously considering settling here upon retirement in 1971. I have lived in Montana over 2 years. I would like to add that I am probably one of the poorer paid employees in the State of Montana, being paid by the Air Force. I have found in the last 3 years I can afford to hire a commercial packer in Lincoln to take me back, me and my son, into the back country for a period of anywhere from 5 days to 2 weeks. The cost is probably equal to about three tires on a pickup truck with a camper.

I am familiar with the Lincoln back country area, having packed and ridden horseback through much of the area, the most recent trip

during this past week for a period of 6 days. It is my honest belief that if a highway or series of highways are constructed into this area, the natural beauty will be forever ruined. It is because of these areas of true wilderness that my family and I want to settle here. We are not alone in this idea, and I am personally acquainted with many military people that have the same thoughts. Montana has a few of the only true wilderness areas in the United States. They are a precious asset not only to the people that live here or in the nearby vicinity, but more important, to the country as a whole. Many, many people visit this area from all States. This is mainly due to the fact that there are these remote, natural areas to see, explore, and admire.

In the back country, as those who have recently seen it know, there are even now marks of mankind. I saw man's brand in the form of the beer and pop cans, cigarette packs, empty meat cans, broken bottles, and gut-shot deer. If the highways are constructed into this area, multiply these sins against nature by thousands. If you doubt this, look at other areas that have been exploited by mining, lumber, motels, cafes, bars, and other businesses and you will see what will happen to this area. The people who want this area opened up by roads will call it progress. The same type people call the extermination of the buffalo progress. When they took the land from the Indians it was progress. When the prairie was fenced and railroaded it was progress. Dam up all the rivers, pollute them, and it's progress. Dig large gaping holes in the hills and throw the silt and poison in the streams and it's progress. Then cut down all the forest until they are bare and eroded and it's progress. If this is what we can call progress, then myself and my kind want no part of progress. A real and honest type of progress would be to include areas of this type into our wilderness program, protect the forest and its wildlife, permanently assure that the area remains natural as it was years ago, and assure our children that they and their grandchildren will be able to see some small part of the country as it always has been. Thank you for the privilege of being able to speak my beliefs on this matter.

Senator BURDICK. Mrs. William C. Vinyard, University of Montana, Bigfork, Mont.

STATEMENT OF LUCILLE VINYARD, BIGFORK, MONT.

Mrs. VINYARD. My name is Lucille Vinyard, and I reside presently near Bigfork, Mont. I am pleased to be able to present my views to you today in favor of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area, knowing that my views are shared by thousands of concerned, taxpaying, voting citizens throughout the Nation. I want to say that I am speaking as a private citizen. Though I am a permanent resident of northern California, I am well acquainted with numerous mountain areas in northwestern Montana, having resided at the University of Montana Biological Station on Flathead Lake for 2 months of each of the past 6 years and for the coming year will be a full-time resident.

As a research assistant on an aquatic plant distribution survey in alpine and subalpine areas of northwestern Montana this past summer I had the opportunity to pack into a part of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat area. What I saw of the area excited me.

The U.S. Forest Service provided me with a brochure, dated January 1, 1966, wherein national forest wilderness and primitive areas of the United States are shown in a pleasing pink color. I was shocked at the infinitesimal amount of wilderness this great Nation has preserved out of the total land area in the "lower 48." It is evident from this map that man has been extremely busy over the last 100 years in the West destroying much of this natural environment with little regard for the future of the natural resources—or human resources. No longer can this Nation afford to whittle away the last vestiges of a "natural landscape" without bringing grave social problems down heavier than ever on its already sagging shoulders. Wilderness is essential for "sane" survival of an already plagued and overexpanding population. We need to add wilderness—not destroy wilderness, as has been the continual pattern since early settlers pushed their way westward.

One only has to look back into a pitifully short history to the once vast white pine forests of the Northeastern and Great Lakes States. I witnessed the dedication of the last small virgin stand of this species in Indiana. There are few chances for wilderness there today. And why? The land could have provided a renewable resource, but man was not looking ahead. Should we not now take a good hard look at what may yet be saved? Of the total land area of the "lower 48" how much remains of primitive America? Has the U.S. Forest Service in its 60-plus years of administration perpetuated more than a fraction of wilderness land area? Are they not now opposed violently to the mere thought of losing a potential timber sale, which in actuality is but another thread in the well woven blanket of bureau perpetuation?

I have witnessed the near extinction of the virgin coastal redwood forests in California in recent years, but it was the private landowners who sought to exploit, destroy, wipe out the virgin forest with the intent to manage second growth. The taxpayers could do little, or nothing, to halt the demise of the virgin forests until a few concerned citizens realized that there was a great deal at stake and moved to save a mere remnant of their heritage.

The populace of 56 years ago did not realize the danger to their natural environment—or give more than an occasional thought to the future, believing that wilderness was perhaps limitless. Little did they realize that we, the United States, could—and would—reach such an astronomical figure as 200 million individuals by the year 1968. But today we are becoming aware—violently aware, of what has happened to our public lands, what is happening to our public lands, and what is planned for our public lands.

Thirty years ago I enjoyed my first back country experience. It was in a rather obscure area in northeastern California, an area under the administration of the U.S. Forest Service, Warner Mountains. Twenty years ago, after successive yearly visits, I was aware of little change; 10 years ago in the same area U.S. Forest Service roads had been improved, cost unknown; timber had been marked for removal; primitive campsites—the outhouses, referred to by the U.S. Forest Service as "sanitary facilities" had been "porcelainized." Why these developments? Was not the natural area enough in itself for those who cared to seek it?

My travels for wilderness experience have taken me, with my professional botanist husband, to areas from the California coast to Isle Royale National Park.

Now—back to Lincoln-Scapegoat. Why am I "bugged" about this? Simple answer. Wilderness is there—great, wonderful wilderness. But so is the U.S. Forest Service. I believe that the people of this Nation should be permitted to make the final decision on the wisest use of the land. We must keep in mind that this wilderness is for the entire Nation with an ever-expanding population which makes it imperative to add wilderness, since wilderness areas do not expand in proportion.

We all know that wilderness cannot be made retroactive. It must be set aside for future generations now—while it exists. I strongly urge the protection of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area by enacting legislation to assure that it becomes a part of the wilderness preservation system. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Kenneth R. Hoeffner, Lincoln.

Mr. HOEFFNER. Senators Metcalf, Burdick, and ladies and gentlemen, I am Kenneth Hoeffner, and I represent the K Lazy Three Ranch at Lincoln, Mont. My partner, Harold Barber, cannot be present at this hearing as he has a hunting party in the Lincoln back country. I wish to make this statement on his behalf also.

We are both native Montanans. I was raised in Augusta, Mont., and feel privileged to have enjoyed the wilderness since youth. I bought a small ranch in the Lincoln area in 1959. I also purchased some logging equipment and have logged in this area to supplement my ranch income, until logging became very marginal. Desiring to stay in the Lincoln Valley, we turned to the outfitting and guiding business because it offered a future and the type of work the whole family enjoys. We recognize the fact that hunting and fishing is becoming less and less a part of outfitting and that many people are coming to Montana because they have lost their wilderness and wildlife, and simply wish to relax and be away from the pressures of civilization. Therefore, we are making the adjustment from logging to that of an interest which promises to grow as the demand is ever increasing for quality outdoor recreation in the wilderness.

There are now hundreds of miles of roads, and many places for camping near these roads that are yet undeveloped. The Lincoln back country has been the constant drawing force and stabilizer in the Lincoln economy. Without it we will have lost one of the most vital elements which has made Lincoln a desirable place for both natives and visitors alike. Without it our wildlife cannot continue in abundance, our fishing would be a matter of expensive put and take. With extensive development the very reason people wish to go there will have been destroyed.

I sincerely hope that this area can remain unmarred by roads for my children and those in the future to enjoy as I have. Therefore I support the passage of Senate bill S. 1121 for the inclusion of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness into the national wilderness preservation system. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

Ben Taormina, Great Falls, Mont.

STATEMENT OF BEN TAORMINA, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mr. TAORMINA. Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf, prior to submission of my oral testimony, I would like to submit to the committee an endorsement for the wilderness preservation.

We, the undersigned, being citizens and residing in the State of Montana, respectfully request the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be preserved as such for the enjoyment of present and future generations of outdoorsmen, fishermen, hunters, hikers and nature enthusiasts.

I have 455 signatures to this endorsement.

Senator BURDICK. It may be received.

Mr. TAORMINA. My name is Ben Taormina, residing out of Great Falls. My profession is management analyst.

It is my considered opinion that the subject area be set aside as wilderness and preserved for all generations as such. This area presently abounds in flora and fauna as God created it. Some species of fauna have retreated to this area in advance of civilization, and today are on the threshold of extinction.

I have on numerous occasions traversed into wild and primitive areas and also into developed areas. I have seen firsthand what development can do to an area. As soon as the hordes have effortless access, the game retreats. The wild flowers are trampled and picked, therefore, the seeds in which they propagate themselves are lost from the breast of mother earth. The beauty of the area is desecrated by human disposed litter, much of which will never decay. The trees and shrubs are cut down or scarred in a moment of thoughtlessness. And finally, as if man could do no more to destroy what was once a thing of beauty, he carelessly sets it ablaze, thus depriving himself of ever visiting the area again and destroying life in its entirety. This can be borne out by the record. All you have to look at is the Las Pedros National Forest, San Bernardino, the Cleveland National Forest, and San Angeles National Forest—the devastation that the masses have done there. They don't have small fires, their fires range from 15,000 to 20,000 acres before they are contained. This is what our masses have done. This is what I am trying to imply.

Life, in the form of flora or fauna, is life nonetheless—the very same life that our forefathers and pioneers depended so completely on to survive so that they could explore and create this great Nation. To me, destruction of this life can be likened to murder.

Does this same civilization have a conscience? Argumentative you may say: No, very few have a conscience. The whole episode is brushed off with an attitude that what has happened is over and done for, and soon forgotten. How many of these so-called civilized people have had occasion to see firsthand, on the spot, charred bodies of deer, bear, and other such forms of animals? How many have heard the animals' agonizing cry which sounds much as a child's cry? A cry which seems to say, "Please, someone, save me; I don't want to die." To hear the sounds of these animals is heart rendering. Ask the forester and the firefighter. They have heard these sounds many times and they cannot be removed from their mind.

A very dismal portrait you may say. Yes, nonetheless every word is truth and has occurred again and again wherever mass civilization has made inroads into these areas. Further, they will continue to exist under these circumstances.

You may ask what is my point. What bearing does this dissertation have to this hearing? My whole point is that these conditions must not be allowed to occur in the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat area. To roam in this beautiful area is a part of my life. It is mentally and physically a part of me. To stand on a ridge or knoll overlooking the majestic country gives me a feeling that I am on the threshold of heaven itself—the fragrance of the trees and flowers, the very earth itself; the sound of a rushing stream, unpolluted, rushing on its way to serve mankind, to provide him with power to see by and create things, to water his crops, to sustain his life. Is this not reason enough to save this unspoiled area from inevitable destruction?

To view this tranquillity sets all my burdens of life aside. Forgotten is the civilization that lies behind me. Forgotten are the bills, the job, the world problems, the suffering, the inequalities, the war and bloodshed, and the various and sundry other things that tend to make existence a chore. In its place is peace of mind and love—love of the many things God has created.

The animals of the forest sense the feeling that swells within me. I who am their purported enemy. The deer come up unafraid, the porcupine saunters up with his quills at ease rather than armed to protect himself. The rabbit and chipmunks come to your feet as if they were asking to be fondled. The mountain goat and the sheep eye you with unafraid curiosity, and the bear cubs cavort, unafraid of harm, of course assured by the sow who maintains vigil and senses that you do not intend any harm to them. This, gentlemen, is my point. For the privilege of seeing, hearing, and smelling this country, I am a better man as my Creator willed that I should be. I return to civilization and my fellow man with pure heart and mind. These are but a few words I submit. Time permitting, I could write a book on the subject. But, last and not least, I want to be assured that this area remains in its natural state for my children, their children's children, and all future generations to enjoy.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Lester H. Peters, Great Falls.

(No response.)

Senator Harry Mitchell, Cascade County.

Senator METCALF. Senator Mitchell is a National Conservation Award winner, Mr. Chairman, and speaks with a great deal of authority on conservation in the State.

Senator BURDICK. You may proceed, Senator.

STATEMENT OF STATE SENATOR HARRY MITCHELL, CASCADE COUNTY, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Senator MITCHELL. Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf, my statement is short.

I am Harry Mitchell, a senator from Cascade County, and original author of Senate Resolution No. 32 which was read this morning by Senator Tom Judge. I have submitted 30 copies of this resolution to Mr. Porter Ward.

The stated purpose of this public hearing is to determine the attitude of Montanans toward S. 1121. The overwhelming support shown here today by the people is obvious and undeniable.

Another excellent indication is the action of their elected representatives who in a democracy pretty well reflect the attitudes of their constituents. When they don't they are voted out of office.

The above-mentioned resolution passed the last legislature with bipartisan sponsorship and no visible opposition. Not one vote was cast against it. In addition I have many letters of support from senators in the last session. I will take the liberty to read their names, but not the county. Senators Hafferman, McGowan, Bertsche, Dussault, Deschamps, Street, Cotton, Haughey, McKeon, Thiessen, Groff, Bennett, Edwards, James, Keenan, Klindt, Rasmussen, and Turnage, who happens to be the minority leader in the last senate. It split about equal, Democrats and Republicans. These, too, have been submitted to your secretary.

In the interest of brevity I will not repeat the record of previous legislatures in reference to wilderness and quality recreation as this is covered in the written statement of former Senator Don Valiton from Deer Lodge. Let me just say that support for clean air, water and a quality environment—which is the epitome of a wilderness area, runs deep in the average Montanans' philosophy. We elected officials are well aware of the environmental problems of some of our sister States—and are increasingly determined to maintain our unique qualities as characterized in the Lincoln back country.

I am sincerely convinced that the majority of Montanans and their elected officials support S. 1121 and urge its quick passage.

In closing I would like to direct some comments to my friends in the Forest Service, and I find myself somewhat in the position of testifying against an old friend in a divorce court because I think it is most unfortunate that the Forest Service, which in the past has protected wilderness areas by administrative action, now seems to have alienated the advocates of wilderness—by single agency administrative actions. The people and their representatives feel ignored when they are denied the opportunity to express opinions, offer constructive criticism and/or different alternatives in the planning stages of a given project. Other agencies both State and Federal have made similar errors and have changed their policies only after pressure has been brought to bear by the public and their elected representatives. The roadbuilders, State and Federal, are an excellent example, as Senator Metcalf well knows. The last 5 years has produced a complete change of attitude at the Federal level by the BPR, and State level—the highway department. This change of attitude is reflected in their new policies to protect the environment during and after road construction. The engineers no longer have dictatorial powers over where a road goes—nor how. Cooperation with the people and other affected agencies now starts in the planning stage and carries through to completion of a project.

Perhaps the time has come for the Forest Service to reevaluate their programs and policies.

Passage of S. 1121 would have two very beneficial results:

1. Legal recognition of a de facto wilderness area as desired by a vast majority of the people.

2. Passage of this legislation, although painful to the Forest Service, would be a small price to pay in return for a new policy which would directly involve the people and all concerned agencies in the planning stages of all future forest service programs. This policy would certainly

result in enhancing the image of this resource management agency and of course make it more responsive to the majority's will.

In other words, allow the people into your planning and decision-making procedures—after all, it is their public domain and money. Gentlemen, thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

(The letters referred to follow:)

SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Libby, Mont., September 19, 1968.

Senator HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Ayrshire Dairy,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR HARRY: As chairman of the Senate Fish and Game Committee during the 1967 session of the Montana 40th Legislature, we of the committee considered Senate Resolution No. 32 requesting Congress to include part of the Lincoln back country and Scape Goat Mountain Area into the National Wilderness Preservation System. This resolution was passed overwhelmingly.

As Senator of Lincoln County and Chairman of the Senate Fish and Game Committee I favor Senate Bill No. 1121 introduced by U.S. Senators Lee Metcalf and Mike Mansfield.

Please give it due consideration as benefiting all the people of our great Nation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. HAFFERMAN,
Senator of Lincoln County District No. 31.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Highwood, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I regret that a previous commitment prevents me from attending your hearing in Great Falls, Montana, on June 11, 1968.

As a forward step in resource development in Montana, I join with Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield in support of U.S. Senate Bill No. 1121. Montana S. R. No. 32 passed in the 1967 session of the Montana Legislature with overwhelming support indicating that the Montana legislative branch of government were in favor of the expansion of this area.

There is a very definite need for other resource developments in Montana, and my most earnest hope is that wilderness and wild life organizations will join in the support of other resource programs that are so necessary for Montana's future. Programs for water development should now be recognized by all as the first step Montana must take in future development for our State.

Yours very truly,

GORDON MCGOWAN,
Senator, Chairman of Montana Senate Water Committee.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Great Falls, Mont., June 9, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK
Chairman, Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country Hearings, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEAR SIR: One of the great tragedies is what we Americans have done to our once beautiful country. There is hardly a place where man can stand and breathe fresh air, be free from noise, enjoy clear, pure water, and be free from litter.

We in Montana are fortunate in that we still have some areas that have not been destroyed by man. However, time is running out on us and we must act immediately to preserve this type of country for ourselves and for our children.

For over 25 years I have been fortunate enough to have made yearly trips in wilderness areas of the U.S. and Canada. I have made several trips into the Lincoln Back Country. It is the most unique and beautiful area I have ever

viewed. Its streams, lakes, and mountains are of such nature that they could not support mass recreation, and its best use would be to constitute it as a part of the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

I heartily endorse and support the Bills before Congress to accomplish this purpose.

Yours sincerely,

WM. H. BERTSCHE, Jr.,
State Senator.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 18, 1968.*

Re U.S. Senate bill 1121.

Hon. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Ayrshire Dairy,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR HARRY: Have received all of your correspondence regarding the "Lincoln Back Country" and should have answered you sooner. I did know of the postponement of the hearing via the news media, so was not in a hurry to send in my recommendation.

When it is re-set, I will try to attend in person and if that is not possible, then I will send you something in writing.

With regard to the election, I was derailed during the final week of the campaign. The endorsement of Tom by Labor was the biggest single factor and his support by the J–C's was also a big asset for him. I have no regrets except that I will miss the excitement of the Legislature!

I sure hope you get back in and will do everything I can with friends in your fair city.

Sincerely,

EDWARD T. DUSSAULT,
Senator, Missoula County.

FLYING D RANCH,
Missoula, Mont., June 14, 1968.

DEAR HARRY: Received both of your letters and sorry I am so late in answering. I am not sure I'll be able to attend the hearings on the Lincoln Back Country as a wilderness area, but you certainly have my permission to use my name as one of the supporters to establish such an area.

Good luck in the November election, again I am sorry I am so late but you know how things are down on the farm in the spring time.

Sincerely,

GASPARD W. DESCHAMPS,
Senator, Missoula County.

MONTANA STATE SENATE,
Helena, Mont., June 5, 1698.

Re U.S. Senate Bill No. 1121 and House of Representatives Bill No. 7148.

To Whom This May Concern:

During the last Montana Legislative session, I supported Senate Resolution No. 32 which contained the following Resolution:

"A Resolution of the Senate of Montana to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Arnold Olson and the Honorable James Battin, Representatives from the State of Montana, urging that parts of the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain Area be enjoined with the National Wilderness Preservation system."

By means of this letter, I wish to re-affirm my position and support in adding to the Bob Marshall Wilderness area an area identified as Lincoln Back Country, all located in Western Montana. It is a natural wilderness area, ideally situated for all types of recreation with spectacular scenery and worlds of wildlife.

I believe this area, like many others, should be preserved and protected for the enlightenment, education, and enjoyment of future generations.

I trust this matter will be given favorable consideration at a special hearing to be held in Great Falls on June 11.

Very truly yours,

J. DEWEY STREET,
Senator from Gallatin County.

MONTANA STATE SENATE,
Glasgow, Mont., June 8, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in full accord with Senate Bill #1121 which would authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain as a wilderness area.

This would retain for Montana a valuable National Wilderness, which is rapidly disappearing in this State and Nation.

I supported Senate Resolution #32 which was introduced and passed in the 1967 session of the Montana Legislature.

I believe Senate Bill #1121, if passed, will carry out the intent of Senate Resolution #32.

It is later than we think. Senate Bill #1121 should become law before the valuable wilderness features of this area are lost forever.

I urge your Committee favorable of Senate Bill #1121.

Thanking you I remain,

ROBERT S. COTTON,
Senator, Valley County, District No. 5.

MONTANA STATE SENATE,
Helena, Mont., June 10, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am informed that the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will hold a public hearing in Great Falls, Montana, on June 11, 1968, on Senate Bill 1121. I hope to be in attendance at the hearing, but since that may not be possible, I write to support the bill and to urge that the Subcommittee give favorable consideration to it.

In a number of instances, it has seemed to me that conservation groups have been overreaching in their demands for expansion of our wilderness areas, and their excessive concern with the pleasures of the few who have the time, money and physical condition which make it possible for them to visit remote areas by foot or horseback. However, I am in full accord with the conservationists who view the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area as a natural adjunct to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and who seek to have it preserved in its natural wilderness condition.

I have hunted in the southern portion of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area each year since 1955, and have become familiar with it. As a landscape painter, I have been thrilled by the breath-taking beauty of the country in its natural condition. Considering the adverse effect which mass recreation and timber harvest would have on the natural beauty ot the area, particularly 25, 50 or 100 years from now, it is my conviction that the Lincoln-Scapegoat country should be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. HAUGHEY.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Anaconda, Mont., June 17, 1968.

Senator HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Ayrshire Dairy,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR HARRY: My attention has been called to Senate Bill 1121, introduced by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield and to House Bill 7148, introduced by Rep. Battin, which would establish the "Lincoln Back Country".

I would have preferred to have appeared personally in support of this measure but due to conflict in time I will be unable to do so. I am, therefore, writing to ask you if you could appear for me in support of this measure. I have very many good reasons for the establishment of this area and there may be those who are much more familiar with the benefits to be arrived from this area but

I can also see that these are times where greater preservation measures for our wilderness areas are needed.

It is difficult for us to see the expansion of America and we need to protect America as a lasting heritage. Living in Anaconda, I know the beauty of the Pintlar Area and having traveled through the Bob Marshall area I know the beauty which is contained in this State of ours.

I could go into great detail but I believe the statement above generally reflects my thinking on this measure. I hope this measure receives great support!

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. MCKEON.

MONTANA STATE SENATE,
Helena, Mont., June 10, 1968.

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Very sorry to not be able to make a personal appearance at the hearing in Great Falls, but let me add my support to U.S. Senate Bill 1121, placing the Lincoln Scapegoat area under the protection of the Wilderness Act.

I am not necessarily an avid supporter of the Wilderness Program, but this area appears to me to be desirable and logical. It is only proper that we as a nation retain for the oncoming generations a valuable national wilderness to compliment the ever growing recreational industry. The Bob Marshall wilderness is a good one and the Scapegoat area will be a wonderful addition.

Sincerely,

C. R. THIESSEN.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Helena, June 11, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: It is with deep regret that I am unable to appear at this hearing on June 11, 1968, but I would like to support the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness. I feel quite strongly that areas like this and particularly this one should be preserved and protected for the enlightenment, education and enjoyment of future generations. This is an area which contains some of the most spectacular scenic and recreational opportunities of the United States. It has all types of game and also the habitat that is necessary to maintain these animals as well as give the tourists the scenic beauty that is becoming more and more scarce.

Hoping that you can see your way to support the establishment of this wilderness area, I remain—

Yours very truly,

W. A. GROFF.

MONTANA STATE SENATE,
Helena, Mont., June 7, 1968.

Hon. Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Committee on Internal Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I wish to add my endorsement and support for U.S. Senate Bill #1121 or House Bill #7148, both Bills which would implement the establishment of this wilderness area and preserve it in its present natural state.

Due to its continuity to the present majestic Bob Marshall Wilderness area, I would encourage that it be made part of this area.

Your favorable consideration of this resolution will be personally appreciated.

With highest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely,

W. F. BENNETT.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Helena, June 8, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country Hearing, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The Lincoln Scapegoat area would be an advantageous addition to the Bob Marshall Wilderness area. It is adjacent to the area, would fit in very well, would provide closer access to a primitive area, would expand the area for recreation, hunting and fishing, would provide additional area for wildlife in its natural environment, would provide additional recreational area for the people of Montana as well as attracting people from outside the state and would provide additional area for posterity.

During my years in Montana, I have seen areas, that once were open to the public, gradually come under private ownership and in a great number of cases put under cultivation of some sort, so that today there are many areas no longer open for public use.

I have had the privilege of visiting a part of this area and I would like to know that my descendents have a chance to see and enjoy an area like this. I am sure that there are thousands of people in Montana who feel the same way about it. We have seen the natural resources of the United States disappear, population explosion taking over to the point where you no longer know when you are out of one city and in another.

An area such as this would give them an area where the people of the future could see and visualize what their ancestors enjoyed, and a chance to live as they lived if only for a short time.

We hope that you will give favorable consideration to adding the Lincoln Scapegoat area, to the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

LOCHIEL EDWARDS,
Senator from District No. 10,
Blaine and Phillips Counties.

MONTANA STATE SENATE,
Helena, Mont., June 8, 1968.

Senator HARRY MITCHELL,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR HARRY: I note that the hearing has been postponed until a later date. The creation of the "Lincoln Back Country" as a wilderness area meets with my approval although I have nothing new to offer as an argument for its creation.

Congratulations on your nomination to the Senate. I suppose you were shocked, as most Montanans were, with the Kennedy murder.

If I don't get to the hearing I'm sure you will give the wilderness proposition a good airing.

Very truly yours,

DAVID F. JAMES.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Helena, June 8, 1968.

Senator HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Ayrshire Dairy,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR HARRY: As a staunch advocate of S.R. #32 urging that parts of the "Lincoln Back Country" and "Scape Goat Mountain Area" be enjoined with the National Wilderness Preservation System, I am taking this opportunity to again offer my whole hearted support at the public hearing on Senate Bill 1121 introduced by Senator Lee Metcalf and Mike Mansfield.

I, too, feel that we have already sacrificed more than enough of our natural resources and environs to selfish interests, and the least we can do for posterity is try to maintain the wilderness and recreation areas which have so rapidly been disappearing in recent years.

I am sorry I am unable to be present personally at the meeting, but please add my voice as one "crying for the Wilderness" if the opportunity presents itself.

With every best personal wish, I am

Very sincerely yours,

P. J. KEENAN,
State Senator, District No. 22.

MONTANA STATE SENATE,
Billings, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Ayrshire Dairy,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR HARRY: I am very happy to go on record in full support of U.S. Senate Bill 1121 and H.B. 7148 according to Montana Senate Resolution No. 32 which would establish the "Lincoln Back Country" as a wilderness area.

It is most important that certain National forest areas in Montana be kept in primitive state for recreation, preservation of wild life and natural beauty for the enjoyment and use of citizens of Montana and the United States.

Since the Scape Goat Mountain area lies in the National Forest system and since the area is outstanding for its natural scenery, plant and animal life, and has a national attraction for all forms of outdoor recreation, I highly recommend that this area be enjoined with the National Wilderness Preservation system.

I further recommend that limited trails and roads be established to permit modern travel to established camp grounds. Entry to primitive areas should not be reserved to Dude Ranchers and outfitters and to those who can afford fancy outfitters prices. Restriction to hiking or horseback riders somehow exclude many local citizens (senior, and low financial income) for full enjoyment and use of these recreational areas.

It is most important that this area be preserved and protected for the enlightenment, education and enjoyment of future generations.

Sincerely,

HERB J. KLINDT.

MONTANA STATE SENATE,
Helena, Mont., June 5, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country Hearing, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in favor of Senate Bill 1121 and am in complete agreement with its objectives.

To me it no longer seems to be a question as to the desirability of establishing wilderness areas such as Lincoln Scapegoat but is now a question of time before this and similar areas are abused and destroyed. We must not only be conservationists in theory but must act without delay to put into practice the lessons we have so painfully learned, that we must protect as many of our wilderness areas as soon as possible.

I urge a favorable committee report and passage of this bill.

R. J. RASMUSSEN,
State Senator, Dist. 5.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Polson, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Ayrshire Dairy,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: Thank you for your letter advising of the public hearing on June 11, 1968 on Senate Bill 1121 concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

I am sorry that I will not be able to personally attend the hearing, and it would be appreciated very much if you would offer to the Committee this letter as my testimony in support of the bill.

I respectfully urge the United States Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Public Lands Sub-committee to favorably recommend Senate Bill 1121 to classify the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as wilderness.

We in Western Montana have abundant evidence of the detrimental effect that inevitably follows and is irreversible when intensive development, logging and travel attendant upon mass use and recreation are practiced upon our wild and natural areas.

Once lost, the wilderness can never be regained. The passage of this legislation will insure to future generations a priceless heritage.

Respectfully submitted.

J. A. TURNAGE,
Senator, District 28.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, at this time may I insert a letter I have received from R. C. Kendall, the adjutant general of the State of Montana, into the hearing record? That would help place the State officials together in the hearing record.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection it is so ordered.

(The letter referred to follows:)

STATE OF MONTANA,
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,
Helena, Mont., September 18, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: As a long time resident of Powell County, Montana and as one who is devoted to the preservation of the natural status of the lands that are so rapidly disappearing from our western states, I am writing to respectfully urge you to support the concept of designating the Lincoln Scapegoat Area as a possible addition to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

Just recently while visiting with the Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, I was tremendously impressed when he told me that he felt that one of his greatest achievements in life was to teach and develop in his sons a real appreciation of outdoorsmanship. He said that over the years he had spent a great deal of time and effort with the boys and they have acquired a capacity for truly enjoying and using the natural values that are so abundant in our state. I think he expressed the feeling of all the fathers who recognize the advantages and benefits that are available to them and their children through the existence of the back country maintained in its natural state.

Over the past years I have had many opportunities to ride and hike through the entire Lincoln Scapegoat area. In addition I am constantly associating with many people both residents and non-residents who enjoy the same devotion that I have for the back country. These are not people from a special privileged group. On the contrary they are people from every walk of life. The one thing they do have in common is the knowledge that this area is easily available and offers access to any one of them regardless of financial ability, to truly use and enjoy a land not cluttered with over crowded campgrounds, vehicles and the man-made devices that would in my opinion completely destroy the natural beauty and atmosphere of this remote environment.

I know from experience that this area is in effect a fragile type of terrain. Fragile in terms of its inability to withstand the pressure brought by large masses of users. The lakes and streams are small and the capacity for fish and wildlife is limited.

It is not possible to put a price tag or compare commercial values with the maintenance of such an area in its natural state. It seems to me that we have an opportunity in Montana to insure that for generations, wilderness areas will exist for the use and enjoyment of those people who are so devoted to the type of recreation and pleasures such a land provides.

Most respectfully yours,

R. C. KENDALL,
Major General, Mont. NG,
The Adjutant General.

Senator BURDICK. Mrs. Doris Milner, Hamilton, Mont.

Senator METCALF. Senator Burdick, while Mrs. Milner is coming forward, I would like to say she was a leader in the "save-the-Selway" program which has resulted in the Selke report. We are in for a tough fight if we turn the bill down.

STATEMENT OF DORIS MILNER, HAMILTON, MONT.

Mrs. MILNER. Of most interest is the 68 letters from the Bitterroot, and when you can get 68 Bitterrooters to agree on anything, it has to be something of good importance. Looking through the letters I found one maverick, they are opposed.

Senator BURDICK. They will be received.

Mrs. MILNER. I am Doris Milner from Ravalli County near Hamilton, Mont., and I appreciate the scheduling of this hearing which affords people an opportunity to express their opinions on the proposal to include the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country in the national wilderness system.

Just recently I spent 10 days in the Lincoln back country, going in by the way of Kleinschmitt Flats, up to Meadow Creek Lake, up to Coony Creek on the East Fork, around the south side of Scapegoat Mountain, over Cabin-Debroda Pass, down into the Danaher Valley in the Bob Marshall wilderness, and out the North Fork. I mention the route briefly to show that I have been through the heart of the area in question. During those 10 days I kept constantly in mind the two conflicting proposals for this area; one, to open it to mass recreation and logging through construction of roads; the other, to maintain it in its natural state, recognizing that its esthetic quality represents the most important resources in the area.

I am not expert on logging, grizzly bears, soil qualities, mineral deposits, or watersheds, but I do think that I know a little about quality outdoor recreation. During the 17 years that we have lived in Montana, we as a family have thoroughly enjoyed our days and weeks spent in the wilderness areas of Montana and Idaho. There has been nothing in our lives comparable to the pleasure that wilderness recreation can offer. Our children have grown to love it as much as my husband and I do, and now they go on their own when they can find time. Because I do recognize the degree of satisfaction to be found in wilderness recreation, I feel a moral obligation to endeavor to secure for the joy of other Americans as much wilderness as possible. Our population continues to grow; the wilderness per capita shrinks. While there are yet suitable wild areas to include in our wilderness systems, I firmly believe that we should make every effort to do so. You can grow trees in many areas of the United States. It is impossible to grow more wild land for recreation.

My conclusion that the area under discussion should not be opened for mass motorized use takes the following reasons into account:

I found the waters of the Lincoln back country to be delicate. The lakes are just as I have heard them described: small, shallow, but capable of supplying adequate fishing opportunity for foot and horseback travelers. The streams are small, but as of now they afford great sport for the fishermen. To this I can personally bear witness.

In order to make this back country a recreation area for large numbers of people you would have to do a mammoth job of facelifting on the lakes as well as on the streams; and then what would you have? It would no longer be the same country which the Forest Service allegedly wants to make available to the masses because of its natural attractions. Inherent in this facelifting are the seeds of destruction of the prime resource.

The name Red Mountain comes up often when the Lincoln back country is being talked about by those who have been there. This is one of the spectacular landmarks in the area because it is a red mountain. However, Red Mountain has greater values than as a scenic wonder. Red Mountain is an adventure for those who will climb the long miles up its great red flanks by foot or by horse. When you climb a

mountain you become part of it; you notice what grows along the way; you observe the changes in the plant life as you climb ever higher; you are aware of the different kinds of rocks and soils that are underfoot. What I am trying to say is that you participate in your environment, and that this participation is the difference between that which is real pleasure and that which is superficial, passing, and impersonal. You cannot savor what is there to be enjoyed by simply passing by. It becomes just one more spectator sport.

From the summit of Red Mountain you could see in the distance the huge shoulders of Scapegoat Mountain, and you knew that there was something great in store. But one doesn't see Scapegoat for free; you pay in saddle sores or pack burns. To me Scapegoat was not just a mountain; it was an experience. This great mountain is rightly approached by foot or horseback. This gives one time to build up the suspense and excitement that is proper for the first meeting with this magnificent rock. It would really be a shame to take in Scapegoat Mountain from a car window or to view it for a few minutes from a vista point. Scapegoat is a community unto itself. This you would never be aware of unless you took the time to walk or ride horseback a few miles along its flanks. Deer start from the brush hugging its base; quite a few species of birds call this home; and high on the ledges are the mountain goats. Those wonderful creatures, so unmindful and so uncaring of our existence, pick their way through impossible crevasses. To watch them is to learn a bit of humility. But these are the things which delight the soul; and I want to have places to delight my soul. We should jealously guard some things from the hand of man's blundering "improvements."

On the hilltops surrounding Scapegoat one can see clearly the damage to the fragile soils wrecked by the 1964 flood. No one had difficulty picturing what this would have looked like had there been an extensive network of logging roads in that area at flood time. It is inconceivable in the face of this evidence and in the hearings of endless hours of discussion on flood controls, that there are those who would still pressure relentlessly to disturb the tree cover on these very hills. How avaricious can people be?

There can be no disagreement about the natural beauty or the wild character of the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country. Today most of us acknowledge that beauty is one of our most priceless resources. It is one to be considered as seriously in the lineup of natural resources as timber, minerals, or grass, and yet some of our agencies, even those with a directive to consider natural beauty as a resource equal in value to others, either ignore its existence or give it priority on the bottom of the list. Of this I have a prime example in mind.

The Bitterroot Valley is a locality which is rapidly changing from a primarily agricultural economic area to one of rural suburbia. Several things have worked together to bring this about. Among these are a fine climate (frequently more moderate than other localities in Montana), a plentiful excellent water supply, clean air (except on days when the wind is from Missoula), and the natural beauty of hills which are still more or less tree covered. People in and out of State are rapidly buying up available property for homesites or for homesite investment property, and they are not buying it to look at stump farms. This change in economic direction and the reasons for it, however, are

22-003—68——11

being completely ignored by the Forest Service, which is permitting logging practices to continue which are destroying the very resource which could insure a future for the Bitterroot Valley. Great clearcut scabs are growing in number on the slopes facing the valley. Long strings of logging roads lace back and forth in ever growing ugly gashes. And out of sight, but not out of mind of those who care about watersheds, are huge mountaintips skinned out, burned, a real desert: this is the headwaters of both forks of the Bitterroot River.

Ranchers are protesting the silt being spewed out of their irrigation pipes in the spring and the dying of the flow in the late summer months. People are protesting the alteration of their esthetic environment, which is being desecrated under the guise of economic blessing when in reality these practices are killing the goose which is trying to lay the golden egg.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat back country is now a wilderness, no matter what it is called officially. If it is not given the protection of the national wilderness system, it will inevitably become part of that great American myth, "the improved natural resource," and this great reservoir of wildness, adventure, solace, and joy will go down the drain with the passenger pigeon.

For these reasons I urge that the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country be made a part of our national wilderness system.

I have one comment. Someone asked today what the Forest Service really meant by "multiple use." I think I have it. Multiple use means pine, fir, and spruce.

Senator BURDICK. I want to say I agree with everything that Senator Metcalf said previously. Thank you.

The next witness will be William Lauckner, Great Falls.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM LAUCKNER, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mr. LAUCKNER. I am William Lauckner. I have lived in Montana all my life and I am familiar with the Lincoln back country, having walked into this area for a number of years with a pack on my back. My wife and I have been in the back country for a week at a time, and I still do this at age 67.

I am very much in favor of protecting this area as wilderness. I am opposed to building roads into it, because I have seen the devastating results of logging, mining, and mass recreation in the wild country.

Our Nation, with a rapid expanding population; an estimated 300 million by year 2000, just 32 years from now, will need, or I shall say must have, all the undeveloped wilderness that we can provide.

There are some things and some values in life that you cannot put a dollar sign on; one of them is a wilderness experience.

How lucky we are that in the years past some men with a vision into the future worked to have the Bob Marshall wilderness protected from roads. We would not have this nationally famous wilderness area today if it had been roaded so that it could be managed.

Roads and wilderness are not compatible. You just can't have your cake and eat it, too.

I want to submit here a petition with the names of 40 interested citizens who want the Lincoln back country classified as wilderness.

Also a statement of Mrs. Lauckner and a couple of letters. I ask that they be made part of the record.

Senator BURDICK. They will be received.

(The data referred to follow:)

PETITION TO AUTHORIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LINCOLN-SCAPEGOAT WILDERNESS AREA

We, the undersigned citizens, want the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area given Wilderness Status under the Wilderness Act. We want it preserved, undeveloped, as it is, for the enjoyment of future generations of outdoorsmen, fishermen, hunters, hikers and nature enthusiasts.

(The above petition was signed by 40 residents.)

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM LAUCKNER

I am Mrs. William Lauckner, and as you can see I'm not young, not a physical giant, and I can assure you not wealthy. I have walked with a pack on my back, filled with enough provisions for a one day or a ten day stay in the wilderness. This disproves the theory that we need roads before anyone but the young, very robust and the rich can enjoy an isolated area.

I wasn't born to this, but had my first wilderness experience 6 years ago, at my husband's insistence. I can assure you of its therapeutic value. I had never before felt a blanket of serenity surrounding me as I did when we sat quietly watching a wild animal busy at its daily chores, or the clear pure water, so clear I could see every pebble. Up to this time the only wild animals I'd seen were in a zoo, or flattened in death on a highway. Water so polluted with garbage it sickened me.

It's a well known fact that mental breakdowns occur far oftener percentage-wise in crowded city areas than in rural areas, and that our good students, and young business people are being pushed at an alarming pace. The thought is being seriously considered that the constant loud noises of planes, cars, cycles, etc. assault our ear drums, and that they will need periods of quiet or hearing will be greatly impaired. We need places where quiet and peacefulness can heal our mental and unconscious bruises.

There are millions of miles of roads, that can take throngs of people to many recreation areas, but there are few places of quiet and solitude left. The Lincoln-Scapegoat area is one. Please leave it as wilderness.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 11, 1968.*

Senate Interior and Insular Committee:

Please include this as testimony in the Senate Interior Insular Committee hearing held in Great Falls, on Sept. 25, 1968, on Bill SB1121.

Altho we haven't a personal experience with this area designated in Bill SB1121 introduced by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield, we have witnessed the pleasure and enjoyment of our sons, who have hiked and hunted in the area. We feel that in their accelerated pace of life it is going to be very important to have an unviolated spot such as this is now, to visit.

In view of this we want this area classified as wilderness, not allowing roads or wheeled vehicles to penetrate it.

Sincerely,

EVELYN OOS.
VINCENT OOS.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 8, 1968.*

Please include this as testimony, in the Senate Interior and Insular Committee hearing held in Great Falls on Bill SB1121, on June 11, 1968.

I was taken into this area the first time when I was 13 years old. Even then I was impressed by the unspoiled beauty and the sense of well being it gave me. I have gone back several tims since. I am now a young man 19 years old with a conviction that this Lincoln Back country designated in the bill should be classified as wilderness to preserve it for me and other young men and our future sons to enjoy.

This is a fragile country and will not stand the influx of people, fishing, hunting, etc., that roads would bring. Its Beauty Would Be Destroyed *For-All Time*.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. OOS.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. and Mrs. Clark Guile of Great Falls. Are they here?

(No response.)

Dr. S. J. Score of Helena?

(No response.)

Joe Meuchel?

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH MEUCHEL, LINCOLN, MONT.

Mr. MEUCHEL. I wish to submit 30 copies of a statement of my friend at Lincoln, Jack Crosby, in support of the Senate bill.

Senator BURDICK. Without objection it will be received and will follow your remarks.

Mr. MEUCHEL. I present my statement in support of Senate bill 1121 and House bill 7148 on the Lincoln-Scapegoat proposed wilderness.

I am Joseph Meuchel of Lincoln, Mont. I am a graduate of the University of Montana School of Forestry. I was employed by the Forest Service as a forester for some years. I am currently self-employed, harvesting national forest timber.

I have lived and worked in the Lincoln area for 10 years. As a walk leader for the Montana Wilderness Association, I have led several walks into the area in question; as well as at least one yearly trip with family and friends.

As a forester I seriously question the management proposal of the Forest Service. The commercial timber within the proposed wilderness boundary is on the very borders of the alpine and subalpine watershed area and as such absorbs a great deal of the early spring runoff, and high intensity summer storms.

Logging this area is virtually going after the last stick of timber on the mountainside. A computation of Forest Service volume figures tells us that the stand per acre is only 6.4 thousand feet, or just barley operable for a prudent logger, even though the timber and the public treasury finances all the road construction.

Since the Forest Service study area takes in twice as much area as the proposed wilderness boundary it is my belief that the lower fringe area outside the proposed boundary contains the bulk of the commercial timber.

Another interesting computation is that, at the allowable annual cut the entire commercial timber area will be cut out in 50 years. Most timber stands in western Montana require from 120 to 150 years to grow a new stand. At higher elevations it takes considerable longer.

Again as a forester I have noted thousands of acres at private, State, and Federal timberlands that have been cut over and left to recover and grow a new crop as best it can with little or no help from the land manager.

These cutover lands, the best timber-producing lands we have, already roaded easily accessible, represent to me a tremendous waste of a resource, in their partial or unstocked condition. I fully believe that timber management can be equated with other forms of land management. That timber production hasn't kept up with other cropland pro-

duction is due to the fact that there has always been another patch of timber higher on the mountain. Gentlemen, we are fast approaching the rimrocks and we are leaving behind lands in generally poor shape for producing a new crop.

It appears that more money and more planning goes into roads than into reforestation. In some instances these have been good investments, in others they are dead end, abandoned roads becoming erosion gullies and sources of stream siltations.

It is a well-known fact that the sawmill capacity of western Montana exceeds the annual growth of timber under present management. Competition for stumpage is keen and prices are at an alltime high. Under this type of pressure, land managers are selling timber in areas that have a greater value for other purposes in the long run.

Resources surveys throughout the West, whether they be for livestock, game, or timber, have through the years generally been revised downward. Livestock and game numbers have had to be reduced to protect the basic resource, soil, and I am sure that timber producing estimates will follow, especially in marginal areas.

A comparison of two Forest Service reports—1963 and 1968—of this area shows a one-third reduction in volume per acre. I feel sure that this came about through land reclassification. I sincerely hope that an evaluation from a national level will bring this area into its proper perspective.

I am more concerned with the land classification of this area than my livelihood or my recreation. I feel this is best suited to its present use and in the long pull will be of more economic value to Montana without benefit of development as now proposed by the Forest Service.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JACK CROSBY, LINCOLN, MONT.

I wish to submit the following statement in favor of Senate bill 1121 and House bill 7148 on the Lincoln-Scapegoat proposed wilderness.

My name is Jack Crosby. I reside at Lincoln, Montana. I have lived in the Lincoln area for 5 years. I have been employed in the logging industry. As a resident of Lincoln area, my family and I have enjoyed the hunting, fishing and backpacking opportunities offered by this area, and hope to enjoy it for many years to come.

As a logger it is my opinion that the timber volume and quality is of such low value that it is not economically feasible to open that large an area just for the timber.

As a hunter and fisherman I feel the area is used as heavily as it can stand. I would not like to see this area become another fish and game planting ground, such as many areas have become.

As a taxpayer I am entirely opposed to seeing my tax dollars spent on roads that are unnecessary. In my opinion the proposed road thru the Scapegoat area would be of no economic value to the Lincoln area.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Melvin J. Reid, of Wantagh, Long Island, N.Y.

(No response.)

Mr. and Mrs. C. J. Doon, Lincoln, Mont.

(No response.)

Mr. C. W. Reiquam, Denver, Colo.

(No response.)

Mr. Dick Swan, of Lincoln.

A VOICE. He also had to leave.

Senator METCALF. All of these people may submit a statement. If they have, it will be filed and incorporated in the record.

Mr. CECIL GARLAND. I have informed them.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Vic L. Ehnes, Great Falls.

(No response.)

Paul Drennen, Helena, Mont.

(No response.)

Juna McClure, Lincoln, Mont.

Mr. CECIL GARLAND. These people, Mr. Chairman, have all been here and left. They have submitted their statement.

Senator BURDICK. I will keep reading them anyway.

Ellen Mulcare, Lincoln, Mont.

(No response.)

Earl Athern, Lincoln, Mont.

(No response.)

Mrs. MULCARE. I am here, sir. My statement is very short.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELLEN LAMBKIN MULCARE, LINCOLN, MONT.

Mrs. MULCARE. Perhaps I should introduce myself as one of the—how did the gentleman from Beaverton, Oreg., suggest it, people who go to the back country are—I can't find the terminology just at the moment. However, I am one of those people.

I have returned from 10 days into the Bob Marshall Wilderness, along with my husband and four other friends, and had a marvelous trip.

I stand opposed to the proposed opening for development of the Lincoln back country for many reasons. The one that prevails most dominant is that this type of area is and should remain a heritage for the coming generations to reap from it the type of recreation it now affords. For in such an area as this, one not only can walk, ride a horse, hunt, or fish, but you are able to find something more rare, peace of mind in this tranquil pocket of our land that we haven't as yet dissected with arteries of roads covered with motorized vehicles and trash. Thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

Pat Mulcare, Lincoln.

Mrs. ELLEN MULCARE. He had to leave, but his statements are the same as mine.

Senator BURDICK. R. E. Klick, Augusta.

(No response.)

Paul Grosfield, Lincoln.

(No response.)

Dr. W. J. Norman, Missoula, Mont.

(No response.)

Kenneth Gleason, Choteau, Mont.

(No response.)

Dr. A. C. Knight, Galen, Mont.

STATEMENT OF A. C. KNIGHT, M.D., SUPERINTENDENT OF GALEN HOSPITAL, DEER LODGE, MONT.

Dr. KNIGHT. I am Dr. Knight, superintendent of the Galen State Hospital. I am supporting Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield on this bill.

I would also like to make the statement that the Powell County commissioners—as you know, a large part of Lincoln back country and the Bob Marshall are in Powell County—wish to go on the record as being in favor of this bill.

I also speak for Maj. Gen. Richard Kendall, adjutant general of the Montana National Guard, and Dr. Gordon Anderson, who is in practice in Deer Lodge, and Joe Brand, who is a legislator from Powell County.

I believe the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Area should be classified as a wilderness area and given protection under the Wilderness Act.

I have, for many years, enjoyed visiting the wonderful lakes, mountains, and primitive areas in Montana and have also seen how such areas can be ruined when they have been abused and allowed to be exploited when modern conveniences such as jeeps, hondas, and so forth, begin to roar into these quiet and peaceful areas.

Man has enough of the hustle and bustle of modern day life and far too much of the roar of the automobile and hondas as it is and there are not many areas left where men can go and enjoy nature in its unspoiled state and when one is able to travel into such areas as the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, this type of experience is not only helpful to him physically but also mentally as it gives relief of tensions, helps to build physical strength as well as one's character.

When our lakes and forests are easily accessible by people, there is not the challenge and the physical and mental benefit derived when such a trip comes as easy as driving to a grocery store. When one must backpack or ride a horse into such beautiful country, only then can he truly experience the wonderful therapeutic values, mentally and physically, that nature can provide in its true and unspoiled state. These havens of retreat are not as has been suggested by some, "only accessible to the rich."

In the many years I have both backpacked and gone by horse into the Pintlar Wilderness Area and the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and the Lincoln back country, I have met people from all walks of life, ranging from university students to teachers, plumbers, teamsters, miners, ranchers, people of modest means, people of limited means, and also people with large incomes. These areas are not a haven for the rich and never have been. They have provided and will continue to provide some of the finest experiences that man can know, not to mention animals and flowers that all so rapidly lose out as man pollutes both the air, water, land, and forest the minute he gets free access to do so.

As a physician and lover of the outdoors, I have had the experience of camping and fishing the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country and also vast areas of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. I strongly urge the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country be preserved as a wilderness area for now and in the future.

I strongly urge the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country now and for the future. Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you. We have a letter from Dr. Gordon Anderson which will be included at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

DEER LODGE CLINIC,
Deer Lodge, Mont., September 17, 1968.

Hon. Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am taking this means of conveying my expression and approval of your Senate Bill 1121, and also the House Bill 7148 by Congressman Battin.

I am taking this stand because it appears very much to be a bi-partisan bill approved by a large majority of the people of the State of Montana and, perhaps, the United States in general; and also from a personal interest.

When I first came from northern Minnesota, approximately 35 years ago, I could see that that country had been cut over by Weyerhaeuser; and had been exploited to the nth degree. A wilderness area was then a thing of the past, as they are now. I was looking for something a little bit more than I had been accustomed to. With this in mind, I settled in Deer Lodge, Montana and within a short time acquired property adjacent to the forestry land and very close to the "Lincoln Back Country" you are attempting to put into the wilderness area now.

I have hunted this "Lincoln Back Country" a great many times, and I had always hoped that I would be able to have property near it; so I could then educate my son to the enjoyments of this type of thing, and not only my son, but my daughters, who have enjoyed it also a great deal.

It has quite distressed us in the last few years, that they have been continually poking roads up into this area, and I speak specifically of the Beaver Creek Road, which comes above us about five miles. So many of these so-called recreational areas have been logged off with the excuse that they are to make recreational sites. They are left with an area of burned over stumps and logs, and erosion and what-not that goes with it, and this I have been bitterly opposed to for a great many years.

Of course, when this happens, when the roads come in, the erosion and such, our forestry is gone; and we lose water-shed. I can never understand this as far as a forestry policy: spending dollars on roads, or rather trying to make a few dollars on timber and then spending it all on roads again.

I think that, basically, that there are a great many areas in the United States that can be used for multiple purposes and opened with roads. But there are so few areas that naturally have the possibilities of this Lincoln Back Country, that to put roads into it and open it up, is one of the greatest mistakes that could possibly be made.

I have been into many parts of this proposed Lincoln Wilderness area. Sometimes we wonder if there are not too many people there already. You meet a great many pack strings. Of course we want people to enjoy it, and it is enjoyed by a great many people who really want to get out and hunt. More important than that, is to get away from the "hustle and bustle," and the tremendous commotion we have on the outside today.

I think that one of the greatest medicines that many of us have, is that we can get off into wilderness, away from the so-called luxuries of life, like the fast automobiles, the screaming whistles, the TV and what-not that goes along with the so-called modern living. Then we can sit down and think about what is actually going on, and enjoy the wonderful things that nature has given us.

For these particular reasons, not only myself, but many of my close associates, and I speak not only of the medical profession, but of sportsmen clubs that I have belonged to for many years, highly favor these bills, to give "Wilderness" status to the "Lincoln Back Country."

I remain,
Respectfully yours,

G. A. ANDERSON, M.D.

Senator BURDICK. S. C. Ashby, Great Falls, Mont. Does he want to testify?

STATEMENT OF S. C. ASHBY, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mr. ASHBY. My first trip into the Lincoln back country was at the age of 8. That was over 30 years ago. I have gone back many times over the years so I have firsthand knowledge as well as strong per-

sonal opinions about why I think the Lincoln back country-Scapegoat Mountain area should be preserved as a wilderness.

This area is visited by people from all over the United States traveling by horseback or on foot. Hiking and backpacking are an increasingly popular means of visiting wilderness country.

The reason for a wilderness trip is quite easily defined. People are seeking high quality recreation where they can get away from the telephone, automobile, motorcycle, and other benefits of civilization.

The Lincoln back country is unique in this respect in that it is possible to have a wilderness outing for as short a period as a weekend or for as long a time as available.

Red and Scapegoat are two outstanding mountains in the area; however, they do not offer the spectacular scenery that is already available to the automobile tourist in many areas, such as Glacier Park, for one example.

In my "nonexpert" opinion the quality and quantity of the timber is such that it would not be feasible for any logging concern to pay for road construction, pay stumpage, cut and haul the timber out, and still be able to show a profit. In fact, it is doubtful if there would be a break-even operation if the taxpayers paid for the road and the Forest Service donated the timber—stumpage free.

The proposed roads in the Lincoln back country would greatly increase the hunting and fishing pressure that is presently at near capacity. There would be a marked drop in hunting and fishing success and quality.

It would very likely spell doom to the cutthroat trout in the streams that up to now have been able to support the trout population through natural reproduction. At present they provide many miles of excellent spawning grounds and should remain unaltered.

The grizzly bear, judging by past experience in many areas, would not tolerate the type of use made possible by roading the area. The wild habitat essential to the survival of the grizzly would be destroyed and this valuable bear eliminated.

There is one field in which I can offer some expert testimony. I am an expert at paying Federal income taxes and I want to make it very plain to you gentlemen serving on this committee that I am sick and tired of the excessive deficit spending spree our Government has been on the last few years. I believe the Forest Service proposal to road this area will be a complete waste of taxpayers' money.

I strongly resent the fact that the people of this country seem to have lost a voice in the way our land should be used and our money should be spent. As our Nation grew, Congress delegated more and more management decisions to Government agencies. However, I do not believe the agency created should be the sole judge and jury on a fate of our land and our money.

We now have around 3 percent of our national forest lands classified as wilderness. When we look at it as a percentage of our total land area in the continental United States the figure shrinks to a fraction of 1 percent.

What has happened to the rest of our once "America, the beautiful"? We have managed to overuse our grass, erode our soil, pollute our water, pollute our air, scar our land with strip and pit mines, denude our forests, all in the name of progress, with just possibly a little greed for the almighty dollar thrown in.

It is time we tried to protect where we can our small areas that are, in fact, wilderness so future generations may have the opportunity to glimpse this land as it once was.

I wish to thank Senators Metcalf and Mansfield for their interest in conservation and for introducing S. 1121 that will include the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat Mountain area in our wilderness preservation system. I heartily support this bill and urge its passage.

Senator BURDICK. The committee has received a very interesting letter from Miles Romney, publisher of the Western News in Hamilton, and a member of the Montana Legislature. Without objection it will be included at this point in the hearing record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE WESTERN NEWS,
Hamilton, Mont., June 6, 1968.

HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: In view of the fact that I am unable to personally present my views at the subcommittee hearing to be held at Great Falls, Montana, Tuesday, June 11, 1968, I ask permission to submit my statement in letter form.

I support the plan to designate the so-called Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country area as wilderness area and to incorporate it into the adjacent Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, or simply create a new wilderness area by law. The proximity and like character of these two back-country wilderness tracts make them ideally suited for joint similar types of use.

Wilderness use is the primary practical use for this area.

Should this area be treated to logging and roading its value for wilderness uses would be vitiated.

It is my conviction that all natural resources should be treated for their best use. If we follow such a practice our progeny will benefit through a prolonged period of time. If we destroy the possibility of the best development in order to make a short dollar gain, we cancel out the possibility of the full use of the main values, and possibly all uses in the years following the exploitation.

There will be those who argue it is necessary to make jobs by cutting off the timber. That can be achieved in a relatively short time which will at the same time ruin opportunities for years of happy use by people who seek recreational uses in the area concerned. There are more and more of such people seeking this type of recreation. In the long run more jobs will be created and more economic gain made by using this area for recreation than by shearing and roading it to death.

Some might tell you exploitation for the fast sawbuck won't hurt anything. Just go to the big clear cut country and look for yourself; just make a real determination of how many planted trees grow; indeed how many are actually planted; how long it takes to produce a forest in Montana.

If the amount of timber available in this Lincoln-Scapegoat area is essential, so that it must be cut away now or soon to salvage the national economy, the United States is in so bad a plight for lumber, that we may as well forget it, and seek a lumber substitute—and keep our recreation areas.

The acreage in the United States set aside or possible to set aside for wilderness uses is lamentably exiguous. At the same time the number of peopple seeking to use it grows perceptibly. Shortly there will be insufficient acreage to satisfy the need. Now is the time to set aside appropriate amount of wilderness acreage, harbor it carefully and enjoy it over the long time, rather than use it up swiftly for quick economic fillip and live to regret it.

Respectfully submitted,

MILES ROMNEY,
Publisher, the Western News,
Member, Montana Legislature.

P.S.—Some might maintain that the percentage of the American people who enjoy using the wilderness areas of the public domain is relatively small. I say that while it is not a majority of the population it is growing so rapidly that it may soon become a majority. It might also be pertinent to note that the percentage of the American people who squeeze a personal profit out of reducing

the forests of the public domain to sawdust is relatively small—much smaller than the number who use it for recreation.

Senator BURDICK. Congressman Quie, of Minnesota, has sent a letter favoring the legislation. Without objection, it will be included at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. June 6, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is my understanding that the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold hearings regarding the designation of the Lincoln Backcountry of Montana as a Wilderness Area under the provisions of S. 1121, in Great Falls, Montana, on June 10 and 11.

Let me take this opportunity to express my wholehearted and unequivocal support for your legislation to preserve that area for this generation and the generations to come as a Wilderness Area—an area that will remain as nature has bequeathed it to us—unrivaled in beauty and serenity, and unspoiled by the thoughtless actions of those who would sacrifice these assets in the name of "progress."

It has been my pleasure to have packed into the Lincoln Backcountry hunting and fishing, and I firmly believe that the development plans which the Forest Service wishes to implement would work against the preservation of these acres which constitute an integral part of this Nation's fast-diminishing and irreplaceable store of natural resources.

I would be pleased to help in any way to be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE, *Member of Congress.*

Senator BURDICK. This completes the witness list. I want to say before you hear from your own Senator that I enjoyed my stop here at Montana. After all, Montana is much like western North Dakota where I was raised. I am sorry if I had to press you a little for time today to get the witnesses through. I just want to reassure you that your complete statements will appear in the record. Those who didn't get a chance to appear here will be on the same basis as all the rest of those who did appear.

We did get the flavor of the meeting from the oral testimony, however. We appreciate it. We want to thank you all for coming.

Senator METCALF. Senator Burdick, I hope you make an announcement that the record will be open for 10 days.

Senator BURDICK. At least 10 days. Let's leave the record open for at least 2 weeks.

Senator METCALF. And the second thing is that everybody here, people all over Montana, are grateful for you coming out here and holding this hearing for us. I think we should also remember that Judge Bob Nelson, an old friend of ours, an old friend of the wilderness, has let us use his courtroom. We have a very able reporter here today. Mr. Ward has done an outstanding job staffing and doing all those exercises in preparing for this hearing. As I previously mentioned, Mr. Rodgers correlated much of the activity here in Great Falls, and Mr. Garland did an excellent job of lining up witnesses, too.

A bill will be introduced by Senator Mansfield and myself as soon as Congress convenes. This hearing will be the basis for the future hearings in Washington where we will hear the Forest Service, the Bureau of the Budget, and agencies that are affected by this legislation.

We will also hear a selective representative group of national conservation organizations and national forestry organizations who will testify for and against the legislation.

But as Senator Burdick has said, this has given us, and will give the Members of Congress who read the record, a tremendous feeling of the ideas and the regard that the people have in Montana for this special and unique area.

I want to say, Senator Burdick, I am delighted that Montana is so prosperous. So many people have come up here and said they have gone into the Lincoln back country on pack trips, and the most affluent of our affluent society are only those who enjoy the wilderness. We have a great deal of prosperity here in Montana. Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. The meeting will now be adjourned.

(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.)

APPENDIX

(Under authority previously granted, the following statements and communications were ordered printed:)

STATEMENT OF BOB COONEY, MONTANA FISH AND GAME DEPARTMENT

Although I have spent the greater part of my life working in Montana with both Federal and State natural resource agencies, I would prefer to present these views from the standpoint of a deeply concerned individual.

I feel strongly that the area described as the Lincoln-Scapegoat portion of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Country (240,500 acres) possesses ideal wilderness potential.

Outstanding among its characteristics are the following:

1. *An interesting variety of topography, vegetative cover, and accessibility.*—The wooded, rolling section making up the southern portion has long been enjoyed by many. Here, small, fragile but beautiful mountain lakes present focal points of recreational enjoyment. Several nearby high but relatively accessible points such as Red Mountain, Pyramid, and Olson Peaks add opportunities for zestful, rewarding climbs. This portion of the area, although possessing true wild character is readily available to easy family hiking and saddle horse trips.

The north central portion in contrast is characterized by spectacular relatively remote peaks, high ridges and intervening canyons. These present a true challenge for those who wish to spend a little more time and effort to sample the more rugged aspects of wilderness. Here the great Scapegoat Mountain complex dominates the scene. The alpine tundra of its highlands presents a unique climax to the most adventurous type of wilderness travel.

Short, relatively easy back-country trips are available on the far northern end and much of the eastern side of the area.

2. *Variety of wildlife.*—The Lincoln-Scapegoat region, with its relatively undisturbed environment, represents ideal living space for a unique variety of game animals, birds, and fishes. An important segment of the state's remnant grizzly bear population has found this place much to its liking.

Elk, mountain sheep, goats, deer and moose are also there and depend, in many important respects, upon the relatively remote character of the land for their living requirements and even survival. The rare west slope cutthroat trout is well suited to its cold, clear streams and the lighter fishing pressure of trail access country. Along with the Montana grayling the area supports a variety of fishes that add much to the joy of visiting this unique region. Ptarmigan, a seldom seen grouse of the alpine environment, adds special interest to the interesting bird life of the area.

Thus, a pleasing variety in topography, vegetative cover, and animal life blend in making this an ideal area for meaningful wilderness classification.

May I conclude by saying that I have had the pleasure of visiting wild lands all across our nation, including Alaska, and feel deeply that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area compares well with the very best.

STATEMENT OF AL LUEBECK, BUTTE, MONT.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness is a matter of deep personal concern to me. I have been hiking through this area for over fifteen years, since I was 13 years old, and it is an area very dear to my heart. I would feel a strong personal loss if roads were built into beautiful and serene places such as Meadow Creek, Mineral Creek and the North Fork Falls. I hope that my family and I, will be able to continue hiking the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness for many years to come.

This is an area especially suited to the hiker. Many very beautiful spots can be reached in just a few hours walking time. Ten years ago I could go into this country and often never see another person for days at a time. Now there is an increasing demand for this type of recreation, and there are an increasing number of people who hike into the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilds.

To me it seems a shame that the United States Forest Service has pressed so hard to build roads into this area when there is so little need or justification for these proposed roads. There is no economic basis for such roads since even the Forest Service admits that new roads would cost more to build than the actual worth of timber in the area.

The main reason the Forest Service now advances for road construction, and this really disturbs me, is to open the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilds to mass recreation. Yet this is a very fragile country not suited to mass recreation. In fact it would be harmed by mass recreation and extensive road building.

I have spent two summers working for the Park Service in Glacier National Park, and it seems odd that two governmental agencies are so far apart in their viewpoints as to which type of lands are suitable for mass recreation. When we consider mass recreation, we think of it being centered mainly around large campgrounds and picnic areas. In Glacier Park almost all of the campgrounds and picnic areas are within three to ten miles of the park boundaries. They lie mainly on large lakes, recognizing that recreation is water oriented, and in open spots where there is plenty of room. The Park Service has not attempted to build campgrounds in the narrow canyons and high mountain plateaus in the heart of the park. The Park Administration recognizes that development of mass recreation facilities in these fragile alpine areas would damage the land, and would destroy the very thing the park was created for. Even though Glacier Park's camping facilities are used to complete capacity during July and August, the administration of the park has said it will construct new campgrounds only in the few areas remaining just inside the park boundaries which are suited for such campgrounds, and not in the park interior.

If the mountainous areas of Glacier Park are not suited for mass recreation and are damaged by it and by numerous roads, then wouldn't the rugged Lincoln-Scapegoat area, which is very similar to Glacier Park, be similarly damaged?

Before I conclude I would like to make one more point. I am very familiar with all of the country in the upper Blackfoot River drainage above Clearwater junction. This is a span of country some 60 miles long bounded entirely on its north side by accessible Forest Service land which lies on the fringe of the proposed wilderness area. Yet in this entire country, the Forest Service now operates only five campgrounds. If there exists such a critical demand for outdoor recreation as the Forest Service claims in making their justification for the development of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, then why doesn't the Forest Service first develop the areas which lie on the fringe of the proposed wilderness? There are already numerous roads in existence which lead into very pleasant country along Dunham Creek, Arrastra Creek, Beaver Creek, Alice Creek and the North Fork of the Blackfoot River. There are now no public facilities in these areas. Why does the Forest Service want to build new roads into wild country when it could develop the same type of recreation facilities along presently built roads?

In conclusion, I feel there is no justification for building roads into the Lincoln-Scapegoat country, that the land would be harmed by road building and mass recreation and that area should be left in its natural state, and made a part of the wilderness preservation system.

STATEMENT OF E. M. BERTHELSON, SECRETARY, NORTHERN CONTINENTAL CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

It is our firm belief that the best interests of the present and future generations of all the people of these United States would be served if this area would be brought into the Wilderness System and thus remain forever undeveloped.

We agree, wholeheartedly with the following information regarding this primitive area, and we quote: "* * * contiguous to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area is a fragile, primitive area offering a highly diversified spectrum of recreational uses ranging from family hiking and camping in the gently rolling bottomlands to extensive pack trips into rugged mountain terrain. Many of its lakes, camps and hunting sites are easily accessible from roadheads and have long been utilized by wilderness enthusiasts."

In response to proposed plans for developing the northern Lincoln Back Country for mass recreation and timber harvest, an extensive study of the area was conducted by conservation and sportsmen's groups. The general conclusion of the study was that this area is not suited for mass recreation for a number of reasons. The small, shallow lakes in the region would soon deteriorate under the demands of mass, water-oriented use. The creeks, which provide many miles of excellent trout spawning grounds, would be destroyed as trout producers if heavily fished or if altered by logging or nearby road construction. The grizzly bear is relatively abundant in this region and could present a problem under conditions of mass use. The wild habitat, essential to the animal's existence, would in all probability be destroyed, and this valuable bear eventually eliminated from another of its few remaining habitats.

From the timber standpoint, most of the accessible timbered areas consist of lodgepole pine of which there is an ample supply in existing roaded areas. The few Douglas fir stands are of poor grade, probably of insufficient value to offset the cost of harvest and transport.

The Lincoln Back Country constitutes a type of recreation resource unique to a few sections of the Rocky Mountains. Many parts of the country can provide developed recreation, but few can offer wilderness as well. Once this wilderness is roaded or otherwise developed, it will be gone forever.

We earnestly request that favorable action be taken to preserve this valuable primitive area forever.

STATEMENT OF O. C. GRATTON, PRESIDENT, CHINOOK ROD AND GUN CLUB

We Montanans for the most part surely see the need for the expansion of Industry in our great State. Yet we must weigh the value of this concept against that of the necessity of retaining for those living today and, of greater importance, those yet unborn, the outdoor recreational area still available.

Since the area generally known as the Lincoln Back Country is one of few such areas left in these United States I feel that it is almost imperative that it be retained, not only as an outdoor recreational area, but that it be designated a Wilderness Area to be preserved for posterity so that we as well as those who will come after us can enjoy this genuine primitive area just as many before us have.

With the advent of automation we, our children, and our grandchildren will surely have more and more leisure time on our hands. Recreation of all kinds and particularly the outdoor variety will no doubt become more and more desirable to those who will need to get away from the ever-accelerating pace of everyday living. Not only will this need be desirable in the near future but it will become virtual necessity for the average citizen of this country. Without adequate facilities to take care of these needs we could very well find ourselves in greater need of facilities for taking care of physically unfit millions to say nothing of the mentally unfit hordes that could conceivably emerge as a direct result of a too tense and harried populace.

In summation I feel that the need is apparent and the solution, at least in part, is in our hands. Let us not fail to that which we surely known we must.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. BARMORE, YELLOWSTONE PARK, MONT.

I cannot claim intimate, personal acquaintance with the area proposed for wilderness classification in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area of the Lewis and Clark and the Lolo National Forests. Neither can I offer expert testimony as to the best size of the area or the best boundary locations. I must leave these details to the judgment of the informed private citizen and the professional land managers who *do* have on the ground familiarity with the area and the pros and cons of the proposal. I should mention, however, that I have followed the pros and cons of this specific proposal as closely as possible through newspaper articles and information distributed by the Montana Wilderness Association. I have closely followed the wilderness preservation movement as a national issue, and I have been professionally associated with the preservation and management of wilderness type lands for several years.

My wholehearted support for wilderness classification of this undeveloped natural area is based on a deep appreciation of the contribution wilderness has

made to the richness of my life, a sharp awareness of the recreational contribution that wilderness can and *should* make future generations of Americans, and the following philosophical and scientific considerations:

1. At the present stage in our national development harvestable timber, exploitable minerals, and opportunities for providing vehicle-oriented, mass type recreational facilities are *not* scarce; undeveloped lands suitable for preservation in their natural state for wilderness-oriented recreation and for their scientific values *are* scarce. In the not too distant future only lands specifically set aside for preservation as wilderness will remain undeveloped. We will have committed future generations to be satisfied with the amount of wilderness that we have decided they should have. This in the face of the strong likelihood that these highly urbanized generations are going to need and want more, not less, wilderness than the present generation. I firmly believe that we should be liberal now in the extent to which we preserve undeveloped wild lands as wilderness for their natural, scientific, and recreational value. I believe we have an obligation to pass on to future generations an opportunity for choosing how *they* want to manage the land and other natural resources. If future generations decide that we have set aside too much wilderness or if they have desperate need for the timber, the minerals, and mass type recreation facilities, the resources and the opportunity for exploitation and development will still be there. But these future generations can only have as much wilderness as we set aside now. Would we be doing them a favor by not setting aside enough; by denying them the opportunity for choice?

2. There is national awareness of the need for mass recreational facilities in and near urban areas. Should we be spending scarce tax dollars developing recreational roads and facilities in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area when this money could serve a larger number of needy people by development of green belts and other recreational lands and facilities in and near our population centers?

3. Why should we now exploit and develop land with great potential for preservation of wilderness and natural values when abundant opportunities exist for development of mass type, vehicle-oriented recreational facilities on forest lands already opened up and partially developed?

4. Why the urgency for "opening up" new forest lands for timber harvest when we are not even approaching optimum management of lands already devoted to and partially developed for timber production?

5. The grizzly bear has been recognized nationally as a rare and endangered species. We have a national goal and a moral responsibility to preserve this magnificent animal. Are we going to give the rare and endangered species program only lip service? Preservation of the grizzly bear demands bold and far sighted action with the grizzly bear given the benefit of the doubt where decisions affecting his very existence are concerned. Recent grizzly bear-people problems in Glacier National Park illustrate that the grizzly bear is benefited to the extent that opportunities for bear-people contacts are reduced. Preservation of the grizzly means preservation of the wilderness habitat he requires. The Lincoln-Scapegoat area is grizzly habitat. Development certainly would not improve conditions for grizzly survival. More likely increased human use would mean increased problems with the bears and eventual significant reduction or elimination of bears in the area. Do we need development that bad? Are we so poor in land that we cannot afford to provide the grizzly bear with what he needs—solitude? If we are "liberal" now with preservation of grizzly bear habitat and time proves us wrong, future generations can easily correct our "mistake", but if we convert grizzly bear habitat to human use, this decision is not so easily reversed.

In summary, I believe we have much to gain in the long haul and very little to lose by dedicating the Lincoln-Scapegoat area to wilderness preservation.

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL L. BERG, BOZEMAN, MONT.

I believe that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area should be designated as a wilderness according to the Wilderness Act.

I have been to this area on two occasions for a total of seven days. I have photographed the goats on the cliff-like walls of Scapegoat Mountain. I saw deer at Half Moon Park. I was also on Red Mountain, and it gave great pleasure to be able to gaze in all directions and see no signs of modernization. I saw on Red Mountain where the grizzly bears dug into the rocky soil. And I understand that the Lincoln Back Country is one of few breeding grounds for this endangered species.

Yes, I'm for wilderness designation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area not only because it offers excellent wilderness recreation, but also because we, as a nation, need to preserve all the wilderness we have. If one owns the business where he works, one becomes interested in the work. If one doesn't, one becomes interested in his hobbies. Today, with businesses getting bigger and bigger less and less people have the opportunity to own their own business. Therefore, more and more people must satisfy their need to take an interest in something through hobbies. And one of the hobbies that is making a tremendous increase in importance in wilderness recreation.

Wilderness recreation (back packing, hiking, and outfitting) is one of the fastest growing types of recreation in the nation today. In 1960 and 1961 I was a packer (on trails) for the Park Service in Yellowstone National Park. We saw few people in the back country of Yellowstone. At that time only one outfitter took only one trip a year with dudes into the Park. Today an outfitter that previously didn't go into Yellowstone takes 5 trips of dudes into the Park each summer. In 1962 I spent most of my free time in the Spanish Peaks Primitive Area. Again, at that time, I saw few people there. The last time I was there (Sept. 14 and 15, 1968) I saw eight parties of people. The time before, I saw four different parties in a 5-hour ride. During these rides, we saw little kids, medium-sized kids, families, and organized groups hiking in the wilderness. There are other evidences of use: I see lost caps and other articles along the trails. Previously, the trails were hardly worn, now they show signs of use. On the West Coast, I am told, that the hikers have used all the native firewood; still they come even though they have to carry firewood in on their backs. Thus it appears to me that wilderness recreation is on the increase.

Now that the snow mobile has become popular, we need a place where animals such as deer and elk will be safe from ignorant thrill seekers that chase them on these devices. Tests show that the mortality of animals chased in the spring is high. The designation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as wilderness would provide a safe place for some of our game animals.

Why shouldn't the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be designated as wilderness? It has been said that there is commercial timber in the area. There may be some, but are the stands large enough and productive enough to make it worth while to put roads to them? I run a small sawmill along with my ranching operation.

Also, some of my friends have gone broke several times trying to make a living as lumber men because they were cutting marginal timber. Last year an experienced timber man went broke in Lewistown. He went broke because he was trying to run a timber business in an area where only marginal timber exists. The big timber outfits can afford to log marginal timber only if they have an income from a good timber producing area to cover the loss encountered by logging the marginal timber. We have found that we have put too much of our grassland into the production of grain. Every year the government pays farmers to seed farm land into grass. Also, the government recognizes that more recreational opportunities are needed, not more production. Therefore, ranchers and farmers are encouraged to take in dudes. Loans are available to get started in this business (up to $60,000 at 5%—see Farm Journal, October, 1968 page 17). It is also possible to use too much area for logging, and it is more difficult to seed trees than grass. This mistake need not be made, since the government now recognizes the need for more recreational opportunities. Presently, outfitters are doing well in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, whereas loggers would find the going rough with the marginal timber available.

The Forest Service also has their problems with marginal timber: They have a limited amount of money available for logging roads. Some of the money from timber sales may go into road construction funds. If money is used to build roads into areas with only marginal timber, it won't be available to build roads into more productive areas. Therefore, neither the Forest Service nor the logger will get maximum benefit for the amount of money spent. Furthermore, in order to get good regrowth, it must be thinned. Again the Forest Service does not have money to thin all areas cut. If the greatest return is to be gained from their money, they must thin the most productive areas first. Chances are the marginal areas will not be thinned. Thus the regrowth will not amount to a hill of beans. If roads are built into productive areas, a profitable logging operation can exist, the regrowth can be thinned, the roads can be maintained for other purposes, and after from 40 to 60 years used to haul out the regrowth. This is not true of roads built into marginal areas.

22-003—68——12

Therefore, lets do the Nation a favor, the people a favor, the Outfitters a favor, the logger a favor, and the Forest Service a favor by designating the Lincoln-Scapegoat area a wilderness area and thus prevent the misuse of Forest Service road building funds and thus help the logger and the Forest Service as well as every citizen of the United States.

STATEMENT OF HUGH D. GALUSHA, JR., PRESIDENT, FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

My name is Hugh D. Galusha, Jr. I am president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. This statement is being offered in support of the proposal to establish the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness, and to give it protection under the Wilderness Act. It is a personal expression and not an official statement on behalf of the bank.

The Ninth Federal Reserve District, which is served by the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, includes the full states of Montana, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Northern Wisconsin and Northern Michigan. As president of the bank, it has been one of my responsibilities to become familiar with the entire district, its economic potential and its relationship to the rest of the United States. Perhaps the most important concern I have detected among the people of this district is for the maintenance of a balance in the social, recreational and economic life of the district. I suspect this represents a sharp departure from the patterns of the past when state planning groups and development organizations had a single concern with the rate of economic growth, which meant smokestacks. I now find broader concerns with the pollution of the air, pollution of the water, and the destruction of natural values of land. There is general recognition of the importance of wild areas, because of their importance to a place where people live, instead of simply a place where they work. Viewed in this light, its long-run importance to balanced economic growth drops into proper context.

As a former Montanan, I am intimately familiar with the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness. It has a unique value both to this region and to the nation—a value derived not only from its present relatively untrammeled condition, but because of the combination of magnificent mountain scenery, alpine parks and river systems, all of which are combined to make the area tremendously appealing to backpackers and other wilderness users. Its most distinguished feature is the accessibility of the view areas to the less hardy of us—people who are not equipped either by training or age for conventional alpine experiences. The grades are relatively easy, the views magnificent, and the parks generously distributed by a benevolent nature throughout the wilderness area so that it is not necessary to climb rocky pinnacles in order to obtain a view. I know of no area in the northern Rockies, much less in the entire Ninth Federal Reserve District, that is comparable.

STATEMENT OF D. M. HUMMEL, JR., PRESIDENT, BILLINGS CHAPTER, MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION

The members of the Billings Chapter of the Montana Wilderness Association, approximately 100 in number, support the establishment of the Lincoln Back Country as part of the Wilderness Preservation System in accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964.

This area offers high quality wilderness recreation which cannot be duplicated in many other places. It is a logical extension of the Bob Marshall Wilderness. If the Bob Marshall is wilderness, why should the Lincoln area be refused this status? We feel that there are no logical reasons.

It should be wilderness due to its high quality trout streams and lakes which heavy use brought by roads would destroy. The grizzly bear in one of its last habitats should be preserved. These are only a few of the many examples.

Please record our support in the hearing transcript on June 11.

STATEMENT OF ERICK S. KRUEGER, BILLINGS, MONT.

Mr. Chairman, I find it impossible to take Montana for granted. I think far too many Montanan's do. But, I am happy to discover that some of my fellow citizens believe, as I do, that Montana's unique wilderness areas are worth preserving.

The present controversy surrounding the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is similar to all of the other previous debates which have taken place within the past few years. All of the hearings have revealed several different viewpoints dealing with what exactly we should do with our wilderness areas. I am disheartened by the fact that wilderness has not always been properly represented during the past hearings. The Montanan who is proud to simply live near our great untamed wilderness, the Montanan who has marveled at God's virgin timber and magnificent wildlife and, the Montanan who wants his children to be able to derive the same sense of well-being that he has himself rediscovered time and time again in the wilderness are continually absent from the hearings. Why? Because, many Montanans do not realize that our wilderness is in danger of being destroyed by the constant onset of civilization.

To remain in a perfectly natural state, wilderness must not undergo any form of man's intervention. That is, man is only a visitor to the wilderness. Highways, lumbering, stock raising, farming, and mining doom everything that Nature has taken so long to create to a certain death. And, furthermore, what Nature has created and has created so majestically, can never be recreated after it has undergone even a mild tampering by civilization.

Montana is my home. I have had to leave it twice for the war in Vietnam and I will have to leave it again for a third and, hopefully, for the last time in Vietnam. I have always been in love with Montana and, especially, with its wilderness areas. I only wish that my fellow citizens could learn to appreciate everything that is wonderfully unique about Montana as much as I have.

And, finally, let me point out that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area will be something less than what God meant for it to be if it is allowed to be encroached upon in any form by man. I believe that this area is worthwhile saving for future generations to visit and wonder at. And, someday in the future, I hope to be able to enjoy our present wilderness areas including the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area with my family and friends.

STATEMENT OF DON VALITON, DEER LODGE, MONT.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Don Valiton, and I am a life-long resident of Deer Lodge, Montana.

I support Senate Bill 1121, by Senators Mansfield and Metcalf; and H.R. 7148 by Congressman Battin, to establish the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

As the Congress seeks to judge this Nation's wilderness requirements, it is most important to keep in mind that we are not meeting the wilderness needs of our people just for today—nor for 50 or 100 years from now—but for all time. If we err in judging those needs, let us err on the generous side in favor of wilderness. We cannot build nor make wilderness; but we can preserve it; and use it carefully.

We are in a unique, highly advantageous position today, as we ask the Congress to approve this legislation, giving wilderness status to the Lincoln-Scapegoat country.

This land is wild—no logging, no industry, no roads, little evidence of man! We have the opportunity now to say: this shall remain wilderness. Witness instead the controversy, the high costs, the wasted years, the scarred lands and resources, that have surrounded the battles to save other national sites, to restore other historical areas, and to preserve spots of beauty in this nation—where man invaded first—and drew protective lines later.

Compare the dwindling amount of wilderness today with the vast acreages of a hundred years ago. Congress is to be highly complimented for passage of the Wilderness Act of 1964.

When the people of my county, State, and Nation inventory our riches, recreational opportunities must, and do, rank high. One outdoor asset—which can be destroyed by man, but never produced by him—is true wilderness. My county of Powell, the state of Montana, and this Forest Region, is blessed by having a generous share of our country's remaining wilderness. Barring a national emergency, let us keep it so forever—this land, with its wildness, its true freedom, its solitude, its beauty, its wildlife, its clean, fresh air, and its pure waters.

People today want "elbow room", "breathing space". Sometimes to be alone. To get away from the shout and the tumult, the tensions and the pressures of the 20th century. Wilderness gives us that opportunity.

My son's life was saved this summer, after a tractor accident, by a skilled surgeon-friend of ours, who moved from the Mid-west years ago, who, in his own

words, said "A wilderness area there was a thing of the past. I moved to Deer Lodge to be near wilderness."

As school board chairman in Deer Lodge, I yearly see applications from out-of-state teachers, wanting to move here to share our outdoors. More than one young person has stayed in Montana to be near wilderness and the outdoors. While we still "export" far too many of our young people, we are keeping many, and we are "importing" many good families from other states, who live the good Montana life we have.

In the economic scheme of things, recreation is of fast growing importance; and bids fair to become the leading income producer for Montana in the years ahead. Wilderness is a bright part of that picture; and it draws hikers, riders, Boy Scouts, hunters, nature-lovers, rich and poor, from all over our nation.

My county of Powell is fort mate in that a very sizeable portion of our county lies within the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. A part of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness is also within the boundaries of my county.

For a life time I have lived near these two wilderness communities. My first trip into the Bob Marshall country was in 1936; and I have hiked and ridden in these two areas several times since then. It is an experience never forgotten, and always worth repeating.

While I enjoy the wilderness immensely, we also like all phases of the outdoors, including the "mass recreation" sites we are developing in Montana. These are being produced by the Federal and State governments, and by private enterprise; and are very important in the recreational scheme of things.

My family uses and appreciates the beautiful Forest Service camps on Georgetown Lake—the wonderful State Park on Yellowbay on lovely Flathead Lake—and we are glad to see in increasing numbers the privately developed campgrounds.

These are within easy reach of already-developed roads and highways. Indeed, we have barely scratched the surface in meeting the needs for mass recreation sites, suitable for intensive use by the public. A multitude of such locations are available now, either on, or near, good highways in beautiful locations. Let's spend our money here, instead of sending the bull dozers, the roads, the cars, and the rough treatment of man, into our dwindling wilderness.

For 20 years I owned and used a 4 wheel drive Jeep. I own and use a Honda Trail 90 motorbike. I hope to own a snomobile. However, none of these have, or even will be, used in wilderness. Such equipment certainly has an important and rightful place in the recreation picture. But as one of our local snomobilers at home told me, "It will take me a hundred years to go all the places around here I want to." He's not talking about invading the wild country. Montana has tremendous areas, roads, and trails outside the wilderness for those of us who use motorized equipment.

I am convinced that a large majority of the people of Montana approve adding the Lincoln-Scapegoat country to the wilderness system. In making this statement, I am relying to some degree upon my experience as a member of the Montana legislature.

I had the honor to represent Powell County for one session in the House of Representatives, and five sessions in the Montana Senate. During most of that time, I was a member of the Senate Fish & Game Committee; and was its chairman, twice. This committee handled much "recreation" legislation. Consequently, I know the people support wilderness. The Montana legislature has defeated in the past proposals calling for invasion of some of our wilderness areas; and did so while I was a member. The Montana Senate recently passed a memorial suggesting establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

When the written record of your committee is completed, it will include—among many others—written statements strongly supporting this wilderness legislation, which has been submitted to you by the Board of County Commissioners of our county; by the Directors and Officers of the Powell County Sportsmen's Association; and by several individuals of the Deer Lodge community. I have made it a point to discuss this legislation with many people in my county; and I can tell you; the vast majority support it; and want it.

As you listen today to the testimony of the proponents of this wilderness legislation, and as you read the statements submitted by others, you will be, as I have been, truly amazed at the broad support this proposal receives from Montana people.

These Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness advocates have laid aside political differences—economic ambitions—and the worker—the businessman—the housewife—the hunter—the young and the old—have joined together for one purpose

today. That is to urge upon the Congress, well-deserved wilderness status for the Lincoln-Scapegoat country.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES BLIXRUD, PACKER, GUIDE, AND OUTFITTER, SEVEN LAZY P GUEST RANCH, CHOTEAU, MONT.

Mr. Chairman, honorable members of the Senate Subcommittee on The Lincoln Scapegoat Area, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear today to testify in behalf of a measure to make the Lincoln Scapegoat Country a Wilderness Area.

I am an outfitter. My wife, my children and I own and operate a small family business near the boundary of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. All of our outfitting operations are done in this area.

Through the summer and fall we take 50 or 60 guests into the back country, and I, as one of several guides available, am button busting proud to show the lady from New York or the elk hunter from California that there really is a country within a country that is still primitive. We see no roads and hear no noisy engines and the quiet soon reminds us of something we cannot get in the busy city life.

These same people can ride down the trail relaxed, communing with nature, sit around the campfire at night and listen to the howling of a coyote in the distance or the bugling of a bull elk on the ridge above. Let us guarantee them that generations to follow will be able to experience the same thing.

Wilderness Areas can be of great economic value as our population continues to grow. Our ranch at the present can show an income of ten to fifteen thousand dollars annually and can increase considerably as long as we have these Wilderness Areas such as the proposed Lincoln Scapegoat Country into which we can take our guests.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS W. WURL, DEER LODGE, MONT.

When I moved to Montana twenty years ago one of the first back country areas I was privileged to pack into was the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. The ten days spent in that area, on this first of several pack trips to that area, was a revelation to me. It was my impression then, and this feeling has been reinforced on subsequent trips to the area, that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Country should be annexed to the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

The varied terrain is ideal for back packing and horse pack trips, but would not sustain the more deteriorating use of large scale group camping that would be made available should roads penetrate the area. The streams, for the most part, are small and would be easily altered and damaged by more than light usage. The evidence of grizzly bear has on several occasions reminded me that I was intruding in this animal's territory, one of his last retreats.

The Lincoln Back Country with Scapegoat Mountain and other outstanding peaks remains one of the relatively unspoiled areas of wilderness that must be preserved in its natural state.

STATEMENT OF TOM MESSELT, SR., GREAT FALLS, MONT.

I have lived in Montana for 54 years. For 18 years I was secretary of the Montana Wildlife Federation. I organized the Sun River Conservation Council which was instrumental in solving the Sun River elk problem of the thirties and forties by the purchase of the winter elk range. I am a member of the Wilderness Review Panel which has ridden and reviewed and evaluated many of the principal wilderness areas of the Northwest.

I do not believe the public will be best served by putting the Lincoln Back Country into wilderness. The merchantable timber in many parts of the area is very important to the economy of Montana as well as the government's share that is used to guard and maintain the forests.

In my opinion mature timber should be harvested, not only for its economic value, but also for the protection of the growing trees in the area. It is very well known that when trees become mature they are susceptible to bug and worm infestation which spreads to the younger growth. The danger is real and the results are devastating.

The general public that cannot physically ride or walk the wilderness is entitled to be able to get into areas with wilderness concept. This does not mean harmful use or destruction.

It means roads from which to view the scenic beauty of rugged areas, with parking and camping facilities.

The Forest Service recreational plans are well laid out and provide for the use of such areas by the greatest number of citizens. These plans do not provide roads to lakes and streams but do provide access in walking distance from parking and camping areas.

I have horsebacked through the principal wilderness areas in the Northwest and have seen many areas with wilderness aspect in many cases equal to wilderness, but on the outside. They fill a great need for those less physically able to ride or walk into wilderness.

I have every confidence in the Forest Service to manage the Lincoln Back Country in the best public interest without it being classified as wilderness.

There could be no objection to extending the Bob Marshall Wilderness to include Scapegoat mountain but there should be very little more. There are no defendable natural boundaries there that are so essential to a wilderness and care should be taken to put such extension where the boundaries would be easily discernible and defended.

The claims being made against the recreational plans of the Forest Service and inclusion of this large area in wilderness are invalid and investigation of them should certainly be carefully done before any decisions are made for its inclusion and classification as wilderness.

STATEMENT OF NEIL E. DISQUE, AMES, IOWA

My name is Neil E. Disque. I am an associate professor and associate director of the Information Service at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

It has been my privilege to enjoy the wilderness area of western Montana, including the Lincoln-Scapegoat country which I have travelled both on foot and horseback. I understand that there are now plans afoot to open this country with automobile roads and to develop it for mass recreation and for lumbering.

Land use in our nation, with its growing population, is of extreme importance. We need land for the growing of timber, for grazing, for harvesting of crops, for industrial sites, for homes and highways, and we are going to need land for recreation purposes, too. Some of the latter land will have to be made available by road to those too young, too old, too physically infirm and just too plain lazy to enjoy it otherwise. But we must maintain a not inconsiderable part of our nation in wilderness—as God made it. Not just relatively small portions. Large portions.

The reasons are obvious, and have been stated before. The wilderness is an important laboratory for scientists who would know nature as it was before man entered the picture in large numbers. The wilderness is the last refuge for many of our most magnificent animals and birds and of plants which may fail to survive in community with man. But I want the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness to survive because I hope that for many generations to come that people will be able to retreat there to drink of the life-restoring powers which that country possesses. I have spent only a relatively few hours of my life there, but they were among my most unforgettable. If this country is maintained as a wilderness, literally hundreds—perhaps thousands—of persons who have the desire and the fortitude can each year experience that feeling of solitude, of tranquility, of majesty which I felt. Once the wilderness is destroyed it cannot be re-created. Let us preserve what remains for its spiritual as well as scientific value. The quality of our life diminishes when we diminish the wilderness.

STATEMENT OF A. B. CURTIS, MAYOR, OROFINO, IDAHO

My name is A. B. Curtis, Mayor of the city of Orofino, Idaho, which elective office I have held since 1950. My term expires January 1, 1970. All of my mature life since 1918, I have spent in forestry and resource work. For over 41 years, I have been in the position of management with the Clearwater and Potlatch Timber Protective Associations—a vast area of north central Idaho under state, private and federal ownership. I began working in 1918 and have been in the

work continuously since that time. I am also a member of the Advisory Council of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

I wish to make a statement concerning the Montana Lincoln Back Country area which contains about 240,000 acres of Forest Service administered land and is presently under consideration as an addition to the nearly one million acre Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. I cannot agree that such an addition should be made and submit my reasons as follows.

As Americans, we must be assured that the public lands of the United States should be retained and managed or disposed of all in a manner so as to provide the maximum benefit for the general public.

I agree with the need for wilderness areas, but they must be correct in character, size and location to serve the people. As the situation now stands, something over 14 million acres are in the wilderness and primitive classification, nearly all of which is in the western United States while the populous areas of the nation are in the east. Expense, time, strength and stamina are essential to visit wilderness areas and few people are able to make such expensive arduous trips into our vast wilderness regions. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, published in January of 1962, shows that driving and walking for pleasure, swimming and picnicking lead the list of outdoor activities in which Americans participate and driving for pleasure is the most popular of all regardless of income, education, age or occupation.

The most critical need for land whose use will be restricted is near urban centers far away from the proposed addition to the Bob Marshall Area.

The ORRRC also shows that recreation need *not* be the exclusive use of an area. Companion use—multiple use is a concept which Americans are just beginning to understand. With the projected population of 246 million Americans by the year 1980 and 340 million Americans by the year 2000, the need for more mass recreation in terms of as many as 433 million visits to the national forests by the year 1980 which figure will be more than double by the year 2000 to a projected figure of approximately 950 million visits, it is evident enough to see that Forest Service development in providing campsites and visitor areas is most imperative.

Certainly, from these projections, it can be noted that the American people need campsites, trails with access, camping facilities and overnite accommodations throughout our country which are and will be served by the highway systems. The need for more wilderness cannot be defended, particularly in the west.

Strict preservation of vast acreages of our western scenic areas is not progress. Our nation must move along in the wise use of the public lands and use them for all possible purposes where the potential exists. Single use must be limited and confined only to such areas which already are best suited for a single use. Such a situation does not exist in the extension of the 240,000 acre addition to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. This area is alive with resources direly needed to make a rich active heart of our west and a better place to live, work and play.

Most people do not realize the tremendous size of a million acres. They do not realize that some wilderness areas are larger than some eastern states. One million acres is merely a term without the recognition of what it may mean in terms of use and access. They do not realize how unwieldy it may be or how difficult it may be to manage. Our history in the west very recently has demonstrated the hardships and costs when great fires follow the electrical storms. This is evident in every serious fire year such as 1967. There have been many bad years prior to 1967 and one would be shortsighted to think that our problems are not now serious in our large western areas. Problems will always be critical until we have access and the means of forest detection, communications and action.

Approximately 85,000 acres of productive timber land with 433,000,000 board feet of commercial timber is within this area. Grazing of sheep and cattle are an important operation in the proposed area. Commercial pack outfits likewise provide an important economic activity.

The addition of another 240,500 to the Marshall Wilderness Area, which now is nearly one million acres, certainly would not add to the need, character, or ease the management of the yet larger area. The Marshall area is already too large for proper use and management. True wilderness areas remain thus simply because that is what they are best suited for and usually other uses are secondary and perhaps not economic.

As an exhibit to accompany this statement and for the record, I am herewith attaching a copy of the Clearwater Tribune dated September 5, 1968, containing

an editorial by the publisher of the paper entitled, "Leave Lincoln Back Country Alone", and I sincerely trust that you and your colleagues will move very slowly on further special set-aside areas which are so direly needed in multiple use. In my opinion, the United States Forest Service does a commendable job of land management. Proposals such as this one by preservation pressure groups only serve to further complicate management by making the job confusing, costly and less effective.

I appreciate the opportunity of being privileged to make a statement.

[From the Clearwater (Idaho) Tribune, Sept. 5, 1968]

LEAVE LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY ALONE

Senate hearings have been set for Great Falls, Mont., on September 25 to determine if 240,000 acres of valuable outdoor recreation area should be added to the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

This Lincoln back country provides stabilizing timber resources for the forest products industry of Lincoln, Missoula and nearby communities, but beyond that the great need in the national forests of the Region is for automobile access to mountain areas along with trail extensions for short distance hiking. Scenic drives as proposed in alternative plans offered after an intensive study of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area, by the Forest Service, offer the best practical solution for meeting the aesthetic needs of the people of the region and the nation.

The values of a road system in the Lincoln back country cannot be over emphasized in view of the 2½ million acres of wilderness already established in the region—areas that are and will continue to get only token use in the forseeable future.

The Forest Service should not be stopped from moving along with its plans for administration of this area. They are much better plans than those offered by Senator Lee Metcalf's bill SB 1121.

The Wilderness people have already locked up 14 million acres of land, and are now relaxing their definition, to accept anything they can get.

They want to act now, because they know that the tide of public opinion will eventually swing the other way and that better use of many primitive type lands can be attained under scenic area and multiple use concepts. RDW

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. ROBISCHON, THE ANACONDA CO., BUTTE, MONT.

My name is James A. Robischon. I am counsel for The Anaconda Company and appear on behalf of The Anaconda Company in opopsition to the enactment of Senate Bill 1121 and its companion measure House Bill 7148.

The Anaconda Company opposes the enactment of the legislation which is the subject of this hearing on two grounds:

1. The enactment of this legislation and the subsequent classification of the proposed land area as "wilderness" is against the interests of the employees of The Anaconda Company in Montana.

2. The enactment of this legislation is not in the national interest.

The operations of The Anaconda Company in Montana are situated in geographical proximity to the area under study. The over 7,000 employees of The Anaconda Company in Missoula, Anaconda, Butte, East Helena and Great Falls have, at the present time, convenient access to this area for recreational pursuits. Under the plan for management of this area by the United States Forest Service for multiple, unrestricted use, the empolyees of Anaconda will have greatly expanded opportunity for the recreational use of this area.

The employees of Anaconda, as would seem to be the case of all but a very few of the citizens of the United States, are limited in both the amount of money and the amount of time which can be devoted to the recreational enjoyment of an area such as this. Under the management plan proposed by the Forest Service, these limitations are taken into consideration. Under the legislation that is the subject of this hearing, the employees of Anaconda and presumably millions of other citizens will be effectively and permanently locked out.

The employees of Anaconda should have the same rights to the use of this land as do the handful of pleasantly situated people who can afford the outfitters and guides and, who are not limited in the amount of time which they can spend away from their employment. The same would seem to be true for millions of other Americans.

Additionally, The Anaconda Company opposes this legislation upon the ground that the addition of these lands to the already vast "wilderness" area in Montana is not in the national interest.

Very little is known of the mineral potential of these lands. The mineral value of this area would be devoted to the benefit of all of the people of our nation and to the enhancement of the economic strength of the nation itself. Under a "wilderness" designation or classification, as is proposed by the legislation which is the subject of this hearing, The Anaconda Company would be effectively prohibited from even the exploration or prospecting of these lands. The nation would be deprived forever of the knowledge of what mineral wealth lies beneath the surface of this area.

Parts of the proposed wilderness area are similar in geological environment to that of the Heddleston District and contain mineralogical, structural, geochemical, and geophysical features of sufficient interest to warrant investigation by The Anaconda Company. Copper occurrences are known to extend northwesterly from the Heddleston district along the south margin of the area. Additionally, a large zone of geochemical zinc anomaly, described in U.S.G.S. Open-File Report, "Reconnaissance Geologic, Geochemical, and Geophysical Studies of the Southeastern Part of the Lewis and Clark Range, Montana," dated 1967, is found within and adjacent to the northeast boundary. Impressive gravity and magnetic geophysical anomalies, some of which may relate to subsurface quartz monzonite intrusives similar to that from which the Heddleston ore deposit was derived, were also detected within the proposed wilderness area by the U.S. Geological Survey during the Lewis and Clark Range investigation (Open-File Report). These occurrences are located at or near the projected intersection of regional structural features, and the area overall appears to be favorable for the localization of ore deposits.

Extensive field exploration is planned to determine whether commercial deposits exist.

It is submitted, that before a decision can be made by Congress as to where the national interest lies in the use of these lands, the mineral value of this area must be ascertained. The effective use of the land belonging to the United States requires that we have complete knowledge of the land's potential for its greatest national use.

As of December 31, 1967, 2,899,764 acres of Montana's mountains, forests, streams and lakes are classified as either "wilderness" or "primitive" areas. This would seem to be adequate recognition of the rights and interests of the very few who would benefit from the proposed legislation.

It is for these reasons that The Anaconda Company opposes the proposed legislation.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH MEUCHEL, LINCOLN, MONT.

I am Joseph Meuchel of Lincoln, Montana. I am a graduate of the University of Montana, School of Forestry. I was employed by the Forest Service as a Forester for some years. I am currently self employed, harvesting National Forest Timber.

I have lived and worked in the Lincoln area for 10 years. As a walk Leader for the Montana Wilderness Association I have led several walks into the area in question; as well as at least one yearly trip with family and friends.

As a Forester I seriously question the management proposal of the Forest Service. The commercial timber within the proposed wilderness boundary is on the very borders of the Alpine and subalpine watershed area and as such absorbs a great deal of the early spring run off, and high intensity summer storms.

Logging this area is virtually going after the last stick of timber on the mountain side. A computation of Forest Service Volume figures tells us that the stand per acre is only 6.4 thousand feet, or just barely operable for a prudent logger, even though the timber and the public treasury finances all the road construction.

Since the Forest Service study area takes in twice as much area as the proposed wilderness boundary it is my belief that the lower fringe area outside the proposed boundary contains the bulk of the commercial timber.

Another interesting computation is that, at the allowable annual cut the entire commercial timber area will be cut out in 50 years. Most timber stands in western Montana require from 120-150 years to grow a new stand. At higher elevations it takes considerably longer.

Again as a Forester I have noted thousands of acres of private, State and Federal Timber Lands that have been cut over and left to recover and grow a new crop as best it can with little or no help from the Land Manager.

These cut-over Lands, the best timber producing lands we have, already roaded easily accessible, represent to me a tremendous waste of a resource, in their partial or unstocked condition. I fully believe that timber management can be equated with other forms of land management. That timber production hasn't kept up with other cropland production is due to the fact that there has always been another patch of timber higher on mountain. Gentlemen, we are fast approaching the rimrocks and we are leaving behind lands in generally poor shape for producing a new crop.

It appears that more money and more planning goes into roads than into reforestation. In some instances these have been good investments, in others they are dead end abandoned roads becoming erosion gullies and sources of stream siltations.

It is a well known fact that the sawmill capacity of western Montana exceeds the annual growth of timber under present management. Competition for stumpage is keen and prices are at an all time high. Under this type of pressure Land Managers are selling timber in areas that have a greater value for other purposes in the long run.

Resources surveys throughout the west, whether they be for Livestock, game or timber, have through the years generally been revised downward. Livestock and game numbers have had to be reduced to protect the basic resource, soil, and I am sure that timber producing estimates will follow, especially in marginal areas.

A comparison of two Forest Service reports (1963 and 1968) of this area shows a one third reduction in volume per acre. I feel sure that this came about through land reclassification. I sincerely hope that an evaluation from a national level will bring this area into its proper perspective.

I am more concerned with the land classification of this area than my livelihood or my recreation. I feel this is best suited to its present use and in the long pull will be of more economic value to Montana without benefit of development as now proposed by the Forest Service.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS A. VOLLSTEDT, PRESIDENT, YAMHILL LUMBER CO., WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, MONT.

I am Francis Vollstedt, President of Yamhill Lumber Company and associate companies, operating sawmills in Meagher County, White Sulphur Springs being the county seat. We are the chief industry of the area, employing 100 men directly and an additional 120 men in our contract logging and trucking operations. Our annual payrolls for the mill labor is over $500,000 a year with an additional $1,250,000 a year for our contract logging and trucking. Without this, this community would become a ghost town in the very near future.

In reference to the hearings on the Senate Bill 1121, we wish to state that we are very strongly opposed to the enactment of this legislation for the following reasons:

1. The state of Montana already has quite a number of wilderness areas, such as: The Bob Marshall Wilderness, the Anaconda Pintlar, the Selway Bitterroot, the Gates of the Mountains, the Mission Mountains Primitive area, plus two national parks, which we feel are more than sufficient for the purpose intended.

2. This is a very selfish bill, as for example, there were less than 1,000 people who visited the Bob Marshall Wilderness area during 1967, which is actually five-millionth of 1% of the present 200,000,000 population of the United States. Also, due to the restrictions proposed in the wilderness area bill, it is only those of great wealth and also those in good health that are able to participate in the luxury of visiting this outdoor area.

3. The amount of saw-timber on this area is 666,000,000 board feet plus an additional 209,000,000 board feet of products suitable for roundwood of all types. As timber is a crop and it does ripen, this entire amount of timber will in time, and not too long a time at that, be destroyed of old age, and in doing so will make these lands impossible for passage for anyone, even animals without road construction. Also, this amount of timber will permanently sustain a minimum of 500 families, which in turn will sustain a community of 5,000 people indefinitely,

which is twice as many people as we have in Meagher County. The state of Montana needs all the industry it can get and any further reduction of its resources will have a serious effect on its economy.

4. We feel that the multiple use as is now projected by the U.S. Forest Service is the proper and equitable solution to this problem as they are doing an excellent job of harvesting the timber, which includes: supervision of cutting the timber, burning the slash, thinning the new stands, preparing for grazing of cattle, control of erosion, also making it more beautiful due to the removal of dead and dieing timber, and the greatest benefit of all is making the area available to the public and not just a few of the wealthy.

For example, we started logging in the Crazy Mountain area about ten years ago where there were no roads. This area contained Forest Lake, which had not been fished by over twenty-five people a year and very seldom hunters reached this area. Today due to the road system that we built, which is now owned by the Forest Service, this is available to everyone, and hunters and fishermen are using it by the hundreds each year. Everyone can partake of these advantages, even the infirm, the children, and the ones most deserving and needing this type of recreation. The overripe timber is saved and a sustained yield is maintained which stabilizes the economy.

After all, the heritage of this great country was for all of the people and none of it should be locked up so that they can not get to it or use it.

STATEMENT OF ELLA M. DELANEY, MISSOULA, MONT.

Gentlemen: My name is Ella M. Delaney. I am an interested taxpayer and a firm believer in using our many natural resources for the good of the most people more of the time.

In reference to the Lincoln Back Country, the U.S. Forest Service has a plan for managing the above area. The U.S. Forest Service is trained to manage the public forest lands on the multiple use concept and are on the premises where they face the actual existing conditions of the specified timber and land area.

Teaching appreciation of our forest lands to our youth and families is difficult to substantiate when beside them lies these many thousands of idle acres that should be producing trees, minerals when available, grazing and water uses as well as recreation.

To grow wood is one of the growing demands of a growing nation. This is readily seen with our population expansion needing homes. These growing families will need thousands of these natural resources and recreation areas that are readily accessible to each member of the family. Jobs will be needed for these young families. Surely we cannot afford to lock up our raw materials to become waste. It is in exchanging the gifts of the earth that gives families abundance and satisfaction, likewise I urge you to analyze the actual benefits that can be secured by full use of our natural resources in the Lincoln Back Country by more of the people most of the time.

Our state and nation deserves the best that can be developed through full understanding of the use of our lands and natural resources.

STATEMENT OF K. H. GLEASON, PACKER AND OUTFITTER, CHOTEAU, MONT.

Mr. Chairman: My name is K. H. Gleason and I am here as one of the guides and outfitters who is very concerned about our wilderness areas.

I appreciate very much the opportunity of appearing before you today to ask that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area be included in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area in order to prevent encroachment into one of the finest wild environments in America.

If the wilderness goes so does the packing and outfitting industry which is the foremost industry in taking people into the recreation areas preserved for that purpose.

We beg for the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness to preserve our few remaining elk, Grizzlies, goats and other wild life and virgin wilderness.

Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH HOEFFNER, K. LAZY THREE RANCH, LINCOLN, MONT.

Senators Metcalf, Burdick, ladies and gentlemen, I am Kenneth Hoeffner, I represent the K Lazy Three Ranch at Lincoln, Montana. My partner, Harold Barber, cannot be present at this hearing as he has a hunting party in the Lincoln Back Country. I wish to make this statement on his behalf also.

We are both native Montanans. I was raised in Augusta, Montana and feel privileged to have enjoyed the wilderness since youth. I bought a small ranch in the Lincoln area in 1959. I also purchased some logging equipment and have logged in this area to supplement my ranch income, until logging became very marginal. Desiring to stay in the Lincoln Valley, we turned to the outfitting and guiding business because it offered a future and the type of work the whole family enjoys. We recognize the fact that hunting and fishing is becoming less and less a part of outfitting and that many people are coming to Montana because they have lost their wilderness and wildlife, and simply wish to relax and be away from the pressures of civilization. Therefore we are making the adjustment from logging to that of an interest which promises to grow as the demand is ever increasing for quality outdoor recreation in the wilderness.

There are now hundreds of miles of roads, and many places for camping near these roads that are yet undeveloped. The Lincoln Back Country has been the constant drawing force and stabilizer in the Lincoln economy. Without it we will have lost one of the most vital elements which has made Lincoln a desirable place for both natives and visitors alike. Without it our wildlife cannot continue in abundance, our fishing would be a matter of expensive put and take.

With extensive development the very reason people wish to go there will have been destroyed.

I sincerely hope that this area can remain unmarred by roads for my children and those in the future to enjoy as I have.

Therefore I support the passage of Senate Bill S. 1121 for the inclusion of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness into the National Wilderness Preservation system.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD G. MCDOWELL, DISTRICT FORESTER, WESTERN WOOD PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION

As an interested citizen who is both a practicing forester and firm believer in forest recreation for all classes of woodland users, I am taking this opportunity to present my views concerning Senate Bill 1121, more familiarly known as the Lincoln-Scapegoat (or Back country) Proposal.

This bill, as proposed, would withdraw for a single-use purpose approximately 240,500 acres. These same acres are presently included in a Forest Service Multiple-Use proposal known as "Patterns for Management: Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area."

This Forest Service plan for multiple-use which provides for protection of the land and its resources, also enables all the people of this country to enjoy the maximum benefits from this same land and its resources. On the other hand, Senate Bill 1121, in proposing the Lincoln-Scapegoat country for Wilderness status, would in effect, deny these benefits to the many, in favor of the very few who have the time and resources necessary for enjoyment of these areas.

Great pressure is being felt, and greater ones are predicted, in the areas of outdoor recreation, water consumption, wildlife needs and wood-fiber use. The Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area management proposal is presently the most intelligent answer to the complex biological and economic challenge presented by this area.

Within this plan is contemplated a new east-west highway across the Continental Divide to provide for the traveler an exciting panorama of the Scapegoat escarpment. This is held to be comparable to the Glacier Park's Going-to-the-Sun Highway. There would also be short spur roads into the lower country to open up the sub-alpine recreation areas to short-term hikers, campers and visitors. Campgrounds are envisioned for the delight and joy of the many of us who have our wilderness experience with our families, some of whose members are not capable of long hikes.

Critical wildlife needs have been anticipated, but the grizzly bear and the native cutthroat trout will feel the pressures of civilization in any event. Habitat protection and the development and enforcement of the proper fish and game laws to protect these species are an integral part of the Multiple-Use plan.

Some of the soil types found in the forest area will permit only light use, and this has been seized upon as a reason to keep man's mechanical artifacts from the scene. However, the soil types have been considered in the preplanning for timber access roads and timber harvest. The Lincoln-Scapegoat Area now can produce 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 board feet of timber per year. Under intensive management, the forest is capable of producing 1½ to 2 times that volume. For a 12-million-board-foot cut at roughly $20 per thousand, the return to the U.S. Treasury would be $240,000 per year with 25% or $60,000 being returned to the counties. This sum, in cash, returned to the counties does not include the added revenue enjoyed through increased recreation use generated by wise management planning. Certainly, many more people will be attracted to this beautiful part of Montana if there is access; and particularly, access of the type afforded by the proposed scenic highway.

I cannot help but make a comment concerning timber harvesting methods, and particularly clear-cutting. Clear-cutting is really not designed to create members for a "Hate-the-Foresters" club. Clear-cutting is a scientific tool or method that is used by foresters for a species or type of timber that responds best to this type of treatment. It is impossible to harvest the defective, overmature, old growth trees without creating slash. To the unfamiliar observer, a clear-cut area is an ugly scene which is offensive to the viewer's aesthetic sense. What is really happening is that the land is being prepared for the rebirth of the new forest. The cradle of this baby forest is ugly until the seedlings overtop the slash. I can only draw a parallel with humanity. If we destroyed all children at birth who failed to meet the aesthetic criteria of those who draw back from the ugliness of our brand new baby forest, we would have no fears about the present population explosion. In fact, you and I, and possibly our clear-cut critics, might not be here. And of possible survivors, Abe Lincoln would not have made it to manhood. What I am saying is that aesthetics are not the only criteria, and we must be careful where the emphasis is placed.

I feel the proper emphasis is placed by the Forest Service in their Multiple-Use Proposal for the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area which encompasses the Lincoln-Scapegoat country. I respectfully ask the Montana Congressional delegation to reconsider their position and to withdraw Senate Bill 1121. In the event they are not of a mind to do so, I ask that, in the best interests of the people of Montana and our entire country, this bill not be passed by the Senate of the United States.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD L. SHULTS, VICE PRESIDENT, TREE FARMERS, INC.

Gentlemen, my name is Ed Shults. I am Vice President of Tree Farmers, Inc. My place of residence is Missoula, Montana. I am a director and Vice President of the Intermountain Logging Conference, a director of the Blackfoot Forest Protective Association, a member of the Montana Forest Practises Committee and a professional forester having graduated with a B.S. Degree in Forestry from the University of Montana in 1940.

During my career, I spent twenty years with the U.S. Forest Service. My position during the last five years with this agency was as assistant forest supervisor on the Lolo National Forest. I am well acquainted with the area known as the Lincoln Back Country.

It is beyond comprehension that any member of the subcommittee or, for that matter, any member of Congress could be so naive he believes the management of our public lands can be designated by direct legislation. The land itself dictates the type of management which should be applied to provide the greatest good for the whole nation.

Our public lands are largely under the jurisdiction of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. The agencies charged with the responsibility for the management of these lands are the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. These agencies are staffed with people professionally trained to determine and designate the proper management for any given area. The members of Congress who might possibly be qualified in this respect could perhaps be counted on the fingers of one hand. The members of Congress from Montana most certainly are unqualified.

Senate Bill 1121 and its companion, House Resolution 7148, have been submitted by members of Congress from Montana because of pressure and backslapping by the Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club and local outfitters and

guides. Enactment of the legislation would be detrimental to the well being of Montana and the nation; whereas, management of the area under the concept of multiple use, as recommended by the Forest Service, would benefit all, including the advocates of wilderness and the local outfitters and guides.

Development of the Lincoln Back Country, as proposed by the Forest Service, would place each and every land use in its proper perspective. Development would render the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area more accessible and more usable. Many recreationists could enjoy one-day or overnight hikes into the area and the number of people who would contract with the local outfitters and guides to take pack trips would increase substantially.

The full recreational development of this area is needed to provide for the use of the great number of people who enjoy family-type recreation. This may be in the form of trips in the family station wagon, the camper mounted on a pickup truck, by snowmobile, motor propelled cycles or four-wheel drive equipment. The people, who visit national forest areas to picnic, camp, fish, hunt, ski, snowshoe, explore, pick berries, gather rocks or to relax, outnumber those who visit wilderness areas a thousand to one. The reasons to develop recreational areas for the needs of these people are many, but seldom heard. They are not represented by pressure groups in Washington, D.C. or San Francisco which contrive to deprive these people the use of the national forests.

People from all states visit the great northwest in pickup campers and small trailers and many take sidetrips through areas such as the Lincoln Back Country will be when developed. The sad part is that they return to their homes believing they have enjoyed an experience in the wilderness and join the Wilderness Society whose objectives are to lock just such people out of the national forests.

Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks are a great boon to the economy of Montana but, if gates were locked and access by automobile was denied, the visitor use would be reduced to less than five percent of the present numbers. The vast majority of people who enjoy the great outdoors simply will not visit an area unless it can be reached and traversed by automobile.

We people in the great northwest welcome the use of our area as a national playground but object to locking up vast areas as wilderness which prohibits such use. We favor wilderness use in proper perspective with other land uses but object to the inclusion of lands which support resources which should be managed for the benefit of all the people and not for the exclusive use of a limited few. We who are acquainted with the physical makeup of this vast mountainous area know that if the idea to set aside wilderness areas had never been conceived, more area would remain in its natural wilderness state than would ever be used by the people of this nation.

The proponents of the legislation in question would have you believe their proposal is in the interests of forest conservation. Forests are a soil crop in life form. Trees cannot be preserved. They cannot be preserved any more than can a field of corn or a field of wheat. When ripe, trees must be harvested to make way for a new crop. Otherwise, the crop will be lost to insects, diseases and wildfires. There is no beauty when a forested area becomes a sea of dead snags or suffers the ravages of fire. Conservation is maximum use with a minimum of waste. This legislation proposes maximum waste with a minimum of use.

We do not fully understand the reasons why this legislation was proposed and is being adamantly supported by our member of Congress. It is contrary to the proposal for management by the Forest Service and sound principles of land management by any known criteria. We strongly suspect they have submitted to political pressures or feel they are doing some small group a favor. Gentlemen, this is no matter to be determined by political maneuvering. We hope this committee and the Members of Congress will study the plan for management prepared by the U.S. Forest Service and, upon learning the true facts, reject this proposal to designate as wilderness an area which should be managed under the concept of multiple use. We feel we can rely upon your intelligence to properly resolve this matter.

Truly, legislation should be enacted which would ban forever attempts to designate by direct legislation the type of management to be applied to our public lands.

STATEMENT OF DWIGHT AND JESSIE SMITH

It would seem to these two local residents, who have been in this area since 1937, that we are reaching out and talking of spending millions of dollars for the

very thing that is available, and has been available for a number of years. There are vast acres of beautiful country that have good roads, at the expense of the logging industry, to choice recreation areas, in the Lincoln, Ovando and Augusta areas.

We have fished the back country area, and cannot see where it could possibly support heavy fishing.

As for the snowmobile sport, there are also vast areas in the immediate area that have been completely untouched. The cost of keeping the roads open for the winter sports, would be staggering, even to our government, who talks in billions.

As former sawmill and logging operators, the thirty million sustained yield borders on the ridiculous, where the timber is concerned.

Referring to cost of roads, there has been lumber and logs hauled out of here for years, and we do not have good roads yet, for all the millions that has gone out of here.

Last but not least, what of our wild life? Can't we have one area that we know will be free of poachers, broken beer bottles, and all the debris that seems to go along with people.

Yours for good government and a clean place of good hunting for our children, in the future.

MONTANA HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
Helena, Mont., July 18, 1968.

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

DEAR SENATOR: My name is Ralph W. Clare. I reside at Helena, Montana, and work for the Montana Highway Commission as an Accountant.

I would like to express my sincere interest in the passage of legislation that will designate as wilderness area the present Lincoln Back Country—Scapegoat.

I would like to have this letter placed on record at the hearing that is to be held on September 25, 1968 in Montana.

Yours truly,

RALPH W. CLARE.

STATE OF MONTANA,
STATE SOIL CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Butte, Mont., September 23, 1968.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

To Whom It May Concern:

The Montana State Soil Conservation Committee wishes to go on record as being opposed to the proposed Wilderness classification of 204,500 acres of U.S. Forest Land in Montana, namely Lincoln back country and parts of Lewis and Clark and Lolo National forests.

It is our feeling that the management of our national forests should be determined upon recommendations made by the U.S. Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture and not by direct legislation. To do otherwise usurps the authority vested in their department. They know far better, the best course of action to more fully utilize this area to the full interest of the majority of the people of our Nation, rather than a minority.

We must favor multiple-use management, if we are to best represent the interests of our State and National economy, for which we are charged to do. We are further opposed to the designation of any lands for a Wilderness area that would include any possible water storage sites, either presently being studied or having future possibilities.

We generally support the Forest Service proposal for the management of this area. They are most capable of handling the intensive and proper management, as well as to provide the controls necessary to insure the protection and enhancement of all values of the area, again to the best interests of the majority of peoples.

Thank you for your kind consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN A. HANSON, *Vice Chairman.*

VAN-EVAN CO.,
Missoula, Mont., June 11, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
Subcommittee Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, Senate Public Lands Subcommittee.

GENTLEMEN: My name is Allen R. White. I am Timber Manager for the Van-Evan Co., Missoula, Montana and I appear here for that Company. I have had 33 years experience in the Woods Products Industry, most of which has been concerned with Logs and Logging.

In behalf of Van-Evan Co., I wish to thank the Committee for the opportunity to express our Company's views in regard to S.B. 1121—Commonly known as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal.

The Van-Evan Co. is an eight year old Company in Western Montana, but already, we provide year-around employment for approximately 400 employees, in Plywood & Lumber production, with an annual payroll in excess of $2,500,000.00. This is exclusive of those employed by our Loggers in the Forest and of course, exclusive of those we indirectly help employ in associated industries.

The Van-Evan Co. is dependent upon a supply of raw material, and the Timber Resources of the United States, are vital to our continued existence. We, as is true of most modern wood products manufactures, are firmly committed to the multiple use sustained yield principals of sound Forest Management.

When Congress established the National Forests in the Organic Act of June 4, 1897, it stated its position as follows: "No national forest shall be established, except to improve and protect the forest within the boundaries, or for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use & necessities of citizens of the United States".

Throughout the years, numerous Acts of Congress, such as—the Sustained Yield Forest Management Act of March 29, 1944—The Anderson-Mansfield Reforestation & Regeneration Act of October 11, 1949—The Multiple Use Act of June 12, 1960—have expressed Congressional concern, that the public Forest be maintained and that the Forest Using Industries, & the jobs they provide, be preserved.

In the immediate area of this proposal, ten (10) Sawmills are presently operating and it must be borne in mind, that not one, has ever operated at full capacity, due entirely to the lack of an adequate Timber supply. In these ten (10) Sawmills some 1500 employees are working on a year around basis, with an annual payroll exceeding $10,000,000.00 and millions more being generated in the form of goods and services.

The United States Forestry Service calculates that there is 12,000,000 board feet of Timber available from the area in question, on an annual sustained yield basis. On todays market, the average stumpage value is in excess of $20.00 per thousand board feet. In an economic analysis of Timber Sale values, it should be constantly remembered, that each dollar of stumpage value harvested, brings twenty (20) dollars in gross national product. Therefore, if we consider an annual cut of 12,000,000 board feet times the average value of $20.00 per M, we are conservatively talking about $4,800,000 of gross national products being generated each year. By keeping this type of economy running smoothly, we sincerely feel, we are contributing significantly to the economic well being of the nation and to all its' citizens, both in the rural districts and the cities.

Before the Business Council in Hot Springs, Arkansas, in 1966, Secretary of Agriculture, Orville S. Freeman, announced his Rural Industrialization program and he stated as follows:

> "To keep people in Rural America, opportunities must be created for them. Specifically, jobs must be provided."
>
> "You who represent business and industry can provide these jobs and at the same time, insure the best interests of your country by helping to cure the ills of the countryside and the ills of the city."
>
> "I have tried to spell out the advantages of Industrial expansion in rural America, and our new departmental program is to encourage rural industrialization and will continue that effort."
>
> "And we want you to know that all of the considerable resource assistance of the Federal Government, is at your disposal, in any effort you make, to bring more economic opportunity to rural America."

With sincere belief in this program, the secretary has met with five other Cabinet Officers—The Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, Transportation, Education and Welfare and Housing and Urban Development. All these men ac-

knowledge that the mass migration of people from the Rural Areas to the cities, is one of the most difficult and pressing problems facing the nation today.

When Congress passed the Multiple Use Act of 1960, they directed the United States Forestry Service to manage the Nation's Forests under the principles of Multiple Use. In accordance to this mandate, the United States Forestry Service has developed the "Patterns for Management Blackfoot-Sun River Area"—which encompasses the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal.

Having had the privilege of seeing the slides and listening to the narrator, John Milodragovich, Supervisor of the Lolo National Forest, Missoula, Montana, I sincerely feel, that it will provide a most sensible and reasonable guide, for several reasons. They are as follows:

1. Sustain the Rural Timber Economy.
2. Provide recreational use for all citizens.
3. Increase game population by providing more forage.
4. Roads into the area will make more accessible, areas which are not now accessible to the ordinary person—the weekend Hunter and those, who are not hardy enough to go into the area by pack string or on foot.
5. Will leave untouched, those areas desired by persons who welcome the solitude of Wilderness.

The Committee must bear in mind, that Timber is a crop and that the proposal not only locks up the present Commercial Timber, but the productive capacity of the land itself. We recognize, that inherent in the application of the multiple use idea, is a balancing of values, which requires an answer to these questions: How big need it be, to accommodate all the people who will in some foreseeable future use it? To what extent and by how many people, will the Wilderness area be used? These questions bring to mind, areas that are at present, in a reserved status, consisting of Wilderness, primitive and National Parks, surrounding the area in question. In these we find the following:

	Acres
1. Bob Marshall Wilderness Area	950,000
2. Mission Mts Primitive Area	74,000
3. Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area	1,238,000
4. Cabinet Wilderness Area	94,000
5. Gates of the Mt. Wilderness Area	29,000
6. Pintlar Wilderness Area	158,000
7. Glacier National Park	1,013,000
Total	3,556,000

Within this 3,556,000 Acres, considerable volume of Commercial Timber is already in Wilderness or reserved status, which already provides ample space and diversification of scenic values for all citizens.

The 3,556,000 reserves Acres is more than the entire state of Connecticut, and more than five (5) times the State of Rhode Island.

We all recognize that man does not live by bread alone, but individuals and Communities alike need bread as a first necessity. In this whole matter of multiple use, the factor of the economy of great areas cannot be ignored. The whole problem, is one of a proper balance between conflicting values—which brings us to believe, the present proposal will sacrifice certain areas of primary commercial value to a proposed Wilderness use, which is now, and will be likely to remain, very scanty.

In closing, we must remind the Committee of the needs of United States Citizens. It has been projected for the year 1968, 13,000,000,000 board feet of Timber, will be the required need of the American public and by the year 2000—the needs will be 20,000,000,000 board feet. Must the question always remain—where do we go from here

Very truly yours,

ALLEN R. WHITE, *Timber Manager.*

FLATHEAD COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Kalispell, Mont., September 20, 1968.

SENATOR BURDICK, SENATOR METCALF AND MEMBERS OF THE SENATE INTERIOR STAFF

GENTLEMEN: My name is Clifford E. Haines, County Commissioner, Flathead County, Montana. I am representing the Commissioners of Lake, Lincoln, Mineral and Sanders Counties as well as Flathead County.

The Commissioners of these five northwest Montana counties meet from time to time to discuss problems of mutual interest and concern. The problem of greatest concern to these counties is the orderly planning and use of the natural resources of the very great percentage of State and Federal land in our counties as well as all the counties of Montana. These problems always come on for a great amount of discussion at all annual meetings of the Montana State Commissioners Association meetings as well as public land hearings.

In western Montana there has already been set aside Glacier National Park, the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and the Mission Mountain primitive area. In Glacier Park there are roads that lead past or near to scenic areas with trails leading to scenic country inaccessible by roads.

The Bob Marshall Wilderness Area consists of 950,000 acres in which there are only trails and forest service landing strips for airplanes. The ordinary citizen is, for all practical purposes, denied the use of this area due to the cost involved and the time needed to traverse this area. In addition to this the resources of this vast area are not harvested and add nothing to the economy of the counties in which it is situated. Due to the periodic invasion of bugs and beetles much of this forest cover is killed with the resulting downfall of the timber. This particular situation does not increase the browse because in areas of heavy forest cover which have died and fallen even the wild game find it difficult to traverse. I have traveled in and hunted on the area encompassed in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. It is truly filled with beautiful scenery and rewarding to the persons able to enjoy it.

From reading the literature on the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area under discussion at this field hearing it becomes evident that this area is a continuation of the type of country within the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, and if maintained as a wilderness area, would join that area on the south and add 500,000 acres to it, making a total of 1,450,000 acres.

Within the area under study are a minimum of 136,000 acres of merchantable timber with an allowable cut of seventeen and one-half million board feet. If you reduce this harvesting by an amount great enough to allow no cutting near roads or public campgrounds, there would remain an allowable cut of fourteen million board feet per year, appreciably adding to the economy of the counties within the several national forests.

When this timber is harvested on a sustained yield basis, and let me now develop this sustained yield expression a bit further by saying that the five counties I am speaking for endorse and urge selective cutting as the only means of achieving this goal. We have arrived at this position after many years of observation. We feel certain this type of harvesting achieves a greater abundance of browse and forage for either wild or domestic animals than any other type of management. It has been developed by the timber industry that seven and one-half man years are required to harvest and process each one million board feet of timber, and by simple arithmetic it would appear this area could generate approximately 100 man years of labor which would run into thousands upon thousands of dollars to aid the economy of the region. In addition, the "in lieu of payments" to qualifying counties by the Forest Service would be a great help to the county road and school systems. Under Montana law ⅔ of these payments are for road purposes and ⅓ for the use of the public school system.

In this study area within the last few years there has been a tremendous activity in prospecting for minerals and much leasing of ground for mining development. I presume this would completely close this Lincoln Back Country to any commercial ventures thereby precluding any monetary return to the State and likewise to county government.

The Gibson Dam, a water storage device, is within the northeast portion of the study area with a road to the site. Also, a landing field at Bench Mark was constructed in 1967 and a road built to this airstrip plus other low grade roads in this back country.

Logging and lumbering in the timbered counties is a really major industry. Without it the western part of Montana would be in serious difficulty. With the pressures on logs for overseas use it behooves us to use all the resources of our area to their fullest measure, always keeping in mind to practice the very best methods of management. Private timber land holders and the U.S. Forest Service are definitely applying excellent management practices.

The eastern half of these United States of America is looking to the western states for recreation due to a lack of foresight. They have despoiled most of their natural recreation areas, polluted their rivers and lakes and are depending

on the western states for clean air and water. Realizing this area is for the use of all the people who are seeking this type of recreation, we must, in a state the size of ours with a comparatively small population, also make the ultimate use of our resources.

In conclusion, may I say I firmly believe the natural resources in the Lincoln Back Country should be used to add to the economy of the area. By building the necessary roads for harvesting the timber and mineral resources of the area, by building one high standard road traversing the high country, together with ample campgrounds and trails to higher elevations, many more visitors will be able to use this great recreation area. It appears to me this system of roads and trails would also enhance management of all the resources of the area, commercial as well as recreational.

Thank you.

CLIFFORD E. HAINES.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1968.

Senator Burdick, Senator Metcalf and Members of the Senate Interior Committee Staff.

GENTLEMEN: The Flathead, Lake, Lincoln, Mineral, and Sanders County Commissioners wish to go on record as favoring the multiple use concept for administering the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area.

In addition, we wish to state our views on the management of timber resources of this area. We disagree with the method known as clear cut and wholeheartedly agree with the selective cutting method of harvesting the timber resources. Because of the low annual precipitation and the short growing season the growing of marketable timber is much slower than in areas of high precipitation and longer growing seasons. We firmly believe the economy becomes more enhanced by using the sustained yield method of harvesting this timber.

Sincerely yours,

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF:
FLATHEAD COUNTY,
LAKE COUNTY,
LINCOLN COUNTY,
MINERAL COUNTY,
SANDERS COUNTY.

BURKLAND STUDS, INC.,
Livingston, Mont., September 19, 1968.

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

DEAR SIR: As the date of the meeting to hear testimony on S. 1121 in Great Falls, Montana, has been changed from September 25, 1968, to September 23, 1968, other business matters prevent me from attending.

The Blackfoot-Sun River Divide study area lies adjacent to the existing Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. The Bob Marshall Wilderness Area is a large area that needs no extension to serve the purposes of a wilderness area. To increase the area would only lock up a large portion of the existing area so that it would not even be utilized for its intended purpose.

All land should dictate the type of management which should be applied to provide the greatest good for all people. The Forest Service has made a comprehensive study of the proposed area. Their proposal sets forth the varied benefits to be derived from extensive and proper management and also provides the necessary controls to insure the protection and enhancement of all values. To include the study area in a wilderness area would defeat their proposal.

With the rapid increase in population in the entire west, more area is needed for the outdoor activities of the people normally within reach of such areas as the study area. Conversion to a wilderness area would largely eliminate such use.

Because we are in the timber harvesting business does not mean that we are against wilderness areas. We are entirely in accord with such concepts, but feel that no area should be so classified without proper study. There are many areas which by their own nature should be and will always be wilderness areas. To include other areas that are more suitable for multiple use is a mistake which will live to haunt us.

We urge that the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide study area be classified and developed as an area recognizing the full recreational potential. To do so some

roads should be constructed and facilities developed for such purposes. At the same time, the forest crop which is mature and will deteriorate in the future should be harvested.

Yours very truly,

C. D. OUGH,
Vice President and General Manager.

COUNTY OF POWELL,
Deer Lodge, Mont., June 18, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: After careful consideration, we wish to inform your committee, that we—as the Powell County Board of Commissioners, and as individuals—endorse and support Senate Bill 1121, introduced by Senators Mansfield and Metcalf.

A considerable portion of the present Bob Marshall Wilderness lies within our county. We view this as an important recreational asset for the economy of our community. Usage of the area—and of the Lincoln-Scapegoat territory—by people in all walks of life is increasing every year. This includes persons of very modest means, as well as those more well-to-do.

It appears to us as very logical that the "Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness", as defined in Senate Bill 1121, should be added to the Wilderness System, as proposed by this legislation.

The suggested addition of lands is ideally suited to wilderness classification and use. We have an abundance of other excellent lands in Western Montana, and in our locality, which are owned by private individuals, by the State of Montana, and by the Federal Government. These could, and should be, developed for "mass recreation" use first before encroaching upon our dwindling supply of wilderness. In most cases, due to their ready accessibility to present roads, this can be done at a much lower cost.

We should view our "wilderness" needs, not just for the present, but for the future for many years to come.

In the long run, passage of Senate Bill 1121 would insure a type of vacation land, which would add to the economy of this county. Blessed as we are with large amounts of land for all types of summer and winter use by vacationers and tourists, recreation is a most important dollar producer; and can be in the future—one of the most important segments of our county's economy.

Sincerely yours,

NEWMAN RAYMOND,
SANDY O. KEIERSON,
R. M. BAUMAN,
Board of County Commissioners.

POWELL COUNTY SPORTSMAN'S ASSOCIATION,
June 4, 1968.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIRS: We, the Powell County Sportsman's Association, are in favor of the Lincoln-Scapegoat mountain area being designated as a Wilderness Area as set forth in S. 1121, introduced by Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf, and H.R. 7148, introduced by Representative James Battin.

We feel that there is not sufficient timber of economic value to warrant the creation of access roads into this area. With such access, it would shrink the now established boundary lines of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat mountain area has much more value over dollars and cents by being left as it is for use as wildlife habitat and recreation. The streams in this area are at present some of the best in the State of Montana, and we would like to see them left that way for future generations to come, and our generation's use.

We have, by the building of dams, and relocation of railroads and highways reduced the lands on which wildlife graze and reproduce. It is evident on some of our forests, that the management or mismanagement of some areas that have logging roads, which created accesses, have caused irreparable erosion, and ruined good fishing streams, that used to reproduce and sustain their own

numbers. These same streams now have to be restocked or cannot be restocked at all.

We therefore urgently request that you give favorable consideration to these bills.

Yours truly,

JOHN MICU, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

BILLINGS ROD AND GUN CLUB,
Billings, Mont., June 6, 1968.

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

At the regular meeting of the Billings Rod and Gun Club held June 5, 1968, it was unanimously voted that this club go on record as favoring the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat as a Wilderness Area.

With the ever increasing population of the United States, it is becoming more and more difficult for a person to get away from it all and with the assignment of areas like the Lincoln-Scapegoat area into wilderness areas is one of the few places left to enjoy nature in its original beauty.

Also with the decreasing grizzly bear population this area, if made a wilderness area, is some hope of retaining this species. As we all know, Montana is well noted for its variety of hunting, this producing a vast income for the state and any areas that can be left in its natural state is of great help for the future generation of sportsmen.

In conclusion our club highly approves that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area should be given protection under the Wilderness act, and that this letter be included as part of the hearing record.

LEE FEARS.

SKYLINE SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Butte, Mont., May 30, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Like most constituents who write you, we are asking for your help, but unlike most correspondents we are not begging for an appropriation. On the contrary, we are begging you not to spend any money. Please, please, please do not ask Congress for money to make any inroads into the Lincoln Backcountry! Please leave it as it is!

The oil and automobile industry lobbies ask for more and better roads, the aviation companies expect the government to maintain weather bureaus for their benefit, the navigation companies demand the dredging of rivers and harbors, importers-exporters seek protection all over the world, and practically every organization is asking for helf—financial help for their own selfish projects.

But we conservationists, weak and unorganized, have but one goal, and that is to keep some of this scenic land of ours as it was when whitemen first came to the country. So if Congress will be generous enough not to appropriate any money to develop the Lincoln Backcountry, it will be doing coming generations a great favor.

If this area which we want preserved in its pristine beauty were of great value, do not think that it would not have been ravaged long ago. Individuals cannot afford to build roads into this rugged country to extract what little value is there, so they want the government to stand this expense so they can reap what profit there is.

The lumber that can be harvested may be evaluated, but the aesthetic beauty cannot be. Please do not be an accessory before the fact in the destruction of this great country.

Yours very truly,

D. ROSCOE NICKERSON,
Secretary.

LEWISTOWN ROD AND GUN CLUB,
Lewistown, Mont., June 7, 1968.

LIVINGSTON ROGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: The Lewistown Rod and Gun Club has voted unanimously to support the proposal concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

We feel that such areas need protecting from the ravages of civilization and progress and that such areas are dwindling to the point that it is high time we became concerned about saving some of this type for the future generations of mankind.

Sincerely,

TOM HARTFORD, *President.*

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: As a retired U.S. Forest Ranger and a Montana citizen I am much interested in, and concerned about, the proposals to add the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area to the Wilderness System—specifically the Bob Marshall Wilderness area.

Since 1939 I have been a resident in the Bitterroot Valley which is bordered by both the Selway-Bitterroot and Anaconda-Pintlar Wilderness areas and have intimate knowledge of the problems concerning the use of these areas by the public and many of the administrative problems of the responsible government agency—the U.S. Forest Service. I am well acquainted with numerous people who have used these areas and or with people who would like to but for various reasons cannot.

Most people look upon these wilderness areas as places where one may go to see the wilderness as God or nature made it without any alteration by man. Very few realize what is involved, what one has to do, what it costs, to really see and use one of these wildernesses and it is doubtful if the Congress, when they passed the Wilderness Act, realized that only a comparative very few of the general public would, or ever could, ride saddle horse or go hiking—the only means of access—into these areas. The desire or hope to enjoy the wilderness solitude, the scenery or the wildlife must remain only a hope to all but a minuscule proportion of our population.

Most of these areas are remote from population centers, are in rugged country and some cover vast acreages. The Selway-Wilderness covers over 1,250,000 acres. The Bob Marshall Wilderness covers over 900,000 acres. To go into them requires that a person have certain qualifications.

First of all one must be in good physical condition; able to ride horseback or hike for long distances over rough, rocky and steep terrain; able to withstand sudden climate variations such as heavy rains, winds and temperature extremes without access to shelter; unless with a guided party be able to cook and digest one's own meals; sleep on the ground or on an air mattress laid on the ground; able to do various types of manual labor such as chopping wood for campfires or cutting obstructions from a trail; able to carry a heavily loaded packsack on one's back or lift heavy loads to the back of a horse or mule.

Secondly, one must have the time necessary to go in and out of a wilderness area. With our modern transportation it doesn't take long to get to a designated area but from there on it's slow going on foot or horseback. Even when following a constructed wilderness trail progress is seldom over two and one-half miles per hour. Ten days or two weeks is usually needed to fully enjoy a trip into and out of one of these areas.

Third; One must have the knowledge, or skill, or native ability to care for oneself in the wild country. One must know how to cook over a campfire; how to build that fire and put it out; how to give first aid to self or other; how to saddle and ride a horse and how to care for that horse; how to load a pack animal; how to put up a shelter; how and where to smoke safely in the woods (if one smokes); and how to find one's way into the wilderness and out again without becoming lost. All of the above if one is not a member of a guided party. If in a guided party most of the above is done for you.

Fourth; one must prepare to spend a fairly large sum of money—depending on various things of course. Should one decide to go into a wilderness area alone and on foot for a few days the cost would be only the cost of transporta-

tion to the area, plus the cost of sturdy clothing and shoes which one may already have; plus a pack or ruck-sack of some kind, plus packsack load of concentrated food; plus perhaps a pup tent and a sleeping bag. A light axe or hatchet is almost a must too. But that is really roughing it and very few have the desire or temperament to make that kind of trip. Most excursions into the wilderness are done in the company of others—sometimes as a family group but more often as a member of an organized group such as a Hiking Club, American Forestry Association, Wilderness Society, Boy Scout, etc. The family group usually has their own saddle and pack animals, and usually live adjacent to the area such as here in the Bitterroot Valley. It is a rarity for a family group to travel any great distance for a trip into a roadless wilderness area. Any one such family group trip is relatively inexpensive because the group usually own their own pack and saddle stock, saddles and other gear, tent and other camping necessities, and a truck or horse trailer. These involve a considerable investment but may be used year after year and for other purposes.

Trips into the wilderness as members of an organized group can be quite expensive. Most organized groups are guided and managed by professional guides and outfitters. Brochures from several local guides and outfitters quote prices varying from $350 to $400 per week per person. They furnish everything but your sleeping bag and air mattress.

There are many hunting parties, both organized and unorganized which go into the wilderness during the fall hunting season—in fact the heaviest use of the wilderness by far is by the fall hunter. But the average hunter cares little about the wilderness as such. He is paying for the chance to bring down a game animal, usually an elk, and for the accompanying conviviality with a group of friends. And even where he brings his own pack and saddle stock and sets up his own camp the cost to him is usually considerable.

Even here in the Bitterroot Valley, where we see the high peaks and narrow canyons of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness every time we look to the west a very small proportion of the population has ever availed themselves of the privilege of spending a week or two in the wilderness. They simply do not have the above listed qualifications.

The establishment of a wilderness area takes out of general public use a large, sometimes a very large, chunk of public land. A very small proportion of our population can ever directly benefit by camping under the stars or gazing at a waterfall, or seeing an elk grazing in a mountain meadow in a wilderness area. And for the sake of the preservation of the natural environment it is probably just as well.

For several years now there have been several organized groups which sponsor ten day to two week trail rides through the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. These are guided, conducted trips and some 25 people from all over the U.S. go along. A party of 25 on a ten day trail ride requires some 90 head of saddle and pack stock. Several non-paying personnel such as guides, packers, cook, tour conductor, etc. raise the number of people to around 30. Suitable camping spots for such a group are very much limited in the canyon country of this huge area. The saddle and pack stock have to be corralled in an area where they can be fed baled hay and where water supplies will not be contaminated. Such a large group of shod animals cannot be turned loose to graze on the very limited natural forage. The first group in camps on lush meadow grass and pine needles and sees lots of wild flowers, green grasses and pine-needle covered ground. The air is fresh and sweet. But 30 humans and 90 head of shod saddle and pack animals can really mess up a restricted area over night. The second group in a week or two later hasn't nearly as nice a place to stay and the third group will find a miniature dust bowl with the corral area in mixed dust scraps of hay and dried manure. And even though it is becoming the policy for all garbage and tin cans, etc. to be boxed up and carried out there is a lot of human debris that remains. I know this use and over-use of available campsites is becoming a vexing problem in both the Selway-Bitterroot and Anaconda-Pintlar areas. What the problem will be if considerably more of the public should find the means and the inclination to vacation in these wilderness areas I can only conjecture.

The Wilderness Act prohibits the use of any kind of powered motor in a wilderness system area. Since the Act became law a new winter sport has come into being. Ski-Doo type snowmobiles are now a possession of almost any family of middle class affluence. They strike out at every opportunity for the snow covered mountain slopes and ridge tops and more people now are going into our mountain country in the winter than ever before. Many of these people do not

go into the hills at any other time. Although these are essentially one day trips they range for many miles into the high country.

From the standpoint of damage to the natural environment it is a safe sport. Travelling over a deep cushion of snow they cause no soil disturbance; they require no road or trail except an access road to the area because they follow any opening where traction looks good; they leave no messed up campsites because they do not stay overnight; there is no danger of snowmobiles or their passengers setting forest fires because of the snow cover; they leave but little litter-lunch debris is usually burned in the camp or warming fire which is built on top of the snow and because of the cold weather beer is usually not much desired and the scattering of beer cans or bottles is not much a problem.

The temptation of snowmobiles to go into the closed wilderness areas is great and will increase. Some illegal travelling in these areas is already being done and patrolling to prevent this will probably be a problem of the administrative agency in the near future. Many people are coming to realize that these huge areas of the public land are, under the present law, not open to public use during the months—in this area November through June—when snow lays deep in the mountains. They are finding it difficult to see wherein use of snowmobiles over the snow would do any damage to the wilderness environment and although the whine of a gasoline motor is certainly an unnatural sound it won't be there come summer and, anyhow, it is no more unnatural than the sound of a braying pack mule.

I cannot believe that further additions to the wilderness system can best serve the majority of people and communities until some of the developing problems of use and administration of the existing wilderness areas are studied and resolved. There are many more problems; problems of ecology which will grow more pressing as time goes on. One of these problems is the matter of suppression of forest fires. Lightning caused forest fires have always been nature's way of crop rotation—cleaning out the old decadent stands and starting the new. Some species simply do not perpetuate themselves any other way. Nature will continue to set fires every summer and without roads or landing fields in the areas the Forest Service or other agency is badly handicapped in fire suppression work.

I believe the Forest Service plan for management of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area has been carefully worked out under the multiple use concept and will best serve the most people in the long run. The setting aside of large areas of wilderness so that future generations may see and enjoy things as they always have been without human molestation was a wise thing. But some 10 million acres are now in this system. Until we see that a considerably larger proportion of the general public is going to be able to benefit now and in the future, further expansion is not in the public interest. I am opposed, for the above reasons, to the passage of H.R. 7148 and S. 1121.

Very sincerely,

SAMUEL T. BILLINGS.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA,
Missoula, Mont., June 3, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: As the pressures of modern living become greater, as nervous tensions build up more and more, and increasing population add to our social and mental stress—it becomes more and more imperative that we provide sanctuaries for our people.

Wilderness areas permit persons to get away from pressures, tensions, crowds, noise, gas fumes, and other concomitants of modern city living. The proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness is just such a sanctuary for our American people. Its need now is not absolute, but it will fill a greater and greater need on the part of the individual as our society increases in mass and complexity.

The area provides hunting, fishing, camping, and trail riding. It is a solace for those seeking natural beauty, peace, quiet, and aesthetic values. These too are aspects of our people that have a right to be met.

The area permits observation of animals and animal life in their native, natural habitat!

I endorse the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness and urge you to continue its support.

Sincerely yours,

LUDVIG G. BROWMAN,
Department of Zoology.

CAMP FIRE GIRLS,
Great Falls, Mont., September 13, 1968.

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: Camp Fire Girls are interested in the preservation of wilderness areas and the expansion of those areas. Our program expresses this in many ways. We are actively involved in conservation projects throughout the nation. Our Adventure '68 is marked evidence of this great interest.

Our council program which now includes a new resident camping facility on Salmon Lake—west of Lincoln Back Country is important to us and would provide an area of expansion to our rapidly expanding outdoor program.

Our program includes 1400 registered members who are potential users of this expanded wilderness area by reason of adjacency as well as our expanding program. I cannot speak for all these members, of course, but I feel I express the feeling of the program as it is currently developing.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY M. BROWN,
Executive Director.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 13, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: The Brown family, Forrest, Dorothy, Doug, 17, David, 15, Norman, 14, whose experience in wilderness areas include three horseback trips of over 200 miles; two 50 mile Scout hikes; one 70 mile family hike, and several shorter experiences, wish to express their views on the proposal of our Senators Metcalf and Mansfield to designate the Lincoln Back Country as a wilderness area.

My first trip into the Bob Marshall was in 1945 when it was beautiful and quiet beyond belief. It is still beautiful and often quiet—but I cannot help but realize how "crowded" it has become. A trip now into the Bob Marshall is like "old home week" at the County Fair. It only emphasizes in my mind that in increased use it has become smaller. The addition of the Lincoln Back Country, though we have seen it only from Gordon Pass, White River Pass, and from the country north of Lincoln, is recommended—pleaded for by all of us.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY M. BROWN.

NORTHWESTERN NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Great Falls, Mont., June 5, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: I am writing in support of the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area. I hope that the powers that be see fit to maintain this area as a wilderness area. Much of our native timberland is being destroyed by what some may feel is progress. However, if we do not take steps to provide much of this area to remain as wilderness area the next generation or two generations from now will not know what the native country really looked like.

May I repeat, I hope that the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area will be able to be included as a wilderness area much the same as the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

Sincerely,

L. E. "VERNE" SEBENS, C.L.U.

LINCOLN, MONT., *May 28, 1968.*

Hon. Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want this area made a preserve for the posterity of wild life, and the beauty of nature.

Man has made inroads on the lands that we feel are necessary to the maintaining of a proper balance of life.

For a proper existence man must have a balance of time, a time for work and a time for pleasure, this can only be accomplished by preserving a place for that purpose.

Our resources in this area are not inducive to mining or lumbering.

The balance of power cannot be established in this country with the destruction of so-called progress.

Humanity cannot live within itself—they must provide for future generations by establishing preserves such as we are asking for, and that the greed and lust of individuals be not permitted to lend destruction to the things that we hold so dear.

This is a plea to you that you make an effort on your part to see that it becomes a reality.

Sincerely,

L. E. HAGERTY,
Justice of the Peace.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Bozeman, Mont., June 4, 1968.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: There seems no end to the careless waste and destruction of the natural resources in our nation, but more specifically in Montana. My family and I are natives of Montana, but have traveled through the United States, and of course, have witnessed the ravages of man's search for wealth by raping God's gifts to man.

Just last fall my eleven year old daughter, Pam, and eight year old son, Mark, seeking refuge from other persons so as to get reacquainted in our very busy world left from the head of Copper Creek, walked to Heart Lake where we camped, fished, cooked out and slept out under the biggest blue sky full of stars you can imagine. Even though the squirrels stole part of our grayling trout, a hoot owl hooted at us throughout the night and a bull elk bugled us awake to fish again, I can only say to industrialize this area would destroy these kinds of activities, not only for myself, but for other fathers to follow who too, would like to experience these same joys with their growing families.

This area in question, encompassing Heart Lake, Scapegoat Mountain, the Chinese Wall and contiguous to the Bob Marshall Wilderness is a great economic asset to Montana, also to the peoples of the nation, and, yes, to the world. If it is economics that inspires the industrialists, let's not be uninformed since the economic return from a wilderness over time will be a better, safer, long term investment than thousands of acres of down, tangled, wasted timber, dirty unproductive streams and eroded hillsides stripped with iron blades from fauna or fluora *never* to return to ann original wild and beautiful state.

If man's economic needs for the resources in this area were urgent, I could be somewhat sympathetic, but this is not the case.

Let's make this area into a wilderness, adjoin it with the Bob Marshall, and let nature reign supreme for an eternity of man to enjoy.

I personally will be happy to pay the added taxes sacrificed by not developing this resource in hopes that others might also enjoy this beautiful area.

Sincerely,

MAX L. AMBERSON.

WILDERNESS OUTFITTERS,
Missoula, Mont., June 3, 1968.

To Whom It May Concern:

We believe the Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country should be made part of the wilderness system because it is an ideal family recreational area, not as remote and rugged as the Bob Marshall or the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness Areas. Its trails, mountain peaks and lakes are ideally designed for family wilderness outings, either by horse or foot. If it is left as wilderness it will retain this esthetic value and be enjoyed by many thousands of people for many generations.

As acommercial outfitting business we do not pack into this wilderness area very often, but from our past experience in this area we feel that the lakes are far too shallow, the top soil too thin and the trees of little commercial value. I can say this with a little authority as I am a college graduate in the biological field. When lakes with maximum depths of 10′ or 12′ and areas less than 60 acres in size become crowded with people and their mechanized camping equipment they soon become the dumping area for all of mankind's waste. The recreational value of this land would very surely become destroyed if roads are allowed to continue their steady progress through it. We also feel that this area should be put into the wilderness system because with its beautiful scenery and

abundant wildlife it represents a part of our rich American heritage, which we cannot afford to lose.

Respectfully yours,

ARNOLD AND THELMA ELSER.

ELK CREEK RANCH,
Augusta, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF:

Concerning the Lincoln Back Country being preserved as a wilderness area, we feel this should be done as soon as possible for these reasons.

The demand for more recreational areas is growing every year and these areas are becoming scarcer every year. We feel that a place where people can enjoy clean air and water, hunt, fish and picture taking should be kept in its natural state for all who want to put forth a little effort to enjoy.

We have been in the outfitting business for ten years and have taken a considerable number of people into this area every year from all over the United States. Most of these people state that they are glad to be able to come to a place that is free of automobiles, beer cans, highways and can breathe air free from smog and to drink water that isn't thick.

We feel that our economy and the economy of the State of Montana will be seriously affected if the Lincoln Back Country isn't put into the Wilderness system.

Sincerely,

BABE AND ADDIE SAYRE.

MONTANA WILDERNESS GUIDES ASSOCIATION,
Seeley Lake, Mont., June 11, 1968.

Hon. Senator LEE METCALF,
Chairman,
Great Falls, Mont.

SENATOR METCALF AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS: For the past twenty-three years, as a Dude Ranch operator and outfitter and guide, I have been actively engaged in providing for people from all walks of life and from all areas in the United States, the means of getting into the Mission Mountain Primitive Area, the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, and the Flathead National Forest.

In the pursuit of this profession it has been my privilege, and the privilege of all the members of our association, to observe at close hand, the ever-increasing use of these lands for recreation purposes by the public. And each year we have become more and more aware of the concern of the overwhelming majority of these people, regarding our wilderness system and its management. A short time ago this use and concern was reflected in the passage of the National Wilderness Act by the Congress of the United States.

Today we are concerned with the proposal to add the Lincoln Back Country area to our wilderness system, which geographically complies with all requirements as stated in the Wilderness Act.

There are those who contend that we need no further additions to our Wilderness System—that what we have now will fulfill the requirements for this type of recreation for all the years to come. This contention is difficult to comprehend, since the administrators of our existing wilderness areas have already become concerned with problems of management due to the increased used by the outdoor-recreation-minded public. And no planners today can accurately forecast what the impact is going to be when this country, in just three short years from now, gears up to fast—cheap—mass air jet transportation, in addition to the population rise, and the increased foreign travel to this country. The most modest of these planners predicts a near-doubled use of our recreation areas. The cold facts are that the stadium we live in is filling up.

There are those who contend that an area such as the Lincoln Back Country with its spectacular scenic value should be utilized by a modern highway system for the use of the motoring vacationist. It is our contention that there are many scenic areas or drives throughout the West and especially in the state of Montana, far more suitable, appropriate and practical for this type of recreation use; and all too few left still unscarred by the aftermath of what we call progress. All of us are aware today of the problems caused by the tossing of refuse, cans, and bottles from automobiles. The container industry, in its research, is going to have to find a solution or we will be literally buried in cans and bottles.

The administrators of public lands for recreation use, must consider very thoroughly the effects and results on a true wilderness area of this type of recreation for the masses. Our association feels very strongly that the Lincoln Back Country is a true quality wilderness area that should not be abandoned to this concept.

There are those who say that the Lincoln Back Country will benefit our communities far more by harvesting the natural resources than by financial returns from recreation use. It is pointed out that a handful of outfitters taking in guests add but little to the economy. May we point out that the days of a handful of oufitters using the wilderness areas is rapidly drawing to a close. Large numbers of outfitters will be necessary to accommodate the increasing demands of the public to visit these areas. May we also point out that the fee system charged outfitters by the Forest Service is being nearly doubled next year, and in all probability will continue to rise in future years. It is entirely probable in the near future that a charge will be established for the general public for their use of wilderness areas. The income from these fees will all continue to rise as the demand for Wilderness-type recreation increases.

Thus recreation use is an economic resource that cannot be exhausted, as long as we have a Wilderness System, with no deterioration of the natural resources within its boundaries. Wilderness Areas have an esthetic value that can not be measured by an economic yardstick, but this esthetic worth will yield the greatest harvest of all in the years to come for all mankind.

The members of this association whom I represent today respectfully recommend to this committee, the addition of the Lincoln Back Country to our Wilderness system.

RICHARD K. HICKEY,
Immediate Past President.

HELENA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I would like to endorse wilderness status for the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as proposed under Senate Bill 1121.

I have spent several summers backpacking into the Lincoln Back Country, especially the Webb and Heart Lake areas.

I believe it is necessary to set aside this area as wilderness, especially the Webb-Heart Lake area, which already is receiving heavy use. Last June when snow was still on the trail I counted approximately 30 fishermen at Heart Lake in one day. Heart Lake is a five-mile walk. Some Montana wilderness areas, such as the Bob Marshall, are actually becoming crowded.

Heart Lake has a thriving population of the rare Arctic grayling. Heart and other lakes within proposed wilderness boundaries contain the disappearing westslope blackspotted cutthroat trout.

Montana National Forests are becoming increasingly developed with public access roads. An example is Park Lake near Helena. This 10-acre lake was opened several years ago with a Forest Service road. The public has made use of Heart: a Helena Boy Scout troop hauled 24 pickup truck loads of flattened beer cans, alone, out of the Park Lake area last summer.

The Forest Service, with money appropriated by Congress, is now building a road into the remote Crow Creek area of Helena National Forest above Radersburg, Montana.

It is necessary to build campground facilities and harvest timber, but it would seem desirable that a few large blocks of land, such as the Lincoln Back Country, be spared from the axe, bulldozer and campground developer.

I regret that I am unable to personally attend and testify at the public hearing June 11 in Great Falls.

Very truly yours,

JOHN KUGLIN.

CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD,
Butte, Mont., June 3, 1968.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Upon hearing about the eagerness of private industry to encroach upon and demolish another percentage of Montana's Wilderness Areas I felt I must beg your support in opposition of such a movement.

People—the prime product of our nation, of our world, of our reason for existence are suffering enough through the selfish wants of industry. The selfish wants to even destroy the natural beauty of our state. What small percentage of land still has natural beauty? I am and will remain grateful for your support.

Gratefully,

LEO J. BELANGER,
City Planner.

FALLS SUPPLY CO., INC.,
Great Falls, Mont., June 11, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Many of us in Montana are familiar with Senate Bill 1121 introduced by our Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf relating to the preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in its present state.

More and more people are becoming deeply concerned about the rapid loss of our wilderness areas in the United States. Certainly there are few places remaining that adapt themselves to retention in the original condition that Mother Nature presented them to us. The Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area is one of those which readily lends itself to its maintenance as a Wilderness Area to be henceforth enjoyed by the citizens of this Country in its original and scenically beautiful state.

I join many, many others in imploring your favorable action on Senate Bill 1121 to retain the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

Yours very truly,

R. D. ROWE, *President.*

CASCADE COUNTY, MONT.,
Great Falls, Mont., September 23, 1968.

To U.S. Subcommittee:

I am in favor of keeping the Lincoln Back-Country as a wilderness area, so that people can use it to 'pack in" and hike—it may be the last frontier area available to them.

I think the tourist income would more than equal the taxes that would result if it was put into industrial use.

This is my opinion as a lover of the great outdoors and an avid sportsman.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN ST. JERMAIN,
Member, Board of County Commissioners.

STEVENSVILLE, MONT., *September 20, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Wilderness Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Charley McDonald, from Stevensville, Montana. I was Forest Ranger on the Stevensville Ranger District, Bitterroot National Forest from 1944 to 1965, the year I retired.

Prior to 1944, I was Ranger on the Salmon National Forest for four years, Ranger on the Minidoka National Forest for four years, Ranger on the Fishlake National Forest for six years, Ranger on the Teton National Forest for nearly four years, Jr. Range Examiner for nearly three years on the Uinta and Wyoming National Forests, and Ranger on the Wasatch National Forest for nearly five years, a total of forty-six years.

During this time I became well acquainted with Primitive and Wilderness areas on the Beartooth, the High-Uintas, the Bridger and the Selway-Bitterroot as well as the Teton National Park, which was formed from a part of my District while I was on the Teton.

During 1965 and 1966 I was privileged to spend over a month riding over much of the Scapegoat-Lincoln Back Country areas with Forest Officers, hunters and outfitters. A few days were spent on top of the Scapegoat Mountain, where the only access was over a very poor and dangerous "game trail." The entire area proposed for Wilderness designation is truly a wild, primitive area. I found most of the timbered areas supporting a stand of low quality timber of low commercial value at this time.

Trunk-line trails at present, are good, altho most of the side trails, and those leading around the Scapegoat Mtn., are little better than game trails. However, they are passable for horseback and light pack duty, and are subjected to quite heavy use. The natural meadows used for grazing recreational horse use, remain in fair condition, as do camp sites. Fishing and hunting conditions are excellent. All the area for several miles around the Scapegoat is in truly primitive condition. The evidence of old sheep use are barely discernable, and only thru the eye of experience. It is possible to retain the Wilderness character of the entire area only if it is managed under Wilderness designation. It is my frank opinion that this should be accomplished by including the area in the Wilderness system. Any roads, logging, or heavy public use such as contemplated thru most multiple use plans, would certainly destroy the Wilderness values and characteristics of the area beyond repair. If the logging roads, clear-cutting and timber operations as managed as present on the Stevensville District, and other areas within the Bitterroot National Forest, that I have observed, is evidence of what may be expected from similar logging operations in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back country, all wilderness aspects would be destroyed. This should not be permitted to occur, since wilderness conditions once lost can never be restored.

The only possible way that the timber stands could be logged at a profit would be for the government to make large investments for road construction. The poor quality of the timber stands would require it sold at minimum rates, and would be less than for logging road construction.

The effects of logging during the past half dozen years on the areas I have observed on the Bitterroot National Forest, have created unsightly appearances, seriously impaired and detracted from the beauty of the mountain slopes. The residents of this Valley have proprietary interest and pride in their green mountain slopes. They view the disfigurement from destructive logging methods with its resulting scars of an entire mountain slope, cut up by roads, clear-cuts, burns and terracing, with unfavorable reaction, and wide public concern. The appearance that is being created from these logging practices, is contrary to the aims intended under the Forest Service Multiple Use guide lines. Erosion problems and silting of farmers ditches and fields is also an increasing problem, traced to the above logging practices.

Ever increasing clear-cut areas remain unstocked or very poorly stocked, because of failure to secure natural reproduction, and/or plantation failures. Expenditures of a hundred dollars per acre to secure preparation and planting, often fails to produce the desired new tree crop. Such a crop, ordinarily planned for a hundred-fifty year rotation, may well be set back twenty to thirty years or more.

From my experiences with many of the present day Forest Officers, I am convinced that most of them have a negative attitude towards the need for establishing and administrating Wilderness Areas. Perhaps they lack appreciation of the value and place of Wilderness in Forest Management scheme of affairs.

What ever the obstacles may be, the Lincoln-Scapegoat area would best serve the public needs by its ultimate inclusion in the National Wilderness system.

I wish to have this testimony made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

C. H. McDonald.

Missoula Sawmills, Inc.,
Missoula, Mont.

Senator Quentin Burdick,
Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
U.S. Senate.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Missoula Sawmills, Inc., a Western Montana based forest industry, welcomes the opportunity to present its views on Senate Bill S. 1121, commonly known as the Lincoln Back Country Bill.

The Public Lands Interim Committee has previously held hearings aimed at discovering what the long term goals of public forest management should be. In spite of the variety of use interests, there was a clear consensus on long term goals of public forest management. These goals are stated as follows:

The long term goals of public forest management should be to make life better for people. This, in our free and open society, means to produce more of what people want. It means more of the kind of environment that is wanted; recreation opportunities, good water and air and natural beauty. It also means more

real wealth for people; generation of the income that can be used by people as they choose, and which subsequently creates the investment that creates other wealth producing industry and the reinvestment that is necessary to develop the forest itself, for all uses.

In an analysis of the above stated goals the question must be asked, "What kind of environment do people want?" We immediately know that we enjoy the undisturbed forest in its pristine state, but, as we think a little further, we also realize that we enjoy our pleasant, comfortable homes and all the other conveniences furnished us by our modern technological society.

We, as individuals, have particular tastes in recreational desires. To divide the public forest into segments in order to satisfy our own individual desires, is hardly reasonable. Perhaps, if we examine statistics, we can determine what type of recreation the majority of our population desires. Through this examination we found that most of the people in the United States who enjoy some form of outdoor recreation do so by auto travel. Therefore, it is safe to assume that most recreationists need roads to travel upon.

Good water and air and natural beauty are probably desired to some degree by all of us. We believe that these desires have been and can be compatible with logical development of our public forest.

Real wealth for people is of the essence so that we may exist to enjoy our learned desires. Without the economic ability to feed ourselves, and our children, we would perish as have some of the unfortunate individuals of India and of the other undeveloped portions of the world. India and portions of South America have vast areas of wilderness as we once had. The difference is that we developed our land and now utilize our resources to better our economic stature.

The United States government, through its agencies, has inventoried the resources of this area, including the Lincoln Back Country, and has fostered the growth of industry to utilize these resources. Industry has grown in this portion of Montana because it has met the challenges and has been able to utilize the renewable resources of the public forest, for the benefit of all society.

Are we now going to lock these resources up so that they will waste away and so that the industry which has grown will now die? What should we tell the men and woment who now earn their life bread, employed through the utilization of the resources from the public forest? We can only tell them that their government which has fostered jobs and a dream of a good future for them is now taking everything away and instead, giving it to a select few.

To classify the Lincoln Back Country as wilderness would be indeed a social and economic injustice.

For the above reasons we are strongly opposed to Bill S. 1121 which would designate the Lincoln Back Country as wilderness.

LEONARD GONDEX.

ANDERSON GRAIN CO.,
Great Falls, Mont., October 4, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was unable to attend your hearing on above subject in Great Falls, but understand the record is still open for expression of opinion on this subject.

All of us in our company, both in the Great Falls office as well as our men at country elevators, are strongly in favor of preserving this area in its wilderness state. We feel that, as brought out at the hearing, there is not enough merchantable timber in the area to justify opening it up for that reason.

As for the Forest Service argument that more roads and picnic grounds are needed to accommodate people who want to get out into the wilds, this argument is self-defeating. As we open up an area like this it is no longer in the wild state, and within a few years, becomes just like so much of our scenic mountain areas have become. Montana of all states, has so much good country that is already open to cars, trucks, cycles, etc., that we should bend over backward to preserve what little is left. Our people have plenty of opportunity now, to go with cars and cycles into beautiful mountain areas for fishing, hunting, picnics, etc.

Moreover, there are more and more people that want to get into country that is still definitely in the wild state—they are fed up with competing on their hikes, with cars etc. We have a cabin on the North Fork of Sun River, above Gibson Dam and lake, on the North Fork trail that goes on into the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, and positioned thus, we have an excellent chance to witness the

great growth, just in the past five years or so, in the number of hikers, campers, and pack trips that go into the Wilderness. They go right past our cabin. It is interesting to note the number of young people that are doing this. Many of them are small groups of kids such as Boy Scouts, many are young married couples—these types are usually hiking. Then there are the older folks that don't want to hike that far—they usually borrow or rent horses, if they don't have their own, and do their own packing, that is they are not with a professional packer or dude ranch operator. Then there are the hunters—the vast majority of which are local Central Montana people, such as ranchers etc. who regularly every year, go back into the area to hunt in the fall—or to fish in the summer.

The point I want to make here is that the argument you hear so often that the Wilderness areas are only for the wealthy, as only they can afford an expensive pack trip or dude ranch outing, is just plain wrong. The people of this type that we see all summer and fall going past our cabin, are in the very small minority. The big majority are just everyday folks who want to get out on their own and rough it. Parenthetically, I might add that all dude ranches are not so expensive that only the very wealthy can afford to patronize them. Klick's Ranch, just below our cabin is one of the best in the state as you know, yet their weekly price is $110 per person per week, including all meals, a horse to ride whenever you want it, use of heated swimming pool, use of a boat if you want to fish in the lake etc. which figures out to $15.70 per day. Where else can you take a vacation today at that figure, including meals and entertainment? As a result, we should perhaps correct the impression that only rich people go to dude ranches, as Klick's have a lot of clients who are only moderately well off. And of course they also have some wealthy ones too. But anyone who can afford any sort of vacation away from home can afford a dude ranch.

Being in the grain elevator business we get a good chance to sample the opinion of our farmers on this subject. We find that by far the majority are not only in favor of preserving the wilderness areas such as the Lincoln Back County, but they are quite vociferous in their opposition to any dam in the Sun River Canyon, such as at Lower Sun Butte or Castle Reef. This is understandable when one realizes that the Sun River Canyon is the best and most widely used access area to the Bob Marshall from this side of the mountains. (There are really three even fairly good access routes on this side-Sun River, Benchmark and via the Teton—the Sun route gets most of the volume). These ranchers use this route to go fishing and hunting, and they don't want it disturbed—same of course is true of the hunters and fishermen in and around the city of Great Falls.

I will not repeat the point that this area is particularly fragile, as this has been covered by others, but it is true. We visited on a pack trip four years ago, this back country about the first of July. Heavy rains had occurred the week before, and erosion was evident in many places. Roads, timber cutting, any sort of 'rearranging' nature, would cause very heavy erosion in much of the Lincoln back country area. Also, as has been stated, the streams are small, and would not stand heavy fishing without repeated stocking—and there are already too many streams in "open" areas that need restocking now, more than can be accommodated.

If letters to other Senators would help, please advise.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

C. B. ANDERSON.

KALISPELL, MONT., *September 30, 1968.*

U.S. SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I submit this statement to you relative to S1121, proposing to establish as wilderness the Lincoln Back Country. I am past president of the Montana Wildlife Federation, a former National representative to the National Wildlife Federation, am a member of the Board of directors of the Montana Wilderness Association. Almost 30 years, or ⅔rds of my life has been involved in wilderness recreation. At the present time I am Chairman of the State Advisory Committee on Recreation of the Montana Fish & Game Commission.

I sincerely support and urge your endorsement and support of S1121. I believe that this bill resulted from recommendations and suggestions of sportsmen, wilderness supporters and conservationists. The area involves land in three different National Forests. Some of us suggested that reconsideration be made of this area,

after a report from the supervisor of one of the National Forests directly affected the future of this area.

I believe that much of the opposition to the Bill comes from those timber interests that actually endorse wilderness where there is no timber whatsoever. Wilderness is like priceless porcelain—once destroyed or invaded, never replaceable. I sincerely submit that a true wilderness area of necessity must have defined boundaries, must include some timber and water areas. The portion of a wilderness area that can be used and enjoyed by man is primarily water-course areas.

The primary question and issue as to the Lincoln Back Country is what is its primary value. The timber species in the area is primarily fir, lodgepole and some spruce. The cost ratio of constructing roads to required specifications for the harvest of this timber lowers the timber economic value considerably. This area is now accessible for quality recreational use, and with further trial construction and maintenance will enhance its recreational use value. Also it will not adversely affect the fishery problem that is so peculiar to much of our mountainous portion of Montana. Due to the cold water temperature, limited food supply, and limited species of fish that can survive and propogate, roads have adversely affected such fisheries in Montana.

I believe that mass recreational use—motorist use of an area—requires blacktop roads, expensive construction and maintenance; and also the "people" problems that results from road invasion. Many areas that now have roads are in dire need of such development before the motorist of today accepts such an area.

This area is not replaceable as a wilderness use. It has a high value as an area of the whole for wilderness, negligible value as a whole for timber or other use. Without the low quality timber area as part of the whole, it would be much like "macaroni without the cheese".

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT C. SYKES,
Judge, District Court.

TROUT UNLIMITED.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Yellowstone and Montana Chapters of Trout, Unlimited are most seriously concerned in regard to the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal and request this letter be made a part of the hearing record.

Under Wilderness status protection of the five wilderness rivers concerned would be assured. This must be done to protect spawning grounds of one of the few remaining native stocks of the cutthroat trout from the erosion of road construction and development.

The lakes in the area as well as the small streams now provide excellent fishing and other recreational benefits. The opening up of access to this area would result in severe deterioration of this as they are not of nature that will support intensive use.

Any opening up of a wilderness area immediately destroys for all time its wilderness value, and at the same time destroys the industry based upon the wilderness condition.

The opening up of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area seems to us a short sighted action when one balances its tremendous present value against the very limited value gained by altering its status.

Yours very sincerely,

WELLS MORRIS, Jr.,
President, Montana Chapter.
WARREN SHEPARD,
President, Yellowstone Chapter.

BIGFORK, MONT., *September 20, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Senate Interior Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: This is in regard to the hearing that you are holding September 23 in Great Falls on S. 1121 to make the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area a part of the Wilderness System.

I am a rancher and also do some guiding and outfitting. I have been in the Lincoln Back Country. It is a fine area of wild country that should be left undeveloped for wilderness use. Part of it can't be logged and a scenic road be put through it without ruining the whole area for guiding and outfitting purposes. More than 20 outfitters now make a living for themselves and their families taking guests into this area. They gross about ¼ million dollars a year. This important industry would be destroyed if the area is developed.

I support S. 1121 to make the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain a Wilderness Area.

Sincerely,

GENE SULLIVAN.

MISSOULA COUNTY TRADES & LABOR COUNCIL,
Missoula, Mont., September 17, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEE: At a meeting of the Missoula County Trades & Labor Council on Thursday, September 12, 1968 we voted to oppose the proposed wilderness classification for the Lincoln Back Country and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests.

We would much rather have the Forest Service put their proposed management for Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area plan into effect. We would rather see the area opened up so more people would be able to use the area in recreation, managed logging and a scenic drive such as the Forest Service proposed.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD WISE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

CITIZENS STATE BANK,
Hamilton, Mont., September 20, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: It is our understanding that you and members of your committee will have a hearing in Great Falls, Montana, on Monday, September 23, for the purpose of hearing arguments pro and con concerning plans to develop or leave alone, the proposed 240,500 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. It is impossible for us to appear in person, hence this letter to outline our thinking on this matter.

We are opposed to the inclusion of this 240,500 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat area being included as a part of the Bob Marshall Wilderness complex.

We have a population explosion in the United States. Furthermore, work weeks have been shortened and vacations lengthened and everything indicates that this situation will continue. The citizens of this great United States of ours have more leisure time than ever before in the history of our nation. With this leisure time, they want to enjoy the great outdoors. If it isn't readily available, to them, for access, by roads, trails and facilities, it is impossible for them to enjoy the benefits of this great outdoors as their time is limited and they plan on seeing a number of attractions during their vacation. A few, and I'm sure it is a very few, of the privileged class of people in the United States, can take three weeks or a month off and either hike or arrange for an expensive pack train trip to take them into wilderness areas. These trips are too rugged for women and children and the average male. Wilderness areas, therefore, limit the use of the area to a very, very small percentage of our population.

We believe that these areas should be opened up so the man on the street can enjoy them. That roads should be constructed, facilities provided and access available. Our two National Parks, Yellowstone and Glacier, here in Montana, are typical examples of this type of utilization.

We are heartedly in accord with the suggestions for the development of this area, as outlined in the 1968 edition entitled, "Patterns for Management Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area," "Lolo-Helena-Lewis and Clark National Forests," which was just recently published by the United States Forest Service and which I feel sure you have a copy of in your files. We need more recreational areas for our people instead of more wilderness area, with its stringent develop-

ment restrictions, which in actuality make it practically physically impossible for the average citizen of the United States of America to view the area.

Yours very truly,

V. C. HOLLINGSWORTH, *President.*

EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE,
Billings, Mont., September 19, 1968.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Since I shall not be able to attend the meeting of the committee holding a hearing at Great Falls, Montana on Sept. 25th. on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal, I wish to have this letter entered as a part of the hearing printed record.

I wish to report to the committee my belief that this Lincoln-Scapegoat Area of 240,000 acres be made a part of the wilderness. This area should not be opened to mass recreation and timber harvesting, but should be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations under the wilderness proposal. Since man's activity in the past has been much limited in this area, it provides a tremendous place where one may enjoy solitude among the beautiful scenic mountains and valleys containing an abundance of wildlife. Let us keep it wild!

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. GLOEGE,
Professor of Chemistry.

SHERIDAN COUNTY SPORTSMAN CLUB,
Plentywood, Mont., September 20, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Care of Rainbow Hotel,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The Sheridan County Sportsman Club want to go on record as wholeheartedly supporting your Senate bill #1121 and Congressman Battin's bill #7148 in preserving the Lincoln Back Counrty as a wilderness area.

Sincerely yours,

BERNT F. WARD, *Sceretary.*

MISSOULA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Missoula, Mont., September 19, 1968.

RESOLUTION

To: Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator Henry M. Jackson, Chairman.
Public Lands Subcommittee, Senator Quentin N. Burdick, Chairman.
From: The Missoula Chamber of Commerce, Missoula, Mont.

Whereas we believe the economic development of Montana depends in large part upon the development of national forest lands with multiple use values for optimum return as long as such management is consistent with conservation principles, and

Whereas the area proposed by S. 1121 is not of wilderness character but better suited to management under the multiple-use concept as recommended by the U.S. Forest Service, and

Whereas the resources of the area are vital to the recreational and economic needs of Western Montana, and

Whereas the full development and use of the area would benefit both the local and national economics and render the 950,000 acre Bob Marshall Wilderness area more useable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, Missoula, Montana, opposes the enactment of Senate bill 1121 for the following reasons:

1. The establishment of Wilderness Areas on the national forests by legislation, in direct opposition to the recommendation of the agency charged with and well qualified to manage such lands for the greatest good, is improper.

2. Designation for the "Lincoln Back Country" area as Wilderness area would limit the recreational use to a limited few.

3. There is a pressing need for family-type recreation on the national forests in this area and we feel the recreational potential of the "Lincoln Back Country" should be developed for all the people who may wish, now or in the future, to travel therein by foot, horseback, boat, airplane or motor vehicle and to camp, hunt, fish, ski, or participate in other recreational activities.

4. The commercial stands of timber should be managed and used to make a proper contribution to the local and national economics. Trees are a soil crop and cannot be preserved.

5. Vast areas of Western Montana have already been reserved as wilderness. The recreational use provided by these areas is only one percent of the total use on the national forests. There is no need for more.

6. The withdrawal of such areas, best suited for multiple-use management, deprives the counties in which such national forest lands are created of revenue-sharing funds derived from the sale of timber. We maintain roads to service the areas leading to the national forests and schools to educate the children of families who work and play in such areas. We do not oppose the wilderness areas as such but believe the "Lincoln Back Country" deserves sensible and proper management.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 23, 1968.*

Senator BURDICK,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee, Cascade County Courthouse,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I feel that I must express my feelings concerning the decision your committee is considering on the Lincoln wilderness area. It is my feeling that enough of the area has been put on the wilderness program and that this particular area be reserved for the multiple use of the public. I feel that families should be allowed to utilize the various recreational facilities which can be developed if the area is kept for multiple recreational use. I feel that if this area were locked up in the wilderness program, that my children and I would certainly not benefit by your committee's action.

I certainly hope that you will consider these views since the Forest Service has done such an outstanding job in evaluating the area and has recommended that the Lincoln Forest area be utilized for multiple recreational use.

Respectfully,

AL D. PONTRELLI.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am writing with regard to the proposed establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness in the area north of Lincoln in western Montana.

I have been a citizen of Montana for the past twenty years, during which time I have served as a microbiologist on the staff of the Rocky Mountain Laboratory, U.S. Public Health Service, at Hamilton, Montana. My wife and I moved to Hamilton from Lincoln, Nebraska in 1948. At that time, we intended to stay in Montana only five years, as a maximum, because of the seeming remoteness and isolation of this area. As time went on, however, we soon became very fond of Montana's remoteness, the beauty of its mountains, lakes and streams, and the peace and tranquility of its forests. Now we consider this state as our permanent home and hope to be able to remain here.

Naturally we believe strongly on the preservation of our existing wilderness areas and the establishment of new areas of this kind wherever possible. Few, if any, other states are blessed as Montana is blessed in still having large tracts of land not yet showing the scars of civilization. It seems to me very short-sighted if we, as a nation, do not consider that the greatest value of these lands lies in the recreational pleasures that they, if kept in their present natural state, can give to many generations of Americans, most of them yet unborn.

Senator Eugene McCarthy, in his remarks after the tragic slaying of Robert Kennedy, mentioned that our country is no longer a frontier state. This is true in many different ways—probably some that even he did not have in mind at the time. In this period of our history when we see so frequently the barbaric acts

that stem from crowdedness in the cities, I consider it increasingly important that we preserve as much of our virgin frontier country as we can. People need some means of "secape" for a few days or weeks of each year. More and more they are seeking this escape in the out-of-doors.

In line with these thoughts, I urge you to consider carefully establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness, in accordance with Senate bill 1121. I would like this testimony to be made a part of the permanent hearing record on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT K. GERLOFF.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN LABORATORY,
Hamilton, Mont.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am presently a resident of Montana working for the National Institutes of Health. As a former resident of Chicago, Philadelphia, Denver and San Diego, I am especially conscious of the population pressure and the need for preservation of wilderness areas in their natural state. I believe that such a preservation can be effected for the longest time under the National Wilderness System and urge you to include into this system the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121.

I wish to have this testimony made part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. COE, M.D.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Joe Strnisha. I own and operate a farm in the beautiful Bitter Root Valley, just five miles south east of Hamilton on Skalkaho hi-way No. 38. I came to Hamilton with my parents in the year of 1912 and made this my home ever since. I am proud to say that I had the Honor of serving our Ravalli County in the State Legislature in 1957 and again in 1959 sessions at Helena, Montana.

I understand that on June the 11th there will be a congressional hearing held in Great Falls on Senate bill 1121 introduced by Senators Mansfield and Metcalf, which will authorize for wilderness classification 240,500 acres of National Forest land comprising the Lincoln Back Country and parts of Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests.

I sincerely regret that I will not be able to attend the hearing regarding the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Wilderness area. However, I do feel that I must express my views on this most important piece of legislation, I am a firm believer in conservation; I believe we must not only live for the present, but we must look to the future, and preserve some of the beauty of nature and the valuable natural resources and recreational values for posterity. Let us be good stewards of all that God has given us.

I am an ardent hunter and fisherman, I love the beauty of our mountains and streams. I just don't think this generation should reap all that is good and leave a wreckage of devastation behind for our future generations. All one has to do is to go hunting, fishing, hiking, or just take a ride in your car and go to the mountains, there you will see hundreds of miles of useless roads, gouged out hillsides and otherwise marred, timberless bald hills, dealt by the hand of man who it would seem cares for nothing other than the monetary gain involved there-in.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to urge your committee to report most favorably for the passage of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Wilderness area, Senate bill 1121, to the Congress of the United States of America for this real important and much needed piece of legislation. Thank you

Sincerely yours,

JOE STRNISHA.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 22, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

THE HONORABLE SENATOR BURDICK: I am writing this statement in support of legislation that will place the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area into the Bob Marshall Wilderness System and request that the following be read into the Congressional Record.

I am a lifetime resident of Lincoln, as my family before me. My grandparents came here in the 1800's. This I believe gives me a look at the past and present developments of the Lincoln area.

I am presently engaged in cattle ranching and commercial flying at Lincoln.

I am quite familiar with the Lincoln Back-Country area having camped and hiked in it for many years. I also fly over the area often and have a chance to view it from a different realm than most. Therefore, I believe it would fit perfectly into the Bob Marshall Wilderness System.

I have observed how the Forest Service has developed and managed the area surrounding Lincoln and if the same system were used in the Lincoln Back-Country, I am certain it would only ravish it of its natural resources and prevent it from being used as a wilderness area. As for the future development of campgrounds, scenic roads, motocycle trails, and snowmobile trails, I am certain that the balance of the area of western Montana excluding that area in the wilderness system, would be more than able to be developed and take care of the people's need for multipurpose recreation for many years to come.

I have heard the argument that wilderness areas are used mostly by the well-to-do. I know this not to be true from my own experience as well as from facts found in studies made pertaining to income, vacation time, occupations, and family situations. The following are some of these facts and their source.

1. The income distribution between easy access campers (i.e., pickup campers, trailer houses, etc.) wilderness visitors show no statistically significant difference. Wilderness campers are not disproportionately more wealthy than roadside campers. From *The Social Characteristics of Participants in Three Styles of Family Camping*, by William R. Burch, Jr. and Wiley D. Wenger, Jr., U.S. Forest Service Research Paper PNW–48, 1967, p. 19.

2. Evidence indicates that persons with less than one week of vacation time are *overrepresented* among wilderness campers and persons with three weeks of vacation time are *underrepresented*. Those with one month or more vacation are as likely to be roadside campers as they are wilderness campers. From the above source, p. 19.

3. A study of users at various wilderness areas in Montana revealed that the business-professional-technical categories of occupation (where one expects the greatest affluence and most leisure time) made up only about 43 percent of the total visitor. The remaining 57 percent was composed of teachers, students, craftsmen, laborers, and military personnel. Taken from *The Wilderness User in Three Montana Areas* by L. C. Merriam, Jr. and R. B. Ammons, published by the School of Forestry, University of Minnesota. Data from p. 25.

4. In the study cited in Note 3, those persons interviewed who had the lowest family income (under $5,000) visited wilderness areas at rate ranging from two to four times that of their rate of visits to auto campgrounds. (Taken from the study cited in Note 3, p. 24.)

5. A study by a sociologist suggests that wilderness visits, rather than being controlled by available income or time, is related to certain periods in a family's life. Wilderness users are generally those just beginning their families or whose children have grown up and left home. No forest-related recreation activity represents a majority "vote" of the American people; all forest recreation groups are minorities, though cumulatively, they comprise a sizable majority. Taken from "Wilderness—The Life Cycle and Forest Recreational Choice," William R. Burch, Jr., *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 64, No. 9, Sept. 1966, pp. 606–610.

In view of the above statements and other conclusions I don't believe roads or any development other than wilderness would be suitable for the Lincoln Back-country Area. I am opposed to any designation other than wilderness.

Yours truly,

C. E. GRANTIER, Jr.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 9, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This statement is in reference to S. 1121 regarding Lincoln Back Country in Montana. I strongly urge that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be included in Wilderness classification.

Others will surely point out the scientific and economic advantages of halting the exploitation of this beautiful land.

My plea is a more personal one. For several years now my sons, their friends and I have spent much time in this great country. Once destroyed it can never be restored. Such country as this is in short supply now. How desperately it will be needed in just a few years! Short term economic interests devour the people's birthright!

How we hope that next year as we stand high in the clouds of Scapegoat, there will be on threat of dozer and chain-saw.

Sincerely,

WM. J. NORMAN, M.D.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1968.

Members of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate and all interested parties.

GENTLEMEN: I am strongly opposed to the enactment of the Senate Bill 1121 which would provide for the wilderness classification of 204,500 acres of U.S. Forest land in Montana for the following reasons:

First, the bill would provide for single use of a great natural resource to the economic detriment of the business enterprises and individuals living in the surrounding area.

Second, the area, I believe, is well managed by the Department of Agriculture-U.S. Forest Service, who, I believe, have managed the use of our natural resource to the fullest extent, thereby providing recreation, water, wildlife, wood, minerals and grazing use each in the proper perspective.

In elaboration of my objections, the effect upon the national economy is well documented. However, I would like to express my views on the effect of the enactment of this bill on the economy of the immediate area.

Most of the communities in the surrounding area have populations of from 1,000 to 2,000 people. The loss of employment of 120 family heads would reduce the economic stability of the area by some 10% on the average. In a time when Montana generally is showing an annual increase in earning capacity of from 5% to 12% the communities affected would be drained of this capacity by some 10%. This situation coupled with the cost-price squeeze and the 4% annual cost of living increase could take the profit out of many of the existing business enterprises, causing further unemployment and additional local tax burdens on the remaining family units.

The communities affected are very dependent on just two major industries that of logging and ranching. For many of the logging and ranching operations the curtailment of capacity to earn, through curtailed cutting and grazing rights respectively, could mean the difference between operating at a reasonable profit and ultimate liquidation. Logging is caught in the same cost-price squeeze as all other industry and to survive must depend on increased capacity. It is also a well known economic fact that the smaller ranch unit must increase capacity if it is to survive. Since the smaller ranch units for the most part are under capitalized they must depend upon Federal grazing rights and State grazing rights to provide them the means necessary to increase their capacity. The bill in question would curtail capacity to earn for both of these industries at a time when increased capacity is most important.

We in the area in question are not naive enough to think that a wilderness classification of the area would bring in a great influx of tourism to offset the loss of existing earning capacity by the substitution of one industry for a good portion of our existing industries. In fact we have completed several feasibility studies of the area and although they point to the fact that tourism is the only industry we can expect to develop in the near future this industry will be slow in maturing. By continued multiple use of the area I feel we could expect to sustain our present economy while experiencing some small measure of growth through development of tourism. Thereby providing the greatest use for the greatest number of people.

I therefore strongly feel that the Department of Agriculture-U.S. Forest Service should be allowed to continue its fine program of multiple use of the area in question and that Senate Bill 1121 should not be enacted.

Very truly yours,

DONALD R. POWELL,
Cashier-Director, First National Bank of White Sulphur Springs, and President, Meagher County Corp.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *March 16, 1967.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing in regard to your proposal to include the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat in the Bob Marshall Wilderness. I feel this will benefit a minority of the people of Montana. I don't feel we should shape our state for the benefit of the out of State Sportsman. I feel the packers have commercialized on this area for years and seem to feel they own it now. The average Montanan can't afford to own horses and pasture and feed it for a ride in the wilderness. My family and I ride trail bikes and snowmobiles along with a lot of our friends and this country gives us lots of pleasure. I feel this proposal is directly aimed at us and many in our likeness. I hope you will study both sides of this situation more carefully.

Sincerely,

VIC L. EHNES.

SPOKANE, WASH., *September 18, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls City Council Civic Center, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I have been reading the publicity concerning the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area in Montana. I am much concerned about two bills in the Congress which will authorize wilderness classification to approximately 240,500 acres of present National Forest Land in that area. The bills are S. 1121, Metcalf, 2–28–67 and H.R. 7148, Battin, 3–14–67. I understand you will conduct a hearing at Great Falls, Montana, on September 25, 1968, looking into the advisability of the proposed change in classification of these lands.

As a resident of Missoula, Montana, for over 20 years I served all that time in the U.S. Forest Service as assistant to the Regional Forester and as Acting Regional Forester for about two years during the period of the second world war. I am familiar with all the area under consideration. After considerable thought and study of the pros and cons, I question the advisability of tying up in wilderness classification, over 240,000 acres of National Forest land which can be managed to such great public benefit under the common sense plan of multiple use as practiced by the Forest Service. I know this area and agree strongly with the present management. I think the area should be left in its present classification as a means of bringing forth the maximum public benefit from these public lands. In that area there is a great need for the broader aspects of the multiple use plan of management.

While I am now a resident of Spokane, Washington, I feel that this is a matter of broad national concern, not confined to the citizens of Montana, alone. I have written my thoughts to Senator Henry M. Jackson, Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, since I understand the Great Falls hearing is held under authority of that Committee.

Thanking you for your kind consideration, I remain,

Very sincerely,

CLYDE S. WEBB.

POLLOCK, IDAHO, *September 19, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Committee,
Great Falls City Council Civic Center,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: In regards to your letter about making 240,500 acres into wilderness I'm fully against this project. It seems they already have plenty in wilderness now. I would like to see bills H.R. 7148 and S. 1121 defeated and the area be left as it is.

Sincerely yours,

LOY O. HOLLENBEAK.

ST. MARIES, IDAHO,
September 19, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I do not feel that it would be in the public interest to enact the Bills now before the Congress, S. 1121 and H.R. 7140.

I am well acquainted with part of the area and have a good general knowledge of the whole. I agree that there are some grand and beautiful vistas; these are not confined to this area alone. There are also great areas of valuable merchantable timber and vast areas of equally valuable grazing land. This nation is surely going to run out of both, sooner than we think. The area has been well cared for by the U.S. Forest Service down through the years, and I am sure that under the Multiple Use Act it will continue to receive the same careful management for all compatible uses. Further it will have improved access so that it will be more easily available to more people.

If the area is given Wilderness status the multiple use concept will be immediately defeated; in effect it will be locked up for the single use of recreation, limited to the use of those who are physically or financially able to make their way into it. Actually this land belongs to all the people. It should not be placed in the position that it cannot be enjoyed by all, if they so desire.

The Wilderness Act places restrictions on the use of mechanical equipment that severely inhibits the best, and most economical management. It precludes the use of mechanical equipment for fire suppression, and places impossible obstacles to the salvage of timber from disasters such as fire, insects, or hurricane.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. SCRIBNER.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN LABORATORY,
Hamilton, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am a commissioned officer in the Public Health Service at the Rocky Mountain Laboratory. My family moved to Montana in 1924 when I was 9 years old and I have lived here ever since except for a 10-year period, 1938–1948, when I was occupied by securing advanced scientific training and World War II. I have therefore hunted and fished and otherwise enjoyed the outdoors recreational aspects of Montana for about 44 years.

During this period of time I have witnessed the vastly increased utilization of the recreational resources and the timber, water and grazing resources as well. Western Montana has important water and timber resources which are important to the national as well as the local economy. However the single greatest resource, in my opinion, is simply space—space which is not cluttered up with highways and noise and fumes, space which contains some of the more beautiful scenery in this country, space which still contains clear, cold unspoiled streams and rivers and lakes which are full of trout for the taking, and woodlands and grasslands plentifully supplied with game for the hunter. In this time of rapidly increasing population pressure, the value of this kind of space for recreational purposes is steadily becoming greater.

Much of this high-quality space, and including the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness, is well suited to wilderness classification. Such action not only preserves the area as a needed high-quality recreational area but also as a vital watershed area. In most such areas, and specifically in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area under consideration, the timber and grazing values involved are relatively low. If steps are not taken now to preserve the unique and increasingly important recreational aspects of such areas, they will inevitably be utilized in piecemeal fashion for such other less important resources as they may contain. In my opinion the failure now to include such wilderness areas in the present wilderness system will represent a serious misuse of our finite natural resources and an irrevocable use of a high-quality resource for short-term and low priority purposes. The future economic viability of western Montana as well as the mental health of our nation are much better served, in my opinion, by the preservation of unique recreational areas rather than by exploitation of their current limited values of timber and grazing.

I therefore urge that the 240,500 acres described in S1121 and known as the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be included in the National Wilderness System and I ask that this letter be made part of the permanent record of testimony on this subject.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD A. ORMSBEE.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Since I cannot attend the September 23d meeting, or I should say, congressional hearing in Great Falls on Senate bill 1121, I hereby urge that these 240,500 acres be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

This bill, introduced by Senators Mansfield and Metcalf, would be a big boon to Montana as it would offer thousands of acres for high-quality outdoor recreation.

Also, I wish this testimony to be made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY B. WISEMAN,
Co-Owner, Dairy Queen.

Senator METCALF,
Senator BURDICK,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I would like to go on record as supporting S. 1121 a bill to make the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness a part of the national wilderness preservation system.

I have lived all my life in the community of Lincoln and have always considered the back country as part of our way of life here. No place on earth holds the appeal to me as a better place to live because we have clean air, clear water and wilderness space to live in. I have always liked to hunt and fish and I cannot believe that roads and large crowds in the back country will help our wildlife but further reduce the place they live and must have in order to survive.

As a rancher in the Blackfoot valley we are becoming increasingly aware that more and more people are finding our country. They come here because the wilderness and wildlife that we still have has been destroyed in most of the states from which they have come. Always they remind us that we must somehow hold on to the very quality of wilderness that has made Montana unique among states.

I cannot in the final analysis imagine our valley without our wilderness. I therefore respectfully urge the passage of S. 1121.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD GEHRING, JR.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 22, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

THE HONORABLE SENATOR BURDICK: I would like it read into the Congressional hearing record that I am in favor of the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area being designated a wilderness area and preserving its natural beauty for our children and our grandchildren.

I have lived in the Lincoln Valley for the past six years. In the short span of these six years, I have seen much of our beautiful valley fall into waste and destruction. We used to have a beautiful view out our southern windows. Now we see the scarred mountains and the wind-rowed brush where once trees stood. In these few years much of the timber has been harvested, mountains clear cut and roads made and left for erosion to take over.

I hope that our back country can be protected from this so that when my children are older they will still have a place to go to and see the wonders of nature in its natural form. So that they can look at its vastness and know the beauty of God's creation.

Yours truly,

MARION L. GRANTIER.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Bruce King, a teacher at Hamilton High School in industrial arts and mechanical drawing.

I feel that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area should be retained in its natural wild condition. Herein are reasons for my thinking so:

1. The wildlife community's ecology would remain intact.
2. Timber harvesters would be prevented from scarring the hillsides with their access routes.
3. The damage from motor vehicles would be prevented if the wilderness designation was there.

My plea is to make the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System. Please make this testimony part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

BRUCE KING.

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA, *July 1, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I have heard that the period for submitting statements to the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country hearing has been extended. I welcome the opportunity to submit a statement and respectfully request that it be made a part of the permanent hearing record.

My home is in Hamilton, Montana, and I am acquainted with many of the beautiful wild areas of Montana and appreciate them more and more. The Lincoln-Scapegoat is a treasure that will become more valuable as the demand for high quality recreation areas increases if we can preserve it in its present pristine condition.

Respectfully,

J. FREDERICK BELL, M.D.

GONZAGA UNIVERSITY,
Spokane, Wash., June 25, 1968.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am a student at Gonzaga University in my junior year. For the past two summers I have been employed by the U.S. Forest Service as a fire control assistant. In this time I have come to enjoy and appreciate the value of Wilderness Areas.

I have seen firsthand the ravages and desecration that result when an area of forest is left unprotected and open to the abuses of logging, mining, and grazing. I therefore urge that the 240,000 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System, in an effort to preserve one of the few remaining large tracts of virgin land that exist in this country, so that I and the generations that follow me may remember America as it was and have a place in which to appreciate the true wonder and beauty of nature.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL F. BELL.

HAMILTON, MONT.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Eldon Wildey from Hamilton, Montana. I have lived here for 30 years and am employed by Safeway Store, Inc.

I feel that it is a privilege to be able to speak out in favor of this great Lincoln Back Country in the National Wilderness System. We use the out-of-doors extensively here in the Hamilton area and also other areas through out Montana, and realize that the wilderness classified areas really are the only ones which we can count on as being wild and undeveloped when our kids grow old enough to enjoy them.

With an ever growing population in this country we look to the Forest Service to guard our wild lands with a jealous eye and expect them to take a dim view of roading and "developing" nature's treasure house of outdoor recreation opportunities.

I wish to have this statement made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

ELDON WILDEY.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: In August of 1964 I retired from the United States Air Force and came to Hamilton to live. We have a small business here, the Dairy Queen. Additionally I was a licensed Guide in Idaho during 1964 and 1965 and also have guided many sight-seeing and hunting trips since in Montana.

Knowing the Selway-Bitterroot/Pintlar Wilderness Areas and watching what is going on here in the vicinity of Hamilton with regards to the destruction of Our National Forests that are not in the Wilderness system is indeed the most heartbreaking experience of my life. An example is the road built in the last two years connecting Rye Creek with the South Fork of the Skalkaho, for one purpose, the lumber industry. Another example is the road to be built next year from the South Fork of Skalkaho towards Fox Peak on the Divide Trail. This road is to be used to cut out, of all things, lodgepole pine. The scenic beauty of this small area and the game that abounded therein is now history. These examples are small when compared to others now in progress or programmed in the near future in this once great Northwest. If we are to preserve the scenic beauty of our majestic forests and their animal habitat it is mandatory that we take immediate steps to stop this wanton destruction on what little this country has left of Mother Nature's creations. This can only be done by declaring as much of Our National Forests as possible Wilderness Areas now! Tomorrow will be too late!

In view of the above, I strongly urge that the 240,500 acres described in Senate bill 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness Area System!

Pelase make this communication a part of the permanent hearing record.

Thank You.

Respectfully,

LEE V. WISEMAN,
Colonel, USAF (Retired).

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 19, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: My family would like to express it's strong support for classifying the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country a Wilderness Area.

I am a retired U.S. Navy officer and we bought property and moved to Montana several years ago because it is one of the few places remaining in the United States where man has not ravaged the earth and atmosphere. However, in the last 15 years we have been appalled by what is happening to much of the land.

As is generally the case, special interest groups are better organized and financed than the general public so their viewpoints most often prevail. In the case at hand I am speaking specifically of the lumber industry. Their sales pitch is always how much money will be introduced into the local economy by reducing every available tree into board feet of lumber. No doubt there is some sawable timber in this proposed Wilderness Area, but the short term gain by such a venture would never compensate for the loss of the long haul.

If we do not soon stop skinning every mountainside there is not going to be any tourism nor lumber industry. People are just not going to come to Montana to gaze upon clear cuts and bulldozed mountainsides. They can see all the barren hills they care to from downtown Burbank. We just plain owe it to future generations to preserve what few remaining virgin areas we have, and God only knows they are few and small when we contemplate the numbers of people who will be seeking their use in the immediate future.

We live along Route 93 and we have been amazed at the increase in number of tourists in the past few years. People, especially from the big cities, are almost frantic to get "back to nature" if only for a short time each year. In my opinion, the area will stand to gain much more financially in the long run by keeping this area in it's wilderness state. Even more important however, is the moral issue at stake, or simply stated "the greatest good for the greatest number." The classification of this 240,500 acres as Wilderness Area is without doubt the proper answer.

Sincerely,

KEITH J. EVANS.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 14, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Ivy Oertli of Hamilton, Montana. I own and operate my own beauty salon in Hamilton.

One cannot live in Hamilton and not eventually become aware of the importance of wilderness to the people. We live near the great Bitterroot Selway Wilderness and I know how many people appreciate the opportunity to enjoy the area.

Here in the Bitterroot we are concerned about logging practices which go on and it looks as if the only treed country we will have left will be that that is protected under the National Wilderness System. Therefore, I heartily endorse the idea of including the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back country in the National Wilderness system so that its great recreational resources will be available for a very long time.

I wish to have this statement made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

IVY OERTLI.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 15, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My name is Walter Smith. I have just completed my tour of duty with the USMC and am presently enrolled in the University of Montana.

The great dream of so many of the Marines as we lay in the mud in Vietnam was to get back and hunt and fish in the Montana Wilderness. The memory of the forests, clear skies and mountains kept us going.

This was part of the freedom we were fighting for. As a memorial for the supreme sacrifice of the thirty or more boys who won't get back please keep the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in the National Wilderness System. Montana should do no less to honor them.

I want to put myself on the permanent hearing record as supporting this proposal.

Yours truly,

WALTER M. SMITH.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 15, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My name is Sam Smith, a Senior at Hamilton High School, and a member of the Montana Youth Conservation Council.

Last year we started an Outing Club to encourage high school students to get out and avail themselves of the fun and beauty of the Wilderness Areas in our vicinity. Evening meetings were held where speakers came to inform us in many areas of forest recreation, management, wildlife and conservation. We enjoyed our meetings and the hikes tremendously. Last Spring many of us were able to attend the Montana Youth Conservation Council Meeting in Great Falls and we were delighted to find that there were Hundreds of other students in Montana who wanted to preserve our wilderness areas.

As these areas are becoming rarer and the number of us young people are increasing in number and in appreciation of their need for these areas, we urge that the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

I would be proud if this testimony could be made part of the permanent Hearing record.

Sincerely,

Sam Smith
SAMUEL B. SMITH.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 15, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Mrs. Robert Smith, housewife and mother of five children from Hamilton, Montana. I welcome this opportunity to express my views on the proposal to include the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country in the National Wilderness System.

The Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness is right in our back yard and we are able to observe first hand the use that this area gets and to know from our own experience what a wonderful thing it is to have these wild areas. Our children as they are growing up are using the wilderness more and more. One son is a member of the Montana Youth Conservation Council and is actively working to preserve these wilderness areas for his peer group and his children.

The Lincoln country represents another opportunity for the Forest Service to increase our reservoir of the highest quality outdoor recreation areas and I heartily endorse the proposal to include the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in the National Wilderness System.

I wish to have this statement made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

BETTYE M. SMITH.
Mrs. Robert Smith.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 17, 1968.*

SENATOR QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Gilbert Jelinek, linotypist residing at Hamilton, Montana. I wish you would include this statement supporting the designation and ultimate inclusion of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as a part of the National Wilderness System in the Hearing record.

Inclusion of the area in the Wilderness System appears to be the only way that we can prevent man from ravaging, destroying and exploiting the last small remnants of wildness, charm and remoteness disappearing from the Nation's landscape.

There is ample evidence of man's destructive and exploitive motives in Ravalli County, where I reside. Approximately seventy-five percent of the land area of this county is public lands under the administration of the U.S. Forest Service. These lands are fast losing their natural beauty and becoming very unsightly by being eroded and scarred by roads, skid trails, clearcutting and other unsatisfactory exploitive forestry practices.

To prevent like unsightly conditions being created by destructive practices, I hope and urge that your Committee will see fit to protect the public's interest in the land and the many valuable wilderness beauties and characteristics of this area by concurring that it would be in the best public interest to designate the Lincoln-Scapegoat country as a wilderness area.

Very sincerely yours,

GILBERT JELINEK.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

SENATOR QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My name is Mark Evans and I have a furniture store on Main street in Hamilton. I am a native of Illinois and moved to Hamilton 14 years ago after hunting and fishing in the area for several years. I chose this area after careful study of the many areas of the west near wilderness tracts. It is my firm belief, bolstered by hundreds of out-of-state visitors who come into our store that the greatest asset we have is unspoiled scenery and wilderness.

In the years we have been here there has been a tremendous loss of beauty and wilderness acreage due to the shortsighted policies of the Forest Service and the pressure of the timber cutters. Some of the best of the Selway-Bitterroot and Anaconda-Pintlar areas were left out when they were reclassified. It is of the utmost urgency that we include the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121

in the National Wilderness System. Our National Parks are bursting at the seams with tourists and our nation is bordering on anarchy because of the crush of too many people. More parks and wilderness is one way to relieve the strains of civilization. We must in particular save the few wilderness areas we have left for the enjoyment of the masses who are coming on with more time to spend than ever before in history.

The timeworn argument of the sawdust people that we must not lock up any more timber since so few get into the wilderness is ridiculous. Just take a trip up any canyon around this area and see all the pack strings going in and out, the hunting camps set up. In fact litterbugs are already a problem. Wilderness is one thing we Americans cannot make, we can only save the little we have left by action now.

Please include my remarks in the permanent hearing record.

Respectfully,

MARK EVANS.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 17, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The public of Western Montana in the last 15 days has been barraged by the opponents of wilderness in newspapers, on TV editorials, at civic club meetings and even in school class rooms. The timber industry and its hand maiden, the Forest Service, protest *too much.* Using the same time-worn, hackneyed arguments such as multiple use, let all the public drive in to see the country, locking up resources; all being drug across the stage again like "dead cats."

We, who live in the Bitterroot Valley, have come to the conclusion that the only multiple use, outside of Wilderness protection, is clear cutting. Drive down into our valley and gaze at the mountains on every side now hopelessly scarred and I'm sure you would vote for putting the Lincoln Back Country into Wilderness protection.

It is strange to me that one of the Forest Service proposals is a scenic highway through this most precious heritage. Send these anxious car tourists down to the Bitterroot and let them use all of our *scenic timber access roads* and let them gaze at acres and more acres of tree stumps and piled brush. We have miles and miles of Forest access roads where they can build camp grounds and provide untold space for Weiner roasts and beer busts.

If your committee wishes to leave part of America with a high quality recreational environment, the Lincoln Back Country is an increasingly rare opportunity to do so. You can insure this by giving it legal wilderness protection.

Yours truly,

THOMAS A. FORD.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 20, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My name is Robert Smith and I am a biochemist at the U.S. Public Health Service laboratory in Hamilton, Montana.

I have never been in the Lincoln-Scapegoat country and can not offer specific arguments why this particular area should be given wilderness status. However, from what I read, specific features of this area are not strongly emphasized by either proponents or opponents of the proposal. It seems to be another campaign in the familiar contest between those who oppose wilderness in general because it puts some of our natural resources out of reach of commercial exploitation and those who favor wilderness areas because they preserve certain esthetic values. I think that it is extremely unfortunate that the U.S. Forest Service in Region 1 seems to be oriented toward commercial exploitation.

In this case the opponents of wilderness seem to be relying heavily on the pseudo-utilitarian argument that putting an area in wilderness is discriminatory because only those who have a horse or can carry a pack are able to use it. While this true, it is not a convincing argument against wilderness. In the first place, those with access to a horse and those who can carry a pack are a large and growing number. They should not be deprived of their enjoyment in the name

of equal justice for all. In the second place, there are already vast areas of national, state, and private forest that are laced with roads. The pleasure of those who like to drive around and look at the woods from a car or a snowmobile will not be notably increased by adding 3 or 4% to the millions of acres now available.

To those who love wilderness its value increases with size. The Lincoln-Scapegoat country, like the Selway corridor, is particularly valuable because it is contiguous with a large existing wilderness. I strongly favor its inclusion in the national wilderness system.

I would like to have this statement made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

R. F. SMITH.

JUNE 5, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: We are the Bitterroot Packers and Guide Association of Bitterroot Valley. Sinve we spend a great deal of our time in hills we know the necessity of having wilderness area for the present time and also in the future for our children.

We want to go on record as urging that the 240,500 acres described in Senate bill 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

Sincerely,

BITTERROOT PACKERS ASSOCIATION,
GLEN HACKNEY, *President.*
RONALD GEBFORD, *Secretary.*

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My occupation is attorney; I am self-employed and serve as Assistant County Attorney and Juvenile Officer for Ravalli County, Montana.

I urge that the 240,500 acres described in S 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

My reasons are as follows:

(1) The history of our wilderness areas are that once they are gone, they are gone forever, and I believe future generations should have a say in their administration of our heritage.

(2) Natural beauty is preserved by such areas and are of great lasting value to our whole country, not something to be desecrated for short term gain of a few.

(3) I further do not believe, because of our population increase, that we can have too much such area set aside for recreation and scientific study.

(4) In time to come the area's economic value to our County and State will far outweigh present commercial concepts.

Sincereiy,

GERALD D. SCHULTZ.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am an outdoor photographer-writer with my headquarters in Hamilton, Montana. I am a western Montana native and intimately familiar with land problems of Montana.

I believe that the proposed 240,500 acres known as the Lincoln-Scapegoat country described in Senate Bill 1121 should be preserved as a Wilderness in our National Wilderness Preservation System and respectfully request that this letter be made part of the hearing record.

I feel that all of the potentials now offered by the Lincoln-Scapegoat area definitely places it in the category of the values which have established our National Wilderness Area System.

Sincerely,

ERNST PETERSON.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My experience for forty years as an employee of the U.S. Forest Service in the capacity of Ranger and Forest Supervisor prompts me to strongly support establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness area.

Since my retirement from the Forest Service in 1955 I have maintained an active interest in local, state and national conservation and natural resource management affairs. I am well acquainted with the timber, wildlife, aesthetic and other values within the area.

If the area is subjected to the usual logging and other commercial exploitive uses, the wildlife, recreational, scenic and other values will be seriously impaired.

Present day forestry and logging practices that I have observed on National forest and private lands are creating unsightly appearances on the landscape. These unsatisfactory conditions occur as a result of the construction of a network of roads, dozer trails and clearcutting.

If natural beauty of all forest lands is to be maintained and restored to protect aesthetic, forestry, wildlife, recreation and other values, the public will be obliged to make vast financial investments to restore and maintain misused lands to their maximum state of productivity.

In view of what is occurring to forested lands that I am familiar with, it is obvious that the public interest would best be served by including the area in question in the wilderness system. If so designated, the minimum of public expense would be required to protect and administer the 240,500 acres involved.

I will appreciate having this letter included in the hearing record.

Sincerely,

G. M. BRANDBORG.

PLYMOUTH CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Helena, Mont., June 7, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR LEE: I'm not entirely aware of all the circumstances surrounding the Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal, but as a general rule, it does appear sound to consider the fact that these vanishing areas will not be around for our use in coming years and generations, unless we take steps now to preserve them.

Each summer, for the last several years, we have taken church youngsters of high school age, and also young adults on back-packing excursions into the Bob Marshall Wilderness area. I'm sure you don't need proof of the value this sort of experience provides for youth and adults.

Because we've known the advantages of this sort of experience, we would encourage the preservation and extension of this kind of area for the coming ones who will tramp these hills when we are gone.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. BURKHARDT, *Minister.*

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: May I introduce myself by stating we own a business in Hamilton, Montana, have acreage in Ravalli county and I serve as co-chairman of the Recreation Committee of the Bitter Root Valley Resource Conservation and Development Project.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area can, I believe, best serve the needs of our fellowman by retaining its natural condition not only for today, but for tomorrow. The trails that lead to our tomorrows must be prepared today. Passage of Senate Bill 1121 would be indicative of man's willingness to exercise the wisdom and intelligence to provide today for one of the trails that will perpetuate the path of tomorrows generations. We endorse the establishment of this wilderness area.

If so desired, this letter may be made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

ALICE R. HARBAUGH
Mrs. Gerald G. Harbaugh.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am LaVern B. Richard, guidance counselor in the elementary schools of Hamilton, Montana.

I believe that areas of the United States, such as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country, should be set aside and spared the depredation of commercialization. These areas esthetic value and recreational value that far outweighs its commercial value.

Therefore I urge that the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness Sytem.

I request that this testimony be made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

LAVERN B. RICHARD.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,

DEAR SIR: We are opposed to the opening of the Scapegoat Wilderness Area to logging and exploitation.

JOE C. AYERS.
HAZEL L. AYERS.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am the medical artist here at the Rocky Mountain Research Laboratory and in my off hours devote my time to the drawing, painting, sculpturing, and etching the animals of the West. I realize that an artist may learn in a class or in a museum or a zoo to paint animals and I take full advantage of all these sources. BUT I have found my finest inspiration after a trip to the wilderness.

Any area set aside to preserve our heritage is little enough for this country to do.

I certainly hope that this Lincoln-Scapegoat area be made part of the National Wilderness System. Any area that could augment the limited range of the grizzly bear is of the utmost importance.

I wish to have this letter made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN L. HAYES.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: We are indebted to local members of the Wilderness Society for calling our attention to the date of the hearing, as we would like to add our support to the efforts of those attempting to maintain and enlarge the wilderness areas of our country.

Having lived in European and South American countries and seen the absence of wilderness areas and the indifference toward this type of preservation of natural resources for future generations, we especially appreciate the still untouched areas of the U.S.

In light of this week's assassination of Sen. Kennedy, and the recent murder of Dr. King, we feel that the therapeutic value of contact with nature should be a part of every child's life. The money spent on building roads and facilities for well-heeled tourists might much better be spent in bringing large contingents of underprivileged children from slum areas for trips into such regions as the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

SALLIE M. BRUTTO.
FRANK BRUTTO.

STEVENSVILLE, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Janie Canton, University student, born and raised on a Bitterroot stock ranch, and a frequent visitor on the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area. I have accompanied a number of parties on pack trips, and have helped guide and train people in riding, packing and camping on trail rides. From childhood I have accompanied my Grandfather on inspection trips over logging areas, livestock ranges, farmer irrigation reservoirs and other forest activities. I am shocked and alarmed at the destructive logging practices I see on every side. As much as fifteen percent of the land cut up with roads, and much more torn up with what they call terraces. After a few years they plant small trees, which in many cases die, often a mortality of eighty or ninety percent occurs. It is said that no money is available to go back and plant again. If this situation persists our timbered hills of this valley will be barren in a relatively few years. What has happened to that sustained yield policy we have heard of ever since I can remember?

I am not thoroughly acquainted with the Scapegoat area, but have been around it, and viewed it thru pictures, and the eyes of others. In my opinion it would be a disaster to have this area roaded up, and cut over as is happening here in the Bitterroot. I am a psychology student, and my studies indicate that great numbers of people in this country may benefit thru experiences with nature, especially provided under Wilderness conditions. This country cannot afford to destroy much more of its wild areas thru commercial exploitation. Let us preserve such as this Scapegoat area for our unborn.

Please count me in support of Senator Metcalf's bill, S. 1121. I would like to have this testimony made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

JANIE CANTON.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: As a school teacher for some 20 years in the Hamilton system, I am perhaps more than ordinarily concerned with the young, and with the world we leave them to live in. For this reason, as well as for my personal interest in conservation, I wish to make my thoughts known to you and to the members of your committee, and to request that you make this letter a part of the permanent hearing record.

We are running out of wilderness at an alarming rate, and once it is gone it can never be re-created. I believe the existence of wilderness to be a necessity to the American mind and spirit, and to be of greater importance than the board feet or the tons of ore the "practical business man" speaks of. We have to *know* there is a place somewhere that is untouched by civilization. This becomes more and more important as our land is covered with more and more shopping-centers and paved with more and more asphalt. Even if one never visits the wilderness, it is essential to know that it is there.

There are other benefits (a living-place for the grizzly bear, for example), but the mental one is of the most importance, so far as I am concerned.

I therefore request that the Scapegoat area, all 240,000 acres of it, be declared a wilderness area, and that it be so maintained. I'd like to be able, with a straight face, to tell my students that they are inheriting a country worth the having!

Sincerely,

IVAN E. AHLGREN.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My name is Frank Cash, and I am the mayor of Hamilton.

I am very much in favor of the wilderness system and I strongly urge that the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

I wish to have this testimony made a part of the permament hearing record.

Sincerely,

FRANK CASH.

G. N. BERGH REALTY,
Hamilton, Mont., June 4, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am writing this letter because I will be unable to attend the hearing.

I am in the real estate business in Hamilton and own a small ranch south of town.

After seeing what has been done to our forests in the past few years (Clear cuts, terracing, roads, etc.), I am thoroughly convinced we must get as much of our forests in wilderness areas as possible to protect them and our watersheds. I would strongly urge that the 240,500 acres described in S1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

If possible I would like this letter to be made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

JACK A. EVANS.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1698.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am an elementary teacher in Hamilton, Mont., and have taught my classes for many years that we should conserve and preserve our natural, national resources to the best of our ability.

I am in favor of Senate bill 1121 which will classify 240,500 acres of National Forest land as wilderness area.

We need to preserve the less common species of big game animals for future generations. I have two children in college and I sincerely hope there will be primitive wilderness areas for them to use and enjoy as they reach adulthood.

Commercialization of wilderness areas may seem to benefit a local area temporarily but we must also think of the state and national picture. For example: A logging operation may briefly help the economy of a local area but does it help the national economy or destroy the area for future use recreationally and commercially? These resources will always be there to use later if needed whereas modern substitutes for lumber are increasing and in many cases can be used now.

I wish to have my opinions here stated made part of the record at the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing.

Sincerely yours,

EVELYN SALADEN.

20TH CENTURY GOD'S COUNTRY.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Since it is impossible for me to be at the hearing, I hope that this letter will substitute and you may still know my feelings.

I am a logger now, and it may be that I seem to be cutting my own throat by being for wilderness areas. But I believe that a person must put the needs of this Nation above even personal greed.

If this Nation is so poor that we cannot set this area aside for wilderness, then it seems that we are too poor in spirit and goods to need what it could provide by not being a wilderness.

I urge S. 1121 be passed and that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

Sincerely,

LOWELL S. HAYES.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Just being a housewife may not carry all the prestige in the world in this modern society, but it in no way lessens my power as a citizen and my power as a voter, or it in no way lessens my appreciation for the wilderness areas.

My husband and I have made numerous trips through the wilderness areas of our country and enjoyed them very much. I get a little sick when I hear the Forest Service deplore the supposed fact that nobody goes to wildernesses because there is no way to drive there. The whole idea of going is to get one's fat rump off a chair and walk or ride a horse.

The problems of this country are seemingly too complex to understand or solve, but that does not mean that we should not try. From what I can read about the cities of this country we have a lot of trouble there and we created the cities. Let us try to preserve some of nature that has caused us no trouble and may even be a place of spiritual rebuilding so we can tackle the problems of our own making.

I very much support making the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country into a wilderness as proposed by S. 1121. And I would like this letter made a permanent part of the record of your hearings.

Sincerely,

ALMA B. HAYES.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am very much interested in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. Working for the United States Public Health Service and operating a small 45-acre farm requires most of my time. My vacation time is spent with my family and others on pack trips into the areas where motorized vehicles do not or cannot go.

It's certainly a pleasure to get back into country where you cannot drive a car, where it's peaceful and the country isn't cluttered with beer cans and other trash. Or where dozers haven't made skid trails to log off the hillsides and destroy the small timber getting to sawtimber, to say nothing of leaving the soil in such a condition that it will erode.

Our wilderness areas are getting to be few and far between and we humans are doing the same with our wildlife that we did with the Indians. At the rate we are logging off our forests, in a few short years there isn't going to be anything left for the next generations to see and enjoy. It's high time the Forest Service should get into high gear and reforest all the cut-over areas as fast as they can and preserve what little area we have left.

For these reasons and many others I could add, I urge that the 240,500 acres described in Senate Bill 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

I wish to have this testimony made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

ROBERT HORNUNG.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN LABORATORY,
Hamilton, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Having lived in urban areas before coming to the Bitterroot Valley in 1965 to do research at the Rocky Mountain Laboratory, I think I can appreciate more than most the inestimable value of the wilderness areas in this country. I strongly urge that the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System. I trust that neither the multiple use concept nor pressures from groups whose interest is primarily economic will obscure the true and lasting value to be derived only by leaving areas such as this unmolested by the destructive influence of man's overwhelming presence.

I wish to have this testimony made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID F. TARMINA.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN LABORATORY,
Hamilton, Mont., June 5, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I, as a taxpaying citizen of this state and country, wish to express my support to give protection to the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness under the Wilderness Act. Let us develop and maintain as many high quality wilderness areas as possible. I wish to have this letter made a part of the permanent record.

Sincerely yours,

BRYAN HESTEKIN.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am a member of the class of 1969 at Hamilton High School in Hamilton, Montana, and am an active member of the school sponsored Wilderness Club.

I am opposed to the plan of developing the Lincoln Back Country into a mass recreation and timber harvest area. I think that society has enough recreation areas without ruining beautiful wilderness. As for a timber harvest, I think that this is completely unnecessary.

May I urge that the 240,500 acres of this land (as described in S. 1121) be made into a part of the National Wilderness System. I wish to have my testimony made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

CONRAD E. YUNKER, Jr.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am a citizen of Montana and a research microbiologist in the field of diseases communicable to man.

With our rapidly growing population and the spread of people all over the continent, areas not encroached upon by human beings must be preserved before, not after, such encroachment occurs. Are we to have a country entirely floored with concrete and land tilled by man? If the only wild places that remain are those too rugged for man's occupation, erosion will destroy those from below until only the bare peaks are left. Water pollution will then become a subject of no importance; there will be no water to pollute.

As one step in the attempt to preserve some wild land to protect our water sheds and maintain areas for recreation, beauty, and peace, I urge that the 240,500 acres described in S1121 be made part of the National Wilderness System.

I wish to have this letter made part of the permament record of the hearing.

Sincerely,

CORA RUST OWEN.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My wife and I, signed below, are both school teachers in the Hamilton school system in an area near some of the yet remaining wilderness.

We both love to camp out, back pack, or just walk into whatever areas are still available to us in this day of steady encroachment into some of the last natural areas in this country. We deplore the term 'multiple-use' as it is used, as it obviously is a means for logging interests to log out the areas involved. The remains can be used for recreation, however we do not particularly like to camp in logged areas as we much prefer 'natural' surroundings.

We believe that some areas must be preserved for us and future generations, for once they are ravaged by roads, motorized equipment, and logged, these areas of slow growth and development are lost forever as natural beauty spots.

We see the face of the once beautiful Bitter Root Valley Range gradually losing its coat of trees and becoming crisscrossed with logging roads. Above all the range is losing its natural beauty, and we know that, at least in our life time, this area will never have the same natural beauty it had even as recently as ten years ago.

Clear cutting and heavy logging has not proven its value to us in areas of slow growth and development, and the Lincoln-Scapegoat area certainly belongs in this category.

If we are to have land left in its natural state for its natural use and beauty, we strongly urge your committee to help pass SB 1121 to make the 240,500 acres described therein a part of the National Wilderness System.

We wish to have this letter read and made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

DEAN L. VINAL.
VIRGINIA W. VINAL.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Grace I. West, a retired cosmetic sales woman. I was born in Italy. I came to the United States, when I was 12 years old. I am a naturalized citizen, 59 years old, reared in Boston, Mass.

I think the National Wilderness System is essential for the preservation of our wilderness. Without this system, the economy of this country would devastate the beauty of our state of Montana.

People all over the United States travel to Montana, for its scenic beauty. I moved to Montana for its beauty and clean air.

Developing roads and parks for the public, creates a problem. The public litters the roads and parks, cut down trees unnecessarily. Montana is known as "The Big Sky Country." We need a beautiful forest to harmonize with the big sky.

I urge the 240,500 acres, described in (S. 1121) be made part of our National Wilderness System for the Montanan's sake and the rest of America.

Please make this letter a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

GRACE IRENE WEST.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN LABORATORY,
Hamilton, Mont., June 5, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am a resident of Montana working for the National Institutes of Health in Hamilton, Montana. Since I moved to this state, I have been highly impressed with the natural beauty of many parts of this country and I have become convinced that many of these areas should be preserved in their natural condition for future generations to enjoy. For this reason, I strongly support the National Wilderness System and I urge you to give your support to the inclusion of the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 as part of the National Wilderness System.

I wish to have this testimony made part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MUNOZ, PH. D.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am a native of Montana and have lived in Western Montana, except for military service, for over 40 years. I have worked for the U.S. Public Health Service at Hamilton for the past 20 years.

I have observed, over the years, the "development" of much of our National forests through logging, recreation etc. and am becoming concerned about the future of these areas. The wildlife native to our back country have become reduced. I particularly am concerned for the future of the grizzly bear. One of the few areas left for this species is in the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area. I feel that the only way to preserve and protect some species of our wildlife is through the creation of a wilderness system.

I urge that the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness system.

I wish to have this letter made part of the permanent record of the hearing.

Sincerely,

EMERY O. BUKER.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am a senior at Hamilton High School and president of the Hamilton High School Outdoor Club.

I believe that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area has far greater value as a wild recreation area than it can under multiple use. In a nation where there is such an abundance of land better suited to timber harvest and mass recreation than the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, we cannot afford to mar the wild beauty of an area so nearly untouched. The generations of benefit this area will give as a wilderness will far outshadow the rather meager financial profits gained from timber harvest. I therefore urge that the 240,500 acres described in Senate bill 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

I request that my testimony be made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

PAUL STANTON.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,

SENATOR BURDICK: I write this letter to you in the hope that with other interested Americans that we may still save the country that is to me a part of everyone.

My belief is that we must preserve, not only for ourselves, but for our children's children.

The Department of Agriculture's practice of "multi-purpose" is a well-meaning term, and in most instances, I agree. However, I feel that we must stop somewhere, and I think this could well be a test of the interested citizens to preserve as much of our wilderness area as we can.

My name is Roland H. Hull, I live here in Hamilton with my wife Betty and my two children. We take an interest in our community, and this carries over into our county, state and nation. "Multi-purpose," if you or any of your committee cares about our West, I would urge you to support Senate bill 1121, make it a part of our National Wilderness System.

My interest stems from being a working foreman of the Daily Ravalli Republican, a daily newspaper here in Hamilton. My wife's interest lies in being a music instructor in our county's public school system. We love the outdoors, to see it spoiled seems to us to be a trend. To see our once great mountains scarred by clear-cut (fly from Hamilton to Lewiston, Idaho), makes us realize that we must urge you and your committee to support Senate bill 1121.

I would like to request that this letter be read at your committee hearing and be made a part of the permanent record.

Sincerely,

ROLAND H. HULL.
BETTY HULL.

KOCH & MCKENNA,
Hamilton, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am writing to you as a lawyer, a resident of Montana, and as a citizen of the United States who is deeply interested and concerned with the preservation of the wilderness heritage for our children and our children's children.

During my teens I spent a portion of every summer either horseback or backpacking through the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area and the adjacent Bob Marshall Wilderness, have visited portions of it since and am quite familiar with the area. I sincerely feel that the wilderness concept is a valid concept and becoming of increasing importance as the population of the United States and of the world increases, and that the highest and best use for the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is preserving it as wilderness for the use of our generation and of forthcoming generations.

Due to prior commitments I am unable to attend the hearing at Great Falls but would appreciate having this letter made a part of the permanent hearing records.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS P. KOCH.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 29, 1968.*

For many years, I have visited the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area. I am quite familiar with the natural resources, the timber, the mining prospects, the wildlife, the rivers and lakes of this area. As a result of this experience, I feel very strongly that these resources should be preserved and protected so that future generations can enjoy them as they now exist.

From a practical viewpoint, the timber and minerals in this back country cannot be economically harvested or mined. I believe that the area will contribute much more to our economy by preserving it as a part of the National Wilderness system. I also believe that we owe an obligation, to the young people who will follow us, to leave this area in its natural state, not making it accessible by roads and highways but only by horse-back or walking. This is the only way that we can save what we have, and it certainly is worth saving.

H. A. DICKINSON.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: We urge you to do whatever is within your power to SAVE the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 for the National Wilderness System.

Mr. Neufelder and I have been through several of our wilderness areas including the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country. To us, this wilderness must be saved for people that enjoy the "Great Out of Doors" in all its natural beauty.

We are retirees but still make trips in to our wilderness areas on foot and also on horseback and enjoy these trips more and more each year. Young and old can enjoy these beautiful lands in our back country.

Senator Burdick, Mr. Neufelder and myself wish to have our statements in this letter made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY A. NEUFELDER.
CARL. V. NEUFELDER.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I was born and raised in the Bitter Root Valley; have lived on a small cattle ranch all my life. Some of my land lies within about three miles of the Wilderness Area in Ravalli County.

I think it will be a wonderful thing to set aside some 240,500 acres (Senate bill 1121) to be a part of the National Wilderness area.

I will go along for Senators Mansfield and Metcalf bill (1121) one hundred percent.

I would like to make this a part of your permanent hearing record.

Sincerely

PRESLEY E. LAY.
BERTHA LAY.

HAMILTON, MONT., *May 31, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My husband and I, Montana residents all our lives, with grandchildren growing up here, are much concerned about the future of our country, and the conservation of all our resources. The wilderness area is most important to all of us, we believe.

We would like our testimony urging the 240,500 acres as described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness Area System, be made a part of the permanent hearing reeord.

Sincerely,

CLARA R. AUSTIN.
JOHN C. AUSTIN.

HAMILTON, MONT., *May 31, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: My husband and I, Montana residents all our lives, with grandchildren growing up here, are much concerned about the future of our country, and the conservation of our natural resources. The wilderness area is most important to all of us, and should be preserved for our future generations.

We would like our testimony to be made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Thank you most deeply for your effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ANDREW SORENSON.
ANDREW SORENSON.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am the art teacher in the Hamilton Schools and have taught in Hamilton for the past 7 years.

My wife and I feel that the proposed addition to the wilderness area is a vital necessity because of the increasing misuse of the present accessible forested lands and the decrease in accessibility to campers and others who enjoy being out for the enjoyment of outdoor living. The motorized vehicles now in common use have virtually wrecked most areas for good camping and good outdoor recreation.

We urge that the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System. This letter is to be made part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES A. ROTH.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I live in Hamilton, 50 miles south of Missoula, Montana. My husband and I came here on retirement from 30 years for Federal Aviation Agency. Our main reason for choosing this area was its beauty and the availability of hunting, fishing, and hiking.

Am much interested in proposed addition to the Wilderness System, namely "Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness." The proposed area is well located as it is

easily accessible from Missoula, Helena, Great Falls. We very much need to preserve these unspoiled areas for our children and grandchildren. After one has lived in a havily congested city such as Los Angeles, one truly appreciates this God-given, rugged, unspoiled country.

I urge that the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

Please make this testimony a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

Mrs. William Staff.

Hamilton, Mont., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator Quentin Burdick,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

Dear Senator Burdick: I am John "J" West, a retired Detroit police officer from Detroit, Michigan. I served 25 years in this department. I am 61 years old. I was born and reared in Michigan.

I think the National Wilderness System is essential for the preservation of our wilderness. Without this system, the economy of this country would devastate the beauty of our state of Montana.

People all over the United States travel to Montana for its scenic beauty. I moved to Montana for its beauty, fishing, and hunting.

Deveolping roads and parks for the public creates a problem. The public litters the roads and parks, cut down trees unnecessarily. Montana is konwn as "The Big Sky Country." We need a beautiful forest to harmonize with the big sky.

I urge the 240,500 acres, described in S. 1121 be made part of our National Wilderness System for the Montanan's sake and the rest of America.

Please make this letter a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

John "J" West.

Hamilton, Mont., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator Quentin Burdick,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

Dear Senator Burdick: I am deeply interested in seeing the above mentioned back country made a part of the wilderness area.

My name is Henry G. Neidhardt and I am a teacher in the Hamilton school system. I have a degree in Wildlife Technology and feel that if we are to preserve any back country including fish and game, we must begin soon. With our increase in population growth it is essential to be able to keep for future generations at least a part of what we are able to enjoy now. This instead of talking about "the good old days—when, etc."

I am in full support of making the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 a part of the National Wilderness System. I wish to have my testimony made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

Henry G. Neidhardt.

Resolution of the Young Democrat Clubs of Montana

Whereas because of the impact of our rapidly expanding industrial culture, tracts of unspoiled, undeveloped lands preserved in their natural setting are rapidly disappearing.

Whereas tracts of land remaining in their natural state have certain cherished values—scenic, scientific, conservational, historic, and recreational.

Whereas these cherished values can today be found almost exclusively in wilderness and wild areas and can never be replaced after improvement of an undeveloped area.

Whereas the Lincoln Back Country and its adjoining areas is a region which remains unroaded and in its natural state, and in this natural state it is today enjoyed by a growing number of hikers, backpackers, hunters and fishermen, and nature lovers.

Whereas there is absolutely no economic basis for the development of the Lincoln Back Country and its adjoining areas: Be it

Resolved, That the Young Democrat Clubs of Montana strongly support the plan of conservation and sportsmens groups in Montana for the designation of the Lincoln Back Country and its adjoining areas as a wilderness area; and be it further

Resolved, That the Young Democrat Clubs of Montana urge the enactment by Congress of a strong Wilderness Bill guaranteeing preservation for future generations of Americans of a small portion of America in its natural state.

OPTIMIST CLUB OF GREAT FALLS,
Great Falls, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The Optimist Club of Great Falls, composed of 100 members of which all are business and professional men, wish to make known that they support Senate Bill 1121.

The membership of this club voted to support the Wilderness Society in their effort to preserve the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area by including this beautiful land in the National Wilderness System.

The motto of our club is "Friend of the Boy" and we believe in America and its youth. By supporting this movement and Senate Bill 1121 we can be assured that some of the Americas beauty will be retained for future generations.

Very truly yours,

FRED C. JONES, Jr.,
President.

GLASGOW, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my pleasure to voice my full support for the proposals made that the Lincoln Scapegoat back Country be included in the National Wilderness system.

Our natural recreational resources are so fast diminishing that it will behoove us to act with all expediency to preserve those area that it still exist in their pristine beauty.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. WEBER, D.D.S., *Past President,*
Valley County Sportsman Association.

ROGER SPRINKLE INSURANCE AGENCY,
Chinook, Mont., September 23, 1968.

To Whom It May Concern:

I would add this tract to the Bob Marshall Wilderness area because the land is needed now by our people. We no longer have wilderness areas to spare. Benefits of the wilds are various, depending upon the person, and usually intangible (fishing and hunting are exceptions), but are commonly associated with such things as outdoor living, the appreciation and knowledge of nature and its beauty, and other advantages less general such as permitting our citizens to withdraw from the hustle and bustle of just plain living in our modern world.

The alternate plan, I believe promulgated by the Forestry Service, would permit various kinds of commercial development totally incompatible with a wilderness. The end result of such a plan would be more in the nature of a suburban development or city park.

If one must enjoy nature between times, that is between the rumble of traffic and the thunder of jets, do it at home; it would certainly be cheaper, about as realistic, perhaps even more so if your home was well insulated from outside noises and your television program was an especially good one on natural history, complete with color, sound, and occasional musical background.

ROGER SPRINKLE.

KASOON, MINN., *September 16, 1968.*

GENTLEMEN: We are interested in saving the Lincoln Back Country as Wilderness. With civilization fast engulfing the land I think its imperative that we save what little wilderness that there is left.

Our oldest son was able to take a canoe trip with the Boy Scouts this summer in Superior National Park on into Canada. Michael said that there were many campers on the Minnesota side but as they went farther into Canada they didn't meet any other campers but saw evidence of their camps. How long will this beautiful country remain wilderness? There have been articles in the paper with concern of pollution of these northern lakes. Ten years from now when our younger sons want to go camping will there be any unspoilt land left for them to see?

We live on a dairy and cash crop farm in southern Minnesota. The reason that we are given for our low prices is that there is a surplus if this so then why is there any need for any more land to be brought into production? Until there is a real need for more food I think that it is our duty to protect this land for the future generations.

Thank you,

MRS. ROBERT ZELINSKI.

DEER LODGE, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing in regards to the Scapegoat, Lincoln Back Country here in Montana. Sir, I make my living packing in the back country. If you could make one trip with me when I take people in to our back country and see the way their whole outlook on life changes in ten days you could understand what I am trying to say.

I've attended the Chicago Sportsman show at the Amphitheatre and also the Los Angeles Sportsman show at the Pan Pacific Building. I have in excess of 600 signatures of people concerned with our Wilderness. I also have 60 signed contracts for the hunting season alone. This summer I hope to handle 125 people on fishing, camping and just plain trail riding and sightseeing in the Wilderness. All these original names and addresses I can put in your hands. Sir, this back country must remain as the Good Lord created it.

Because of my livelihood, the people who work for me and all the people concerned, I'm asking for permission to have my say at the hearing in Great Falls June 11, 1968.

Sir, we have enough asphalt jungles, we need this wilderness for the good and welfare of our country.

Thanking you in advance for your time, I remain

Respectifully yours,

ED STEFALO.

KALISPELL, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The proposal under H.R. 7148 and S. 1121 to reclassify and place under wilderness type of management about 240,000 acres of national forest land in northwest Montana is unsound, unjustified and inadvisable. I am opposed to such action.

In this section of Montana with some 50% of its economy based on timber products and since the entire state has declining tax revenues more vast wilderness would only increase tax burdens on other properties that are already increasingly excessive. In fact a state sales tax program is being advocated to secure needed revenues.

I am quite familiar with the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area and with the U.S. Forest Service's indicated plan for its multiple use management with limited road access that would be of lasting national as well as local benefits to all. A few roads, some recreational developments and good harvesting practices of the timber resources under Forest Service policy is absolutely essential to the best interests of the public. Likewise big game management would be enhanced and better fire control would result.

Full consideration must be given to the fact that in this general locality of Montana 1 million acres in Glacier National Park, 950,000 acres in Bob Marshall Wilderness and 75,000 acres in the Mission Mts. wild area already dedicated solely to recreation obviously meets forseeable future needs.

Bob Marshall Wilderness immediately north, and nearby Mission Mt. wild area receive minimum public use, less than 1% of the total recreational use of the three national forests involved. Also these areas solely dedicated to a single form of public use, and access are only by trail for a few rugged individuals who can afford the luxury of costly horse travel expeditions. Also these expeditions are almost entirely dependent upon a few Outfitters who can penetrate and serve such undeveloped areas. Foot travel by wilderness hikers is virtually non-existent.

It is hoped that the proposed legislation receives negative action by your committee. It is in the public interest to do so.

I appreciate the opportunity to voice my opposition to any increase to the Bob Marshall Wilderness area and respectfully request that you place this letter in the public record.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED J. NEITZLING.

KALISPELL, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: In your subcommittee meeting on public land at Great Falls, Montana, Sept. 25, I will appreciate your consideration of this letter with the request that it be filed in the record of the hearing.

Having served in the U.S. Forest Service in various field positions and assignments from 1922 to 1962 in Montana, Idaho, and the New England States I am well acquainted with its policies, over all plans and objectives based on multiple use of the National Forests.

In no time during these 40 years, and my 6 years actively engaged in the real estate business, since my retirement has the U.S. Forest Service deviated from its basic philosophy of managing the national forests for the greatest good to the greatest number of people.

It is increasingly important that our national forests continue to be managed under the concept of full multiple use without hampering legislation however well conceived.

Since its creation the U.S. Forest Service has been free of scandal and selfish political manipulation where such vast and valuable natural resources are involved.

It is my hopeful suggestion that the Forest Service be given a vote of confidence and encouragement by your important committee in the future management of our public forests. Furthermore any legislation effecting the administration and management of the national forests should be designed to broaden and strengthen the principle of multiple use, leaving highly trained dedicated, well organized career personnel free to perform their professional duties.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED J. NEITZLING.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: For the reasons stated below I wish to record my opposition to H.R. 7148 and S. 1121 under which the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area would acquire Wilderness classification. My opposition in this case stems not from a negative attitude toward Wilderness areas in general. I am at heart a conservationist.

Indeed, it would have been a tragic mistake had not some of the pristine majesty of our country been preserved for future generations, as well as the present, through the Wilderness, Wild and Primitive concept of management. Nor do I imply that there are not remaining areas elsewhere suitable for inclusion in the Wilderness classification but every proposal requires evaluation on its merits.

Here the over-riding consideration is the relationship of the Lincoln back country to the contiguous Bob Marshall Wilderness. The latter, may it ever remain wilderness, is large, adequate and does not need to annex the former. On the other hand a vastly greater number of people stand to benefit profit-wise and pleasure-wise from the multiple use of the area in question. It is a well known fact that harm to the local economy and curtailment of the enjoyment of the majority is the price we must pay for locking up an area.

I am familiar with the Forest Service plan for the orderly development and management of this regions. It is a sound and good plan and merits approval.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

P. W. BASTINE,
U.S.F.S. (Retired).

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 30, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I wish this letter made a part of the record of the hearing concerning the Lincoln Back-Country held in Great Falls, Montana, on September 23, 1968. The meeting was chaired by Senator Quentin Burdick, South Dakota.

I am employed by the U.S. Forest Service, Region One, Missoula, Montana, and have been for 10 years. I am presently serving as an Employee Development Specialist. I served on the Lincoln District as Fire Control Officer with trail construction and maintenance responsibilities from January, 1964, to July, 1965. I spent quite a bit of time in part of the area concerned, specifically in the area east of the North Fork and south of Scapegoat. I had the opportunity to see the area because of the trail responsibilities and the District Ranger's request for my opinion on timber, soil, and water conditions. I, at that time voiced my professional opinion concerning the proposed development of the Lincoln Back-Country to the Ranger and other professional employees.

I speak here, however, as a concerned private citizen. I feel that development of the Lincoln Back-Country would prove detrimental to the soil, water and wildlife resources. This area, as outlined by the Lincoln Back-Country Protective Association, is fragile. The country is at present an excellent watershed, yet the lakes and small streams are in the process of evaluation and are, in effect, disappearing naturally. I believe man's intrusion with development would only serve to hasten the process and not to any benefit. These resources, especially water, are important now and will increase in importance since already, states to the south and west are looking to Montana as a source of water and recreation.

Montana recovers slowly from hurts inflicted by either man or nature as the fire scarred hills and Indian trails so vividly show. I feel we owe the land due consideration both in areas being used for industry and recreation at the present time and special consideration to those areas for which we have reasonable doubt concerning their fragility. The area concerned has known man and still shows the scars from his use.

My feeling as a user and a manager of public lands, admittedly on a minor scale is that even should the area be covered with prime timber or uranium, the land's value lies in its primitiveness, not in it material value. The 240,000 acres requested seems a small price to pay for assurance of water, recreation and solitude for those who desire it.

I speak neither from rancor nor dissatisfaction with the Forest Service, an organization comprised of many knowledgeable, dedicated and responsible citizens. I am speaking from a feeling, reinforced by visits to California recreation areas, that in my lifetime, certainly in my childrens, we may be standing in line to enter public lands. I would like to be able, when and if that time comes, to enter a place of silence and beauty to show my children and grandchildren what the land once looked like.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. BROWN, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA BIOLOGICAL STATION,
Bigfork, Mont., October 4, 1968.

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Senate Interior Public Lands Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I request the following statement for Senate Bill S. 1121 be included in the hearing record.

As a professional Botanist (speaking only for myself), my interests in wilderness probably exceed those of most—I use it for aesthetic purposes as well. It is only in wilderness areas that man's effect on the environment is minimal and where scientific studies of pristine conditions can be found. This is important as a control (or standard) by which the effects of man can be measured elsewhere. I strongly feel that any *de facto* wildernesses that exist should be protected as much for scientific purposes as for others. There are too few such "committed" areas now. My studies, incidentally, have taken me into a number of wilderness areas in California, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah. Thus, I am a long-time user of wilderness.

I am acquainted with many people who find great satisfaction in just *knowing* that protected areas exist, though they may never be able to get to them. They will see them in the photos of others, and will hear of them; they will thus appreciate them vicariously. I have witnessed this at presentations of color-slide programs of my own before many groups, before laymen as well as college students.

Opponents of wilderness—proponents of "multiple use"—tell us in their national advertising that only 2% (source not stated) of the population actively utilizes wilderness. However, the ever increasing population will mean vast increments in totals over the coming years. If but 2% (or less) of the area of the contiguous states now is of wilderness character, it is of great importance that any possible additions be made soon—before they are lost. Furthermore, it is certainly probable that the percentage of wilderness users will increase vastly because of the ever-increasing interest in conservation, as well as because of the ever increasing concentrating of populations. Senator Jackson recently referred to the 90th Congress as a "conservation-minded Congress" and we must believe that the Congress represents the will of the people. The trend conceivably could continue.

I am well informed of the Lincoln Backcountry area, though I have yet to get within its boundaries. I have read or heard both the pros and the cons as to whether it should be preserved or committed to "multiple use." I am thoroughly convinced that the *abuses* of the latter must be avoided at all costs—and it will cost the taxpayer.

I therefore strongly urge that S. 1121 be passed to save the Lincoln Backcountry for posterity.

Sincerely,

WM. C. VINYARD, *Research Associate.*

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 14, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I would like to have the following testimony entered in the record of hearings on Wilderness designation for the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country.

I feel that anyone who is not *industrially* or *managerially* involved with this back country would without hesitation recommend Wilderness management for this area. I am not a professional forester nor a timber man so am not as anxious to chew up every mountain side that may have a few mature trees on it.

A Forest Service official recently spoke on the lumbermen's need for the marginal Scapegoat timber. He claimed that if such areas were not available for logging, the three National Forests would need to reduce their harvest program. It is very heartening to know that the policy makers for these three forests are finally admitting that they have over the years been pressured into an annual cut dangerously above the sustained yield. Organized, thinking citizens have become so concerned about this unbelievable, proliferated cutting program that plans are now under way to supply our Congressmen with a comprehensive formal record of the situation.

It is the same story here that we have experienced so often, especially in this Northwest. The managers of these public lands under pressure from timber companies will offer many, many tantalizing reasons why basically non-commercial timber back country should be roaded up for a highly marginal harvest. They say it will make better access, more picnicking, fishing, hunting, etc. Now here they drag out an additional bait. Build a glittering scenic highway through it.

We have scenic highways galore, we can build more when we really need them. But we can never build wilderness areas. We need more of these now. Consider the problems already developing in many of them because of overuse. Consider the ditches called trails, and the barren pack-stock grazing in the Bob Marshall, just next door.

Many claim wilderness advocates are selfish because so few can participate in this type of recreation. To them we say, "There are so many so-called back-country areas roaded and accessible that they will never, never be able to visit all of them." If they want more picnic areas they should prevail on the managers to build facilities in these places. If it were not for the roads and clear cuts, some of them would be just as beautiful as the Scapegoat.

In contrast to those who feel we are selfish I have heard more than one person say, "I'll get my enjoyment just from knowing that the particular Wilderness Area is there." Our family has young friends coming out from the Middle States and East, summers. It makes one feel good to hear and see how they revere the thought of wilderness. Coming from that generation it is proof of how tremendously these areas are going to increase in value over the decades.

Fortunately the nation has become conservation and wilderness minded. The nation realizes how small pockets of local economy pressures have permanently misused areas. If enough people have had an opportunity to know about these hearings, the national interest will prevail in this Lincoln-Scapegoat decision too.

Respectfully yours,

N. J. KRAMIS.

TOWNSEND ROTARY CLUB,
September 19, 1968.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: A question that should be answered on the Lincoln back country proposal is "Will it be beneficial to all?"

On the 23rd of September a hearing is to be held in Great Falls, Montana to determine if another huge block of land will be added to the Bob Marshall Wilderness area. The Rotary Club of Townsend feels this would be a serious mistake in that this land would then forever be locked up for the few individuals who have the time, financial resources and physical stamina to enjoy this scenic back country. The rest of us will only know it exists in name.

It is recognized that a recreation potential exists in this area. Perhaps in addition to a hike or a horse ride, a major winter sports area could be in the offering. But this wouldn't be allowed in a Wilderness status. Would it not be wiser to develop the full potential of this recreational offering? Already many mountain lakes and creeks are becoming serious problems due to lack of any sanitation facilities.

Presently Montana can only boast of losing many of its graduating students. The same applies to all the small communities and the National movement is now directed to rural communities and the stabilization of the same. Certainly, if there is a timber resource to be harvested in this area, it can only help in this economic stabilization of Montana and its communities and this definitely appears to apply in this instance. Not only is there employment where employment is badly needed but some of the monies derived are directed back to the counties where the tax base in this low population state is so small and where this money is so badly needed.

A proposal suggests a high mountain scenic drive road. Certainly this suggests many people would be able to enjoy some of this scenery. There are very few such roads in Montana worthy of driving a family car over.

Another point worthy of consideration is the acreage already put into cold storage. A lot of thought was put into these areas and no doubt we need them. It is also known that more areas are being studied and recommended for this Wilderness status. Let the people who know this type of country and its needs make the decisions for the good of all of us. Are the two million acres already in

this status in Montana a pretty fair share of the Wilderness system in the United States or are the people going to look to Montana to continue to prevent the full development of the State?

With all of us living in a mountainous area, it is only too readily seen that this high, rugged country can remain as is. The greatest percentage of this proposed area will always remain as is and a little access and development can only help us to see some of these wonders of nature.

The Townsend Rotary Club submits this respectfully for your consideration and is definitely opposed to closing this area for the select few. Will this closure really be "beneficial to all"?

Yours very truly,

BILL KEARNS, *President.*

TOWNSEND ROTARY CLUB,
Townsend, Mont., September 19, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman of Public Lands Committee,
Cascade County Courthouse,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: At our last regular meeting, the members of the Townsend Rotary Club, voted unanimously against putting the Lincoln Back Country into the Bob Marshall Wilderness. It was our feeling that a multi-use area would make better use of these lands. We feel that in a multi-use area there is lots of room for primitive areas, sites where the average family could go, as well as having some commercial use. Which this commercial use, could employ several hundred men. Why serve a few when you can serve a lot.

We are therefore entering this letter as a protest against Senate bill number 1121.

Thank you for your attention.

CHARLES S. HOLLING, *Secretary.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *September 23, 1968.*

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
County Court House, Great Falls, Mont.:

Western Forestry & Conservation Association opposes S. 1121 to classify Lincoln back country as a wilderness area for several reasons.

1. Since the 240,500-acre Lincoln back country joins the approximately 1-million acre Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, making it a roadless wilderness would have the effect of making Bob Marshall Wilderness even more inaccessible to short-term vacationists.

2. Wilderness Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–577) calls for individual complete review of specific areas including forests service primitive areas, national park roadless areas and roadless portions of Interior wildlife refuges and game ranges for inclusion in the wilderness system by separate act of Congress within 10 years or by 1974. Of well over 150 of these areas to be studied and considered by the administering agencies and the President and acted upon by Congress, only two have been reclassified to date. This activity would seem to be far enough behind schedule without consideration of additional areas.

3. Provision for comprehensive study and recommendations by administering agency contemplated in Wilderness Act is short circuited by process of direct legislative proposals such as S. 1121.

4. The U.S. Forest Service is presently empowered under the Multiple-Use Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–517) to administer this area, for its best combination of uses in the public good.

ARTHUR M. ROBERTS,
Forest Counsel, Western Forestry & Conservation Association.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 20, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Care of Judge Robert J. Nelson's Chambers,
Cascade County Court House, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Since I will be unable to attend the hearing concerning the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area, I would like to add this note as one more voice in support of this proposal.

In general I think that man and civilization have combined to alter too much of the world. Some of this is necessary, and some for our own comfort. We have tempered with ecology and have yet to evaluate the results of much of our activity. Our one absolutely priceless resource is our land as it was created. Naturally, this isn't possible everywhere, but in those few remaining natural areas we should be very cautious in our plans. There is an eternity in case we should change our minds and wish for a fully developed recreational area. Once we bring too much civilization into wild country, however, we can never turn back that intrusion.

I think that there should be places on this earth where man can escape from machinery of all types, and where he must depend upon himself or a horse to see the rest of the trail. The land can only appreciate in value if we leave it protected as it is. Wilderness areas will become a rare thing indeed, as our population grows. And if the time should come, it can always be "developed."

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

HELENE T. ALLAIRE.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA,
Missoula, July 23, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is a letter in support of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area. It is my strong belief that we have reached a decision point in history. If my grandchildren are to enjoy the benefits of this state as I have enjoyed them, then action must be taken now. Formation of wilderness areas is one of the few ways to insure that unspoiled natural beauty will be around for future generations.

It is my understanding that a number of groups are soliciting support to keep the area open for snow mobiles and scooters. In my opinion, this course of action would be a tragedy. Not only does the presence of motorized vehicles severely detract from the natural beauty of such an area, but the way would be open for further development including roads, logging, recreation areas, etc. As this kind of development takes place, the possibility of a true wilderness is forever lost, and those who wish to enjoy Montana as it was are further restricted.

In closing, I would again like to urge the wilderness classification of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. I request that this letter be made part of the Hearing Record.

Sincerely,

ROY R. FOLSOM,
Audiologist, Speech and Hearing Clinic.

CARTER, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Lincoln-Scapegoat Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Since it will be impossible for me to attend the public hearing in Great Falls on June 11, I am taking this means of expressing my whole-hearted support for the proposal to include the Lincoln Back Country in the Wilderness system and ask that this letter be made a part of the record of that hearing.

I have lived my entire life in the dry land farming area north of Great Falls. The most completely satisfying, enjoyable and relaxing experience I have had has been a pack trip to the Lincoln back-country. The natural scenic beauty along with the diverse wildlife including grizzley and black bear, mountain goats, deer, elk and moose is an incomparable thrill to behold.

The fact that this fabulous area is so readily accessible from existing roads by horse-back or on foot to anyone interested in expending a relatively small amount of time and effort is indeed gratifying. I think we can all agree that any

richly rewarding experience is deserving of the expenditure of some time and effort on the part of the recipient. The cost need be no more, if indeed as much, as for any comparable amount of time spent on another recreational activity.

Further extension of roads into this fragile area would certainly destroy the present natural balance of scenic and wildlife beauty for all time to come.

Adoption of this proposal would be of priceless benefit to present and future generations.

Yours very truly,

NORMAN W. JACKSON.

LITTLE VALLEY RANCH,
Avon, Mont., June 5, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We wish to go on record as endorsing the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area being declared a Wilderness Area.

There are many other areas more suitable for development as public recreation areas, and we feel that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area should be retained in its natural state. To develop this area would be to destroy it, and this indeed would be a great loss both to the State of Montana and to the Country.

Sincerely yours,

LIT and BETTY DUPONT.

MILLTOWN, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Re Lincoln Wilderness classification.

To: Senator Quentin Burdick.

I have watched areas similar to this one become grossly overtraveled, trampled; fishing become strictly a plant one day and catch the next program.

This Lincoln-Scapegoat area could become too accessable for the streams to withstand the influx of tourism and increase in population that will inevitably befall Montana.

On short term planning, I would say yes, go ahead and use this area for logging and mass recreation—I'd no doubt sell more gas. However, the use of foresight far better applies here.

I therefore urge the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat local as a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

ROD STEBBINS.

CHINOOK, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

SENATE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: As I am not able to attend the hearing on Senate Bill 1121 on the Wilderness classification of 245,500 acres of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, I would like to indicate my full support for the passage of this bill by means of this letter.

Sincerely,

HAROLD SHANKLE.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

DEAR SIR: My comments have to do with the Senate Bill 1121 regarding the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Since our wilderness areas are rapidly diminishing I feel that it is essential that we preserve and extend such areas as we can. I therefore urge that the area named be brought into the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Thank you.

Cordially,

LEONARD J. KOVAR.

POLSON, MONT., *June 2, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: As I will be unable to attend the public hearing to be held in Great Falls on June 11, I am writing this letter in support of the proposal

to place the 245,500 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat Area in the National Wilderness Preservation System as provided for under the Wilderness Bill (P.L. 88-577).

I retired recently following 33 years of service as Refuge Manager with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. I have located here in Montana and built me a home where I could be close to and enjoy the splendid wilderness that still remains unspoiled in this great state. I am just selfish enough to want to see some of it preserved in order that I might enjoy it, as well as those in the generations to come.

I am familiar with the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area, having hunted and fished there in the past. I know this to be true wilderness in character and certainly should be preserved as such.

Development of this area would, in addition to destroying its natural beauty, adversely affect the elk, grizzly bear and other wildlife and native fish.

I am extremely firm in my belief that it is for the best economic interest of the State of Montana and for the future generations of the people of the United States, that this area remain undeveloped and included within the National Wilderness Preservation System. Certainly I trust, and do feel, that you and your Committee will do everything within your power to accomplish this.

It is especially desired that this letter become a part of the hearing record. I thank you.

Sincerely yours,

BEN M. HAZELTINE.

POLSON, MONT., *September 15, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Since writing to you on June 2 regarding my sincere interest in the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area, I have given this important matter further thought and study. The following comments are to supplement and further emphasize remarks contained in my previous letter.

Certainly I want to join and lend my support to the hundreds of wilderness conservation minded people in Montana and elsewhere throughout the United States who feel that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area should be retained in its glorious natural wild condition.

The area is now being used by many people—almost to capacity—without abusing it. Roads throughout the area can only result in overuse and destruction of the natural values which people seek.

Many excellent campgrounds and sites for their development exist nearby, outside the proposed wilderness area. Meanwhile, existing campgrounds are not being fully used. There are plenty of lands elsewhere in Montana to provide adequate recreation development without sacrificing the irreplaceable wilderness and wildlife values of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

The U.S. Forest Service roading, logging and intensive recreation plans for the Lincoln-Scapegoat area are in direct conflict with wilderness preservation which is so urgently needed for present and future use by our people. The relatively few timber stands here are known to be of poor quality. Certainly investments in a permanent logging road system and an intensive forest managemet for this timber cannot be justified if the higher wilderess values of the land are considered.

Everywhere, bulldozers are poised to strike. And what the other mechanized equipment does not destroy, the strip mine, superhighway and shopping centers will. So why can we not set aside and preserve these relatively small amounts of God given wilderness before it is too late.

I had hoped to be able to attend the Senate Committee hearing scheduled on the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness proposal in Gt. Falls, Montana on September 25, and to speak before the Committee. However, it now appears unlikely that I will be able to do so.

Therefore, I submit these meager written comments in support of the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness area, as proposed by the Wilderness Society, Montana Wilderness Association and other wilderness conservation groups.

I do hereby request that this letter and these remarks be made a part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

I feel confident that I, as well as my wilderness minded associates, can depend upon you to give this matter fair and just consideration, and to do your utmost to follow up on this wilderness movement.

Sincerely yours,

BEN M. HAZELTINE.

HAMILTON, MONT., *May 28, 1968.*

MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION,
Bozeman, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Our statement regarding the classification of the Lincoln Back Country as Wilderness—we are supporting it 100%.

We are definitely not of the more affluent class of people but still do not find these areas prohibitively expensive to enjoy. Because of the more meager needs of a back packer they are more accessible to us than parks. Therefore we feel they are actually available to a larger cross segment of population.

Once a 400 year old pine is destroyed it will be generations before our descendants will see one to take its place, if ever. Once a wilderness is gone it is gone forever.

Anyone taking a trip through our national parks knows the time is short before we will need tremendously greater areas for the esthetic enjoyment of great masses of people. As population becomes continuously denser and living at an unceasingly faster pace the need for such areas will increase accordingly.

We feel this area suitable for such an investment in our nations present and its future.

RICHARD AND ROSEMARY MIKESELL.

POLSON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Subject: Lincoln back country.

MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION,
Bozeman, Mont.:

I'm sorry that my letter is delayed, but wanted to add my firm support to efforts to preserve the Lincoln-Scapegoat country by Senate Bill 1121. I noted with chagrin the characteristic efforts of big lumbermen to prevent this preservation by talk of "locking up" resources. It is typical of the lumber baron as a type that one of them, in a recent Missoulian article, was most critical of this attempt to preserve this beautiful country, while only months ago the same paper carried an account of the same baron flying to northern Saskatchewan to enjoy the wilderness he downgrades here. Sort of a case of "if they have no bread let them eat cake." Good luck.

BILL BISHOP.

OUTLOOK, MONT., *May 1968.*

I heartily agree with the Mountain Wilderness Association, in its stand concerning the proposed plans for developing the northern Lincoln Back Country for mass recreation and timber harvest. The area is not suited for mass recreation as outlined by the Montana Wilderness Association, in their recent letter of May 1968.

MARGARET HASS.

GLACIER REALTY & INSURANCE AGENCY,
Kalispell, Mont., May 29, 1968.

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Hearing on Senate Bill 1121,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Being unable to attend the hearing in person, I would like to make the following statement:

It is imperative that the area comprising the 245,500 acres of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests be classified as wilderness.

This area is contiguous to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, and is most favorably suited for family hiking and camping. With our increase in population it is more important than ever that sites of this type be preserved. More benefit will be reaped from maintaining these areas for family camping, hiking and hunting than by destroying them by logging operations.

Yours sincerely,

M. S. MCLELLAND.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please add our support to Senate Bill 1121 for the wilderness classification of 245,500 acres of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

We believe the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness should be left in its primitive state so that future generations will be able to enjoy an unspoiled bit of nature.

There must be a quiet place left for the preservation of forest animals, for bird sanctuaries away from poisonous sprays, and unpolluted water for survival of a few species of mountain trout.

These benefits cannot be restored to an area, once lost.

Let us preserve a few of our accessible wilderness areas now—for tomorrow!

Sincerely,

MAE W. and GEORGE H. GABLE.

MISSOULA, MONT., *May 27, 1968.*

SENATE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
Great Falls, Mont.
(Attention SENATOR LEE METCALF).

As surely as our boys in Viet Nam are fighting to protect their homeland, we here in Western Montana intend to fight to protect ours! I refer to approximately 240,500 acres of the most beautiful country in the world—the Lincoln Backcountry and Scapegoat Mountain Area.

I long for the day when public lands will be cared for by governmental agencies with the knowledge that these lands belong to the public—not to the governmental agencies. When that time comes, letters such as this will become unnecessary.

I only wish to point out that there is still a large segment of the American population willing to "get off their duff" and enjoy what is left of Outdoor America—they don't need a road to take them there, either! When you combine this with (1) dwindling grizzly bear habitat, (2) fine deer and elk range, (3) lakes that support rainbow, cutthroat, golden, and brook trout, and (4) consider that this area borders an existing wilderness area—it seems senseless to equate this with a few thousand board feet of lodgepole pine.

I can only urge you to take all measures possible to get the Lincoln-Scapegoat area into a Wilderness classification before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Dr. GARY E. EUDAILY,
Member, Montana Wilderness Association,
Director, Western Montana Fish & Game Association.

WOLF POINT, MONT., *May 28, 1968.*

To: Chairman, Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands.
Subject: Hearing on S. 1121 (wilderness classification of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area).

DEAR SIR: I respectfully request that this statement be included in the written record of the hearing.

It has been the wish, for many years, of many people of Montana, that the so-called "Lincoln-Scapegoat" or "Lincoln backcounty" be given wilderness classification, thus protecting it from the misuse and eventual destruction that would result if it were "developed" for mass recreation, logging and mining. I have never been in the area under discussion but I was born and raised in the mountains of southwestern Montana and I have seen what happens when an area is opened to roads and logging. I have hiked the mountain trails for over 20 years and in that short span of my life have seen several areas I love, destroyed by the road of the mass recreationist, logger and miner.

Whether we approve or not, our nation is becoming a nation of leisure, with people looking for something to do. More and more they are turning (returning?) to the outdoors, and it is up to people of vision, such as those who have fought for many years for the Lincoln backcountry, to provide these increasing throngs of recreation-seeking Americans with quality-type recreation. There will always be plenty of space for the recreationist who wants a drive-in camp site,

with electricity and running water (from pipes). There will not be enough roadless areas left even 10 years from now, if they are not set aside now, today. Once destroyed, these areas are gone, forever, along with the grizzly bear and the black-spotted native trout that lived there.

I respectfully urge that Senate Bill 1121 be passed, thus protecting the 245,500 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Sincerely,

J. NEVIN THOMPSON, D.D.S.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *May 4, 1968.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to express my approval of and agreement with the Wilderness Association in regard to the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area. Namely, that this area be brought into the National Wilderness Preservation System.

MARGARET HILEMAN.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: A public hearing will be held in Great Falls, to provide further information relative to a decision on classification of the Lincoln Back Country as Wilderness to be included in the present adjoining Bob Marshall Wilderness.

Please enter this statement as part of that hearing.

In my opinion this land would best serve the people if allowed to remain in its present state of undevelopment. The demands of the people for this type of recreation is increasing at a greater pace than we have provided for. This country in question is typical of much of Western Montana. Fragile soils, small streams, render it entirely unsuitable for mass recreation; and once the bulldozers have a go at it, we will have just one more area of torn up mountains, soil erosion and silt polluted streams.

I find it difficult to believe the statements made by the "fast buck" boys that Montana economies will be seriously retarded if we do not open this area to multiple use, which would include timber harvest.

If we are so desperately in need of timber that questionable areas such as this must be used now, then it certainly is not complimentary to the agencies responsible for the management of our timber lands for past practices whereby it becomes mandatory that we must reach into the very last pockets of our once vast timber resources.

In a recent issue of Life Magazine there is an article titled: "These Murdered Mountains," which describes the complete destruction of the mountains and streams by the mining industry in the Eastern United States. One only has to open his eyes in Western Montana to see exactly the same thing being done by other industries.

In summary may I ask that this particular area be left as it is now and given Wilderness protection. If, in the distant future, the demands are such that this must be used for timber harvest, then it can be done. One only hopes that if this comes about, logging methods will have been developed to a degree whereby timber may be removed without the devastating destruction of our soil and water resources as practiced today.

Sincerely,

T. W. EDISON.

CORWALLIS, MONT., *June 2, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I believe, both as a private citizen and as a member of the Montana Wilderness Association, that the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area should be accorded wilderness classification.

Thank you for considering my point of view and concern about this matter.

Respectfully yours,

E. TERRILL NOBLES.

BILLINGS, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

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

DEAR SIR: As an interested citizen, I urge you and your committee to recommend approval on Senate Bill 1121, dealing with the wilderness classification of

the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests.

There are two few of these areas left that are suitable to this type of outdoor activity. This country would add little to what Montana already offers, if it were to be added to the areas used for mass recreation, whereas it now offers, both to this generation and generations to come, the priceless heritage of true pristine wilderness.

As a realtor would phrase it: the maximum land use for this area is—"Wilderness!"

Sincerely,

AUSTIN DARKENWALD.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to register my support to the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal, and request you do all that you can to bring this proposal into reality.

The future of this wilderness portion of Montana, I believe, is not in development for mass recreation and timber harvest, but in preservation as a natural wilderness that may be enjoyed in a special way for this generation and others to come. Natural, virgin forest areas are rapidly disappearing from the American landscape. We have here an excellent opportunity to preserve such an area at practically no cost to the taxpayer and certainly no injury to existing business or commercial interests.

Sincerely,

HARRY SCHMAUTZ.

KALISPELL, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Too much of our forests and mountains are being torn up by logging and roads, and we must protect more of our remaining forests that are still unspoiled.

I am very happy to support you in your effort to create this wilderness area.

JIM STEPHENS.

FLATHEAD VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Kalispell, Mont.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I favor making the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat area into a wilderness area for the use of all the citizens of our great country. I feel that we have so little left of our great domain to be used for future generations.

Sincerely,

LEO W. SHEPHERD.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Please be advised that the undersigned supports the proposed wilderness designation for the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area adjacent to the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

I feel that the values present there are worth preserving.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. SALANSKY.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Re proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The proposal to create the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness has my whole hearted support and approval.

As well as the more evident reasons for establishing this area as a wilderness is one I believe has not had too much publicity and that is to help protect the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

I know you are aware of the logging and road building developments taking place at the north and northwest boundaries of the Bob Marshall, namely the Spotted Bear River logging road and the Bunker Creek logging road. These activities are right up to the boundaries of the Wilderness and cannot help but have a detrimental effect.

The establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness will help to protect the southeast boundary of the Bob Marshall and, in my opinion, for that reason alone, deserves favorable consideration.

Very truly yours,

W. C. E. HEINECKE.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 13, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF:

We have been contacted by the Montana Wilderness Association and it has been brought to our attention that the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness area is "under the gun". Please add our names to the growing list of avid supporters of this wilderness area.

Montana is one of the fewer great states that have areas that can be considered as wilderness. If called upon we would be most willing to enlist support, give testimony or submit statements that would help maintain and preserve this freedom of the wilds for present and future enjoyment.

Mr. and Mrs. TED R. CLARKE.

BETHLEHEM LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Kalispell, Mont.

To Whom It May Concern:

I speak not only for myself but I echo the feelings of many of my people when I say how concerned we are that programs like the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area become a reality. If this land belongs to we the people as we have been told that it does then certainly we should have something to say about what is done with it and what happens to it. Just look at a map and see how really little truly virgin land is left . . . if the economy of our state and nation is such that this area of land has to be logged or otherwise used then we had better throw in the towel because we have lost the battle already. There just isn't any question that far more people will benefit from this land being a wilderness area than anything else—not only from our state but the nation—not only in our time but in the years to come.

Very sincerely,

H. PEDER WALDUM, *Pastor.*

SNAPPY SERVISENTER,
Kalispell, Mont.

Senator METCALF,
Member, Scapegoat Wilderness Area Hearing Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: In the interest of maintaining recreational areas for increasing number of people seeking such recreation, I strongly urge the inclusion of the Scapegoat Wilderness Area to the Bob Marshall Wilderness or even its formation as a single area to be used as the famous Bob Marshall is now being enjoyed.

It is important that we keep in mind that the need and demand for this sort of thing is ever increasing. Our numbers of the population that seek this are greater than ever before, and these same people are now being faced with the shorter work-week, all of which increases the need for these lands. And finally, it can simply be stated that it is a means of preserving one of our natural resources.

Thank you for your attention to my letter and request.

Sincerely yours,

VERNE W. LUPTON.

KALISPELL, MONT., *September 23, 1968.*

I feel that the best use of the Lincoln Back Country would be to preserve this in its natural wilderness state. Let this be the "control laboratory" for areas that are still to be explored and researched· Our science people need this more than the small timber returns it offers.

Very truly,

GEORGE R. DACHS.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I would like this letter to be made part of the testimony for the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness hearing.

I would definitely like to have this area left as a wilderness area for several reasons. It is by far better to put in wilderness as opposed to opening roads like we already have to locations of the same general surrounding. The timber is of little value, as it is of a very low grade and sparse. Wild game and trout is plentiful in this area now and available to those that, even though may not be able to afford renting horses etc., can reach it by short hikes.

In closing I urge you to speed passage of Senate bill No. 1121.

Respectively yours,

ROY O. TRENSON.

LINCOLN, MONT.

Hon. Senators METCALF and BURDICK.

I would like to have this letter made a part of the record to include the Lincoln Back Country in the Wilderness Act under S. 1121.

My time spent in the Lincoln Back Country has been limited due to the fact that with my job I do not have much free time.

I believe that the resources of hunting, fishing, camping and other outdoor recreation in an unroaded area far exceeds the mining, and timber resources whose value is questionable and scattered over such a wide area the cost of building roads in a very unstable soil would be completely out of reason. I hope the area will be made a wilderness and all motorized vehicles will be kept out. This area should remain in its natural state for the use of those who desire to get away from the humdrum every day life and enjoy the peace and tranquility of no time clocks to punch, no cars to run a person down, no trains or planes to rush to catch—a place they can travel as their fore fathers did, by mule, horse back or on foot, stopping when they want, to rest and enjoy the tranquility.

ARTHUR E. TINSLEY,
Montana Highway Patrol.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

Senator BURDICK,
Senator METCALF,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATORS: I have been a resident of Lincoln, Montana for the past 21 years. I am now 23 years of age and have lived and worked with my father on a cattle ranch in Lincoln. I am presently a law student at the University of Montana and hope some day to practice law in this state. I am writing this letter in the honest desire and opinion that I can represent the great majority of younger people in this area concerning the Lincoln Back Country.

With all humility may I say that I pride myself in considering all important issues such as this with concentrated thought and regard for both sides of a question. I have not been pressured by family or community ties, and I truly feel as many of the youths I have conversed with that the Lincoln Back Country should be placed in the National Wilderness System as your Senate Bill 1121 provides.

When weighing the facts, it seems most sensible from all standpoints to keep this primative area in its present state. I do not understand how this fragile area can possibly sustain heavy automobile tourist traffic and exploitation by the lumber industry. As it now stands, this area is being used to its fullest capacity by hikers and horseback travel.

The Lincoln Back Country is a valuable area for game animals and as Lincoln residents fully realize, when roads are established in an area the wild game animals soon disappear or become very scarce.

Economically speaking, any exploitation by the lumbering industry, and any increased tourist trade, could not begin to pay for the road construction costs and destruction and deterioration of the land by heavy traffic.

There seems to be a minority of people backing this multiple use plan merely for their own economic interests; this group has little regard for the land itself. However, it is heartening to see the tremendous amount of work that individuals and groups have put forth to save this area.

It has been apparent that the people who are sincerely interested in this area want its preservation for future generations. We in Lincoln have now had an intimate taste of the democratic process at work and urge you, the esteemed law makers of our land, to support Senate Bill 1121.

I submit this letter to you in the hope that you may realize how the majority of young people in this area who are vitally interested in the Lincoln Back Country feel. I honestly feel I am speaking for their sentiments on this issue.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN GROSFIELD.

RONAN, MONT., *May 28, 1968.*

Mr. CECIL GARLAND,
Lincoln Backcountry Wilderness Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

DEAR MR. GARLAND: I wish to let you know that I am in full support of promoting the Lincoln Back Country as a Wilderness Area.

There are too few places left in the United States where a person can get away from the roar of the automobile with their exhaust fumes.

Thank you for your efforts.

Yours truly,

W. R. ANDERSON.

LINCOLN, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF.

I wish this letter to be considered on public record regarding the proposed Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness area.

I am for the Scapegoat area being set aside as a primitive wilderness area with no more disturbance than is necessary for trails and fire control.

I have spent about eleven seasons in the proposed wilderness area, since 1942, on trail construction and maintenance; I know that timber is not a resource of any consequence in the area for I work in the logging industry.

While the streams and lakes are fine fishing at the present, they are not large enough to stand the pressure roads would put upon them.

The area is now a breeding ground for mule deer, elk, grizzly bear, goats, and mountain sheep. This will all be gone when the area is crisscrossed with roads, as all present-day operations are.

Why should we destroy so much for so many while getting so little for so few?

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE D. LANTIS.

LINCOLN, MONT.

SIR: I am against the building of roads in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. I feel this in the first place is another needless government expenditure—and everyone knows the government spends great quantities of money—our money—the peoples' money—with appalling recknessness.

If people want back there, I say let them walk or ride horseback—it'll keep them physically fit—another government program. There are plenty of other just as beautiful and more beautiful places to visit with a car.

What is so terrible about leaving a virgin a virgin? Let's not spoil *all* of God's creation for Him. Let's leave our remaining wilderness areas just as they are—virgin and unspoiled.

Sincerely,

MARION MARTY.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 11, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like the following information made a part of the forthcoming Lincoln Back Country Wilderness Area hearing.

I am fifty seven years old, born February 24, 1911, a citizen of the United States, a resident of the State of Montana for fifty six years, and a tax payer of Cascade and Lewis and Clark Counties of Montana. Our business is Automotive Parts. I have purchased a Montana fish, bird and big game license every year since I was fifteen years old and have enjoyed the privilege of using these permits in many areas in the State. I have made several trips into the Bob Marshall Wilderness area and also the Lincoln Back Country and am a strong supporter for including the Lincoln Back Country area into the Bob Marshall Wilderness area.

The reasons for my support of this bill are too numerous to include in this letter, and I am sure have been voiced many times by more capable people

than myself. However, at the forthcoming hearing, if necessary, I would be more than happy to give my reasons for supporting this bill.

After having lived in Montana for fifty six years and enjoyed the many benefits that are available to all people regardless of residence, I feel that not to support this bill would be the greatest injustice I could ever do to the State of Montana and all people that may ever come to the State to enjoy its wonderful recreation facilities.

Please do all possible in your power to conserve and preserve the natural recreation areas we have in the wonderful State of Montana.

Yours very truly,

OTTO HAVERLANDT.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT,
Bloomington, Ind., September 19, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand that consideration is now being given to the establishment of a wilderness area, now referred to as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness. I strongly favor this proposal and urge the Congress not to permit this area to be converted to other use unless overriding considerations of which I have no knowledge make that a necessity.

This summer I made an extended tour of the Canadian Rockies, Western Montana and Idaho, and Utah and Colorado. I am impressed by the need for more acreage in both natural wilderness areas and recreational parks. We have many sites which offer the attractions of beautiful landscape and natural wonders which indicate fitness for recreational purposes. Areas suitable for the preservation of the original wilderness are scarce indeed. It seems to me, therefore, imperative that we seize upon the few spots suitable for that purpose and preserve them indefinitely as original wilderness areas. I understand that the Lincoln area is such a place.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. HYNEMAN,
Professor of Government.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT,
Bloomington, Ind., September 18, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: During the past two years I have been associated with a research project that, to my good fortune, has been conducted in Montana and contiguous states. Thus, I have been afforded the opportunity to hike a portion of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. On the basis of this experience plus observations of "wilderness" areas that have been developed, I strongly urge the preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area in its wilderness state.

The factors supporting the above position are manifold, and I regret that I lack the expertise required to present them with authority. Several, however, are within my competence. These include the fact that the Lincoln-Scapegoat region comprises a natural ecological system. To attribute systemic qualities to the area is to suggest intricate interdependencies—interdependencies that in this case happen to be fragile. It is, for example, a well-supported generalization that with significant intrusions of people and their garbage, bears tend to come down from the high country. With this departure from reliance upon natural sources of food various aspects of the bear's behavior change. This results in an increase in the number of encounters between the casual tourist and the grizzly. And although the bear may have the short-run advantage, the secular trend does not augur well for his continued existence as a true wilderness animal.

In addition to the impact of high density tourist utilization upon the feeding and migratory patterns of large mammals, even a casual inspection of the trails, the soils and the topography of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area clearly indicates that the construction of roadways constitute an extreme silt damage potential to waters whose carrying capacity is low and to species whose margin for viability is very slight. This observation has been confirmed by professional geologists.

In addition to the ecological-systemic aspects of this issue, certain purely human considerations strongly argue for the preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area as wilderness. By this I mean to suggest not only its preservation as testimony to our occasional ability to transcend short-term interests and payoffs, and not only the satisfaction which arises from the mere knowledge that an ecological system exists in a nearly pristine state, but also I think it extremely important that there remain areas whose accessibility is limited to those willing to make an investment in terms of personal effort.

It is with the above in mind that I strongly urge the passage of Senate Bill 1121.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BADEN,
Research Cordinator, Political and Administrative Development Program.

WAYZATA, MINN., *June 5, 1968.*

To Whom It May Concern:

May I add my plea to those who are asking that the Lincoln Back Country be made a wilderness area.

The beautiful, solitary areas are becoming fewer and fewer. Please can't we preserve and cherish the ones remaining.

The Minnesota Historical Society recently republished a book called "The Valley of the Mississippi Illustrated", originally published in 1854. In it the author, Henry Lewis, included many lithographs of his impressions of the countryside. And looking at those lithographs as the country was and I see it as it now is I wonder if we should have been the ones to "modernize" it. Our ability to "soil our own nests", to use an old English expression, is greater even than the ability of nature to clean up after us.

Sincerely,

JEAN S. GALUSHA.

LINCOLN, MONT., *June 14, 1968.*

DEAR CECIL: Your tireless work towards having the Lincoln Back Country designated as a wilderness area are to be commended. I bought my home in Lincoln because it would be close to such unspoiled natural wilderness. There are not many such areas remaining in this country. It should be preserved as it is without roads for the people of Montana and other visitors. Future generations also could then benefit by its preservation.

I vigorously support the proposal that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness be given protection under the Wilderness Act.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. MCQUILLAN, M.D.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT., *August 4, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: During the week of July 22nd, my wife and I, along with our three horses completed a captivating trail ride in Glacier Park. We started out at Lake McDonald and terminated the pack trip at Sun Point on upper St. Mary Lake.

The traffic that we encountered on these rugged trails, some on horseback, but mostly people hiking, was astounding to us. This experience assured my convictions that the use of our wilderness areas is going to increase tremendously in the future years.

Now is the time to act and reserve such areas as the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness. During the past twenty years, I have witnessed a major portion of our local mountainous area being transformed from it's natural beauty into a badly defaced landscape, much of it crisscrossed with dusty logging roads.

As farsighted citizens and conservationalists, it is our duty to act now to preserve this area for the use of our future generations, preserved in its natural state, unscarred by roads and the ravages of logging operations.

Please include this letter as a part of the Senate Interior Subcommittee Hearing Record. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE J. SMITH,
Past President, Thompson Falls Rod & Gun Club.

LINCOLN, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF:

I would like this letter to go on record as to my feelings on the Lincoln Wilderness area affair.

I can see no logical reason why this or any other wilderness area should be made a public access by building roads into them.

Beautiful hunting and fishing areas have been almost totally destroyed in the past by this same method; namely, The Bitterroot East Fork and West Fork, Superior, Little Joe National Forest, and Columbia Falls just to mention a few.

We, as residents of Lincoln, want to see this area remain as it has been in the past so that the future generations will also be able to enjoy the wildlife and recreation areas as we do.

The only way this can be accomplished is to leave it as it is and let those who want to do their hunting and fishing from automobiles to the places which man has already destroyed through his greed and laziness.

Sincerely,

AVERY G. JOHNSON.

LINCOLN, MONT., *June 3 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF:

I was born and raised in the Bitterroot Valley at Darby, which for awhile was thickly populated with wild life. Now, with so called progress and industry, you are very lucky to hear a squirrel, let alone see any big game in what once was one of the most beautiful places in Montana. If a portion of the area had been made a wilderness area as we are trying to do with the Lincoln Back Country, a true Montanan would have a place to go to remember what Montana was like once, and not be having to hear a car, chainsaw or a motorcycle tearing up the countryside.

The proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area is one of the reasons our family has taken residence in Lincoln. It is one of the most beautiful spots in Montana, but if not made a wilderness area soon, it will be scarred up with roads and tree stumpage as most of the rest of a once beautiful country like the Bitterroot Valley is now.

I have made numerous trips to the Selway and Bob Marshall primitive areas, and to me this is Montana at its fullest.

Anyone disagreeing with this proposal must be from North Dakota and very jealous. Anyone that objects to this proposal has never been in the back country and seen how beautiful it is without the help of man or machine.

Sincerely,

AVERY A. JOHNSON, Jr.

COLVILLE, WASH., *September 16, 1968.*

MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION,
Lincoln, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: I today received your pamphlet concerning the meeting at Great Falls to promote support for legislation to provide permanent classification of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area as Wilderness. I have already written Senator Jackson enlisting his support for wilderness classification for this area under the bills now before the Congress in Washington.

I am whole heartedly in support of this legislation and just as much against the Forest Service desire to open up the area for such all out development as they propose.

In case you wonder why my interest, it was my privilege at one period of my life to have traveled and been in this area almost in its entirety, extensively. It is beautiful territory to be classed as Wilderness and I consider it not the type of territory to be developed for all out recreation use and logging development. Such would only result in erosion in the drainages, overused camping areas, overgrazing in places and motorcycles and snow mobiles in entirely too many areas where they have no business to be. It would also lead to encroachments of an undesirable nature onto the Bob Marshall Wilderness area. I have seen other areas of a similar nature developed and have noted the changes that take place afterwards. Montana has an abundance of areas now open for recreation and there is no need to sacrifice this Lincoln area. Once opened up the damage is done and there is no way to rectify the error.

Very truly yours,

VERNON L. COLLINS.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 17, 1967.*

Senator METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to see the Lincoln back country area included in the Wilderness Act of 1964. This act is the only way we can save a small amount of our natural beauty and wildlife for the future.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY OGILVIE, *Teacher.*

TWIN BRIDGE, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am very much in favor of seeing the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area included in our National Wildlife Preservation system. I would strongly urge you to support this measure.

This is the only way in which some of our common heritage and natural scenic beauty can be saved for our children and generations to come.

Please support this measure to add the Scapegoat area to our National Wilderness Reservation System.

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS R. MILLER.

Senator METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area should be included in the Wilderness Act of 1964. This would protect the beauty and resources for the future.

I firmly believe this will be best for all.

Sincerely,

EVA C. NOWLIN,
A Citizen and Taxpayer.

DILLON, MONT., *September 13, 1968.*

Mr. LEE METCALF,
Helena, Mont.

DEAR SIR: We are very glad to examine your record and know you are most interested in conserving our resources by saving our wilderness areas. Will you try to include the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in a lasting wilderness area?

Yours truly,

M. B. PYEATT.
MARGARET PYEATT.

DILLON, MONT., *September 12, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I like Lincoln Back Country as it is in its natural wild condition. I would like to see it continue as a habitat for bears, birds, bees and Boy Scouts, as well as back-packers who like to escape, occasionally, from multi-purpose roads and developments.

Sincerely yours,

MARY L. KRETZER,
Teacher in the Elementary Grades.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1968.

CECIL GARLAND,
President, Lincoln Back Country Protective Association.

DEAR MR. GARLAND: We are both familiar with the Lincoln-Scapegoat proposed wilderness area; having made a pack trip through the area shortly after the floods several years ago.

We are in agreement with the views of the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association concerning the proposed acreage addition to wilderness classification.

Please feel free to utilize this letter in support of your testimony at the hearing in Great Falls.

One item we would like to stress—is that we do not feel that by classifying this area in question as wilderness that it sets it aside for just a few people of means. It will mostly certainly be enjoyed by the average family interested in the outdoors for many years to come, and we do not feel that it is a selfish move to restrict the area for just a "few" privileged people as opponents of the bill have so often tried to stress!

Sincerely,

GLEN T. CHILDS.
ELSIE F. CHILDS.

FAIRFIELD, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

MR. CECIL GARLAND,
President, Lincoln Back Country Protective Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

DEAR MR. GARLAND: I would like to see the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Area made into a Wilderness Area.

This summer my four children ages 5, 8, 11, and 12, my husband and myself backpacked into an area such as this. We spent two very wonderful days back away from roads and crowds of people. It was an experience that not one of us will forget.

I think that we should all realize that once areas such as these are opened up with roads, and the timber cut they lose their beauty and peacefulness. Man can not replace an area such as this, only God. But man can preserve it, if he will.

Sincerely,

MRS. WILLIAM J. MCRAE.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

CECIL GARLAND,
President, Lincoln Back Country Protective Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: We suggest that the Lincoln Back Country bill authored by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield be enacted without delay. By giving this "wilderness" classification we are providing for future generations of Americans who are not yet here to do this for themselves. We have already despoiled much of the nation's natural resources and beauties; the least we can do at this late date is to set something away to be used when the results of the expected "population explosion" make it necessary to draw upon these untouched reserves for expanded recreation.

Furthermore, this Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country may be the answer to our dwindling grizzly bear population. Biologists and wildlife experts have stated that the grizzly is in danger of extinction. This back country is ideally suited as a refuge for this animal. And, since Glacier National Park is experiencing increasing tourist-hiker problems in connection with its grizzly bear population, it might just well be that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country could prove to be the last stand of Ursus horibilus. Future generations of Americans—several hundred million strong—might someday call this noble experiment "Grizzly Bear National Park" or "Grizzly Bear National Wildlife Refuge".

Sincerely,

DAVID R. GUELFF.
WILLIAM H. CAMERON.
JAMES P. CYR.
ROBERT A. BOND.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., September 18, 1968.

DEAR MR. GARLAND: I would like to add my voice in support of saving the Lincoln Back Country Area. Surely, our children will curse us if we allow this great natural heritage to be exploited.

All best wishes for the success of your venture.

Respectfully,

JAMES H. VAUGHAN, Jr.,
Associate Professor.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 17, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing, urging you and the Congress to create a Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

My family and I have used this area in its primitive state rather extensively. During the past twenty-five years I have spent from one to three weeks, almost every year, traveling, hunting, fishing and sightseeing in this proposed wilderness area. I can testify to the need and use of this area by the public, especially during the last five years, as most of the good camp areas are in use and in increasing number of people are on the trails.

I have enjoyed several of our present wilderness areas. It is my opinion that the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness has more to offer in the nature of true wilderness than any I have seen.

I feel that the creation of the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness will be one of the greatest accomplishments of our time and also if it is not created it would be a great loss to us and future generations.

I as that this letter be made a part of the record of the Congressional hearing.

Respectfully yours,

W. EDWIN STAHL, D.V.M.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 19, 1968.*

Mr. CECIL GARLAND,
President, Lincoln-Scapegoat Protective Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

DEAR MR. GARLAND: We conservation-minded folks ask that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be set aside as a roadless wilderness as suggested and urged by Western Montana Fish and Game Commission and other organizations. We are urging this as an investment in America's future.

We are aware, of course, that various interests would like to road the area, log it, and mine it, although the area consists of very poor saw timber and no notable mineral deposits.

It's time to stop looking at everything through rose-colored glasses with dollar-signs engraved on each lens. It's getting so every remaining roadless area burns a hole in our collective pocket. How about thinking ahead a few years? Enacting SB 1121 will indicate that we are doing just this.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. COFFEY.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 20, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Hearing Committee.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senator from Montana.

SIRS: I would like the following statement to be made a part of the Senate hearing record.

My father and mother came to the Blackfoot Valley in 1919 and for many years ran the Lincoln mercantile store. I have lived my entire life in Lincoln, except for the years I spent in the service in the E.T.O.

I made my first trip to the Back Country when I was about five years old. A friend and myself, both about the same age and weight rode in pack boxes on an old roan pack horse for this trip. The party consisted of my mother, a lady friend (the mother of the boy in the other pack box), a local packer and others I cannot recall. This was my first experience.

Since that first trip into the area, I've made countless hunting and fishing trips into the wilderness. More important was the desire to get away and ramble around where the presence of man was not greatly in evidence. During the late 30's and early 40's I worked as a packer and guide in the Lincoln Back Country. I did this because of the excuse it offered to spend more time in the loved area.

Since my earliest recollection, people have come from everywhere in the United States to enjoy the kind of recreation this area has to offer. Many people who never went into the Back Country came to Lincoln because of our wilderness and wildlife environment. Their children and grandchildren go into this area

today, and beyond a doubt the great majority are in favor of keeping the area in the wild state. To this day during the summer and fall months people still come to Lincoln for the same reason they did 40 years ago—to see the wilderness.

I believe to take away our Lincoln Back Country would be a tremendous disservice to the economy of our valley and to the quality of our recreation potential.

As owner-operator of the local I.G.A. grocery store in Lincoln, I am aware of the large number of people who go into this area and the supplies that are purchased for these trips.

The changes in Lincoln over the period of my life time have been very great. The lumbering industry, the highway, the advent of electricity have all brought a way of life that we could not visualize in the early days. The Lincoln Back Country is still the same. I would like to see it remain as such, so my grandson can see part of this country as his great-grandfather saw it. There is an ever increasing number of people flowing into our valley and the pressures on our wilderness and wildlife community are growing also.

With the possibility of a large mining complex coming into our valley, ever greater pressures will be exerted on our wilderness resource, therefore if we are to be a well rounded community, we must retain our wilderness "flavor" and environment.

That the Lincoln area will always be a desirable place to live and raise our families is, in my opinion, highly dependent upon the retention of the Lincoln Back Country.

Senator, I therefore urge the passage of bill number S 1121, that will set aside the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

ROBERT P. DIDRIKSEN.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We are very much in favor of the house bill concerning the program for preserving the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country as a wilderness area. In our opinion it would be drastic move to destroy this most remarkable wilderness area, so our future generations cannot see wildlife in its natural habitat as we have been doing for so many, many years. The wild game and life does not compare with the kind of wild game and life one sees in the National Parks in this country. This is actually a wilderness area, so far untouched and unscarred by man, where nature is at its best. We have been in the outfitting and packing business in this area since 1946; after serving four years in the United States Army, we found no other place that meant so much to us. It isn't easy to "live off the scenery", as you might put it. That is not the idea, we are here because we love this back country and wilderness life. Even though we try to make our main living from pack trips into this area, there are easier, surer ways to make a living. However, we chose this life because of the wilderness and wildlife in this area. We would like to have every one enjoy this wonderful primitive area as we have along with our family.

This is a fragile country, it could be ruined with the logging and road building as so much of our local area has been scarred by roads and other industries that have come to the Lincoln Valley since we first started in this business over 20 years ago.

We realize one cannot hold back progress, however, there must be some wilderness preserved and where will you find a better place than the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country.

We would like to go down on record for passage of bill S. 1121, to preserve the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country as a true wilderness area.

GENE and MARTHA YOUDERIAN.

R. L. PAYNE CO.,
Lincoln, Mont., September 22, 1968.

GENTLEMEN: I would like this letter to be made a part of the Lincoln Back Country hearing on September 23. Because of business reasons I will not be able to attend the hearing.

My family and I moved from California to Montana in 1965. I have established an electrical contracting business and am presently building a home in Lincoln.

We enjoy the Lincoln area with its hunting, fishing, and scenic country. I have back packed and ridden horseback into the back country. It is my feeling that this area should remain as it is and be protected by classifying it as a wilderness.

There is no comparison of California's outdoor recreation to Montana's. This can be proven by the hundreds of Californians that come to this area for vacations. The outdoor recreation potential is great. I feel that if we don't do something now to protect it, we will be losing a big asset for Montana. I urge you to protect this country and classify the Lincoln Back Country as a wilderness.

Sincerely,

ROBERT PAYNE.

HELENA, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

We request the Lincoln Back Country be designated a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

GERALD L. COOPER.
PRUDENCE M. COOPER.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1968.

CECIL GARLAND,
President, Lincoln Back Country Protective Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

DEAR CECIL: I would like to see the Scapegoat Wilderness saved as a Wilderness for my generation to enjoy as much as the past Generations have enjoyed. If they build roads back in the Bob Marshall Wilderness, the public will ruin the Wilderness for the wildlife. I think we should have some of our country saved for our wildlife and the Bob Marshall Wilderness is the perfect country to save.

BOB MARTINELLI.

HELENA, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Although I can't be at the hearing, I want to go on record here in complete support of Senate Bill S. 1121, to make the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness area.

I live in Helena and have all my life and I can tell you that we in Montana need this Lincoln Back Country preserved for wild country outdoor use.

Please see that Congress accepts my letter as a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM NOREN.

HELENA, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am very sorry that I will be unable to attend the hearing but I would like to go on record as being in complete support of Senate Bill S. 1121 to make the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness Area.

There are too few of these areas left and I feel that what we do have should be preserved.

Please see that Congress accepts my letter as a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DARLINE L. MCDOWELL.

HELENA, MONT.

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Since I am unable to attend the hearing I am putting my views on paper. I am in favor of Senate Bill S. 1121 to keep the Lincoln-Scapegoat Country a Wilderness area. There are too few places of this nature left. Quiet places of natural habitat where the game can thrive.

Competition for open spaces increases and it is most vital to preserve as much land as possible. We here in Montana appreciate these areas where we can go

to relax, to either hunt, hike or ride horseback. Beautiful scenery and lots of wild game. It should not be disturbed.

Please see that my letter be accepted as a part of the hearing record.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Darline L. McDowell.

Helena, Mont., *September 20, 1968.*

Senator Quentin Burdick,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Burdick: I am well acquainted with the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area, and believe that it should be a wilderness area. I agree that it has great recreational value as it is, in its natural state, and am sure that this would nearly all be lost if it were to be logged off and left as many of our areas are.

Please do everything possible to help pass Senate Bill S. 1121.

Yours truly,

R. I. Brewer.

Palmquist Electric Co.,
Helena, Mont., *September 21, 1968.*

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I have been in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country several times and sincerely believe it should be preserved for future recreation.

I would appreciate your helping pass Bill S. 1121.

Very truly yours,

E. E. Palmquist.

Helena, Mont., *September 19, 1968.*

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: My wife and I would like to request wilderness protection for the area designated as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

Our reasons are many and too lengthy to go into detail. We speak as users of this area—by horse pack train, our own donkeys, back-packing and hiking for the past 30 years.

Montana is a state blessed with areas that can be made into wilderness areas for the enjoyment of all the people in the United States. Other states are not so endowed, and we should fight to preserve these areas until the time comes that it is an absolute necessity for their development. That time is not here yet.

We request that this be made a part of the record of the committee hearing on this matter.

Respectfully,

Bob Samson.

Helena, Mont., *September 20, 1968.*

Dear Senator Burdick: I would like to express my strong feelings in favor of the proposal to make the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness area.

It means a great deal to me, to know that an area is designated as wilderness and will be protected from mans sometimes pointless progress (road building etc.).

The long range recreational potential of the Lincoln Back Country for the individual who enjoys hiking, fishing and hunting in this area should be considered more important than any short range profit making use such as timber cutting.

Sincerely,

Mike Trevor.

Helena, Mont., *September 20, 1968.*

Dear Sirs: Please register my opinion as being against putting roads into this proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area for logging and recreation. I am for leaving it as it is for future generations to see and use, and making it part of the existing Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

Sincerely,

Mark Hopkins, Jr.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1968.

Hon. SENATOR BURDICK.

We the undersigned would like to request wilderness protection for the area known as "The Lincoln Back Country."

Sincerely,

DONALD D. ANDERSON.
JACK G. CRIDER.

HELENA, MONT.

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Although I can't be at the hearing, I want to go on record here in complete support of Senate Bill S. 1121, to make the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness area.

"I live in Helena and have all my life and I can tell you that we in Montana need this Lincoln Back Country preserved for wild country outdoor use.

Please see that Congress accepts my letter as a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

LLOYD D. BACKEBERG.

HELENA, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am definitely in favor of Senate Bill S. 1121, to make the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness area. We here in Montana appreciate the area as it is. I feel that there are to few areas of this kind left and that they should be preserved.

I am unable to attend the hearing in Great Falls on Monday, September 23, 1968 but I would like to have Congress accept my letter as a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

LLOYD BACKEBERG.

HELENA, MONT., *September 24, 1968.*

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

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the Helena Wildlife Association, wish to go on record supporting bill No. S1121, placing the Lincoln Back Country into the wilderness area.

Sincerely yours,

L. BACKBERG,
President, Wildlife Association.

HELENA, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Although I cannot be at the hearing, I would like to go on record here in complete support of Senate Bill S. 1121, to make the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness area.

I live in Helena and know this area very well. We in Montana need this area preserved as a Wilderness area.

Please see that Congress accepts my letter as a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

ANTONE W. HAMES.

HELENA, MONT.

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am very well acquainted with the Lincoln Back Country Scapegoat Mountain area, and I think the proposal to make it a wilderness area is wonderful. I have hunted, fished, and packed in this country and taken others in with me. We are all agreed, it has great recreational value as it is in its natural state.

Please do everything possible to help pass Senate Bill S. 1121 on the Lincoln Back Country; and also make the contents of my letter a part of the hearing record.

Yours very truly,

ANTONE W. HAMES.

HELENA, MONT.

Hon. Senator BURDICK:

I am very concerned about the possibility of the Lincoln Back Country being destroyed. We are all aware that it could never be replaced. Please leave it as it is.

Sincerely,

GEORGE SNYDER.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1968.

Hon. Senator BURDICK:

This is to express my wishes that laws be passed to make the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

GERALD L. ANDERS.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 22, 1968.*

CECIL GARLAND,
President, Lincoln Back Contry Protective Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

DEAR CECIL: I would like to see the Scapegoat Wilderness saved as a Wilderness for future generations to enjoy as much as people have in the past generations. Also to preserve the wildlife.

It is to my opinion that if the Lincoln Scapegoat Country is opened to the public, by building roads, etc., it will also ruin the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

T. E. MORTENSON.

HELENA, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am very well acquainted with the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area, and I think the proposal to make it a wilderness area is wonderful! I have hunted, fished and packed in this country and taken others in with me. We are all in agreement that it has great recreational value as it is in its natural state.

Please do everything possible to help pass Senate Bill 1121 on the Lincoln Back Country; also make the contents of my letter a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

FAY L. MCDOWELL.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 23, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like this letter to be part of the hearing record.

The area on trial does not need more roads at this time.

The roads that have been built all over this area are not maintained after the purpose has been accomplished.

The money that has been wasted on a few, I'm sure can be put to better use to benefit all the people. Thank you.

Sincerely,

WILLARD and WAUNETA EVANS.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1968.

Hon. Senator BURDICK:

I urge you to do everything within your power to preserve the Lincoln Back Country by making it into a wilderness area. I feel this tract of land will be of considerably more value to present and future generations by preserving it in its natural state rather than allowing it to be desecrated by commercial activities.

Sincerely,

CURTIS W. KOSMAN.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I was much pleased to hear of your introduction of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness bill in the U.S. Senate and would encourage your continued working towards the passage of this bill. As you undoubtedly know this is some of the most fabulous wilderness left in the United States, and its proximity to the Bob Marshall area makes it even further worth maintaining as a wilderness.

The people of Montana do appreciate your work, and that of Representative Batton in this issue.

Thank you.

Cordially,

VAN KIRKE NELSON, M.D.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 19, 1968.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Please place us on record as two more individuals interested in seeing the Lincoln Back Country classified as Wilderness area.

We feel it is important to preserve the country as God created it for the coming generations. This is an area accessible to many of us. It is not a costly vacation to back pack into a Wilderness area. People who cannot afford skiing, snowmobiles, big boats and costly trips can afford this and it is an accomplishment which puts a person in accord with nature, the greatness of God's creations can truly be recognized, and you can find much peace and contentment within yourself.

Must our progress rob us of our past?

Very truly yours,

MAURICE BAKKE.
JILL BAKKE.

THE NECKYOKE,
Kalispell, Mont.

Hon. Senator METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to add my support to the creation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. I firmly believe that this area should be left wild and in its natural state for the future generations of America to enjoy.

Sincerely,

ROCKY KOERPER.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 20, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We would like to urge your support of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area, now under consideration.

Montana has many scenic areas which are accessible by road, so that those who are not able to, or do not wish to go by foot and/or horseback can still enjoy the beauty of the outdoors. But it is necessary, now and in the future, to have areas which are preserved in their natural state as much as possible, and this can only be done through designation and use of such areas as "wilderness."

As residents of western Montana, we are particularly interested in such areas, and hope that the Lincoln-Scapegoat will be favorably considered.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. SCOTT.
BONITA F. SCOTT.

KALISPELL, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Various estimates show a tremendous population explosion in the near future.

For this reason, I see it as our duty to preserve as much choice area in its wild or primitive state as we possibly can for the enjoyment of our grandchildren and their children.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area is a prime example of an area which should be preserved.

Respectfully yours,

O. M. BOVENG.

DEER LODGE, MONT., *July 1, 1968.*

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Leon L. Lake, a retired Forest Ranger. I pioneered in the Forest Service from Jan. 1, 1918 to June 1, 1951 under various titles from Forest Ranger to District Forest Ranger on a good many National Forests, i.e., old Jefferson, old Missoula, Deerlodge and Kootenai Forests, two different districts on the Old Jefferson and three on the Deerlodge.

In the good old days one was trained to handle timber management, range management, construction and maintenance of various kinds of improvements, wildlife management, fire control, recreation and engineering. Now days the Forest Service even on each district has a man for just about each activity plus one for Radio and Radar.

It is needless to say that I had a lot of experience in all phases of Forestry work especially timber sales work. In my day the Forest Service policy in logging timber was under the selective cut method. In other words all trees had to be marked for cutting and in Douglas Fir or Ponderson Pine good sound growing trees under 10 or 12 inches diameter breast high had to be left for a future cut; besides this we oftentimes left larger sound trees with a pointed top for seed trees, perhaps three or four per acre. It was figured these larger trees might weather through a fire and re-seed the area. Now in Lodge Pole Pine we sold such timber mainly for power poles, posts and poles and most always this type was sold under the selective cut system. However on one area in about 1950 or 1951 a broadcast slash burning was made and since then all logging areas the broadcast slash burning prevails. On one area on the Kootenai Forest I helped ready an area for broadcast burning, but did not see it done as the weather prevailed against it.

Nowadays the broadcast burning system seems to be the Forest Service policy everywhere. If some young timber has been left on the area it is cut down and fire lines made all around the area, consisting of usually one or more sections of logging slash. When the weather is right the slash is touched off and oftentimes the fire crosses the lines causing a man made Forest fire. This I know happened once on the Kootenai Forest. The CCC's couldn't control it. It has happened elsewhere.

In my days our fire propaganda stated that forest fires burned up the humus and mineral soil and quite often it would take years before it was naturally reseeded. That meant reforestation with millions of seedlings which is exactly what is being done under present day methods. Of course in a Lodge Pole Pine type a fire will break open the hard cones and natural re-seeding takes place within a few years.

It makes me almost sick to look upon the present day denuded logging areas with eroded cat trails on moderate to steep mountain sides? Where we piled and burned the slash the policy was to throw plenty of brush along those cat trails and steep roads in order to slow up spring runoff and erosion, but while this could still be the present policy, I haven't seen where it is being practiced.

I realize the economics of logging may take precedent over everything else, yet this clear cut and broadcast slash burning certainly doesn't spell conservation as practiced in the old Forest Service days. Where different sizes of timber were entermixed in a logging chance, under the selective cut system it had been determined that within 50 or 60 years the same area would be logged over again. Even though the broadcast burned areas are re-planted it will, in most species, take another hundred years for a future logging chance, providing a Forest Fire doesn't enter into the picture.

While it would be foolhardy to think that logging should be abolished on all Forest lands, yet there are areas in remote country where Wilderness or Primitive Areas should be established in order to preserve the wilderness beauty and conservation of all other resources for future generations.

Now then the Lincoln-Scapegoat Proposed Wilderness Area borders the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and if the former is logged over with cat trails and roads constructed everywhere under the present clear cut system of logging and broadcast slash disposal it will be somewhat like living in a place with a nice tidy front yard with the back yard bordering up against a big denuded scar once known as a beautiful forested area where wildlife roamed at will.

I once helped fight a Forest fire on the Dearborn River in 1929 and remember looking at Scapegoat Mountain from a distance. From my point of view one could count numerous mountains with vast areas of rugged terrain in between. Except for glaciers some of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area would compare quite favorably with Glacier National Park.

LEON L. LAKE,
Retired District Forest Ranger.

HELENA, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: I have never written to anyone on anything before, but now I believe I should wake up if we are to have any unspoiled back country left. Glacier Park and Yellowstone are big chunks taken from Montana for the American people and we should try and preserve every bit we can for hunting, fishing, photography, and nature lovers for Montana people.

I realize that the majority live in urban areas and couldn't care less unless they can get to the country in a camper or trailer and leave their beer cans for mosquito propagation. This is human nature and no amount of education will change this unless they are educated from childhood or unless these areas are set aside.

I urge you to do everything you can to see that the Scapegoat Wilderness proposal passes.

Thank you kindly.

Sincerely,

R. L. GAMWELL.

HELENA, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: It is with a great deal of consternation that I view any other possibility for the Lincoln-Scapegoat area other than a designated wilderness area.

To preserve our natural heritage is one of the major obligations of today's citizenry. This area in particular, comprising one of the most bountiful and scenic sections of Montana, deserves to be considered first in deilberations regarding Wilderness Areas.

I would ask that you exert every influence in your power to insure that this area of our state be given a wilderness designation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

PALMER M. SCOTT.

HELENA, MONT., *June 13, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

To Whom It May Concern:

I urgently recommend that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area be preserved in its natural state. My family and I moved to Helena from the west coast just this last week. Our primary reason was that we wanted to enjoy the magnificent, wild country in this state.

I was born and raised in Oregon, in the country east of the Cascades. During the last ten years we saw, despite efforts of many groups, the opening up and ruination of much of Eastern Oregon's wild areas. It is a bitter and futile thing to see wild and lovely rivers turned into reservoir backwaters, with thousands of people polluting the water, and wrecking country that local residents had used and respected for generations. We saw many high-Cascades lakes opened up (with blacktop roads) to the general public. These once-serene and quiet places are now pitifully congested messes all summer, every summer. The big game hunting and fishing has declined drastically from its former abundance. It is bitterly true that the delicate balance of nature cannot withstand the rigors of mass recreation.

We firmly believe that Montana's greatest resource is her still-unspoiled wilderness areas, and that they must be preserved at all costs. The alternative that we have seen in Oregon, is tragic.

Thank you.

RITA RASMUSSON
Mrs. Ralph Rasmusson.

MONTANA LIVESTOCK MARKETS ASSOCIATION,
BOZEMAN, MONT., *July 30, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: For many years I have been interested in the preservation of our fast-diminishing Wilderness Areas. Further, I have been a heavy user of the wilderness and primitive areas in various groups and on my own.

I have just returned from a quasi-conservationist trip into the areas of Yellowstone Park not opened to the public in the company of Mr. Hugh D. Galusha, president of the Federal Reserve Bank, editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, and others interested in preserving these areas.

I am particularly familiar with and interested in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, and of the current effort to open this area for commercial purposes under many guises, some of which seem most insincere to me.

In any event I would like to add my name to those interested in consigning the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area to the Bob Marshall Wilderness, and in thus preserving this area unspoiled for those generations that will follow us.

I specifically request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record that will determine the fate of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area.

Respectfully,

ROBIN B. MACNAB, *Secretary.*

FORT SHAW, MONT., *June 12, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: This is to remind all of us that the wilderness area is one of the finest natural resource programs that we have left in the State of Montana. After twenty five years of hunting experience back in the mountains along the Continental Divide, which takes in the Lincoln back country scapegoat area, I think that this territory should be included in the wilderness area of which would be attached and adjoining the Bob Marshall wilderness.

If we don't start now to protect some of the most vital things that we have in our State it will not be long until we will not have a wildlife State that we have been so proud of. With all my travels in the scapegoat area and vicinity in the Rocky mountains I think this is one of the most spectacular and one of the grandest game countries in the world.

I believe it is time for us all to start thinking about preserving areas and territories like this one, if we lose our primitive areas we have lost them forever.

Yours very truly,

LONNIE GUILL.

KALISPELL, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Concerning the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness proposal and our personal interest, we feel our back country is too rapidly disappearing and would do what we could to preserve its beauty as a wilderness.

Sincerely.

ROY R. BUTTS.
BETTY J. BUTTS.

HELENA, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It was a pleasure to visit with you a few minutes on the plane when you were enroute to your Bozeman speaking engagement several weeks ago.

It isn't often that I feel strongly enough about a piece of legislation that I write to my senators. At this time, however, I do and I write you in relation to Senate Bill S–1121.

I am aware of the plans for development of some of the Lincoln back area into a multiple-use project. To me and to many people I know this would be a grievous mistake. We have sufficient areas now under way or already established for recreation and for the other uses intended.

I encourage you to make every effort to retain this area as it presently is and would like to assure you that you have the support of many, many people in trying to retain this area as a wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

BASIL C. ASHCRAFT.

SEELEY LAKE, MONT., *June 9, 1968.*

HON. LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. METCALF: After watching, for the last twenty years or more, the disintegration of the once beautiful forests that covered this valley of the Swan, in which we live, as well as huge tracts in other parts of the North Western portion of Montana: The terracing of the hill sides to facilitate the removal of the logs, the subsequent erosion that muddied the once clear streams and is now silting up our lake, the serious reduction in the numbers of our wild creatures because of the removal of their food and cover, it is gratifying to us to know that you are working toward the passage of this bill that will set aside at least a part of the beautiful wild country for the enjoyment of the citizens of our country as well as visitors whom we try to entertain.

We want you to know that we are back of you. The Hon. Mike Mansfield and Representative Battin 100 percent in your endeavors to preserve a part of this beautiful country by having it declared a Wilderness area.

We shall be voicing our belief in this endeavor until the Bill is passed.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STARK,
MARIE LAIRD STARK.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The proposed "Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area" is one of merit. What with the encroachment of man upon all that we can survey it seems only fitting that we take the *time* now to set aside tracts of unspoiled land for ourselves and the future generations.

I trust you will do all you can for this proposal.

Sincerely,

JIM MITCHELL.

COLUMBIA FALLS, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

COMMITTEE FOR LINCOLN-SCAPEGOAT WILDERNESS,
Lincoln, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I favor the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

This back country adjacent to the Bob Marshall Area will extend and preserve a more extensive area of our rapidly disappearing back country.

The possible commitment of this natural wild area to the timber industry and for mass recreational use would only lead to destruction of its natural values which we all seek and enjoy.

I therefore favor the protection of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness by the Wilderness Act.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. COTNER, D.D.S.

WHITEFISH, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: The proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area, I feel, is absolutely essential for the future use of the people of Montana in particular and for the people of the United States in general.

We have far too few wilderness areas and what we do have are constantly under fire by pressure groups who want to exploit them for personal gain.

Here is an opportunity for us to retain some wilderness area for future generations to enjoy and I urgently request that you assist us in making the Lincoln-Scapegoat into a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

S. E. KOSER.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Since the Bob Marshall Wilderness, for all practical purposes, has been reduced in size, the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area is essential to management of native trout and wildlife.

Further, the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is of much greater value to the nation as a wilderness area. The terrain is such that its preservation is absolutely necessary. The beauty of the area is unexcelled.

Please accept this as a plea to assist in the preservation of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Sincerely,

NORMAN S. BEYER.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Please enter this statement as part of the record in support of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal.

The physical characteristics of this area are such that its value for the greatest number of people for the longest period of time would be for recreation.

Recreation is fast becoming Montana's number one industry. People are attracted from the over-crowded areas by our clean air and water.

I sincerely urge your support of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

Sincerely,

HAROLD QUONDE.

KALISPELL, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

DEAR SIR: I am in favor of designating the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as a wilderness area. Montana is the last of our states except for Alaska that still has true primitive land that can be preserved for future generations. Protect it now or it will be lost as has so often happened to primitive land in other states. So often I have witnessed the destruction and littering of beautiful land by people who lacked appreciation for it. Roads promote increased use by people which in turn will invite littering and destruction of an areas natural beauty. Take the initiative now, declare this a wilderness area, and the rewards will never cease.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN L. MONROE, D.D.S.

HELENA, MONT., *June 10, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: As a sportsman in the State of Montana, I would certainly support the bill to make the Lincoln back country into a wilderness area. It is my understanding that this wilderness proposal may be found in Senate Bill S1121.

It is my feeling that Montana has a distinct advantage in having some areas of wilderness unlike those in any other part of the country. It is my hope that these wilderness areas may be preserved for future generations rather than be exploited for commercial purposes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT Q. CREBO.

HELENA, MONT., *June 10, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is my sincere hope that Senate Bill S. 1121 making the Lincoln-Scapegoat area a wilderness area will pass. I feel that areas such as this in our state should not be exploited commercially, but preserved for our children and grandchildren. My husband and sons spent many happy hours in this Lincoln country.

Sincerely,

Mrs. TATE W. PEEK.

ELKHORN RANCH,
Bozeman, Mont., June 8, 1968.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Elkhorn Ranch, which since 1922 has been continuously an operating guest ranch, and its many conservation minded guests feel strongly that the Lincoln Back Country described in Senator Lee Metcalf's and Senator Mike Mansfield's Bill 1121 should be given statutory wilderness protection under the 1964 Wilderness Law.

We are acquainted with the Scapegoat-Lincoln area and our whole outfit would respectfully urge you to do all possible to see that this area be preserved for the joy and use of future generations. We, therefore, wish to register our support for the passage of Bill 1121.

Respectfully,

GRACE NUTTING MILLER,
President.
RONALD D. HYMAS,
Vice President and Manager.

HELENA, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing to you in support of the bill S. 1121 that would make the Lincoln Scapegoat area a Wilderness Area. To me this is a most important measure because there are so few places left in the United States that are not unspoiled.

Sincerely,

FLORA MARTIN.

HELENA, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing to you in regard to Senate Bill S. 1121 to make the Lincoln Back Country into a Wilderness area. I believe that in this age of densely, over-populated areas that it is most urgent that we look to the future to establish some wilderness areas. This area has always been a delightful retreat for many people and it would be nice to keep it that way.

Thank you for supporting this type of legislation.

Sincerely,

BETTY LOU HOFFMAN.

MORRISVILLE, PA., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Please help us save the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country as a living memorial to all who love the peace and quiet of nature as it is. This area should be preserved as wilderness so future generations shall have the opportunity to fish, hike and hunt.

Living in the urban East where little land is left for people to enjoy as they please, I urge you to vote to save this wilderness area while it is yet there to be saved.

Yours truly,

Mrs. R. LEE BUECHLER.

HELENA, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am very much interested in the passage of Senate Bill S. 1121. Camping has been our chief summer activity for many years and we have enjoyed the many campgrounds that Montana provides. We have raised four children and the three boys still enjoy this outdoor life. We believe that this type of entertainment has been helpful in making them better young people.

Your support of this bill would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

MRS. CLEMENT BRENT.

UNION BANK & TRUST CO.,
Helena, Mont., June 7, 1968.

HON. LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Please let it be known that I am totally in favor of Senate Bill 1121, the placing of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Country into the wilderness system.

With the increase of population, and the number of inquiries from non-residents about living in Montana, it is most important to preserve a large wilderness area for our public use. Forced backpacking into the area is not only healthful, but one sees all the things that can't be seen from the paved highway. Also, it helps slow the mad pace at which we're now going. More power to the project.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT S. TURNER.

FRITO-LAY, INC.,
Madison, Wis., June 6, 1968.

Hon. SENATOR FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I am not a native Montanan, nor do I live there now, but I have found the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country to be one of the greatest wilderness areas I have ever been privileged to visit. In my opinion, this wild, yet delicate, area could not stand the pressures of commercialism that would be brought about by automotive highways being built into it.

I urge that all that can be done be done to preserve this truly great wilderness area as an historic memorial for future generations.

Sincerely,

J. C. WILSON,
Vice President and General Manager,
North Central Division.

HELENA, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I wish to go on record in support of Senate Bill 1121, Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal.

Montana should put forth every effort to establish this as a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

ELAINE HOOVER.

FORT SHAW, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
President of Great Falls Chapter,
Wildlife Association.

DEAR LIVINGSTON: I would like to offer my support of SB1121, concerning reclassification of the Lincoln Back Country Scapegoat Area.

It has been my pleasure during my lifetime to have had many wonderful trips into this area and I think that we owe it to posterity to promote recreational areas to the fullest extent, not only in this area, but in all available areas. It is my firm belief that if every individual could spend more time viewing the great works of the Grand Architect and less time chasing inflated dollars, we would have much less violence, crime and related ills which envelops our nation today. Montana is one of the greatest recreational states in the nation. Let's keep it that way.

Respectfully,

CHARLES L. BARTLET.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: This letter is written for the purpose of expressing the deep interest in Bill S1121 about which we understand there is to be a public hearing in Great Falls on June 11.

It is the sincere feeling of the undersigned that the Lincoln-Scapegoat proposal should be promoted for the benefit of present and future wilderness users.

Anything that you and your associates can do to promote this concept would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. RUNKE.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, are 100 percent behind Sens. Mansfield's and Metcalf's proposed Lincoln Back Country Bill, which would authorize "wilderness" classification for 240,500 acres of national forest in the Lincoln area.

This is a forward-looking bill, with the welfare of future generations of Americans at stake. Areas such as these should be rigidly protected with wilderness status now and, when the need arises many years or generations from now, these areas can be re-assessed. But, if we hesitate now and give in to mining and timber interests we have nothing for the future. Wilderness recreation is fast being recognized as a very necessary, though intangible, commodity. This so-called "population explosion" behooves us to set aside some of this wilderness now while we can.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. COFFEY,
W. P. MONCURE,
WILLIAM H. CAMERON,
DANIEL R. GUELF,
DENNY EDWARDS,
NEAL MAIN.

CANYON CREEK GUEST RANCH,
Melrose, Mont.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I am writing pertaining to the Lincoln Back country. I do not pack into the Lincoln back country, but I have packed into The Beartooth Wilderness, Absoraka Wilderness and am presently packing in the Pintlar Wilderness area. Our ranch is located in the Pioneer range 17 miles from the Big Hole river.

I very definitely urge you to make the Lincoln back country a wilderness, as one cannot ever begin to describe this type of country and the way the population is growing they are finding more and more use and it is all we have to offer many to show and enjoy nature as we have known it in the past.

My guests are perfect examples of this on the great praise they have for the wonderful areas out west and the way we have tried to protect them. Let us do it right by making the Lincoln back country a wilderness area.

I have sent out a form letter to all of my hundreds of guests having them to write you and their Congressmen to give you support for this project of making it a Wilderness area.

Most sincerely,

PHIL SMITH.

TRAIL CREEK OUTFITTERS,
Billings, Mont., June 3, 1968.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

SIR: I am in favor of Senate Bill S. 1121 which would give wilderness status to the Lincoln Back Country because it will keep out timbering and roads which are very detrimental to our big-game populations, especially elk and to the scenic beauty of our forests. I have seen what damage this will do in a few short years particularity in the south portion of the Little Belt Mountains near White Sulphur Springs and this is just one instance.

More people are enjoying our outdoors every day and we need to do something about it now.

Very truly yours,

W. A. CUNNINGHAM.

STEVENSVILLE, MONT., *May 1968.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: We would like to see the back country of Lincoln as it is and not have it ruined by tearing it up with roads, etc. This country should be left as it is because it furnishes recreation for many people. If it is torn up it would ruin it for many people and there would be less people coming. Besides there are so few places left like this in Montana.

Sincerely,

HARLAND HELLER,
DONALD BENNETT.

HARLOWTON, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

DEAR MR. METCALF: In reference to the proposed Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area (Senate Bill S. 1121) I am very much in favor of keeping the area a wilderness along with all our other wilderness and primitive areas. They along with many others were set aside for that purpose many years ago. Today the majority of them have been opened for mining and lumbering harvesting and have literally been ruined. The few that are left are among a small number of places people can see what God created and doesn't have the touch of man's destructive hand. If the Lincoln wilderness area is opened then it will pave the way for total destruction of all our wilderness areas.

I am also in favor of the freedom of public use and not make it mandatory that they should have a guide. This will only benefit the guide and outfitters and also take one more of the freedoms away from the public.

Since I have had first hand experience at seeing these areas and packing into them on horse back, I know what we would be losing if these areas shouldn't be reserved for what they were intended.

Due to the short notice that we had to write this letter the members couldn't write individual letters, but the majority of the membership of the Upper Musselshel Sportsmans Association, which has approximately 100 members, agrees with the contents of this letter.

Sincerely,

TED TAYLOR,
President, Upper Musselshel Sports Association.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to have this letter become a part of the Hearing Record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal. I am writing this letter as a native Montanan, one who has worked for the Forest Service during summer vacations while going to the university, and one who has spent a considerable amount of time enjoying the unique advantages of the Montana wilderness by backpacking and horse. I am a university professor who has taught at the University of Montana for 11 years, and while I am not specifically trained in forest management I have spent a good deal of time and interest on the subject of wilderness areas and speak, certainly, with profound interest and feelings for the state and its uniquenesses. I am very much in favor of having the Lincoln-Scapegoat area become a part of the Wilderness Act. I have backpacked in this country, have flown over it, and have smokejumped into it, and I am completely convinced that it is a unique area that is relatively "fragile" and will not stand serious population inroads without changing its character substantially. It is an area of beauty and one that would benefit all of us to have remain in a natural state. To the best of my knowledge, it is not a land that has highly profitable forest products and certainly it seems that short-term profit would poorly substitute for the long-term advantages to all the citizens of the Unied States in having this become a part of our heritage.

I feel strongly that as our society becomes more urbanized, that areas of this kind must be maintained for people who have the interest to seek them out for solace and a personal kind of restoration.

There is little enough of this kind of country available and Montana is extremely fortunate in having more than its share. It should not be molested and destroyed for short-term profit; certainly the long-term benefits to he economy of the state must be considered. As tourism increases with an increase in our na-

tional economy this kind of country can only work for the betterment of the individuals immediately surrounding the area and to the state as a whole.

I would hope that your committee would very seriously consider the long-term benefits to all the peoples of the United States and that consideration be given to what I consider to be an obligation of holding significant portions of our country in a natural state so that coming generations can, at least in some small way, have a tie with our heritage.

Sincerely,

CHARLES D. PARKER.

CHOTEAU, MONT., *May 30, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
President, Great Falls Chapter, Montana Wilderness Association,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I heartily support Bill SB1121 to include the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area in the wilderness association system.

I packed and hunted in all parts of the Bob Marshall Wilderness area for over thirty years and know how much it means to people from many parts of the country and varied walks of life to be able to see the wildlife and natural beauty of such areas.

We, as a state or a nation can not afford to destroy such areas as the Lincoln Back Country by building roads and campgrounds into primitive areas like this.

I, therefore sincerely hope that the Lincoln Back Country will be set aside as part of our wilderness area.

Yours truly,

JOE W. WHITE.

ARIO'S SADDLE SHOP,
Great Falls, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned, are in favor of making the above mentioned, a Wilderness area to be incorporated into the Bob Marshall Wilderness area.

This area is widely used by Packers and Hunters and those individuals who back pack into this country. If roads were to be pushed into this area, it could do nothing but go down hill in value, as the more people that use a small area like this, the more it is ruined.

Also, from what we are able to learn, there is little marketable timber in this area, so this should be an important consideration for designating it as a Wilderness Area.

We will appreciate your efforts in creating this Wilderness area.

Sincerely,

H. EARL HAGGERTY,
JAMES MORGAN,
O. M. OAKLAND,
ROBERT J. MARQUARD.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 27, 1968.*

The primitive areas in Montana and other States are being encroached upon more and more every year. At the same time, the demand for recreational use of land is constantly increasing due to our growing population and increased leisure time of our working force.

Areas that are now in a primitive state should be set aside now and their present state protected for all time for the benefit of those who now use them for recreational purposes, and for generations yet to come. We all know that the need for recreational areas will increase; the time to preserve them is now.

The Lincoln Back-Country Scapegoat Area is the kind of country that needs to be preserved in its present state. It is urgent that this step be taken now. This area, like many in our State, is being discovered by many persons from outside of Montana every year. Failure to enact legislation to restrict its use for recreational purposes will leave it open to encroachments of many kinds and each encroachment will require a compromise and a restriction of its full use as a primitive area, making the classification as a wilderness area more difficult.

We, the undersigned, urge that the Senate Interior and Insular Committee act favorably on SB 1121.

HAROLD A. JOHNSON,
VINCE C. JOHNSON.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 28, 1968.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Lincoln Back Country of Western Montana is an area dear to my heart. I have backpacked into part of it and I look forward to many more such trips. I want to add my voice to those desiring wilderness status for this area.

I am deeply concerned at the possibility of roads being punched into the Lincoln Back Country, and the deprivations of logging operations, etc. Since this beautiful section of Montana is so easily reached by hikers, I believe it should be left as a place for this kind of enjoyment.

My great grandparents came to Western Montana in 1860, and I have a personal pride in my heritage. The nagging worry as I see less and less of our wilderness being kept for other generations is constantly with me.

I wish this letter to be entered as part of the testimony in the hearing that your committee is conducting, supporting SB 1121 to give wilderness status to the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Area.

Very truly yours,

VEDA JACOBS,
Teacher, Great Falls Public Schools.

MEHMKE RANCH,
Great Falls, Mont., June 1, 1968.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am in favor of Senate bill 1121 concerning the Lincoln Back Country. I think this area should be attached to the Bob Marshall Wilderness area. I have been through it on horse back several times and it would be nice to leave it as it is, in its natural state without the fear of the encroachment of roads, logging operations, etc.

Recreation is a big business in Montana and this would add to it immensely in the way of camping, hiking, horseback riding and also a refuge for our wildlife.

CARL MEHMKE,
Farmer, East of Great Falls.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 25, 1968.*

THE SENATE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.

DEAR SIRS: I am twelve and when I heard about the following I decided to write. This is concerning the Lincoln Back Country (Heart, Webb, and Parker lakes). I feel that this area should be included in the Bob Marshall Wilderness. If not, highways and roads would crisscross it, ruining its natural beauty. And with these roads and highways would come swarms of people at a time. Now there's nothing wrong with people, except that they too often bring littering and polluting, and then the bulldozers digging and churning soil. I feel that we must act now to conserve these beautiful wildernesses or lose them forever!

Sincerely,

RON GILBOE.

WESTERN LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Great Falls, Mont., May 28, 1968.

To the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

GENTLEMEN: I wish to go on record as favoring S. 1121 known as the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Area.

There are such few areas left that are truly Wilderness Areas that one can hike in over a week end. We have made this hike from Lincoln to Heart Lake, Webb Lake and Parker Lake, at different times, and it is beautiful country. Putting roads in this back country would ruin it. First of all the lakes mentioned are small lakes and they could not take the pressure they would have if roads were built to them. Fishing now as it is is just great but it would be nothing if roads were built to this area. It is an easy hike to Heart Lake where you can fish the same day you arrive and most of the next day if you were limited to time.

Perhaps the biggest argument one could give to make this a Wilderness area is the money that could be saved by leaving it as it is. To build roads in this area would be very expensive and I for one think it is time that we cut expenses in our government instead of spending more and more. This would be a true waste of money.

Sincerely,

H. I. GILBOE.

KFBB–TV–5,
Great Falls, Mont., June 4, 1968.

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: Today on my television show "It's A Woman's World" I was introduced to the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area by Mr. Tom Edwards and Mr. Cecil Garland. What a tragic loss if this majestic area is to be ruined by roads and made into a mass recreation area.

Add my name to the list as being vehemently opposed to the destruction of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area.

If my media can be of any further assistance in the preservation of this area please call.

Sincerely,

AUDREY CREECY,
Hostess, "It's A Woman's World."

HELENA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: "If only" and "Next time" are two of the most tragic expressions people of today can use. And both could very well be the cry of Montanans who let slip past the opportunity to preserve and dignify one of our greatest assets, the wildernesses which surround us.

"If only I had acted in time to join the interested wilderness lovers in their efforts to preserve this heritage", we will all hear when progress moves in to bulldoze the forests, valleys, lakes and streams which we accept as one of the specialties of being a native of Montana.

"Next time I will write to the proper people who can do something about saving one of our greatest Montana heritages", we also will hear.

The proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area needs our support to save it from the encroaching push of humanity. Later is too late. My Boy Scout son, Greg, and I were fortunate enough to go on a Wilderness Walk last summer, through the Gates of the Mountains Wilderness, and the impressions we derived from this experience were most real and satisfying.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area should remain wild and original, a home for the few remaining wild animals we have, a place where we human beings may intrude only with polite awareness of our intrusion, leaving with precious memories and without signs of our passing through.

This privilege of sharing such a vast unspoiled area should not die with us or the past. It should be carried on into the future so that our children and generations to follow will live to enjoy and respect this privilege that has been ours.

Sincerely yours,

PHYLLIS CLOUSE.

HELENA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Your efforts to protect the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness under the Wilderness Act is much appreciated.

Add my name as a supporter to endorse this Wilderness designation.

Yours very truly,

ELSIE A. TRAVIS.

HELENA, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This letter is in wholehearted support of Senate Bill S. 1121 pertaining to the Lincoln back country being designated a wilderness.

We must make sure that there are some areas left which contain a few, or many, challenges for the spirit and the body for those thousands who care to exert themselves a little or a lot to avail themselves of the opportunity.

The alternatives are dreadful to contemplate: masses of humanity packed into sociological jungles of man's most successful efforts at self-demeanment, where hope is lost and cynicism prevails, with the consequent violence and tragedy which fill the news every day.

Whether one ever visits a wilderness at all, the mere knowledge that they are there is an antidote of sorts to the poisons pervading our great and troubled land.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. CARROLL.

CENTRAL MEDICAL CLINIC,
Helena, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: As an enthusiastic back-packer, I am greatly interested in favorable action on Senate Bill S. 1121 which would make a Wilderness Area out of the Lincoln Scapegoat Area.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM HARPER, M.D.

CENTRAL MEDICAL CLINIC,
Helena, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: As a citizen of Montana, I am interested in favorable action on Senate Bill S. 1121 which would create a Wilderness Area out of Lincoln Scapegoat Area.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MCMAHON, M.D.

CENTRAL MEDICAL CLINIC,
Helena, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The Lincoln Scapegoat Area has been one of our favorite hunting locations for a great number of years, and I certainly hope that Senate Bill S. 1121 creating a designated Wilderness Area will be favorably action upon.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. STRIZICH, M.D.

CENTRAL MEDICAL CLINIC,
Helena, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing to you to indicate that I am greatly interested in favorable action on Senate Bill S–1121 which would create a designated Wilderness Area out of Lincoln Scapegoat Area.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. DRYNAN, M.D.

HELENA, MONT., *May 24, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: It has come to my attention that the area known as the "Lincoln Back Country," including Heart Lake, Scapegoat Mountain, and the Chinese Wall, may be opened to easy access of vehicles.

It would certainly seem a shame that such areas could conceivably have in the future some of the lazy riffraf who now take it upon themselves to litter, mar, deface, and destroy our public picnic and recreational areas, requiring constant care. Naturally, any one at present is welcome in areas such as the "Lincoln Back Country"; however, the people who now frequent them are generally fine sportsmen or naturalists who enjoy them for what they are, and help keep them clean and in perhaps better condition than they found them.

For the most part, the only access to the "Lincoln Back Country" at present is on foot or horseback. Let's keep it that way!

Very truly yours,

GLENN R. WILSON.

SCORE CHIROPRACTIC CLINIC,
Helena, Mont., May 27, 1968.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I want you to know that I think it is a must to designate the Lincoln Back Country as a wilderness.

Sincerely,

S. J. SCORE, D.C.

HELENA, MONT., *May 28, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Several years ago I came out to Montana for a visit. I was very impressed by the natural beauty of the state. Tho being a Yankee and very proud of the New England states, I must concede that Montana with its vastness and beauty won me over, so I decided to return and live here.

To see wild animals in their habitat is a new experience, an experience that cannot be duplicated in the east. As time goes on there will be no wild life territories left, as this country is becoming so commercialized. Please keep the Lincoln back country a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

ADA OLIN.

HELENA, MONT., *June 1, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.:

1. I strongly urge the acceptance of this proposed bill, S. 1121.
2. The opportunity to preserve this wonderful area in its primitive state for the people of our nation should not be lost.
3. To loose this area to the ravages of the highways would deny forever the right our people have to enjoy the rarest of all our natural assets, the unspoiled wilderness.

PHIL GUNN,
Owner, Main Motel.

HELENA, MONT., *May 31, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I am strongly in favor of establishing the Lincoln Back Country as a wilderness area. This is one of the few areas left where one can get away from the noise and hustle of modern living. Let us keep D–8 Cats., chain saws, and road builders from cutting this area into wasteland.

If you can arrange a trip into this area, I am sure you will see that it should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL C. ALM.

HELENA, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I regret very much that an earlier commitment makes it impossible for me to attend the hearings of the Subcommittee on Senate Bill S–1121 and to testify in favor of the bill.

I have traveled extensively through the area and know it well. In my opinion, Half Moon Park under Scapegoat Mountain is the most beautiful spot in America and it and the surrounding area should be preserved now. The whole area has very limited economical value and there would be absolutely no dislocation of the economy or social organization in the vicinity. Almost every acre is in its natural state.

In the portion of the area immediately North of Lincoln, there are several summer lakes that are within easy hiking distance from the roads end. I have

never been along the trail past these lakes that I have not seen hikers on the trail or campers at the lakes. A road where the trail now is would destroy the fishing and logging would certainly destroy the beauty.

I hope the Committee can recommend passage of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

LEIF ERICKSON.

HELENA, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

To Hearing of the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands, Great Falls, Mont.

SIRS: It is my sincere wish that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area will be made a wilderness area.

This is the prudent thing to do. Anything we save is not wasted, but for future use. We can only contemplate on the growing and varied needs of future generations for this area and others like it and how they will thank us.

Sincerely,

DON BEAUDETTE.

HELENA, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.,

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: In response to an invitation from the Helena contingent of the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association to write requesting your committee to exercise all the influence possible to protect the Lincoln Back Country, I can hardly find words to urge this endeavor strongly enough.

Even in Montana where open space is taken for granted, our family's richest experience for the past twenty years has been a camping trip into partial wilderness area where we've seen no other human being except family and invited guests for the vacation period. Even now so close to the experience, our five children regard the summer vacation they remember as an oasis to dream about returning to when the struggle gets rough. Our camping area has just been criss-crossed by a logging road!

Montanans welcome tourists from the cities who are in need of an "oasis." We aren't pleading just for Montanans. We would like to share walks through forests and meadows, mountain vistas and wild flowers to be seen from paths and trails. Will you help us?

We are always proud of Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield, but especially so for their sponsorship of a bill to designate the Lincoln Back Country as a wilderness area. We urge you and your committee to support this legislation.

Thank you.

Most sincerely,

HARRIETT C. MELOY.

HELENA, MONT., *May 31, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.,

DEAR MR. RODGERS: I definitely feel that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area should be preserved for a wilderness area.

There is very little suitable country left with the unspoiled natural beauty and game living in their natural habitat. Once this land is taken for mass recreation it is gone.

Sincerely,

MRS. BELL PITCOCK.

HELENA, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.,

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I want to add my urging to that of the Wilderness Association that the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat area as defined by the enclosed map be designated and made permanently the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

Innovations and modern transportation made up of motor bikes and four wheel drive vehicles have caused extreme damage to any wild country that is at all accessible to them. The only possibility to preserve any of our beautiful mountain country is to designate areas where this type of transportation is prohibited. Excluding the possibility of some important mineral discovery, the

Scapegoat area has no value other than scenery and fish and game production which would be forfeited with the building of roads or harvesting of the scant timber available.

I would like this letter made part of the hearing record of the meeting in Great Falls on June 11th.

Sincerely,

R. L. SAMSON.

HELENA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

Honorable LEE METCALF: In regards to Senate Bill 1121, I am writing to advise I am in favor of this bill placing the Lincoln-Scapegoat Country in the wilderness system.

Yours truly,

C. VANCE WILSON.

HELENA, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I wish to go on record in favor of Senate Bill 1121—placing the Lincoln-Scapegoat Country in the wilderness system.

This is some of the loveliest country in Montana, in fact in the United States. In our fast growing urbanized world we will come to need more and more land we can be quiet in and watch and listen to and learn from our wildlife and our heritage.

Sincerely yours,

JEAN WEEKS.

HELENA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I would like to add my support of Senate Bill 1121 which will place the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in the wilderness system.

One of the agreements advanced against this type of legislation is that the area is being reserved for the wealthy. This has not been my experience. Last year my fifteen year old daughter hiked for six days through the Bob Marshall Wilderness area. The trip was sponsored by our Church and the total cost was $10 which was applied to food.

To me this is a far healthier expenditure of teenage energy than rioting.

Sincerely,

NORINE TOWLE.

HELENA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Yes I am very much in favor of making the Lincoln Back Country into a wilderness area.

My daughter and I back packed into that area for 8 days last summer and are planning on two weeks this year.

It should be left as is.

Yours truly,

TOM N. CHAPMAN.
LINDA CHAPMAN.

HELENA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is good to know that you are holding a hearing here in Montana on Senate Bill S. 1121.

I wish to go on record as strongly in favor of this bill. Far too little of this beautiful world can still be found in its natural, undeveloped state. There are still people who find inspiration in being outdoors away from the organized campground and the aluminum beer can.

Some decisions can be reversed, if it turns out a mistake was made. Once a wilderness area is gone, however, it is gone forever, and there is no chance for "second thoughts." Please do everything possible to save this wilderness for future generations to enjoy.

Sincerely,

VIVIAN ALLGAIER.

HELENA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing in support of making the Lincoln Back Country into a wilderness area.

There are so few recreational areas left in the U.S.A.; outside of Montana, that have not been taken over by commercial enterprise, it would behoove this state now to plan so that this situation does not develop here.

If we are to remain an attractive area for tourists there must be areas reserved for people to enjoy our natural beauty. Growth in Montana, no doubt, is inevitable. We are still one of the few states that has enough space left to plan for recreation facilities. I hope this opportunity will not be overlooked.

Sincerely,

MONTE KYLE.

HELENA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing in regards to the proposed Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness. I strongly support that the Lincoln Back Country be maintained as a wilderness area.

Wilderness and natural beauty appears to be important aspects in attracting tourists to the state of Montana. Man has pushed the frontier for industry and metropolitan area's further. We need to conserve some of our land's natural beauty and wild life for future generations.

Sincerely

FAY SWEENEY.

HELENA, MONT.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing to you in favor of Senate Bill 1121. I believe the Lincoln Scapegoat Country should be in the wilderness system.

Such a small proportion of our land has truly majestic mountains. The peace they can afford a human soul is far superior to that purchased through tranquilizers, I believe. So much of the mountain country is already being "devoured" by us humans. Let us save this piece of land from ourselves.

Sincerely,

MARY EDNA STEVENS.

HELENA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. METCALF: I am writing in support of Senate Bill 1121. Having backpacked in the Lincoln Back Country I feel I know something of the area. It is ideal for hiking, packing, and back-packing, and I most fervently hope it will always be available for this activity in a wilderness state. The Lincoln Back Country is especially accessible from Great Falls, Missoula, and Helena.

I feel that mass recreation would certainly destroy the area. It is not suitable for use by large groups of people. There is already a multitude of mountain areas that are open to the motoring public which could be more extensively developed for these uses. With the increasing stress of modern society, I cannot help but think these wild areas vital as a real sanctuary for "getting away from it all." There is real peace of mind for those who spend a day hiking to a mountain top—not to mention the great fun and benefits from the physical exercise required of one who gets out and walks. I want this area preserved for me and my children to explore further. And I truly feel that the wilderness will become more and more important to all people for this type of activity.

Many of the wild areas of the entire earth have vanished. Let's keep this area which is vital to the grizzly bear and other decreasing species. The area would seem of little value for timber—or mass recreation. I feel it most important to all mankind that we preserve the entire ecology of this region for enjoyment and study.

Again—I urge passage of S. 1121. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

NANCY W. TUNNICLIFF.

ST. PETER'S PRO-CATHEDRAL,
Helena, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Since moving to Montana 6 years ago from New York State, I have been highly impressed with the natural beauty of this state. Both my family and I enjoy the awesome majesty of this country and more particularly the present wilderness areas.

Beyond my own selfish enjoyment, however, Montana is one of the few areas left in the country where the existence of such wilderness areas is possible. We have an obligation not only to ourselves, but to our children and to the yet unborn millions of citizens of the United States, indeed the world, to preserve for them such back country areas.

Such legislation as the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Bill (Senate Bill S. 1121) must be approved not only for recreational and historical reasons, but further, to maintain a necessary zoological and botanical balance.

Pragmatically, it is unrealistic from the long range picture of Montana economics to dismiss the vast attractions such areas will have for Montana, to Montanans, as well as the urban megalopolis citizen of the future. Such attractions will far outweigh any immediate economic advantage from timber.

I do appreciate your support of this bill and ask for your continued support that this proposal may become a reality.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND D. BROWN, *Dean.*

HAMILTON, MONT.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I have lived in the Bitterroot Valley for fifteen years engaged in fur farming. I appreciate the values of our wilderness areas as I have spent many happy days on horseback viewing the wonders of nature.

I urge the addition of the 240,500 acres described in S. 1121 be made part of the National Wilderness System. This additional area will help keep alive a portion of our wildlife that is so rapidly being forced out of existence.

I wish to have this testimony made part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

JERRY A. MILLIGAN.

GALEN STATE HOSPITAL,
Deer Lodge, Mont., September 18, 1968.

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: I sent the enclosed letter to Quentin Burdick in regard to classifying the Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country Area as a Wilderness Area and was prepared to testify at the previous scheduled meeting.

I plan to come to Great Falls Monday along with Don Valiton and several others from this area, to testify in behalf of the classifying this a Wilderness Area.

I would like to have the enclosed letter entered as testimony. Don Valiton requested previously for time for testimony for he and myself, however, I want to make sure we will also be able to testify this time. He suggested I write you in order that thirty copies could be made of this letter.

If there is anything more that needs to be done, do not hesitate to call me at the Galen State Hospital—my extensions are 220 and 222—just call through the Butte Operator.

Sincerely,

A. C. KNIGHT, M.D., *Superintendent.*

CHARLO, MONT., *September 19, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: A recent guest editorial of the air on a Missoula TV station by a representative of timber interests, enraged me.

Arguing against creation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Mountain Wilderness Area, the speaker urged "multiple use" for the sake of the larger number of people who would benefit. He cited the 100 jobs which would result from harvesting the merchantable timber, with consequent benefit to the economy. He catered to the selfish interests of the uninformed by saying only a few wealthy persons could pack into a single-purpose wilderness.

Perhaps within the next few years more people would go into the area in its present state. Certainly there would be more timber fallers, leaving scarred, denuded slopes which would not heal for decades, would not grow another generation of mature trees for more than a century. Once they had done their worst, who would want to go into cutover areas to hike or camp? The desolation along sections of Highway 2, southeast of Libby is an example of what would happen to the area in question. Timber cutting in the Indian Forest on the east side of Flathead Lake is spoiling the pleasure of many more thousands than those who actually go into the mountains: they see the scars from across the lake.

I hope the specious, but fundamentally selfish arguments of the lumber and mining interests will not hoodwink so many that it will be difficult for Congress to create this Wilderness Area. In an increasingly urbanized society there will be ever greater need for the refreshment of spirit that comes to harried, modern man in the peace of natural, unspoiled surroundings. With longer vacations, better transportation, and more families learning the joys of camping, the area would become a national asset, not just another stand of timber or mining claim for exploitation by local interests.

You will, I know, be guided by what you believe to be "the greatest good, for the greatest number, for the longest time."

Sincerely,

FRANCES D. LOGAN.

CHARLO, MONT., *September 19, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I would like to add my voice to the many voices now raised in support of setting aside a wilderness area in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Mountain area in Montana. In both quality and location this wild country well merits such preservation.

The people of the Nation, born and unborn, will find it a uniquely rewarding in provision of the spiritual refreshment essential to a growing population. Man does not live by bread alone.

Disproportional commercial considerations, as you so deeply realize, too often are permitted to impoverish and demean rather than enrich and ennoble.

Sincerely,

S. R. LOGAN.

HELENA, MONT., *September 10, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I write to you today to *urge* designation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as an official wilderness area.

It may be a bit unusual for me to speak out on this subject since I have been a resident of Montana for only six months; perhaps all the more reason for my speaking out. You see, I came to Montana by choice. I am the exception to the youthful movement away from Montana. After having traveled through the United States, including the more populous, urban areas, Montana's rugged beauty unpolluted by civilization especially attracted this yong man and convinced me that this was the place to begin my professional life. Here is where I would practice law, begin a family, and live out my life.

Montana has a wonderful asset in its beauteous natural areas. Those who have the trust of decision-making would do well to observe the tragedy of the more populous areas. No reasonable person is against progress. It remains for our leaders, however, to define and give guidance to progress.

Upon such basis, I submit, forward thinking progress will be served in a very real sense by designating the Lincoln-Scapegoat unit as a wilderness area.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH J. VETRICK, Jr.

FORTINE, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

HON. LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: First, may I express appreciation for the interest and concern which you, Senator Mansfield, and Representative Battin have shown in the Lincoln Back Country by the introduction of bills which would establish a Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. At the least, this action has focused public attention on the effort of conservationists to resist plans of the U.S. Forest Service which they believe to be unwise; at best, it could result in permanent protection for this primitive section of the continental "backbone".

Second—as the opening paragraph discloses—I strongly support and urge passage of legislation to establish the proposed Wilderness Area. Too rapidly our wild mountain country, in Montana as well as elsewhere in the nation, is succumbing to despoilation or domestication by road building, lumbering, dam building, commercial pleasure facilities, and mass recreation. While these are legitimate and desirable enterprises, there exists in America ample room for their needed expansion in suitable areas without invasion of the pitifully small remaining protected wild lands which also serve an important function in our modern society.

Unless the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is given permanent protection, the constant pressure of lumbering interests, motor recreationists, and—I regret to say—the Forest Service will result in opening up the country to roads, logging, and mass recreation. Values which the area now has for quality recreation, wildlife habitat, pristine scenery, water retention, and scientific study would then be seriously impaired, lessened, or destroyed.

Because for more than half a century my life has been enriched by visits to Montana wild country, and because I thereby know that developed areas can never provide a like enrichment, I am deeply concerned with providing coming generations with true wilderness experience.

Sincerely,

WINTON WEYDEMEYER.

BUTTE, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

SENATOR LEE METCALF,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: A nation's greatness is not only judged by the things it accomplishes; in science and industry, but also by esthetic values. Therefore, I am writing this letter in support of making the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness area.

Areas such as the Lincoln Back County should be preserved as wilderness regions for the use and enjoyment of future generations. Their natural beauty should not be marred by industrial infiltration.

If we do not protect these areas for future use, what natural areas will be left to show my 18 month old son when he is grown?

Therefore, Senator Metcalf, I firmly endorse your efforts in endeavoring to make the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. COURTNEY.

BENCH RANCH,
Fishtail, Mont., September 16, 1968.

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: Because of the late date I write this letter care of you rather than to the Public Lands Subcommittee.

The purpose of this note is to express my strong support for the establishing of a Lincoln Back Country Wilderness.

I am sure one of the strongest voices against this wilderness area are those using the multiple use argument.

As a cattle rancher I am certainly aware of the value and need of the multiple use concept. However, I feel so strongly that certain areas must be set aside to protect and preserve a truly wilderness area.

I urge that the utmost consideration be given to establishing the Lincoln Back Country Wilderness.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. HEYNEMAN.

LAUREL, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I sincerely recommend that the area referred to as the Lincoln Back Country be established as a wilderness area. I have been in parts of this and I believe it should be kept in its original state as much as possible. The establishment of this area as a wilderness area would keep it unspoiled for our future generations.

We should do what we can now to preserve this natural beauty for coming generations.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT V. DOHENY.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE OF PUBLIC LANDS,
Great Falls, Mont.

HONORABLE SIRS: The Lincoln Scapegoat area north of Lincoln, Montana, has some of the most splendid scenery available in the entire United States. Please cast my vote to have this area classified as a wilderness area. Even though I will soon be too old to negotiate the trails of that country by "shank's mare" my memories are more treasured than those which might be derived by driving to the base of Scapegoat mountain.

I will be unable to attend the hearing at Great Falls, so enter this as a part of the record.

Very truly yours,

ROLLAND KARLIN.

HARLOWTON, MONT., *September 19, 1968.*

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: As an interested party for keeping the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness, I would like to be able to list knowledgeable reason why it should be left as is. All I can come up with is an emotional attachment for that part of America's character but please add it to your list which I know includes many cold facts to justify keeping the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. NORMA ZIKMUND.

HAMILTON, MONT., *September 13, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Max L. Olive, businessman, outdoorsman and human rights advocate of Hamilton, Montana. I will not be able to be present at the hearing on the 25th of September but I do with to express my opinion on the proposal to include the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country into the National Wilderness System.

After observing the various governmental and private pressures which are brought into play to "develop and manage" our national forests, I am convinced that the only guarantee which man, plants and animals have to maintain their natural balances is to include any wild area in the National Wilderness System.

I enjoy outdoor recreational opportunities afforded in the wilderness area and I feel that while they are still in existence we should make every effort to protect them under the law through wilderness classification.

I therefore urge that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

Please include this statement as a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

MAX L. OLIVE.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

SENATE HEARINGS COMMITTEE ON LINCOLN BACK-SCAPEGOAT WILDERNESS AREA,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing to you in the hopes that you will favorably consider wilderness status for the Lincoln Back Country. I have lived in and used this area a great deal over my 60 years. It is my belief that if logging is permitted they will destroy its value like they have in so many other places.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL L. HARTSE.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *September 12, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Please do all in your power to support S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, for establishing a sound Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. The value of the land as wilderness, as indicated by such discriminating creatures as the grizzly bear and native cutthroat trout, is for more than its potential for forestry and mass recreation, as envisioned by the Forest Service.

We must recall that these are irrevocable decisions if wilderness is not preserved, and that man is becoming ever more aware of the necessity to experience non-man created things. Thank you.

BRUCE MACBRYDE.

RESOLUTION OF POLSON OUTDOORS, INC.

Whereas, the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegote Mountain area is a magnificent mountain wilderness; and

Whereas, the proposed wilderness is contiguous to the already existing Bob Marshall Wilderness Area; and

Whereas, there is a proposal to open this area with an all-weather scenic highway; and

Whereas, Montana is literally crisscrossed with scenic highways and byways having both all-weather and seasonal capabilities; and

Whereas, the ever-increasing human population and ever-decreasing areas of natural beauty make it imperative that additional areas of land be set aside to guarantee their natural quality and their pristine beauty; and

Whereas, most wilderness areas, by their very nature are extremely fragile and can stand only limited use; and

Whereas, the grizzly bear, the elk, the Rocky Mountain sheep, and the mountain goat are gradually being deprived of their natural habitat; and

Whereas, this area is considered valuable as wilderness because it has not already been despoiled by man; and

Whereas, if this area is allowed to become roaded, it will become just another mountainside, the likes of which already exist in Montana by the millions of acres; and

Whereas, the area contains many natural sites, lakes, streams that are easily available to all who desire to take advantage of this natural environment without the need of a good road; and

Whereas, the outdoor recreational industry in western Montana is now a multi-million dollar activity and is serviced by well equipped, experienced, and economically sound facilities that are designed to allow the seeker of quality recreation in the high back-country a means of satisfying his wants; and the proposed multiple-use program and all-weather scenic highway would virtually bring this beneficial and lucrative industry to financial ruin; and

Whereas, a multiple-use program of forest management does not, in our opinion mean that the less valuable assets of an area shall be developed at the expense and sacrifice of the more valuable; and

Whereas, the area in question has tremendous potential as a watershed of real value which could be easily impaired through irresponsible and not-needed development; and

Whereas, the present multi-purpose development proposal seems to us to be one of sacrifice of long-term investment of the misplaced value of a short term gain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Polson Outdoors, Inc. oppose any multi-purpose development proposal for the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area; and be it further

Resolved, That Polson Outdoors, Inc., support the move to give the said area wilderness status so that it can truly enjoy the protection so necessary to preserve its outstanding and unique natural qualities and recreational values; and be it further

Resolved, That Polson Outdoors, Inc. make every effort to make its wishes known by sending a copy of this resolution to the Montana Delegation in Congress; the Secretary of the Interior; the Secretary of the National Wildlife Federation; the President of the Montana Wildlife Federation; the Governor of the State of Montana; and to the Lake County's Legislative Delegation.

The above Resolution was passed by Polson Outdoors, Inc. at its regular meeting, September 17, 1968.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 13, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I strongly support Senator Mansfield's bill, S. 1121 which would authorize the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area within the Helena, Lewis and Clark, and Lolo National Forests of Montana. The area is one of spectacular beauty and should not be despoiled.

I request that this communication be made a part of the Hearing Record.

Very truly yours,

DOROTHY D. BARMEYER
Mrs. George Barmeyer.

MISSOULA, MONT.

DEAR SIR: I regret that I will be unable to attend the hearing on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal because I will be starting my third year at the university. Therefore, I ask that my letter be made part of the hearing record.

This summer, I was employed by the U.S. Forest Service as a GS–3 Fire Control Aid at the Lincoln Ranger Station, Lincoln, Montana. Being in this area, I had the opportunity to hear various discussions of the area concerned. Most of the people wanted to see the Lincoln Back Country a wilderness. Those who saw otherwise would have a personal gain if the area was opened, such as making money logging, mining, or other business.

I came across a Forest Service publication entitled, "The Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area, Management for People." This publication was not allowed to be put on the Information and Education Board for public display. Instead, it was to be handed out only to those who asked for it. This publication, in pamphlet form, described the proposal of a highway through the concerned area besides logging and winter sports development.

I do not believe this construction of roads and logging will be of benefit to wildlife ecology as the pamphlet claims. There is also a corporation which would also like to mine in the area concerned.

It is my personal view that the proposed development of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is really destruction. I fail to see any logic in turning down the output of little or no money to save something irreplacable for the large output of taxpayers money to destroy an area so someone can personally gain wealth through further destruction. There are other areas of less significance to wildlife ecology which will serve their purpose.

I feel this area, if made a wilderness, will undoubtedly be of great support to the fish, elk, and the endangered grizzly.

I hereby state that I am against invasion of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area and support the wilderness proposal.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. ROSSMILLER.

CHOTEAU, MONT., *September 9, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: This is my statement in regard to the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal and may be used at the hearing in Great Falls, Montana Sept. 25, 1968:

With the increase in population each year which also increases the flow of visitors and traffic into our National Parks and Camping Areas in the National Forests I believe all the more should be done to protect and preserve our wilderness.

Each year tourist and campers push further and further into our undeveloped areas, setting forest fires and disturbing the natural habitat of our wildlife.

I believe these areas should be preserved and protected for those who love and understand it enough to respect it. People who are uneducated to the ways of the wilds have no business there until they do understand its true nature.

If this area is designated for a wilderness it should be policed the same as our National Parks and only those with good intentions be allowed to use it.

Some time in the far distant future, the time may come, when lumber, or ore, may have to be used from these areas. Such provisions should be made at this time. Say 50 or 75 years from now. Drastic changes will no doubt come about by then if "Change" keeps up at the pace it is going now.

So please, lets preserve a little of America, as God saw fit to give it to us.

Sincerely,

AGNES LINDSETH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *September 12, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Living in Philadelphia as I do, no part of Montana is ever going to become a weekend retreat of mine. Nevertheless, I feel that preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness is personally important; is as important, in fact, to city dwellers of the East as urban planning. I may not get to Montana more than three times in my lifetime, but I hope that when I do, I will be able to find there a refuge from all the unesthetic, displeasing aspects of our civilization that cannot be avoided during the daily run of our urban lives. Areas within the National Wilderness Preservation System seem to be the only places reasonably protected from noise, pollution, litter, and invasion by man and his destructive effects. Please don't let us wall ourselves in! We need an avenue of escape from these unfortunate by-products of our civilization. We need to preserve what is peaceful, permanent, silent and beautiful, what is our heritage of beauty just as is any work of art. Why is it that everyone readily understands that a Leonardo da Vinci must be saved at great cost, but it takes nearly a legislative battle to preserve a section of wilderness, certainly no less an important part of the beauty around us? I heartily support the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness and its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and I hope that support shown for this Wilderness Area will be understood to apply also to as many potential wilderness areas as possible throughout the nation.

Please make this letter part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL HASTINGS.

HELENA, MONT., *June 1, 1968.*

SENATE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We would like to speak for the coming generations which will have little or no knowledge of Wilderness areas unless we expand what we do have now.

Surely, you will designate the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area as a part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Thank you.

ROBERT W. STOCKTON.
DOROTHY M. STOCKTON.

THREE FORKS, MONT.

Attention of Hon. Quentin Burdick, Great Falls Hearing:

In this day of stress and strain it behooves each human being and mankind in general to put away and keep in the bank something in reserve. As a civilization we have used freely our natural resources and sad to relate we have wasted many of them in the name of progress and economy.

At this date in history those who are alert can see the "hand writing on the wall" and cry out for the preservation of this small percentage of our heritage. I join my voice to those who speak not for themselves entirely but for generation yet unborn, who will seek the solitude as a respite from the strife and struggle of everyday life. Beside man, other creatures inhabit this globe and to some of them an area of remoteness is essential to life itself.

As a citizen of Montana, I would give my whole-hearted support to S 1121 and my best wishes to the Senators who had the foresight to introduce it.

E. E. LIDDERDALE.

LEWISTOWN, MONT., *May 27, 1968.*

Mr. R. H. HULTMAN,
President, Montana Wilderness Society,
Bozeman, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I want to go on record in support of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

It seems particularly timely to preserve this and other areas as wilderness in the light of recent studies sponsored by Resources For The Future, Inc.

Hans H. Landsberg, author of the U.S. Resource Outlook: Quantity and Quality, indicates that our forests are producing at a more rapid rate than the annual cut. The latest detailed estimates (1962) showed that growth exceeded cut by 60%.

This is indeed encouraging news—reflecting better management, improved measurement and substitution of forest products with metals, plastics, and other synthetics. It also means that we would be remiss to allow timber cutting in any area with high wilderness values including the Lincoln-Scapegoat area of Montana.

Sincerely,

BOB L. BURKHOLDER.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *May 28, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Several years ago I enjoyed a pack trip through the Bob Marshall Wilderness with the Trail Riders of the Wilderness sponsored by the American Forestry Association and even then I was saddened by the amount of refuse scattered around that beautiful country.

If the Lincoln Back Country should be developed I shudder to think what would happen to that irreplaceable and unique area which is a precious heritage for this whole United States that we are just beginning to appreciate.

Please count me as strongly opposed to developing the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE FISHER.

BUTTE, MONT., *September 13, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: I would like the following statement included in the hearing of the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

Montana is the land of the great outdoors. For the past several years I have hiked and went on horseback into the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness and the Bob Marshall Wilderness. I have spent many hours fishing, hiking and sight seeing in a land we must all work to keep as it was meant to be. Wilderness areas are one thing we should have more of. Let's work to keep industry out of the few

remaining playgrounds in the United States. Industry will benefit only those who think of the money as number one. A wilderness area will benefit your children, my children and all those who love the great outdoors in the hundreds and thousands of years ahead. The time has come to act on this bill. It is up to you and I to provide recreation for the future. Pass this law and make the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness a playground forever.

R. M. McDONOUGH.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIRS: I firmly believe that the Lincoln Scapegoat area should be classified as a Wilderness Area.

I would like to have this letter entered as a record at the meeting.

Yours very truly,

W. A. BROUELETTE.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The passage of Senate Bill 1121, classifying the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as Wilderness, is of extreme importance to me and several of my friends, who are users of the area for hiking and other recreational use.

During the subcommittee hearings in Great Falls on June 11, Dr. Joseph Mussulman and I will be camped at Meadow Lake, in the shadow of Arastra Peak, enjoying a brief respite from a busy life. We will be offering special incantations in the hope that the Lincoln Back-Country will achieve Wilderness status.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. LEWIS,
Associate Professor of Music,
University of Montana.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: Montana scenic beauty is its greatest asset and is of great significance in the National picture. I think we would suffer an irreparable loss if the Lincoln Scapegoat area were allowed to be logged and opened up to vehicular use.

I would like this letter to become a part of the record.

Yours truly,

HOMER A. MASON.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

LINCOLN-SCAPEGOAT HEARING,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: I am sending you this letter in support of adding the proposed Lincoln Back Country area to the Wilderness to be saved for enjoyment by the generations to follow us.

You will undoubtedly be told that the small amount of timber involved is necessary right now to keep the lumber industry going. I feel that such statements may safely be disregarded on the grounds that if there was anything worth harvesting that it would long since have been cut and the country despoiled and laid waste.

Yours truly,

A. P. BROWN.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: I am a fisherman who enjoys the upper Blackfoot River. I am sure that any logging or roading of the area will bring about a great increase in silt entering this river. I have seen this area and don't think the soils are stable enough to stand any amount of disturbance.

We just can't afford to have this area as anything but a wilderness. Please add this letter to your record of this hearing.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. MORRISON, M.D.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Re Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIRS: This letter is being written to signify that I am in favor of a wilderness classification for this area. I am in favor because people would destroy its main values.

Sincerely,

MAX SCHLANCH.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The following statement is to be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

I am in support of the legislation introduced into the Senate by Senator Lee Metcalf and Senator Mike Mansfield to establish this area as a wilderness area under the requirements of wilderness as outlined in the Wilderness Bill, Public Law 88–577.

The area under consideration is easily traversed by groups on foot or on horseback and because of the relatively gentle nature of the valley floors becomes a "gentle wilderness" approachable by the very young as well as the elderly. In the summers of 1965, 1966, and 1967, I was with groups of friends exploring various parts of this area. On one of these trips we were accompanied by youngsters less than 10 years old, children of a California couple enjoying our Montana resources. On another trip two members of our group were over 65 but still enjoying this wild but gentle area.

Although there is some timber which may in the future be of high value to our national economy, at the present time I believe the value of this land is greater as wilderness recreation land than as timber producing land.

In several of the areas I've visited the impact of too many people using too confining a space has already resulted in serious "human erosion." The camp sites were impacted, the grass was overgrazed, the small trees and shrubbery have been cut for "primitive camps" and the accumulation of trash was overpowering. I cannot imagine that this area has any great potential as a developed, roaded high-visitor use area. There is no scenery comparable to that of Glacier, or of the Swan or Mission Range, or even of Wolf Creek Canyon.

If camp sites were developed at the road heads of present roads which penetrate almost to the proposed boundaries, a greatly increased number of visitors could be accommodated and still this wild area protected for those who want to make a special effort to reach remote areas.

The grizzly bear, the black-spotted cut-throat trout and the remoteness of the area are all attractions to out-of-state visitors and therefore are economic factors to be considered in evaluating the potential of this area.

For the greatest long-range return from this area, I urge its inclusion in the wilderness system.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET E. ADAMS.

DRUMMOND, MONT., *October 3, 1968.*

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please include this letter in the testimony or put it on record concerning the Lincoln Scapegoat area. I think that it should be made into a wilderness area, free from roads, loggers, or miners. I am sure many people enjoy hiking into the wilderness and roughing it. I am 13 years old and have gone into the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area several times. It was lots funnier than driving some place and sleeping by our truck. There are many places to log and mine. I realize that in the future such areas will have to be mined and logged to meet the populations demands. But until that time I think it should be a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

JOHN OHRMANN.

DRUMMOND, MONT., *October 2, 1968.*

DEAR MR. METCALF: This letter concerns the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness. In my opinion, roads and its litter, that usually accompanies roads, would ruin this area as would mining. This area is also a perfect preserve for wildlife, especially the grizzly which is in need of help. For these reasons and because of this areas beauty and my deep love for this land I would like to see it become a wilderness very very much.

Yours truly,

SUSAN OHRMANN.

EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE,
Billings, Mont., September 20, 1968.

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: Please present this letter as testimony in support of the inclusion of the Lincoln Back Country as wilderness country: I understand that on Wednesday, September 25, at 9:00 a.m., a hearing for this purpose will be held in the Civic Center in Great Falls.

The Lincoln Back Country is only one area under consideration for Wilderness designation, however, no opportunity must be lost to set aside as Wilderness as much primeval land as possible; the population press, the growing complexity of contemporary society demands it. When man can no longer find a primitive setting into which to escape, to contemplate, to broaden his perspectives, society will have to give new concern to the kind of creature he may well become. We are all familiar with the predictions by both Sociologists and Psychologists, predictions of the expected behavior of man when population hems him into and binds him into his concrete jungles. Needless to say, these predictions are not pleasant to contemplate but as a Sociologist, I find myself in basic agreeemnt with them. To provide man with an occasional escape into the forest primeval might just offset these predictions; we must not miss the opportunity to give him this escape and certainly the Lincoln Back Country will provide one such area.

I strongly urge the classification of the Lincoln Back Country as Wilderness.

Most sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. WALTNER,
Assistant Professor of Sociology (on leave).

BILLINGS, MONT., *September 20, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have never seen the Lincoln Back Country, perhaps I never will. This is not really important. But my children and their children might well enjoy the wilderness aspects of this area, and this is important. It is important to me, and I hope, to you.

Many people stress the need to supply campgrounds and picnic areas for the public. These are undoubtedly needed. Facilities, however, can be constructed in many places, whereas wilderness is where you find it—unless marred by thoughtless man.

All this, of course, leads to my plea that the Lincoln Back Country be retained as a wilderness and not be subjected to the "improvements" of modern man.

Sincerely,

BETTY E. TRAPP.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 22, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: We would like the 240,500 acres of land in the Lincoln Back Country added to the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

We understand that in addition to the lumbering interests, the Anaconda Co. has been doing extensive mining exploration in adjacent areas and we do not want to see another Berkeley Pit and the ensuing air and stream pollution in this wilderness. We have seen no mention of this in newspaper accounts.

These areas should be added to the Bob Marshall Area to preserve one of the few remaining natural wilderness areas in the United States.

Sincerely,

JERE C. MCCAULAY.
CAROL M. MCCAULAY.

ROSEMOUNT, MINN., *June 3, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Senate Interior Subcommittee Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Based on the known existing qualities and features of the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area and the ever increasing need and shortage of areas of this type. I respectfully request that it be included in the National Wilderness Preservation System. My reasons for this request are as follows:

As it presently exists this area is relatively undisturbed and in a state of natural balance. Opening it to mass recreation would almost undoubtedly destroy that balance as it has in so many other instances. The persons using the area under such a program, having not had to expend any real personal energy to travel there, would quite assuredly be most interested in what suits their own pleasure first rather than what best suits the area.

The annual cut of timber in the United States relative to the annual growth and the value of the timber in this area being what it is can hardly justify opening this area for logging. Based on existing supplies of the same type of timber of better quality in already accessible areas, the opening up of this area could not be of adequate over-all benefit to justify it. The topography of the area being what it is, logging could only have a detrimental effect on it due to the soil erosion and siltation of streams that would result.

Considering that Federal legislation has been passed to protect our endangered species of wildlife, and that the Grizzly Bear which is one of these species is relatively abundant in this area, destroying the wilderness character of this area would be in disregard and negligent of this existing law of the land. It has been proven by example many times over that the Grizzly will not survive in other than a basically true wilderness environment. Although he may not be necessary for the immediate economic well being of the Nation, the existence of the Grizzly Bear in reasonable abundance in their natural state is of far greater and longer range value than dollars can ever measure. He is part of the American Heritage which must remain if generations to come are to know the true America and the past on which it was built and on which it became a great nation.

In summary, although I am not a resident of Montana it is where I head for whenever the opportunity to do so arises and especially to areas such as the Lincoln Back Country. I may even be in a better position to appreciate these areas than those fortunate enough to live near them. It is because of this magnetism that areas such as this have for many thousands of people who truly love them as God created them that I urge the Lincoln Back Country be given true Wilderness status. All Americans have a stake in these areas, for when they cease to exist as they were created a part of that which has made America great and good will cease to exist also. I would like to leave you one basic thought to close my request; that is the policy of the United States Forest Service of, "The greatest good for the greatest number in the long run." Can there be any question as to what is truly right for this area? Thank you very much for your time, effort, and concern in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

C. WILLIAM IRELAND.

MOOSE, WYO., *May 29, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN,
Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Please add this letter to the hearing record on S. 1121, said hearing to be held on June 11, 1968.

While I have not been able to travel through the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, I have been in adjacent country, have read and heard a great deal about this region and have seen many pictures of its beautiful variety.

I therefore feel very strongly that the great good for the American people of the present and the future will be served by giving to the Lincoln country a Wilderness classification. I venture to comment that both the present and the future economic as well as the esthetic needs of the United States will be thus served, and the future will be grateful.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET E. MURIE.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *May 31, 1968.*

Re Senate bill 1121.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: In 1964, my late husband, Harvey Broome, and I went into the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat area in Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests. From first-hand experience and awe of this overwhelming country, I urge you to protect and classify this area as Wilderness.

Think of the power vested in this Committee to preserve this magnificent heritage of America.

I respectfully ask that this letter be made a part of the printed hearing record.

Yours very truly,

ANNE BROOME
Mrs. Harvey Broome.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEE: I want to urge your favorable action on Senate Bill 1121 on placing the Lincoln-Scapegoat Country in the Wilderness system.

Wilderness areas are an invaluable resource in the moral and spiritual regeneration of America. There are substitutes for beef, minerals, timber or whatever it is people want from these areas. There is room for more intensive use type recreation if development in terms of paved roads, tourist facilities, etc., are in view.

There is no substitute for Wilderness (or whatever we can regard as a reasonable facsimile of it).

The law of diminishing returns acts more quickly here than in any other phase of human life. Accessibility destroys it.

So how can it be a valuable spiritual resource if it isn't going to be used by masses of people? This can't be proved; it can't be expressed in dollars and cents. It has to be taken on faith.

The use of Wilderness as such—or as we find it in our parks and primitive and wild areas is going to increase all the time. People will learn to use it properly. They must and they will.

The pressure on all Wilderness and quasi-wilderness is increasing by the minute. I was in the Grand Canyon in April, hiked on two trails, two nights out both times—and hardly had ten minutes uninterrupted privacy. (It was Easter week—but no matter) We met a family of five, the youngest about 4—all had hiked 18 miles to the Colorado and back, all were carrying packs. What a beautiful family! It was as attractive as the scenery to note the wonderful rapport and enjoyment. Remember I am well past the middle of my life—a woman—too heavy—but I can still enjoy this kind of thing. Saw hundreds of Boy Scouts.

Trails we need—sometimes shelters—campgrounds are essential, but thats all. Let the others congregate on the outer margins, as suggested in a recent issue of Our National Parks (published by the National Parks Association) until they learn the proper use of Wilderness.

Rolly and I have hiked in the Bob Marshall area adjacent to the Lincoln back country. I have driven from Avon to Seeley Lake dozens of times so I do know the country. The trails in the Marshall area were ankle deep in dust—tin cans piled high where the Salmon flowed into the South Fork—Just to show that we need more acres—and more maintenance of course (This was 1961).

Amidst all the problems that beset you in your capacity—it should be a joy to espouse this cause.

Sincerely,

POLLY RENNE.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 1, 1968.*

THE MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION,
Bozeman, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: It has been brought to my attention that the area designated as the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area is in danger of being developed for the use of large masses of people and extensive timber harvest. Such development would seriously depreciate another of our cherished Wilderness Areas. As our Association is concerned with this problem I am writing to you to lend my support to any effort you might make to prevent this area from becoming a typical California Recreation Area, i.e., roads in every direction, camp grounds in every other canyon, and charging, noisy motorcycles on all the trails around them.

It should be remembered by our Association that persons such as myself come to Montana primarily because of the vast number of Wilderness Areas that remain in your state. Thirty years ago as a boy in California there was still many of these areas that I enjoyed here. Each year there are fewer and fewer of these areas left which can provide seclusion and a true wilderness experience. Therefore, many California residents who unwittingly let their wilderness areas go by the board now use Montana Wilderness Areas and appreciate all too well the primitiveness of areas such as the Lincoln Back Country.

I urge that every effort be used to maintain this area in its present state of development.

Sincerely yours,

VERNON M. WALKER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *May 31, 1968.*

The MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION,
Bozeman, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: I certainly wish to go on record as fully supporting your resolution No. 12 requesting the necessary action to bring the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area into the National Wilderness Preservation System.

As this area is ideally suited for wilderness preservation it would be unthinkable to develop it for any other purpose. There are too few areas now where our citizens and our visitors can truly enjoy and appreciate nature at its best.

I will appreciate your presenting this letter at the hearing to be held June 11 as I am unable to be present.

Yours very truly,

JAMES MAILLIARD.

HIDDEN VALLEY FARM,
Elizabeth, Ill.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: It has been brought to my attention that an effort is being made to open the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area to lumbering and worse. I have had the good fortune to travel the area by horseback on several occasions. These trips have been the most enjoyable that I have ever taken. There are too few areas of this kind left. Once gone they will be gone forever. I am sure you will do all you can to preserve what little is left of God's Country.

Sincerely,

PAUL OSTRUM.

KINSTON, N.C., *June 9, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: Please add my name to the list of those who favor placing the Lincoln-Scapegoat area into wilderness status.

Sincerely,

GARY D. JOHNSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 8, 1968.*

DEAR SIRS: Let it be known that I am another who believes that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness should remain untouched forever.

Yours sincerely,

ROBT. J. AMPORT.

HAMMOND, WIS., *June 8, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: Regarding the hearing to be held on June 11 with Senator Lee Metcalf in Great Falls, I wish to offer my support for the preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area under Wilderness Status.

In my opinion, our nation must continue to protect these areas of beauty from roadways and unnecessary exploitations.

Ours is a beautiful country. May it remain this way through protective legislation when necessary.

Sincerely,

JOHN AFDAHL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 6, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: I have recently received your letter concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area about which a hearing will be held on June 11, 1968. It has been my privilege and pleasure to have spent many happy hours through the past 17 years in the very area which is being brought under discussion. We have entered this area by foot and by horseback and I am well aware of the impending catastrophe which would take place if this area were subjected to exploitation which undoubtedly would occur if this area were opened up. It is an area adjacent to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and is in no way nearly as rugged as that area which is permanently set aside.

The area is beautiful and extremely fragile and would be completely destroyed by opening up this area to mining and lumbering interests. It's creeks are small, it's lakes are small and will not tolerate excessive pressure.

In addition, the threat of forest fires, of which Montana has entirely too many, would be enhanced and the area littered with beer cans and waste material.

I can see no sense whatever in building a road through this area, part of which would be at a great expense to the government, at a time when the nation is crying economy.

So please add my vote to others who are in favor of maintaining this area as a wilderness area.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN G. PARRY, M.D.

FULLERTON, CALIF., *June 7, 1968.*

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: As we are temporarily out of the State, we did not receive your notice of hearing till June 6, 1968, and of course, due to circumstances, cannot attend the hearing. Please add this letter to those wishing to save the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness. At present, although we are out of State, we do still own property in the State of Montana and have maintained our residency in that State and wish that we may be of some help in trying to save the above-mentioned Wilderness area.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. J. M. MILLER.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 4, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been advised that a special public hearing is scheduled on Bill S. 1121 in Great Falls, Montana, on June 11.

As a long time resident of Montana, and as an amiable visitor into some of its back country, I am extremely interested in the preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country as a wilderness area. I am familiar with this area of Montana, and it seems to me it could best be usefully maintained in its present state rather than to be opened up to all types of traffic. Adjoining as it does the Bob Marshall Wilderness area, it seems to me it will be wise to include it as a part of that area.

There is plenty of other land in the state for general recreational purposes, while there is less and less back country areas such as this to preserve for our future generations.

I hope favorable consideration will be given to S. 1121.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. HENDON.

HINSDALE, ILL., *June 3, 1968.*

Re Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Wilderness Area, Senate bill S. 1121 and House bill H.R. 7147.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: As can be seen by the address above I do not reside in the great State of Montana. Yet I, too, am extremely concerned over the possibility that one of the few beautiful areas of wilderness remaining to us may forever be given over to road builders, mining interests, etc. I am speaking of the Lincoln Back Country.

I speak from experience when I say that this area is for only the people and citizens to enjoy in the years to come—not private interests. I come out every year for a week or two to ride in this beautiful region—to see an area and relax in an area that is hard to find these days—the Lincoln Back Country. There are thousands of people like myself that need and want to keep the few areas of wilderness remaining free from roads, mining pits, and decimation of this type. I want my children and the generations to come to have the chance to live in—even for a brief time—a wild area that is left clean and natural.

Therefore I strongly urge the passage of the above bills. I ask that you resist any pressure to turn over this beautiful wilderness area to be forevermore ruined by commercialization. I hope that this letter will be presented at the hearing to be held at Great Falls June 11, 1968.

Sincerely yours,

CARL D. BERRY, Jr., M.D.

CRESCENT CARDBOARD CO.,
CHICAGO, ILL., *June 4, 1968.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Great Falls, Mont.:

Having property in Montana as well as being from Chicago area think it would be grave mistake for the Government to open up Lincoln-Scapegoat back country to highways and development. This is one of the last remaining untapped areas in the Nation. Will be greatly disappointed in the decimation that will come as a result of puncturing this area.

D. B. OZMNU.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *May 29, 1968.*

DEAR SIR: Having had the pleasure and the spiritual refreshment of visiting the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country area on several occasions, we would strongly urge that this area be rewarded with wilderness status. It would be a national disgrace and a loss forever if this lovely area would be open for roads, lumbering, or mass recreation.

With sincere wishes that this be kept in wilderness,

FRED and ESTHER GOLDMAN.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 1, 1968.*

Re the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness proposal.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing out of deep concern for a bit of beautiful country back in Montana's hills—the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area, whose very existence as a remote haven for people and animals alike is now in jeopardy.

It seems that there are two factors involved in the issue of whether to preserve this area intact or to open it up with roads. One is a faulty definition of progress; the other is, I feel, an honest question of right or wrong.

For so long the wilderness was there to be conquered. Change of the wilderness spelled progress to our ancestors. Today the wilderness no longer threatens us; we threaten it. We have it within our power to completely destroy every last acre of untouched land. Change of the wilderness now too often means destruction, not progress. We cannot destroy any more of our remaining wilderness areas. To do so is, I feel, completely wrong.

Likewise, in the past few centuries, man has systematically wiped out several hundred species of wildlife—sometimes by killing the animal or bird itself, often by ruination of its habitat. To open up the Lincoln-Scapegoat country is another step in the extermination of the grizzly, one of our most awesome and magnificent creatures, through the destruction of its habitat.

The decision to open up the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area or to retain it as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System is irrevocable. We must make the right, the wisest decision. We must preserve it. If this area is ever opened up, it is lost forever. It can never be returned to the wild, beautiful land it now is. The area and its wildlife will be gone and we will all feel keenly the loss and be poorer because of it.

For these reasons I would like to go on record as strongly urging the placement of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Yours truly,

SANDRA JEAN HOLLAR.

SPOKANE, WASH., *May 31, 1968.*

DEAR SIR: I would like this letter made part of the record of the hearing regarding the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country, which is to be held at Great Falls, Montana, June 1, 1968.

It is my strong opinion that the Lincoln-Spacegoat Back Country very definitely should be saved for us now and for the future, as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. The wilderness has always been a part of our heritage as Americans, yet we are in danger of allowing 240,000 acres of this heritage to slip through our fingers.

This wilderness, which according to experts, could not tolerate extensive traffic, is in danger of perhaps becoming just another series of roadside campsites. The land, and the wildlife it supports, would both suffer if this area were opened up by roads—and once this happens the uniqueness of this wild area will be forever lost, for it would never again be true wilderness.

There are plenty of nearby areas which are available for access by car for those who choose to see the country in this way.

The unpolluted North Fork of the Blackfoot and other streams would have their headwaters contaminated, thus contaminating the entire rivers, if this area were opened up by roads.

Also, it has been observed that the amount of quality timber in this area is very small.

Most of us who wish this area preserved in a wilderness state stand to gain nothing financially from having taken this position. However, we would gain the assurance that this unique area will be preserved for us and for future Americans as part of the heritage of our country.

Sincerely,

CAROL ANN HOLLAR.

MOREHEAD CITY, N.C., *June 6, 1968.*

Re Lincoln back country-Scapegoat area in Lolo National Forest.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: Inasmuch as population is increasing, wilderness is decreasing. I do not see in this area outstanding timber resources that are of present need. This area is not suited for mass recreation; however, it is superb for future hunting, as the last habitat of the grizzly bear. Any possible loss of tax and timber income would be more than offset by hunting, fishing, and recreation derived. Let us make it part of the Wilderness System.

Yours,

BOB SIMPSON.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 17, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: This letter is an expression of my opinion on the proposed wilderness classification of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area, sometimes referred to as the Lincoln Back Country.

I am unalterably opposed to tying up in wilderness classification any more national forest lands in this area for the following reasons:

1. The area in question is bound on the north by the million acre Bob Marshall Wilderness. Surely this is ample wilderness area to serve present and foreseeable future needs.

2. If the area in question could be developed under the Forest Services' multiple use plan it would make a profound and permanent contribution to the economy of western Montana's forest industries. In view of our population explosion and the rapidly increasing need for food and fiber, we can ill afford to take more forest land out of production. The development of roads in this area would make the Bob Marshall Wilderness much more accessible to many hundreds of people who want to make hiking trips in to the wilderness. There is a large segment of the American public who cannot afford the services of pack and saddle stock as offered by dude ranches.

3. As a final note, let me say that I know the area in question as well as any man. It formed a portion of the ranger district which I managed from 1929 to 1941. It does contain many scenic and recreational resources. Under good common sense multiple-use management these resources would not be destroyed but would be enhanced and opened up so that many more people could enjoy them.

It is my sincere hope that you will see fit to use the influence of your good office to defeat H.R. 7148, Battin March 14, 1967, and S. 1121, Metcalf, February 28, 1967.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM K. SAMSEL.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *September 17, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you at this time to register my opposition to the proposal to classify as a wilderness area the approximately 240,500 acres on the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide.

I believe that the multiple use plan for the area proposed by the Forest Service would result in much more beneficial use by many more people than it would under wilderness classification.

Very truly yours,

FRANK B. CASLER.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: It is not possible for me to attend the hearing in Great Falls, however I am greatly concerned about the two bills in Congress (H.R. 7148 and S. 1121) which would give Wilderness classification to approximately 240,500 acres of national forest land in Montana.

I am well acquainted with the area in question, with its fine stands of mature, merchantable timber, its exceptional recreational possibilities and its acres of good grazing. If this area is closed off by a wilderness classification all of this potential will be lost, and use will be afforded only to the limited few. The result would be a tragic waste of resources which need to be managed and used to provide the greatest benefit to the people and the country.

The U.S. Forest Service have made detailed studies of the area and have developed a multiple use plan which is good common sense and much preferable to a wilderness classification with its attendant limited use. I strongly recommend that this area be left open and that it be developed and used in line with the multiple use plans of the U.S. Forest Service.

Very truly yours,

C. R. BYERS.

PLAINS-PARADISE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Plains, Mont., September 17, 1968.

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The members of the Plains-Paradise Chamber of Commerce, in regular session and by unanimous vote, are opposed to the proposed Lincoln Wilderness Area, as outlined in S. 1121 and H.R. 7148.

We wish this Area to remain under U.S. Forest Service jurisdiction, and managed under the multiple Use Plan for the benefit of all.

Sincerely,

O. J. MURPHY, *Secretary.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *September 16, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Reference is made to the hearing relative to the proposed Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area. As you probably know this area and the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area have a common boundary for many miles. If Wilderness classification is approved for the Blackfoot-Sun River unit the result will be a roadless area of approximately 1,190,500 acres. I am familiar with the entire area.

Because of constant pressure for more Wilderness throughout the Northwest I recorded some questions and some of my conclusions relative to this matter some time ago. A copy of the material is enclosed.

It is my feeling that the resources of the Blackfoot-Sun River unit, timber, grazing, recreational, etc. be so managed that the general public will be benefited.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES C. URQUHART,
Retired Forest Supervisor.

WILDERNESS—HOW MUCH?

Fifty years ago the roads into many public forests, and some private ones also, consisted of a pair of parallel ruts which extended a short distance beyond the forest boundary. The mileage of trails was limited. As we lugged back packs over the cliffs and thru brush and down timber on the way to fires or when engaged in other work, the inspirational value of wilderness was seldom recognized.

Today the forest wilderness is being brought under management. Lumbermen are cutting designated areas of mature and decadent timber, creating needed jobs and contributing to the economy in various ways. Timber sale receipts go to our depleted national treasury and to financially hard-pressed counties. Multiple purpose roads are being constructed. They serve recreationalists, loggers and are useful in the event of insect infestation or tree diseases. When fires occur large crews of men and bevies of bulldozers can often be taken to the vicinity of a fire day or night with little regard for wind or smoke that might stymie aircraft. Accessibility is an important factor in fire control.

We now have some splendid wilderness areas. There is constant, powerful pressure for more. How much more roadless, minimal use area is justified particularly where commercial timber land is involved?

Who will see the Wilderness Areas? Two relatively small groups probably, one made up of those rugged individuals who can hike and carry their supplies, another made up of those who have the time, money and inclination to take horseback trips. Who else? Hunters and fishermen are motivated largely by the location of wildlife populations. However, in some areas they do contribute to the cost of trail maintenance and horse pasture problems.

What will the Wilderness travellers see? Some will see stands of thrifty trees. In addition to seeing lakes and peaks in the high alpine country many will see dead and decadent standing timber and a tangle of dead trees on the ground. Some may see high hazard single burns and timber killed by forest insects and tree diseases. They may see some overgrazed horse pasture.

Before more of these minimal use areas are approved, especially those containing a material acreage of commercial timber land, why not have some research to determine the approximate volume of traffic the area will support without detracting from the atmosphere that makes wilderness desirable? How about a grazing survey to determine whether there will be ample horse feed in the right places to fit the maximum traffic desirable or permissible? How many thousands of people will be excluded from the area due to lack of a road? What about the per capita cost of maintenance of camp spots and trails in the roadless units?

The "Wilderness Act" Public Law 88-577 is interesting as are various regulations having to do with administration of these areas. The law states that the

wilderness system is "for the permanent good of the whole people". Other statements include "untrammeled by man" "outstanding opportunities for solitude". It is implied that Wilderness areas will be protected and preserved in their "natural condition". What could be more natural than lightning fires burning dead and decadent timber or anything else that will burn? It has been decided that motorized equipment is detrimental to the wilderness concept. However, helicopters, power pumps and saws may, and likely will be, used for fire suppression purposes. If the wilderness atmosphere can be polluted by use of power equipment on fires, why increase the cost of current trail maintenance by prohibiting the use of power saws for this work? The law seems to imply that additional funds will not be provided because of wilderness areas. If there is material use and no added expense is incurred it is predicted that camp spots and trails will be in unsatisfactory condition.

The creation of large, permanent, roadless areas is unprogressive from the standpoint of controlling fire, insects and tree diseases.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Reference H.R. 7148, Battin, and S. 1121, Metcalf.

I wish to register my opposition to the proposed conversion into a wilderness area of over 240,000 acres in the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area.

As I understand, this area adjoins or is near the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. Why should we have such an enormous acreage which so few can ever explore or enjoy?

Far more people will benefit if the Forest Service continues to manage the Blackfoot-Sun River area under the present multiple-use plan.

The good of the people should be the first consideration in the handling of public land.

Very truly yours,

JESSIE M. THOMPSON.

LIBBY, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I wish to state my opposition to the creation of a new Wilderness Area in the Blackfoot-Sun River country.

With the Bob Marshall area, the Glacier Park area and the Cabinet Mountain area in the Kootenai National Forest I strongly believe we have sufficient land removed from multiple use under Forest Service management in northwest Montana.

Lands under Forest Service management are open to extensive recreational use and serve the public in other needed uses.

Sincerely.

S. KYLE BEEBE.

CLOVERDALE, CALIF., *September 14, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Relative to bills H.R. 7148, Battin, and S. 1121, Metcalf, which you are about to consider in a public hearing:

Beginning in 1929, I have been in many parts of the area under consideration, thru the years since, and I do recognize the recreational value and scenic beauty of the area very much. There are also many other values to be considered, i.e., minerals, grazing, timber, permanent hunting lodges or so-called dude ranches, and summer homes, most of which are being used to some extent at present.

In my mind, these uses do not depreciate the recreational and scenic values to an extent that would offset their loss to the State of Montana, or to the Nation as a whole, and I believe the time is rapidly approaching when the total resources of our country must be brought to bear on our problems.

With this in mind, I would be glad if you would, in your hearing, consider all possible results before recommending that an area of nearly a quarter million acres, more than 375 square miles, be set aside to the exclusion of any of the uses mentioned above or others that may be desirable in the future.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

ALBERT C. AUSTIN.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

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

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Regarding H.R. 7148, Senate S. 1121 concerned with proposed Wilderness classification of a part of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area, and on which hearings are to be held in the near future at Great Falls, Montana, I will appreciate your giving consideration to my views on the matter as herein expressed.

I sympathize strongly with the aims of those who believe the establishment of adequate "Wilderness" areas to provide for the enjoyment of present and future populations is an absolute essential. In the particular case here involved, however, the character of the area concerned is such as to raise serious doubt of its suitability for "Wilderness" classification. With the sole exception of the immediate Scapegoat Mountain vicinity the area appears to conform much more to the concept of multiple use as applied by the Forest Service than it does to that of Wilderness.

The needs of the growing populations of such relatively nearby centers as Great Falls, Helena and Missoula for recreational areas to which easier access is possible than by foot or horseback should be self evident. This area is such that with the provision of very few roads, motor vehicle access could be provided, thus serving the interests of the many as against those of the few who could afford the expense and time that would be required for access were the area to remain roadless. This is a strong consideration in view of the rapidly increasing populations involved.

Another equally strong consideration is the effect "Wilderness" classification of this area would have on local communities. The locking up of such a major part of the local timber resources could not help but have a deleterious effect on the general level of business and on employment in particular.

I urge the defeat of H.R. 7148, S. 1121.

Respectfully,

HERBERT A. EDD.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *September 13, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: This is a request on my part to have my views put on record in regard to the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area in Montana, a hearing on which is to be held very shortly.

While I am, and long have been, in favor of wilderness classification for substantial areas of land, I do not think there should be a re-classification of this particular area. It should be managed under multiple use principles, carefully thought out and applied.

Sincerely,

CARL G. KRUEGER.

SUPERIOR, MONT., *September 13, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: It is my hope that you will use your influence to help defeat bills H.R. 7148 and S. 1121, as I believe the broader multiple use plan as carried out by the present management will benefit far more people in the long run. Changing to wilderness area will only benefit a few for a short season each year.

Sincerely,

H. F. WIRT.
JOYCE V. WIRT.

HAVRE, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: This is to inform you that the 900 member Hill County Wildlife Association of Havre, Montana, has gone on record in support of the proposal to create the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area near Lincoln, Montana.

We understand that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is delicate in nature with limited ability to withstand roading, logging, and soil disturbance. For this reason, we feel the area should be retained in its natural wild condition for the enjoyment by future generations of sportsmen and nature lovers. We are opposed to the U.S. Forest Service proposal which would develop the area for timber harvest, as we believe the wilderness recreational opportunities of the area greatly overshadow its meager sawtimber values.

Regarding the hearing on this proposal, to be held in Great Falls on June 11, 1968, a representative will be present from our Association. However, we request that this letter be made part of the hearing record.

Thank you for your consideration and support.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL J. EVANS,
President, Hill County Wildlife Association.

UPPER GALLATIN CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Gallatin Gateway, Mont., June 1, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This Association stands for the preservation of Montana's greatest natural resource—its natural beauty.

Therefore it heartily endorses the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area as an outstanding part of our heritage.

We also wish to stress that time is fighting against us.

Yours respectfully,

MARC T. PATTEN, *President.*

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *September 20, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: Please consider and record my feelings in regard to S. 1121.

I object to having this 250,000 acres of National Forest land in Montana being classified as wilderness.

I do support the U.S. Forest Service plan, which has been properly planned to maintain the area for the public and the future.

Yours very truly,

GARDNER F. TEALL.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *September 18, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: I present for the hearing on S.B. 1121, my feelings, which are:

1. Definite opposition to the classifying of the 250,000 acres as wilderness.
2. Favorable opinion to the Forest Service plan of managing the area for the best public interests.

Yours truly,

A. D. NEUMANN.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *September 20, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: For the hearing in reference to SB 1121 on September 23, 1968, please, place on the record my opposition to classifying this area as wilderness.

It will not be to the best interests of the public to set this area in this classification.

The area should be used to serve the public and, yet, maintain adequate protection of the resources.

Yours very truly,

R. C. CARLSON.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *September 20, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIRS: Please enter my statement into the record at your hearing on SB 1121 to be held in Great Falls, Montana on September 23, 1968.

I certainly favor the Lincoln Back Country to be under the multiple use management plan prepared by the U.S. Forest Service rather than a proposed wilderness.

Sincerely,

IRIS BROWN.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *September 19, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: For the hearing in Great Falls, Montana on September 23, 1968 relative to SB 1121 I wish to make this statement for the record.

I am opposed to placing this acreage into Wilderness classification.

I am in favor of the Forest Service plan for multiple use to favor the greatest number of people.

Sincerely,

NEILL A. GEBHART.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *September 18, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: Please enter this statement in the record of your hearing on S. 1121 held in Great Falls, Montana, on September 23, 1968.

I am opposed to this bill which would classify as wilderness approximately 250,000 acres of national forest land in Montana.

I support the Forest Service plan for coordinated management of all resources of the area. This, I firmly believe, would serve the general public's interests and needs far better than would wilderness classification.

Very truly yours,

A. P. HANSEN.

COEUR D' ALENE, IDAHO, *September 19, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: As your hearing in Great Falls, Montana, on September 23, 1968, on S. 1121, I wish to go on record as opposing the classifying as wilderness the 250,000 acres of National Forest land in Montana.

The U.S. Forest Service has studied the area and its resources and their plans would serve the public interests and the area much better than the wilderness plan.

Sincerely,

D. L. QUINCY.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *September 18, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to present this brief statement supporting the Forest Service plan for multiple use management of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area, commonly referred to as the "Lincoln Back Country". Please enter my statement in the record of the hearing on S. 1121 to be held by your committee at Great Falls, Montana, on September 23, 1968.

The Forest Service plan is based on careful consideration of the many resources of the area. The plan adequately provides for protection of the fragile soil areas and watershed values, and for balanced management of wildlife, fish, recreation, and timber.

In my opinion, the Forest Service plan will better serve the needs and desires of the public than would the alternate proposal for wilderness preservation.

Respectfully yours,

GARRY RINGOLD.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *September 18, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to express my views for inclusion in the hearing records on S.B. 1121 which would classify some 240,000 acres of the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide Area in Montana as wilderness.

I believe the best interests of the vast majority of the public will be better served if this legislation is not passed and the area covered by this bill be managed as proposed by the Forest Service, for multiple use. This plan provides for protection of the aesthetic values and at the same time will permit harvesting of timber and provide family type recreation through the building of roads and campgrounds, which will serve more people than if the area were declared wilderness.

Our rural communities need the jobs and payrolls generated by use of the timber resources, the counties need the tax base, and the nation requires the products developed from a well managed forest if our country is to maintain the standard of living presently enjoyed by her citizens.

The State of Montana combined with the neighboring State of Idaho contains more than four and a half million acres of wilderness and primitive area, which should be sufficient to meet the desires of the minority who engage in this type of recreation.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE RAUCH.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 10, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I wish to submit the following statement in favor of Senate bill 1121 and House Bill 7148 on the Lincoln-Scapegoat proposed wilderness.

My name is Jake Crosby. I reside at Lincoln, Montana. I have lived in the Lincoln area for 5 years. I have been employed in the logging industry. As a resident of Lincoln area, my family and I have enjoyed the hunting, fishing and backpacking opportunities offered by this area, and hope to enjoy it for many years to come.

As a logger it is my opinion that the timber volume & quality is of such low value that it is not economically feaseable to open that large an area just for the timber.

As a hunter and fisherman I feel the area is used as heavily as it can stand. I would not like to see this area become another fish and game planting ground, such as many areas have become.

As a taxpayer I am entirely opposed to seeing my tax dollars spent on roads that are unnecessary. In my opinion the proposed road thru the Scapegoat area would be of no economic value to the Lincoln area.

Sincerely,

JAKE CROSBY.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., *June 4, 1968.*

MR. TOM EDWARDS,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Committee,
Ovando, Mont.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: Having traveled and camped in the Lincoln Back Country on two occasions, once in your own good company, I feel qualified to comment in support of S. 1121 and, accordingly, authorize you to submit this statement to the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in behalf of S. 1121.

As an individual who prizes a wilderness experience and as one willing to spend money in Montana to achieve this objective (I have traveled to Montana for this purpose the last five or six consecutive years), I can only say that, if the Forest Service is permitted to construct a system of scenic roads, picnic grounds, vehicular campgrounds, septic tank systems and the rest of the destruction that results from unremitting and continued surrender to automobile traffic, then the Lincoln Back Country has seen the last of me and possibly tens of thousands of others like me in the years to come. I don't have to go to Montana to take a scenic drive and find an auto campsite or a picnic ground. And I do not believe that Montanans or out-of-staters really need the facilities the Forest Service would construct for them. I believe that there are very few wild areas as readily accessible by foot or horseback as the Lincoln Back Country. It should be an affront to any American who lays claim to being an outdoorsman of very modest proportions to even suggest that the area be roaded. There is no public demand for the Service's proposal and they know it. Their idea is that once the roads are built and the facilities installed, the people will use them and create "people statistics," to which the Service can point with pride, even though the area and its environment have deteriorated. I submit to you gentlemen the possibility that the Service may become addicted to the "eyeball recreation" which attends road construction. This is not bad, in and of itself, except where, as here, the penalties of development far outweigh its limited advantages.

It is my earnest hope that the Committee will consider the highly probable fact that the long-range economic benefit to Montana will be better served by preservation and conservation than by the short term benefits which might accrue to the Forest Service plan.

I take similar exception to the Forest Service's plan to road and log the area. I have personally viewed the limited timber resources in the area, much of which is lodgepole pine. This species exists in great abundance outside of the area. The need to log the area is also diminished by the fact that the Service is free to make certain that the allowable cut from the national forests involved is in no way adversely affected by wilderness designations. Thus, there should be virtually no adverse impact on logging operations.

I wish to enter objection in still other respects. The ecology of the Lincoln Back Country is fragile, and neither its land, water, or wildlife can withstand mass recreation pressures. I am especially concerned about the already limited habitat of the grizzly bear, an animal of declining numbers who cannot tolerate the high degree of human activity which the Service would inflict upon him. While I have never seen grizzly in the Lincoln Back Country, I have seen their tracks and other signs and know that, without wilderness protection, the day is not far off when even this limited contact will be a thing of the past.

It is also evident that the native trout in these small lakes cannot withstand the fishing pressures which the Service would create. This raises the spectre of hatchery trucks, with inferior fish aboard, rumbling up the Service-built roads to create still more inferior "put and take" fishing.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that the Lincoln Back Country urgently needs the protection of the Wilderness Act. I would also like to draw the Senator's attention to the fact that, while we can make irreparable mistakes in placing too little or too few lands in the National Wilderness Preservation System, we can make only minimal mistakes, at worst, in the other direction. While I would like to perish the thought, the members of this Committee know that the Lincoln Back Country, if designated as wilderness, could be withdrawn from such classification if the future needs of the American people so require. Hence, wilderness designation for this fine expanse of wild country is like money in the bank, and it increases in value while it's in there. The Forest Service's unseemly haste to develop the area is out of all proportion to the need to do it. Left to its own devices, the Service may, in a few short years, bankrupt itself of its remaining de facto wild lands. Without wilderness protec-

tion, the American people will carry, for all time, the burden of hasty and mistaken action if the Lincoln Back Country now falls prey to unnecessary and undesirable development.

I sincerely and urgently request the Committee to approve S. 1121 and thus establish the fact that the highest and best use of the Lincoln Back Country, economically, aesthetically and recreationally, will accrue to its status as wilderness.

Sincerely,

A. T. WRIGHT.

NORTHBROOK, ILL., *May 27, 1968.*

GENTLEMEN: It is imperative that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Bill, H.R. 7418 is passed. Anyone who has had the opportunity to travel through this wonderous area knows that this Bill is an absolute must to receive affirmative action before Congress.

There should be somewhere in the immediate confines of the continental United States of America where there are no cars, no roads, no phones, just the beauty that God carved out for us to enjoy. If we take this area off of the Wilderness roster, then another area next year and other areas in years to come then by the time our youngsters grow into men there will be no wilderness.

You in the State of Montana have a great deal to be proud of—mountains, clean rivers, pollution free air, alas, The Big Sky Country. Keep it this way by stopping anymore advances economically into your wilderness areas.

If anyone wants to visit the Scapegoat-Lincoln Back Country in the years to come, what is wrong with mounting a horse or walking in to see it? Our Fathers and Grandfathers did. Once the wilderness spell is taken off the land it is gone forever. Keep the magic on this marvelous mountain country by passing this important Bill.

Respectfully,

RICHARD P. SUTCLIFFE.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 8, 1968.*

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: It was our family's pleasure to enjoy three pack trips into this area in the 1950's. We've also enjoyed visiting Rocky Mountain National Park, Yellowstone, Sequoia, Grand Canyon, Bryce, Zion, Rainier, and many other places. The family has grown and separated now; however, when we do get together, the one vacation spot all of us want to talk about is the Meadow Creek, Scapegoat, Blackfoot River wilderness. Such beautiful details that come forth—memories of trees, creeks, trails, and mountain tops come alive as the discussions progress.

May I be so bold as to remind you gentlemen, you are not dealing with 1968 or with 1999 or with 2055! You are dealing with eternity! Everywhere on this earth the white man has been turned loose en-masse; he has devastated the natural beauty of the country beyond all recognition.

I use this phrase reverently, "For the sake of God Almighty and for posterity" let's keep this wilderness the way He created it. We've done enough damage to this country of ours! Let's Stop!

Sincerely,

VICTOR A. CLOSE.

MAPLEWOOD, N.J., *May 29, 1968.*

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Last summer I spent my vacation in the Bob Marshall Wilderness and it was one of the most delightful times that I have ever spent. I think that one of the most beautiful parts was the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country area which has not yet been declared a wilderness area. This area and the Bob Marshall Wilderness are contiguous to each other, and if the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is not preserved immeasurable harm will be done to the Bob Marshall Wilderness and the entire Wilderness program.

For many years I have been a member of the Wilderness Society and have enjoyed several pack trips sponsored by them. I would like to feel that others who follow at a later time may also thrill at natural beauty unspoiled by man.

I know the power of the lumber interests and the many people who like to rough it from an air-conditioned car after the plumbing has been installed.

Seldom do I write to members of Congress, but I strongly feel that some areas should be saved from the ravages of the bulldozer, chain saw and gasoline fumes.

I would be appreciative of anything you can do to foster the Wilderness Program.

Sincerely,

CHESTER R. NEUBURGER.

AMERICAN CHEMET CORP.,
Helena, Mont., May 31, 1968.

Mr. TOM EDWARDS,
White Tail Ranch,
Ovando, Mont.

DEAR TOM: In my behalf will you please represent me as being in favor of H.R. 7418?

There are at present many roads into areas that are not being used very much for recreation just because the average tourist will not walk more than about 100 yards.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat back country is one of the very few areas left, and like the grizzly bear, the trumpter swan and the eagle, these things will all pass out of existence if we don't attempt to preserve some small portion.

After twenty years of entering the back country annualy, I would hate to see it disappear.

Sincerely,

L. H. LARISON.

PENSACOLA, FLA., *June 7, 1968.*

To Those Considering Lincoln-Scapegoat Bill H.R. 7418:

Peace, quiet, tranquility, communion with God and nature! Where can one find it? Not along the once tranquil shores of the Potomac, now lined with the refuse of a million people who have never experienced the restful sounds of nature unadulterated by the noises of man. Not among the fertile fields and pastures of our great plains where the relentless groans of the tractor, truck, irrigation pump, and self-propelled combine replace the slap of the farmer's rein on the back of the mule. Not along the shores of the great Gulf of Mexico, where the quietness is oft interrupted by the chug-chug of the drilling rig, pulsation of the helicopter, boom of the seismograph charge. Not across the great sea of water and grass which is the Everglades, with the roar of the air boat, the thunder of the jet training plane, the whine of the outboard motor. Not among the myriad lakes of Minnesota, each becomes the cottage site of a beneficiary of the fruits of our industrial society, seeking refuge from the relentless noise and pace of that society, only to find the search futile, defeated by the implements of that search, the pontoon plane which flies him there, the outboard that takes him across the lake, the chain saw that cuts the wood for his fire, the power plant that provides light for his cottage, the hammer and saw building a retreat for the newly arrived neighbor, undertaking the same exercise in futility.

Is quiet and tranquility lost to America forever? Is there no place in this great land where peace can reign supreme? Yes, a few such places remain. In those few parts of the Great Rocky Mountains not yet penetrated by the lumber man's chain saw and truck, not yet succumbed to the steel, asphalt, and concrete of the great road builders, not yet become the route of the giant airliner transporting the slaves of commerce, not yet become the training ground for America's finest young men whose destiny is to fight and die without having experienced the spiritual uplift of quiet communion with God and nature.

Are we now to complete the exploitation of God's wilderness? Is our nation so poor that this small remaining portion must also go? God help us if our greed extends so far!

Sincerely,

FLOYD T. NETH.

CORGAN & BALESTIERE,
Rochester, N.Y., May 22, 1968.

To Whom It May Concern:

Several years ago I had the opportunity of packing into the Lincoln Back Country and the Bob Marshall Wilderness area. It was an unforgettable experi-

ence. Several years later our entire family was exposed to the thrills of a wilderness pack trip. We made a base camp at Meadow Creek, fished there and in nearby streams. Both of those trips had a lasting and profund effect on my two teen aged sons to a much greater degree than they were ever able to learn in a classroom lecture or by reading a book. They were made aware of the fact that there is still a part of this country which remains substantially as it was when the country was first settled, and they believe that this is a part of their American heritage. They were particularly impressed with the fact that they could get off of their horse and drink from a stream which was unpolluted and where the landscape was not cluttered with empty beer cans, gum wrappers and trash.

My typical business day is as harried as the average American, and when the going gets a little too rough I usually sit down at my desk and reflect that there is such a place as the Lincoln Back Country, and that hopefully I will be there again with my family, free from the harassment of the telephone, the noise and smell of automobiles and the other by-products of our modern day world.

I am particularly concerned about the welfare of my children and the children of other Americans and that we retain the wilderness areas such as the Lincoln Back Country for their use and the benefit of their children.

I most sincerely urge that you do whatever is possible to insure the passage of the bill now introduced in Congress.

Sincerely,

A. L. BALESTIERE.

THE AIR PREHEATER CO., INC.,
Wellesville, N.Y., May 28, 1968.

Mr. THOMAS EDWARDS,
White Tail Ranch,
Ovando, Mont.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: It has come to my attention that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country is in imminent danger of being opened by roads to mass recreation, lumbering and other commercial interests.

I do not think it fair to assess this matter only with respect to its immediate value from the vantage point of these interests, for it may well be that the greatest economic value of this area in the long run is to be found in its being classed as "forever wild." In addition, the intangible values of this as an unspoiled wilderness area cannot be calculated and therefore forces me to strongly urge the passage of H.R. 7418.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE H. LANG.

BRODERICK & BASCOM ROPE CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., June 4, 1968.

Mr. TOM EDWARDS,
White Tail Ranch,
Ovando, Mont.

DEAR TOM: I have been informed by you that there is a possibility that the back country near Meadow Creek, known as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country may be opened up by roads for mass recreation and other forms of exploitation.

I would regard this as a great tragedy and would like to add my statement opposing such a development.

Wilderness country of this sort is in short supply and can never be re-created once it is spoiled. I hope that effective action can be made to prevent this from happening in this beautiful part of Montana.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. BASCOM.

DRUMMOND, MONT.

Re Lincoln Scapegoat Area.

The word fragile has been used to describe this area. I can think of no more fitting word than this. Small streams of good fishing, but too small to be able to take much pressure. A last small area where there are still a few grizzly, and goat. An area where a person can step a few yards off the trail, and feel he is walking where no man ever trod before. Things that have very little value in dollars and cents perhaps, but are really priceless when the last one has been destroyed. And there is so little of it left.

At present Montana has hundreds of miles of good roads alongside trout streams. If this country is opened up, it will no longer be unique, but will be just another thirty miles or so, of roadway, following a fished out stream.

Since this is of such importance to future generations, and since we don't need the lumber right now, I believe we must place this area into wilderness classification. If the time ever comes, when the lumber must be harvested, let the generation that needs it make the decision.

But I'm sure by that time, people will no longer tolerate the wasteful, polluting methods of certain industries. And they will come to place great value on unspoiled recreation areas, and on clean pure water, and its sources.

Thank you,

BILL OHRMANN.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 30, 1968.*

MR. TOM EDWARDS,
White Tail Ranch,
Ovando, Mont.

DEAR TOM: I would appreciate your making my views known at the public hearings in June to classify the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country as wilderness.

I have known this area since 1913 and have packed back into it twice and I feel that should it ever be opened for highway travel and lumbering we would be losing one of the few remaining virgin areas in the United States as well as voiding the area of most of the type of game which is fast becoming extinct. I have watched other areas such as this being opened up and believe me, it isn't long until all the game moves out and the area takes on the looks of a garbage dump. It is hard for me to understand why so many people can hardly wait until such a beautiful, serene and peaceful area is turned into a crossroads where the timber is stripped away, the soil chewed up and the lakes and streams polluted. I say, let's set this area, and as many others as possible aside for the benefit of not only us but our generations in the future while there is still some of these areas left to set aside.

Thanks Tom.

Sincerely yours,

CARL E. THISTED.

E. BOLLAY ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Boulder, Colo., June 3, 1968.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The Lincoln-Scapegoat back country is an important part of the few remaining areas where nature has not been disturbed by man. I have many pleasant memories of past visits and look forward to seeing this back country along with my family on future trips. It is worth a thousand asphalt guided tours and roadside picnics to spend one hour in the middle of nature's true majesty. This feeling can only come from a virgin, isolated area.

While I may be somewhat subjective in my feelings for this area I have no difficulty in being totally objective in stating the scientific worth of this back country. It is impossible to understand our present pollution without being able to examine the unpolluted. The measurements taken of the air, water, and ecology are the only remaining standard measurements that can be taken. Without being able to understand the interactions between natural forces in detail it will be impossible to reestablish a reasonable environment for the rest of the nation.

These natural laboratories must be left completely intact or they are worthless. There are already too few.

The wilderness is as fragile as a snow flake. Bill number HR7418 will insure that the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country can be protected.

Sincerely,

C. P. EDWARDS, *Chief Engineer.*

NOTE.—The above statement is my own and does not necessary reflect the opinion of E. Bollay Associate or EG&G.—CPE

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 6, 1968.*

MR. TOM EDWARDS,
White Tail Ranch,
Ovando, Mont.

DEAR TOM: God help this country if it does not have the foresight and steadfastness of purpose to resist encroachment upon its already limited wild lands under whatever pretext it is presented.

Unfortunately many supposedly knowledgeable people lack the ability to keep a simple set of books . . . they think they can consume their resources and someway still have them.

I am very positively opposed to "opening up" the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country near Meadow Creek. Future generations of wonderful people will appreciate our foresight in preserving this country as the Lord made it.

Kindest personal regards,

L. R. FOUKE.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 7, 1968.*

MR. TOM EDWARDS,
White Tail Ranch, Ovando, Mont.

DEAR TOM: I have been out of town and just received your letter of May 15th. I am enclosing my check in amount $50.00 to share some of the costs of your project.

I am in the Real Estate business. In fact, for two years I have been President of the Chicago Real Estate Board. Therefore, I have natural sympathy with the real estate developer, and can easily understand his point of view. However, I also attempt, every summer, to get away from developed real estate and disappear into the original wilderness as Lewis and Clark found it. I believe that museums are important in the life of America and, indeed, the world to preserve the past as it has been presented by the greatest bar artists. In the same way we must have a museum which will hold sacrosanct some of the origin virgin great land of our country, not only for people like me who like to go into the wilderness for a complete change of pace, but as a truly museum piece of this country as it was originally.

I, therefore, hope that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Bill, H.R. 7418, will be passed. I know this country well, and feel strongly that it should be preserved in its original form.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS J. BEATTY.

FORT COLLINS, COLO., *June 13, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am in support of Senate bill 1121 which would authorize the establishment of the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness in Montana.

I request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record on S. 1121. What a few million people can do to a mountainous area is certainly in evidence in Colorado. We had better save what we can now from the effects of progress.

Thank you.

NED B. MITCHELL.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 9, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with information received from the Wilderness Society of Washington, D.C. I am requesting that this letter be made a part of the hearing record concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. This hearing is to take place June 11, 1968 in the City Council Chamber of the Great Falls Civic Center, Great Falls, Montana.

I am in favor of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area within the Heleria, Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests of Montana. As I have pointed out in previous letters, and I wish to emphasize again, there can not be too much watershed protection.

I am also glad to note the bi-partisan support that this measure is receiving from the Democratic Senators Lee Metcalf and Mike Mansfield who sponsor S. 1121 and from Republican Representative James Battin who sponsors H.R. 7148.

Respectfully,

(Miss) FRANCES WEBER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 12, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to express my view on the importance of protection for the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in Montana.

I urge that your subcommittee emphatically endorse bills S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 to demonstrate the urgent need to get this Wilderness Area into the National Wilderness Preservation System as soon as possible.

This wilderness area—one of the finest examples of pristine quality with its abundance of wildlife and other spectacular attractions for the camper, hiker, fisherman, conservationist, student, backpacker is certainly too precious an area in this era of fast dwindling wild America to be destroyed by logging, road building, and "intensive recreational development"

This area is relatively fragile and could not support intensive recreational use. Road building would seriously affect parts of four wilderness rivers here which now provide spawning grounds for the endangered grizzly bear would also be jeopardized in one of its few remaining haunts.

Please include this letter in the hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

Yours respectfully,

A. G. SODERLAND.

KINGSTON, TENN., *June 12, 1968.*

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to see the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness tract be established as a wilderness area as proposed in Senator Mansfield's bill S. 1121.

Manmade developments of all kinds are being made at such a rapid pace that I fear we are going to find we have left ourselves no place to get away from the pressures of civilization.

It is better to set aside more land as "wilderness" than we actually need at the present time for once it is invaded for mining or clear cutting it can not be restored. However, if in years to come it is found an excess of a portion of it may be removed from the "wilderness" category by an Act of the Congress. By placing it in reserve now it gives us a chance to see what our real needs are forty or fifty years from now.

Will you please include this letter as part of the record of the hearings?

Yours very truly,

C. M. DUBOIS.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 12, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like our statement made a part of the hearing held by your committee in Great Falls, Montana on June 11th concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

We were unable to be present but want this committee to know that we favor Senate bill 1121 and H.R. 7148 which would authorize establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area and its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

We are members of the Missoula Community Improvement and feel very strongly concerning this measure.

The Forest Service has many areas it tries to maintain for the benefit of the public. From our observation, this management is becoming increasingly difficult, even in areas where some patrolling is possible. To open a remote area like the Lincoln-Scapegoat area to public campgrounds would mean the destruction of that area within a period of years.

We live near an area that is open to the public and it has become a cycle race track as well as a juvenile parking spot and beer can dump. The logging roads that created this area are good roads. There is no longer hunting because game is driven back into the hills still further. A gravel parking lot covers the spot where a breathtaking alpine meadow once drew families for picnics.

National Park management is becoming difficult with full time rangers. What will happen to a place like the one we are speaking of?

Let the people who wish to enjoy it walk in. Let's keep special interest groups from destroying what belongs to the nation.

(Mr. and Mrs.) DELAS E. ROBBINS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 11, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I strongly favor S. 1121 authorizing the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area.

It is extremely important to the future of our country and the rapidly growing population that we have enough land for their comfort and pleasure.

I request that my statement be made part of the hearing record.

Yours truly,

(Miss) H. D. PETSCH.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June, 1968.*

GENTLEMEN: Please make this a part of the printed hearing record concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat area hearing.

That area should be made a permanent wilderness area. It is too delicate and fragile to be logged, roaded and torn apart by campgrounds, highways, and trails. Trees in that area don't amount to much as a lumber product.

I fully support H.R. 7148 and S. 1121.

Sincerely,

E. L. ROBINSON.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 12, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The ruined, dumped, logged and generally ravaged mountains of Northern Montana present a sorry spectable indeed to the passing traveler. I am encouraged to read that at least one small area remains unspoiled and I hope that legislation can be passed to keep it that way. In relation to its population, Montana can hardly be short of suitable recreation areas in the extensive logged forests—surely regions where the impact of logging has been softened by time would be more suitable in any case than a brand new scar.

Very truly yours,

C. R. B. LISTER.

GLENSIDE, PA., *June 10, 1968.*

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I believe it is in the best interest of the American people to pass the Senate bill 1121 and the House of Representatives bill 7148. The 240,500 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area because of its scenic value, native animal life, (including the endangered cutthroat trout) must be added to the National Wilderness Preservation System. I love the outdoors and hope some day to visit this area.

I would like this letter to be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Thank you.

JOSEPH L. WALICKI.

LINCOLN, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: My husband was born in Marysville, Montana, and Montana has always been our legal residence. Although we have lived in

China, the Philippines, New York, we have always spent our vacations in Lincoln, Montana where we still own property. Mr. Mayger was the first President of the Lincoln Back Country Committee. Our boys, now grown men, still come back to Lincoln on vacation—the younger one from Switzerland.

We are all desperately interested in the preservation of the Lincoln Back Country in its natural state.

We rest our faith with you.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) William Mayger.

Brookings, S. Dak., *June 18, 1968.*

Dear Sir: I wish to add a favorable comment to the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

My wife and I and our three boys have had the privilege of backpacking in two remote and beautiful mountain areas, the Cloud Peak Primitive Area in the Big Horn Mountains, and the Tetons. These were profoundly wonderful and refreshing experience that I wish could be experienced by many people. The addition to the Wilderness system of another area to be protected and preserved such as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area is desirable and to be recommended.

Exploitation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in the form of logging and intensive recreational use is in conflict with the area's preservation for the long span of time that is ahead of man.

Please see that this area is provided wilderness designation.

Respectfully yours,

Darrell G. Wells.

Missoula, Mont., *June 7, 1968.*

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: Please record my objection to opening the Lincoln-Scapegoat area to logging, etc. . . . I think this area should remain in its primitive state.

Sincerely,

R. Crassley.

Helena, Mont., *June 5, 1968.*

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I hear you and other loyal Montanans are working very hard to preserve the Wilderness area in the Lincoln Country. I do hope and pray you all will succeed in your "fight." It would be so disasterous for our wonderful State to be "invaded" so-to-speak. I am sure pulling for you. We all are so fortunate to be able to live here and try to preserve this beautiful land for future generations.

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Roy Shumate.

Lincoln, Mont., *June 4, 1968.*

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I respectfully request that I be given the opportunity to present an oral statement on the Senate bill 1121 at the hearing to be held at Great Falls, Montana.

Sincerely,

Joseph Meochel.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I would like to see the Lincoln-Scapegoat area protected as is.

The few wilderness areas left are part of our American heritage. Let's save it now while we still can or we won't have any.

Anything you can do will be greatly appreciated not only now, but in years to come.

Sincerely,

MARY J. NELSON.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am strongly opposed to allowing any logging interests into the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Help us preserve the Wilderness Areas as is. We have few enough left. Thank you.

Sincerely,

BOB NELSON.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *June 1968.*

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Subcommittee.

DEAR SIR: Please include the following statement on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area of Montana hearings June 11.

I strongly support the position of the Wilderness Society in their effort to save this area for recreation as a wilderness area.

The nation's greatest need is for high class recreational areas where people can escape from near made problems.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area must be maintained as wilderness if it is to provide this type of recreation.

Sincerely,

BOB MILLER.

BIGFORK, MONT., *September 27, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Having been following with interest the hearing on the proposed wilderness area north of Lincoln, Montana.

Having lived in the Flathood area for the past 58 years and most of this in the monutains and timber. I am interested in conservation of natural resources, however I don't think a wilderness area is the answer. The looks of any area changes, even if Montana never enters it. The natural weather enters the picture and changes things. Also disease enters forested areas once in a while.

I have a section of timber land east of Bigfork. Was saving about 40 acres of this nice timber for the future. About 10 years ago, just as the frost went out in the spring we had a real bad wind which laid this area flat. I naturally in the interest of conservation, and of course income, logged this. If I hadn't logged this deer and elk couldn't have grazed in there for probably 40 years. As it is now a nice crop of trees are coming as well as grazing for wild animals. This same thing could and does happen in these proposed wilderness areas. If spruce timber becomes diseased and dies and in a few years uproots, elk and deer range is gone for years. Doesn't it seem sensible to log it, have a good young stand of trees come in and have grazing? I really wouldn't mind seeing a good road up through the Bob Marshall Wilderness clear through to Lincoln. Many older people could then enjoy seeing this area.

Horseback and pack trips could still be taken for the ones who like to rough it. I've seen some of these hunting and fishing camps and horse camps in the timber over the years. I'll have to admit they don't add very much to the scenery while they are there, or after they leave. Good controls, logging and otherwise are a must where people are concerned.

In conclusion, I hope I've made it clear I do believe in conservation. I do like to see country in the wild state, I do like to see it just the way it was 25 years back, however, it never stays that way due to nature.

If you wish this can be entered as written testimony for your hearing.

Sincerely,

OLONDER G. SLETHANG.

HELENA, MONT., *September 27, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: My husband and I would like to take this means to express our support of your measure to include the Lincoln Back Country Area in the Wilderness Area.

Once an area such as this is lost, we can never regain it. Thanks for all your hard work in this area.

Sincerely,

PAT AND BOB ANTONICK.

STEVENSVILLE, *September 28, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I would like my letter to go on record at the hearing to save the Lincoln back country. These people that say they can't afford trips back in our Wilderness and that is just for the wealthy don't know what they are talking about. We are just ranchers with a modest income and we among many others manage at least one trip each year. And as for it only being possible for the hardy and young, I'm looking forward to my annual trip next summer and I'm a woman 57 years old. I hope to continue going for several more years. My son David who is 15 years old has been going since he was six. One time we went into the Big Horn Craigs with a two year old baby. Another time we rode in forty miles into the Selway with a four year old girl that rode her own horse all the way. Don't tell me that this "back country" is only for the "rich and hardy." There is so much country for the road campers. We do this too and enjoy it, but please leave the Lincoln back country as God made it. In all it's wild beauty, don't destroy the wild habitant of the Elk, Moose and bear, leave it for the wild life. Let it be left like it is for people that appreciate it. I want our son and his descendants to know and live it as we have. To be able to go back where man has not in his greed destroyed nature as it was intended to be. Can a land like this be valued in dollars and cents? It's priceless, it can be sold but beauty like this could never be bought. Once it's gone it's gone forever. Please don't let this happen.

Sincerely,

EUGENE AND MARION TINGLE,
DAVID TINGLE.

POLSON, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, Great Falls City Council Civic Center, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: There are already vast areas in Montana and Idaho now under Wilderness classification, yet certain interests are advocating placing the Blackfort-Sun River area under another wilderness area. I am familiar with this as well as the other areas and know what relatively few people use them.

It seems to me that if the Blackfoot Sun River area were placed under a multiple use plan of management it would be the sensible thing to do. Under such a plan the commercial timber in the lower elevations could be utilized without interfering with those that like to visit the scenic high rugged country.

I hope therefore that H.R. 7148 and S. 1121 are defeated.

Very truly yours,

FRED E. THIEME.

POLSON, MONT., *September 28, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEE: If they make a primative area north of Lincoln don't let them put in roads and take the timber out as once you put in roads it won't be a primitive area and the game hasn't a chance.

I have lived here and hunted in the Bob Marshall since 1924. They pack in by horses it is not expensive and you have a chance to get your game and they have also. They put a road up Shotted Bear river and took out the timber and ruined a good Elk country as there is about a hundred trucks and trailers go in there every fall and they kill the few Elk that come down.

They have put in a new big road on the best side of the river to Bunker Creek and are taking out the timber, they intend to go on up Bunker Creek and over the top this will do away with the Elk in the South part of the wilderness.

I was over this new road about two weeks ago and we seen about 20 Elk. I talked to the fellows working there and they said they would be there the first morning with their campers when it opened.

It is like cutting the two legs off of the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

Another thing they are taking out all the timber and the smaller trees six and eight inches they knock over and burn them leaving the ground bare. It will be a hundred years before it will be harvested again.

The Summers lumber took out the timber about twenty years ago. They took the ripe trees and left the smaller ones and in ten years they will cut it again, that is around Lake Ronan.

Don't let them put in roads as there won't be any game they haven't a chance and it won't be a primitive area. Once they put in roads they are there for ever.

Yours truly,

C. J. TREMPER.

SUN RIVER, MONT., *October 3, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Even though I could not attend the hearing in Great Falls, I am one of these who favor having the Lincoln Back Country added to the Bob Marshall Wilderness. As we all know this area is too fragile for unrestricted public use. Thank you.

Sincerely,

C. J. CLARK.

CHOTEAU, MONT., *October 2, 1968.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing in support of the Lincoln Back Country bill (S. 1121). I am a proponent of this bill for the following reasons:

(1) true primitive areas such as this are at a premium in this age of the bull dozer and it is doubtful another opportunity will arise to establish this as a wilderness area.

(2) expert testimony in Great Falls demonstrated the erosion problems and lack of suitable terrain for building roads.

(3) road invasion will push the premium big game animals, such as elk and bear, out of the area after the initial onslaught by road hunters.

(4) top fishing for those who are willing to put forth a little extra effort would be reduced by the development of more recreation.

(5) tourism is increasing in Montana because we have something to offer. However, people are not going to want to visit our "back country" areas to see the mining and logging industries at work. They come to Montana to get away from polluted air and water.

Sincerely yours,

D. E. BOSSHARDT, M.D.

KALISPELL, MONT., *October 1, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: We would like to add our voices to the many others in favor of having the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain made into a Wilderness Area.

We may never see this beautiful part of Montana, except through the pictures as has been presented over K. G. V. O. Television in Missoula, but we would like to think there are some places where others may go just for the pleasure of seeing some of the beauty Montana has to offer. We are transplanted Montanans and are very proud and privileged to be living here in this very lovely Flathead Valley.

Yours very truly,

(Mr. and Mrs.) KENNETH KNISLEY.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *October 1, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I herewith would like to express my support of S. 1121, and strongly urge that the "Lincoln Back Country" be made a wilderness area.

Truly yours,

ARIE DELIPDISCH.

STEAMBOAT SPRINGS, COLO., *August 19, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a former resident of Montana, I would like to express my approval of the plan to place the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

As a citizen of the United States, I am concerned, that if we don't establish these areas as wilderness now, they will soon be exploited, and ruined as so many timbered, mountainous areas with which I am personally acquainted.

Please make this letter part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DALE ENGQUIST.

ELKINS PARK, PA., *September 10, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to make known my support for S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, authorizing establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness as part of the national Wilderness Preservation System. Please include this in the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Sincerely yours,

MARIANNE SIMON.

SEATTLE, WASH., *September 16, 1968.*

Re Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness proposal.

GENTLEMEN: The Lincoln-Scapegoat should be preserved as Wilderness—not logged or developed for intensive use. I strongly support bills S. 1121 and H.R. 7148. Wild country, free of exhaust fumes and free from roads, will soon be the most valuable national commodity we possess. We must not deface any more of it. I wish this statement made part of the official record.

DAVID BIRKNER.

BEND, OREG.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: If it is not too late, I would like to register my support for a Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness as proposed in S. 1121.

As a former resident of Butte, Montana, who has known and enjoyed this area for many years, I am strongly of the opinion that if any area is suited for Wilderness classification, the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is. Such classification could not possibly adversely affect the lumber industry, and for recreational purposes, the area over the years will be much more valuable as wilderness than if it is developed for mass recreation as the Forest Service proposes.

I regret that distance and other commitments made it impossible for me to attend the recent hearing in Great Falls, but trust that this letter can be made a part of the hearing record.

Yours very truly,

P. W. CHASE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *September 15, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the Wilderness Society, the garden club of Philadelphia and the garden club of America, I wish to express my strong feelings concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal.

The proposal of Senator Lee Metcalf and Senator Mike Mansfield—Bills no. S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, to authorize the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area within the Helena, Lewis and Clark and Lolo National forests of Montana is of the greatest importance to our country.

Certainly by now the people of this country have realized how very wrong it has been to give up so much of our primitive land to loggers or recreation projects. As has been noted the timber in this area is of inferior grade and if roads are cut through for recreation purposes the erosion problems will be tremendous.

There are many excellent Camp grounds and sites existing in nearby areas so, it is utterly ridiculous to turn this fine primitive wilderness into another area open to the thoughtless who will ruin it in very short order as we all have seen in many areas across our country.

I have flown over this beautiful area many times on my way back and forth to the northwest from the East. To look down and see that untouched land is thrilling and I pray you will do all that is possible to keep it that Way.

I hope you will enter my views, as any interested conservationist, into the hearing records.

Most sincerely,

VIRGINIA C. WOOD.

BOULDER, MONT., *July 5, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

My wife and I are very concerned about the future of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Primitive Area. Since we both believe that Montana's greatest resource is its natural beauty, we are not only alarmed, but disappointed in the systematic takeover of Montana's most precious commodity—its natural state.

The saddening thing is that the mountainsides are always invaded for such reasons (the public is told) as recreation and multiple use of land and water. These reasons appear innocent, but where will they stop? Presently, we have thousands of access miles to countless beautiful areas in our state and very little of our wildlife population is spared the sound of snarling cycle engines. Will it be the Primitive Area and the Bob Marshall tomorrow? I hope not!

The people in favor of invasion of one of our remaining primitive areas and wildlife refuges are the people too lazy to walk for recreation, too selfish to care about our future children's welfare, and probably the type who would litter the proposed road through the area from his automobile, cycle or snow-machine.

As a Forest Service worker I have been cleaning up for these people on my own for several years now—It's downright disrespect for our countryside!

There are also those who would derive great monetary benefits due to the access of the proposed road. Is this the issue? Are we practicing conservation, or are we worshipping the almighty dollar? Or are we practicing political back-scratching regardless of the fate of the people?

Were Teddy Roosevelt alive today, I believe he would tell us to shape up, enjoy our wilderness, leave it that way and tell every person defining recreation as "riding in an automobile" to "Get A Horse."

Are the people and agencies who want into the wilderness the type of rugged individualists who made this country and Montana what it is today? I don't think so!

Man has proven that he can tame the elements and carve up its beautiful landscape. Now let's save some wilderness for the people who want to see it as our fathers saw it and who choose to face it as they did, even if it be for only a week at a time.

I am not in favor of hindering progress, but I think we should stop, think, and decide just what progress really is—especially for Montanans.

If this area becomes absolutely necessary for our use as water power, timber, etc.—then it would be a different story—but it surely isn't that at the present time.

As a teacher, outdoorsman, bowhunter, fisherman, skier, polecutter (logger), Forest Service employee for 4–5 summers, and a lover of good old Montana, I submit this letter in hope that you will weigh carefully the facts presented you and act accordingly. Remember, we can't remove the road, once it's through the timber.

Thank you for hearing me out. I appreciate it very much.

Yours sincerely,

SAM SAMSON.

THE CHRIST HOSPITAL,
Cincinnati, Ohio, September 20, 1968.

Mr. CECIL GARLAND,
President, Lincoln Back Country Protective Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I would like to add my voice to the many people who would like to see Lincoln Back Country saved from further invasion by motorized travel and other inroads by civilization. I have travelled on foot and on horseback through many miles of this territory and would like to see it preserved for my children and future generations to enjoy as much as I have.

With expanding population and encroachment by industry, roads and other commercial interests, it is even more important to preserve what little wilderness area we have left in our great country. I can speak for my own personal group of six people, who have hunted and travelled together for many years. Please convey my sentiments to the honorable Senator Lee Metcalf at the hearing at Great Falls, Montana on September 23rd, 1968.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. JOHNSTONE, M.D.

BASEL, SWITZERLAND, *September 16, 1968.*

COMMITTEE FOR LINCOLN-SCAPEGOAT WILDERNESS,
Montana Wilderness Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: Although technically a non resident of Montana, our family has been associated with Montana with my grand-father being a member of the States First Territorial Legislature and my father's birth in Marysville to the point that I have always considered it my home having spent vacations in the Lincoln area off and on for the past 39 years, returning from China, Philippines, areas of the Far East, Near East and presently Europe. I have traveled over the many years of vacations the entire proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area proposal, both by horse as well as on foot, fishing, hunting and enjoying the vast panorama of the country at its national best. From experience, I can assure you that this area is unique in the world not particularly from its scenery, but more as it affords one reasonable accessibility to the fast vanishing question of unadulterated nature, extensive wild life in its original state, and the country is climbable to any degree of one's ability.

I have listened with concern the present plans under consideration to open the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area for mass recreation and timbering. I am against such a proposal basically from an economic point of view, to say nothing of the beauty that such a proposal would destroy. This area encompasses less than 1% of the federally owned reserves and yet houses the Nation's most valuable but fast disappearing asset—its wild life. The proposal may have minor marketable pockets of timber, but in opening it up as proposed it would not only destroy the present delicate balance that the land now holds, but for eternity destroys the very thing that makes this land so attractive. It is now used almost to capacity by people who travel from far and wide for this very type of recreation, and therefore the proposal in question appears to me to be a questionable logic and certainly questionable economics, particularly when one considers the area in its original state to be irreplaceable.

Yours very truly,

B. S. MAYGER.

TOSTON, MONT., *October 9, 1968.*

MR. GARLAND: Please enter this letter in the Wilderness Hearing in full support for the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

We have already seen too many areas that the forest service has opened up to logging, roads etc. and as far as we are concerned has ruined the area.

Thank you.

(Mr. and Mrs.) PLEON CASS.

MR. GARLAND: I would like to enter this letter in full support of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. I have hunted in this area and would hate to see it opened up to logging or other commercialization.

Thank you.

CLAUDE J. FLYNN.

October 9, 1968.

DEAR SIR: I am most disappointed to see what the Forest Service intends to do with the poor timber in the Lincoln back country. Logging such poor grade of timber is of not major economical benefit to the State.

Example: The Forest Service is in the process of putting in a scenic road thru the Crow Country in Broadwater and Jefferson county with the intention of logging the scrub timber. They put in a beautiful looking road but you should see it since they put it to use. In fact, they are ruining all the roads from the high country to the saw mills due to the extreme heavy loads. The Forest Service is trying to make a showing of progress but we the tax payers are or will be paying for it in the long run. They are making the country so accessible. Last year they opened Area No. 38 for cow permits this year 150 permits for control of the head. Next year or so they will have both the cows and bulls or a permit bases so that there will be no over bill due to the accessibility of "their" (elk and deer) country. One area like this is bad enough let's not have any more.

PAUL EICHNER.

DRUMMOND, MONT., *October 3, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing in regards to the preservation of the Lincoln back country as a wilderness area. I am very much in favor of this remaining a wilderness area. As areas become more commercialized there is a great need for what few wilderness areas that remain so that future generations may see and enjoy nature as it is.

Our family has taken pack trips into areas and have enjoyed them so much. More famiiles should enjoy nature together. Let us hope this area is set aside as a wilderness area.

Your fellow Montana friends appreciate the work you are doing toward this bill.

Yours truly.

(Mrs.) WM. R. OHRMANN.

DENVER, COLO., *October 4, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We had the pleasure of visiting the Lincoln Back Country last summer.

We hope you will do all in your power to preserve it for future generations.

Next to Colorado we enjoy your lovely State and visit it every year.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY CASWELL.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *October 2, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to say that I am in favor of your Senate bill S. 1121 on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. My home state is Illinois—and it is quite a joy to have a wilderness area to enjoy.

Sincerely,

NANCY WYATT.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 30, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I wish to express my sentiments in regard to the Lincoln Back Country. I am in favor of S. 1121, which proposes to put this area into the Wilderness system.

For the past 15 years I have spent considerable time in the Lincoln area, having had a cabin there for years, and more recently, ranching interests.

It has been with great interest, and concern, that I have followed proceedings with regard to the Back Country, starting with a proposal presented in booklet form by the United States Deparment of Agriculure, Forest Service, Northern Region, dated March 1963, entitled "Long Range Plan Northern Half Lincoln Ranger District." Subsequently there have been meetings with the Forest Service, sportsmens groups, area residents etc. In spite of the fact that "multiple use" is the theme of the proponents of commercializing the Back Country, the majority of testimony in it's behalf has been offered by the Forest Service, lumbering interests and the mining industry. Under the guise of acting in the interests of recreation and the majority of the people, in truth, roads are proposed as an access to the limited timber resources in the area. The mining interests are naturally interested in keeping any potential area open without restriction. I am quite certain the record will show that those mainly opposed to the inclusion of the Lincoln Back Country into Wilderness are the Forest Service, with a management concept in mind, and commercial ventures with financial gain in mind. Much has been said about the general public to focus attention on this appealing aspect, but the general public this "multiple use" purportedly benefits, has been very little in evidence at any of these meetings. I assume this to be through lack of interest, as both those in favor of Wilderness inclusion and commercialization have been most active. I question if this area would spell any great financial bonanza if left to the ravages of lumbering and mining. It apparently has become a matter of principle rather than large financial return.

Experts in their fields of geology, wildlife etc., not connected with the Forest Service or industry have testified for the record as to the fragility of the area, and what effect multiple use would have. The choice is evident. Another eroded, denuded area as can be seen by automobile on countless miles of mountain highway, or beautiful mountain meadows, wooded hillsides, clear streams and an animal population to be enjoyed by all those who care.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. LYDIARD.

SPOKANE, WASH.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to give my support for the formation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in Montana.

This fine area is of a caliber well worthy of preservation in its wild state. It would be a very worthwhile addition to our wilderness system.

The 240,000 acres in question will provide hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation for generations to come.

I wish this letter to be made part of the written record.

Very truly yours,

E. R. VAN GELDER.

SPOKANE, WASH., *October 3, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SENATOR METCALF: I wish to voice my approval of the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area. I think this will be an excellent addition to our wildlife resources, in the area of Glacier Park.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. PATTERSON, M.D.

SPOKANE, WASH., *October 3, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In regard to the Wilderness area between Missoula and Great Falls, Mont. I would like to see this kept as a reserve or park area and not let this beautiful area be spoiled by logging or public roads.

Please keep this letter on written record.

I am a member of the Spokane Mountaineers Club. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MARY M. MCPHERSON.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 30, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have torn up my previous letter. After listening to the recent Wilderness hearing in Great Falls, it did not seem eloquent enough. When one feels very deeply on a subject, it is sometimes hard to express that feeling adequately in written words.

I wish to heartily endorse Senate Bill 1121 and to strongly protest the forest service plans for multi-purpose use of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

People far more scientific than I have protested the forest service's plans for multi-purpose use. To build roads in this area would amount to a huge and continual expense. The lakes are such that they could not withstand fishing by the general public. To anyone who loves this country, the thought of this lovely, peaceful land being scarred by lumbering and mining is sacri-religious.

Montana is truly blessed to have such areas of beautiful wilderness and I think we must preserve these areas for future generations. Action must be taken now—before it is too late!

Opponents to the wilderness bill claim this is a land for only the wealthy. The experience of going into this country is open to anyone who possesses two feet and a lunch in a paper bag. Even now, when this country is viewed only by those who walk or ride horse back, it is disheartening, to those of us who love the wilderness, to view the lakes where the carless have discarded beer cans, old shoes, milk cartons, cigarettes, and so forth. Imagine what this tranquil land would look like—open to the general public, whose chief pastime seems to be riding through beautiful scenery, only to discard beer cans.

The cost of maintaining roads in this area would be monumental. In spite of all the work and expense done to keep them up, I feel the roads could never be satisfactory and would be a hazard to the general public.

There are about two or three miles of the Copper Creek road near Lincoln which have been worked on, oiled, a constant expense! In spite of all the money spent on this road, it is in worse condition now than before work was ever done on it. It is used by the lumber company and is in horrible condition, full of huge holes, in spite of all the work that has been done each summer on these few miles.

Another example is the road from Copper Creek to the Seersucker-Liverpool road. This was put in by forest service, ostensibly for the general public but also and chiefly for the lumbering interests. This road is already in poor condition. It is not particularly scenic, particularly as you pass the many portions already scarred by the lumbering activities. In its first year or so of use and access to the general public, it has already had one forest fire. Open the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness to the general public and this area will soon be scarred by unsightly lumbered areas, forest fires, and the beautiful waters contaminated by mining activities.

It is unfortunate that the mining industries, lumber industries, and the forest service have the money to carry the fight on to Washington. We individual lovers of the wilderness cannot afford to come to Washington to fight these big money interests. We can only hope our letters and prayers will help to see that Senate Bill 1121 is passed.

Sincerely,

MRS. ROBERT E. LYDIARD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO,
Moscow, Idaho.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please record the following statement on behalf of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness as a part of the record of the recent hearing.

I wish to give the strongest possible support to the efforts to give the Lincoln-Scapegoat region under consideration a place in the national wilderness system.

I am especially pleased that Congress has established such a system, and its stronger provisions under the 1964 Wilderness Act have come none too soon. The Lincoln back country has outstanding qualifications for such wilderness protection. I am especially disturbed that the U.S. Forest Service wishes instead to develop this area for lumber harvest and massed recreation. Surely such actions will diminish rather than increase the quality and the quantity of experiences now available in the Lincoln Back country—a definite contradiction of wilderness values the Forest Service has supposedly committed itself to protect. Therefore, this prime wilderness can only be protected under the latest wilderness legislation. It is a gift, not to Montanans, but to the nation and to her future as well. I urge that, on their behalf, do no more than to give it the strongest possible wilderness protection.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

RONALD J. KLIMKO, PH. D.

MISSOURI VALLEY CLINIC,
Bismarck, N. Dak., September 27, 1968.

Re Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness proposal.

Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: As legislative chairman of the North Dakota Chapter of the National Wildlife Federation and as wilderness society representative for North Dakota, I would agree with the findings and wishes of Montana conservationists in regard to the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness area. I would urge you to work toward adoption of Senate Bill 1121 to preserve this valuable pristine area for generations to come.

As you know, this will be the first congressional hearing on an area of defacto wilderness and we feel that it is highly important from the precedence setting standpoint to many conservationists.

I would like this letter to be made part of the hearing record.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. JOHNSON, M.D.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 25, 1968.*

Re S. 1121.

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Having recently completed a week of elk hunting in the proposed Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness, I would like my statement to become a matter of record. I see a part of America that relatively few people see and I dare say many will not.

Nature cannot compete with logging and mining industry. There is no compromise between clear waters native trout and the washings of a mining company. Likewise, there is no compromise between elk, deer, bear and multitudes of smaller and lesser animals that need the protection of thick timber and open alpine meadows, with the logging industry.

The discussion goes on—multiple use is not a compromise either. I've hunted multiple use areas and they are poor hunting indeed. We are not losing a thing by placing this area into wilderness status, rather we would be placing an area in reserve status. As surely as the earth turns, sometime in the far future the mineral and wood resources of this area will be claimed.

It takes a special kind of people to live in this great State of Montana. We are not plagued with the problems of a sick society. Montana people want this area to be included as a wilderness.

Senator, I thank you for your time and indulgence. I'm sorry I couldn't testify at the field hearing held there in Great Falls, September 23, 1968. I had made a prior commitment and the new date of the hearing was out of my control. And, it was a pleasure to shake your hand.

Sincerely,

FARRELL J. FORD.

CAPRI, INC.,
Helena, Mont., September 26, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEE: I have followed with much interest, the efforts being used to take what is called "The Back Country" at Lincoln and turn it into private wilderness area, which might serve at some future date some two to three hundred people, three months during the summer and one month during the big game season. In that group of course would come the bird watchers, photographers, etc., but, looking ahead some fifteen to twenty years, we have to balance this out against total utilization of the natural resources; viz., timber, gold, silver, copper and perhaps in the future years the very rare metal. Having lived over sixty years in Western Montana and seeing just now the steps forward being made in developing the natural resources which add so materially to the income of two-thirds of the population of Montana, all of whom reside in what we call, "Western Montana"—I'm so hopeful that you will end your efforts towards the support of bill S 1121.

Two different years, I have made the wilderness ride in the Lincoln Back Country and just must admit, when they named it "Wilderness" it was properly done. It certainly is no place for people, not even tourists. It has been my observation that what pleases tourists, are beautiful wide highways, lots of gas stations and lots of hamburger stands—all of which you thoroughly understand.

Thanks in advance for the use of your good judgment and efforts. I'm as always,

Very sincerely yours,

J. E. O'CONNELL.

HELENA, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please put this letter in the hearing record on S. 1121, the bill to classify the Lincoln Back Country for wilderness purposes.

I am very much in favor of this bill by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield to make the Lincoln Back Country a Wilderness Area. It is very popular in its present condition to many people in Helena and vicinity who enjoy hiking and horseback riding trips in the area.

I hope that your committee will act favorably on S. 1121 and assure that we and our children, as well as theirs, will continue to enjoy this beautiful wild country.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. DONNA POLISCHUK.

HELENA, MONT., *September 22, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This concerns your hearing being held in Great Falls September 23 on S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield and Representative Battin, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Lincoln Back Country and adjacent wilderness lands as a Wilderness Area.

These bills have my wholehearted support, and I urge their prompt enactment.

I am 78 years old and have been engaged in the ranching business most of my adult life. I also own and operate a sawmill and have done considerable logging. During the past 35 years, I have been in the area in question many times. I am familiar with the timber stands of the West Coast and Northwestern Montana. The timber in the Lincoln Back Country doesn't compare with the other stands. It is poor in quality, scattered, and strictly limited. In my estimation, it is not worth destroying all this beautiful wild country and the fine trail-type hunting and fishing and sightseeing that exists here.

If more places for campgrounds and other developed recreation sites are needed, they should be located elsewhere. There are better places for campgrounds along the Blackfoot River nearby and the highway, in the Sun River country, and in the Seeley Lake and Swan Valley areas. I am against a high mountain scenic drive or other roads through the Lincoln Back Country. They would cut up the land and ruin the wild country for other uses.

I hope you will approve S. 1121 and make the Lincoln Back Country and the area around Scapegoat Mountain a Wilderness Area.

Please include this letter in the record of the hearing.

Very truly yours,

FRED P. GABRIEL.

CARMICHAEL, CALIF., *September 1, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am strongly in support of S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 which would authorize the establishment of a 250,000 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness and include it in the National Wilderness System.

Although I am not opposed to multiple use of public lands or mass-recreational development, I seriously question whether it would be in the best long term interests of the nation to sacrifice the Lincoln Back Country and its rare and endangered forms of wildlife to meet demands that can just as easily be met by more intensive development of less unique areas.

Over the years we have watched the retreat of wilderness-dependent wildlife such as Rocky Mountain elk, bighorn sheep, grizzly bear, and bald eagles in the path of encroaching civilization. Fortunately we still have remnant populations in such last strongholds as the Lincoln Back Country.

The Lincoln Back Country is also reported to contain in its undisturbed mountain streams natural stocks of the endangered native cutthroat. As a professional fisheries biologist I have personally witnessed the rapid disappearance and the near extinction of the native Lahontan cutthroat trout which was once abundant in the streams of eastern California. The native cutthroats do not seem to be able to thrive with heavy fishing pressure or with man-caused alterations to the environment.

With backcountry hiking becoming increasingly popular among the nation's recreationists, wilderness recreation use in the Lincoln Back Country will probably become very substantial even without convenient motor vehicle access.

I hope your committee will recognize the value of retaining this area for wilderness recreation.

Also I would appreciate having my letter included in the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area.

Thank You.

Sincerely,

ERIC ROBERT GERSTUNG.

CHICAGO, ILL., *September 24, 1968.*

Re Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness proposal.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing on behalf of my family to urge adoption of S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, which provide for the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness and for its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Although we live in Chicago we have spent some time in and near this lovely wild area and we would like to see it protected in the best possible way.

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT MILLER.

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY,
Oshkosh, Wis., September 17, 1968.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Because of our concern for the future of wilderness in America we wish to make it known that we support all attempts to establish the 240,000 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in Montana. Although such attempts are invariably met with opposition from commercial interests, the creation of such wild areas is the only way in which wilderness will survive the pressures of this century.

Further, we hope our brief statement can become part of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM WILLERS, Ph. D.
(And others).

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *September 24, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am in favor of including the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as wilderness. Such habitat is fast disappearing from the American scene. As a backpacker, I can well appreciate the values of such recreation. Also my research acquaintance with high mountain lakes is that they are not immune to mass recreation and soon lose their appeal as quality fishing locations once over-use sets in. We certainly have enough multiple use areas in the west. Please conserve the Lincoln-Scapegoat area and its wilderness values for those of us who enjoy these activities.

I would like to request that this statement be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Sincerely,

FRED W. RABE.

CHICAGO, ILL., *September 23, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: My husband, a dedicated fly fisherman (at this moment fishing in the Rocky Mountains of Wyoming and Montana), and I and our children, as great appreciators of nature and its conservation, request that this be made a part of the subject hearing record.

We strongly oppose any destructive development to Montana's irreplaceable Lincoln-Scapegoat area, not only in the interest of preserving the many species of wildlife dependent upon natural wilderness for survival, but to preserve for present and future generations the charming solitude and beauty of one of the few remaining wilderness areas of our country. Needless to say, the birds and other living things cannot be preserved for man's benefit and enjoyment unless the habitat they need is also preserved. Man's hunger toward civilization

with his powerful tools would only be barbarous if he destroyed such a beautiful and valuable part of our lives.

We urge the passing of bills S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 authorizing the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness and its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sincerely,

CARLENE JOHNSON,
ALLAN JOHNSON,
The Angler's Club of Chicago, Federation of Fly Fishermen, Wolf River Conservation Club, Vice President, Lincoln Park Casting Club, Vice President, Professional Casters Association.

BILLINGS, MONT., *September 23, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to support the classification of the Lincoln Back Country as a Wilderness Area.

If I understand the situation correctly, not all the area is really of wilderness character, yet the Forest Service's failure to consider a compromise situation forces Wilderness advocates to push for the entire 240,000 acres. This is unfortunate, to say the least. There is an undeniable need for mass recreation facilities, and to chance losing suitable lands simply because a government agency does not want to yield to public demands is rather poor management.

To me there are many reasons for including this area into the Wilderness system. The fragile nature of much of the area, ecological values of an undisturbed area, protection of the grizzly bear habitat (only one of many species of wildlife) plus the aesthetic and spiritual values that economists keep trying to give a monitary value.

For some reason the U.S. Forest Service thinks that because about twelve percent of the National Forests in Montana are now Wilderness or Primitive Areas this is sufficient. Strange, is it not? This arbitrary decision is made while they are at the same time concerned about management to accommodate ever increasing use of these areas.

One last point: the Montana Chamber of Commerce wants to attract more money into the state—which is fine—but are not enthusiastic about Wilderness (not enough money). Montana gladly promotes the "Big Sky Country". Yet, what is a more natural combination to promote than the Big Sky Country and Wilderness?

Sincerely yours,

CARL V. LIND.

IDAHO POLE CO.,
Bozeman, Mont., September 18, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Cascade County Courthouse,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is in reference to proposed legislation as set forth in H.R. 7148 and S. 1121 relative to the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide area of north central Montana. Being producers of forest products from areas located within central and western Montana we have vital interest in any contemplated changes that would affect management of our public lands, particularly if such changes would diminish the multiple-use concept now basic to Forest Service administration of public lands. Multiple-use planning impresses us as being in the best interest of all concerned.

A 1963 report compiled by Mr. Boyd L. Rasmussen, past Regional Forester of the Northern Region, states there were then 14,318,715 acres in the National Forest Wilderness system. Thirteen percent (13%) of the total area of the dedicated National Forest Wilderness system is found in Montana; only Wyoming and Idaho have larger acreages.

In addition to these classified areas the National Forests of Montana have thousands of acres primitive in character simply because development is yet in the planning stage.

It is our feeling that the passage of the two bills in question would preclude all future development and use of camp grounds and picnic sites within this vast area. Use projections by the Out Door Recreational Resources Review Commission plainly indicates the demand for camp and picnic areas far exceeds that for dispersed hiking and riding and is increasng at a rapid rate.

We do endorse the wilderness areas concept as a basic means to preserve and protect, in a virgin state, areas of natural beauty or outstanding interest. However, it is our thinking that multiple-use planning for timber lands accommodates a much larger number of indviduals who may share directly from expanding recreational areas and facilities and benefit from renewable resources. It seems to us that the percentage of our citizenry who find it economically feasible to make use of and enjoy many areas in the wilderness system must indeed be small. We are of the opinion there are certain groups who would like to see all Forest Service lands incorporated into wilderness areas and we feel that each additional block so transferred tends to establish a precedent. It is a known fact that within many forest areas merchantable timber is becoming decadent, over mature and should definitely be harvested under Forest Service planning.

We respectfully request your support in the defeat of H.R. 7148 and S. 1121.

Sincerely,

G. L. HARRINGTON, *Manager.*

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 23, 1968.*

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Buiding, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: I am writing in opposition to bill S. 1121 in which it is proposed to set aside a large area in Western Montana—a portion of the Lincoln backcountry—as a wilderness area.

The U.S. Forest Service has come up with a plan for this area which I feel is logical and would be the most beneficial to all concerned. This area can and should be opened up as proposed to the larger number of tourists and vacationers rather than be accessible to those who are in a position to pack in. This multiple use plan will be better for fire control, wild game management, tourism, and would not sacrifice the beauty and recreational value of the area.

The economy of Western Montana is heavily dependent on the resources of this area, and we cannot afford to lose for all time the harvest of timber that this bill would eliminate. I have personally been in the Bob Marshall Wilderness, and I firmly believe that the area of this wilderness is large enough to take care of the purposes for which it was set aside.

I urge you to reject this bill in the best interests of the citizens of Western Montana, as well as the many tourists from other states who will be visiting us in future years.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. STEWART.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *September 19, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: While Montana is not exactly next door to where I live in Philadelphia, it constitutes an important part of this country as far as I am concerned. In fact I am planning a week's visit to the wilderness area of Montana during the first week of October. I do not think I need impress upon you the need for preserving every large or small vestige of wilderness left to us in this country. Frankly, I am a preservationist not a conservationist, and I suppose in the eyes of many could be considered a radical on this particular subject. I do want to go on record, however, and request that this letter be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area in connection with the public hearing to be held on September 25th on Senate Bill 1121 and H.R. 7148. This area *MUST* be preserved, in its true wilderness state, along with many others in order that we shall not have a country consisting of various stumps and concrete ribbons of highway, with gridiron pattern housing encompassing the entire landscape.

Flying over the urban areas of the East Coast there is hardly a green area of any magnitude left. Flying across the country, and particularly those areas that are still uninhabited, I cannot help but be impressed by the terrible ravages of lumbering. Sustained yield is a great theory, though I doubt it is successful in practice.

Democratization of the outdoors is also a great theory, and in practice in my view, results only in the proliferation of beer cans, aluminum foil and garbage. Frankly, when it comes to the outdoors, I believe that it should be accessible only to those who are willing to demonstrate an appreciation of it.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT J. KAHN.

SANDPOINT, IDAHO, *September 17, 1968.*

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: When your Public Lands Subcommittee's hearing is held at Great Falls September 25, please enter this letter as an expression of opposition to the proposal to designate the Lincoln Back Country in Montana as a Wilderness Area.

The adjoining states of Montana, Idaho and Wyoming already have more than 10 million acres locked up for single-use. Rather than add to this total, we need to develop, manage and use our natural resources to the fullest extent.

It has been estimated that the 240,500 acres in the Lincoln Back Country will sustain an annual timber harvest of 16 million board feet, which will provide jobs to support 120 families and generate a value of $4,500,000 to the national economy each year.

Development of the area also will add to Montana's recreational potential by opening up not only the Lincoln Back Country but providing more access to the million-acre Bob Marshall Wilderness Area to the north.

Respectfully,

J. M. BROWN, Jr.

BILLINGS, MONTANA, *Sept. 18, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in regard to the hearings on the Lincoln Back Country in Montana and its status as a wilderness. Also I would like to request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record.

I, as a Montana native, have never been able to understand why man persists in extending the blighting hand of asphalt and civilization into areas that once deflowered can never recover. THEY CAN NEVER RECOVER . . . do those people who seek to punch roads and strip trees from this land fully realize the damage that they are doing? Why is it so difficult to reserve such a small portion of America to the gentle and appreciative footfall of the nature-lover, backpacker and other outdoorsmen?

I would imagine that the Forest Service arguments are backed by powerful facts and logic on how this land should be opened to the use of more people and the timber interests also put forth additional facts and figures. These people fail to grasp the real significance of what the State of Montana stands for in the minds of people who are not fortunate enough to live here. The residents of Ohio, Maryland or Florida think of this great State of ours as that far northern country where the trout are plentiful, the Grizzly reigns as king and a man can actually stand where no man has stood before. Why is Montana written up every month by at least one and usually more of the popular outdoor magazines? It is because Montana is one of the last bastions of the wild animal and not because of our logged off mountains.

Throughout our history men have done great acts of destruction in the name of progress but now is the time to think in terms of posterity and not in terms of campgrounds and lumber. Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

LOU O. ALEKSICH, Jr.

BEMIDJI, MINN., *September 17, 1968.*

DEAR SIR: In view of our dwindling wilderness in the United States, we would like to express our opinion that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area be placed in the National Wilderness Preservation System. We firmly believe that this area should be given wilderness designation by Congress, as provided in S.1121 and H.R. 7148.

We wish this letter to be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. EDWARD ANDRESEN.

CITY OF DIXON, ILL., *September 18, 1968.*

Re Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have just been reading through the literature on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness which is proposed for the State of Montana.

I certainly want to endorse this particular action and applaud those who are engaged in the preservation of this primitive country for future generations. The brochure which I have been reading is excellent in giving the basic information for the average citizen to understand the importance of this territory.

I predicate my position on this issue from the enjoyment that was mine in earlier years of my life when spending time in the high country of Rocky Mountain National Park and Yosemite National Park, wherein it was possible to be in this country and enjoy the quietness and solitude of a territory unspoiled by man and his organized society.

These opportunities are rapidly passing me by because of advancing years and the inability to get away from my business responsibilities, but I have three grandsons (from 9 months to 3 years) and I know they will inherit my interest and desire and appreciation of nature. It would certainly be of comfort to me to know that some of this primitive area would be available to them in their formative years—and early maturity—to enjoy and recognize that the delights of nature have been preserved for them due to the careful planning of our generation.

I certainly hope this will be a decision which will be acted on favorably by the Congress.

Very truly Yours,

GEORGE W. LINDQUIST, *Mayor.*

GLACIER SERVICE CO.,
Missoula, Mont., September 20, 1968.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: This letter concerns the bill, S. 1121 now being proposed to set aside another large area of Western Montana centered on the Blackfoot-Sun River Divide as wilderness. I have devoted considerable thought to this question, and am strongly opposed to this bill.

In the first place, the area concerned is adjacent to the very large existing Bob Marshall Wilderness, and would only be an extension of that wilderness. In this respect, it is in the wrong place to begin with, because it does not create any new wilderness accessible to visitors who could not just as well go to Bob Marshall.

I am sure your committee is familiar with the Forest Service multiple use plan for the region containing the proposed wilderness, and I consider this approach to its development to be the most logical and beneficial to all concerned. Our Western Montana economy, and specifically including my own business, is heavily dependent on lumber production. The permissible annual timber cut in this region is even now essentially being used, and I don't think we can afford to lose for all time the large harvest that this bill would sacrifice.

This area should be opened up as proposed, to the larger number of tourists and vacationers, rather than be accessible to the few who have the time and resources to pack in. I firmly believe the multiple use plan will be better for tourism,

better for fire control, better for wild game because of controlled timber cutting, and will generally contribute to the growth of our area without sacrificing the beauty and recreational value of this mountain area.

It is my sincere hope that your committee will reject this bill, in the best interest of the people who live and work here, and also all the visitors we hope to have in future years.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT T. PLUNKETT.

RENO, NEV., *September 28, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Interior Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Please include this letter in the official hearing record of the September 25 hearings on the Lincoln Back Country Wilderness Proposal. Please send me a copy of the Record when it is available for distribution. I urge you to support the bill that would establish a Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness of 240,500 acres. The best use for this area is wilderness, not mass recreational development and logging. Development of this area would destroy the grizzly bear, elk, and trout habitat. This area, one of the last strongholds of the grizzly bear, should be preserved. It is important that the wild mountains, forests, lakes, and streams of the Lincoln Back Country are included in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sincerely yours,

REED SECORD.

BURNS CLINIC,
Petoskey, Mich., September 26, 1968.

Chairman, PUBLIC LAND SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to support the proposal of Senators Metcalf and Mansfield for the establishment of a Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in Montana. I believe this tract would make a fine addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System, and can thus best serve this and future generations. I believe its development for a mass recreation and timber harvest as proposed by the Forest Service would be a mistake, and that inclusion of this area in the Wilderness System will afford the best chance for permanent protection. Please make this statement a portion of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. TANTON, M.D.

ENGLEWOOD, COLO., *September 24, 1968.*

Chairman, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to strongly urge the placement in permanent Wilderness classification of the approximately 240,000 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat area in Montana, as per H.R. 7148 and/or S. 1121.

I urge this because Wilderness is the higher value for that area based on the ever-increasing need of Wilderness as a national human resource, and because the timber and vehicle recreation need is adequate and abundant elsewhere.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

E. H. HILLIARD, Jr.

GREENBELT, MD., *September 16, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to have this letter entered in the printed record of the hearings regarding Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area (proposed).

I would urge the inclusion of the largest and most qualitative area designation for this wilderness area, to be protected under the landmark Wilderness Act of 1964.

To that end I support the proposals of the Montana Wildlife Federation, Western Montana Fish and Game Association, Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council, and the Wilderness Society for this area.

I spent part of 1956 in Idaho-Montana wilderness areas (non-official title, then of course) with my father and family—it is a great part of my heritage as an American to have been in that wild area. I should not want it lost to the possibilities of my children. In the days of so many crumbling absolutes, I want wilderness left for my children so they may hold up their daily existences to its measuring stick.

Yours Sincerely,

EDWARD ZAHNISER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to voice my support for the designation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. As an extremely active mountaineer and lover of wilderness I have been appalled to see this country's wilderness slowly dying; as a zoologist I am sickened to see animals, defenseless against man's civilization, become homeless and eventually extinct. I am sure this bit of land can be saved for posterity; I am sure that the loggers, road builders, and recreation developers can busy themselves elsewhere, in some place already ruined by man's invasion.

Sincerely,

LAURA JASCH.

TACOMA, WASH., *September 12, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat addition to the Wilderness system should have the full support of all Americans who do not equate all values with dollars and cents. To those of us who have hiked through this glorious wilderness the potential dismemberment of this uniquely beautiful place by the Forest Service is especially alarming. Countless thousands of others will be able to enjoy this wilderness also in the years to come—lured by natural beauty and wildlife, and not by developments for "mass recreation."

Moreover, the economic values of the area are relatively insignificant as far as the timber industry is concerned. If roads are slashed through this back country and the weak forests ripped out, one of our most beautiful wild environments will have been destroyed. For what? For whom?

I hope that congressional protection can be given to this wilderness. The Forest Service concept of Multiple Use is becoming negatively monotonous and deplorable when it insists on "doing" something to all of its holdings. There are many Americans who insist that many areas should be used by preserving them. I wish this to be made part of the record of the Lincoln-Scapegoat hearing.

Yours truly,

RONALD J. BECK, M.D.

VERMILLION, S. DAK., *September 13, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am very much interested in the proposal for the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in Western Montana. I have visited this country and know its high potential for wilderness values and consider it to be of the utmost importance in the public interest that it be classified as wilderness. With this in mind, please accept this letter as a part of the record produced at the hearing on September 25th.

During the last seven or eight years I have visited several of our national wilderness areas, and, of course, adjacent territories. Having seen both, it has become clear to me that highgrade wilderness territories are indeed a rare thing and that the few remaining ones must be jealously guarded.

Much is said of the recreational values of wilderness territories and of their historic values, and of their values for scientific purposes. All of these are certainly valid and are alone sufficient to justify the setting aside of vast areas under wilderness classification as conceived by the 1964 Act. However, in my opinion another value ranks even higher. I see them as a kind of Noah's Ark where endangered species of both plant and animal life may escape the fate of the carrier pigeon and numerous other forms of life which have become extinct and no longer make their appropriate contribution to our ecological system.

I am convinced that mankind too readily interferes with the complex systems which nature has evolved over the milleniums and that we are far too slow to recognize the fragile nature of system and the importance of each part of it. It is important that we recognize that our fellow creatures have a right to a place to live and be unmolested by mankind's husbandry and development programs. It seems clear to me that mankind needs to have them survive. Until we rediscover our urgent need to live in companionship with other creatures, it is imperative that our small "islands" of unmolested countryside be left in their original and natural state.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area is high quality wilderness country. The complex plant and animal community of this area is much the same as it was throughout the centuries past. Today it is a place to be enjoyed and revered by men who have the strong urge to travel by primitive means to experience the great joy and sense of security that comes from a renewal of ties with nature. Tomorrow it will be a womb from which is reborn species essential to life elsewhere in our land. It will be a laboratory to which man may resort to observe how it is with nature when things here seeme to have gone awry in the domesticated world.

For the benefit of both man and his fellow inhabitants of this land, please preserve the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area as a wilderness under the 1964 Act.

Yours truly,

MARTIN WEEKS.

SILVER SPRING, MD., *September 16, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Since I cannot, unfortunately, attend in person the hearing on S. 1121 to be held in Great Falls, Montana, on September 25, 1968, I should like to set forth my views in writing with the request that, if appropriate they be made a part of the hearing record.

I am wholly in favor of S. 1121, and believe that Senators Mansfield and Metcalf warrant the gratitude of Americans everywhere for their efforts to preserve this portion of Montana against the spoliation that is overtaking so much of our natural heritage.

My support for the bill is based on more than my conviction that we must move, before it is forever made impossible, to conserve the best of the remaining remnants of our wilderness. While that alone would suffice, in this case I am personally familiar with the area involved. As a native Montanan, even though for thirty years a legal resident of Maryland, I make an annual visit to Lincoln, and almost every year a visit by horseback to the Lincoln Backcountry delineated in S. 1121. I will not attempt a detailed description of its ecological and other characteristics, which I am aware will be presented to the Subcommittee in detail by others. Suffice it to say that the area is ideally suited for precisely the use that it now receives—as a wilderness area for pack trips, by horse or on foot, and as a fish and game area that can both protect endangered species like the cutthroat trout and the grizzly and yet provide quality hunting under appropriate controls. It contains some spectacular mountain scenery, such as Scapegoat Mountain, and a lot of simply quiet, pleasant areas, not uniquely beautiful or unusual, but possessing the intangible but important quality of being unspoiled, quiet, virginal. For myself, I would find it hard to say whether I find greater pleasure in the contemplation of the rugged grandeur of Scapegoat or the quietness and peace of a stretch of trail, or a small valley, along the East Fork of the Blackfoot. I am sure that both should be maintained as inviolate, as the Wilderness Act permits.

May I add that I have examined, with some care, the Forest Service Patterns for Management, Blackfoot-Sun River Area, and the later pamphlet, Management for People. While the area covered by these booklets is considerably

larger than the area proposed for wilderness protection in S. 1121, it does include the S. 1121 area, and proposes to drive a scenic highway, at considerable expense, through its heart.

The proposal seems to me wholly wrong. It is not justified on the ground of increasing accessibility for pack trips, hiking or the like; the S. 1121 area is already available for those purposes at a number of road-end points. It is not justified on the ground of increasing the number of picnic areas; there are many, even in the immediate Lincoln area, that could be developed in areas where streams, lakes, forest and mountains are present, but the wilderness is gone forever. It is not justified on scenic grounds; while there are spectacular views, they are not intrinsically different from the views that can now be had of the many ranges of the Rocky Mountains from highways already constructed. And overriding all of this is the inevitable fact that once there is a road, there cannot be wilderness protection.

I urge, therefore, as strongly as I can, that the Subcommittee report favorably to the Committee on S. 1121, and make every effort to secure its passage into law. There is still time to secure, not only for our generation, but for generations to come, a small additional piece of undisturbed and undefiled land in which to find quiet and peace.

Respectfully,

C. A. HORSKY.

MISSOULA, MONT., *September 4, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 3106 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Montana Chapter of the Wildlife Society, composed of professional workers in wildlife management and related fields, discussed the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area at its annual meeting in Lewiston, July 20, 1968.

The concensus of the group was that so-called development of this area with roads, logging, and mass recreation facilities would be incompatible with the character of the area. There is not enough mechantable timber to make logging worthwhile. There is good hunting and fishing for the limited number who now hike or pack in, but good game range is limited and the lakes are small. Fish and game resources could be easily depleted if the area were made accessible to large numbers of hunters by roads. This is still one of the few areas where people can get away from the hustle of the "machine age" and we would like it to remain that way.

The Montana Chapter of the Wildlife Society wishes to go on record as favoring classification of the Lincoln-Scapegoat country as wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

REUEL G. JANSON,
President, Montana Chapter, Wildlife Society.

DRUMMOND, MONT., *October 5, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing this letter in favor of a wilderness area. I think it should be left as it is and not changed.

Almost every summer my family and I go up there fishing or camping. The country is so beautiful it shouldn't be changed in any way. We are lucky to have such places so we shouldn't abuse them. Thank you.

Your truly,

JANE OHRMANN,
(Age 14).

LAUREL, MONT., *September 27, 1968.*

Senator MANSFIELD,
Senator METCALF,
Congressman BATTIN,
Congressman OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: R. N. Witter, Land Supervisor of the Northern Pacific Railroad, in speaking in opposition to the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area, stated

that the average wilderness user is well above the average American in income, education, and available leisure time.

We, the undersigned believe we are average people, of average income and education. This wilderness area should be preserved so that the average American has a place they can visit which has not been damaged by man and is the same as when our forefathers visited the area.

Please enter this in the Congressional Record, at the Congressional hearing on the Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

HOWARD L. THOM.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *September 18, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am one of the fortunate residents of the State of Idaho who has had an opportunity to take a trip through the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness areas which is now up before the Senate Committee for wilderness status.

In August of 1964 I was director of the Wilderness Society's tour taking the Lincoln Scapegoat-Bob Marshall trip. I will long remember this exceptionally beautiful part of the United States. With so little country of his kind left, I feel that its preservation for all times to come far exceeds its value for the temporary purposes of logging or road building which ruins areas of this kind.

Perhaps the last reserve of the wild grizzly bears lies in the Lincoln Scapegoat area. Once this is open with roads or open by logging, the bears will have lost their last reserve.

I frequently hear the complaint that members of the public do not use or appreciate areas of this kind which are set aside strictly for recreation and scenic beauty. This is a very shortsighted view when statistics show that the population of the United States will double every 63 years. There were 5 million people alive in 6,000 B.C. and experts estimate that it took a million years for that number to have grown from 2½ million. Thereafter the population doubled once every 1,000 years or so and in the year 1850 there were a billion people living on the earth. It had doubled in about 200 years to reach the figure of one billion. Thereafter, the population doubled in the next 80 years, reaching 2 billion in 1930. According to experts the world's population will double from 3.3 billion now in the next 33 years. These figures come from the September 15th issue of the Wall Street Journal.

I am sure that the Loop in Chicago or the heart of Detroit would not have been built with the streets that they have if the builders had been able to envision the automobile and the airplane. Certainly the time has come to look ahead 50 or 60 years and realize how precious wilderness areas will be to the people living in this country at that time. I am sure that in the year 2050, if we save these areas, politicians of every grade will look back and admire the wisdom of those in charge of the destiny of our lands in the year 1968.

I request that this letter be made a part of the record to be considered by the committee at the time they make their decision.

Yours truly,

PAUL C. KEETON.

SPOKANE, WASH., *September 17, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As Chairman of the Committee on Wilderness and Wildlife of the Spokane County Medical Society and Chairman of the Committee on Conservation of the Inland Empire Chapter of the Sierra Club I strongly advocate passage of S1121.

I am familiar with the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area having explored its trails, fished its lakes and streams in the past. This area has already been subject to overusage by both commercial packers, hikers, and hunters and fishermen to the extent that this fragile area is now a problem area and only by acquiring the status of wilderness will it be allowed to regain a semblance of its original ecological balance. It must be protected even from the very people who wish to preserve it, but only through the wilderness classification can a new con-

cept in management of the wilderness areas be instituted. I am sure you are or your committee is aware of the Pandora's Box which the Wilderness Act opened up; the problem of how to restrict overusage and retain true wilderness values making it mandatory wilderness status for threatened areas so that these areas may be rested while we humans try to decide the best methods for preserving the wilderness.

Any form of road or commercial usage would destroy the area. In addition, the desire for preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area is the possibility that the American public can set aside additions to current proposed lands under the National Wilderness Preservation System.

It is encouraging that the American people care enough about the additions of natural areas and are wise enough to seek to set these areas aside lest they be lost for the future. This shows progress in appreciation of our natural heritage on the part of the American people and is truly representative of the democratic process of land preservation.

Let it be an accolade to the forethought of legislators and citizens to take this unprecedented step.

S. THATCHER HUBBARD, Sr., M.D.

CORNELL COLLEGE,
Mt. Vernon, Iowa, September 4, 1968.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I strongly endorse S. 1121 introduced by Senators Mansfield and Metcalf authorizing the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in northwestern Montana. This choice piece of scenic mountain country would border the Bob Marshall Wilderness and these two contiguous units would constitute one of the most magnificent units of wilderness remaining within the boundaries of the U.S. outside of Alaska. Mineral potential for this area is apparently quite low and it appears that the low-quality lodgepole pine found there would hardly justify the investment in materials and roads needed to harvest it. An equally serious threat is the Forest Service's proposal to develop the area for mass recreation which would include a scenic roadway penetrating the heart of the area. There exists only one Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness; there are literally dozens of other already road-penetrated areas with high scenic value which could be further developed for mass recreation with an accompanying scenic road.

I wish this letter to become part of the official hearing record.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. LYON.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *September 17, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I request that the following statement be made part of Senate Committee Hearing scheduled on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal to be held September 25, 1968 in Great Falls, Montana.

My husband and I support the Senate bill 1121 and H.R. 7148 which would establish a Lincoln-Scapgeoat Wilderness area. Being teachers we are vitally aware of the human needs of future generations. One of these needs being high quality recreation which only natural unspoiled areas can provide. We must look at the social good that this area gives us now and in the future. Roads in this area would endanger the grizzly bear which requires wilderness areas to survive. There are few places left in the U.S. where grizzly bears can live. Logging roads would also cut down on elk numbers. Much of the country proposed for wilderness lies in high area zones which would not be good logging areas anyway. Steep slopes and shallow soils in these high areas mean they need to be protected against erosion. Road building and logging may bring on erosion problems and endanger the watershed. There are five important rivers flowing through the proposed wilderness area including spawning grounds for the endangered spawning cutthroat. Hiking, natural lakes and clear streams for fishing, and hunting opportunities are all available within a two to three hour easy

walk or horseback ride from roads ending at the proposed boundaries. Let's not sacrifice this great wilderness to logging and roads.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY STURTS,
KEITH STURTS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *September 20, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I urge that the unique and irreplaceable Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area be preserved intact by being placed in the Wilderness Preservation System, with the passage of S. 1121 of Senators Metcalf and Mansfield; and request that this letter be made part of the hearing record.

Respectfully yours,

LEYLAND E. STEVENS, M.D.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *September 20, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I urge that the unique and irreplaceable Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area be preserved intact by being placed in the Wilderness Preservation System, with the passage of S. 1121 of Senators Metlcalf and Mansfield; and request that this record be made part of the hearing record.

Respectfully yours,

LINDOL R. FRENCH, M.D.

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Plainfield, Ind., September 25, 1968.

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: I am in favor of S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 which would authorize the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness and its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

I request that this be made part of the printed hearing record.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours.

WAYNE C. STAPF,
Marion County Chapter (Indiana).

EDMONDS, WASH., *August 14, 1968.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Chairman, Senate Public Lands Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I wish to go on record as being totally and wholly in favor of the establishment of wilderness protection for the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area.

I have always felt that you were sympathetic to conservation measures such as this and I trust that my feelings in this regard are not ill-founded.

Any effort on your behalf to bring this accomplishment about will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WALDO M. REED.

HELENA, MONT., *August 21, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Committee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a Montanan having reached the age of 63 and having spent many happy and exciting years hunting and fishing in the now famous Lincoln Back Country, Montana, I feel very strongly that passage of S. 1121 is necessary to support the good fiber and strength of future generations who have the will and desire to use it as I have.

The continued trend of destruction by bulldozers to slash piles around the fringe areas is anything but beautiful. I would hate to see the rest of it so.

However, we cannot correct what has been done yesterday, but we can do the right thing today with the wisdom of yesterday, so tomorrow will be better or as good as we had it ourselves.

Let us create this area into a Wilderness Sanctuary and let the old grizzly at least have a place to make his last stand—this proud, timid, man-fearing creature who has been accused of many, many things he didn't do, or had good reason for doing.

I therefore want to go on record favoring passing of S. 1121 and its enactment as so stated in the bill.

Respectfully yours,

FRED G. HOUSTON.

MARTINSVILLE, N.J., *September 2, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN OF LINCOLN-SCAPEGOAT BACK COUNTRY WILDERNESS HEARING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR METCALF: I have just spent two weeks in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country where I learned of the movement to have the area declared a National Wilderness. This letter is in support of this movement. As an Easterner, I was very impressed with the natural state of the Back Country since there is too little of this left in our country. I feel we must conserve our resources in this area as one of the few frontiers left for the future. Its juxtaposition with the Bob Marshall Wilderness makes the plan even more appropriate.

Although I appreciate the desire to have the scenery accessible to the public by a road, I feel that doing such would destroy the other half of the beauty—the wild life and the spirit of the land. Once a road is put in the country it will no longer retain its feeling of wilderness.

I would like to have this included in the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

NANCY EGAN.

FISH CAMP, CALIF., *August 26, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Chairman, Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: We wish to express our concern over the Forest Service intention to log off the area proposed as wilderness by S. 1121 and H.R. 7148. We live in a national forest and know how devastating these operations are.

We urge you to prevent this destruction by supporting the wilderness bills protecting the Lincoln-Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area.

Yours truly,

J. D. and H. P. MCCLYMONDS.

BIGFORK, MONT., *October 5, 1968.*

SIR: I would like to go on record as being in favor of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. I am a graduate student at the University of Montana and am very much interested in the preservation of all wildlife species. As you know, the preservation of wildlife depends upon the preservation of wildlife habitat. The Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area has many different habitats. In these habitats may be found such animals as the rare grizzly bear, bighorn mountain sheep, mountain goat, elk, mule deer, and black bear. If these various habitats are destroyed (and some of them will be destroyed by the United States

Forest Service) these wild creatures will also be eliminated. For the above stated reason, I am in favor of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. BURR,
University of Montana.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *September 30, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEE: I am writing in support of S. 1121 concerning the Wilderness status for the Lincoln Back Country. Although I have a knowledge and appreciation for the Bob Marshall, I cannot claim any great familiarity with the Lincoln Back Country, much as I would like to. So my point is one of principle; the principle that we need all the quality wilderness that we can save because the pressure of population in the very near future is going to cause the nearly complete modification of anything that is not so saved. People will appreciate this scene "as it was" and Montana will benefit once again, as a sort of Switzerland of America, for the foresight of those who today have it within their power to set these areas aside.

The increasingly prevalent statement that wilderness status is "locking up" so much natural resource, or that it is making inaccessible so much country that could otherwise be enjoyed by the more mobile and conventional means is, to my way of thinking, a disgraceful admission that we have already deteriorated and lost the important ability to propel ourselves through our own means. This alone is ample argument for the classification of a certain segment of this country where individual effort is necessary for access. The Lincoln is excellent wilderness, and the fact that it is adjacent to the Bob Marshall does not worry me any more than saying that the proposed Spanish Peaks wilderness is also in the State of Montana.

I hope that this area can be set aside for Wilderness classification. Please do not bother to answer this, as I can understand how busy you are.

Yours very truly,

JOHN MONTAGNE.

BOISE, IDAHO, *September 25, 1968.*

Re Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness proposal, S. 1121.

CHAIRMAN,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS: The Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness would be a quality addition to the wilderness system, and now appears to be the time to make the congressional designation. The values there should be preserved in the true public interest which has so much more greater value than leaving it exposed to traditional commercial utilization.

This unique public asset needs the wilderness law protection before its quality may be eroded by timber harvest and mass recreation development which involves the roading that always destroys the indepth quality of such a forested area as this Lincoln back country.

It is fortunate that we yet today have this opportunity to preserve this area designated in S. 1121 that can still qualify under wilderness law criteria of special character to the benefits of people who now and in the future need this remaining bit of quality environment.

It is difficult to understand how the Forest Service as a public service agency could consider otherwise, although we can understand why the commercial timber harvest views this as prospective reserve assets for him. But this latter cannot truly be benefit to the public interest. And there are many other places where mass forest recreation can be better practiced.

S. 1121 should become law, and congressional efforts towards this end will be appreciated.

Request is made that this become part of your hearing record of September 25 at Great Falls, Montana.

Thank you very kindly.

Respectfully yours,

BRUCE BOWLER.

COEUR D' ALENE, IDAHO, *September 19, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Care of Great Falls City Council, Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: At your hearing in Great Falls, Montana, on September 23, 1968 on S. 1121, as opposing the classifying as wilderness the 250,000 acres of National Forest land in Montana.

The U.S. Forest Service has studied the area and its resources and their plans would serve the public interests and the area much better than the wilderness plan.

Sincerely,

D. L. QUINCY.

COEUR D' ALENE, IDAHO, *September 20, 1968.*

PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Care of Great Falls City Council, Great Falls, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: For the hearing in reference to S. 1121 on September 23, 1968, please, place on the record my opposition to classifying this area as wilderness. It will not be to the best interests of the public to set this area in this classification.

The area should be used to serve the public and, yet, maintain adequate protection of the resources.

Yours very truly,

R. C. CARLSON.

SPOKANE, WASH., *September 21, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is to let you know that I support your efforts to obtain wilderness status for the Lincoln back country northeast of Missoula. Although I have not yet seen the area, I believe that its best use would be for wilderness experience protected from too easy access and consequent abuse by the drive-in recreationist and from logging.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. ROGERS.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In connection with the proposed Lincoln Back Country Wilderness, to be added to the Bob Marshall Wilderness, I would very much like to see this made a part of the Wilderness in order to preserve its beauty and use. Even now, with access by foot or horseback, we see many signs of depredation, such as beer cans and liquor bottles lying around in camping areas and other careless acts. With better access to this area, I can see a deterioration of it in very short order and there are all too few areas left to be maintained and defended against mass use.

I hope your committee will recommend this Wilderness Area.

Sincerely,

GRACIA R. HILDE,
Mrs. William Hilde.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *September 15, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE CHAIRMAN: This organization wishes to have this letter made a part of the official record concerning the proposed hearing on the above-named bill to be held in the Civic Center, Great Falls, Montana on the 25th of September, 1968.

We are completely in favor of the above bill and urge its immediate passage. This is very necessary legislation to save part of our nation.

Respectfully submitted.

OLYMPIA AUDUBON SOCIETY,
By J. M. PETERSON, *President.*

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 12, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: At this time, a campaign to close 240,500 acres of land to multiple use, in the Lincoln area of Montana. This area borders the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and comes very close to Highway 200 on the Southerly border.

I oppose any such action to close this area to the public as a whole.

The area concerned is badly needed for recreation and should be developed as such, it should also be open to mining, lumbering, grazing and many other uses under the heading of multiple use.

By declaring this a Wilderness Area, would be locking out the majority of the general public and giving it to the very few who are financially able to go into this area by pack train etc.

Lincoln, Montana is situated within 100 miles of Great Falls and about the same distance from Butte and Missoula and about 50 miles from Helena, the Capital City of our State. Many thousands of persons come to Lincoln and the surrounding area to hunt, fish, skimobile, and ride motorcycles and enjoy the magnificent mountains.

There are so many recreation hungry visitors that come to this area that all accessible areas are rapidly turning into actual garbage dumps caused from over use.

We need more room for the hordes of visitors seeking fun on their day off that can't take a pack trip into the wilderness areas for a week or so at a price far beyond the average workers budget.

May I add, that as well as needing more recreation room, we also need a stable income in our community, as well as the State as a whole.

To close this additional huge area, to mining, logging, grazing and numerous other activities would actually strangle this area.

There are some selfish people who advocate the setting aside of wilderness areas for themselves to enjoy. These people represent only a small minority. The others who need and enjoy a day or so out in the hills to get away from the grind can't afford trips into the back country by pack train etc.

The so called Lincoln Back Country should be left open to multiple use.

Our rich and well off brothers can still use over a million acres of wilderness. (The huge Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.)

The 240,500 acres of land in question should be developed to promote recreation and all other activities that contribute so much toward the welfare and happiness of the general public.

Most all of the land that borders the highways is privately owned. More and more of this land is being posted by the owners to keep people out, because of the damage done to their property by careless persons forced to use private land for their week end camp outs etc.

Closing areas such as the Lincoln Back Country would intensify the situation more and more as time goes on.

In the very near future our city brothers week end trips to the country will mean sitting in a car on a crowded highway with no place to go.

I request that my protest be made part of the hearings record.

JOHN A. THOMPSON.

WHITMAN COLLEGE,
Walla Walla, Wash., September 8, 1968.

SENATOR LEE METCALF,
Senator from Montana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Please chalk up one more loyal Montanan enthusiastically in favor of preserving the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. As a senior economics major interested in outdoor recreation, I'm becoming more and more convinced of the worth of quality recreation of the type that can now be found in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

While I've not been able to spend time in the area under consideration, I have spent a great deal of time in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, the Mission Primitive Area, and in Glacier National Park. The benefit that could be derived from a complex of such areas in western Montana is almost unimaginable. I find the prospect of such a complex of areas in my State really exciting. Montana has the potential to become a center of quality outdoor wilderness recreation. It would be tragic if we failed to act now to secure the Lincoln-Scapegoat and other areas as wilderness for the future.

Sincerely,

ART SCHAFER.

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, MONT., *September 13, 1968.*

Re Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This letter will advice you that the Meagher County Rod and Gun Club at their recent meeting expressed overwhelming support of the proposal to establish the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country of Montana as a wilderness area. Although the members of this club are primarily from this area, their setiments are strongly in favor of establishment of permanent wilderness areas in this state. We have seen much of our local areas, which were once accessible only by foot or horseback, now crisis-crossed by roads, eroded jeep trails across the mountain sides and strewn with litter.

We feel it is essential in developing and maintaining Montana as a tourist attraction and also for the benefit of its residents that certain areas be placed in the wilderness classification. To say that wilderness areas, because of difficulty of access, do not receive sufficient public use to justify their existence ignores the great and increasing numbers of hikers, backpackers and horseback riders, both within the state and the nation.

Again, we recommend approval of the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country as a wilderness area and request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record of your committee.

MEAGHER COUNTY ROD AND GUN CLUB,
By VERLE L. RADEMACHER, *President.*

HELENA, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is a request that the proposed Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain Area of Montana be changed to a Wilderness Area as outlined in S. 1121, and which will be discussed at a Congressional Hearing beginning at 9:00 a.m. on September 25, 1968.

I have traveled throughout many mountainous areas and feel deeply that the area under consideration should definitely be included as a Wilderness Area. Our population is increasing rapidly and it is necessary that areas such as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area be preserved in its natural beauty, not only for the preservation of wildlife but for our ever-growing demand and usage by the citizenry.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS S. ASHTON.

HELENA, MONT., *September 10, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: It is my understanding that you are chairman of the Hearing scheduled September 25, 1968 on the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area. In your capacity, it should be of interest to you to know that the Helena Jaycees met on June 13, 1968 and voted unanimously in support of classifying the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area as a wilderness area. The chapter strongly supports Senator Lee Metcalf and Senator Mike Mansfield's Senate Bill 1121 and Representative James Battin's companion House Bill 7148.

Attached is a photocopy of the news article on this matter as it appears in the Helena Independent Record on June 14, 1968.

This chapter is keenly aware of the value of preserving this beautiful Lincoln Back Country as wilderness. It has great aesthetic value and great commercial value also if used strictly for wilderness recreational purposes. This area would be ruined if it is ever permitted to be cut up with roads. Its mountainous beauty, nature, fish and wildlife must be left in its present state for use by Montanans and others as well.

I and my chapter of 141 members cannot urge you too strongly of the great importance of your doing everything possible to effect early passage of Senate Bill S. 1121!

To give this Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain area the attention it deserves would you personally see that this letter is made a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

JAMES K. WHEAT,
President, Helena Jaycees.

[From the Helena Independent Record, June 14, 1968]

JAYCEES ENDORSE WILDERNESS AREA

The Helena Jaycees voted unanimously Thursday night to support efforts to classify Lincoln Backcountry-Scapegoat area as a wilderness area.

The chapter will send letters to the Montana Congressional delegation urging support of two identical bills, House Bill 7148 introduced by Rep. James Battin and Senate Bill 1121 introduced by Sen. Lee Metcalf, which would authorize the secretary of agriculture to classify as wilderness, the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Backcountry and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests.

In addition to the letter from the Jaycee chapter, individual members were urged to write letters in support of the bills.

The area proposed for the Wilderness designation covers 240,500 acres. The Montana Fish and Game Commission has voiced approval of the designation along with several other organizations.

CRANE MILLS,
Corning, Calif., August 20, 1968.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: When the national policy for handling the Nation's natural resources has been decreed by Congress to be multiple use, it is hard to understand how the framers of Senate Bill 1121 can justify their proposal to place an additional 204,500 acres of land in Montana in the wilderness system. It would make much more sense to manage this area by the multiple use concept in a way that will provide both more recreation and greater contribution to the national economy. The recent demand for logs for export from the Western United States is bringing into focus the fact that the Nation's forest resources are not unlimited—and that the withdrawal from management of additional forest areas will place even more burden on a natural resource that is straining to meet national needs and could very well same day become overburdened by the demands for building materials.

We urge you to turn thumbs down on Bill 1121 and place the area under the multiple use management plan that has already been drawn up for it by the Forest Service.

Very truly yours,

RAY CRANE.

ILLINOIS AUDUBON SOCIETY,
Chicago, Ill., June 12, 1968.

Senator HENRY JACKSON,
Senate Interior Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please enter into the hearing records our desire to protect the Scapegoat Mountain area in Montana as a wilderness area.

We would be appalled by any attempt to build roads into the area, or to use it for mass recreation or to open it up to lumbering.

We have made a personal visit to the area and have been impressed by the great beauty of the place.

Let us not assassinate our most scenic areas as we assassinate our leaders.

Please send us a copy of the hearings.

Very truly,

RAYMOND MOSTEK, *President.*

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY,
Oshkosh, Wis., June 11, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I wish to express my deepest hope that the proposed 240,500 acre Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area (Senator Mansfield's Senate Bill 1121) become a reality. I can well imagine that private interest represents a powerful lobby against such a bill, but unadulterated lands, such as those in question, are becoming increasingly rare, and their protection is a real service to the country.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM B. WILLERS, Ph. D.

SCARSDALE, N.Y., *May 29, 1968.*

Mr. VIC REINNEMER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REINNEMER: The Lincoln Scapegoat Back Country must be spared from the automobile! We who love the wilderness always seek the roadless areas to enjoy the clean uncluttered refuge for true recreation as we understand the meaning of the word: Recreate. Such recreation is not possible when confronted with such "symbols" of civilization as beer cans, cartons, wrapper and all sundry items left by careless travelers.

To reach a peak through the effort of walking and horseback riding and to enjoy the views so arduously reached is a deserving reward. The automobile drivers and occupants who are heedless and despoilers of the land have no right to reach those views. There are already too many chair lifts, "scenic drives" and motorized campsites to satisfy those who are in a hurry to get somewhere, particularly when they are so insensitive to the debris they leave behind.

We have a duty to the future generations to assure them wilderness spots.

Please see to it that this spectacular spot remains a wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ALLAN HARVEY.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 13, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We are in favor of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area in Montana. This high mountain area, lying next to the Bob Marshall wilderness area, will serve to protect for future generations a highly scenic area, one of the few remaining unspoiled areas left in our country. Timber is of relatively low quality in this area, apparently there are few potential mine sites in this area, so there should be little need to retain this land for industrial uses.

We request that this letter be made part of the hearing on this proposal.

Respectfully,

H. D. LINDQUIST.

BOZEMAN, MONT.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to support the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area within the Helena, Lewis and Clark, and Lolo National Forests of

Montana. This area urgently needs the protection that only wilderness designation will provide.

Please include my statement as part of the record of the public hearing being held by your committee.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. CULVER.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
FRIDAY HARBOR LABORATORIES,
Friday Harbor, Wash., June 14, 1968.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness within the Helena, Lewis and Clark, and Lolo National Forest of Montana, as proposed in S. 1121 and H.R. 7148. I would like to have this letter of support made part of the printed hearing record on the proposed wilderness.

I believe that the wilderness values of the proposed Wilderness area surpass those of commercial or recreational development. The area is now undeveloped. Wildlife is abundant, and includes most of the large mammals of the United States. Some of these, such as the grizzly bear and wolverine, require large tracts of wilderness for existence, and have been exterminated from most of their former range within the United States. The establishment of this wilderness will be beneficial in the preservation of these endangered species.

The proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness offers such activities as hiking, horseback riding, fishing and hunting. Its establishment will help meet the needs of the increasing numbers of people interested in such wilderness activities.

In contrast to the wilderness values, the mineral and timber values are not outstanding. Much of the area is high in elevation, and supports a relatively poor growth of timber. I believe that extensive recreational development is not justified. The lakes in the area are small and would not support "high quality" fishing and other water sports for large numbers of people. Many good campgrounds and other recreational sites exist outside this area in nearby regions.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN MCPHERSON.

GRANGEVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Grangeville, Idaho, June 5, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee,
Great Falls City Council-Civic Centre, Great Falls, Mont.

At the regular meeting of the Grangeville, Idaho Chamber of Commerce, Tuesday, June 4, 1968, the Timber, Mining and Water Resources Committee gave a report on the proposal—HR 7148—Battin—and Senate Bill S1121—Metcalf and Mansfield—to add 240,500 acres to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

After discussion of the proposal the Chamber of Commerce of Grangeville, Idaho went on record as opposing HR 7148 and Senate Bill S1121.

We wish this action taken by the Chamber of Commerce of Grangeville, Idaho to be made a matter of record at the hearing to be conducted in Great Falls, Montana on June 11, 1968 at 9:00 a.m. at the Great Falls City Council-Civic Centre.

We recommend that the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area remain in its present status as Multiple Use Area.

ROBERT G. BLACK,
President.
GOLDIE S. ROBERTS,
Executive Secretary.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am Mrs. Elsie Wayne, a retired mathematics teacher. I still substitute a good deal, as it is hard to get a person who can teach high school mathematics in a small town.

The wilderness system is necessary if our country is going to preserve our natural beauty. It is the last frontier for our citizens to escape from the encroaching manufacturing business and home building.

I urge to you, secure the 240,500 acres described in S1121 as a National Wilderness system.

Would you kindly have my testimony made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

ELSIE M. WAYNE.

NORTHWEST TRIBUNE,
Stevensville, Mont., June 5, 1968.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country Hearing,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am the editor of a weekly newspaper in a small town in Western Montana. I am also a housewife and mother. I am writing to you as a private citizen interested in preserving some of our natural wilderness for my grandchildren to enjoy.

I have lived in the Bitter Root Valley of western Montana for the past 20 years, having spent most of my life up to that time on the prairies of western Nebraska. So you see I really have a vast appreciation for the mountains.

I have seen the many changes that exploitation has brought to this valley in those 20 years and feel that if this pace continues for the next 20 years, there will be no place left where my grandchildren or their children can enjoy the beauties of nature and the outdoors except those set aside now as wilderness areas.

I am urging that Senate bill 1121 be passed to preserve the Lincoln-Scapegoat back country in its natural state. Feel free to use this letter at the hearing in Great Falls on June 11.

Sincerely,

MARILYN DOWNING.

HELENA, MONT., *June 10, 1968.*

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I understand you will be in charge of the hearing on the Lincoln Back Country.

I want you to know that I am very much in favor of making this area a wilderness acreage under the Wilderness Act.

Congress, and our President, should do everything possible to protect this Lincoln Back Country by law under the Wilderness Act.

Please put my letter in the Hearing record.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. FITZGERALD.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 10, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, wish to go on record as favoring S. 1121 which would authorize the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area and its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

We strongly oppose this irreplaceable land being developed by the Forest Service.

We would request this statement be included in the printed hearing record.

Very truly yours,

ANNE MOORE.
HARVEY E. MOORE.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE:

Please assure everlasting protection of 240,500 acres as the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness. It would be a great natural laboratory where scientists could seek wildlife secrets to benefit all of us.

Let's save this magnificent area from the rowdy wreckreationists and destructive road builders.

Thank you very much.

ROSALYNDE JOHNSTON.
GEORGE W. MUNFORD.

CARMEL, CALIF., *June 11, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am in favor of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in Montana. So far as I can see, there is no good reason for the Forest Service to object to this proposal.

We have altogether too few of this kind of sanctuaries in the United States.

Sincerely,

C. EDWARD GRAVES.

LIBBY, MONT., *June 10, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to go on record as favoring Senate Bill, S. 1121, to authorize the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area within the Helena, Lewis and Clark, and Lolo National Forests of Montana, and request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

L. LLOYD EVANS.

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *June 10, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recently I read of the Forest Service proposal to develop the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

I have hiked the area, and to develop it doesn't make sense from the standpoint of wildlife or recreational use.

This is a very unique area and should be preserved in the wilderness system.

Please make this letter part of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

T. H. DAVIS.

CHESTER, N.J., *June 11, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am in favor of adopting S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 which would authorize the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area and its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System. This beautiful wilderness area relatively untouched by man should be preserved in its natural state as it is one of the finest examples of pristine wilderness in America. There are very few wilderness areas left in America and the value of the Lincoln-Scapegoat country as wilderness far exceeds any use it could have as an area developed for mass recreation and commodity production such as timber harvesting with an accompanying road system. Montana's 34 million acres of Federally owned land—in addition to many more millions of acres or state, county, city, and private ownerships—provide adequate facilities and sites for potential recreation development without sacrificing the irreplaceable wilderness and wildlife values of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. This wilderness is too precious to the Nation to allow its destruction by logging, roading, and other destructive development. Only wilderness designation by Congress, as provided in S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, will assure its protection. I request my views be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Yours truly,

F. ROGER BIES, Jr.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 10, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I will be unable to attend the hearings on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal that will be held in Great Falls, Montana on June 11. But I would like my statements to be part of the official hearing record.

I am very much in favor of putting the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area in the National Wilderness Preservation System. I have been within one hundred miles of this area about twenty years ago.

It has all of the wilderness values that you could want, protection of our wildlife, as well as several streams that flow through it. In fact it is one of the best wilderness areas in the Western United States.

I hope the study committee can see to put it aside, as it has values to our country and the State of Montana.

Sincerely yours,

LESLIE M. CORNFORTH.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., June 10, 1968.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to express my complete support for S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, authorizing the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area. In a case like this, where the wilderness recreation and scenic values are so great and where timber values, at best, are marginal, the best form of "management" is to leave it as it is. Wilderness classification for this area will also help to insure the survival of the Rocky Mountain Grizzly, which vanishes when an area becomes roaded. Please include this letter in the hearing record.

Very truly yours,

R. L. JOLLEY, Ph. D.

NORTH ARLINGTON, N.J., *June 11, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to let you know that I wholeheartedly support Bill S. 1121, co-sponsored by Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield and H.R. 7148, by Representative James Battin (Montana). It would, indeed, be a pity to spoil the beauty of the land and destroy the wildlife within the Lincoln-Scapegoat area!

As the population increases, we must keep an eye to the future and preserve as much of the beautiful land and precious wildlife as we can.

The above statement I trust will be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. Many thanks for your attention to this request.

All good wishes to you in your work.

Faithfully yours,

JOSEPHINE E. CIAK.

HELENA, MONT., *June 12, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a private citizen I am in favor of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area as provided in S. 1121 and H.R. 7148.

This beautiful area is part of the precious little wilderness left in America today. Our American wilderness is important in a very real sense. It is a pioneer heritage. The remaining wilderness and wildlife are remnants of the American scene as it was when white man first set foot on the continent. This is important aesthetically and also from the standpoint of science and education. Many plants and many animals including the grizzly bear and endangered Montana westslope cutthroat trout found in the Lincoln-Scapegoat area will become extinct unless wilderness sanctuary is provided. Biological communities in their

natural state are a necessity in understanding and improving plant and animal communities modified by man.

It is my understanding that the timber of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area is of little commercial value and that mineral exploration has disclosed little mining potential. Although technology can provide substitutes for some dwindling resources, it cannot increase the supply of natural environments. Therefore, I favor designation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as a wilderness area. It will be a legacy for unborn generations.

I request this statement be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. HOLTON.

GRAND FORKS AFB, N. DAK., *June 12, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish the following statement to be made part of the hearing record on bill S. 1121 (Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness Area). Military service prevents my personal appearance at the hearings currently in progress in Great Falls Montana.

I make this statement to urge the passage of Senate bill S. 1121 to incorporate the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat area into the National Wilderness Preservation system. Having spent many days hiking, fishing, and horseback riding in the above-mentioned area, I can testify as to its tremendous beauty and to the therapeutic, relaxing effect it has in its present state on all who visit there. The profound effect on human lives of existing in a world of unspoiled nature, of living for a time completely away from other human beings, and signs of humanity can only be realized in a wilderness area such as the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. The structured relaxation of recreational areas with their cooking and camping facilities, and designated fishing areas cannot provide the atmosphere of total communion between man and nature so essential to our mental health in today's world. Primitive wilderness can!

Even the most carefully administered timber harvest cannot prevent the blight and ugliness which results after man has moved on. The results of thousands of other such harvests with their ugly slashes smeared across hillsides are plain for all to see. Their numbers are manifest and stand today as mute testimony to the care with which they have been logged. The not-so-apparent damage that will result from opening this area should be mentioned as well. Streams will become polluted or fished out. Wildlife will be killed, or driven deeper into the fast dwindling primitive areas of the Bob Marshall wilderness. Govt. expenditures to initially develop the area and maintain it thereafter will run into the millions of dollars.

I implore the committee on behalf of myself as an individual, and on behalf of all those people who would speak out if they knew of the proposal; Prevent this needless waste. Save one of the last, and most beautiful of our natural wilderness areas. Support this bill through your favorable recommendations and votes. Thank you.

Sincerely;

GERALD O. WILLIAMS.

FOREST GROVE, OREG., *June 11, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to express my views on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area and its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the bills S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, which I hope to see passed.

Only wilderness designation by Congress as provided in S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 will insure its protection.

I request that my views be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area.

Yours truly,

GUY E. MCNUTT.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 9, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In connection with the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal (S. 1121 and House Bill 7148) I wish to express my wish that this Lincoln area be placed in the Wilderness Protective System. I request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record on this subject.

Sincerely,

MARILYN M. GOGAS.

SOUTHEAST SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
Chicago, Ill., June 16, 1968.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Our membership desires to go on record with your Committee as being opposed to allowing its destruction by logging, roading, and other destructive development, of the area covered by S. 1121.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. KELLY,
Newsletter Editor.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *June 14, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I recently learned of the Public Lands Subcommittee hearing scheduled for June 11, in Great Falls, Montana, which concerns the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal. Since I was unable to attend this hearing, I wish to express my support in writing for Senate Bill 1121 which would authorize the establishment of this wilderness area within the Helena, Lewis and Clark, and Lolo National Forests of Montana.

This area remains largely undisturbed by man at present; it also has a unique wildlife fauna including such endangered species as grizzly bear, cougar, and wolverine, which are dependent upon wilderness habitat for their existence. Accordingly, the lands within the proposed boundaries seem especially suited for wilderness designation, and I sincerely hope that this area can be managed so that it will remain in its present primitive condition.

I request that this correspondence be included as part of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. TRAINER,
Wildlife Biologist.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to enter my enthusiastic support of S. 1121 and H.R. 7148, identical bills establishing the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area in the National Wilderness System.

This area is not suitable for lumbering due to the scarcity of suitable timber resources, and mineral values are practically nonexistent. This area is the last home of the grizzly bear, and is one of the few areas where the lakes and streams are spawning waters for the endangered cutthroat trout.

While this area is still a primeval area, it is within easy reach of the citizenry. If the area is left to the Forestry Department, it will soon lose all of its fine wilderness values due to the road net which will be built, and to no purpose.

I strongly urge giving wilderness designation to the entire 240,500 acres. Will you please make this letter a part of the hearing record.

Yours truly,

OREN V SHAW.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 10, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a citizen whose Montana heritage goes back three generations, I am writing you to solicit your support for the Livingston-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal. As my late father who worked with your office on this believed, I would say that there are few places left in this whole country with the natural beauty of this proposed wilderness area and fewer still that can show the future generations of Americans what this country was originally like. Please have this letter be made a part of the record of your hearing. Thank you.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM M. MAYGER.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 7, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Care of Great Falls City Council,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I address you and the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands in behalf of a "wilderness" or "wild" classification for the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Area, as outlined on the accompanying map.

My husband and I have wilderness camped along the south fork of the Sun River, crossing the divide into the Danaher and the Bob Marshall wilderness. We deem the south fork of the Sun to be as wilderness worthy as the west and north forks. It should all be an integral part of the Bob Marshall area.

We have seen the Scapegoat-Caribou Peak section of the Divide from the air and in pictures taken by Robert F. Cooney. It merits protection in a wilderness status as much as the northern part of the Lewis Overthrust already included in the Bob Marshall. We are fortunate yet to have the opportunity to afford it this protection.

The essential character and value of the Bob Marshall Wilderness invalidates the claim that it is already large enough and this proposed area is superfluous. The Bob Marshall, of all wilderness areas, offers an opportunity for a complete wilderness experience, from river valley, grass and meadowland up through rugged high country. The proposed area but strengthens and enhances this value. Too many view "wilderness" as that land which is good for nothing else, instead of a section typical of our land as white man first knew it. Here in the Bob Marshall area we see our Montana land as it was before our time—as the Indian knew it. Would that we could tread as lightly as he, leaving it a living monument to that primitiveness from which we sprang.

This size area will all too soon shrink, just through the process of human dynamics, to an insufficiency. To mining, timber and grazing, the traditional economic pressures against wilderness, we now have added man's desire and demand for play. This is becoming an economic force in itself, one which man seems bent on pursuing in ever widening and self-destructive circles. The actual wilderness experience, the experience of his own primitivity, will become an increasing rarity.

I come from a part of our country where the original character of the land has been completely altered, gone forever. In this, my adopted state, I place a high value on what can be so easily lost.

Wilderness land and grizzly country (and this is one of the two remaining areas where the grizzly still can find room to exist), these are a kind of wealth we can hardly even yet appreciate in this wide western land. I would hope to see modern man practice enough self-restraint to prevent their destruction.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDWIN G. KOCH.

MINING & RESOURCES ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Lewiston, Idaho.

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, Great Falls City Council-Civic Center, Great Falls, Mont.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE HEARING PANEL: The Mining & Resources Association, Inc. would like to go on record as supporting the outlines as suggested by the U.S. Forest Service in their studies made of the Blackfoot-Sun Divide Area, which borders on the Bob Marshall Wilderness on the south east.

We believe the sustained yield practice now being used by the U.S. Forest Service to utilize the existing timber stands should be allowed.

We would suggest that a complete mineral survey be made to determine the mineral values within this proposal.

Because of the scenic grandeur within this area, we recommend the plan of the U.S. Forest Service to create road systems to points of interest, with the addition of well maintained camp sites for the use of those who wish to enjoy a true wilderness type environment.

We therefore, believe the multiple-use management of this proposed area as recommended by the U.S. Forest Service should be adopted, which would utilize the timber stands, mineral deposits, grazing lands, preserve the present wildlife, and allow a vast portion of the unaccessible area in the high country to remain in wilderness status.

Sincerely,

ERNEST BUTLER, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 24, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the Wilderness Society and as a concerned American. I request that you place on the record, that I am in favor of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scrapegoat Wilderness Area being placed in the National Wilderness System.

I am concerned about our country's natural resources and hope that you will take my letter into consideration. Again, I am in favor of the position of the Wilderness Society's stand concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat area of Montana.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

MELINDA KAHN.

BOULDER, COLO.

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to request the following statement be included in the hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Proposal:

I find it extremely difficult to understand why the Forest Service has proposed development of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in Montana. The physical description of the area shows that there is almost no merchantable timber in the area, so that the principle of multiple use would dicate that other uses be found. The mineral potential is too low to warrant opening the area to mining. The recreation that is now taking place in the area, especially fishing, hunting and remote camping, would be destroyed by any intensive recreational development. In short, it appears quite obvious that the best use for this area would be to preserve it as a *de jure* wilderness. Lincoln-Scapegoat is especially important to the concept of wilderness in this country in that it is now a *de facto* wilderness, but has no legal designation as such. If the Forest Service is allowed to destroy the existing character of the area through thoughless incursion of civilization, it will have established a precedent allowing it to ruin other, similar areas. I urge that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be added to the Wilderness system as the most fitting use of this land.

Yours truly,

JOHN LIEBSON.

BRONX, N.Y., *June 22, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Re S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 I am in favor of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area and its placement in the National Wilderness Preservation System for two reasons.

(1) There are already enough camp areas in Montana which are not being fully used.

(2) As far as the timber which is poor in quantity and quality is concerned, investments in a permanent logging road system and in intensive forest manage-

ment for this timber cannot be justified if the higher wilderness values of the land are considered.

Since I was unable to be present at the hearing on June 11, I request that my letter be made part of the printed hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

LILLIAN M. FRIEDMAN.

WRIGHT'S BOOK SHOP,
Madison, Wis., July 4, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I wish to draw your attention to the recent hearing scheduled for June 11 in Great Falls, Montana regarding the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness proposal for that area within the Lolo and Lewis and Clark National Forests. I have been a frequent visitor to your beautiful state, and I recently returned from Red Lodge, Montana, where I served as a faculty member for the "Red Lodge Music Festival." As on all past visits to your state, I continue to be extremely impressed with the broad vistas and unspoiled habitat—enjoyed in a reasonably undisturbed state by Man and animals alike; I am very certain that, if Montana can retain much of this character, her main industry—her compelling product for the market—will surely be her unspoiled features in some reasonably unbroken context (from an ecological standpoint). In 30 years our nation's population will double, and the implications for Montana, as elsewhere, aren't perhaps fully recognized (although I am aware and thankful for your own special conservation efforts in Congress) in terms of long range future potentials and goals. For this reason I now write of "Scapegoat."

Although I was close to the hearing site while in Red Lodge, I regret that an intensive schedule allowed me to get nowhere near Great Falls for the purposes of making these views known at any hearing. Therefore, I respectfully request that you call this letter to the attention of Senator Burdick, Chairman of the hearing, and that it be made a part of the official record of the hearing.

I strongly feel that the wilderness values of this region under consideration under S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 far outweigh those of the intensive recreation and logging plans of the U.S. Forest Service. Too often the U.S. Congress does not consider the long range need for strongly protected natural land areas of high quality in view of the tremendous population pressures to come—the need for lands to be so-preserved is not always recognized by the U.S. Forest Service when localized pressures are exerted for commercialized recreational bonanzas. Such would be completely out of place in the "Scapegoat" country where wilderness values—just now receiving more attention by a crowd-weary population—are absolutely superb. This 240,000-acre mountain wilderness straddling the Continental Divide absolutely must be placed in the National Wilderness System by Congress. I urge your strongest support.

Sincerely,

GORDON B. WRIGHT.

BARBOURVILLE, KY., *July 1, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Congress of the United States,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have just returned from a three-week stay in the "Big Sky Country" where, after a one-week stint as a teacher in the Red Lodge Music Festival, my wife and I spent another 10 days seeing some of the great country in Montana.

We made a purposeful effort to get as far into the "Scapegoat" region which has been studied for inclusion in the nation's wilderness system via public hearing. I read of a hearing postponement of the Great Falls' June 11, 1968, date due to Senator Kennedy's death in the Billings Gazette—or so I thought—and was subsequently unaware of future plans for such a hearing.

However, despite some snow due to the untimeliness of the visit, I am enthusiastic about the possibilities of inclusion of this region in the Lolo and Lewis

and Clark National Forests in the wilderness system under the 1964 Wilderness Act. I sincerely feel that the state and the nation can do no less than assure the burgeoning population—whose growth rate I find somewhat alarming—be assured that it may still have wild places to enjoy, places Man and wildlife can enjoy but cannot replace. This region in your lovely state of Montana surely is one such region deserving the best possible protection so that Man may enjoy it as it now is, a mountain wilderness whose values are very great. The massed recreation plans of the U.S. Forest Service must not come to be in the Scapegoat region. Massed recreation and logging are far more compatible to forested and mountainous regions which already are laced with road developments.

I urge that you do everything possible to help place this region in the national wilderness system, and that you place this letter in the official hearing record for the Scapegoat Wilderness.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

JAMES E. KOWALSKY.

RONAN, MONT., *June 14, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please include my wife and I among the proponents of the proponents of the proposed Lincoln Scapegoat Wilderness area.

We feel that the wilderness idea can be carried too far. That to some extent we protect an area from "mass recreation" for the benefit of a few dude wranglers and wealthy sportsmen who can afford a few hundred dollars for a week of hunting.

That a few used logging roads make an area more useful to the "average hunter" without curtailing the hunting potential.

But as I said in the beginning we hereby endorse the aforesaid L.S.W. area.

Best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE P. BICK.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 13, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: It is my understanding that you will be present for a hearing in Great Falls concerning the feasibility of establishing the Lincoln Back Country as a Wilderness Area. It is my hope that you will favorably consider the establishment of this area as a wilderness.

I am not one who plagues your office with letters on every petty issue that arises, but as a responsible Montana citizen and businessman I am concerned over the future status of the region in question. I have personally inspected it both from the ground while using it for recreation and from the air. I can not see how mass recreation will leave anything worth while in this rather fragile area. Neither does it appear that the timber is of a quality to make harvesting it economically desirable.

Certainly in this era of increasing population many of us in Montana are concerned about preserving a portion of this country in its present status for future generations to enjoy. Dollars are important to us all, but we had best also stop to consider what we leave for the future.

Sincerely,

JAMES N. BROGGER, D.V.M.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Any aid or assistance you can give to the proposal to enlarge the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area southward to where it naturally belongs will be greatly appreciated by myself and many of my friends in Butte. Most of us talk often of this and discuss it but seldom write to you. We feel quite strongly about this now and wish to make our feelings known to you.

Sincerely,

Dr. JACK GOEBEL.

LOS ALAMOS, N. MEX., *June 17, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please make the following statement a part of the hearing record:

I favor adding the Lincoln-Scapegoat area of Montana to the National Wilderness Preservation System, as provided by S. 1121 and H.R. 7148.

Timber in this area is poor in quantity and quality. Federal investments in a logging-road system and in intensive forest management for this timber cannot be justified if the higher wilderness values of the land are considered.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness must not be sacrificed for recreation development. There is adequate Federally-owned land in Montana to provide sites for recreation development without destroying the irreplaceable wilderness of this area.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA H. DOUGLASS.

BEAVERTON, OREG., *June 19, 1968.*

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I request that my strong support of the proposal to establish Wilderness Status for the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area, within the Helena, Lewis and Clark, and Lolo National Forests, be made part of the hearing record for the recent public hearings.

Yours very truly,

WILBUR P. MCNULTY, Jr.

LA GRANGE, ILL., *May 31, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is in regard to S. 1121 and H.R. 7147 which I understand will shortly be voted upon.

I had the opportunity of spending considerable time in the Lincoln back country bordering the Bob Marshall wilderness in the great state of Montana. This section of beautiful wild country is now being threatened by interests such as the timber and mining people and I would like to make a plea at this time for its inclusion in the wilderness category. There is so little virgin land left for the enjoyment of the public and for our children and the generations to come that I feel it is vital to preserve what little of the unspoiled land that we have left.

Although I live in the state of Illinois, I have close ties to the state of Montana as both of my parents were born and raised in that state and both grandparents settled there in the early days. I have had the opportunity to ride in the Lincoln back country and adjoining wilderness on many occasions and am hoping that this land will be kept unspoiled for my children and future generations to enjoy. Therefore, I strongly urge that you vote in favor of inclusion of this section of the country under the protection of the wilderness law.

Sincerely yours,

CARL D. BERRY, M.D.

AMERICAN SHEET METAL & ROOFING,
Helena, Mont., June 6, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Many of the happiest moments of my life and that of my friends have been spent in the magnificent Lincoln, Montana back country. I look forward to my annual trek, sometimes more often, with the same feeling you have when going home after a long absence. It's one of a few diminishing number of places where man can get away from the rigors of civilization, the worry of business, the wars, the violence, the greed, and replace it with peaceful solitude and relaxation. No man can spend a week or even a few days back there without benefiting from it mentally and spiritually, for none of the mechanics of civilization are there to interupt your thoughts.

It holds in its boundaries one of the few remaining haunts for the magnificent grizzly which is claimed to be headed for extinction; a crime to all Americans and a disgrace to our heritage if this should come to pass. With present access, the human traffic is almost too heavy to maintain the balaince of animal life that has existed for centuries.

Its value as a wilderness area to our generation, not to mention future generations, far exceeds any commercial value that could be derived from this area. I urge you to do every thing in your power to have this area classified as a "Wilderness Area".

Please make this a part of the hearing record. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE W. DRENNON.

POWER, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We hope you can do something about incorporating the 200 thousand odd acres of land near Lincoln into the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. We in Montana and in the nation should have a retreat where plants and animals remain unmolested from the encroachments of civilization so that we and future generations can travel half way around the world if necessary to see wild life in its natural state. Such a retreat could make Montana famous. But we must protect it from roads and industry—keep it free of beer cans and other contamination—keep it beautiful. Every country should have set aside such wilderness areas. In fact, every state should have such an abode for its people if it is really looking to the future.

We know how you feel about our natural resources and feel we can count on you to do your best.

With sincere thanks,

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD AND ROSINA WOODHOUSE AND FAMILY.

WARD DRUG CO.,
Minot, N. Dak., June 6, 1968.

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I am writing to you in regard to the forthcoming hearing in Great Falls Montana on S. 1121 of which you are Chairman.

I am quite familiar with the country, having hunted just north of there and camped and back packed into the Lincoln Back Country on a couple of different occasions. I believe that it would be a terrible mistake not to preserve this type of wilderness for our children and grand-children. God only knows how rapidly these areas are disappearing not only here in the U.S. but also in Canada where I have hunted on several occasions.

I urgently request that you give this bill all the support you can and I would appreciate it if you will make this letter part of the record of the hearing on S. 1121.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. SAUNDERS.

RONAN, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Since I will not be able to attend the hearing of the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands in Great Falls, Montana, June 11, I am writing this letter in support of Senate Bill 1121 on the Wilderness Classification of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests.

I have traveled through portions of this area from Bench Mark on the Sun River side and from the Danaher Ranch on the head of the South Fork of the Flathead River, and am well aware of the Wilderness value of this area.

The true worth of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat area to all the people of this country, both the present generation and future generations, lies in its preservation as a Wilderness Area. It would be a most sound investment in the future. I hope the Senate Interior Subcommittee will act favorably on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. JUDGE.

MEDICAL ARTS CLINIC,
Minot, N. Dak., May 28, 1968.

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: As a sportsman, a hunter, an outdoorsman, and a nature lover, I would like to go on record as being in favor of the establishment of a Wilderness Area in the Lincoln Back Country and am in support of S. 1121 to designate the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as a wilderness area.

I am very sorry that I will be unable to attend the hearing on the Bill at Great Falls on June 11; however, I would appreciate it if my feelings on this matter could be made a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

BERNARD B. HUSS, Jr., M.D.

MINOT, N. DAK., *May 29, 1968.*

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

MY DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I should like to take this opportunity to support Senate bill S. 1121 to establish Lincoln Back Country as a Wilderness Area and to add it to the National Wilderness Preservation System. I think it is worthy of the highest priority and consideration that irreplaceable wild country be preserved for my children and grandchildren as a place of refuge from the enlarging cares of the day and a place of re-establishing a sense of proportion in our mechanized world. I think it is also extremely valuable that they be able to enjoy and participate in that type of country which forms so great a part of our nations heritage.

Please understand that you have my enthusiastic support and the support of my friends in regard to bill S. 1121. I regret that I can not be in Great Falls on June 11 to testify at the hearing, but I request that this letter be made a part of the hearing record of S. 1121.

I plan to be in this area or near by areas later this year, having been there last year and having thoroughly enjoyed it. I consider my experience in being in the wilderness area as very gratifying and fulfilling.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL M. STUMP, M.D.

HELENA, MONT., *May 31, 1968.*

SENATOR LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am so pleased to learn that there will be a hearing in Great Falls on your fine Senate Bill, S. 1121. I think you will find that the people of Montana are behind you on this and you are to be congratulated for your foresight. The beautiful Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain is a perfect example of land wonderfully suited for wilderness status. This is excellent!

As you know, Montanans are again, and will constantly, be faced with the uphill struggle to maintain a few acres of unspoiled lands for our children and their children to enjoy, and fight for. The day is not too far distant when Montana will be more overrun with people with their destructive plans and schemes to remove all surface materials, including animal and vegetable, for the much sought for dollar. If no action is taken at this time, the choice areas will be taken first and the more undesirable areas later, but by that time it will be too late to preserve like the Linocln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain.

I was fortunate to see and enjoy many areas in Montana and Yellowstone Park before they became outsized garbage pits by thoughtless, mercenary, and stubborn humanity. Many of our plains animals, both fish and fowl, as well as big and small mammals, have been driven from their homes to forested areas for

survival, or are almost extinct by the encroachment of civilization. These include the blackfooted ferrett, the prairie dog, the sage grouse, the coyote, ground squirrels, and many more.

Many species of fish formerly lived in waters now only usable by the warm water varieties, and those able to survive in silt laden, polluted streams and impoundments. Even virgin streams and lakes are now becoming unfit for use due to extensive and clear cut logging by many hungry saws and wheels, sanctioned by government bureaucracy.

We must not and cannot forfeit our lands, trees, flowers, and animals to satisfy a few; it *must* be preserved for all. The wheels of civilization must be kept out. Otherwise, we will have nothing left but roads, eroded hillsides, polluted waters, and sky-high garbage piles. All mechanized vehicles should be banned, otherwise we have lost all.

Thousands of our Montana residents do not now realize nor appreciate how fortunate we are. Many of us can be completely and utterly away from civilization within minutes from our back doors—the only sounds that remind us of humanity are the drone of an airplane motor or the roar of a jet engine. This we have at our finger tips—many thousands of people spend hundreds and thousands of dollars and many hours time to come here and enjoy it for a few days or weeks. We must fight to protect this privilege as our unspoiled areas must not be molested as our lands already scorned by humanity will become progressively worse all too soon. If we here in the West do not fight to preserve what we have, it is certain that others will not and all will be gone. We need courageous, foresighted warriors to carry on this never ending struggle.

In view of the foregoing reasons, I cannot urge you too strongly to take all measures to get Congress to pass Senate Bill, S–1121, and protect forever for the people of the nation and give the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat Mountain Area wilderness status.

Will you be certain that this letter be made a part of the June 11, 1968 hearing record.

Respectfully,

WARREN K. LELAND.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA,
Missoula, May 31, 1968.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Thank you for arranging the hearing in Great Falls relative to the Lincoln-Scapegoat area and for notifying me of it.

I had planned to attend the hearing. Unfortunately, the faculty of the Law School will meet Tuesday, June 11 to consider action on students with low grades. This meeting is critical, to the students and to the academic standards of the School. I don't know whether the meeting will end early enough to enable me to come to Great Falls to attend the hearing in the afternoon.

In any case, I will prepare a written statement for inclusion in the printed record.

Very truly yours,

LESTER R. RUSOFF,
Professor of Law.

NORTH VALLEY STREAM, N.Y., *May 28, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee of Senate Interior Committee,
Senator METCALF,
Senator MANSFIELD,
Gentlemen of the Committee.

DEAR SIRS: My husband and I feel impelled to express our support for the authorization of "Wilderness" classification for the Lincoln Back Country and the National Forest Lands as described in this bill because of our desire to bequeath our children and theirs a part of America, still magnificient in its original splendor. Perhaps because we are "Easterners" we are well aware of what can happen to natural wilderness as a result of poor planning, shortsightedness, and capitulation to special business interests.

Pilgrimages with our family and friends to this area permit us the opportunity to see this beautiful part of our country as it has been for eons, unspoiled and in all its glory—the animal and plant life in great abundance with its age old checks and balances to perpetuate it. This land serves as the last refuge for many species of animals and natural growth and is a place where we and our children can seek out the wonders of nature and a way of life fast disappearing in the "jet-set" world. Hopefully this beauty will be preserved for our future generations to venerate as we do.

Respectfully submitted.

MRS. HAROLD R. GOLDBERG.

NORTH VALLEY STREAM, N.Y., *May 31, 1968.*

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee of Senate Interior Committee,
Senator METCALF,
Senator MANSFIELD,
Gentlemen of the Committee.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I feel impelled to express our support for the authorization of "Wilderness" classification for the Lincoln Back Country and the National Forest Lands as described in this Bill because of our desire to bequeath our children and theirs a part of America, still magnificent in its original splendor. Perhaps because we are "Easterners" we are well aware of what can happen to natural wilderness as a result of poor planning, short-sightedness, and capitulation to special business interests.

Pilgrimages with our family and friends to this area permit us the opportunity to see this beautiful part of our country as it has been for eons, unspoiled and in all its glory—the animal and plant life in great abundance with its age old checks and balances to perpetuate it. This land serves as the last refuge for many species of animals and natural growth and is a place where we and our children can seek out the wonders of nature and a way of life fast disappearing in the "Jet-set" world. Hopefully this beauty will be preserved for our future generations to venerate as we do.

Respectfully submitted,

CARYLL GOLDBERG.

PIOCHE, NEV., *June 1, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you in regards to the hearing to be held on June 11, 1968, concerning the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal. I have spent some time in this area on pack trips and feel that it is one of the greatest places in the country to really enjoy this land of ours as it is naturally. I would very much like to see this area kept as a wilderness area, to be enjoyed as an untouched part of our land, with no roads into it to mar it's beauty or spoil the way it is now.

Within the past few years a road has been built across a range of mountains in our area here in Nevada that is the summer and fall range of our deer herds and since that time our deer herds have literally vanished from the land. They have no natural protection from jeep hunters and hunters camping in their feeding grounds and it is a sad thing to see happen.

Please use my letter as part of this hearing record.

Thank you sincerely,

GORDON H. COLE.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

Hon. QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: Please make this letter a part of the hearing record on S. 1121—the bill by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield to establish the Lincoln Back Country and adjacent areas for wilderness use.

I strongly support S. 1121. My family and friends have used this beautiful wild country for many years. We hike and hunt or fish and camp in this area. We enjoy the solitude and the natural scenery of the place. In late June and July, the

wildflowers appear in a maze of beautiful colors, and much wildlife usually can be seen.

Roads and logging can only result in marring these great assets which are becoming rare in our overcrowded country. Let us keep those that we have left. There are better places to grow timber crops and enjoy developed recreation.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) SHIRLEY A. HURRIE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *May 13, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing you in support of designating the Lincoln Back-Country as a Wilderness Area.

In the summer of 1967 my wife and I and our two children, ages 5 and 8 years, explored some of the wilderness areas of Idaho and Montana. We had heard of the Lincoln Back-Country and spent a weekend trying to get into the area. Because of its seclusion, we managed to get only to the edge of the area itself, but at a distinct vantage point, namely, Red Mountain, from which we could survey almost the entire area. We hope to be able to go through the wilderness itself on our next trip, possibly this summer.

We were much impressed by this wilderness. It is, first of all, wild roadless country. Secondly, it is essentially land-locked, consisting of one or two integral watersheds surrounded by high ridges on all sides. Third, it is large enough to constitute viable wilderness by itself. Fourth, and most important of all, it is a prime habitat for large mammals.

We observed evidence of grizzlies on Red Mountain itself. It is our understanding that this area has a large proportion of the grizzlies remaining in the United States. We are well aware that the grizzly bear could become extinct. It has already so become in California, in spite of our sizeable Sierra Wilderness, because of the incursions of man. In fact, grizzlies used to live right here on the Peninsula near to San Francisco. What pictures we have seen of the animals in the Lincoln Back-Country have convinced us that this is indeed an essential wildlife habitat which must be saved if we are to save certain of our American mammals.

Here we have the opportunity to set aside an area which will stay wild if we will but keep roads, logging, and mining out of it, and limit the access to it. It clearly requires protection under the Wilderness Act to accomplish this. It is my conviction that someday we will have to establish certain animal wilderness preserves where man's presence is distinctly limited if not prohibited. We know that certain species, such as the Bald Eagle, California Condor, and Grizzly Bear cannot exist in close proximity to man, usually because they fail to reproduce under such conditions. Whether or not such a policy should be applied to the Lincoln Back-Country in the future would require further study. It clearly is an area that can be so protected. For now we must do our best to keep it in its natural state. I think that the sportsmen will understand that they may have to undergo some restrictions in order that they can even have the increasingly rare opportunity to bag the noble grizzly.

I hope that the people of Montana appreciate how fortunate they are to have so many expansive wilderness areas left in their state. While they may still feel that their state is under-developed, I would avidly testify to what over-development, such as we have in California, can do. Our population pressures are now so great that few of our designated wilderness areas are really that any more. You cannot find a place in the Sierras today, even on the ruggedest peaks, where you can sit in solitude and not see or hear the undesirable effects of man. And, our air pollution problems are now so severe that the overflow from the urban basins threatens to destroy plant life in our wilderness areas.

Montana has always been known as the big game state; let us hope it always will be. Surely hunting and recreation play an important part in your state's economy. In addition, your wilderness areas provide the multiple-uses of (1) an adequate supply of pure water, (2) minimum flood and erosion danger, (3) pure air, (4) a natural climate, (5) abundant wildlife, (6) and reduced fire hazard. Beyond these local benefits, those wilderness areas are absolutely essential to serve the United States as a whole.

I would think the logical move would be to add the Lincoln Back-Country to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. This would not only make one large contiguous wilderness, but would add the spectacularly scenic Scapegoat Mountain Area to the scenic wilderness to the north. Then, if it is desired to give the Lincoln Back-Country special status as a wildlife habitat, that can be done later. The present objective, of course, is to keep this area from being developed.

We, therefore, ask you to save the Lincoln Back Country as a superb wildlife wilderness habitat, and as one of the last stands of that noble North American native, the Grizzly Bear. Please make this letter a part of the permanent hearing record.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP S. FLINT.

To: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
From: Committee for the Development of Outdoor Recreation.

Senate Bill 1121 and H.R. 7148 propose the addition of 240,500 acres of National Forest Lands to the existing 950,000 acres of wilderness. This area is referred to as the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness or the Lincoln Back Country.

Reasons for objecting to these proposals:

1. This bill would make the area available to only a select minority who can afford pack trips or own a string of horses.

2. This area would be taken away from general public use. These are the same people who are paying taxes to support and maintain it. It should be available for use by the majority and not a select few. There is a shortage and limitation of present campgrounds and recreational facilities. More people are getting out and outdoor recreational area is needed. To close this area is discrimination against the general public, the taxpayer.

3. There are nearly one million acres of wilderness in the adjoining area. It is used for the affluent few. Only a small part of this is in use.

4. How many times have you been in the Bob Marshall Wilderness?

5. This would completely stop the development of this area and the surrounding area.

6. Plans have already been formulated by the Forest Service to turn this area into a useful and resourceful area. Forest Service Multiple Use: Wood, Water, Forage, Wildlife, and Recreation. For the good of many.

7. Land is no more fragile and frail in one area than another. Under Forest Service control, the land would be developed and strengthened.

8. Fire control is harder in undeveloped areas. Much could be lost due to the inaccessability. There are rich timberlands ready for harvest. This timber should be harvested. It is dense and there is no feed for the elk and deer. Look at the two year old clear cut. There is feed up to an elks stomach. There is fire control. There is progress. This is how our country was built.

9. Like it or not this is a motorized age. The future generations to come will become more motorized. Trail machines cover ground faster and generally do not carry as large a pack or as much litter as slow moving backpackers and horses. A wilderness won't stop the people who drop litter and leave garbage. They are in every class and every group.

10. If this area were more accessable it would be used by more back packers. The average hiker has but one or two days to enjoy. It would put them that much closer to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

11. This area is being used by trail bike riders and snowmobilers now. Why should they be excluded from this area because of a minority pressure group. It would be as sensible to introduce a bill setting aside this area for motorized vehicles only. There would be an outcry of "Unfair". Put the shoe on the other foot, how does it feel?

12. Since the general public, the taxpayer, supports this land, it would be a forced subsidy. The taxpayer would be subsidizing the packer.

13. Note that a large portion of support for this bill comes from out of state interests.

A Point to Ponder: What is true Wilderness? What is traditional means of travel? Why not everyone walk, no canned foods allowed and no firearms.

This year Scapegoat and what would be next? Where would it stop? Public land shouldn't be tied up for the select few. It was set aside for the use of all. It should be left so the majority can use it.

(The above petition was signed by 250 residents.)

EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE,
Billings, Mont., May 28, 1968.

CHAIRMAN,
U.S. Senate Subcommittee Hearings on the Lincoln Back Country Civic Center, Great Falls, Mont.:

We, the undersigned and members of the Eastern Montana College Faculty, would like to strongly recommend the establishment of Lincoln Back Country, including the Scapegoat Mountain Area, as permanent wilderness under the Wilderness Act.

We feel that the above area would best serve the public interest and wise conservation by being declared wilderness. It would provide an excellent area for one and two days on a family basis as well as taking away some of the recreation pressure on the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. However, the Lincoln Back Country is a very unique area of scenery and wild country, which we cannot afford to lose. It provides undisturbed habitat for the grizzly bear as well as other wildlife of a rare or endangered nature. Also, the area contains some of the best cutthroat trout fishing in the United States in its undisturbed water drainages. Possibilities exist for ecological research, but its main contribution would be that of quality recreation—which is extremely hard to find in our modern, developed world. The Lincoln Back Country is a natural and cultural resource and heritage which should be given legal establishment for the present and future generations of Montana and the United States. We request that the above statement be included in your official hearings on June 11, 1968.

(The above petition was signed by 25 members.)

LAUREL, MONT., *May 29, 1968.*

Re Senate bill 1121.

Hon. Senator QUENTIN BURDICK,
Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Great Falls, Mont.

HON. SENATOR BURDICK: We believe the best way that wilderness areas can be preserved is through the Wilderness Act.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat Area is used by an increasing number of people from Laurel, Montana, and we the undersigned would like to see it classified as a wild area (Senate Bill 1121).

(The above letter was signed by 55 residents.)

FORT BENTON, MONT., *September 23, 1968.*

SENATE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Attached with this statement are two additional containing the signatures of persons in support of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat addition to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

If the committee would wish to have a more extended form of this petition, the number of persons who would likewise express their preference could be reached in every community in Montana. And in all areas of the country. Our limiting factors are, as is so well understood, time and monies.

My single comment, for this situation, is that it is a sad process when the determination of programs and policies of public nature can, largely, depend upon who has the most money and time with the expectation of regaining both in subsequent commercial channels.

As all particulars of the processes are carried by the relatively small group who take part in such as this hearing, the acute question rests in the determination of how the majority viewpoint is made clear.

These petition forms are a representative sample of that support.

ERMAL HANSEN.

PETITION

To the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands, the Honorable Senator Quentin Burdick, Chairman:

We, the undersigned, residents of the State of Montana, hereby petition your Subcommittee and the entire Congress of the United States to designate the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests as a wilderness under the Wilderness Preservation Act of 1964.

We do this with the belief that this area must be preserved in its natural state for the future so that our children and their children can continue to enjoy the hunting and fishing and other wilderness experiences that are found in this area.

(The above petition was signed by 34 residents.)

PETITION

To the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands, the Honorable Senator Quentin Burdick, Chairman:

We, the undersigned, residents of the State of Montana, hereby petition your Subcommittee and the entire Congress of the United States to designate the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests as a wilderness under the Wilderness Preservation Act of 1964.

We do this with the belief that this area must be preserved in its natural state for the future so that our children and their children can continue to enjoy the hunting and fishing and other wilderness experiences that are found in this area.

(The above petition was signed by 95 residents.)

PETITION TO AUTHORIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LINCOLN-SCAPEGOAT WILDERNESS AREA

We, the undersigned citizens, want the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area given Wilderness Status under the Wilderness Act. We want it preserved as it is, undeveloped, for the enjoyment of generations of outdoorsmen, fishermen, hunters, hikers and nature enthusiasts.

(The above petition was signed by 42 residents of Great Falls, Mont.)

JUNE 7, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Care of Livingston Rodgers, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We, the undersigned, urge passage of Senate Bill S. 1121.

Preservation of the nation's wilderness areas seems a most necessary heritage to leave for posterity.

(The above petition was signed by 17 residents.)

HELENA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: You are asked to have this letter made a part of the hearing record to be held June 11, 1968 by Senator Metcalf at the Civic Auditorium in the City Council Chamber, Great Falls, Montana, on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposal.

We have a strong feeling that this area should be preserved as a wilderness area, as a heritage to future generations. European nations were almost too late in practicing conservation of this type. We should accept their lesson before we are too late.

(The above letter was signed by 10 residents.)

To Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

We, the undersigned, being citizens or residing in the State of Montana respectfully request that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be designated as a wilderness area and be preserved as such for the enjoyment of present and future generations of outdoorsmen, fishermen, hunters, hikers, and nature enthusiasts.

(The above petition was signed by 386 residents.)

We the undersigned request wilderness protection for the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat area.

(The above petition was signed by 47 residents.)

[From the Hungry Horse (Mont.) News, Sept. 20, 1968]

LARGER BOB MARSHALL

Some part of the reason for wanting to enlarge the Bob Marshall Wilderness appears to be reaction to man's plundering the land and polluting air and water. He certainly does.

There is need for national parks and wilderness.

However, instead of enlarging the Bob Marshall by adding the 240,500-acre Lincoln-Scapegoat Mountain tract on the south, consideration should be given a multiple-use proposal.

This would have limited road access, preservation of scenic attractions, maintenance of wildlife, and timber harvesting on a sustained yield basis on about 136,000 acres.

To be kept in mind is that not all citizens can afford horse use, prevalent way for the comparatively few who enter a wilderness.

In a limited access area, those who drive their own cars would be able to take their families into this back country for sightseeing, hunting and fishing.

Topic of enlarging the Bob Marshall will be a leading state story next week.

Senator Quentin Burdick (D-N. Dak.), a member of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, will preside at a Monday hearing in Great Falls.

Western Montana is favored by having 1,013,129 acres in Glacier National Park, 950,000-acre Bob Marshall Wilderness, 75,000-acre Mission Mountains Wild Area, and this publication among others champions the proposed Jewel Basin as a scenic preserve.

Furthermore, enlargement of the Bob Marshall to the south will not particularly affect Columbia Falls mills, but citizens of this state need to give thought to the multiple purpose use concept.

There are inadequate revenues in this state whose principal export seems to be its young men and women. More jobs are needed in Montana.

The lumber industry is important. Removal of 136,000 acres of productive forest land with an estimated annual allowable cut of 17,500,000 board feet is of consequence. So is prospect of mineral development near Lincoln.

Popular stand is to be in favor of enlarging a wilderness. What is needed even more is intelligent and forceful multiple use concept where there is improved management of wood including less burning, reduced pollution, more erosion control, further safeguarding the water resource, as well as wildlife and scenic features.

There is more to conservation than enlarging a wilderness.

[From the Naturalist, 1967]

WILDERNESS—ITS MEANING TO MAN

(Daniel H. Henning,[1] Eastern Montana College, Billings, Mont.)

Federal wilderness occupies approximately one and one-half percent of the

[1] Dr. Henning is assistant professor of social science at Eastern Montana College. He has served as a ranger naturalist with the U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service in Federal Wilderness Areas for several summers. This article was written at Glacier Bay National Monument, Alaska, where the author was a park ranger on an isolated duty

United States and is located in national parks, national forests, and national wildlife refuges. Under the Wilderness Act of the United States Congress, wilderness and potential wilderness areas are now being given legal recognition.

INTERPRETATION OF WILDERNESS

The Bible mentions wilderness nearly 300 times; it considered wilderness to be vast and uninhabited. But what does wilderness actually mean in the twentieth century? The Wilderness Act defines it as a natural community of primeval character that is untrammeled by man. Dr. James P. Gilligan, a student of wilderness and Director of Wildlands Research Laboratory at the University of California at Berkeley, states that a true wilderness area, "should be 20 miles to the interior from the roadhead" and should give one "the feeling of remoteness and vastness of area which is not diminished by the presence of a road, airfield, or other civilized intrusion or any part of it." From this, one might conclude that a wilderness is a large natural area that has not been used and developed by man, where man leaves trails, although the size of the area may be relative to the individual. In short, man is merely a visitor to a wilderness.

Many people point out that it is possible to have forest recreation with other use and development in a given forested area. And this is true, but one does not have wilderness recreation combined with commercial use and development. When man adapts a wilderness area to meet his civilized needs, it can no longer be considered a wilderness—the natural area or biotic community has been modified by man. Thus with use and development (lumbering, grazing, roads), a cultural, non-renewable, natural resource is removed from society forever.

According to Dr. Gilligan, much of the wilderness today remains only because it has been uneconomic to develop these as areas up to now, or because recreational pressures have not been too great. A large portion of wilderness in the United States is in the mountainous areas of the West. However, pressures for development and use of these areas are increasing rapidly.

An argument often used against wilderness areas is that they receive little public use. Authorities in the National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service estimate that only two percent of their visitors enter wilderness areas. Yet with our many public lands open to regular forest recreation, it is apparent that this limited use can be recognized and accommodated, especially in a democratic society that recognizes minority rights. Moreover, the atmosphere of being near an expansive area of wilderness contributes to the enjoyment and inspiration of visitors who are not particularly attracted to "roughing it."

In this relationship, wilderness areas can be likened to museums: (a) both receive relatively limited public visitation, and (b) both are "cultural" resources. Certainly, we would not develop our museums into dancehalls with the objective of increasing public visitation, but we are doing similar things to many wilderness areas today. Perhaps, someday, society as a whole may recognize the values of wilderness as a cultural resource to be preserved for posterity. Let us now consider some of these values.

WILDERNESS VALUES

Spiritual

In a setting of natural beauty, free from the pressures of civilization, wilderness provides undisturbed solitude and tranquility where men may feel close to God. A Jewish economist, in the back country of Glacier National Park, said, "I find a temple of worship in the wilderness."

A retired forester said, "I prefer the works of God to those of men." Many who have spent time in the wilderness would agree with this man's statement, despite the modern ingenuity and creativity in art and engineering. Many people have commented that the unspoiled natural beauty of the wilderness causes them to feel that there is a Supreme Being, a power beyond, who is somehow responsible for such grandeur and for the unique scenes and life of the wilderness. A college girl, after viewing a mountain lake with its forested valley and waterfalls, said, "I have never felt so close to God in all my life."

Jesus Christ spent forty days in the wilderness when he was led by the Holy Spirit to be tested by the Devil and on numerous other occasions when He was preaching or praying. John the Baptist lived in the wilderness until he made his first public appearance. Did not Jesus Christ and John the Baptist go to the wilderness so that they could be closer to God so that they could have clearer

channels of communication to God which would not be interfered with by the civilization of Galilee?

Many agree that it is impossible to spend time in the wilderness without believing in some sort of divine power. People who sometimes give little thought to their spiriual lives suddenly become aware of them in the wilderness when they are free of the nagging pressures and worries of their civilized lives. For them, it is like being in another world, free from the ties of the other. This, some would say, "is merely escaping from reality." Others would say that it is drawing closer to reality by giving the soul and mind a place and atmosphere for re-creation to face the civilized world with spiritual and psychological fortitude after a deep communication with God and His natural creations.

A movement for Christian Interdenominational Services in National Parks was recently organized to take advantage of the spiritual aspects of wilderness. During the summer season, student ministers are assigned to points of heavy visitation in our National Parks. The slogan is "Take Christ along on your vacation." Simple worship services are provided at lodges and campgrounds. Student ministers have commented on the strong receptivity of their congregations.

During the writer's experience as a ranger naturalist in our National Parks, he has noticed that ministers made up a significant proportion of the people that he encountered on wilderness hikes. This profession obviously demands a great deal of a man and exposes him to the untold depths of suffering of his congregation. One minister said, "I am out here to get my spiritual batteries recharged."

Essentially, wilderness provides intangible and/or spiritual qualities to human beings. In civilization, we are usually concerned with secular development, with making and getting things more modern, convenient, larger, faster and easier. And we have achieved a great deal, particularly in the last 50 years, until it has affected our way of thinking, our dealings with our fellow man.

At the same time, we have neglected the development of our spiritual life and the things that are part of it, preferring to devote our psychic energies to civilization and its involvement. But man cannot live by bread alone; he cannot be happy or have peace unless he has spiritual bread as well as secular bread. "So what you should do is to seek His Kingdom; then all these things will be given to you besides." One of the ways to develop your spiritual world is to partake of the spiritual qualities of a wilderness for communication with God.

Stress removal

Lowell Sumner in his article, "Are Beavers Too Busy" in the *Sierra Club Bulletin*, June, 1957, noted that as the civilized world becomes more industrialized and expanding populations become more urbanized, the life of man becomes exceedingly complex in all its aspects. There is an ever-increasing amount of emotional stress or nervous strain. Mr. Sumner referred to Dr. John A. Schindler's "How to Live 365 Days a Year," for the estimate that 50 percent of all illness owes its major cause to chronic emotional stress. There has been a large increase in the incidence of mental illness in the United States. The mounting complications and tempo of modern life makes inroads into our tranquility and security.

Wilderness provides for many people an important antidote which relieves or prevents stress through the healing power of natural surroundings. When they return to their civilized environment with its consequent pressures, they have a better perspective which the inspiration and re-creation of the wilderness experience gave them.

Thus wilderness provides a place of temporary refuge from civilization—a place where one may escape from the familiar sights and sounds of his fellow human beings and where one may feel close to his natural beginnings. The healing power of wilderness, its ability to overcome stress through understanding and enjoyment of natural things, may be due in part to a realization by the individual of how small he is in the natural scheme of things. Consequently, he is able to take himself and his problems less seriously by acquiring poise and a sense of humility. Who can consider himself big and his problems large in the mountains and forests filled with natural beauty? Who can see a mountain meadow of wildflowers and still be obsessed with himself? Who can fail to be thrilled at being alive when he feels himself a part of living things?

Everyone feels the effects of our complex society. Emotional stress and nervous strain may overwhelm an atheist just as deeply as one who professes some spiritual belief. It may prevent a person from fully turning to God for comfort,

strength and guidance. Once, temporarily freed from his immediate environment of civilization and placed in a peaceful wilderness, an individual may be able to solve or reduce his "large" problems with God's help. All of us could benefit in some way by using wilderness to rid ourselves of emotional and/or nervous problems that block our spiritual growth and that keep us from developing fully into mature persons in contact with the living reality of the world.

Fellowship

A wilderness atmosphere makes possible a unique social experience. Sitting at the campfire discussing the occurrences and observations of the day and making plans for the next, or hiking along sharing discomforts and joys in a wilderness setting seems to break down the barriers between people and to leave them with a warm glow of human understanding. There are no strangers in the back country. A genuine feeling of acceptance, of friendship and of love—extremely difficult to find in civilized gatherings today—is almost invariably present in the environment of shared experiences in the natural beauty and serenity of the wilderness. It usually molds individuals, regardless of the variety of their backgrounds, into a tightly knit group. Moreover, families as well as friends are brought closer together under this experience. Its informality often results in conversation of a high order in a truly democratic spirit.

In our complex society, people have difficulty in finding the fellowship and family life that every human being craves. Many of us spend most of our time in solitude while surrounded by others. The strong, old fashioned family with its shared joys, hardships, and work, seems to be removed and to be replaced with modern conveniences ranging from cocktail parties and television to automobiles and automatic washing machines, all of which affect our sharing of experiences. However, some groups and families have found one way to reach peaks of solidarity and fellowship: by going on a wilderness camping trip.

In this situation, everyone must assume his or her share of the work responsibilities. Everyone faces the same joys and hardships. Common experiences draw the individuals together and they begin to understand each other as fellow human beings facing life rather than a worried mother, a careless son, a withdrawn secretary, or a boisterous schoolteacher. With their shared experiences, the stage is set for communication. The early morning sun shining through the trees, the mid-day hike to a mountain lake, the peaceful evening over a campfire have a natural tendency to inspire one to speak of God's love without the embarrassment that might be present in other situations.

Health

As man falls heir to the growing list of conveniences and luxuries of civilization—especially the automobile—he has fewer opportunities to exercise his body under rugged conditions, and particularly those of wilderness. Back country visitors welcome the type of exercise that wilderness provides. It gives them a feeling of healthy pride to know that they can hike through forests and up mountain trails.

However, there is an old saying that "a pearl of great price is not obtained for the asking." Thus wilderness values must be earned through the personal achievement of hiking of riding. For those who have spent months of little walking and are "out of shape," these values may have to be earned with blistered feet. But with persistence and fortitude, and with the determined attitude of "I'm not turning back," even the out-of-condition wilderness visitor usually makes it to where he is going, enjoys the country en route, and has fun over his discomforts.

The Apostle Paul said, "And don't you know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit? He lives within you, a gift from God the Father. So you are not your own." Exercise seems to be essential to the health of the body (as well as making one "feel good") while inactivity seems to encourage illness (as well as making one "feel not so hot"). A healthy body is essential to a healthy mind. Yet how many of us are afraid of hiking or of the exercise connected with wilderness because we feel that we are too old or are out of condition. Naturally, one can not expect an older individual to climb mountains (although some do), but what is so harmful about slowly hiking around a forest lake or strolling through a meadow of wildflowers? In so doing, a wilderness visitor derives a sense of health by being elevated from a spectator to a participant in an outdoor activity.

Nature

Without civilized intrusions or developments of any type, wilderness, with its living plants and animals, remains and evolves in its natural state as it has for

centuries. Consequently, the visitor to these areas enters a natural world or living museum that contains wildlife such as moose, mountain goat, mule deer, as well as virgin forests, flowering alpine tundra and other natural phenomena.

Some of the less abundant species of wildlife are present and protected in Federal wilderness areas. Certain animals, particularly species approaching extinction, must have large tracts of undisturbed country for survival. Areas of wilderness serve as reservations for these animals as well as for the more numerous types, preserving them for posterity. Wolverines are an example of the vanishing species requiring large amounts of wild habitat. Few are left in the United States. It is interesting to note that wolverines are one of the few animals that do not suffer from arthritis; this species may have value for medical research.

Jesus Christ said, "Are not five sparrows for two cents? Yet God keeps every one of them in His Mind," and, "Look at the lilies of the field! See how they grow! They do not toil, nor do they spin. But I tell you Solomon in all his glory was not clothed as one of these." People recognize the manifestations of God's innate love for the world in the beauty and adaptations of wild animals and plant life. Wilderness provides an undisturbed area where animals and plants can live in a natural world without man-made modifications in their fight for survival. Certain species of rare wildlife would not survive unless they live in a wilderness. Is it God's will that their last sanctuaries should be taken away from them by man's developments? Througout the world, over 100 species of wildlife have become extinct since the time of Christ and 250 species of wildlife (including birds) are now threatened with extinction as development moves on to their last sanctuaries.

In the U.S., the Dept. of Interior commented that 40 species of wildlife have become extinct in the last 150 years (e.g. eastern elk and prairie wolf) and that 60 more are in the endangered list; they need wilderness habitat in order to survive (wolverine, keydeer, grizzly bear).

Ecological

Many ecologists (biologists who study plants and animals and their interrelationships to their environment) recognize the value of wilderness as a control laboratory for research. The undisturbed ecosystem of a wilderness permits research, study that does not have to compensate for man-made modifications. This basic research can be applied to management practices outside wilderness areas. Also, wilderness plants and animals can furnish superior genetic stock. Dr. Stanley A. Cain, president of the Ecological Society of America, states, "Wilderness areas are the only yardsticks we have or can have—of the long continued interactions of natural ecological laws in the absence of man."

Watershed

The vegetation of a wilderness watershed, in its natural condition, is able to contribute fully to the water storage and supply of surrounding areas.

Recreation

With the increased hours of leisure available, hiking in the wilderness provides a unique and constructive form of relaxation that furnishes great enjoyment of life and refreshment for strength and spirit. It involves a physical and mental experience that cannot be obtained from any other form of recreation; it gives one both recreation and inspiration.

Esthetic

The unspoiled beauty of the primeval forest, the mountain lake, the alpine flower, wildlife and other wilderness scenes provide unbelievably outstanding, and often unexpected, emotional experiences.

Fishing

Many visitors come to the wilderness for the unequalled fishing that is offered by its numerous lakes and streams. Here, with little fishing pressure, the waters produce trout of large size and quantity, permitting one to get his sport and his creel limit in almost every instance.

Creativity

Many writers and artists have drawn on stimulation of sense and on the inspiration of wilderness and nature throughout history. It gives them a form of beauty which is one of the most perfect experiences on earth and which they feel obligated to communicate to others in their writing and art.

Historical

Wilderness provides the visitor with the opportunity to see part of America as the early pioneers saw it, an untouched natural area with virgin stands of trees and abundant wildlife. Many visitors are able to sense the feelings of pioneers by traversing wilderness miles from civilization and other human beings. Visitors of all ages are able to perceive, as an educational and cultural experience, the very wilderness from which the United States developed. Many wilderness areas contain early historical landmarks. For example, in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area in Montana there is a centuries-old trail once used by hunting parties of the Flathead Indians. Old stagecoach roads can also be seen.

Preservation for the future

The values of the wilderness deserve emphasis, for in them we may find a further value for future generations: namely, much of the preservation of Federal wilderness. Values of the wide open spaces, of the secluded forest or lonely peak, the spiritual satisfaction to be gained from getting just a little closer to God and nature than would be possible anywhere else, are precious things. The means to their satisfaction are consequently of great value in our society today to all who understand and cherish these values. We must be sure that generations to come are given at least an equal opportunity to seek satisfaction in wilderness areas, a need that may become ever more pressing with the further urbanization of our country.

God has been good in giving us a high standard of living in a democratic, industrialized civilization with abundant natural resources. He has also given us the natural beauty of the wilderness for our physical, mental, and spiritual satisfaction. But are not these things to be held in trust, to be passed on to future generations? It is quite possible, within our lifetimes to develop our wilderness to the extent that this gift of God will be removed forever from future generations.

[From the Examiner-Post, Sept. 21, 1968]

FROM THE EDITOR

Man's spirit cries out for relief from the fierce political programming of this intemperate season. The voices in the air are insistent, and the very air itself smells of ambition, greed and self-importance. All of the clangorous meetings to produce decisions that have already been made, and the endless speeches to cozy men's minds in one way or another, finally produce immense irritation and distraction. But there are simple means of relief that are very close to hand. To combat the political hectoring that is going on now, and bedevilment in general, I recommend the sort of restorative that I discovered on Miami Beach during the Republican National Convention last month.

After a rigorous four-day encampment with the Grand Old Party, I walked out of my hotel and across the thin, hot strip of sand that separated the honeycomb of pleasure palaces from the sea. This strip of sand was an absolute boundary between an intricate and incredible system that was devised to please man in as many simple ways as possible and an ocean that was not going to be concerned with him one way or the other. Behind me everything was calculated, planned and wholly ordinary; ahead, you could take a few steps into the sea and be in pure wilderness. On a whim, I took one of the curious little plastic bugs they call Hydro Scooters and planed out into the ocean.

The deafening jangle of politics was gone. The vast edifice of cunning, flattery, deceit and humbug dropped behind the curtain of the skyline and out of sight. Suddenly, I felt beneath me the vasty deep of a mysterious and unspoiled ocean. The change was violent, and nerves dulled by boredom came alive with a shiver of apprehension. Riding the ingenious little motorized "Frisbee," I was quartering the waves with my mind and body working together to decipher the infinite variety of shape and surge. And I knew that these very waves might have come from the coast of Africa or Portugal. Weariness lifted. I had the tiller of my life in my hand. The sea was my impersonal adversary, and it was doing more for me than a friend.

Since then, I have often thought of the restorative power of maintaining a delicate balance with the forces of nature. It is the tilt of the land, the run of the waves, the lift of the air that allows the spirit to tack and makes it possible for man to make some small headway.

BILL EMERSON.

[From the Billings Gazette, Sept. 22, 1968]

LET'S KEEP WILDERNESS

The Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness, located high along the Continental Divide 30 miles northwest of Helena, is threatened by a Forest Service plan involving logging, roadbuilding and development of intensive recreation sites.

At present, except for a few trails and a couple of ranger stations, that mountainous country is a land of rushing streams, wild-flower-carpeted valleys, and the home of grizzlies, black bear, elk, moose, Bighorn sheep and other animals.

Identical bills, introduced in the Senate by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield and in the House by Representative Battin, would preserve the area as a virgin wilderness under the 1964 Wilderness Act. Hearings will be conducted by Metcalf Monday in Great Falls.

In an area when population pressures, technology and affluence are all chipping away at the remaining wilderness in this nation, it is more than ever necessary to set aside large tracts, such as this 240,500-acre area, so that future generations may know what the continent was like untouched by civilization.

Beyond that, crowded men increasingly need a place to escape, to enjoy solitude.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area is also the home of several species threatened with extinction, including grizzlies.

Conservationists and others fear that roads and logging of the area's lodgepole pines plus recreation facilities would damage—perhaps irretrievably—the area's wildlife. They argue further that the timber is of poor quality in the area, and the small shallow streams can't stand intensive fishing from easy-access roads.

We favor legislation that would forever keep the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness from development of any sort. Wilderness actually has become one of the highest uses that can be made of land—a use that will be increasingly precious to teeming generations to come.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *September 5, 1968.*

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Room 3106, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Preservation of areas such as the Lincoln Back Country will be the most important contribution this generation can make to future generations. High class recreational areas such as the Lincoln Back Country will, in fifty years, be as valuable as our national parks are today. No one today would say Yellowstone Park is a mistake. No one tomorrow will say that saving wilderness areas was a mistake.

I strongly urge this area be preserved as is.

Sincerely,

BOB MILLER.

KALISPELL, MONT., *September 23, 1968.*

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Room 3106, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: My name is Father Thomas Best and have been an active Episcopal Priest in Montana for ten years. I am the director of the Exodus Back Park Camps and President of the Friends of Glacier National Park.

Church business in Des Moines, Iowa, denies me the opportunity to express my approval of Senate bill 1121 and House bill 7148 and the Lincoln Back Country wilderness area.

It would seem to me that the continued trend of destroying wild areas for various economic reasons must soon cease. These areas become smaller, not greater when in these time of exploding population the reverse should be the order. Watershed and air renewal are just two prime reasons for keeping these areas wild. The horrid waste of clean air and pure water can only be corrected by allowing large areas of wild land to create these basic and vital natural resources for man's survival. Removal of timber and heavy recreational use will only create one more dump as a monument to man's selfish stupidity that avoids basic economic values once lost and totally destroyed.

We need these areas not only for refreshment of man's spiritual needs but also for the ecological refreshment of God's earth.

THOMAS BEST.

BROOKFIELD, WIS.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Room 3106, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am opposed to the building of any access roads in the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness area.

I am a purchaser of your annual big game hunting license.

At present I am hunting in area 280 for elk, bear, and deer.

Thank you,

GEORGE T. RICHEL.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: May I introduce myself and my wife, we are Eldred G. White, and Clara L. White, both employed at the Ravelli Republican here in Hamilton as printers.

We are both ardent hikers and like to camp out in natural surroundings, not in a lot of logged-over camping areas which seems to be the coming trend.

We hope that the Senate Bill 1121 will pass making the 240,500 acres described in the bill part of the National Wilderness System, to be enjoyed by not only us but also our children's children in years to come.

We are all for you, and wish to have this letter read and made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

CLARA AND ELDRED WHITE.

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: It has not been three hundred years since the old Liberty Bell rang out in Independence Hall declaring freedom throughout America, yet in that short time the freedom of enjoying some of its primitive areas is fast slipping away from us.

To quote from *Oil and Vinegar*, our local paper, "Thanks to our system of highways and thoroughfares we can now drive clear across our country and never see a thing."

It is necessary for those of us who know the value of the forests and the life-giving elements that exist there to make an effort to preserve it for posterity.

It is difficult to analyze the thrill of picking huckleberries on the mountainside or describe the effect of hearing the howl of coyotes as they enjoy their feast when one is walking through the dark forest in the blackness of the night. Yet these things have the value of invigorating and renewing the spirit and make it possible to return to the battle of life that goes on in the crowded areas.

There will always be objections. Only men with a vision can look forward for future generations.

Please let us not be destructive and wasteful of this wealth but save some of it for the future.

Sincerely,

CORA E. VAN DEUSEN.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Room 3106, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am engaged in the care and maintenance of automobiles. I have been a resident of Western Montana for almost 70 years.

During this time I have seen many changes take place, especially in our most valuable assets, the great outdoor world of recreation.

I am not opposed to multiple use programs and think they are progressive and necessary in many places.

However, when roads are built the chain saws and bulldozers move in. The land is denuded and streams are polluted and silted. Gradually our game habit is being destroyed for many many years by clear cutting and terracing.

All for a quick dollar at the present time.

I will wager that if the leaders of nations could get together, ride the wilderness trails, see the wildlife, catch some fish, smell the aroma of a campfire and a well-prepared meal, relax and enjoy a good night's rest amid the peace and quiet only found in these places, the world would be a much more peaceful and pleasant place to live.

Therefore, I urge that the acreage described in S. 1121 be made a part of the National Wilderness System.

Please have my testimony made a part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

HARVEY C. ELLIOTT.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *September 21, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: As a non-resident hunter of your State, I would like to go on record in opposition to making access roads in the Lincoln-Scapegoat proposed Wilderness area.

By leaving this area in its natural state it is still possible to leave something to future generations other than a concrete jungle.

Conservation of your state's natural resources is of prime importance. Many states in the east would welcome the opportunity to safeguard this type of area from being defaced.

Sincerely,

B. OUHOOLEN.

WAUKESHA, WIS., *April 18, 1968.*

DEAR SIRS: Leave the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness as it is this date then our Grandchildren will have an opportunity to enjoy a place of beauty and solitude. I had to wait until I was 67 years old before I could enjoy it and it was worth every day of it. We ask that it not be cut up with roads as it would just invite the everyday litter bug called the tourist and the destruction of a beautiful wildlife refuge. We ask that it be left as it is.

B. G. GARBER.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing this in hope that you will help us preserve the Scapegoat Wilderness Area for posterity.

There are hundreds of miles of roads in the Lincoln area already and once beautiful creeks and mountains are covered with slush from sloppy logging. Of course, logging is not my business so I don't know whether it could be done neater or not. I have not seen enough timber in this wilderness area to warrant its total destruction. Also those tiny lakes and streams could not stand the pressure of motorized tourists.

Sincerely,

GERALD HIMMER.

LYNNWOOD, WASH.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Room 3106, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: We just returned from a pack trip into the area which we understand is under discussion for converting to a status other than rough wilderness. Frankly we think it would be a shame to open this up to vehicle traffic and destroy the real beauty and the opportunity to get away from roads and all that goes with them.

There is little enough land left in this country that is completely natural. We think it should stay that way. We would like to come back to the real wilderness.

RICHARD A. THOMPSON.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Room 3106, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please add my name to those supporting the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

My deep concern has passed to a state of alarm at the rate our wilderness areas and native forests are being clear cut, domesticated and managed. We in Montana are in a position to save some of it by preservation under wilderness status. Other states have lost the opportunity forever.

The areas set aside are already receiving enough use to justify this existence. This use will certainly increase in the next 10 or 20 years.

Very truly yours,

Dr. WILLIAM L. JELLISON.

AUGUST, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

Hon. JAMES BATTIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BATTIN: In regard to Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness, we are against any roads or any disturbance of that country at all. What do we want to destroy it for? Let us keep what we have that is the way Mother Nature kept it for so long. Roads will destroy it forever. For those who want a road they are like the tumble weed, they came last and do not amount to much.

Yours truly,

DOC and PAULINE ALT.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am the Mother of three generations and the father and sons have all been hunters and fishermen, and they love the Wilderness. They also love the forest and love to work in it. I would urge the passage of S. 1121, that acreage be made a part of the Wilderness system. I wish to have these statements made a part of the permanent hearing record.

We as a family have done a lot of camping over the past years.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) AMY STANTON.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 15, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I would like to have the following letter entered into the record, requesting wilderness protection for the Lincoln-Back Country-Scapegoat area.

My family and I have walked on several occasions into the Lincoln Back Country, and enjoyed the unspoiled beauty of the area. We have made trips into this area for as little as $35 for the whole family including gas from Great Falls. I know of no other area where a family can go into an area that is yet unspoiled by man for this kind of money. I have seen many school boys on summer vacation backpack into this area and spend two or three weeks at a time. Many people enjoy this area, many kids enjoy the area, and I believe we can afford, and we owe, these kids yours and mine, the protection for this area that they may enjoy it in the future. For the record I own a trail bike and I have ridden it thousands of miles in the mountains both on trails and logging roads, and I can ride it 20 more years and never see it all, but I don't believe I should be allowed to ride it into this area and spoil it for the future generation.

I would like to have the following names entered into the record in favor of wilderness protection for the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Thank you,

Martin E. Cox; Narry Becker; Barbra Becker; Betty Cox; V. Curry; Brad Curry; Mil Mann Ulm; Ken Mann Ulm; James Potter.

WILLOW GROVE, PA., *July 2, 1968.*

Chairman, PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
3106, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the Batona Hiking Club I am in favor of the establishment of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area within the Helene, Lewis and Clark and Lola National Forest of Montana. I believe this area should be placed in the Wilderness System.

This area consists of over 1200 members who are in favor of conserving such an area, not because it benefits us, but because it is in the national interest.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH GEDER.

BROOKFIELD, WIS., *September 21, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I believe the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness area should be preserved in its present state.

Some lands should be left as they always have been.

Also, the non-resident hunter who is willing to spend a large sum for a license should be considered.

Very truly yours,

MARK FRANK.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *September 22, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed road through Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

I have hunted this area and found it to be the only area which comes close to the complete primitive. It is my fervent hope that you will keep it that way.

Thank you,

WALTER A. URMASHER.

RHINELANDER UNION HIGH SCHOOL,
Rhinelander, Wis., November 11, 1968.

DEAR SIRS: I recommend that S. 1121 and H.R. 7148 be passed, making the Lincoln-Scapegoat area in Montana a part of the national wilderness system authorized by the National Wilderness Preservation System.

I am a teacher and a conservation club sponsor in Wisconsin, and am a dedicated proponent of conservation measures which will preserve and protect areas of the country for myself—and my students—to visit and appreciate in years to come. Inclusion in the Wilderness System seems the only way this hope can be kept alive.

Please include, if possible, this testimony in the hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat area.

Sincerely,

CHARLES STJERN.

JUNE 7, 1968.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I applaud your efforts in the interest of conservation of America's wilderness, both within and beyond Montana's borders. I support the proposal of preservation of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area under the Wilderness Act.

America can no longer afford to exploit its unspoiled forests and mountains for financial gains. Nor can we ignore the fact that "mass recreation" in an area such as this can only mean mass destruction.

Sincerely,

TILE B. BJORK.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am very much in favor of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness. I feel that every acre of land that can be preserved in its natural state is an asset to our state and country. Many people cannot enjoy nature in its natural beauty and unless you lose it you never appreciate it. I hope my grandchildren will be able to enjoy what we have and are enjoying and this may be the only way it can be assured. The effort on your part is commendable and surely appreciated by many.

Sincerely yours,

ROY ZINKE.

HAMILTON, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

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

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: We in Hamilton are interested and concerned in the development of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Area for mass recreation and timber harvest.

Having just returned from a trip up the East Fork of the Bella Root River, where I saw whole mountain sides completely bare due to clear cuts and roads for timber harvest, I felt that I must protest the unenecessary destruction of our National Wilderness.

I feel that we should preserve for future generations the undeveloped National Forest Land—where wild life, plant life and animal life live and roam the valleys and mountain ridges. The preservation of this wilderness is of far more value than that which would be received from cutting trees to make timber for sawmills.

This area now is being used by many people without destroying it. Building of roads would only add to over use and eventual destruction of our back country which is the heritage of our children for future generations.

I believe that the 240,500 as described in S. 1121 should be made a part of the wilderness system, and I wish that my protest be part of the permanent hearing record.

Sincerely,

PEARL DINEHART.

HELENA, MONT., *September 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Please do all you can to see that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness is given protection under the Wilderness Act.

Surely in a state the size of Montana it's not too much to ask that some of our land remain wild and free.

Our freedom is being threatened in so many ways please not this, too.

Respectfully,

MARJORIE MERRILL.

HELENA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to voice my support for Senate bill 1121.

Montana needs more wilderness areas in favor of not only the people but also the resources.

Very truly yours,

JANE ARMSTRONG.

HELENA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to voice my support for Senate Bill 1121. There are too few timber wilderness areas left in our state and country. If we act now we can leave what few are left in tact.

Very Truly Yours,

JAMES R. MCCABE.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 21, 1968.*

Senator METCALF,
Senator BURDICK.

DEAR SIRS: I would like to have the following statement made a part of the hearing record on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness proposed.

My wife and I are native Montanans and enjoy the out of doors.

We moved to Lincoln last year because we like the mountains and their splendor the way the Creator made them. I have hunted the Lincoln area and parts of the Lincoln Back Country for eight years. Therefore, I am greatly concerned that the area is about to be altered and destroyed by roads.

The fact that we in Lincoln have this wilderness wild assures us of a continued supply of all game animals, for without providing a place for them to live we are sure to lose them.

We purchased a motel business in Lincoln. Many people come to our town and stay before and after a visit to the Back Country. Most of the people are aware of the possibility of our losing this country to roads are greatly alarmed. They feel, although some of them may never actually go into the area themselves, that the Lincoln area as well as the entire Nation would be losing one of our greatest resources—Nature itself! Once destroyed, no one can replace what beauty and glory it had in the beginning.

We are raising a family here and we hope that our son and daughter will still be able to know the kind of hunting, fishing and quality outdoor recreation that we have known.

These areas are the very things that sets Montana apart from all other States and makes it such a wonderful place to live.

I respectfully urge that S. 1121 become a law and that the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness become a part of the National Wilderness preservation system.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MCGUIRE.

LINCOLN, MONT.

I am a Lincoln housewife, mother and clerk.

I would like this letter entered in the records of the Sept. 23rd hearing for the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness as my testimony.

Number one as a housewife and mother I am interested in seeing our wilderness preserved so that my sons ages four and five might enjoy some of the wonderful experiences I have had so much pleasure from; such as seeing bear, elk and deer in its natural surroundings, as well as other wild game.

Secondly, through my job I have realized how many people come to our state from every corner of the United States to get away from air-pollution, riots, skyscrapers and crowded streets to relax and enjoy our natural beauty, fishing and hunting grounds.

We think of Miami, Los Angeles and Las Vegas as a "vacation" place—these people think of our land as a wonderful place. We take our land for granted—where these people cherish this as a place of sanctity!

Is logging potential enough to destroy this? I don't think so!

Are the roads proposed for this area necessary? Even tests have proven much of the soil unstable for logging and heavy travel.

Are trails that inexcessible? Hardly—when a six year old can ride on horse back 20 miles in and another 20 out; or when a 65 year old man can hunt twenty miles from the nearest road after just having major surgery.

Do we have the proposed money to spend to destroy something so wonderful and cherished by so many people?

I don't believe so—and I believe testimony from Montanans and all other states will prove my faith.

BONITA L. AIBISTON.

FAIRFIELD, MONT.

I firmly believe keeping our beautiful wilderness as it is.

BERT VANDER JAGT.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.

I do not think we should make any other improvements in any of our beautiful Montana mountains of wilderness areas. Lets keep Montana rugged and beautiful.

Sincerely,

ARLEE VANDER JAGT.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 3, 1968.*

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
President of Great Falls Chapter,
Montana Wilderness Association.

DEAR SIR: In regards to the Lincoln-Scapegoat area, I am highly in favor of making this a Wilderness Area and preserving it as it is today.

I have packed in to this country on hunting trips off and on for several years with good results and would definitely like to see it stay as it is.

If this area is opened up for roads and motor driven vehicles it will not only spoil it but will be another leg closer to our present Bob Marshall Wilderness Area which some of our public want to get into with cars, etc. When this happens—it will be spoiled for everyone and another dump grounds for beer cans and other debris.

I am not a rich man, but with a little enjoyable effort I have been over the most of our back country and so can others if they want back there bad enough.

Also this country is of little use except for wild game and sightseeing which brings a lot of revenue to the State of Montana.

I could go on and on about this subject but this letter was limited to 300 words and I would run out of paper before I finished, so I hope these few words will help.

Thank you for listening,

ROY WOLVERTON.

DOLORES, COLO.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: We wish to add our urging that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area be preserved as wilderness area. True, as part of the National Forest lands, it belongs to the people of the United States, so should it not be preserved for them in its virgin state? There is so little virgin country left now for those citizens who wish to seek it and present trends continuing virgin land will grow more scarce, while increasing numbers seek its solitude and beauty.

Thank you

(Mrs.) WALTER HINES.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I wish to add my voice to those in favor of establishing the Lincoln-Scapegoat area as a wilderness area.

As a Montana native, now transplanted in California, I am well aware of the need to preserve what we can of our nation's beauty. Every summer that we are able, we return to Montana to hike, back-pack, fish and generally enjoy Montana's relatively unspoiled forest areas. I say relatively because every year I notice with dismay more roads, more cabins, loggers—in general more development into our forest areas.

Because I have loved and enjoyed Montana so much I feel a deep obligation to do what I can to preserve her beauties for my children and the generations to come. I can see no better way than through the establishment of Wilderness Areas, and I can think of no area more worthy than the Lincoln Back Country.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) ALEC G. PETRIE.

CAMERON, MONT., *May 26, 1968.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a licensed outfitter and guide, I would like to see the Lincoln Back Country preserved. If they keep changing all of this back country there won't be anything left for the younger generation.

Sincerely yours,

DARYL STROUND.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Hon. Senator BURDICK:

I would like to enter my statement in the records for the preservation of the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat area as a wilderness.

Knowing the area as an amateur back packer, this peaceful and fragile country would soon deteriorate, as most areas have that has been opened to the populous for mass recreation.

Being one of the last strong hold of the grizzly bear and species of native trout, let us save some of our outdoor heritage for future generations.

This area being on National Forest land would cost nothing to acquire, and no funds to maintain.

CLARK C. GUILE.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Hon. Senator BURDICK:

I would like to enter my statement in the records for the preservation of the Lincoln Back Country-Scapegoat area as a wilderness.

This is beautiful gentle country, very fragile with the only marks of man the forest trails and a few campsites. In our crowded civilization we need these havens from the rush and clutter.

I derive great spiritual strength from my experiences in this country and hope my children and grandchildren can do the same. To spend a few days being self-sufficient gives one composure to live in our high-pressure society.

The land is in National Forest land and would require no funds to acquire or maintain as a Wilderness.

MRS. CLARK C. GUILE.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 6, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Great Falls, Mont.

I would like to go on record favoring adding the Lincoln-Scapegoat area to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

We must do something to preserve a portion of our great heritage for the future generations.

Sincerely

JOHN E. HOLLAR, Jr.

OMAHA, NEBR., *June 10, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: It has come to my attention that a hearing is being held on the disposition of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back Country. I would like to voice my support in the efforts to preserve this area as a part of the National Wilderness Preservation System and I sincerely hope that this venture is successful.

Sincerely

PAUL D. SHERVEY.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 24, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Field Hearing for the Lincoln Back Country,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am a hiker and a back-packer, and I enjoy getting away from people into beautiful country with mountains and lakes, wild flowers and wildlife. I think the Lincoln Back Country is such a place, ideally suited to Wilderness use by hikers and horsepackers, and easily accessible from the road ends between Great Falls and Lincoln.

I think this country is too fragile to stand the impact of mass recreation with roads and campgrounds. And it would be a crime to spoil this area by logging it off in big blocks and scarring it with logging roads. I don't think "bull dozed America" should include the Lincoln Back Country. Please let's add this to the Bob Marshall Wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

CARLEY MCCANLAY.

BIGFORK, MONT., *May 6, 1968.*

SENATOR METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I think the Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness proposal a wonderful idea.

I'm for it 100 percent.

We need more roadless areas like the Bob Marshall Wilderness, where we can get away from motors, bikes, automobiles, etc.

We have too many mountain roads and clear cuts now which take away the cover needed by animals. I'm a native of this area and have watched the distruction of so many of our wilderness areas. I have worked with the wild life organization, especially the recreation areas of the past 17 years and do hope more can be done for the conservation of our natural resources.

Very respectfully yours,

ERNEST M. WEED.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 4, 1968.*

DEAR MR. CHURCH: I am dropping a few very important lines in regards to the Bob Marshall area. I am very in favor of making this area a permanent wilderness area. I am a lifelong resident of Montana and have fished the past 20 years. While we still have the time to keep and preserve an area as this lets do it and do it now. I have 2 young children and hope that someday they will enjoy the joys of the outdoors as I have.

In regards to the lumber industry I get very perturbed to see some of the logged out areas ruined for good so I hope you can persuade this area to become a wilderness area. My wife feels the same.

TOM BUGNI.

OVANDO, MONT., *June 13, 1968.*

DEAR MR. RODGERS: We live close to the Lincoln-Scapegoat area. The Bob Marshall Wilderness is the object of conversation and planning and participation of pack trips whenever time and togetherness would allow members of our family to go. We all hope to do some more serious examining of the great Scapegoat this summer before school starts.

It is a sad thing to see the slaughter of timber and scalped mountains and sincerely hope that the area you folks hope to keep in its natural state will be allowed to so remain. Too rapidly the wild beauty is being marred by the results of human carlessness this area is part of home to all of us and a pleasure to all who have been able to come and enjoy some time in the peace and quiet.

May God guide and bless all of you as you strive to keep this primitive area in its natural state.

ED ELLEN KAREN.
CHARLES GEARY.
JOHN YORK.
FORBY JONES.

HELENA, MONT., *June 9, 1968.*

DEAR SIR: As avid campers and hikers we are very interested in wilderness areas. We are in favor of the Lincoln-Scapegoat area and hope for the passage of this bill.

Yours truly,

JOYCE AND JIM STEFFECH AND FAMILY.

WOLF CREEK, MONT., *September 16, 1968.*

SENATOR METCALF: I would like for this letter to be made a part of the hearing record.

I am very much in favor of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness. Having packed and guided in this area, and the Bob Marshall Wilderness for the past nine years, I know how important this area is to anyone interested in wilderness.

Once roads and logging are started and scooters and snowmobiles are allowed this country is lost to Wilderness forever.

There is certainly enough mountain country in Montana for these activities without taking the Lincoln-Scapegoat country too.

RON MILLS.

BILLINGS, MONT., *May 27, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Care of Livingston Rodgers, Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Count me in as one who wishes to save the Lincoln Back Country. I only wish I could speak for generations to come in our family for these areas will be an even greater treasure to them.

We are ardent outdoorsmen and cherish the times spent in our few available wilderness areas. Oh, how I wish there were more of them for my children and my children's children to enjoy. I wish we could preserve the majestic mountains, wild flowers, trout streams, and game for man to delight in. There are so few areas unspoiled by the foolish man who doesn't know their value.

Man is closer to God in the great outdoors and in nature he speaks easily to Him. If we allow the Lincoln Back Country to be scarred and destroyed by industry we are destroying one of God's great cathedrals.

Sincerely,

MRS. JANICE HEINRICH.

KALISPELL, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
% Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Because of the tremendous increase in use of public lands and recreational areas it is imperative that wilderness be expanded while it is still available and where it is available.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area as proposed is one of the finest areas remaining. Its best use for the most people for the longest period would be for recreation.

Events of the past few years, the attitudes of many of our citizens, the general health of the nation clearly indicate a definite need for more recreation. Most of the East and West Coast areas are becoming crowded. A heavy influx of people seeking recreation and a chance to get away from the congested areas are coming to Montana.

There is no doubt that the Lincoln-Scapegoat area if made into Wilderness will be a great attraction for Montana.

Recreation can and will become Montana's largest industry if our wilderness areas are protected and the recreation potential is property utilized.

Sincerely,

DALLAS F. EKLUND.

AUGUSTA, MONT.

DEAR MR. LIVINGSTON RODGERS: I would like very much to see the Scapegoat area and the Lincoln Back Country left as it is and put in to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area.

There will never be another chance to do so, and the area which are already crossed by roads will never have a chance to be returned to a wilderness.

The Scapegoat area is a pretty and rough country which is one of the last strong holds of the grizzle bear in the United States except for Alaska, and other wild life as elk, goats and deer. It is a place where you can hunt all day and seldom ever run into another hunter, these places are getting harder to find every year. Roads would ruin it for ever as a place to get away from the roads and civilization. As a packer and guide in these area, I would give my full support to put these country into the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and back Senators Mansfield and Metcalf on the bill S. 1121.

Yours Truly,

GENE SWANSON.

HELENA, MONT., *June 2, 1968.*

HONORABLE SENATOR: The Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area must be preserved for Montanans and others to enjoy today and for years to come.

Our modern society is full of daily pressures and expectations that increase each year. We need more designated areas for recreational purposes where we can hie away from the rush of activities to exercise muscles. We need to "commune with nature" so that we take time for introspection.

Nature has its own laws and the balance of animals and vegetation make slow, deliberate changes. Humans need to be close to and take lessons from nature.

Help us preserve Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area!

Sincerely,

PAULA T. JANK.

LINCOLN, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the Lincoln-Scapegoat hearing, which is to be held June 11, 1968, in Great Falls, I wish to express my views. Since childhood—I am now well past 70 years of age—I have been an ardent outdoor person, and feel that the remaining few virgin areas should be left as nature made them.

I request that this letter be made part of this hearing.

Yours truly,

FRED TUTJEN.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 22, 1968.*

HONORABLE SENATOR METCALF: Part of testimony for Lincoln-Scapegoat area:

My husband has lived here for 15 years and myself for 4 years.

We feel that if the Senate Bill 1121 doesn't go through, the Lincoln Back Country will be destroyed. By destroyed we mean, that people using this road and such will probably end up with nothing but litter and man-made forest fires. Not only do we want this area to remain without a road, but the person and persons who make a living at packing back to this Back Country each year at this time will make no money for the winter.

Lincoln is mostly a tourist area especially the back country. Folks come from all over the country to pack back there and enjoy the beautiful wilderness and hunting. Any road built in Lincoln area destroys the beautiful Landscape as well as the hunting and animals.

So therefore, we are for the Senate Bill 1121.

Yours truly,

ROBERT K. MCCLURE, Jr.
NANA MCCLURE.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 31, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
P.O. Box 1159,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: Having given a lot of consideration to the proposal of setting aside or incorporating the Lincoln-Scapegoat area into a wilderness, I am firmly convinced that it should be designated as wilderness area.

I hope that this note will enable you to present my feelings to all persons interested in retaining this area in its natural state for future generations.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. DRAPER.

HELENA, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

DEAR MR. METCALF: Our country needs all the wilderness areas it can preserve. Until our citizens develop social techniques to live amicably in cities (as I write this Senator Kennedy lies on an operating table) many of us need to visit such areas to replenish our serenity. If we ever (and I doubt we will) develop psychologically to the point where we can live like sardines in cities in harmony and love, then one can use the reserved wilderness areas as museums.

For whatever purpose recreation of self or as museums of the future wilderness must be preserved.

I work with anxious parents all days and some nights. From a purely personal angle I need to escape to the mountains where there are no phones and no machines.

Best wishes,

BELLE C. RICHARDS, M.D.

LINCOLN, MONT., *May 31, 1968.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Post Office Box 1159,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I have a letter from Mr. Garland informing of the hearing on the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness (proposed) to be added to the Bob Marshall Wilderness. To my mind this most important and urgent bill should be passed before it is too late. I have lived in the mountains most of my life and am

opposed to the building of garbage avenues and beer can boulevards (roads) in our National Forests.

A wilderness exploited and spoiled is forever spoiled. Let us have a few places where we can get away from polluted air and filthy water, where one can live a moment with God and see some of his work not turned into hell by our so called progress. I would like to have the Senators and Representatives at this hearing to be informed of my views.

Sincerely,

AXEL H. BILLQUIST.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *September 22, 1968.*

HONORABLE SENATOR METCALF: Part of testimony for Lincoln Scapegoat area. I have lived in the Lincoln area all my life, and I'm for Senate Bill 1121.

Yours truly,

ALLAN P. PARTZAHN.

HONORABLE SENATOR BURDICK: I believe very strongly that our wilderness areas should be kept intact and not opened up to be exploited by private business concerns. These private concerns would turn this beautiful natural area into an arid waste land not fit for human or animal use.

Sincerely yours,

BARRY REUTERDAHL.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *September 21, 1968.*

(Attention of Cecil Garland.)

DEAR SIR: As a non-resident hunting in your western states for the last ten years, and hunting at the present time for elk your state in area 280.

I am opposed to making access roads in your proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat wilderness area.

To conserve your natural resources is of prime importance for the future.

Thank you.

RICHARD E. KUZDAS.

HELENA, MONT., *June 6, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: We are disappointed to hear that "very few" letters in favor of Bill 1121 and the one for keeping the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and placing them in the wilderness system have been received.

Through the past years we have been on many pack trips, through these areas—especially the Bob Marshall once all over it, past and around the "Chinese Wallet."

It would be tragic if these beautiful places were not saved from commercialization, for all of us and for the future and many friends from all over the country love them.

Sincerely yours,

BERTA YOUNG.

BOULDER, MONT., *May 3, 1968.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: In 1944 I saw smog in Los Angeles, a new problem kill several emphysematous children on the few days a year it bothered.

In 1968 several days of smog obliterated Helena and on three days it bothered Boulder, a mountain village at 5,000 feet.

Air, water, and sound pollution are destroying us. But odors invade, cars proliferate, trees fall, ad infinitum.

Please, please protect and enlarge our wilderness, the only clean areas we still have. Support the Lincoln Back Country wilderness designation.

PHILIP D. PALLISTER, M.D.

TOSTON, MONT., *May 31, 1968.*

SENATOR METCALF: I will be unable to attend the June 11th Hearing in Great Falls on the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness Area.

Please present this letter in support of this proposed wilderness area.

I could write a long letter stating reasons why I support this but I will list only a few to develop this area would endanger our grizzley bear population.

We (the people in Montana) definitely need these wilderness areas such as this Lincoln-Scapegoat area. These areas are becoming less and less once these areas are opened to logging and logging roads I feel then are lost forever for I have seen many times the mess that results.

I feel that these areas will have a great economic value not only now but in the future where if an area is developed such as for logging I feel it's economic value lasts only a few years and the condition of the land is sometimes lost forever.

This is all I will say for now.

Please feel free to ask for more support if needed.

Thank you,

FRANKLIN SLIFKA.

JUNE 6, 1968.

LIVINGSTON RODGERS,
Montana Wilderness Association,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIRS: Being a rancher, I'm urging all persons, interested in better hunting, for the sportsmen. So making this Lincoln Back Country wilderness area, would help our game have a place to roam away from roads and hunters driving up to them in cars and trucks. Ruining are beautiful back country, in which all Montana should be proud of, is what this passing this bill would do.

Any one wishing to go in this beautiful back country can do so. There are dude ranchers in business to do this. The services are something people are missing, not taking this trip in the back country away from roads, see the game unafraid, living in this beautiful untouched wilderness.

What a wonderful thing it would be making this back country part of the Bob Marshall Wilderness; let's all back our Senators Mansfield and Metcalf on legislation (S. 1121).

BUD SWANSON.
OPAL SWANSON.

AURORA, ILL., *May 28, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like this letter to be made part of the hearing, regarding the Lincoln-Scapegoat hearing.

I have personally made many trips from here to the mentioned area. My family and myself regard this region to be one of the few left in this country that is available without being able to drive into such, as a park or forest reserve.

Highways or roads of any sort in this area would destroy the value of it, removing what it has been in the past.

If this area is made accessible to everyone what wishes to see nature from the front seat of an auto, then it becomes one of thousands. We have plenty of them. Please do not let this happen. We have so few areas left such as this, so when they are gone then there is no reclamation.

There is thousands of people that do not want to see nature from an auto, camper or trailer, so where do they go? Canada? Alaska? Australia?

Please help protect this area and let it remain as is. The rangers and their help has maintained excellent care of trails and has maintained various streams and camp sites, that are numerous, and close to the area without having to penetrate it.

So there is ample accommodations available for this type of nature lover or fisherman or hunter.

Your help is desperately needed to protect this area. You will have many people with you on this matter and I personally will be glad to be of service in any way possible.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM GARLAND.

RONAN, MONT., *May 22, 1968.*

MR. CECIL GARLAND,
Lincoln Back Country Wilderness Association,
Lincoln, Mont.

DEAR MR. GARLAND: I saw in the paper where the Montana Fish and Game Commission also want the Lincoln Back Country as part of our wilderness system. I would like to level my name in support of your work. It is also to be hoped that the Mission Mountains Area may also in time become a part of the vast primitive area of Northern Montana.

Yours truly,

ART AYLESWORTH,
Associate in Business Analysis, Northwestern National Life.

LINCOLN, MONT.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR: Please include my name with those who wish to save the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness area for its natural beauty.

I am in favor of your bill S. 1121 which favors the inclusion of this area in the Bob Marshall Wilderness area and excludes it from logging, commercialization camping and summer homes.

Logging roads are already built in to the base of Red Mountain and that is far enough into this primitive area.

Yours truly,

H. H. FISHER.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *August 31, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to go on record expressing my feelings about the Lincoln Back Country.

For the past 10 years I have been visiting Lincoln, Montana, and the "Back Country." Five years ago I purchased a little ranch west of Lincoln about 3 miles.

The basic reason for purchasing this ranch was for a headquarters for my family and friends to have and use before packing into the Lincoln Back Country.

The day roads and vehicles go into that great country, I'm selling the ranch and heading for the remote areas of Canada.

The greatest asset Montana holds for me and my family is the Lincoln Back Country. If you destroy this great, quiet, peaceful country with roads and vehicles you destroy Montana for me, my family, and friends.

Please consider and reconsider before you allow legislation to pass that would let this great area pass with it.

Best regards,

MARSHALL S. ASHCROFT.

HELENA, MONT.

HON. SENATOR BURDICK: Would very much like to see the Lincoln Back Country stay in its present state.

Having used this area many times, its great beauty lies in the fact that it is not mutilated by logging, mining and motorized vehicles.

Sincerely,

LEROY OEWARF.

Senator METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Field Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I wish to go on record as being in favor of the Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness.

Our Back Country is fading away much too fast and this area is one that should be preserved for the future.

The timber is not of a high quality and would not pay for the cost of roads and harvest.

I strongly urge you to get this area made a wilderness.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE VORHUS.

LINCOLN, MONT., *September 18, 1968.*

SENATOR LEE METCALF: I wish to make this letter part of the hearing record and support S. 1121.

My wife and I hate to see the Lincoln Wilderness area opened representative as it seems over primitive areas are slowly vanishing, and these are one of the natural God-given things we have left.

We are residents of Lincoln and so we are raising our family here, and we would like for them to be able to enjoy this area as we have.

Thanking you,

We remain,

Mr. and Mrs. ELMER W. STOKES.

HELENA, MONT., *June 8, 1968.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
Box 1159, Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Let me begin with a quote by Joseph Wood Krutch who has stated in words far better than most:

"Our civilization is rapidly becoming one in which only two values are recognized—power and amusement.

"It would be a pity if the last refuges where man can enter into another kind of relation with the natural world should be improved out of existence."

The Lincoln-Scapegoat country is such a refuge and deserves protection in the Wilderness System. Sure one can measure the economic values of lumber, mines, and cattle (although in this case they are small) but what value can one place on a priceless wilderness heritage? Support S. 1121 and H.R. 7148.

Sincerely,

DAVID SHANER.

KALIPELL, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

Senator LEE METCALF,
Care of Livingston Rodgers,
P.O. Box 1159,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing to you in support of the proposed Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness. This area is comparatively small in proportion to the land being used for other purposes. This nation can well afford to set aside the area of recreation.

To be more accurate this nation cannot afford to allow the beautiful and delicate area be destroyed. The best use for this area from all standpoint in recreation. The economic return through the year will be tremendous and the unmeasurable return from the people involved will be very great.

I strongly urge the preservation of this area.

Sincerely,

IRA NEWBURG.

BIGFORK, MONT., *June 5, 1968.*

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: In reference to Lincoln-Scapegoat area proposed for Wilderness Status.

I feel very strongly that this area should be a wilderness area. Since most of this area is primarily recreation type area with very little other use, I certainly hope you will use your influence to give it the protection which wilderness status would provide. Surely we are poor nationally in this type area and should try to preserve as much as possible.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED C. ARVIDSON.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 21, 1968.*

To Whom It May Concern:

I personally feel a wilderness area should be created in the Lincoln Back Country.

I left the State of Michigan 14 years ago for basically one reason. There really was no place you could go without standing on someones shoulders.

I want to be able to put a pack on my back and walk into beautiful country without having to jump off the trail because of some lousy motorcycle creating a heck of a racket.

The tenderfoot country is a prime example of motorcycle madness. Years ago (5 or 6) this country was gorgeous. Now go to Monument Peak and start walking. Count the machines that make this trip. Look at the hillsides with the trails cut into them by spinning wheels. Ask the riders why they don't walk and enjoy the magnificant scenery and all they tell you is "Why should I take 4 hours to walk somewhere when I can *ride* there in 30 minutes."

Give me someplace where I can walk with my family in peace and solitude. That's all I ask.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER A. HARDEBECK.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 2, 1968.*

Senate Interior and Insular Committee:

I want this statement to be made part of the hearing held in Great Falls, Montana on June 11, 1968, on Bill S. 1121.

I have hunted in the designated area of the Lincoln Scapegoat country, and feel it would be wrong to destroy this wonderful natural habitate for animals, by intruding roads, lumbering or mining into it. I want it to remain as wilderness for my future children to enjoy.

Sincerely,

ROBERT V. OAS.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 2, 1968.*

Senate Interior and Insular Committee:

Will you please include this in the hearing record on Bill S. 1121 introduced by Senators Metcalf and Mansfield, to be held in Great Falls, on June 11, 1968.

My husband has hunted in this area and I hope one day I and my children can accompany him to enjoy one small spot on earth that isn't crowded, and breath unpolluted, fresh air.

Please leave this area intact, by classifying it as a wilderness area.

Sincerely,

(MRS.) DIANE OAS.

○