on the original proposal—that this would also be the world's most ridiculous example of obsolete, outmoded, and retrogressive engineering. There can be little benefit gained either technologically or in world prestige by wasting critically needed taxpayers' dollars to build an antique teakettle.

There is no doubt that the United States already enjoys the world's leadership in development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We do not have to make ourselves appear to be foolishly striving for bigness, regardless of the contribution which such bigness might make in the refinement of reactor technology.

4. Economic studies submitted by the Atomic Energy Commission indicate that the entire capital cost of the generating facility will be paid for with interest in 9 years of dual-purpose operation.

I have already addressed myself to this point in the first part of my remarks. For this reason, I think it will be sufficient merely to reiterate that the increase in cost per kilowatt of installed capacity of almost 22 percent in this new proposal would certainly have an adverse effect on the economics of the proposition which the House has three times rejected.

Mr. Speaker, the attempts of the conferees to force half a Hanford loaf on the House of Representatives in no way negates the 10 compelling reasons listed in the separate statement attached to the Joint Committee report on the original AEC authorization bill and the position previously taken by the House of Representatives. Under the circumstances, I sincerely urge my colleagues in this body to rise in even greater force to announce that they will not tolerate such a complete disregard of the need for economy at a time when we are already involved in the most expensive defense effort we have ever undertaken. I feel it is the responsibility which every one of us has to our constituents and to the Nation to assure the most prudent and effective expenditure of Federal funds. The Hanford proposal contained in the conference report is indeed a question of waste. However, it is not a question of wasting steam, but a question of wasting more precious Federal dollars.

Pay Increases for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will amend the law relating to longevity step increases for postal workers. This bill is a companion measure to legislation previously introduced by other Members of Congress in the House and the Senate.

Over the years it has been the intent of the Congress to eliminate some of the discrimination against postal employees, and this bill will give them benefits comparable to those now enjoyed under the Classification Act by other Federal employees.

Under the law now in effect regular civil service employees receive longevity increases after 10, 13, and 16 years' service in the same grade. However, as a result of the antiquated law affecting postal employees they receive such increases only after 13, 18, and 25 years' service in grade.

The approval of this legislation will bring the benefits of postal employees more in line with those accorded other employees of the Federal Government, and will correct an inequity which has been in existence far too long.

The Senate has already acted on similar legislation, having passed S. 1459 on July 17; and I am very pleased to see that our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had referred the legislation to the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, which held hearings on the same yesterday. I am hopeful that prompt and favorable consideration of the bill can be completed in the near future.

Labor Day, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as America pauses to observe Labor Day, 1961, it is fitting that we as Americans pause to reflect upon the special meaning and significance of Labor Day this year.

In the past, the labor of our people has resulted in the strongest and freest nation which this world has yet known. It was by labor that we expanded from our earliest beginnings in New England past our western continental boundaries to those great new and far distant States of Hawaii and Alaska. But these accomplishments should not lead us to believe that our labor has ended; in fact, the challenges of today cause us to rededicate ourselves to toil not only for the benefit of our great Nation but also for the entire world.

The international challenges of today are extreme. The free world looks to us for leadership; the entire world looks to us for the establishment and endurance of a lasting peace. Therefore, on this day which we set aside to pay tribute to labors past we must pause to reflect on the Nation's future and on our world's future. For the great burden of preserving our democratic heritage rests upon the American citizen whose work and individual initiative has molded this Nation into a land of free ideals.

With a renewed dedication Americans must labor with deeper conviction than ever before that the preservation of our individual freedom and democratic principles rests upon the shoulders of Americans themselves—Americans who are dedicated to this land of opportunity and its destiny of freedom.

On this Labor Day let each man resolve to give new meaning to his labor in order that we may rise to the challenges of the day and provide a lasting peace for tomorrow.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1961

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, eternal, sure, and still omnipotent, when the world seems falling to pieces around us, and so many fair hopes are being dashed to the ground, help us in the midst of the whelming flood to stay our minds on Thee and in the strength of the everlasting values that nothing can destroy.

Through all the mystery of life, Thy strong arm alone can lead us to its mastery. Forgive us the distrust of ourselves, of life, and of Thee, and the doubts which besiege us, when, if we but had eyes to see, we would know that the heights about us are full of the chariots of God and the horsemen thereof.

As we spend our years as a tale that is told, may it be to the last page a tale of service well done, of tasks faced without flinching, of honor unsullied, and of horizons stretched out, as daily we fare forth toward journey's end when our work is done. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 1, 1961, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on Friday, September 1, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 561. An act to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1656. An act to amend chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to transmission of bets, wagers, and related information;

S. 1657. An act to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia;

S. 1983. An act to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the

world in their efforts toward economic development and internal and external security, and for other purposes; and

S. 2239. An act to amend the act to incorporate the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, approved June 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 227), in order to remove the statutory limitation on the amount of property such society may receive, purchase, hold, sell, and convey at any one time.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 4, 1961, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1983) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic development and internal and external security, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

On request of Mr. CHURCH, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Retirement of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CHURCH, and by unanimous consent, the special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Contested Nominations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON and by unanimous consent the Trading With the Enemy Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Norman Q. Brill, of California, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Saul W. Jarcho, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of representatives and alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PIG TIN

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice presently being published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 50,000 long tons of pig tin now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted at the 80th Annual Encampment of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, at Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the designation of November 19 as Dedication Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Texas Mortgage Bankers Association, relating to the service charge on FHA loans where the original amount of loan is $9,000 or less; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Polish American Congress, central and northern New York State district, at Utica, N.Y., favoring the adoption by the U.S. Government, as part of its foreign policy, the restoration of the western lands to Poland to the Rivers Oder and Niese; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY BACKS PRIVATE UTILITY CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSMISSION LINES TO SERVE THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—RESOLUTION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Upper Colorado River Commission meeting in Denver on September 1 unanimously endorsed the private utilities offer to construct the power transmission lines which will serve the upper Colorado River storage project.

It should be emphasized that the creation of the Commission was authorized and ratified by Congress when it approved an interstate compact. Four of the five members of the Commission were appointed by the Governors of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, and the Chairman is appointed by the President of the United States. The Commission was created to supervise the regulation, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

The Commission in its resolution points out that the Bureau of Reclamation has changed its so-called yardstick system to a modified system, thereby increasing the number of delivery points from 15 to 24, which will consequently reduce the irrigation assistance to states by approximately $50 million. It should be noted that the private utilities have argued for some time, based upon compelling data, that they can transmit power from the Colorado units under existing lines, thus saving an estimated $136 million Federal investment in construction costs alone.

The private utilities in the upper basin have taken the unusual action of firmly committing themselves to reducing power wheeling charges as soon as their capital investments in the wheeling fa-

cilities have been amortized. The Commission points out that "such reduced wheeling charges would substantially increase the revenues available for the basin funds as compared with the originally proposed combination system." Colorado's member of the Commission, former Senator Edwin Johnson, estimates that wheeling costs will be reduced by $146 million as a result of the action taken by the private utilities. This gives additional assurance that power can be delivered to the load centers in the upper basin States at 6 mills under the private utility proposal, as required by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution appear following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION

Whereas the Congress exercises the policy-making power of the United States; and

Whereas Congress authorized and ratified an interstate compact among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming which created a commission representing Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to supervise the regulation, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the Upper Colorado River Basin; and

Whereas the legislature of each of said five States ratified said Upper Colorado River Basin compact; and

Whereas the chairman of said commission is appointed by the President of the United States; and

Whereas the commissioners are appointed by the Governors of the said four States—each Governor naming one commissioner to serve at his pleasure; and

Whereas the utilization of the waters apportioned by said compact for the generation of hydroelectric energy is subservient to the use and consumption of such waters for agricultural and domestic purposes; and

Whereas the regulation, conservation and utilization of the waters of the said Basin requires the construction of both storage projects and participating projects; and

Whereas this development is implemented by the enactment of Public Law 485, 84th Congress, an act authorizing the Colorado River storage projects and participating projects; and

Whereas said projects will generate electric energy which will be marketed; and

Whereas the revenues from such marketing must repay the construction costs of said storage projects including electric facilities and a portion of the construction costs of said participating projects; and

Whereas the early development of the participating projects is of great importance to the progress and welfare of the Upper Basin States; and

Whereas at the hearings of the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees in 1954 and 1955 on the authorization for the construction of said Colorado River storage project and participating projects, the investor-owned electric utilities offered to wheel storage project power to preference users over their transmission systems; and

Whereas the Congress in House Report No. 1087, 84th Congress, 1st session, expressed favorable interest in these proposals and stated at page 17:

"The Department of the Interior advised the committee that it was sympathetic to the private companies' proposal and indicated that the suggestions would be given studied consideration if the project were authorized. Therefore, the committee expects the proposal by the private power companies for cooperation in the development to be carefully considered by the Department of the Interior and the electric power and energy of the projects to be marketed, so far as possible, through the facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area, provided, of course, that the power preference laws are complied with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected."

Whereas under the provisions of law certain parties are entitled to a preference for the purchase of project electric energy at the price established by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas in the Upper Colorado River Basin investor-owned and Federal transmission lines serve both preference and private users; and

Whereas the investor-owned utilities have proposed a combination transmission system with certain lines to be constructed and operated by the Federal Government and the remaining lines to be provided by the investor-owned utilities with wheeling service for Colorado River storage project energy over such lines to specified load centers; and

Whereas according to recent tables submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation changing from the yardstick to the modified system thereby increasing the number of delivery points from 15 to 24, the irrigation assistance to States has been reduced approximately $50 million; and

Whereas the controversy over the construction of transmission lines has been exceedingly detrimental to reclamation and must be resolved quickly on merit alone; and

Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission believes that the investor-owned utilities after their capital investments in wheeling facilities have been amortized should adjust their wheeling charges to cover only ad valorem taxes on such transmission facilities, plus operation, maintenance and replacement costs actually incurred; and

Whereas such reduced wheeling charges would substantially increase the revenues available for the basin fund as compared with the originally proposed combination system; and

Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission has the direct responsibility to protect the adequacy and integrity of said basin fund above other considerations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Upper Colorado River Commission, having obtained from the investor-owned utilities firm assurance that they will enter into agreements with the Bureau of Reclamation for bona fide wheeling contracts in which the utilities will limit their wheeling charges after their capital investments in said transmission facilities have been amortized or after the initial 50-year period, whichever is the earlier, to cover only actual ad valorem taxes and actual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs on transmission facilities associated with such wheeling contracts, endorses the combination proposal of the investor-owned utilities, provided that the Congress determines that under such proposal the project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected when compared with other methods of energy transmission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commission advise the Congress of this endorsement and that the Chief Engineer and Secretary of the Commission is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to members of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress and to other interested parties.

CERTIFICATE

I, Ival V. Goslin, chief engineer and secretary of the Upper Colorado River Commission, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly passed and approved by the Upper Colorado River Commission at a regularly called meeting of said Commission held at Denver, Colo., on the 1st day of September 1961.

Witness my hand this 1st day of September 1961.

IVAL V. GOSLIN,
Chief Engineer and Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARROLL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1747. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 867).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 2585. An act relating to the credits against the employment tax in the case of certain successor employers (Rept. No. 868).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Res. 144. Resolution to refer S. 1845 to the Court of Claims (S. Rept. No. 872).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 8444. An act to amend the act of August 12, 1955, relating to elections in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 869).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 2470. A bill to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Taylor Street NE., District of Columbia (Rept. No. 873).

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 1292. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 874); and

S. 1745. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 875).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 653. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a momument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 877); and

S. 2423. A bill to provide for the appointment of a representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 878).

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 870)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report, without recommendation, the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend the cloture rule by providing for adoption by a three-fifths vote, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed

on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 871)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2426) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

ESTABLISHMENT OF TEACHING HOSPITAL FOR HOWARD UNIVERSITY AND TRANSFER OF FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 876)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, without amendment, the act (H.R. 6302) to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon.

I have studied H.R. 6302 and the departmental and committee reports made concerning it at considerable length. This study convinces me that the measure has great merit.

I should mention at the outset, that I have considered this measure in the light of a possible application of the Morse formula to those provisions of it which transfer the hospital to Howard University without reimbursement. I am satisfied that the measure does not violate the Morse formula.

The Senate report accompanying H.R. 6302 indicates:

> Howard University operates under a Federal charter granted in 1867 (14 Stat. 438)—

And that—

> Pursuant to legislative enactment in 1928 (45 Stat. 1021) Howard University receives an annual appropriation from the Federal Government in partial support of its operations. In addition, the Federal Government has carried on an extensive building program at Howard to provide the university with physical facilities to conduct its work.

The fact that this great educational institution is located in the heart of our Nation's Capital, and the further fact that it receives substantial annual appropriations and other Federal assistance, makes it clear that for all practical purposes, Howard University is, in effect, a quasi-governmental institution. That being the case, the transfer of the hospital to the university bears a close analogy to an intra-Federal governmental transfer of property. Under such circumstances, the Morse formula is inapplicable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A joint resolution was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution extending recognition to the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1966 and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STABILIZATION OF THE MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1747) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF T. EMMETT CLARIE, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT (NEW POSITION)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 13, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination:

T. Emmett Clarie, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge, district of Connecticut—new position.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney, district of Delaware, term of 4 years, vice Leonard G. Hagner.

Hosea M. Ray, of Mississippi, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Mississippi, term of 4 years, vice Thomas R. Ethridge.

Donald F. Miller, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Washington, term of 4 years, vice William B. Parsons.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, September 12, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Tuesday, September 12, 1961, at 11 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

George C. Young, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge, northern and southern districts of Florida, vice George W. Whitehurst, retired.

Elmer Gordon West, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Louisiana, a new position.

Richard J. Putnam, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge, western district of Louisiana, a new position.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from an address prepared for delivery by himself over Wisconsin radio stations on September 3, 1961, on the subject "Labor as the Voice of Freedom."

Excerpts from address prepared for delivery by himself over radio station WGN, Chicago, Ill., on September 3, 1961, on the subject of "A Western Antidote to Nuclear Tests by Communists."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 415. An act for the relief of Margaret Jean Dauel;

S. 513. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Acadia*, owned by Robert J. Davis of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges;

S. 888. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in the State of Utah to Joseph A. Workman; and

S. 1012. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim of the Greif Bros. Cooperage Corp., to certain land in Marengo County, Ala.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House.

H.R. 32. An act authorizing the establishment of the Fort Smith National Historic Site, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 256. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7916) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. HOSMER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DURING 1ST SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate. The letter enclosed a copy of a statement concerning the activities of the Committee on Public Works during this session of the 87th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the enclosure be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
September 5, 1961.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: I would like to submit for your information and for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a summary of the activities of the Committee on Public Works during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

There is attached hereto a list of measures considered and approved by the committee and enacted into law, also those approved by the committee that did not become law, and a discussion of other activities of the committee.

While a large number of the measures before the committee were not enacted into law, the session was marked by many accomplishments in discharging the responsibility assigned it. The various proposals approved by the Committee on Public Works will contribute substantially to the economic well-being of the Nation.

By extending and strengthening the Federal-aid highway program; improvement of small upstream watersheds; by extending, broadening, and expanding the Federal water pollution control programs; continuing studies of additional flood control and navigation improvements; and providing for construction and alteration of Federal office and post office buildings throughout the country, will provide means for the general enhancement of the national economy, and improve the way of life of our citizens.

Two measures approved by the committee are of national interest and worthy of special mention, and their principal provisions are discussed more fully in the data following; these are the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, and the Internal Revenue Code and highway trust fund amendments, provide the necessary authorization and funds for bringing the Federal-aid program for the Interstate Highway System back on the schedule originally adopted in 1956. This act provides authorization for completion of the system as presently estimated, and provides revenue to go into the highway trust fund sufficient to meet the obligations for its completion by 1972. Completion of this system will contribute to our economic welfare, serve the national defense, and improve the safety of our highways, thus reducing accidents, loss of human life, and the tremendous damages and property losses caused by the hazards of our existing highways.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments will expand and support the aid in technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and in providing limited Federal grants for construction of sewage and waste treatment facilities by States, interstate agencies, and municipalities. It will go far in alleviating the present problem of pollution of our streams and protection of the urgently needed supply of water for the rapidly expanding population of our Nation.

The work and accomplishments of the committee were made possible by the work and diligence of the chairmen of the various subcommittees, and the excellent cooperation of all the committee members. To those members, and to you, I wish to express my appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered in connection with the work of the committee, and in securing passage of the many measures by the Senate.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, 87th Cong.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS ENACTED INTO LAW—PUBLIC LAWS

No.	Date approved	Provisions	Estimated cost
9	Mar. 29, 1961	Authorize beach erosion control project for shore in San Diego County, Calif.	$1,498,000
61	June 29, 1961	The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961—Amend Federal-aid highway laws to make certain adjustments in the highway program, and for other purposes.	11,560,000,000
88	July 20, 1961	Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961—Extends and expands the authorization for grants to States and interstate agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.	630,000,000
184	Aug. 30, 1961	Modification of the project for damages to levee and drainage districts on Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., with particular reference to the Kings Lake Drainage District, Missouri.	80,000

BILLS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PASSED BY SENATE

Bill No.	Date passed	Provisions	Estimated cost
S. Res. 16	Feb. 13, 1961	To authorize the Committee on Public Works to employ additional temporary personnel and providing additional funds for the committee.	$125,000
S. 48	June 12, 1961	To authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas.	0
S. 49	do	To provide for annual audits of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for filling vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes.	0
S. 51	July 7, 1961	To provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space, to carry out remodeling and renovation of the east and west wings of the White House, and the Old State, War, and Navy Building.	13,270,000
S. 340	Aug. 14, 1961	To authorize the Chief of Engineers to enter into a contract with the Standing Rock and Cheyenne River Indian Tribes for clearing portions of the Oahe Reservoir area.	0
S. 811	June 13, 1961	To establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission	0
S. 931	July 7, 1961	To repeal that part of the act of Mar. 2, 1889, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title.	0
S. 1742	Aug. 21, 1961	To extend the provisions of the Federal Disaster Relief Act to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters.	0
S. 2295	do	To amend the act entitled "An act for the organization, improvement, and maintenance of the National Zoological Park" approved Apr. 30, 1890.	0

REPORTED BY COMMITTEE

S. 1563	Aug. 16, 1961 (reported)	To authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Ga.-S.C., to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes.	0

The committee adopted 3 resolutions providing Federal office building surveys at specified locations, and 41 resolutions authorizing review surveys of streams and localities for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes at various localities throughout the Nation.

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, Public Law 249, 86th Cong.

NEW BUILDINGS

Location	Project	Estimated cost	Location	Project	Estimated cost
Calexico, Calif.	Border patrol station	$375,000	St. Paul, Minn.	Courthouse and Federal office building.	$11,673,000
Los Angeles-Long Beach area, California.	Customhouse	3,250,000	Harrisburg, Pa.	do	7,470,000
Jacksonville, Fla.	Federal office building	9,573,000	Philadelphia, Pa.	do	42,680,000
Marianna, Fla.	Post office and courthouse	633,000	Del Rio, Tex.	Border patrol station	342,000
St. Petersburg, Fla.	Federal office building	5,325,000	Do.	Sector headquarters, border patrol	535,000
Macon, Ga.	Post office and Federal office building.	4,334,000	Charlottesville, Va.	Federal office building	2,333,000
Porthill, Idaho	Border station	152,000	Spokane, Wash.	Courthouse and Federal office building.	8,694,000
Louisville, Ky.	Federal office building	13,100,000	Washington, D.C.	Federal Office Building No. 5	42,000,000
Houlton, Maine	Border patrol headquarters	410,000	Total estimated cost (20 buildings).		156,542,000
Harvard area, Massachusetts.	Civil defense headquarters	3,000,000			
Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.	Border station	312,000			
Pigeon River, Minn.	do	351,000			

ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING BUILDINGS

Sacramento, Calif.	Post office and courthouse	$1,059,000	Grand Forks, N. Dak.	Post office and courthouse	$370,000
San Francisco, Calif.	Appraisers building	709,000	Oklahoma City, Okla.	do	879,000
Chicago, Ill.	Federal building	2,044,000	Portland, Oreg.	Courthouse	269,100
Do.	Main post office	3,890,000	Do.	Interior building	1,442,000
Do.	Railroad Retirement Building	1,468,000	Philadelphia, Pa.	Pennsylvania Athletic Club Building	704,000
Louisville, Ky.	Post office and customhouse	1,209,000	Do.	5000 Wissahickon Ave.	5,296,000
Owensboro, Ky.	do	337,000	Knoxville, Tenn.	Post office and courthouse	462,000
New Orleans, La.	do	3,872,000	Dallas, Tex.	Federal office building	819,000
Do.	Federal office building	1,415,000	Houston, Tex.	Post office and courthouse	1,518,000
Bethesda, Md.	National Institutes of Health	2,328,000	Arlington, Va.	Pentagon building	6,915,000
Detroit, Mich.	Post office and courthouse	4,628,000	Washington, D.C.	Agriculture building	3,538,000
Grand Rapids, Mich.	do	831,000	Do.	Treasury building	2,386,000
Minneapolis, Minn.	Federal office building	1,129,000	Federal buildings at 26 locations throughout the country.	Court facilities	11,970,000
Do.	Post office and garage	595,200			
Grand Island, Nebr.	Post office and courthouse	364,000			
Jersey City, N. J.	Post office	228,000			
New York, N.Y.	General post office	1,168,000	Total estimated cost (31 alterations).		67,882,300
Do.	Vesey Street Federal Office Building	4,040,000			

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Cong., as amended

Project	Estimated Federal cost	Date approved	Project	Estimated Federal cost	Date approved
Magma Creek, Ariz.	$2,544,500	May 31, 1961	Middle-South Branch, Forest River, N. Dak.	$1,148,508	Aug. 15, 1961
Muddy Fork, Illinois River, Ark.	710,500	Do.	Sallisaw Creek, Okla.	4,552,584	Do.
Big Sandy Creek, Colo.	871,374	Aug. 15, 1961	Beaver Creek, Oreg.	832,400	Do.
Bull Creek, Ga.	1,849,300	May 31, 1961	Camp Rice Arroyo, Tex.	395,300	May 31, 1961
South River, Ga.	853,703	Aug. 15, 1961	Lower Plum Creek, Tex.	3,303,900	Do.
Seven Mile Creek, Ill.	190,200	May 31, 1961	Twin Parks watershed, Wisconsin	778,325	Aug. 15, 1961
Middle Fork, Anderson River, Ind.	1,004,480	Aug. 15, 1961			
Fall River, Kans.	4,188,800	May 31, 1961	Total	24,367,074	
Bayou Rapides, La.	1,143,200	Do.			

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1961

TITLE I

(Public Law 61, 87th Cong.)

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 provides for completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways on the schedule originally authorized by the Congress in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, by authorizing a firm program of annual appropriations for apportionment to the States, based on the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System submitted to Congress earlier this year, as outlined in House Document No. 49, 87th Congress.

Section 108(d) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 provided that apportionment of funds to the States for financing construction of the Interstate System for fiscal years 1958 and 1959 would be made on the basis of existing law, and that apportionments for fiscal years 1960 through 1969, inclusive, would be made to the States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing the system in all the States. These cost estimates used in making the apportionments were to be based on detailed studies and submitted to Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958, and revised at periodic intervals during the life of the program. Apportionments made on this basis are commonly referred to as the needs formula for apportionment.

Pursuant to section 108(d) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the Secretary of Commerce submitted to Congress on January 7, 1958, a State-by-State estimate of cost for completing the Interstate System, which was published as House Document No. 300, 85th Congress, and used as a basis for apportionment to the States of funds authorized for such systems for the fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Section 102 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 gives approval to the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System transmitted to the Congress on January 11, 1961, and published as House Document No. 49, 87th Congress, as a basis for apportioning to the States the funds authorized for the Interstate System for fiscal years 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966.

The existing law has authorized the appropriation of a total of $25.440 billion for payment of the Federal share of the cost of completing the Interstate System. The 1961 cost estimate indicates that the total cost of completing the Interstate System will be $41 billion, of which $37 billion is the estimated Federal share. Section 103 of Public Law 61, 87th Congress, increased the total authorized amount from $25.440 billion to $37 billion. No changes are made in the authorizations through fiscal year 1962. From 1963 through 1969, authorizations were increased by varying amounts, and new authorizations were made for fiscal years 1970 and 1971. The total increase in authorizations was $11.560 billion.

Section 111 of title 23, United States Code, authorizes a State or political subdivision thereof to use the airspace above and below the established gradeline of the highway pavement of the Interstate System for the parking of motor vehicles. Section 104 of Public Law 61 allows a State or political subdivision to use the airspace above and below the highway not only for parking, but for other purposes as well, and to permit the use of such space by others, provided that such use does not impair the full use and safety of the highway, or otherwise interfere in any way with the free flow of traffic on the Interstate System. This airspace could thus be utilized for parking and other purposes by States, municipalities, or private interests granted permission for such use by appropriate authority, subject to the conditions relating to safety of the highways and the free flow of traffic, and to rules and regulations prescribed and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce under existing law. This section would also authorize the Secretary of Commerce to revise agreements made prior to the date of enactment of Public Law 61, upon application, and in conformance with existing law, as amended.

Section 105 of Public Law 61 authorizes the use of funds appropriated for defense ac-

cess roads to pay the cost of repairing damage caused to highways by the operation of vehicles and equipment in the construction of classified military installations and facilities for ballistic missiles, if the Secretary of Commerce determines that the State highway department of any State is, or has been unable to prevent such damage by restrictions upon the use of such highways without interference with, or delay in, the completion of a contract for the construction of such military reservations or installations. This provision applies to damage caused by construction work commenced prior to June 1, 1961, and still in progress on that date and construction work which is commenced or for which a contract is awarded on or after June 1, 1961.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 provided for regulation of outdoor advertising signs or displays within 660 feet of the highway rights-of-way of the Interstate System, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, in compliance with agreements with the States that they will regulate such advertising. Where outdoor advertising is so controlled by the States, the Federal share of construction of projects will be increased by one-half of 1 percent to 90.5 percent, provided that the agreements pursuant to the law had been entered into with the States prior to July 1, 1961. Section 106 of Public Law 61 extended the date within which agreements with the States relative to the regulation of outdoor advertising could be entered into from July 1, 1961, to July 1, 1963.

TITLE II

Title II of Public Law 61 was considered by the Committee on Finance. It contains adequate financing provisions for completion of the Federal-aid highway program on the basis of the latest estimates for completing the Interstate System, and for increasing the apportionments for the A–B–C program to a level of $1 billion per year.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

(Public Law 88, 87th Cong.)

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961 extend the authorizations for grants to States and interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing, constructing, and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution. It enlarges, expands, and extends the present Federal water pollution control law and programs, to further the efforts of over 50 years by the many Federal, State, municipal, health and sanitary officials, and others, in control of pollution of our Nation's waters. The law provides the Federal Government working in a joint effort with State and local authorities, the necessary means to alleviate the present waste of our water supplies through pollution.

Public Law 88 expands and extends the grants to the States and interstate agencies for study and establishment of water pollution control programs; includes a provision for inclusion of storage for regulation of streamflow in planning reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of water quality control; authorizes funds for research and demonstration of methods and procedures for treating municipal sewage and wastes; authorizes establishment and equipping field laboratories and research facilities at seven locations in the United States, and research and study of the water quality of the Great Lakes; increases annual Federal grants to the States for construction of sewage and waste treatment works, in both total amounts and the amount for individual projects; makes the Davis-Bacon Act applicable to projects for which grants have been made; provides that interstate or navigable waters shall be subject to abatement under the act; strengthens the enforcement provisions of the law; amends the Water Supply Act of 1958 to permit the Federal agency concerned to make its own determination of future water supply needs and include the determined capacity in reservoir projects, without definite contractual commitments from States or local interests.

More detailed discussion of the amendments follow:

The first section of Public Law 88 places the responsibility for administration of water pollution control activities and enforcement measures directly with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, rather than the Surgeon General.

Section 2 grants authority to Federal agencies to give consideration in the survey or planning of any reservoir to inclusion of storage for streamflow regulation for water quality purposes. Such storage and releases is not to be provided as a substitute for adequate treatment of sewage and other waste-controlling methods at the source. A determination would be made of the benefits of such capacity and an appropriate share of the cost allocated to this purpose. Beneficiaries would be determined and if the benefits are widespread or national in scope, the costs of such capacity would be nonreimbursable.

Section 3 removes the limitation of $100,000 that could be used to establish and maintain research fellowships, but requires the Secretary to report annually to Congress on his operations under that provision of the law.

This section also authorizes the Secretary to develop and demonstrate under varied conditions: (1) Practicable means of treating sewage and other wastes to remove the maximum amounts of pollutants in order to restore and maintain the Nation's water at a quality suitable for repeated reuse; (2) improved methods and procedures for identifying and measuring effects of pollutants on water uses, including new pollutants; (3) methods for evaluating the effects of augmented streamflow on water quality and water uses to control water pollution not susceptible to other means of abatement for these purposes. An authorization of not more than $5 million per year and a total authorization of $25 million is provided.

This section further authorizes the establishment and maintenance of field laboratory and research facilities, including, but not limited to, one in the Northeast area, one in the Middle Atlantic area, one in the Southeast area, one in the Midwest area, one in the Southwest area, one in the Pacific Northwest, and one in Alaska. Provision is also included for research, studies, and technical development work, with respect to the quality of waters of the Great Lakes, including an analysis of water quality under varying conditions of waste treatment and disposal.

Section 4 increases the grants to States and interstate water pollution control agencies for the operation of their programs from $3 million to $5 million, and extended such authorizations through June 30, 1968.

Section 5 provides that no construction grant may be made for any project in and an amount exceeding 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof, or $600,000, whichever is the smaller; except that for a project that serves more than one municipality, the Secretary will allocate to each municipality to be served, such reasonable and equitable share of the estimated cost of such project as he determines reasonable, subject to the 30-percent and $600,000 limitation, with a total of all the amounts so determined limited to $2,400,000. No grant is to be made for any project in any State in an amount exceeding $250,000, until a grant has been made for each such project for which an application was filed with the appropriate State water pollution control agency prior to 1 year after the date of enactment of Public Law 88, July 20, 1961, which the Secretary determines met the requirements in effect prior to that date.

This section also provides that sums allotted to a State which are not obligated within 6 months following the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of projects approved by the State agency, shall be reallotted by the Secretary to States having projects which have been approved for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds, and such sums will be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State. Whenever a State has funds subject to reallocation and the Secretary finds that the need for a project in a community in such State is due in part to any Federal institution or Federal construction activity, he may, prior to such reallocation, make an additional grant to such project which will reflect an equitable contribution for the need caused by such Federal institution or activity, and State allotments shall be available for payments for projects in such State which have been approved under these terms.

This section increases the authorization for appropriations from $50 million annually to $80 million for fiscal year 1962, $90 million for 1963, and $100 million for each fiscal year 1964 through 1967; at least one-half of the funds appropriated, are to be used on projects in cities of 125,000 population or less.

The provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act are made applicable to projects for which grants are made for sewage and waste-treatment facilities, which requires that laborers and mechanics employed by contractors shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing for similar work in the immediate locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

Section 6 provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or his designee, shall be a member and chairman of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board established in the Department, and the term of any member is extended until the date on which his successor's appointment is effective, and present members of the Board shall remain until the expiration of the terms of office for which they are appointed.

Section 7 provides that interstate or navigable waters will be subject to abatement under the law. It also provides that a conference could be called by the Secretary in the case of interstate pollution, upon the request of the Governor of any State; the State water pollution control agency; or the governing body of any municipality, with the concurrence of both the Governor and of the State water pollution control agency. In the case of intrastate pollution, the Secretary may call a conference on the matter only when requested by the Governor of the State in which the pollution is occurring; but he may refuse to exercise Federal jurisdiction if in his judgment the pollution is not of sufficient significance to warrant the exercise of such jurisdiction. The Secretary may call a conference on pollution matters on his own initiative in the case of pollution on interstate streams.

After the conference, if the Secretary believes that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made, he shall recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action, and shall allow at least 6 months for taking such recommended action. If at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action to reasonably secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing before a hearing board, which will issue its findings.

Following the public hearing, if the pollution is not abated within the time specified in the notice issued, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to bring a suit

on behalf of the United States to secure abatement in the case of interstate pollution, and in the name of the United States in the case of intrastate pollution, only with the written consent of the Governor of such State.

This section also establishes the compensation of members of the hearing board, and includes the definition of a municipality.

Section 8 provides that the summary of conference discussions issued by the Secretary will include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any Federal property. Notice of any hearing involving any pollution alleged to be caused by any such discharges shall be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property involved, and the findings and recommendations of the Hearing Board shall include references to discharges found to be contributing to the pollution.

Definitions under the law are changed to include Guam, and interstate waters to include coastal waters.

The Water Supply Act of 1958 provides authority for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to include municipal and industrial water supply capacity in reservoirs under their jurisdiction. Under that act not to exceed 30 percent of the total cost of any project may be allocated to anticipated future demands if State or local interest give reasonable assurances that they will contract for the use of storage for anticipated future demands within a period of time which will permit paying out the cost allocated to water supply within the life of the project. Section 10 amends this act to permit the Federal agency concerned to make its own determination of future water supply needs, and on the basis of such determination, to include capacity in a project without definite contractual commitments from State or local interests.

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the current issue of Time magazine, September 1, 1961, has a cover story on a man who is well known to the Senate.

The magazine lists him as Lawrence Francis O'Brien. We know him in a more familiar vein as Larry O'Brien. But either way, he is a dedicated and exceptional public servant.

As Presidential Assistant for Congressional Relations, Larry O'Brien's assignment is one of the most difficult and exacting in the administration. He must maintain peaceful and fruitful relations with not only 100 Members of the Senate but also with the more than 400 Members of the House, not an easy job. One would have to search a long time for a task more demanding of tact, diplomacy, good sense, and a sense of humor. Secretary Goldberg might have a comparable assignment if, each week, he had to help renegotiate a contract between a musicians' union headed by Maria Callas and the Metropolitan Opera Co. with Mr. Khrushchev as impresario.

In all seriousness, Mr. President, this administration has been in office a relatively short time. But it has been long enough to prove out Larry O'Brien as an outstanding aid to the President. It has been long enough for Larry O'Brien to win our deepest respect and affection as the President's "man on the Hill."

I am delighted that Time magazine has seen fit to make him better known to the people of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article previously referred to be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN ON THE HILL

In his walnut-paneled White House office, Lawrence Francis O'Brien held a hurried conference with his aids. He had been warned by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON that an important southern Senator was wavering on an administration bill. "See what you can do with him," O'Brien told a staffer. Then, as the meeting broke up, O'Brien turned to his telephone and called another Senator to thank him for a favorable vote the previous week. "I didn't want you to think we didn't notice and appreciate what you did," said O'Brien in a low Yankee twang. "The President mentioned it at the leadership meeting this morning."

During that same morning O'Brien heard warnings, gave orders, and expressed gratitude in a dozen other telephone calls; he talked to Congressmen, lobbyists, Democratic National Chairman John Bailey, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Between calls, he raced downstairs three times for quick conferences with President Kennedy. Then he was off to Capitol Hill for a meeting with LYNDON JOHNSON and Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD in the Vice President's office. After lunching on the run, O'Brien talked to a dozen Congressmen, examined the fever charts of a dozen pending bills. Returning to the White House in midafternoon, he held another staff conference, saw the President again, greeted North Carolina's visiting Democratic Gov. Terry Sanford, finally shrugged into his jacket and left for the Mayflower Hotel, where a Democratic National Committee cocktail party for Congressmen was in full swing.

All in all, that day last week was a relatively relaxed one in the life of Larry O'Brien, 44, whose job as President Kennedy's special assistant for congressional relations makes him one of the most important of all New Frontiersmen—with responsibility for seeing to it that the Kennedy administration's programs become public law.

A PROBLEM OF CLIMATE

To the casual observer, that responsibility might seem simple. After all, Democrat Jack Kennedy took office from Republican Dwight Eisenhower with lopsidedly Democratic majorities in both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives. But Kennedy won his way to the White House by such a perilous plurality (118,000 votes out of a national total of 68 million) that he could in no sense be considered to have a mandate that might compel Congressmen to go along with him. Indeed, many winning Democratic Representatives and Senators who led Kennedy on the ticket within their own constituencies, could reasonably decide that they knew better than the young President about what was good for the people.

In such a political climate, the job of convincing or, if necessary, pushing the Congress into following the administration has become one of the toughest and most sensitive in Washington. It requires keen understanding of the equations of politics. The President's man on Capitol Hill must know instinctively which Congressman will respond to deference or flattery, which ones require threats or pressures from home, which ones will leap at the hint of Presidential support in the next campaign. O'Brien possesses such understanding in good measure. And he is an expert in the political uses of power, patronage, and persuasion.

CHECK IT WITH LARRY

In his operations of Capitol Hill, O'Brien's greatest asset is the all-out backing of the President himself. In the first days of the New Frontier, Jack Kennedy made it obvious to Congressmen that Liaisonman O'Brien was armed with all the authority he might need. Senators and Representatives calling Kennedy with political proposals invariably were asked: "Have you checked that with Larry O'Brien?" They soon got the idea.

O'Brien knows precisely how far the President will go in making legislative concessions to Congress. More than once, when approached by Democratic congressional leaders with suggestions for compromises that might speed administration programs through the Senate or House, O'Brien has accepted on the spot, without having to refer to the President.

As a man who prefers the carrot to the stick in his operations, O'Brien uses the power of the Presidency sparingly. Time and again, congressional leaders have urged him to recommend that President Kennedy intervene directly in legislative matters. Time and again, O'Brien has refused, acting only in crucial cases when a Presidential telephone call or White House talk with a key Congressman is most timely and can be most effective.

THE FRIENDLY LOBBIES

Other top administration officials follow the President's lead in helping O'Brien move New Frontier programs through Congress—and it is indeed a crusty legislator who is not flattered by a friendly telephone call, made at O'Brien's suggestion, from a member of the Kennedy Cabinet.

O'Brien has also made effective use of the pressures that can be brought to bear on Congressmen by the liberal lobbies that abound in Washington—notably that of the AFL–CIO, under its own able legislative man, Andy Biemiller. When administration legislative interests coincide with those of a particular lobbying group, O'Brien makes certain that one of his staffmen compares notes and coordinates efforts with the lobbyists. Intelligence is exchanged, a list is made of Congressmen whose votes might be swayed, and high-tempo lobbying techniques, ranging from direct-mail campaigns to carefully arranged visits from constituents, are turned on the solons.

THE USE OF PATRONAGE

Just before O'Brien took over as President Kennedy's liaison representative to Congress, he conferred with Republican Dwight Eisenhower's man on the Hill, Bryce Harlow. From Harlow, O'Brien received a piece of sage advice: not to get too overtly involved with patronage problems. Said Harlow: "With patronage, you will have to turn down 10 men for every 1 you say yes to. You make people unhappy instead of happy."

O'Brien has followed that advice—up to a point. Officially, patronage is left to Democratic National Committee Chairman John Bailey, who works in consultation with O'Brien Staffman Dick Donahue. But O'Brien knows well that patronage is still a potent political instrument; he makes recommendations to Bailey on major appointments, and his suggestions receive top-priority consideration. Thus, when the 14 members of the Italian-American congressional bloc threatened to vote against the administration's feed-grains bill just to demonstrate their power, O'Brien quickly found out what was on their minds: no man of Italian descent had been appointed to a major administration post. O'Brien promised to look into the matter for them, the bloc voted right, and a few weeks later the White House was pleased to announce the appointment of Salvatore Bontempo as head of the State Department's consular service. For good measure, Michel Cieplinski was named as Bontempo's assistant, mollifying an 11-member Polish-American group in the House.

All Congressmen now know that, although John Bailey is the nominal dangler of politi-

cal plums, O'Brien is really the man to see when they have a patronage problem.

WORLDS APART

For all the political power tools that he can command, Larry O'Brien's greatest strength lies in his personal relationships with the Members of Congress. He can talk their language. Like them, he is a political pro. He has the pro's disdain for windmill-tilting amateurs. "The eggheads," he says, "want the candidate to win on his own terms, to defy the party and interest groups. The egghead thinks it's worthwhile to be defeated. I think it's worthwhile to be elected." This same pragmatic professionalism sets O'Brien apart from many of the other men who surround President Kennedy. "I don't know what I'm doing in this crowd," O'Brien once mused. "I didn't go to Harvard, and I'm not athletic. I don't even play touch football."

Larry O'Brien was born in the Roland Hotel, a small hostelry that his father owned, in downtown Springfield, Mass., on July 7, 1917—6 weeks after John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born, 75 miles across the State and a world apart, in his father's big home in Brookline. Both Lawrence O'Brien, Sr., and Myra Sweeney O'Brien were immigrants from County Cork. Myra was a proud, slender woman and a talented cook—her clam chowder, beef stew, and soda bread were locally celebrated—who had worked as a domestic before her marriage. O'Brien, Senior, was a scrappy redhead, and an up-and-coming real estate operator. By the time young Larry was born, his father owned a string of drab roominghouses, an insurance business, and the Roland Hotel.

ONE PLACE TO GO

Inevitably, the O'Briens encountered and bitterly resented the anti-Irish feelings that gripped western Massachusetts—the Yankee-bred hostility toward immigrants, the Puritan suspicion of Roman Catholics, the "No Irish Need Apply" signs on the factory gates. "My father ran into bigotry," says Larry. "It made him a strong Democrat. It was one place for him to go. He wasn't wanted elsewhere." O'Brien, Senior, became a Democratic Party organizer deep inside a Republican fastness. "It was the old story of the Irish immigrant becoming a citizen, a first voter and a politician at the same time," says his son. "I can remember my father coming back home from the 1924 convention. He brought us hats in the shape of teapots."

The O'Brien kitchen became a political headquarters, and Democratic leaders from Boston made their way there—notably, flamboyant James Michael Curley, archetype of "The Last Hurrah" breed, and smooth-tongued David Ignatius Walsh, first Irishman ever elected to the U.S. Senate from Massachusetts. Walsh was sometimes a trial: whenever he paid a call, he insisted on quizzing Larry on his American history and catechism. But Curley was another, headier cup of tea: as a bug-eyed boy, Larry listened spellbound as his father and Curley conspired like Sinn Feiners about the ways to break the hated Yankee Republican grip on western Massachusetts. And always there was a recurrent theme: "Our kitchen used to be the place where some of the boys would meet, and my father would say: 'All right, now we'll get the signatures.' It was organizational politics, signatures on petitions, door-to-door canvassing. He was a great one for planning—all the things I wound up being involved in myself."

In 1932, when Larry was a part-time helper in Springfield's Democratic headquarters and his father was a State committeeman from western Massachusetts, the O'Briens defied their Irish Catholic neighbors and supported Franklin Roosevelt for the Democratic nomination, instead of Al Smith, who was the local favorite. O'Brien, Sr., was denied a seat in the Massachusetts delegation for his heresy, but history proved that father knew best.

When he was 20, Larry started taking night-school courses at the Springfield branch of Northeastern University (Jack Kennedy was a Harvard sophomore that year). He graduated in 1942 with an LL.B., but he had never had any real notion of practicing law: "If there had been a course in practical politics, I'd have taken that." He was, in fact, getting all the practical politics he could absorb—accompanying his father around the State, stumping for Curley and every other Democratic candidate in sight, and chinning with wardheelers over the mahogany bar in his father's restaurant. At 22, Larry was a rush-hour bartender in O'Brien's Cafe and Restaurant and chairman of his political ward. That same year he ran for office for the only time in his life—and was elected president of the Hotel & Restaurant Employees Union.

THE BEST MAN

During World War II, O'Brien marked time unhappily as an Army sergeant at Massachusetts' Camp Edwards. His poor eyesight (20–400 vision) red-lined him for combat duty. On one 10-day furlough he married Elva Brassard, the daughter of a Springfield house painter. They had courted sporadically for 5 years—on O'Brien's terms. "It was always going to political rallies or running over to see what the city council was doing," recalls Elva O'Brien. "That was Larry's idea of a date." Their best man was Foster Furcolo, an old friend of O'Brien's and a political comer.

After the war, Larry O'Brien returned to Springfield to manage the O'Brien Realty Co.—which had grown to include a gas station and a parking lot in addition to the restaurant—and to get back into politics. In best man Foster Furcolo, organizer O'Brien had a ready candidate. Having come up through the wards, Furcolo was ready for the big time, and O'Brien was eager to handle his campaign for Congress. With his usual attention to detail, he gridded the Second Massachusetts District into 60 units, recruited a corps of secretaries, and kept a swarm of volunteers busy mailing campaign letters to their friends.

During that first Furcolo campaign, O'Brien devised many of the campaign techniques that later became standard operating procedure for John Kennedy's State and National efforts. But 1946 was a Republican year, and Furcolo was defeated by a scant 3,295 votes. As soon as the returns were in, O'Brien went methodically to work on the 1948 campaign. And in the second Furcolo race, O'Brien brought in a winner, with a 15,000 plurality. In gratitude, Foster Furcolo asked O'Brien to come to Washington as his administrative assistant. Two years later, the two friends came to a mysterious and bitter parting of the ways (neither man will reveal the reason), and Larry O'Brien came back to Springfield vowing that he had quit politics forever.

Tea and telephones. It was one of the briefest retirements in political history. Within 6 months, O'Brien was hard at work, organizing Massachusetts for John Kennedy, then a third-term Congressman and an unannounced aspirant to the Senate. Kennedy had known O'Brien casually for 5 years, had spotted him as a campaign organizer of rare talent. Within a year, O'Brien had recruited 350 secretaries, 18,000 volunteer Kennedy workers. By the time Kennedy formally announced his Senate candidacy, O'Brien was all ready with a purring statewide political machine. The O'Brien brain was a supermarket of political innovations: the campaign tea parties, with Kennedy's mother and sisters pouring (and an omnipresent guestbook to provide O'Brien with the names and addresses of potential campaign workers); the expanding "O'Brien Manual," a handbook of organizational instructions written in language that any amateur could understand; the O'Brien home telephone technique, rounding up women volunteers who would each call all the people listed on a single page in the telephone book, ask for support and offer transportation to the polls. Explains O'Brien: "The key to this is the full utilization of womanpower. Normally, women are wasted in a campaign. They have children. They can't come to headquarters."

To the Kennedy team, O'Brien was and is more than a skillful political organizer. He has the experience and understanding to serve as a bridge between the Democratic Old Guard and the New Frontier. The bright, eager young men around Jack Kennedy have always baffled and often offended the Skeffingtons of Massachusetts; but Larry O'Brien can talk to politicians in their own language and win them over. "He was the essential transition man for us with the Old Guard," says Bobby Kennedy. At the same time, O'Brien was an invaluable professor of political science for the likes of Bobby, Kenny O'Donnell, Dick Donahue and other young members of the Kennedy group who were rank political amateurs in Kennedy's successful 1952 senatorial campaign. They have since become a close-knit, highly professional team that is known in administration circles as the Irish "Mafia."

BIG THOUGHTS

As a first-term Senator, Jack Kennedy had a legislative record that was nothing to brag about. But his political appeal was such that in 1956, when Democratic presidential nominee Adlai Stevenson threw the vice presidential nomination up for grabs at the party's Chicago convention, Kennedy made a wildly disorganized 11th-hour attempt for the prize. He lost to ESTES KEFAUVER, but by so narrow a margin that it set the Kennedyites to thinking really big thoughts. Recalls Larry O'Brien (who had not even attended the convention): "After that convention, we began to realize that Kennedy could go all the way."

With Larry O'Brien and his organization working as though their own lives were at stake, Kennedy won reelection to the Senate in 1958 by close to 900,000 votes, the biggest plurality in Massachusetts history. Kennedy's reputation as a prime votegetter—presumably on a national scale—was correspondingly enhanced. And so, in late February 1959, Jack Kennedy called a special presidential strategy session at his father's Palm Beach home. Present were Brothers Bobby and Teddy Kennedy, Brothers-in-Law Sarge Shriver and Steve Smith, Adviser Ted Sorensen—and Larry O'Brien. In this first formal planning for a Kennedy effort to reach the White House, O'Brien was assigned the job of establishing Kennedy organizations throughout the United States.

COURTHOUSE VERSUS WHITE HOUSE

Carrying out that assignment, O'Brien crossed the Nation nine times, traveling 100,000 miles, talking deep into every night, stoking himself with three packs of Pall Malls, a Niagara of black coffee each day. He set up the local organizations, staffed mostly by enthusiastic amateurs in the States where Kennedy had to win presidential primaries to have any real hope for the Democratic nomination. O'Brien could also talk turkey with such patronage-minded politicians as a local West Virginia leader who told him bluntly: "I'm not interested in the White House. I'm interested in the courthouse."

The primaries won, O'Brien was in Los Angeles setting up Kennedy headquarters a full month before the Democrats met to choose their candidate for President. In Los Angeles, O'Brien's elaborate telephone and walkie-talkie system of instant, 24-hour communication with the convention floor and each State delegation headquarters was a marvel of modern political efficiency. After

the convention, O'Brien applied all his tried and true organizational techniques to Kennedy's winning campaign against Republican Richard Nixon. "It was dog work," he recalls, "but it was worthwhile: it worked." Jack Kennedy's own postelection appraisal of O'Brien: "The best election man in the business."

Immediately after election day, O'Brien drew an arduous assignment: checking the qualifications, background, weak points, and strong suits of nearly 10,000 prospective officials in the new administration. One afternoon in Palm Beach, going over the list of names with O'Brien, Kennedy casually notified him of his new job: "By the way, I think this role of congressional liaison is for you." As a graduate of both Houses, Kennedy gave O'Brien a warning against the pitfalls of intimacy. "In politics," the President-elect told him, "you don't have friends. You have allies."

THE UNFIGURABLES

In his campaigning travels, Larry O'Brien had come to know many Congressmen—but he had never dealt with them in their legislative capacity. Now it was time for just such dealing. First O'Brien huddled with a select group of Capitol Hill veterans, sought to make a knowledgeable estimate of the political shape of the 87th Congress. It was decided that the Senate, with a minimum amount of attention, would back most of the Kennedy program. But the House of Representatives was a different matter. The presession analysis showed that there were about 180 certain House votes for most New Frontier programs, about 180 votes that were almost equally sure to go against the administration. That left between 75 and 80 votes that were more or less unfigurable.

Next, O'Brien met early in February in his Mayflower Hotel suite with three of the canniest young Democratic members of the House: Missouri's RICHARD BOLLING, New Jersey's FRANK THOMPSON, and Alabama's CARL ELLIOTT. BOLLING had already gone over the list of New Frontier legislative proposals, estimated as things stood that only one—the housing bill—was a sure shot for House passage. The conferees ran through the entire roster of 437 Representatives—name by name, back-home problem by back-home problem, interest by interest and prejudice by prejudice. "We decided," recalls one of the men who sat in on the Mayflower session, "that we had two target areas, the eastern industrial Republicans and the moderate-to-conservative southerners. We figured there were 40 southerners we couldn't touch—but we've modified that since, because we have touched some of them."

As his staff contact man with southern Representatives, O'Brien wisely selected Henry Hall Wilson, Jr., 39, a North Carolinian who had done yeoman service for Candidate Kennedy in Wilson's native State during the 1960 campaign. Wilson knew little about legislative dealing with Members of Congress. "But we figured he could learn," says Dick Donahue. "The most important thing was to get our own man, so that if he had any ties he had 'em to Larry instead of to a bunch of people he's known and become obliged to on the Hill."

THE ABSOLUTE KEY

In their studies of the House balances of power, O'Brien and his congressional advisers decided that there was a key man: Georgia's CARL VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee and one of the two or three most influential southerners in the House. They decided that it was vital to lure VINSON away from the conservative camp: he could, among other things, bring at least a score of southern votes along with him. Says BOLLING: "VINSON was absolutely the key to the whole session." O'Brien concentrated his own efforts on VINSON. The old gentleman won O'Brien's genuine admiration—and O'Brien won his. As it has happened since that time, CARL VINSON and his House followers have voted down the line for the New Frontier's programs.

The first major administration legislative item to come up for floor vote in Congress found O'Brien with his organizational fences not yet in place. It was the feedgrains bill, which found rural and urban Congressmen bitterly divided. About the only appeal that O'Brien and his staffers could make to Democratic Congressmen was not to let the President down on his first bill—"Let's win this one for Jack, Jackie, and little Caroline." The bill passed the House by seven votes—and since then O'Brien has been able to move more sophisticated weapons into action on behalf of the administration program.

His bulky (5 ft. 11½ in., 187 lbs.) frame and his reddish, whiskbroom thatch are a familiar sight in the Capitol's corridors. In turn, Larry has made it his business to meet nearly all the inhabitants of Capitol Hill at a marathon succession of cocktail parties and at leisurely Sunday brunches on the O'Brien's Georgetown terrace, with wife Elva presiding at meals that include O'Brien potatoes. But O'Brien has remembered the Kennedy warning: although he is liked by nearly everyone, Republican as well as Democrat, on the Hill, he has made use of only one close friend: Representative EDDIE BOLAND, the Congressman from O'Brien's own district. (It was BOLAND who was the earliest to spot Jack Kennedy's presidential potential. In 1946 he told O'Brien: "Kennedy's a real comer. He can go all the way.") On the Hill BOLAND'S office has become an anteroom to O'Brien's headquarters, and other Congressmen have come to regard the Springfield Democrat as the resident of Capitol Hill who has the most direct line to O'Brien.

* * * * *

The administration has suffered defeats: its medical care for the aged bill was shelved without ever coming up for vote; its farm program was gutted; its school aid bill, now vastly diluted, is still in grave doubt. Its crucial foreign aid bill got relatively unscathed through the Senate, was murdered in the House—despite O'Brien's valiant fight for sorely needed long-term borrowing authority—and some time this week will come compromised out of a Senate-House conference.

Despite the defeats and the enforced compromises, the Kennedy administration's legislative record compares favorably with any since the first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt. Steered intact through the divided 87th Congress were a $394 million depressed areas bill, an increase in the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour with expanded minimum wage coverage, an omnibus $6.8 billion housing bill, a controversial feedgrains bill, a huge 11-year, $21 billion interstate highways bill. Most of the credit belongs to Larry O'Brien, a man who hates to lose. "We never know when we're beaten," he says of himself and his staff. "We never say die."

He does know that there is a time to compromise. Says he: "As realists, we want to get as much of our program through as we can. If you feel that you are getting as much as you can, all right. If you don't get as much as you can, you've failed." On that basis, no one can say that Larry O'Brien has failed.

TIMING IN DIPLOMATIC NEGOTIATIONS—THE BERLIN SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the August 30, 1961, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, there appears an article by the distinguished special correspondent of that newspaper, Mr. Joseph C. Harsch.

It deals with the factor of timing in diplomatic negotiations. Mr. Harsch refers to the Berlin-German situation and points out that negotiations in time may be just as valuable as stitches in time.

It is his thought that we have forfeited many negotiating cards in that situation by our failure to play them while they still had value.

I have tried to get at a similar idea in past speeches by reference to the "time lag" in foreign policy and to the tendency of our diplomacy in recent years to be continuously in pursuit of the last car of a train that is always moving away from us.

Mr. President, I commend to the Senate the article by Mr. Harsch. It contains much wisdom, expressed with much simplicity. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE NATIONS—NEGOTIATE WHAT?

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Everyone in high place, including Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany, says the West will be negotiating with Moscow about Germany sometime, presumably fairly soon.

But the nearer the diplomats come to negotiation, the less there is to negotiate about. The fact is that action is anticipating negotiation and leaving an ever-narrowing area of matters to be discussed in negotiation.

And if I read the signs of the times correctly, Western bargaining power in negotiation is dwindling with each passing day. If the Western governments continue much longer to be unable to agree over the time and purpose of negotiation, they will end up with nothing to do at the presumed future conference with the Soviets except to accept with or without protest a set of accomplished facts.

The division of Germany into two Germanys is an accomplished fact. The incorporation of East Berlin into East Germany is an accomplished fact. The closure of the refugee escape hatch between the two Berlins is an accomplished fact.

There was a time when willingness to grant what now has been taken might well have had some value on the bargaining table. Had the West been willing 6 months ago to accept the division of Germany in return for concessions from Moscow, it is quite conceivable that Western diplomats could have obtained firm and clear guarantees about access to West Berlin.

The opportunity for such a trade is gone now. Moscow has what it wants without negotiation and without offering something the West wants in return. This is not the first time that bargaining counters have been wasted from failing to use them when they still had some value.

Well back in the cold war Moscow was seriously concerned over the ring of Western airbases which surrounded the Communist empire. Moscow presumably would have been prepared to pay a price for the abandonment of some of those bases.

The bases are being abandoned now and there is nothing to show for it. Changing weapons and changing political conditions are driving the West from bases without the payment by Moscow of a single penny.

Well back in the cold war there was a time when Poland might have renounced some of

its so-called "Western territories" in return for a West German agreement on the Polish-German frontier. The Poles were ready to give up Stettin and parts of Silesia, too, but not including Breslau. Bonn refused to consider any settlement of the frontier.

Subsequently the Poles have repopulated Stettin and the border area of Silesia. It is too late now for the Germans to get anything beyond the Oder-Neisse line.

Before the Soviets gave Walter Ulbricht the green light for his cement wall project through Berlin, Western diplomacy might have offered the Oder-Neisse line in return for continued four-power status in Berlin. In that case Herr Ulbricht might have had to be satisfied with East Germany without East Berlin.

It was not necessary for the West to lose its rights in East Berlin had it been willing to bargain when there was still time.

French diplomacy not only saw the dangers in the situation but itself and alone did accept the inevitable. Paris recognized the Oder-Neisse line. But because Bonn insisted on clinging to the reunification doctrine Washington and London reluctantly did the same. The Adenauer policy of giving nothing and admitting nothing may have lost to Germany valuable pieces of land now settled by Poles and the twilight freedom which East Berlin enjoyed until recent days.

Five years ago, probably even a year ago, Herr Ulbricht probably would have been delighted to settle for East Germany minus East Berlin. Now he has East Berlin.

In diplomacy a card is forfeited if it is not played while it still has value. Too many cards have been forfeited unnecessarily.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY—EXPERIENCE IN FREE EUROPE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Thursday some of my colleagues and I on this side of the aisle expect to offer extensive comments on the remarks regarding the price situation in the steel industry made in the Senate on August 22. One element of our comments will include a discussion of labor's responsibility equal to management's to the national interest, in terms of employment costs.

It is therefore with the greatest interest that I have read two columns by David Lawrence in the New York Herald Tribune of August 30 and 31. Mr. Lawrence discusses the need for voluntary self-discipline by management and labor in their wage and price policies. He quotes Mr. Arne Ceijer, chairman of the Swedish Federation of Labor Unions and chairman of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, who stated in a speech:

> The freedom of the parties in the labor market to fix wages and working conditions without interference (from the state) is a freedom under responsibility.

Mr. Lawrence also cites the method of settling labor disputes in Great Britain as embodying an approach which brings "the national interest to bear on local disputes as a way of reaching compromise."

These two principles of labor-management responsibility and universal consideration of the national interest should receive much consideration in the United States. Over the past 2 years I have advocated legislation in aid of these principles. Mr. Lawrence writes that "perhaps the real weakness is that in America there is no national body composed of labor and management leaders—which can have a powerful moderating influence on the different labor unions and persuade management to strive harder for improvement of wage scales." I believe that the Peace Production Act (S. 2204) and the National Productivity Council Act of 1961 (S. 1181), both of which I introduced this year could serve to fill this need while stimulating the formation of local labor-management-public groups to bring about grassroots cooperation.

A start has already been made toward legislative action along these lines through Senate adoption of my amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (S. 1991), directing the National Advisory Committee established under this act to assist in the formation and the work of such local groups. Mr. President, we have now before us a dramatic example of the national dilemma resulting from a wage settlement and management pressures which have set off the threat of new inflationary pressures rising from the basic steel industry. The time has come to provide the framework for the exercise of voluntary wage and price responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent to have the two columns by Mr. Lawrence inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 31, 1961]

MORAL SUASION, NOT LAW USED TO HALT BRITISH STRIKES

(By David Lawrence)

In England this writer had an opportunity in recent days to discuss with top men in the field of labor-management relations the problem of avoiding strikes.

Great Britain has made considerable progress in this area by what might be called moral suasion instead of law. This is of particular interest to America, where in recent years one administration after another has been groping for such a solution.

Not all is rosy in England, to be sure. At the moment, for instance, labor is protesting vociferously against the plans of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Selwyn Lloyd, to bring about what is called a wage pause. This has thus far affected only the civil servants, whose wage increases have been halted because Mr. Lloyd, as head of the British Treasury, sees ahead some storms in the balance-of-payment problem. Mr. Lloyd also has proposed a national economic planning agency which, though not a part of the Government, would be an independent body consisting of national representatives of the unions and the employers and probably himself. It would provide information and statistical data about the national economy to help it to operate.

The Trades Union Congress—the national organization of British labor unions—has frowned on the plan because of a fear it will brush aside the existing informal but effective arbitration machinery.

In Great Britain, the settling of labor disputes involves a minimum of governmental intervention. While the procedures developed separately in each industry over the years differ widely, they share one approach—to bring the national interest to bear on local disputes as a way of reaching compromises. Approximately 3,000 disputes a year are settled at one stage or another by the procedures agreed upon by both sides. This approach began back in the 1890's and has been developing ever since.

THREE STAGES

In the engineering trades, for example, the procedures operate in three stages. If a dispute cannot be settled informally, a works conference is set up at the factory, with management on one side and the shop stewards representing the union on the other. The meeting may call in outside advice from the local employers' association and the district officials of the union.

If the two sides can't agree, either can demand the second stage of the negotiation—a conference which takes place, not in the local factory, but in one of the centers where the employers' association and the unions have their district offices. This is at the district level. At this stage, more than half the disputes sent up from factory level have been settled.

But if no agreement is forthcoming, the dispute is taken up by the central conference, which meets on the second Friday of every month throughout the year. This is the highest level of negotiation in the engineering industry, and it is attended by members of the national bodies on both sides.

Other industries use similar procedures. The iron-and-steel industry, for instance, sends down to the local level national representatives of both management and labor. They work from the top down, but the effect is the same.

Other industries in Britain use governmental arbitration machinery, and others have no formal procedure.

But the thing to remember about British industrial relations is that agreements between management and labor on a national level do not have the legal status of a contract as in the United States. They are more or less in the form of "gentlemen's agreements." This is a weakness in the system, because it has led to a large number of wildcat strikes.

The influence of Communists inside labor unions in Europe is being felt more and more. Top officials of the labor unions deny that the Communists wield any such influence. Indeed, they point proudly to the fact that a relatively small number of workers are identified with the Communist Party. But this is a naive approach. The Communists in Moscow have long been operating through only a handful of persons in many a national organization. These agents are responsible for stirring up all kinds of antagonisms and for agitating extreme positions.

Communist influence in labor unions is small in the Scandinavian countries, but it is growing in France and in Italy. It has played a part also in British trade union affairs, though the British are not willing to admit that it has caused any considerable damage. Recently, however, one of the largest unions, the Electrical Trades Union, with 240,000 members, was suspended from the national organization—the Trades Union Congress—because many of its officers are Communists or are sympathetic with Communist aims. These officials could not possibly have been elected if the members had not been indifferent and failed to attend union meetings and vote.

There is no question but that Moscow has recognized clearly one of the weaknesses of the free world—its labor problems—and has gradually infiltrated in important unions, making disputes more and more difficult to settle. This is all the more reason why statesmanship is so necessary nowadays to bring about the settlement of labor-management problems.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 30, 1961]

EUROPE CALLED AHEAD OF UNITED STATES IN HANDLING LABOR RELATIONS

(By David Lawrence)

One of the biggest challenges in the current competition between the Soviet Union and the Western countries is to be found in the field of labor-management relations.

There is no equivalent on the Western side as yet for the discipline which the Soviets have achieved in handling their labor. The Western countries are being urged to find voluntary methods that will attain some semblance of order in the wage-price problem and permit economic progress without disastrous interruptions due to major strikes.

In the United States, the friction between the two economic forces has long been recognized as serious, but no solution has been achieved. Nobody wants to see the Government run the labor unions or direct the management of the employing companies. So the tendency thus far has been to rely on some form of Government mediation. It has not always proved effective.

Europeans, on the other hand have made some progress toward voluntary settlement of disputes which it would be desirable for America in particular to examine and see whether some of the same principles could not be successfully applied in this country. On this writer's recent trip to Europe, he had an opportunity for a long talk, in Sweden, with Arne Geijer, who is not only chairman of the Swedish Federation of Labor unions but also chairman of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He has often visited the United States and is well known to its labor leaders. Mr. Geijer is a Member of the Swedish Senate and is frequently mentioned in discussions as likely to be the next prime minister of Sweden.

In the interview which this writer had with him, it was apparent that Mr. Geijer sees clearly the gravity of the whole labor problem in the world today. He favors a policy of moderate wage demands rather than hit-or-miss settlements which hurt the economy. He says that wages must not get out of line with the development of industrial productivity. This is, of course, even more important to European countries, which must watch their competitive position closely in export markets.

MUST MODERATE DEMANDS

The Swedish labor leader is also insistent that workers must moderate their wage demands with respect to social welfare measures. He sees a growing competition between labor and government in the field of social welfare. He thinks that workers cannot have both—maximum wage increases and generous social-welfare arrangements. He would prefer to see the Government handle the whole welfare problem.

It has taken time for Mr. Geijer to convince local labor leaders of the long-range advantages of a moderate wage policy and better cooperation with management, but he is making substantial progress. He said, incidentally, that the United States has a lot to learn about the settling of disputes with labor. But perhaps the real weakness is that in America there is no national body composed of labor and management leaders—which can have a powerful moderating influence on the different labor unions and persuade management to strive harder for the improvement of wage scales.

So many large unions have arisen that the AFL–CIO is more of a coordinating body today than a disciplinary institution. It is rare that the top labor leaders of the United States exercise any direct influence in unions outside their own industries.

Mr. Geijer, in his capacity as chairman of the International Federation of Free Trade Unions, recently made some interesting points in this connection in an address to the International Labor Conference in Geneva. He said:

"Industrial expansion in the economically developed countries is going very fast at present. It is accompanied by steady changes in the life of the community. The functioning of society is more and more dependent on an increasingly elaborate machinery. We know from recent experience that even relatively small disputes in the labor market can have quite disastrous effects on the economy of an individual country.

"One is therefore always faced with the problem of how to limit labor disputes, strikes and lockouts by democratic means, in order to benefit as much as possible from the rapid pace of development. In some countries their problems have been solved through legislation which, in many cases, covers quite extensive areas, and this is an infringement upon the freedom of the parties in the labor market to secure peaceful conditions.

NOT MISUSE FREEDOM

"To my mind, the freedom of the parties in the labor market to negotiate agreements concerning wages and working conditions is an essential part of a democratic society. * * *

"However, we must not misuse this freedom. Otherwise the state can be forced to intervene or can make an excuse for doing so in order to ward off serious harm to the community. The freedom of the parties in the labor market to fix wages and working conditions without interference is therefore a freedom under responsibility. * * *

"The national unions must also give enough power to the central organization to enable it to settle the demarcation disputes between them.

"During the last decade most of the agreements concluded in my own country have been reached as a result of central negotiations between the two top organizations, that is to say, the Confederation of Swedish Employers and ourselves. Only on one occasion have the national unions negotiated separately. It is likely that central negotiations covering the whole wage market will be the rule also in the future. But a condition for central negotiations is good will on the employers' side and an atmosphere of understanding for the needs and demands of the different low-paid groups especially."

But all is not optimism about the future of labor relations in Sweden. There are fears of a major strike next year—the first in many years. Wages keep on going up, and so do prices. Profit margins are narrowing. That's why so many of Sweden's industrialists pin their hopes on the European Common Market. They look for increased volume even at smaller profit margins to help them out of their wage dilemmas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business, S. 174, be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 174) to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "fifteen" and insert "ten"; in line 5, after the word "President", to strike out "Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendation with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceeding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided*, That the President may, as part of such recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area included, to exclude portions not predominantly of wilderness value or to add any adjacent area of national forest lands that are predominantly of wilderness value. The recommendation of the President with respect to each area shall becomes effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section." and insert "Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided*, That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be continued in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value: *Provided further*, That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be continued in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the continued inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest lands: *And provided further*, That primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as a part of the wilderness system until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resub-

mission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for continued inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within fourteen years following the enactment of this Act shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest land."; on page 10, line 18, after the word "adjournment", to strike out the comma and "the Congress did not approve a concurrent resolution declaring that the Congress is opposed to such recommendation" and insert "neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided,* That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided."; on page 11, line 10, after "(g)", to strike out "The public" and insert "Public", and in the same line, after the word "notice", to insert "when given"; in line 18, after the word "a", to strike out "concurrent"; on page 12, line 5, after the word "specific", to insert "affirmative"; in line 12, after the word "jurisdiction", to insert a comma and "subject to the approval of any necessary appropriations by the Congress"; on page 13, line 12, after the word "character", to strike out "The wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation" and insert "Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation"; on page 15, line 4, after the word "works", to insert "transmission lines"; in line 15, after the word "system", to strike out "may" and insert "shall"; in line 16, after the word "restrictions", to insert "and regulations"; on page 17, after line 5, to insert:

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

After line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each maintain available to the public records of portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction, including maps and descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and description of areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

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

And, on page 19, after line 15, to insert:

LAND USE COMMISSIONS

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

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wilderness Act".

WILDERNESS SYSTEM ESTABLISHED

Statement of policy

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas in the United States and its possessions to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

Definition of wilderness

(c) A wilderness, in contract with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Extent of system

SEC. 3. (a) The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this Act as the wilderness system) shall comprise (subject to existing private rights) such federally owned areas as are established as part of such system under the provisions of this Act.

National forest areas

(b)(1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe: *Provided,* That the areas classified as primitive shall be subject to review as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wildnerness and shall report his findings to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area

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

(2) The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to but not in interference with the purposes for which national forests are established as set forth in the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11), and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86-517 (74 Stat. 215).

National park system areas

(c)(1) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, each portion of each park, monument, or other unit in the national park system which on the effective date of this Act embraces a continuous area of five thousand acres or more without roads. Within ten years after the effective date of this Act the Secretary of the Interior shall review the units of the national park system and shall report his recommendations for the incorporation of each such portion into the wilderness system to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each such portion for which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each such portion shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall include, as part of his recommendations to the President under the provisions of this subsection, a description of the parts of each park, monument, or other unit submitted which should be reserved for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. Such parts shall shall be determined in accordance with the procedures for rulemaking under section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), except that the public notice required under such section shall be at least ninety days prior to the determination proceedings. No designation of an area for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, or administrative installations shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the Act approved August 25, 1916, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes" (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 and following). The accommodations and installations in such designated areas shall be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition. Further, the inclusion of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system within the wilderness system pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such area in accordance with such Act of August 25, 1916, the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such area, including, but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 432 and following); section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C., sec. 796(2)); and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C., sec. 461 and following).

National wildlife refuges and game ranges

(d) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within ten years following the effective date of this Act, and such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges added to his jurisdiction after such date but not later than fifteen years following such date as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within two years following the date on which such refuge or range was added to his jurisdiction. Before the convening of Congress each year the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each area recommended for such incorporation by the Secretary of the Interior during the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each area shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Modification of boundaries

(e) Any proposed modification of adjustment of boundaries of any portion of the wilderness system established in accordance with this Act shall be made by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the vicinity of such boundaries and public hearing to be held in such vicinity not less than ninety days after such notice if there is sufficient demand during such ninety days for such hearing. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Effective date of President's recommendations

(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided*, That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided. Any such resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C., secs. 133z-12—133z-15) for a resolution of either House of Congress.

Effect of public notice of proposed addition to wilderness system

(g) Public notice when given by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that any area is to be proposed under the provisions of this Act for incorporation as part of the wilderness system shall segregate such area from any or all appropriation under the public land laws to the extent deemed necessary by such Secretary. Such segregation shall terminate (1) upon rejection of such proposal by the President, (2) upon approval by the Congress of a resolution opposing the incorporation of such area in the wilderness system, or (3) five years after the date of such notice if the proposal to incorporate such area as part of the wilderness system has not been submitted to both Houses of Congress prior to the expiration of such five years.

Addition or elimination not provided for in this Act

(h) The addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for under the provisions of this Act shall be made only after specific affirmative authorization by law for such addition or elimination.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PRIVATELY OWNED LANDS WITHIN THE WILDERNESS SYSTEM

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system any privately owned land within any portion of such system under his jurisdiction, subject to the approval of any necessary appropriations by the Congress.

GIFTS OR BEQUESTS OF LAND

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may each accept gifts or bequests of land for preservation as wilderness, and such land shall on acceptance become part of the wilderness system. Regulations with regard to any such land may be in accordance with such agreements, consistent with the policy of this Act, as are made at the time of such gift, or such conditions, consistent with such policy, as may be included in, and accepted with, such bequest.

USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Other provisions of law

SEC. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes

stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes as also to preserve its wilderness character. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

Prohibition of certain uses

(b) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas.

Special provisions

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Within national forest areas included in the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become well established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable. In addition, such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable.

(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including exploration for oil and gas), mining (including the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (B) the grazing of livestock, where well established prior to the effective date of this Act with respect to areas established as part of the wilderness system by this Act, or prior to the date of public notice thereof with respect to any area to be recommended for incorporation in the wilderness system, shall be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions and regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary having jurisdiction over such area.

(3) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, formerly designated as the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou roadless areas in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber, the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall preclude the continuance within the area of any already established use of motorboats. Nothing in this Act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, Seventy-first Congress, July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020), the Thye-Blatnik Act, Public Law 733, Eightieth Congress, June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, June 22, 1956 (70 Stat. 326), as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Modifications of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area within the Superior National Forest shall be accomplished in the manner provided in section 3(e).

(4) Commercial services may be performed within the wilderness system to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system as established in this Act.

(5) Any existing use or form of appropriation authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or game range existing on the effective date of this Act may be continued under such authorization or provision.

(6) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(7) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

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

RECORDS AND REPORTS

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

CONTRIBUTIONS AND GIFTS

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act. Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.

LAND USE COMMISSIONS

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, during my 5 years in the Senate, I look back upon three bills, reported from the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which have great historic significance. The first such bill admitted Alaska to statehood; the second admitted Hawaii. As I am proud to have had an active role in the enactment of the two statehood bills, so I am proud to present to the Senate today the third of these truly momentous measures, S. 174, the wilderness bill.

It is, Mr. President, the successor of a series of wilderness bills, each of them a refinement upon an earlier version. The issue has been before the Interior Committee throughout my term in the Senate. The committee, composed almost entirely of western Senators, whose States will be most directly benefited, has labored long and earnestly to fashion legislation equitable to all.

There is no question but what the whole American people have much to gain from the establishment of a wilderness preservation system. Nevertheless, the pending bill is of primary importance to westerners. We will be its chief beneficiaries. In most other parts of America, people have come to know only the domesticated life of congested cities and clipped countrysides. It is in the West

alone that a person can still escape the clutter of roads, signposts, and managed picnic grounds. The vanishing wilderness is yet a part of our western heritage. We westerners have known the wilds during our lifetimes, and we must see to it that our grandchildren are not denied the same rich experience during theirs. This is why the West needs a wilderness bill. The entire country shares in the same need.

Because the areas covered by the pending bill have already been set aside in their primitive state for some measure of preservation, the proposed wilderness system can be established, if we act now, with no adverse effect on anyone. The tracts involved have already been excluded from timber sales, and consequently do not form any part of the cutting circle for any community or lumber company. Such grazing as now occurs may continue, subject only to the provisions of existing law. Established mining operations—there are only half a dozen of them within the whole of the proposed system—will remain in business, since the restrictions as to the use of wilderness areas are expressly made subject to all existing rights. So there will be no economic dislocations resulting from the enactment of this wilderness bill.

I regret, Mr. President, that the author of the bill, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, who, on behalf of himself and 13 other Senators, introduced this measure on January 5, cannot be here to direct the course of the debate. He learned last week from his doctors that he had to undergo an operation which will keep him away from the Senate for at least 2 weeks more. Before he departed, on last Thursday, he made an extended statement on the bill, which begins at page 17016 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 24.

I hope the Members of the Senate will read his excellent explanation of the bill, its purposes, and provisions, as well as his reply to those who would emasculate it.

In his statement, the chairman outlined in some detail how this measure superimposes, in respect to areas already set aside for some measure of preservation in their natural state, a directive to the administering Federal agencies to maintain the wilderness character of the tracts involved.

Three types of areas are affected. They are: First, national parks and monuments; second, wildlife ranges and refuges; and third, designated wilderness type areas in the national forests.

None of the Taylor grazing lands are involved. No Indian lands are involved. Any areas placed in the wilderness system beyond the three categories covered in the bill would have to be added by an affirmative act of Congress in which the House, the Senate, and the President all concurred.

The committee has been careful to preserve States rights within the proposed wilderness system. No change is made in regard to the application of State water laws. State jurisdiction over fish and wildlife will extend equally to those parts of the national forests which become wilderness areas, so that no added Federal interference with hunting or fishing is in any way involved. Where the use of aircraft or motorboats has become well established, the practice may be permitted to continue. In addition, such measures may be taken to protect the national forests from fire, insects, and disease, as the Forest Service deems necessary.

There has been predominant agreement among the members of our committee and the witnesses who have appeared before it—the committee has heard more than 500 witnesses—that this Nation must preserve some of its wild, scenic lands in their natural, unspoiled state. We must do this while we still can, for wilderness is not a renewable resource. Once occupied, cut over, or exploited, it is lost forever.

The problem has been how to go about it. How much should be preserved? What should be the rules for classifying primitive tracts as wilderness? How should the wilderness be administered afterwards?

The rules adopted in the pending bill require that each tract becoming part of the wilderness system must be carefully reviewed by the Federal agency administering it, then made the subject of a recommendation by the President to the Congress, where it must lie for at least one full session, and where it is subject to disapproval by either the Senate or the House of Representatives. Each branch of the Congress, retaining the same prerogative it would have to reject any proposed bill up for affirmative enactment, may, by passing a resolution of disapproval, prevent the inclusion of any area recommended to be part of the wilderness system. Thus, the power of Congress to make the final determination is fully guaranteed.

Once an area is placed in the wilderness system, the bill before us provides that it may be reopened for particular developments, if the President of the United States should decide, upon appropriate application, that the use proposed to be made serves a greater public interest than its continued preservation as wilderness. The Congress, of course, retains the power to authorize any activity in a wilderness area, should this prove advisable in the future. By the same token, Congress could alter or abolish any or all wilderness areas, once established, if the public interest were ever to so require.

Moreover, it is not made impossible to enter wilderness areas in search of critically needed metals. Under the bill, limited prospecting for any metal may take place, without need for permission, providing it does not disrupt the wilderness environment. Permission is to be given for more extensive prospecting and mining, if there is need for it. The bill simply assures that the decision to contravene the wilderness character of any of these tracts shall be made at the highest level of government, by the President or by the Congress.

I represent a State in which most of the land is owned by the Federal Government. Many people in my State earn their livelihood through permissive use of Federal land. I would oppose the pending bill if it constituted any threat to these people. I support the multiple-use principle in the administration of our public lands wherever it makes sense, that is, wherever the land is suited for multiple use.

I recognize the importance of lumbering and mining to the economy of Idaho, and I do my best to represent their legitimate interests in this Senate. Although both industries oppose the pending bill, I believe it will, in the long run, prove to be an actual benefit to them. Let me explain why I believe this to be the case:

The Federal Government, which once owned all of Idaho, still owns nearly two-thirds of it. Under existing law, the Government has locked up over 3 million acres in now established primitive areas, comprising nearly a tenth of its total holdings. In these areas, lumbering is prohibited and mining is subjected to severe restrictions. As a matter of fact, there are no mines at all now operating in any of these primitive areas. Moreover, the areas may now be created, their boundaries altered, and new tracts added, by administrative decision alone, without need of any review or approval by the Congress. This is the highly unstable condition under present law.

The pending bill would establish a wilderness system in Idaho based on these existing primitive areas. But before these areas could become a permanent part of the system, each one would have to be reviewed for wilderness values within 10 years following the enactment of the bill. Those portions found to be more suitable for multiple-use—for lumbering, mining, and grazing, as well as recreation—would be released from their present restrictive classification and would revert to ordinary forest lands; the remaining acres, where wilderness values clearly predominate, would then be recommended for retention in the wilderness system. Each such recommendation would be submitted to Congress and made subject to veto by either the House or Senate. At the end of the 10-year period, after the wilderness system has been so established, no new areas could be added without an affirmative act of Congress.

Thus the wilderness bill returns to the Congress its rightful supervision and control over our public lands; it promises greater stability in the management and classification of these lands for the benefit of those industries which depend upon them, even while it sets aside wilderness areas for preservation in their natural state, to be enjoyed by all of us now living, and by our descendants through the years to come.

Mr. President, the loudest arguments that have been heard against this bill make the least sense. Those who protest, "We can't make a living off wilder-

ness," overlook the fact that wilderness preserves will constitute an attraction of increasing appeal as the population grows, and more and more people seek some respite from the clutter of clustered life—from the confusion of congested cities. These wilderness areas will become a mighty magnet for the tourist trade, already vital to our economy in the West. Few industries have as much potential for us. Taking wise precautions now to preserve some of our untamed land, while it is still intact, is just good business for the future.

Opponents of the bill have countered that wilderness only appeals to a minority of our people, that the majority prefer to take their outings by automobile, to park a trailer or pitch a tent in a developed campground, or to enjoy the comforts of organized life at resort hotels, motels, or dude ranches.

I concede this to be true. But should the majority trample underfoot the rightful entitlement of the minority? What a novel doctrine. One would think America big enough to set aside wilderness preserves for the many of our citizens who seek to escape the incessant crowd, to search for solace in solitude amidst a sanctuary far removed from the banality of beer ads and cigarette commercials.

Indeed, this very fact has led other opponents of the wilderness bill to charge that its object is to create vast playgrounds in the West for rich easterners. What poppycock. I would think that the business any vacationer brings to the West is welcome, from whatever part of the country he may come. I am thankful that many do come to Idaho from afar to witness the unique attractions of our primitive areas. But the fact remains that most of the hikers, hunters, and fishermen who enjoy the wild lands of my State come from the farms and towns of Idaho itself. As for the rest, the big majority are westerners from neighboring States. Every Senator voting to report this bill favorably to the Senate represents a State that is west of the Mississippi River.

Perhaps the most ridiculous argument of all against the wilderness bill is that somehow it represents some sort of creeping socialism. Such a charge is so patently absurd that it ought not to be dignified with reply. Yet people are easily frightened by this label, which doubtlessly accounts for its injection into the controversy over the wilderness bill. There is, of course, no substance whatever to the charge. All the land involved is already owned and managed by the Federal Government and is subject to its plenary jurisdiction. Furthermore, insofar as the primitive areas in the national forests are concerned, restrictions concerning their creation, extension, and general use, can now be imposed by administrative action of the Forest Service alone, with no provision under existing law for review or approval by the Congress.

One of the virtues of the wilderness bill is that it restores to the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, a larger measure of supervision and control over the management of our public lands than Congress now enjoys. If it is the specter of a spreading, indifferent, and unresponsive Federal bureaucracy that people who cry creeping socialism fear, then they should applaud the wilderness bill as a step toward returning unduly delegated power to Congress, where it properly belongs. For these people to oppose the wilderness bill makes no sense at all.

Mr. President, amendments have been offered to the pending measure which would give to the appropriate departmental secretaries and the Federal Power Commission the authority to permit intrusions upon the wilderness system. The amendments are not needed, for these agencies will make their recommendations to the President, in any case, to whom this very authority is given. The adoption of the amendments would weaken the integrity of the wilderness system proposed, since each intrusion would be left to the final judgment of agencies which are in fact engaged in serving a specialized clientele.

I am not critical of persons who evaluate hydroelectric power, or timber, or minerals, above continued preservation of a wilderness area. Our population has grown until there is great pressure among conflicting uses for land. We develop city plans and adopt zoning ordinances to keep order in our towns and cities, and we are rapidly moving toward rural zoning. There are a great many disagreements about zones and zoning. These disagreements occur between entirely sincere men. Industrialists sometimes find it hard to understand why an industry is not preferable to the maintenance of a residential area, or more desirable than a playground.

We do not, however, let the industrialists, or the realtors interested in shopping centers and apartment developments, have the final decision on the modification of city zones, nor do we leave the final decision to the appointed public officials who deal with them. The power of decision we reserve to elected officials, the mayor and the city council, who are responsible to all the people.

So, Mr. President, in this bill we properly leave such final decisions to the elected Chief Executive who is accountable to the whole people, in this case the President of the United States, and to the Legislature, which in this case is the Congress of the United States.

I think it is regrettable that so reasonable and constructive a measure as the pending bill has been subjected to such heated and ill-considered attacks. Yet this is the case in my own State and in many others, so much so that an old cynic once remarked to me, "Whenever you are asked where you stand on the wilderness bill, you'd better say: 'Some of my friends are for it, and some of my friends are against it, and I always stand with my friends.' "

This kind of doubletalk by elected officeholders, plus the distorted claims and counterclaims of alarmists on both sides, has engulfed the wilderness bill in a storm of nonsense. Neither friend nor foe has sought shelter long enough to inquire just what the bill, as amended by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, actually provides. The prevailing attitude seems to be, "Don't bother me with facts. My mind is made up."

In such a situation, the members of the committee have had to use their best judgment in drafting legislation which, while fair to the special interests involved, is designed to promote the general interest. With this as our objective, we adopted a number of amendments to the bill as originally introduced. I, myself, proposed three amendments, all of which the committee approved. I believe the resulting bill, as amended by the committee, fully protects the needs of our economy, while establishing a wilderness system of lasting recreational value for all the people.

In view of the fine exposition of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] of the contents and purposes of the pending measure, before he left for the hospital, and because a number of my colleagues desire to speak on the bill, I shall not take more time.

I close by urging the Senate to approve this wilderness bill. If it becomes law, we will have taken another historic step forward along the path charted by Theodore Roosevelt, pioneered by Gifford Pinchot, and traveled by all the great conservationists who followed them.

We will have preserved, for now and for generations unborn, areas of unspoiled, pristine wilderness, accessible by a system of trails, unmarred by roads or buildings, but open to the considerate use and enjoyment of hikers, mountain climbers, hunters, fishermen, and trail riders, and of all those who find, in high and lonely places, a refreshment of the spirit, and life's closest communion with God.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The business is S. 174, the wilderness bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to commit the bill, with all amendments, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Chair repeat the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to recommit the pending business, S. 174, to the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 183]

Allott	Ellender	Mansfield
Case, S. Dak.	Hickey	Metcalf
Church	Jordan	Moss
Dworshak	Kuchel	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent because of death in the family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio entered the Chamber and answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 174) to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday and the day before I spent some time studying the bill now before the Senate. I was reminded of the fact that the subject matter of this bill was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year. It affects all of our national forests, and I am wondering why the bill was not submitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

It is true that quite an extensive study was made of the wilderness proposal by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but the lands involved in the bill will affect our national forests, and our national forests have always been under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In view of the fact that several Members of the Senate have entered the Chamber only in the last few minutes, I am not sure that all of them are aware of the motion the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has made.

Is it not correct, I ask the Senator, that he has made a motion to commit the so-called wilderness bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And is it not correct that, under the rules of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is supposed to have referred to it "all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects," including, as No. 6, "forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain"?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not correct that in a letter of the Secretary of Agriculture to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which appears at page 31 of the report, Secretary Freeman referred to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, and then stated:

> In this act, the Congress declared the establishment and maintenance of wilderness areas to be consistent with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

And he then stated:

> In inserting this provision as a committee amendment to the bill which became that act, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made it clear that the enactment of that provision was not intended as a substitute for the enactment of legislation to establish a national wilderness preservation policy and program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I was going to refer to that. It will be recalled that in the report which was submitted to the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when the bill for the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act was considered, it was shown that S. 3044 came from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it, in a measure, recognized the 14 million acres that were already set aside for that purpose.

It is my belief that this new bill is so far reaching that it should be looked into and studied by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It may be that the committee will be in complete agreement with the policy sought to be established. I do not think there will be much variance. But the methods by which the policy is to be attained to establish the wilderness areas may seriously conflict with our method of developing forests for commercial uses and otherwise.

It strikes me the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should certainly have a look at it, and I do not think there should be any objection to that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had any hearings or has it made any recommendations with regard to the so-called wilderness bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. None whatever, except the reference in the report, as the Senator has just stated, when the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act was enacted last year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note that the bill itself, at page 6, in paragraph (b)(2) of section 3 states:

> The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to but not interference with the purposes for which national forests are established as set forth in the Act of June 4, 1897, and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960.

In view of the fact that the bill before the Senate, on its face, and the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, both refer to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act which was handled by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it occurs to me that the motion by the Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is very much in order and very well taken.

I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I am a

member of the National Forest Reservation Commission, which was created by act of Congress some years ago. That legislation, I understand, was handled by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

It seems to me it would be only natural for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to take cognizance of this bill, and that we should have some recommendation from the committee after it has had an opportunity to study the bill. Therefore, I shall support the motion to commit the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This bill has been before the Senate for many years. I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has previously requested that the bill be referred to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. We had the subject before us last year, and we dealt with the wilderness question in the bill which was enacted by the Congress. We recognized that 14 million acres, as I remember the figure, had been set aside as wilderness or wilderness-type areas. We recognized this as one of the legitimate uses under the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the wilderness bill was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presumably upon advice of the Parliamentarian, did the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry request that the bill be referred to it rather than to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. Nothing was done about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why does the Senator from Louisiana come in at this late date, after the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has passed upon the question, to now ask that the bill be referred to his committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, bills are sent to committees automatically, I presume by action of those at the desk. We do not have an opportunity to follow through with respect to all the bills which are introduced in the Senate.

When I found that this bill was being reported to the Senate, I got busy and looked into it. I studied it.

I repeat, the bill involves all of the areas in our national forests, because that is the land involved in wilderness. It struck me the bill would affect our national forests to such an extent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should take cognizance of it and do something about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has not the Senator from Louisiana really slipped on his claimed rights, by permitting the bill to go to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without protest? The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings. I know the committee has been engaged for 2 or 3 years in an attempt to iron out the difficulties.

Is it not also true that a large portion of the wilderness involves public lands, and that public lands are managed by the Department of the Interior, so that the reference was not a captious reference of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is entirely wrong about that. The Interior Department has charge of our parks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The national forests, from which the wilderness will be carved in the future, are under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are not the public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about national forests.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am speaking of the public lands, such as those under the Bureau of Land Management and the wildlife refuges.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; but all the present wilderness areas have been carved, as I said, from our national forests. I repeat, over 14 million acres were previously acted on. Many of our parks have been carved out of lands formerly under the national forests.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. CHURCH addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had promised to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The proposal of the chairman of the committee has taken me unawares, yet I can see a jurisfication for it. As the Senator says, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the establishment of wilderness areas last year. A good many members of the committee, if not a majority, were in favor of some such legislation.

I, for one, had overlooked the fact that the bill had been committed exclusively to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this year.

I do not believe we can permit private forestry—the farm forestry which is complementary to farm operations—as well as the national forests which have been acquired and not carved out of the national domain, to go outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I come from an area where private forestry—the cutting of pulp during the winter or the cutting of logs under selective cutting—is complementary to the farming operations. Many farms today, in the eastern part of the United States, could not afford to continue on summer operations alone but can furnish a good living for a family with harvesting of pulp and timber during the winter months.

I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana would be willing to consider a requirement that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry report back to the Senate by a specific date. I think it is a good idea to have wilderness areas of reasonable size set aside for the benefit of the public, whether it be 5,000 or 10,000 acres. Anyone who wishes to can get lost on 5,000 or 10,000 acres as easily as he can get lost on 105,000 acres.

I think such areas in parts of the country in which they do not exist now would be desirable. But the program could be overdone.

Unfortunately, the situation is that there are some people, particularly those in the livestock and mining businesses, who do not like the idea of having any wilderness areas at all. Other well-meaning people would set aside so much area in wilderness that perhaps there would be economic failure in this country, even if we did not starve to death. We are in between extremists.

I would not wish to see the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry deprived of consideration of forestry proposals in the United States, and particularly those respecting the national forests which have been acquired by purchase rather than carved out of the national domain. Of course, all of the national forests in the East have been acquired by purchase.

I would put such national forests in a little different category from the national forests of Utah or Nevada or of other Western States, where the forest areas have been set aside from land which has always been owned by the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not opposed to a wilderness bill. The Senator well remembers that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry looked into the proposal last year, when the committee reported the sustained yield bill. There was language in the bill to recognize the wilderness areas already established.

Mr. AIKEN. I had the impression that the majority of the members of the committee favored establishment of wilderness areas.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly.

Specifically answering the Senator's question as to whether I would agree to a requirement that the committee report the bill by a specific date, I would have no objection to that proposal. I do not wish to kill the bill by any means.

Let us not forget that the House will not consider this bill this year. It strikes me that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry could be given an opportunity to look into the proposal, say next January and part of February, and report back by March 1. I would not object to that.

It strikes me that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should, by all means, look into the bill and study its implications and the effect it would have on forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has said that the bill would not become law this year. We are sure of that now.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry could consider the bill and report back on the 15th of February or the 1st of March. We could report the bill back, and I believe that there would be much better feeling. The bill would be much more sure of ultimate passage than if the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were bypassed and ignored.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly the point I desire to make. I believe that would be the result if our committee were to look into the subject and study

it, though not with the idea of going over every detail that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs covered.

Mr. AIKEN. Could we make the date March 1?

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that referral of the bill to the committee would help its passage in the House of Representatives. I hope that Senators who are interested in the passage of the wilderness bill will agree to a commitment of the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because I honestly believe that such referral would assist the passage of the bill in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I believe that instead of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry being subjected to criticism because of his alleged untimely motion to commit the bill to his committee, the chairman of that committee should be commended for interposing at this time a warning to the Senate.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to a reference in the minority views on the bill which points out that—

> The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which is making an inventory of the Nation's recreation resources, and which is scheduled to report early in 1962, has contracted a study of wilderness with the wildlife research center at the University of California. The broad objective of the study is to make a careful appraisal of the place of wilderness and wild areas in the national pattern of outdoor recreation.

Certainly the Senate should be advised that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has spent $2 million through its activities and its operations in engaging capable university groups and other agencies to make extensive studies during the past 3 years. I have raised the question that it is not timely for this body to consider the bill a few months prior to the time when this extensive report will be submitted. It is very significant that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission is composed of 15 members, 7 of whom are laymen, 4 of whom are Senators, and 4 of whom are Representatives.

So Congress has actually a majority of the full membership of the Commission, and therefore can be expected to participate fully in drafting the report at a meeting which is scheduled for late this month in Colorado. Is that not a point that should be recognized at this time so that we can correlate and coordinate not only the extensive work which has been done by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but the work which could be undertaken by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry based upon the report of the extensive studies made by this national Commission?

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my good friend for bringing that subject to the attention of the Senate as another argument to have the bill referred. I repeat that Senators who are really and truly interested in having a wilderness bill passed should take heed of that point, and let us go into it. I feel confident that if the bill is referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is then submitted to the Senate and passed, in all probability it will have a better chance of enactment by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The committee of which the Senator is chairman has jurisdiction of the national forests, but it is my understanding that the forest preserves and the national parks incorporated in the bill are created from the public domain, and that less than 5 percent of the total mileage in the States from New Hampshire to North Carolina is under the jurisdiction of the National Forest Service and therefore within the jurisdiction of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is chairman. Am I correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the national forest areas would be the only areas included in the wilderness system upon enactment of the bill. In the past 15 years or so the Secretary of Agriculture has set aside certain areas. Up to the present time the exact amount is 14,664,053 acres which have been classified as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe territory, consisting of 4,888,173 acres in 14 wilderness areas, 998,234 acres in 29 wild areas, 886,673 acres in 1 canoe area, and 7,890,793 acres in 39 primitive areas. The bill would recognize those areas, but all of them have been carved out of national forests.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I read from the Standing Rules of the Senate the reference to the jurisdiction of particular committees. Under rule XXV, section (m), Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is the following as being within the jurisdiction of that committee:

> Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much of such forest areas is included in the public domain?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not recall the exact amount.

What I am contending is that additional areas will be carved out of the lands of the national forests which are under the Department of Agriculture. For that reason I say that before we carve out more wilderness areas from the national forests, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should have a look at the proposal. I do not refuse to answer questions, but as will be seen when I read the short statement that I wish to read, the Secretary of Agriculture could set aside an unlimited number of acres and declare it to be wilderness if he desired to do so.

As I have said, it is my belief that the bill goes quite far. I do not know what effect it would have in the light of the national forestry bill that was passed last year. But I believe we ought to look into it. That is all I am asking. It strikes me that the Senate itself would be better off if it were to take that step.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. As I understand, the Senator concedes that under the Standing Rules of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction over the forest reserves and the national parks created from the public domain. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

That is the point I wish to make. The wilderness areas would be carved out of lands that are now under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. CHURCH. If the Senator will look to the actual statistics, I think that he will find that almost all the areas covered by the bill are drawn from land that came from the public domain, and therefore is properly under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ELLENDER. That covers lands that have been set aside and parks that have been created over the years. I agree.

I agree to that. I am saying to the Senator that under the pending bill the Secretary of Agriculture would be able to enlarge these areas a good deal; he would be able to encroach on the national forests to a large extent. It strikes me that that is a reason why the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CHURCH. Any additional land that is brought into the wilderness system, once the system has been established, must be brought in by act of Congress. Moreover, under the bill, all of the land that comes into the wilderness system is subject to review by Congress and to veto by either the House or the Senate. Therefore, Congress has the power of final decision in every case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Through the veto; yes. Before that happens, though, the bill would freeze over 14 million acres of national forests as wilderness areas. That would be the law. There may be something that we on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry might suggest, instead of having these areas frozen by law in the first place and then reviewed by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, and then have the effect of the law set aside by the President, provided that Congress does not veto such action. I would like to reverse the procedure. I would like to have prevail the same system that has prevailed in the past; that is, to have Congress establish these areas, and not let them be established and then passed upon by Congress by way of veto.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator realizes, does he not, that primitive areas in the

national forests can today be created and expanded by administrative decision alone, without any power of veto by Congress?

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the Department of Agriculture; yes.

Mr. CHURCH. The bill then would restore to Congress a greater measure of control, would it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. What the Senator has said is true under the Department of Agriculture, not under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators to the language at page 18, line 7, of the bill. I read from the committee amendment on that page:

> Within a year following the establishment of any area within the national forests as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the U.S. Senate, and the House of Representatives, and such descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act.

Two questions come to my mind in connection with this language. First of all, on the face of it, it suggests the establishment of areas within national forests as a part of the national wilderness system. If that is true, then I would like to have the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the establishment of areas within the national forests.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I am arguing for.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Secondly, why should the Secretary of Agriculture file a map and legal description with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dealing with wilderness areas established out of national forests, and not file the same map and legal description with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which normally deals with this matter?

It seems logical to have specific consideration by and recommendation from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in order to clarify at least the import of passages like that. I am sure the people in my national forests will wonder why the Secretary of Agriculture should come under the supervision of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when areas are established within national forests, and not the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, so I may explain that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The reason the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs wants to have a map is so that we can find what mining interests are involved, so that people who want to explore in the public domain can find out about these things.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would have no objection to having the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs go into that matter. However, it seems to me that with respect to areas established within national forests, the Committee on Agriculure and Forestry might also like to have a report.

Mr. METCALF. Perhaps so. We also want to find out what water supplies are involved. That comes under the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee. We want to know where it is possible to explore damsites, and with respect to other things that come under the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it is to be made that broad, perhaps the Committee on Public Roads might want to look at the water situation, for example.

Mr. METCALF. So might the Department of Commerce with respect to wildlife refuges.

This spreads the matter of jurisdiction over many committees.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I merely wish to say that the wording of the rule of the Senate with respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as was pointed out a few minutes ago, specifically clothes the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with specific jurisdiction over "forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain."

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not complaining about that. However, in the bill the Secretary and the Chief of the Forest Service would have the power to create more of them and buy more land adjacent to them, and enlarge them, and these departments are now under the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KUCHEL. Under present law the Secretary of Agriculture can clothe every acre with the state of primitive. This also seeks to replace in Congress, after appropriate proceedings in the executive branch, some of the authority that the Secretary of Agriculture presently has given to him by law. I shall make some comment on my own time on the Senator's motion. However, I thought in answer to the questions raised by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] it should be pointed out that the rules specifically give the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs authority over that type of forest reserve.

Mr. ELLENDER. After being created; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that the Senator from California has completely forgotten the fact that all of the national forests are not created from the public domain. If he wants to leave out the whole eastern part of the country so far as the application of the pending bill is concerned, his point is right.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield at this point. I did not interrupt the Senator when he was making his statement.

Mr. KUCHEL. I apologize to the Senator. If he does not desire to yield to a Senator for a question, I apologize.

Mr. HOLLAND. The rule giving jurisdiction to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can be found at page 25 of the Senate manual. Subsection 6 specifically reads:

> Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

There are three national forests in my State, the Ocala National Forest, the Osceola National Forest, and the Apalachicola National Forest. None of these was created from the public domain.

As we go up through Georgia and the two Carolinas and Virginia, and so on up through the Appalachians and Alleghenies, we find hundreds of thousands of acres of land in the national forests, beautiful national forests, created for the protection of water reserves and for other purposes that are salutary, and we want to preserve them. Every one of them is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and every one of them is being administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Furthermore, I remind the Senator that only last year, when the Senate was considering the multiple use bill, the Senator from Florida made a motion in committee which recognized the fact—and it is in the legislation to speak for itself—that our action was not designed to interfere with the progress of the Wilderness Act, which the Senator from Florida wishes to support. But he does not wish to support it at the expense of giving to the western part of the country all the attention without regarding the wilderness values in the national forests in the eastern part of the Nation, every one of which is located on lands bought by the States, by private interests, or by the Federal Government itself, in order that a national forest might be created. They are great areas, beautiful areas, areas about which we in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry wish to have something to say.

So far as the Senator from Louisiana is concerned, I think he is speaking up only as he should for the jurisdiction of his committee, for the preservation of the integrity of the Department of Agriculture, and for the East to continue to have something to say in connection with this important bill and its objectives.

The Senator from Florida is a friend of the proposal to establish wilderness areas. I love to go into them myself. I stood for them in committee last year; I wish to stand for them on the floor of the Senate. However, I cannot stand for the pending bill, which serenely forgets the fact that there is a Department of Agriculture and there are committees of Congress which have jurisdiction of many national forests not carved out of the public domain.

Until Senators from the West get around to understanding what is the obvious fact, that we in the East do have an interest in the national forests, it

seems to me that they are setting up what will amount to a complete roadblock to any enlargement from the original establishment of wilderness areas. So far as the original establishment of the wilderness area is concerned, consisting of some 7 million acres, as the report shows, that practically all comes out of the national forests in the West. To say that the Department of Agriculture has no interest in this matter and that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has no legitimate interest in it is simply to be blind to the facts in the case and to the fact that the greatest population in the country, in the eastern part of the Nation, values tremendously its national forests and values highly the maintenance of virgin areas therein, whether they are established as formal wilderness areas or not.

I hope the Senator from Louisiana will persist in his motion and that it will prevail, because there is no other way for Congress to approach this problem in a method which will find harmony prevailing in the later consideration of a larger program than to let the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have an opportunity to consider the proposed legislation.

Of course, the Senator from Louisiana is correct in saying that he never saw the bill which was introduced before it was referred. The Senator from Florida notes that of the large number of Senators who introduced the bill, only two were members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. Practically all the others were members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. They have an interest in the proposal—a legitimate interest. I respect that interest. I wish to help them work it out. However, to say that other Senators, who come from the eastern part of the Nation, do not have an interest in the bill or its objectives is to negate what is, of course, the fact.

I hope the motion of the Senator from Louisiana will prevail.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to make an observation again with reference to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture would be reporting to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I comment on the point raised by the junior Senator from Montana with respect to mining. In the national forests of the West today, the jurisdiction over the land which is involved in the mining, prospecting, and development of claims does not get to the Department of the Interior or the Bureau of Land Management until the mining claim is developed and it goes to patent. The administration of the service areas is within the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture through the United States Forest Service.

So I say again that if the Secretary of Agriculture is to file maps and legal descriptions of the areas with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he should also file them with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am sure that thousands of mining claim holders in the national forests of the West would not understand a proposal that wilderness areas should be established affecting their present claims or claims which might be filed, and that the reporting and the handling of them should be turned over to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when, under present law, they deal with the Forest Service, which has control of the management of the service area.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Since the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] mentioned that I was a sponsor of the bill and am also a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is chairman, I wish to make a comment.

Because of my slight seniority, I was afforded the opportunity to choose between serving on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I thought a long time before making my decision, because the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs deals with such activities as the wilderness and the national park system. The word "Forestry" in the title of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made me finally decide to accept membership on that committee. However, I must say that in the last half hour I have heard more mention of forestry in the title of that committee than I have heard in the committee itself since I became a member of the committee in January. The committee has always been referred to as the "Committee on Agriculture." I have not heard a tree mentioned since I began to sit on that committee. I think the chairman will admit that I have been diligent in my attendance upon the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Oregon has been diligent in her attendance.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Forestry was simply pushed into the background; it has never been considered before.

Because I have attended hearings in other parts of the country on the wilderness bill in other years, I am certain that the hearings have been thoroughly held and well conducted, and that all the material is available to members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry right now.

Also, this is my first experience, since becoming a Member of the Senate, in seeing Senators who are really fundamentally, I think, opposed to the whole principle of wilderness trying to indulge in what appears to me to be some kind of stalling action. I do not quite understand that. It seems to me that if Senators profess great interest in the wilderness and are actually interested in it, they are well enough informed by now to vote.

The Secretary of Agriculture says he strongly recommends the bill. This should convince members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the concern of the Department of Agriculture for the bill.

I dislike to see the Senate engage in what is purely a stalling maneuver, when every Member of the Senate knows exactly what the principles of the wilderness bill are. It seems to me that the motion of the Senator from Louisiana, the distinguished chairman of the committee of which I am a member, should be defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I give assurance that my motion is not a stalling action. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry dealt with forestry last year and the year before, before the Senator from Oregon became a member of the Senate. We have before us a bill dealing with wilderness. I think we should deal with it adequately.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Does not that mean it is unnecessary to have this bill rereferred?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill relates to forestry. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry ought to have something to say about it, because it deals with a subject in which our committee is deeply interested; namely, forestry. I do not know what effect the bill will have on forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I had agreed to yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I did not know until the motion was made this morning that a motion would be made to commit. I wish to express my approval of the motion.

The statement was made by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] a few moments ago that all Senators know what this is all about. Frankly, I do not think all Senators know what it is all about. It is true that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has spent considerable time on the bill. So far as I know, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has not spent any time on the bill.

There are 15 million acres of land with which the Department of Agriculture—that is to say, the Forest Service—is directly concerned, affected by the bill.

There is a great deal more in total acreage with which the Department of the Interior is directly concerned. I do not know on what basis the bill was originally referred to committee. I will say to the Senator from Florida—because of certain remarks about western Senators—that a lot of us in the West do not feel that this bill is satisfactory. I have never known resistance to be made to such a motion when the chairman of a committee had a specific interest in the substance of the bill. I will support the Senator from Louisiana, as I believe I properly should, because here are 15 million acres of forest land; and, as the Senator from Florida has already stated, a great deal of forest land in the United States is not affected by the bill.

Let me point out that on the east side of the Chamber there is displayed a large map which shows in green the forest lands of the Nation; and in the

rear of the Chamber there is displayed a map in black and white which shows the wilderness and wild areas which are the subject matter of the bill. It will be noted that the wilderness bill as such deals primarily with the Western States and also deals with Minnesota, South Carolina, and New Hampshire, but the bulk of the acreage involved in the bill is to be found primarily in the Western States.

So I say to the Senator from Florida that certainly there is no desire on the part of any of us to usurp the authority or jurisdiction of the committee over the bill. On the contrary, I believe that in accordance with the longstanding custom of the Senate, the Senate should recognize the prerogative of the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to have the bill referred to his committee, particularly when it is perfectly obvious—and let me point out that all Senators have on their desks a sheet entitled "Land Area Subject to Inclusion in the Wilderness System"—that 15 million acres included come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

So it would be a break with precedent, I believe, if the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, having such a great interest in this matter, and inasmuch as so much of the land comes under the jurisdiction of his committee, were not to have an opportunity to look at the bill itself.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota, to whom I previously promised to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to speak later in my own right on this matter; but at this time I wish to ask a question. First let me say that I appreciate the courtesy of the Senators concerned.

I should like to say that the first bill dealing with this matter was presented to the Congress in 1956, as a study bill, by the late Senator Murray.

In 1957, the Senator from Minnesota introduced the wilderness bill, for legislative action. That was in the 85th Congress.

In 1959, I joined with my friend, the late, departed Senator Neuberger, in introducing the wilderness bill. We held hearings in various parts of the country, before various committees; and I wish to say that, as the author of the bill, I never took so much abuse in all my life as I did in connection with the bill. I come from a State in which there are 22 million acres of forest land, State and Federal, besides privately owned land; and the abuse I received in my own State from the vested interests was unbelievable. But we did not retreat.

Then the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] took up the bill, and introduced a modified bill. I wish to say we had the cooperation of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] on these matters, in working out what were serious problems.

In the opinion of many Senators, the early bills went too far. But the bill now before the Senate is a modified bill.

My point is that under section 3(b) of the bill, certain areas dealt with are already designated as wilderness areas, and the bill does not provide for the inclusion of a single new acre. That has been done under existing law, by the Secretary of Agriculture; and section 3(b) provides that the wilderness area shall include four categories—"wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe"—and this section states:

(b)(1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service—

Which is in the Department of Agriculture—

as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe: *Provided*, That the areas classified as primitive shall be subject to review as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided*, That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be continued in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value: *Provided further*, That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be continued in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the continued inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest lands—

And so forth. So, under the bill, the classification is to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the recommendation is to be made by the President; and then the Congress itself can reject any of these areas, by means of a motion of disapproval—a procedure which has not been followed in connection with previous legislation in this field.

So if there is any problem about jurisdiction, let me say that we ought not send the bill back to committee. We have put in 5 years of work and study. I know the interests which have fought this bill. There have been honest differences of opinion as to how far a wilderness preservation system should go; and I think the Senator from Vermont stated the matter well when he said there have been some extremists on both sides.

But the fact of the matter is that there have been powerful mining interests and powerful lumber interests who have been opposed to the bill. By the way, I would be interested to know who published the sheet entitled "Land Area Subject To Inclusion in the Wilderness System." What is its authorship? Where did it come from? I want to know where it came from.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say I distributed that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that. Is this sheet based on the Senator's research?

Mr. ALLOTT. It is the result of research I had done; yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I saw one like this which came from the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator will notice that at the bottom of the sheet the source of the figures is stated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But I have seen a very similar sheet which came from the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. ALLOTT. That may be. The one on the Senator's desk was printed through my office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the Senator's explanation.

Mr. ALLOTT. And if the Senator has any question about the validity of the figures, I shall be very happy to explain them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not have any question at this time as to the validity of the figures. I only say that some of the most powerful economic interests in the country have fought the wilderness bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; and some of the most powerful economic interests in the country have fought for the wilderness bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those who have fought for the bill are primarily those who want to preserve certain areas of the country for the growing population, to make sure there is sufficient recreation area for its use.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield only for questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that 85 percent of the total national forest is in the public domain?

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be; I cannot state the exact amount.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana permit a request to be made at this time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; a request for insertion of some matter in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in in the RECORD a table which appears on pages 32 and 33 of the statistical appendix of the annual report of the Bureau of

Land Management, giving the summary of federally owned land, by State and major agency.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 10.—*Summary of federally owned land, by State and major agency, 1959*

Area	State	Department of the Interior				Department of Agriculture			
		Bureau of Indian Affairs		Other		Forest Service		Other	
		Public domain	Acquired	Public domain	Acquired	Public domain	Acquired	Public domain	Acquired
		Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*
1	California		837.3		12.5	19,668,564.0	295,275.0		628.0
	Oregon		1,518.9	40.0	1,348.8	14,403,742.0	534,811.3	14,598.8	
	Washington		56.4		6,559.5	9,447,525.0	241,082.3	160.0	229.4
	Total, area 1		2,412.6	40.0	7,920.8	43,519,831.0	1,071,168.6	14,753.8	857.4
2	Arizona	22,415.0	8,674.6		1.4	11,381,243.0	298.9		70.9
	Idaho	330.0	42,066.4		67.4	19,951,955.4	389,183.8	27,840.0	3,872.6
	Nevada		7,641.8		4.5	5,037,861.0	20,206.0	18,372.4	.5
	Utah		360.6	12,650.0	15.0	7,716,780.0	210,653.4		
	Total, area 2	22,745.0	58,743.4	12,650.0	88.3	44,087,839.4	620,342.1	46,212.4	3,944.0
3	Colorado		573.0		169.3	13,727,324.0	631,594.0		71.6
	Kansas		320.9		205.1		107,039.0		181.7
	Montana		128,228.1			16,623,091.6	12,396.5	72,447.2	422.3
	Nebraska	152.5	170.0			197,578.0	142,138.0	21,325.6	175.8
	New Mexico	391.4	85,353.2		4.7	8,489,981.0	514,227.0	200,413.5	325.0
	North Dakota	1,662.2	6,122.0		11.7	103,530.0	1,001,002.0		1,118.7
	Oklahoma		40,872.3		235.4	440.0	266,668.0	8,363.0	4,837.7
	South Dakota		140,451.6			1,201,224.0	802,449.0		360.0
	Texas				12,498.1		775,262.0		3,056.4
	Wyoming		1,127.3		2.2	8,671,262.0	470,596.0		16,476.8
	Total, area 3	2,206.1	403,218.4		13,126.5	49,014,430.6	4,723,371.5	302,549.3	27,026.0
4	Alaska	4,072,146.3		36,961.4	1,804.4	20,742,273.0	7.0	6.9	15.9
	Eastern States Office:				2.6				
	Alabama				20.7	25,319.0	606,651.0		105.1
	Arkansas					1,030,772.0	1,400,665.0		
	Connecticut								
	Delaware								
	District of Columbia								411.9
	Florida					162,193.0	912,549.0		5,750.7
	Georgia						785,678.0		1,565.6
	Illinois					420.0	210,593.0		29.1
	Indiana						121,086.0		
	Iowa		40.0				5,695.0		364.3
	Kentucky						458,523.0		
	Louisiana					435.0	591,291.0		1,336.3
	Maine				12.9		50,281.9		5.0
	Maryland								11,647.8
	Massachusetts						1,651.0		.3
	Michigan		4,016.8			266,390.0	2,292,771.0		50.0
	Minnesota		28,667.4		57.2	1,140,477.0	1,645,910.0		16.9
	Mississippi		213.6		3.0	1,590.0	1,132,222.0		383.7
	Missouri				63.3	1,796.0	1,372,290.0		642.0
	New Hampshire						677,533.3		
	New Jersey								34.9
	New York						13,747.0		1,319.9
	North Carolina		401.0				1,124,371.0		1,673.5
	Ohio						106,266.0		639.8
	Pennsylvania				264.3		470,862.0		32.5
	Rhode Island								
	South Carolina						587,274.0		464.2
	Tennessee				6.0		595,982.0		554.2
	Vermont						230,954.0		
	Virginia						1,449,481.0		4,217.8
	West Virginia				45.3		903,878.0		
	Wisconsin		39,446.7			7,948.0	1,460,621.1		.7
	Total, Eastern States		72,785.5		475.3	2,637,340.0	19,208,826.3		31,246.2
	Grand total	4,097,097.4	537,159.9	49,651.4	23,415.3	160,001,714.0	25,623,715.5	363,522.4	63,089.5

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that only 13,000 acres out of the 14 million acres, as tabulated on the sheet to which I referred a moment ago, entitled "Land Area Subject to Inclusion in the Wilderness System," are what might be called acquired land, and therefore are subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

May I add that I was a member of that committee for 6 years, and I was a rather diligent member.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, I do not like to go over the ground time and time again; but the 14 million acres to which I referred a while ago, and which this bill will recognize as wilderness areas, have been carved out of lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and subject——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Out of the public domain.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that, and I understand that—but out of lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield for a question? If the bill were amended so as to include a provision that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shall have some joint jurisdiction when the recommendations are made by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, would the Senator be satisfied with such a provision?

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that after holding hearings the committee may report the bill as written. But I should like to look into the bill and, as the Senator from Vermont suggested, report back on March 1. In my humble judgment when the bill is reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and I am sure it will be—it will then have a better chance of passing the House of Representatives than if the Senate were to act now on the bill as it now stands.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question on this point of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield, without losing the floor.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I ask the Senator from Minnesota if, in his very charitable and broadminded support of the bill, he would agree to the deletion, on page 15, of subdivision (3), which I un-

derstand gives preferential treatment to areas in the northern part of his State, so that they will not be subjected to an equitable and fair interpretation and application of the bill. Would he agree to the deletion of that section?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator read the language? I did not get the point.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The language on page 15, line 18, and following on to the next page of the bill, sets up a preferential status for the Senator's own State which is not accorded the other 49 States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All this does is sustain existing law. I have not heard any great uproar about repealing existing law. If it will make the Senator any happier to make such a motion, I will be glad to have him come into the State of Minnesota and explain it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota will explain to this body why that provision is in the bill——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not put it in.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho cannot divulge the information which was given to the chairman of the committee, whom I respect. Otherwise he would tell the able Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nothing in this bill repeals any law relating to any canoe or wilderness area. If the Senator wants me to educate him on this subject, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator concede that the other 49 States do not receive the preferential treatment which is asked for in this subsection by his State?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If there is an existing law on it, any Senator is entitled to invoke it. Congress already passed the law to which the Senator refers, and any other wilderness areas provided for under existing law are covered by this bill. The Senator knows that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will yield hereafter only for questions. I am supposed to be before the Appropriations Committee. I have a short statement yet to make.

I yield now to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator knows that all of the national forests in the eastern part of our country, east of the Mississippi River, and some west of the river are made up of lands purchased, and not of lands in the public domain of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know why any reasonable consideration of the interests of that great part of the United States to have some wilderness areas seems to have been excluded from this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know why, but it strikes me that would be an argument and a reason why the committee of which I am chairman should consider the bill, so that all parts of the country can be treated similarly, if they can be.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield for just one brief statement, I should like to say that, for one, I do not appreciate the suggestion that everyone who is opposed to the bill as written or wants at least a chance to look at it is influenced by some ulterior interests which are vaguely mentioned. The Senator from Florida has not been approached by any lumber, mining, or grazing interests. The Senator from Florida headed up the movement in his own State to set aside more than 1 million acres of land as the Everglades National Park, which, of course, is a wilderness. He knows something of the kind of opposition which arises under those conditions. The Senator from Florida supported, in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry but a few months ago, a bill to make possible the rounding out of an important forest area in the State of Minnesota. The Senator from Florida has no ulterior motives, but he feels the people in the eastern part of this country and the national forests in the eastern part of this country, such as Osceola, Ocala, Apalachicola, in Florida, and Nantahala and Mount Pisgah Forest in North Carolina, every one of which the Senator from Florida has enjoyed and hopes to enjoy many times more, are entitled to consideration in this field, and the committee which has jurisdiction over those areas is entitled to some consideration in this matter.

The Senator from Florida hopes the distinguished chairman of the committee will so amend his motion as to include an early date for reporting. The Senator from Florida is willing to attend hearings during the recess in order to have ample time for action at the second session of this Congress; but the Senator from Florida is insistent that our committee have some chance to look at this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a short explanation of S. 174, with particular emphasis on the fact that the national forest areas will be the only areas included in the wilderness system upon the enactment of the bill. These, as has been stated on the floor, were set aside by the various Secretaries of Agriculture and the bill would make them permanent—legalize them, in other words.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT EXPLANATION OF S. 174 (THE WILDERNESS BILL)

S. 174, with the committee amendments, creates a National Wilderness Preservation System consisting of:

1. National forest areas classified on the effective date of the act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe.

2. Such national park system roadless areas of 5,000 acres or more as may be recommended by the President and not disapproved by either House of Congress.

3. Such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as the President may recommend and are not disapproved by either House of Congress.

Commercial enterprise, roads, motorized equipment, mechanical transport, and structures or installations are excluded from the system. Exceptions are made for existing private rights; needs for system administration including health and safety; use of aircraft and motorboats in national forest areas where already established; prospecting, mining, reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other necessary facilities when authorized by the President; and established livestock grazing.

National forest areas would be the only areas included in the wilderness system upon enactment of the act. At present, 14,664,053 acres have been classified as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe, consisting of 4,888,173 acres in 14 wilderness areas, 998,234 acres in 29 wild areas, 886,673 acres in 1 canoe area, and 7,890,793 acres in 39 primitive areas. The primitive areas would be reviewed by the Secretary of Agriculture within 10 years after enactment, and might be (1) included or excluded from the system on Presidential recommendation not disapproved by either House of Congress; (2) excluded on the lapse of 2 years without further recommendation after a Presidential recommendation to include or exclude has been disapproved by either House of Congress; and (3) excluded by the lapse of 14 years without a recommendation of continued inclusion becoming effective.

National park and wildlife refuges and game ranges areas might be included in the system upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior within 10 years after enactment of the bill and upon Presidential recommendation not disapproved by either House of Congress. Special provision is made for wildlife refuges and game rangelands added to the Secretary's jurisdiction within 15 years after enactment of the bill.

The boundaries of the system may be modified at any time upon public notice and hearing (on sufficient demand), recommendation of the appropriate Secretary, and Presidential recommendation not disapproved by either House of Congress.

Additional lands might be added to the system through act of Congress, acquisition of private lands within the system, and gift or bequest.

Section 9 of the bill provides for a Presidential Land Use Commission for any State where 90 percent of the land is federally owned (Alaska) to advise the Secretary of the Interior. Its recommendation would be included in any recommendations to Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the pending bill establishes a national policy of wilderness preservation with respect to lands in the national forests, the national park system, wildlife refuges, and game ranges, and would, by legislative action, limit the uses which may be made of those lands. National forest lands are the only lands which would be automatically covered by the bill. Parks, refuges, and rangelands might be added later. Because of its jurisdiction with respect to national forests, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is therefore concerned with the provisions of the bill.

From the committee report on this bill, it would appear that at least 14,664,053 acres of national forest lands would be directly affected by the bill and withdrawn from general forest use. That number of acres has already been classified. Any additional areas within the national forests which might be classified "on the effective date of this act" by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe would also be directly affected and withdrawn from general forest use. There is no limit on the number of acres of national forest lands which might be so classified between today and the date upon which this bill

becomes effective. It may be that no new areas will be so classified. However, the authority is there, and I note that between February 24, when the Department of Agriculture furnished the table on page 30 of the committee report, and July 17, the date of the tables beginning on page 51 of the report, one primitive area had apparently been reclassified as a wild area. It may be that no additional changes in classification will be made. However, the authority is broad enough to include any or all national forest lands in the wilderness restricted use system. The authority is very broad.

The Secretary and the Chief of the Forest Service have no legislative criteria or guidelines imposing any limits on their authority. Between the date this bill might pass Congress and the date of its approval by the President, the Chief of the Forest Service, who is not of Cabinet rank, could classify all national forests as canoe areas and thereby place them in the wilderness restricted use system. Neither the House nor the Senate would have even the opportunity to disapprove in any fashion. It would require full legislative action to undo what this bill authorizes the Chief of the Forest Service to do. I believe our committee has a very real interest in any legislation which contains authority for such a profound effect on the national forests.

The only legislative guidelines or restrictions imposed upon the Chief of the Forest Service are contained in section 2(b) of the bill. Section 2(b) of the bill contains two differing definitions of wilderness. The bill does not contain any definitions of "wild," "primitive," or "canoe." These are no restrictions at all.

Section 3(e) of the bill provides for the modification or adjustment of boundaries of the wilderness system. The committee report states that the act does not include a specific acreage limit on areas which may be involved in a modification of boundary under section 3(e) since such modifications are subject to disapproval by either the House of Representatives or the Senate; and that it is not intended that the authority of section 3(e) should be used to achieve a change primarily for the purpose of adding to or eliminating an area of land from the wilderness system.

Whatever may be the intention expressed in the committee report, section 3(e) does provide authority for adding additional national forest lands to the wilderness system and, as pointed out in the committee report, there is no restriction on the area which may be added. We do not know how some future Secretary might use this authority, but our committee has such an interest in national forest legislation as should require our full examination of any bill containing such authority. Any national forest lands classified by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, or canoe on the effective date of this act—and again I point out that their discretion in making such classification is practically unlimited—would become a part of the wilderness area permanently without further action by Congress. Any area classified on that date as primitive would be required to be reviewed within 10 years; and if the President, after such review, determined that the primitive area should be continued as part of the wilderness system, Congress would be given only a veto power to prevent such continued inclusion.

According to the committee report on the bill, it is contemplated that over 14½ million acres of national forest lands would be included in the wilderness system immediately; about 22 million acres of national park lands might eventually be included in the system; and large areas of the 22 to 23 million acres of wildlife refuge or game rangelands might also eventually be included in the system. As I have pointed out, authority exists under the bill for the inclusion of over 185 million acres of national forest lands, although nobody expects that to be done. However, even though all of the national forest lands are not included, the setting up of a restricted wilderness system will affect national forest areas not included in the system. Uses prohibited in, or precluded from, the restricted areas, such as recreation for people unable to hire guides and horses, grazing, mining, logging, and so on, would be concentrated on other national forest areas.

Our committee, of course, has had no opportunity to determine what the impact would be on the national forests as a whole, either at the present time or in the future, as our population and our needs for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish uses increase. Our committee also has jurisdiction over forestry generally, and restrictions on the use of Federal areas as provided by this bill may well have an effect on private forestry that should be the concern of our committee.

Last year the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported S. 3044, and the Congress adopted a companion bill, H.R. 10572, providing for the administration of national forests for multiple use and sustained yield. The purpose of S. 3044 was to provide a congressional policy that the national forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes, to thereby continue the Forest Service policy that the national forests shall be administered for the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run. In the minority views on the pending bill, it is stated as follows:

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

The minority views also said that the measure "would deny to all but an infinitesimal fraction of the people of this country—less than 2 percent—their rights to land which belongs to them all." The authority is in the bill to cover the entire national forest. It is anticipated that millions of acres would be covered. By precluding all but an infinitesimal fraction of our people from these restricted areas, the bill should have an impact upon the national forests and forestry in general of legitimate concern to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

In addition to diverting recreational users from the restricted areas to other national forest areas, the permanent legislative restrictions of the bill on mining, range, timber, and other uses may result in increased use of other areas of the national forests for these purposes. We do not know what the effect may be now or in the future, but in view of the concern of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the national forests, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be given an opportunity to study this bill and report such recommendations as it may have to the Senate.

In conclusion, the only lands immediately affected by the bill would be the national forests. Authority is contained in the bill broad enough to cover any or all national forest areas, depending solely on the judgment of the Chief of the Forest Service, and to completely change the use of the national forests. The multiple-use policy enacted last year on the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would be discarded in such case. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be given an opportunity to study the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to modify my motion that the bill be committed to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to add that a report from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be made on the bill not later than March 1 of 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his motion.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly suggest to the Senator from Louisiana that he change the date to February 1, because I think we shall have to do this work in the time of adjournment anyway.

It may be that upon reading the very voluminous records and reports we would decide not to have hearings. I certainly do not wish to take a position that would be regarded as precluding action at the next session of Congress. I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana would not.

Would he be willing to change the date upon which the committee report would be expected to February 1, 1962?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Florida in that request.

Mr. ELLENDER. A 30-day period seems short.

Mr. AIKEN. May I add to what has been said that I think the bill could be reported by February 1. Last year in

the committee we considered the subject in connection with a multiple-use bill for national forests. We wrote into the purposes of the bill considered last year the words:

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

So we did have in mind the establishment of wilderness areas. I believe that wilderness areas will be very important for the preservation of the wildlife and wildflowers of this country as well as to provide areas in which people who wish to live in absolute silence in natural surroundings may do so. I think we must use good judgment in the establishment of such areas. It seems to me that we in the East need more such areas, although probably not as large ones as there are in the Western States.

I do not want to see the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry bypassed on matters relating to forestry or to national forests which have been established from other than the national domain.

It seems to me that a bill could be reported by February 1. We probably have been remiss in not asking for it sooner, and to that extent perhaps there could be some justification for not granting the request now. But on the whole it seems to me that there would be greater harmony and in the long run we would be more likely to get a good bill through Congress after having had more opportunity to consider it in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There are some very able new members of the committee, including the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who have not had an opportunity to consider the proposed legislation as members of that committee. I think we would probably do better to bring the bill back from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the 1st of February. If no deadline were stated, I would be inclined to vote against the motion, even though I am the ranking minority member of the committee. But if the Senator includes in his motion the reporting of the bill by February 1, I think the committee could do so, and I shall be glad to support such a motion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am looking for a 1962 calendar to see exactly on what day February 1 falls.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under the law the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission is to make its report not later than January 31 of next year. It seems to me that the committee should have at least a 2-, 3-, or 4-week interval after that time so that the report might be studied by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish further to modify my motion by making the date for the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the Senate February 5 of next year.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask what day of the week February 5 will be?

Mr. ELLENDER. That will be a Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Senator has a right to so modify his motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator for his courtesy on this question. Of course, he is acting entirely within his rights in making a motion to commit the wilderness area bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which, in my opinion, has a limited interest in it. However, I point out that for more than 5 years the bill has been before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, hundreds of witnesses have been heard, and thousands of pages of testimony have been taken. While I understand the realities of the practical situation as it exists at the present time, I think the bill which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported is a good one. I shall vote against the motion to commit, and I hope that the motion to commit will be defeated.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the last half dozen years, proposed legislation on wilderness areas, similar to the bill which is now before us, has been introduced in the Senate. On every occasion, the Presiding Officer of the Senate has referred such bills to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No one ever arose to dispute or question such referral.

Today, at the time set for the debate on the proposed wilderness legislation before us, my good friend the able senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, made a motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Under the rules, he has a right to make such a motion. Under the rules, I believe the Senate ought to vote the motion down.

When the Presiding Officer of the Senate, not once or twice, but several times, referred proposed wilderness legislation to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he did so under the rules of the Senate. Earlier today those rules were referred to. With respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, what do the rules state in respect to its sitting in judgment on proposed legislation introduced in the Senate? The rules are fairly clear.

Rule XXV, section 1(a), subsection 6, in respect to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry sitting in judgment on proposed legislation provides:

> Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

With respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as has been previously iterated in the debate today, the rules prescribe that the committee shall sit in judgment on proposed legislation relating—and I refer to subsection 4 of subdivision (m):

> Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

Several Senators have demonstrated not only that the Parliamentarian and the Presiding Officer were within their rights, but that they were logical in the decision that was made.

Of some 14 million acres under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture operated upon in the bill, only a few thousand are not related to the public domain but, as has been suggested, have become private property. Thus, only 99-plus percent of the forest lands dealt with by the bill are created from the public domain, and come specifically under jurisdiction of the Interior Committee.

The distinguished Senator from Florida has suggested that if the proposed legislation were enacted into law, there would be some reason for fear or trepidation on the part of Senators representing Eastern States that forest areas within their States not created from the public domain and under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, could not be made primitive or could not become a part of the wilderness system. I deny it.

If the proposed legislation were enacted, it would merely provide, as has already been clearly indicated in debate, that the area of the public domain classified by the Secretary of Agriculture today as primitive shall be deemed wilderness until the Secretary and then the President of the United States and then either House of Congress makes a determination to the contrary.

If the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] wishes to introduce proposed legislation creating a wilderness out of any of the area owned by the Government of the United States in his own State, let him do so. That would be what would be required of him, if he so desired. That would be precisely what would be required of him if the proposed wilderness legislation were enacted into law or whether it were not enacted into law. After a half-dozen years, during which some of us have tried to fashion a decent piece of legislation, avoiding the extremes of either side in this argument, we have finally been able to do so. The proposed legislation would affect 2 percent of the lands in the United States, and something less than 5 percent of the areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Now that the time has been set for debating and voting the bill up or down, I do not believe we ought now to say, "Let us send the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry." It may well be that the proposed legislation before us touches or impinges slightly upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I assert, nevertheless, as a positive fact, that the Presiding Officer and the Parliamentarian were completely correct in their prior decisions, because in the great bulk of land areas operated on by the bill before us it is the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, under the precise rules of the Senate, which has and which ought to have jurisdiction over this legislation.

Some years ago I introduced some legislation in the Senate dealing with the subject of air pollution. A question arose as to which committee ought to

have jurisdiction. Some contended that it ought to be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; others contend that it ought to be sent to the Committee on Public Works. There was the question of legislation which was in the same area and which had previously been considered by the Committee on Public Works. That concerned the contamination or pollution of waters. The bill referring to water pollution went to the Committee on Public Works. It seemed to me that that was the committee that should handle the subject of air pollution. I went to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and he agreed that no objection would be made to such a referral. The Committee on Public Works sat in judgment on air pollution legislation; it passed the Senate and the House, and it became the law of the land. Congress performed a high public service on that occasion when it relied on the wisdom and judgment and recommendations of the Committee on Public Works.

Here today is a piece of legislation that has run the gamut of thousands of pages of testimony in many Congresses, on which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has sat for long days in long sessions of Congress in trying to fashion a reasonable bill. Here is a piece of legislation in the public interest. It is also in the public interest for the Senate to vote down the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to send the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Let us proceed to vote on the proposed legislation on its excellent merits, at the end of which I am sure can be honorable and constructive debate.

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the distinguished Senator from California for what I believe are cogent reasons for opposing the motion to commit the pending bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Ordinarily such a motion would be accepted without debate in the Senate, if there was any evidence at all that the committee to which the referral was to be made had any jurisdictional interest in the subject matter of the bill. It is conceded that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has some jurisdictional interest in the subject matter of the bill. If the motion had been made in a timely way, according to the normal procedures of the Senate, then I believe no argument would have arisen. However, the wilderness bill is not an obscure piece of legislation pulled from a pile of noncontroversial bills and suddenly sprung on the Senate floor without any previous publicity or previous hearings or previous argument.

As has been well pointed out, the wilderness bill is exceedingly well known in all parts of the country. This is not the first Congress that has had the bill before it. It was before two previous Congresses. It has been before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in one form or another for the past 5 years. During all that time no member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry suggested that it was not an appropriate bill for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, either to hold hearings on, or to report to the Senate for action. Not once in the 5 years, through the course of all these public hearings and all this publicity, was such a motion ever made or such a suggestion ever tendered on this floor. Once again, extensive hearings were held on the bill this year, and never once was the suggestion made that the bill was not fully within the competence of the Interior Committee. Not once, Mr. President, was that done. Not until now, 5 years later, 500 witnesses later, 2,500 pages of recorded testimony later, when the bill comes to the floor of the Senate for legislative action, and without prior notice of any kind to the leadership or to the members of the Interior Committee is the motion made to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. It could not be said that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was unaware of the existence of the bill, because that committee performed a great service to the wilderness bill and to the whole wilderness program by providing an amendment to the multiple-use bill which was sent to the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, by providing that multiple use was not inconsistent with the wilderness system. That amendment was reported to the floor today.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. The bill has been well known to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to all its members. There were endless opportunities, consistent with the best practices of the Senate, to make a motion to bring the bill properly before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

This is a very poor time and a very late hour, just as the Senate, after 5 years of hearings and deliberations is about to work its will, to come in, without any kind of prior notice, and say, "We want the bill in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and we will report it back some time next year."

We all know what this means. Reporting the bill on February 6 to the Senate means that the difficulties in getting the bill finally enacted into law are going to be greatly multiplied. It has taken 5 years to bring the bill to the Senate floor. The House will not act on it in committee, even, until after the Senate has passed the bill. Only after the Senate has passed the bill, can we have any reasonable expectation that the House will begin to act on it. Any further delay will compound the difficulty of ever getting the wilderness bill enacted into law. Therefore I say this motion comes too late.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the distinguished Senator from Idaho understand that the desire of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to have the bill referred to that committee is predicated upon academic jurisdiction of the committee, or will the farmers of America be hurt by the bill if it is enacted into law?

Mr. CHURCH. I would say that the farmers of America have very little connection with the bill other than their enjoyment of the wilderness areas along with other citizens of the country.

Mr. PASTORE. I have been sitting here for a long time, and I have heard the dissertations on the question of jurisdiction, like that of my friend from Colorado, who like myself has engaged in some practice of the law. I was trying to discover for my own satisfaction whether this involves a question of academic jurisdiction or whether the enactment of the bill would ruin the farmers of America.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill, I am sure, would apply to the 10,000 farmers of Vermont as equally as it would apply to the 24 or more farmers of Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I ask a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. First I should like to yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to know from my distinguished friend whether the garden clubs of America are in favor of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. They are.

Mr. PASTORE. Then I would be inclined to weigh the 24 farmers of Rhode Island in the balance with the people who belong to the garden clubs of America.

Mr. AIKEN. If the 24 farms in Rhode Island failed to be financial successes, their operators would not go on relief.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island to something which he has probably overlooked; that is, that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as is stated on page 25 of the Senate Manual, specifically extends to:

> Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

Every national forest east of the Mississippi, and some to the west, were created not from the public domain, but from bought or acquired land. There is no argument, then, about the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry over those areas.

So far as the interest of the Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, I wish him to know that the Senator from Florida is enough interested in wilderness areas that he was very actively the leader in setting up the Everglades National Park, comprising more than a million acres, more than the area of the State of Rhode Island. This park is, of course, preserved forever as a wilderness area. So the Senator from Florida, in supporting the motion, is in no sense forgetting both the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and the fact that the bill was reported on July 22, any time for recommittal, of course, has transpired since

that time and not in earlier periods—and that the Senator from Florida has been instrumental in asking that the report time be moved up, so there can be no question about the chance for both Houses to act last year. I understand now that the motion of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana calls for a report time of February 5, 1962.

The Senator from Florida also reminds the distinguished Senator from Idaho that there is no ban whatever upon the consideration of this measure by the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives in the vacation period, just as the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would itself expect to have to consider it.

The question remains, then, Which is the desirable way to act:

Without considering the jurisdiction of the committee which has jurisdiction over national forests in all the eastern area of the Nation, the national forests which are visited by vastly more people and enjoyed by vastly more people than those in other areas of the country? Or by ramming the bill through without the appropriate recommendations of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

The motion is not dictated by some ulterior interest or malignant desire, but simply by the desire to know what is in the bill and to report it back at a time when action can be taken much more harmoniously than it could be taken today.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield, so that I may make an observation in response to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that a million acres of wilderness in Florida may be larger than the entire State of Rhode Island; but we in Rhode Island rejoice in quality more than we do in quantity. I am not being critical of anyone; I am merely wondering if this is an academic objection of jurisdiction, or whether the farmers of America will be affected by a bill which, as I understand from the distinguished Senator from Idaho, has been pending for 5 years, with this question never having been raised before. The Senator from Rhode Island simply wishes to ask the question, as diplomatically as he can: Why?

Mr. CHURCH. My answer to the Senator's question is simply that the approval of the motion will entail additional delay. Additional delay will place the enactment of the bill in jeopardy. It is as simple as that. That is why 5 years have gone by, and no question has ever been raised until today. For that reason, I feel constrained to oppose the motion; for normally it would be accepted as an act of courtesy to any committee of the Senate that felt it had jurisdiction.

Mr. AIKEN. Why does the Senator say that the bill should be considered only by a committee which took 5 years to bring it out, when another committee which should consider a part of the bill, has guaranteed to report it to the Senate by the 1st of February of next year? If it had been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the first place, the bill would probably be law now.

Mr. CHURCH. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported the bill in July. It is a controversial matter, which required many hearings. The bill is a revision upon a revision upon a revision. If the Senate could pass the bill now in this form, which I think is a very reasonable and constructive form, the House of Representatives would have a fair chance to act upon it, and the bill might become law before the end of the second session of this Congress. If that is not done, the chances of the bill's passage will be placed in very serious doubt.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that the forest lands in Minnesota are exempt from the general provisions of the law. Is there any particular reason why motorboats are exempt in the Minnesota national forests, and are not exempt throughout the whole country? Why should one State be exempt from the provisions of the law?

Mr. CHURCH. The bill attempts to conform to the provisions of all existing laws. In the case of Minnesota, there was a combination of particular laws relative to the establishment of primitive areas in the northern part of that State. Those laws are spelled out in the text of the bill for that reason. As for motorboats, wherever the practice has been established to permit the use of motorboats or airplanes in wilderness areas that practice may be continued under the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Why not apply that provision to the whole country, instead of only to Minnesota?

Mr. CHURCH. With respect to motorboats and aircraft, the bill applies equally to all areas where the practice has been established.

Mr. AIKEN. I was wondering why a special exemption was spelled out for one State.

Mr. CHURCH. The only answer I can give the Senator is that this particular area involved special enactments of Congress, which are merely referred to in the text of the bill.

Mr. President, the question which now faces the Senate is on the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Since I feel strongly that the motion ought not to be approved, and therefore am obliged to oppose it, the matter of jurisdiction as between the two committees is brought into question.

When Congress passed the Legislative Reorganization Act, it attempted to set forth in the law of the land a rule which applies when a jurisdictional dispute arises concerning any measure pending before the Senate.

Section 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act clearly provides that the criteria for determining which committee shall have jurisdiction, whenever a dispute arises, is to be based upon the predominating subject matter in the bill. The subject matter in proposed legislation determines the jurisdictional question whenever a dispute arises between two or more committees of the Senate.

Using the criteria in the law, I think it is perfectly clear that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has full jurisdiction in this matter, because the predominant subject matter lies in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, not in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield that I may propound a unanimous-consent request, without his losing his right to the floor?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote at 12:30 p.m. on the Ellender motion to commit the wilderness bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Reserving the right to object—and I probably shall not object—has the distinguished majority leader notified the Senator from Louisiana of his proposal?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It meets with his approval.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not object—have the yeas and nays been ordered on the motion of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The request for the yeas and nays can be made after the agreement has been entered into.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, did the majority leader confer with the Senator from Louisiana as to the time proposed for the vote—12:30? That is only about 30 minutes from now, and several Senators wish to speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Idaho will have time in which to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on the motion to commit, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the rule with respect to standing committees of the Senate makes it clear beyond any question that the subject matter of the bill belongs in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Rule XXV(m)4, on page 34 of the Senate Manual, reads: "Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain." Thus such areas are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator does not contend for a moment, does he, that the national forests created from bought or acquired lands are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not. The point of my argument is that the subject matter in the bill—the predominating subject matter in the bill—rests in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Let me spell that out: I do not for a moment maintain that there is no claim at all on the part of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a brief question?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I am informed that the Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction not only over the lands acquired and purchased but also over the national forests in the public domain. Therefore, notwithstanding the concurrent jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under the Senate rules there is no question that the Interior Committee has jurisdiction over the public-domain lands. Is not the Secretary of Agriculture included by the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. He is.

Mr. CARROLL. I was very much impressed with the argument presented by the able Senator from South Dakota, to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture would report—I refer to page 18 of the bill—to the Senate Interior Committee. I think the committee would certainly accept a simple amendment providing that the Secretary of Agriculture also shall report to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I would see no objection to that.

But I think the argument of the able Senator from Idaho is absolutely unanswerable.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

I would also point out that under the bill it is clear that the predominant subject matter relates to the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee. The wilderness system which would be established by the bill is based upon three categories of public lands: The first are the national parks and national monuments, and clearly they fall entirely within the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee.

The second are game refuges. As to these, it is clear that the Committee on Agriculture has no jurisdiction, and that the committee which does have jurisdiction—the Committee on Commerce—is raising no objection.

So we are left with the third category, which is forest lands. It is clear, under the rules, that forest lands taken from the public domain come within the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee; and of the national forest lands, 160 million acres have been taken out of the public domain, compared with only 25 million acres which have been acquired through purchase.

So who can argue that the predominant interest does not lie within the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee?

That is why the Interior Committee has been able to hold hearings on the bill for 5 years; and the question of jurisdiction has not been raised until this morning—because under the established Senate rules the bill belongs to the Interior Committee.

So on the merits of the matter before us, I submit that the motion of the Senator from Louisiana should be rejected.

But when we consider the legislative situation—which can only mean that the motion has been made here, this morning, for a purpose of working a further delay in connection with enactment of the bill—and when we add to that the fact that the bill has been given more exhaustive hearings than any other bill I can remember, and the further fact that the entire record of the hearings is today before the Senate, together with the committee report, and all the facts concerning the bill, certainly there is no reason why the Senate should not now work its will on the bill.

As I have said, Mr. President, the motion to refer comes too late, and its effects would be only to postpone the time when the bill may be enacted into law.

Therefore, I submit that all who wish to see a wilderness system established should oppose the motion to commit, and the Senate should go forward with its legislative duty.

So, Mr. President, I hope the motion to commit will be rejected.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield again to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Will not the Senator from Idaho agree that there is no disposition on the part of any Senator who is a member of the Interior Committee to interfere with any of the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee with reference to acquired lands? For example, the able Senator from Florida and the able Senator from Vermont have said that if acquired lands are affected, those in the eastern part of the Nation desire that they be conserved for the benefit of posterity. But that has absolutely nothing to do with the lands affected by this bill or with any change of existing law, other than to strengthen the position we take.

I do not like to get into a conflict in regard to committee jurisdiction, because we need the help of able Members such as the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from Louisiana, if the bill is to be passed.

I should like to stress the point which was made so ably by the Senator from Idaho; namely, that out of almost 15 million acres which compose public domain land, only 15,000 or 18,000 acres came from the national forest reserve, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture. So why would we wish to commit the bill to the Agriculture Committee, even though a few thousand acres of the land fall within its jurisdiction, when the bill deals with almost 15 million acres?

I think no more need to be said on our side. The able Senator from Idaho has stated the matter lucidly, cogently, and pointedly; and I am sure that if the bill were put over until February 1 or March 1, nothing would be gained.

I can say that powerful economic forces have been working against this bill for 10 years. I remember that in the 80th Congress a request was made of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for studies on a program of this type. However, the bill lay dormant for 6 or 7 years. But, as the able Senator from Idaho has said, then the bill began to move, and it has been well worked over. I do not know that I approve of every provision of the bill. After all, my State has cattle, mining, oil, and lumber. This is not an easy bill for Senators from the West to accept. There are many conflicting economic forces that are moving against the bill, and on the other hand the conservation groups in my State are not very strong. As a legislator representing the people of my State, I have to balance all things concerned.

But in my opinion, this is a very modest bill. It is not an extreme, radical piece of proposed legislation on the conservationist side; and, by the same token, we have not yielded everything to those on the special interest side. This is a good, central piece of legislation, I believe, in the national interest, and I agree with the Senator from Idaho that the motion to commit should be rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to say to him that I, too, come from a State in which many persons earn their livelihood through the permissive use of Federal land, and I am aware of the importance of lumbering, grazing, mining, and other business interests which depend on the use of public land. If this bill, which our committee has so carefully considered, constituted any real threat to these interests, I would oppose the bill.

But we have arrived at this bill after long deliberation, after careful trimming, and after having worked revision upon revision upon revision, and what is now before the Senate is, in my judgment—and, indeed, in the judgment of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Interior Committee, a measure which establishes for the future wilderness preserves which the entire country needs and can enjoy; and yet does so in a way that is not in conflict with the economic interests of the Western States.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield again to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I have another worry about the bill—entirely apart from lumber, entirely apart from grazing and mining, entirely apart from conservation. The Senator from Idaho and I come from a semiarid area, where water is our lifeblood. I have to be very careful with the provisions of the bill as they affect future water development. I do not want the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Secretary of the Interior, or any conservationist groups, interfering with the future development of water in our area. As I have indicated, water is our lifeblood. I do not want interference in these primitive areas with development of a watershed. We must have water for a growing, thriving, populated area.

As the Senator from Idaho has said, let us not turn our backs on the progress we have been making. If there are imperfections in the bill, we can correct them next year, or 2 years from now, if modifications become necessary. This

is a step in the right direction. I hope we will not take a backward step and refer this bill to the Agriculture Committee, when the Interior Committee has been studying the subject for many years.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the able Senators who have been speaking in behalf of the pending wilderness bill. Our committee has been engaged for several years in a rather grueling, if I may use that word, study of the problem. We have had opportunity to hear witnesses from all over the country. In addition, as our colleagues know, we have held hearings in the field. I am sure the request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry comes as a rather late move. As the lawyers would say, laches should apply in this particular situation. We could at least have had joint hearings, if that is what the committee desired.

In view of the fact that the bill has been pending before the Senate all this time, it seems to me it is most unusual that this kind of parliamentary move is made in an effort to prevent the Senate from voting on the bill this year. It has been announced time and time again that we anticipated a vote this year on the bill.

I may add, in conclusion, that, like the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I come from a State rich in all the resources involved in the pending bill. I think our people are reasonable and sensible about the question. We believe we have made the kind of legislative compromise that will help the multiple-use requirements of my State and the country as a whole. After all, these resources belong to the people of all 50 of the States, and not merely those of 1 State. I certainly hope the Senate will vote down the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I want to note that, with this bill, it is possible to create a wilderness system without adversely affecting anyone. The bill has been carefully drafted with that objective in mind. The wilderness system is based upon areas which have already been withdrawn either as primitive areas into national forests or as national parks, monuments, or game refuges. In these areas lumbering is already prohibited. Such grazing as presently exists may continue as before. It is not affected by the bill. Insofar as mining is concerned, in all the area covered by the bill there are only six mines in operation today, and those mines would continue in business, because the bill expressly provides that any restrictions that may apply in a wilderness area are made subject to existing rights.

So we can pass the bill without adversely affecting anyone's rights, if we act now. That is how the committee approached its task. It was with this objective that the committee drafted the legislation so carefully and so cautiously. That is why we held such extensive hearings. That is why it is now time for us to face up to the need to vote, and not delay action further, which would put the whole measure into extreme jeopardy.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for that purpose, subject to the approval of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ALLOTT. The inquiry is this. I had just stepped out of the Chamber for a moment. It is my understanding that, by unanimous consent, the Senate will vote at 12:30. The opposition to the motion has now consumed 17 minutes of that time. I inquire as to what the situation is with respect to the time for the proponents of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no provision in the unanimous-consent agreement about the division of time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suggest that the proponents could take 10 minutes. I would like a little time to conclude. Would that meet with the approval of the Senator?

Mr. ALLOTT. If that is the situation, I ask unanimous consent that the previous unanimous-consent agreement be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not see the majority leader on the floor, but my understanding, when he spoke to me about it was, that the time would be equally divided. The opponents have utilized some 17 minutes of the 32 minutes that were left at the time the unanimous consent was given. I do not think it would be proper that the Senator from Idaho would hold the floor—I am sure it was not the intention of the majority leader—during all the time until a vote came. I will wait until the majority leader comes into the Chamber, and then make my request.

Did I understand the Senator from Rhode Island objected to my unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PASTORE. No. I was merely going to suggest that the Senator withhold his request until such time as the majority leader entered the Chamber.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on his cogent remarks in reference to S. 174, of which I am a cosponsor. The Senator's comments on the aspects of the measure having to do with mining, exploration for oil and gas, and related items were timely and pertinent.

On February 28, I presented a statement before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee when this legislation was a matter for hearings. I read briefly from that presentation:

> I am gratified that the basic multiple purposes of the national forests would be maintained under the provisions of the bill and that the areas comprising the national wilderness system are already within Federal ownership. And, further, that sufficient controls and safeguards for industrial interests are contained in the drafting. Prospecting and mining, including exploration for oil and gas, the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, and other facilities needed in the public interest within specific sections of national forest areas in the wilderness system could be authorized by the President upon his determination that such uses would better serve the interests of the United States than would their denial. Provision is also made for the periodic review of areas included in the wilderness system, based on sound procedures applicable to both the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

In urging prompt enactment of this wilderness bill—S. 174—I am not unaware of the arguments that we should wait until after the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has made its report.

In the course of working out the 10-year program that this wilderness bill sets up for the establishment of a wilderness system, we shall receive much benefit from the results of the outdoor recreation resources review now nearing completion.

One area of its helpfulness will be in appraising the importance of our areas of wilderness in terms of their size and number for meeting our recreational needs, and in terms of their relationship to and with the needs for other outdoor recreation areas.

Some persons, however, have so misunderstood or misconstrued the nature of the undertaking of this review as to argue that its being underway is a reason for delaying action on this wilderness bill.

Many who have advanced this argument have actually been more concerned with opposing or delaying the wilderness bill than they have been with either the success of the outdoor recreation resources review or with the development of a better wilderness-preservation program.

Nevertheless, others may have been misled or confused by this argument, and some who advance the argument may actually fear some disadvantage to the review if this wilderness bill now passes.

I clarify this question and emphasize that enactment of this wilderness bill will help—not hinder—the review.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Senator ANDERSON], who introduced S. 174, was also the author of the measure that established the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. He has emphasized that the outdoor recreation review has not been an occasion for delaying wilderness legislation. I noted that when Senator ANDERSON, himself a member of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, was reporting on congressional activity to that Commission's March 12 and 13, 1961, meeting with its advisory

council, he spoke of the February hearings held on the wilderness bill and reported:

> Persons appearing in opposition spoke often of the work of this (Outdoor Recreation Resources) Commission, urging a delay in the wilderness bill until the final report was available.

Then Senator ANDERSON said, and I quote him:

> My comment has been that the enactment of the wilderness bill would help our Commission in its deliberations.

The wilderness bill would make wilderness preservation a national policy. This is a decision of the Congress for which recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Commission are not needed. Yet it will be helpful to the Commission in making its recommendations to have this policy definitely established.

The proposal makes wilderness preservation a responsibility of existing land-administering agencies as an aspect of the administration of our already existing national forests, parks, and refugees—rather than the responsibility of a new agency with a new category of land. Such a decision is not a concern of the Outdoor Recreation Commission but of Congress, yet when made it will facilitate the drafting of the Commission's report.

The measure prescribes the proper uses of areas of wilderness and determines such special provisions as are to be made with regard to economic and other nonconforming uses of these areas. This too is a concern of the Congress that is not a responsibility of the Outdoor Recreation Commission but if settled will help the Commission in its deliberations and recommendations.

We would, in this legislation, determine procedures and requirements regarding records and reports and other matters that are of no concern to the Outdoor Recreation Commission yet perhaps of some guidance value in the preparation of recommendations by the Commission.

We provide for a 10-year review program for the prescribed potential areas from which the permanent National Wilderness Preservation System will be constituted. This obviously, too, is a provision properly to be made by Congress that can furnish the Commission a framework within which to present its recommendations.

The recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission will indeed be of importance to us in establishing our Wilderness System, as well as in our providing for all other kinds of outdoor recreation.

The Commission's inventory of all our outdoor recreation resources and its recommendations regarding our various needs for such resources will be of great significance during the decade following the enactment of the bill. It will be during this 10-year period that the land-management agencies, the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, and the President will be determining the recommendations to Congress as to the exact areas to be preserved in the wilderness system, and the Congress will be scrutinizing these recommendations and taking action as may be deemed necessary.

This is the kind of help for which the outdoor recreation resources review was established. We shall profit from it greatly, the more so as our wilderness policy and program are established and set going.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter to the editor of the Washington Post of this city which appeared in this morning's newspaper over the signature of Michael Nadel, of Arlington, Va.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> I hasten to point out how fallacious is Mortimer R. Doyle in his criticism in behalf of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association of Julius Duscha's accurate report in the Washington Post that the lumber industry opposition to the wilderness bill is based purely on dollar-and-cents economic grounds.' "
>
> Mr. Doyle's justification of the lumber interest's opposition—"because there are no jobs in the wilderness"—is based by him on his deduction that "the wilderness bill, as presently drafted, would deprive more than a million and a half workers of the assurance of continued employment."
>
> It may possibly be that NLMA hopes to exploit soon the areas now being preserved (in which case the enactment of the wilderness bill is all the more urgent), but unless it does so hope, its concern for the workers cannot be immediate. There is not a single acre involved in the wilderness bill that is now available for timber cutting.
>
> The report of the Senate's Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the wilderness bill says (on page 17):
>
> "There is no timber harvest today from the lands being considered for inclusion in the wilderness system under S. 174. Parks and wildlife lands are restricted from extensive timber exploitation by the basic legislation creating them. The national forest lands affected by S. 174 are not now subject to exploitation for timber."
>
> This report also points out that the available timber outside preserved areas is not being anywhere nearly fully utilized. Says the report of the committee:
>
> "The States with national forest wilderness areas have 65.9 million acres of commercial national forest lands, outside wilderness, with an allowable annual cut, on a sustained basis, of 8,475 million board feet. In 1960 only 7,835 million board feet were cut."
>
> "The commercial timberlands in the wilderness-type areas," the report emphasized, "are not a significant portion of our timber resource for future years."
>
> The heart of the wilderness bill is that Congress shall have the opportunity to review recommendations with regard to de facto wilderness areas that are already in Federal ownership, and that are already included in portions of our national forests, national parks, and national wildlife refuges.
>
> At present administrators can make significant changes on our national lands without such review by Congress. It is wise that Congress, which represents the people, should have a say in what becomes of the people's lands.
>
> Not one of the 1.5 million workers in the forest products industry, as I have already noted, will be hurt by this bill.
>
> MICHAEL NADEL.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my hope that the Senate will act affirmatively on this bill. We should, in my opinion, discharge our obligation in this important matter. The measure is in the national interest.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in order that the proponents may have time on the motion I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, since the Senator who made the motion is now in attendance at an Appropriations Committee hearing, that there be a quorum call and that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be taken from the time of the proponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Louisiana is not present to carry on in behalf of the motion to commit, which he made. I shall use only a few minutes at this time.

Reference frequently has been made to the possibility that the Secretary of Agriculture might have some interest in this proposed legislation. I have a reprint of a colloquy at hearings before the Senate Commtitee on Interior and Insular Affairs on a water resources bill held July 26 of this year. I wish to quote a question, and an answer by Secretary Freeman.

After reference had been made to the wilderness preservation system and other aspects of our water resources development, I made this comment:

> Of course, wilderness areas safeguard and preserve watersheds, but at the same time you can certainly envisage the possibility that recreational uses of these locked up areas may provide very serious problems and difficulties for these water resource boards and commissions because when we consider watershed management, soil moisture conservation, building reservoirs for storage of water, then certainly there could be a very decisive conflict.

Secretary Freeman replied:

> There could be. You are absolutely right, sir.

Mr. President, I believe an unreasonable position has been taken by some of my colleagues on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who contend that we must move forward at this precise time to approve the proposed legislation. There is not a Member of this body who does not know the House does not plan to act on this bill this session. What is the hurry on our side?

Mr. President, as I pointed out earlier in the debate, there is not a member of our committee who does not realize that the action today in the Senate, in considering the wilderness bill, is a virtual repudiation of action taken a few years ago by this body when it voted to establish the National Outdoor Recreation Re-

sources Review Commission, which will make a report not later than January 31, 1962, to this body.

I have an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26, 1957, when the bill to establish the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was announced for consideration on the call of the calendar. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is presently the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, made this comment:

I recognize that it is entirely proper to object to a bill of this nature on the call of the calendar, but I wish to make a brief statement.

Nearly all the wildlife and conservation organizations with which I am acquainted have been working steadily on this matter for some years. The chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senator from Montana, Mr. Murray; the Senator from Colorado, Mr. Carroll; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Neuberger; and I, from the Democratic side, have jointed in sponsoring the bill, along with the Senator from Utah, Mr. Watkins; the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. Barrett; the Senator from California, Mr. Kuchel; the Senator from Colorado, Mr. Allott, and the Senator from Arizona, Mr. Goldwater, from the Republican side. There is nothing political about this measure.

I read further from the comments of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], on the Senate floor June 26, 1957:

As the number of people who visit our national parks increases, there is involved a very definite problem of properly accommodating them, for example, Yellowstone Park, which belongs to all the people of the country, and not merely to rich people. Priorities are needed in order to get inside the park. The number of people visiting the western lands and parks of America is increasing tremendously. It would be the sheerest kind of folly to fail to pass the bill which provides only for a survey to determine what is needed in order to accommodate persons who will visit our parks in increasing numbers.

That is the comment made June 26, 1957, when the Senate considered the bill to establish the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Mr. President, I have pointed out many times in the past few weeks that more than $2 million has been appropriated in the past 3 years to enable the Commission and its staff to conduct extensive surveys and studies, with the help of properly qualified universities and other bodies throughout this country.

The Commission is composed of 15 members; 7 laymen, 4 Senators, and 4 Representatives. One of the Senators is the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who has played a prominent part in the monthly meetings and in the negotiations and discussions of the Commission. I know when the final report is drafted and submitted to the Congress in January, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will play a very vital part in drafting the report which will be submitted.

Mr. President, in making these comments today I have been consistent, because I objected to reporting the bill at this particular time, since there will be no action concluded in this session of Congress, because the House has indicated it would be impossible for that body to consider the bill. Certainly, final action cannot be taken until sometime during 1962.

Mr. President, I repeat, as vigorously as I can, that when an effort is made to take action on the wilderness preservation bill prior to the receipt of the report which will be presented to the Congress in January, there is involved a virtual repudiation of action which was taken June 26, 1957, when this body referred to the importance of creating the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

I reiterate that I have no desire to try to delay unnecessarily consideration of the bill, but I point out the impractical aspects of trying to complete action today, within a few weeks of the adjournment of this session, when we know the bill will lie over on the House side until next year. I support the Ellender motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with the provision that it be reported back to the Senate on or before February 5, 1962.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the opposition yield back the 2 minutes remaining?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I understood that all time had been yielded back.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, are there 2 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was a quorum call, during which the time was not taken from the time available to either side. The time may be used or yielded back.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the opposition yields back its remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Lousiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Minne- [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent because of death in the family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

Mr. DODD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 184]

YEAS—32

Aiken	Dworshak	Prouty
Allott	Ellender	Russell
Beall	Fong	Schoeppel
Bennett	Hickey	Smith, Maine
Boggs	Holland	Stennis
Butler	Johnston	Talmadge
Cannon	Jordan	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Tower
Cooper	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Morton	Young, Ohio
Dirksen	Mundt	

NAYS—41

Bartlett	Hayden	Miller
Bible	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Burdick	Hill	Morse
Bush	Humphrey	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Neuberger
Carroll	Javits	Pastore
Church	Keating	Pell
Clark	Kefauver	Randolph
Douglas	Kuchel	Sparkman
Engle	Long, Mo.	Symington
Ervin	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Gore	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Gruening	McGee	Yarborough
Hartke	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—27

Anderson	Eastland	McNamara
Bridges	Fulbright	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Proxmire
Capehart	Hart	Robertson
Carlson	Hruska	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Lausche	Scott
Chavez	Long, La.	Smathers
Cotton	Magnuson	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.

So Mr. ELLENDER's motion was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7576) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Wednesday, Sept. 13, 1961, pp. 19209–19213.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the report is signed by six of the eight members of the conference group.

As the Senate will recall, the principal item in issue between the House and the Senate on this bill was project 62–a–6, electric generating facilities for the new production reactor, Hanford, Wash., $95 million. This project was included in H.R. 7576, as reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but was deleted by the House in their action on the bill. The Senate, acting on the House bill, amended it to include the Hanford project and, in addition included a project 62–e–4, providing $5 million for nuclear research in connection with the development of new uses for coal.

The substitute project agreed upon by the conferees provides for a 400,000-kilowatt electrical plant to be used exclusively to supply the power requirements of the AEC's Hanford plutonium production site. Although this project does not have all of the economic advantages of the originally proposed 800,000-kilowatt plan as approved by the Senate, it does have the potential for lowering the Government's cost in connection with the operation of the Hanford site.

The economic justification for the 400,000-kilowatt plant is based upon data supplied to the Joint Committee by the Atomic Energy Commission. These data indicate that this proposed $58 million plant can be paid off by savings on the cost of electrical power at Hanford over a period of about 9 years of operation. It should be noted that these payout estimates include a 4-percent annual interest charge on the plant investment. As such, this project is a sound economic investment for the Government.

It should be emphasized that all of the electrical power produced at the facility will be used for national defense purposes in connection with the operation of the AEC Hanford installation which produces material for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Since the electrical power is limited to use at the Hanford installation, the question of whether or not the AEC will be entering the commercial power business may be discarded as a consideration.

Finally, even though the plant as agreed upon by the conferees will have one-half the rated capacity of the originally proposed project, it will still be the world's largest atomic powerplant from a single reactor.

Mr. President, I believe that the position agreed upon by the conferees is a sensible compromise in the best interests of the Government, and accordingly I urge Senate approval of this conference report.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not sign the conference report because of the one item contained in it for the development of a single generator to utilize the steam from the plutonium reactor at Hanford. I do not expect to oppose the general adoption of the report, but I wish to make my objection a matter of record.

The Senate passed the bill authorizing the construction of two generators at a total cost, I believe, of $95 million, to utilize the steam from the reactor and for the production of 800,000 kilowatts of electricity, most of which would be sold. I felt that that violated the basic provisions of the Atomic Energy Act and would put the Atomic Energy Commission into the direct commercial sale of electricity.

It must be borne in mind, however, that about 2 years ago Congress authorized, the Committee on Appropriations approved, and Congress appropriated $25 million to convert the heat from this reactor into steam. That money has already been spent. The $95 million which was originally authorized in the bill was an additional amount to produce this electricity. I felt it was uneconomic, and I think the figures show that it was an uneconomic, high-cost electricity. I opposed it in the authorization bill.

This provision in the conference report provides for the installation of one generator or one unit to produce about 400,000 kilowatts of electricity, practically all of which will be used at the plant itself. I still feel this is expensive electricity and that the proposal is unwarranted. I feel that if the full, actual costs of the electricity were assessed to the kilowatts, if the full costs were included, one could determine that it would be possible to build a steamplant to produce electricity cheaper than this expenditure will produce it.

Therefore, because I could not approve of this item, I did not sign the conference report. However, a majority in each House approved the report on the authorization bill.

The provision for the electricity to be produced by this generator also includes a substantial amount of money, is nevertheless a minor part of the total appropriations authorized by the bill and which are essential. I do not object to any other provisions of the conference report.

Simply for the record, I suggest that this steam will be available, but, so far as I know, no private or public body is willing to buy the steam or to build the generator to generate the electricity. I think that is definite proof that the electricity to be generated at the Hanford plant is uneconomic. If it were economic, then I think there would be a scramble on the part of private and public bodies to take over the steam and to build generators themselves. Significantly, they will not do it; and, so far as I know, there is no attempt on the part of anyone to take the steam and build a generator as a part of a private operation.

Again I say that this operation will put the Atomic Energy Commission into the business of manufacturing electricity commercially. Although Congress can change the act at any time, basically the Atomic Energy Act places the Atomic Energy Commission in the business of experimentation and development. There is nothing in the plutonium plant which adds to the knowledge of the art of manufacturing electricity in any material degree. We know what kind of plant it is. Plants like it have been built before. This op-

eration will not add to the general advanced knowledge of the production of plutonium. There is nothing in the generator or in the transmission of the steam which will add anything to the advanced knowledge of the production of electricity. It is all standard procedure.

To extend the operations of the plant to the manufacturing of electricity will violate the basic provisions of the Atomic Energy Act as it now exists. As I say, Congress can change the provisions of the act any time it wishes to do so, and apparently intends to do so. But it is my contention that the Atomic Energy Commission has no more business operating a commercial electric powerplant than the Civil Aeronautics Commission has operating an airline, or the Securities and Exchange Commission has operating a bucketshop or any other kind of securities disposal enterprise. But apparently that is what the Atomic Energy Commission will be expected to do. Evidently we are moving into that area.

While most of the electricity—about 350,000 kilowatts—can be used at the Hanford plant, there will still be, under present circumstances, about 50,000 kilowatts which will be sold or otherwise disposed of. My personal opinion is that it will not be sold at a price which will reflect the cost of the production of the electricity. So the Government will be subsidizing that production; the Government will be placed squarely into the production of power on a subsidized basis, through a Commission which never was established to enter into commercial enterprise operations.

Let me emphasize again that, in my opinion, if this electricity could be economically or competitively produced, private and public bodies in that area would be bidding for the steam and building their own generators to make and sell the electricity. However, that is not the case. No; the Government will subsidize the production of that electricity.

As is true of some of the other operations of the Government, all the costs will not appear in the final rate structure on which the charges for the electricity will be made. I think it will be subsidized electricity, and the difference in cost will come out of the Federal Treasury as a subsidy. I think some of the costs will be concealed, just like the sheriff's hat.

There is an old story about a sheriff who submitted an expense account and included the cost of a hat in which some bullet holes had been shot. The board of supervisors refused to pay for the hat, saying it would not pay for a hat or other articles of personal clothing, even though they were destroyed in line of duty. They therefore denied the claim for the hat.

The next month the sheriff submitted another bill but did not include the cost of the hat at all. However, at the bottom of the bill was a little note which said, "The hat is in here, but you can't find it."

That is the way with the price structure for the electricity which will be developed at the Hanford plant. The Government will establish a cost structure, but the whole cost will not be shown in it. The $25 million which has already been included for convertibility will not, in my judgment, be included in the cost structure. Neither will many other additions and deductions be included. The electricity will be subsidized at Government expense. This will be a new program, an innovation in putting the Government directly into the production and sale of electricity through the Atomic Energy Commission.

I will not try to prevent the adoption of the conference report, because, in the main, with this exception, the items contained in the report are essentially for the continued development and operation of atomic energy. I only make an exception with respect to this one item, and have given my reason for not signing the conference report.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield, of course.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sorry; I thought I had been yielded the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator from Iowa believe that next year or another year we will have before us a proposal to utilize the remainder of the steam and build other generators, so that eventually we will end with the original proposal to use all the steam?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I anticipate that next year the Commission will come before us with a proposal to build the other unit. There is a reason for that. The only unit which they are proposing to build can probably be used from 65 to 70 or 75 percent of its time capacity. If there were two units, because of the particular situation with respect to dump power out there, they probably could not use two units on an overall basis of more than 35 percent of their capacity. That would send the cost away up. But they will use the figures now—those who are advocating the complete utilization of the steam—based upon the high percentage of utilization for one generator, in order to try to sell the second one next year or the year after.

No; I do not believe there is any question that the public power people will come before Congress, having had this much success with respect to one generator, and will want a second generator next year.

Mr. BENNETT. So instead of really facing the whole problem now, this is simply a foot-in-the-door method, and the Commission will be back next year. That is what worries the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I feel so, and that is why I am opposed to this plan. I believe it is uneconomic and unsound. That is why I wish to make my own position clear.

Mr. President, I do not care to delay the action of the Senate on the conference report; and I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to associate myself with the entire statement made by the Senator from Iowa. I, too, signed the minority views when this proposal came from the committee, and I take the same position that the Senator from Iowa does. I feel that this provision constitutes a foot in the door. I am not sure whether it justifies a vote against the entire conference report, but I am sorry this provision is included in it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to make several observations.

First, let me say that the very light which illuminates this Chamber at this moment is being generated through the operation of a Government-owned plant. We do not propose that anything new be done at Hanford. But a tremendous amount of steam is being wasted there at the present time. It will be developed and generated there, regardless of whether it is used in the way now proposed. We only propose to harness the steam and make good use of it. The electricity thus generated will not be sold commercially, but will be used exclusively at the Hanford plant. If that is not economical use, I should like to know what economical use is.

Second, I should like to state that an important letter in connection with this matter is dated August 18, 1961, and was addressed by A. R. Luedecke, General Manager of the U.S. Atomic Commission, to James T. Ramey, executive director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States; and the letter proves the economics of the proposed use of this plant. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX A

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1961.

MR. JAMES T. RAMEY,
Executive Director, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. RAMEY: In accordance with your request of August 16, we have calculated the duration of the dual-purpose period at the Hanford NPR necessary to pay off the investment in a powerplant consisting of one turbine-generator unit. The unit assumed was sized at the 400-electric-megawatt level now under study for a two-unit project. The budget estimate is $58 million.

As requested, the calculations have been performed on three different bases:

1. FPC's primary evaluation.
2. FPC's secondary evaluation.
3. FPC's secondary evaluation including credit for advanced power sales.

The results are as follows:

1. On the basis of the primary evaluation, a 12-year dual-purpose period (14-year production campaign) would pay off the plant.
2. On the basis of the secondary evaluation, a 10-year dual-purpose period (12-year production campaign) would pay off the plant.

3. On the basis of the secondary evaluation including credit for advanced power sales, a 9-year dual-purpose period (11-year production campaign) would pay off the plant.

You will recall that current studies have assumed an 8-year dual-purpose period, 10-year production campaign.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. LUEDECKE,
General Manager.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, beyond that, I have nothing further to say. This compromise had to be effected. I am sorry we did not succeed in providing for generation in this way of the entire 800,000 kilowatts. The compromise means we shall have to waste one-half of the potential, but that was the decision at which the conference committee arrived. But I maintain that the decision was a wise one in view of the opposition in the House of Representatives. I think the proposed use is economic, and is the right thing to do, and is the best that can be achieved in view of the attitude of all concerned.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island. I, too, rise in support of the conference report on the AEC authorization bill, H.R. 7576.

It seems to me the question before the Congress is a very simple one. The Atomic Energy Commission is constructing a large reactor at its Hanford installation, to produce plutonium, which is one of the essential ingredients in atomic weapons, particularly small tactical weapons. From the present status of international affairs it would appear that the Government will require the production of this plutonium for an extended period—at least 15 years. In the operation of this plutonium reactor, large quantities of steam will be produced in connection with the secondary cooling of the reactor.

The issue before the Congress is simply this: Should we utilize a part of the 11 million pounds of steam per hour which will be produced by this reactor, or should it be wasted into condensors and dumped into the Columbia River?

I am supporting the conference proposal to cut the plant down to one generator which will produce approximately 400,000 kilowatts, to be used exclusively for the AEC Hanford installation. I do this in the spirit of compromise and as a means of avoiding the question of whether the Atomic Energy Commission would be in the commercial power business.

It should be clear that the electric power produced under this compromise amendment will be devoted to the Hanford national defense installation which is producing one of our essential weapons materials—plutonium.

Considerable savings will be achieved in the AEC power costs at the site by utilizing the byproduct steam of this plutonium reactor. Every dollar invested in these facilities will be paid back with interest in terms of power savings. This has been attested to by the Atomic Energy Commission, based on reports by the Federal Power Commission, the General Electric Co., and their architect-engineers. The Joint Committee has requested that there be undertaken an optimization study on the single generator which should indicate that even greater savings can be achieved if the use of a single generator is optimized.

It has been stated that the construction of the one generator at Hanford would release an equivalent amount of power supplied by the Bonneville Power Administration and further increase the alleged surplus in the Northwest. It is true that this would release power that Bonneville would otherwise supply to the Hanford installation. The joint committee has testimony, however, that Bonneville would supply this power to private utilities and private industries in the Northwest who are in urgent need of additional power supplies.

It has been alleged that the 400,000-kilowatt generator would not make Hanford self-sufficient, because of standby power required from Bonneville. As indicated in the report by the managers of the House, this would be true in any event, whether AEC produced its own power or obtained power from Bonneville. The present power supply from Bonneville to the Hanford installation obviously has to have backup power, and so would any other alternative arrangement, including AEC-produced power.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to emphasize that this is an economic project. It will serve the national defense, and it is a sincere compromise effort to work out a solution between the desires of the Senate and the House.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to compliment the Senator from Rhode Island, who is in charge of this measure. I believe that in view of the circumstances, which he has brought out, the conference report is as good a measure as it was possible to achieve. It would have been shortsighted indeed for the U.S. Government to have continued to purchase nearly 400,000 kilowatts of electricity, while at the same time permitting its own potential power to go to waste at the very spot where the power being purchased is being used. I would even have voted for development of the entire amount of power, all of which is now going to waste there—approximately 800,000 kilowatts. But I understand it was not possible to obtain an agreement in regard to the entire amount.

Certainly the Senator from Rhode Island has done a remarkably fine job in bringing to us the conference report we are about to adopt.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, so far as the production of steam at reactors is concerned, let me point out that every reactor in the United States produces heat. At Hanford enough heat has been produced to raise the temperature of the Columbia River by 2°, but turbines or generators to produce electricity from that steam have not been installed all these years. In the opinion of some, that has been wasted. However, that has not been done, because the production of electricity in that way would be uneconomic. As I said the other day, a great deal of water runs down the Potomac River; and, according to that theory, all that water is being wasted, and we should have constructed many dams, to produce electricity, regardless of the cost, because all the water is being wasted. But the question is one of efficiency and the cost per kilowatt and whether the electricity which could be produced and acquired in other ways would be cheaper for the Government than electricity produced in that way. I merely wish to make that point clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MEDICAL CARE—THE FORGOTTEN ISSUE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as we approach the close of the session some time this month, I have in mind winding up the issue of medical care insurance for the aged, on which I wish to speak briefly, but to the point.

Mr. President, medical care insurance for the aged is obviously the forgotten issue; and if we have forgotten to call it the forgotten issue, we are reminded of it by the President's sudden interest in the subject, as evidenced by the exchange of letters with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the chairman of the Special Committee on the Aging, of which I am also a member. The exchange only emphasizes the default of the administration in regard to medical care insurance for the aged at this session.

Mr. President, we may just as well call a spade a spade. The issue has been deferred until 1962, out of choice, because apparently it is deemed more advisable to have it debated and brought to a decision in the 1962 congressional campaign year than in 1961.

All this does is to spend another year with this issue—another year during which the aged, about whom all of us are deeply concerned, will not have the protection they might very well be given by this legislation, which I hope very much will be enacted. They could have had it in 1961, in my opinion, and they would have been very much more likely to have it in 1961 than in 1962, although of course I hope we shall still do in 1962 what we should have done this year.

But I would be less than honest and devoted to my duty, and fair to the other Senators who joined me in the effort to get something done in this field this year, if I did not make this statement.

Together with 10 of my colleagues—and I wish to give their names: Senators COOPER, of Kentucky; SCOTT, of Pennsylvania; AIKEN, of Vermont; FONG, of Hawaii; COTTON, of New Hampshire; my own colleague, Mr. KEATING, of New York; KUCHEL, of California; PROUTY, of

Vermont; and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts—I am the sponsor of a bill to provide health care insurance for the aged, a bill for which I have fought for a long time, and which was introduced on February 13, 1961.

Subsequently, I tried, by amendment of one of the pending bills, to bring about some action, but knowing we did not have the votes and that, unless the majority side wished to bring it up, it would not be adopted, I consulted with the very distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has had the leadership in this matter, and he gave us various assurances on the floor that something would be done, that hearings would be held, and a real effort would be made to bring the matter to an issue and determination this year.

Of course, nothing has been done. My amendment did not have a chance, as we all knew, and I would not prejudice it by forcing it to a vote under those circumstances.

So here we are, near the end of the session, with the statement of President Kennedy in a letter to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] in which the President said, "I intend to recommend that this legislation be given the highest priority at the next session of Congress."

The President of the United States will have to do more than give it the highest priority, because he had given it the highest priority in 1961, and it became the forgotten issue of 1961.

Medical care insurance for the aged represents an even more inept example of administration leadership than Federal aid to education. At least, on Federal aid to education, an effort—however weak—was made to rescue the legislation. On medical care for the aged, not even a word was uttered by the President from the day he placed it on his "must" list of legislation at this session as one of the 16 measures he said had to be passed.

I am not too convinced that even in 1962 there is going to be action on this measure. I am not given to making aimless speeches on the floor, or speeches of partisan protest, for all the good that they do. However, I think it is essential that the record should be kept straight, in view of the fact that those who took such a strong position in the 1960 campaign that medical care for the aged would get attention, that it was very high on the list, and would have the strong support of the administration—they are the ones who are laying it aside. And, what is more important than the affairs of the aged is that the issue may also become the forgotten issue of the 1962 campaign. It is being tossed into that controversy, with strong opposition from doctors of medicine, in a congressional campaign year, when it may suffer expressly on that account.

Therefore, the point of my speech today is that the President should lend his encouragement to an agreement on a bill between the Republicans and Democats. He cannot pass such a bill without some strong support on this side of the aisle, as he knows, and as he knew when he stood in this Chamber as a Senator and asked for support, and, as he knows, he has not been able to pass any real welfare measure in this session without Republican support. Nothing will endanger this program more in 1962 than the failure to call now for an effort to have an agreement between Republican and Democratic Senators for this type of legislation, as well as in the other body, on a compromise bill before we get together in 1962. That is the purpose of my speech.

I urge the President of the United States to ask the Special Committee on the Aging to use the congressional recess of 1961 to reach a compromise between the Democratic and Republican plans on medical care—the Democratic plan being the Anderson-King bill, and the Republican plan being the bill which I introduced and referred to a moment ago. At least there we will have some chance of avoiding the enmeshing of the legislation in 1962 politics.

If the President is realistic, he knows that he will need Republican support to adopt a medical care for the aged plan, just as he needed Republican support for every major legislative success he has had at this session.

So, having sponsored, with other Republicans, the alternative to the administration plan, I am convinced that a satisfactory compromise is available to the administration which will make medical care for the aged a reality for 12 million to 14 million citizens 65 and over in 1962, and not a political will-o'-the-wisp, as it has been in 1961.

What are the lines the settlement can follow? I believe there are four proposals in which there is a real possibility of getting together.

One is to cover all the aging, not merely those on social security, which is a very important element of the plan which the other Republican Members of the Senate and I propose.

The second is to provide for preventive care. There is no doctor's care provided in the Anderson-King plan or in the administration plan, but it is a critically essential plan for us to avail ourselves of the different facilities which the States have for the care of the aged, instead of centralizing and making uniform a Federal plan which tries to conform, but utilizing all the available medical facilities in every State, and allowing the States to better and improve their plans.

Finally, beneficiaries of voluntary health plans should be given the opportunity to continue their health plans, or health insurance, or participation in a trade union plan or a pension and welfare plan, as an alternative to accepting the benefits under the Federal bill.

Those are the four areas in which, I am convinced, it is possible to work out a compromise.

As to the general situation, Mr. President, it is getting worse, not better. It is for this reason that the administration must bear the full responsibility for failing to push the legislation at this session of Congress.

What has happened so far with the Kerr-Mills bill, which we passed in the absence of an ability to agree on either my program, which was, incidentally, backed by Vice President Nixon and which received the overwhelming support of Republicans in the Senate, and the plan which was then Senator Kennedy's program? We passed the Kerr-Mills bill, but it has proved to be utterly inadequate to the purpose for which it was adopted by Congress.

Little change in the provision of medical care for the aged has occurred, but the major net effect of this legislation in its first 6 months of operation was to shift a sizable share of the costs from the States to the Federal Government. Only a little over 10,000 new people have gotten the benefit of any medical care plan by virtue of the so-called Kerr-Mills bill. Indeed, only 12 States and 2 possessions; namely, the Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, are thus far actively participating in the program, and in these virtually all the cases handled have been transferred from the old age assistance program, because the Federal participation under the Kerr-Mills bill is much larger than it was under the old age assistance program. Only 10,229 persons, to be exact, have received medical assistance for the first time under the Kerr-Mills bill in the period between October 1960 and April 1961, the last date for which we have figures.

Since the Kerr-Mills program has an income ceiling ranging from $1,000 a year per person in Kentucky to $1,800 in New York, and $2,600 a year per couple, many people who would be eligible will not make use of its benefits because they will not submit to the "means" test.

Taking my own State, we estimated 800,000 eligible under the Kerr-Mills bill. There is a potential reach of that number of people over 65. Actually, 16,337 have received benefits of the program, and a great majority of those are persons who were being cared for under the old age assistance program and now are being cared for under the Kerr-Mills bill.

Mr. President, the forecast is not very auspicious, either. Twelve States and 2 possessions, as I said, are actively participating in the program. What have we to look forward to? Four States have passed appropriate legislation which is under consideration by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Eight States have passed bills and are now in the planning stage for their programs. Four States are in the process of passing legislation; perhaps the legislation has been passed by one house or another, or is in some other legislative stage.

As we look forward well into 1962 we observe that about half of the States will be participating; 28 out of a total of 50.

Mr. President, the need, which was so much talked about on the floor in the debate and in the campaign of 1960, has not decreased. It has materially increased. The number of citizens over 65 has materially increased. Indeed, it is estimated that the number will double in the next 40 years, by the end of this century.

Costs for doctors, drugs, and hospitalization have materially increased. Incomes of the aged have remained inadequate to meet these costs.

I cite one figure. Two-thirds of our senior citizens live in family units which have incomes of under $4,000 per annum. That is just about the breaking point at which an individual might conceivably be viable in terms of medical care if not stricken with some catastrophe.

Unless we have any illusions about the income figures, 53 percent of those who are over 65 live in family units with family incomes of under $3,000 a year. This is markedly inadequate and very close to the standard under which assistance is extended under the program of the Kerr-Mills bill.

What do we find? We find that the Kerr-Mills bill has not done the job which needs to be done. That is the first point.

The second point is that the problem has, if anything, grown rather than decreased.

The third point is that the administration, out of choice, I think as a strictly political decision, has deferred the whole problem for another year.

Mr. President, this is a pretty tragic situation. I have strongly urged in this speech, therefore, that the administration, at the very least, try to redeem its fault of omission by encouraging, supporting, backing, and requesting that there be agreed upon a bill, as between both sides of the aisle, or those of us on both sides of the aisle in any position to agree as to this type of proposed legislation, so that at least when the Congress comes back into session in January we can be ready to "go to town" with a bill which has been agreed upon, which would not require hearings and a reconciliation of varying points of view as between various people who are in favor of this type of legislation.

In respect to that particular subject, I wish to make a few observations, because the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the other body have shown why it is necessary to do far more than we have yet done, or, apparently, than the administration has in contemplation doing.

There developed in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on the other side of the Capitol a very strong difference on the question of cost. There were cost estimates of the program under a social security scheme offered by the administration, related to the so-called Anderson-King bill, and they ranged from $152 million in 1962 to $2,640 million annually at the end of the century. The effort to finance the program was to be based upon 1½ percent of payroll, three-quarters of 1 percent each from the employer and the employee, with an increase of the social security tax base from $4,800 to $5,200 per annum.

These figures were very sharply challenged by the insurance companies, which estimated the cost as early as 1963 at $2,179 million per annum, a level not expected to be reached, according to the Government witnesses, until sometime between 1975 and 1990. The estimated cost in 1964 is $2,483 million, almost the same cost as was calculated by the Federal Government witnesses for the year 2000.

These are very marked and very alarming differences. Indeed, the question of cost is a very critical one in this regard.

We already observe the difficulty which is created on the question of cost by an estimate made by the Special Committee on Aging. Whereas we thought the Kerr-Mills medical assistance program would cost an aggregate of $600 million in its first full year of national operation, in all the States, the estimate of cost now has been raised to $800 million, roughly half of which will be provided by the Federal Government.

Indeed, expenditures under the Kerr-Mills program are getting within "shooting range" of the expenditures which my Republican colleagues and I predicted would be adequate for a general revenue plan for medical care for the aged. We had estimated overall costs in the area of $1 billion to $1.2 billion, with Federal participation of about $600 million, to relieve us of all the arguments and difficulties inherent in the social security approach.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator some questions for information.

Can the Senator advise us how many States have qualified to participate in the program authorized by the Kerr-Mills bill which was enacted a year ago?

Mr. JAVITS. Only 12 States, plus Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Even when one projects everything ahead optimistically to 1962, including the legislation in progress, the plans being made, and so on, one can reach a grand total of only 28.

Mr. AIKEN. I am happy to say that my own State has put itself in a position to cooperate with the Federal Government under the Kerr-Mills program, but I am disappointed and somewhat discouraged by the infrequency with which States indicate interest. When Congress is about to pass a bill some States say, "This is our business. There should not be a Federal program."

Congress passes a bill, and leaves it to the States to qualify and to cooperate under the program set up by the bill. I well recall the amendment to the Social Security Act passed last year. Only two or three States qualified. An unemployment compensation act was passed by the Congress, and only three or four States put their houses in order.

Thereafter it becomes necessary, in order to extend the benefits at all, to enact Federal legislation. I fear that is what is about to happen in regard to the Kerr-Mills program, which the Congress authorized last year. While it was not a complete program by any means, it did take a step toward the ultimate goal of adequate medical care for the older people.

I am disappointed to learn that only 12 States have put their houses in order, so as to take advantage of the law.

This may lead to the argument that the Federal Government will have to provide the benefits, that one cannot rely on the States to do so. Sooner or later the Federal Government will do it. Then it will be said, "You are federalizing things which ought to be under the jurisdiction of the States."

When the States will not provide what is needed, I do not know what else can be done. I can visualize the same thing occurring in regard to medical care for the aged. The States apparently are not going to put themselves in a position to care for their own aged people, even with the cooperation of the Federal Government. Eventually, although I had hoped it would not be necessary, I can see us enacting Federal legislation to supervise the program and to provide the medical care and hospital care for the older people of the country which is needed, regardless of the State of residence of the people.

Mr. JAVITS. Not only has the State participation been relatively disappointing—and I shall furnish for the RECORD the complete chart of the situation in all of the States—but also I point out that only some 10,229 have actually participated under the Kerr-Mills program. That is all, notwithstanding the assertions on the floor of the Senate, which the Senator may remember, that 10 million of the aged were eligible to be considered under the Kerr-Mills program.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the program which my own State has established, there will be in the State 6,000 or 7,000 elderly people who will qualify under the Kerr-Mills program. If that ratio were applied to all the States, several million people in those States might be made eligible. If the other States take no action, we shall find ourselves enacting Federal legislation which will cover all of them.

Mr. JAVITS. In my own State of New York there is a potential of 175,000 New York citizens over 65 who might become eligible under the Kerr-Mills bill, but we need a Federal program that would reach an estimated 1,325,000 persons over 65 who would fall in the general category of needing some help with their medical problems. This point is emphasized by the fact that there are about 16½ million people over 65 in the country—incidentally, every day 3,000 more people join the ranks of those over 65—and about three-quarters of those have chronic ailments. As we all know, people over 65 on the average spend twice as many days in the hospital as the rest of the population. Their hospital bills are twice those of persons under 65, and their average income is only half as much.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may add to what I have already said?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In the United States there are 16½ million people over 65 years of age. They are very fortunate that they have someone in the U.S. Senate like the senior Senator from New York to put their case before the public and before the Congress. Otherwise they would be in a very deplorable situation indeed. I think it is also deplorable in some States the people who complain

about the situation make no move, or little move, to correct it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Vermont may not have been in the Chamber when I started. The purpose of my speech is to point out that notwithstanding the weeping and wailing which went on in 1960, at the time of the great national campaign, about the fact that we had to do something for the aged—at that time medical care insurance for the aged was one of the big measures on the President's "must" list for 1961—the session of 1961 has come and gone without anything being done about the problem. In fact, between the time it was put on the President's "must" list and last week, when he wrote a letter to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] saying he wanted it to have the "highest priority" at the next session of Congress, not a word was said about it. It was the big forgotten issue of 1961. I point out that people like myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and other Senators have been trying to stimulate some interest in the problem. It is pretty tough when those who made medical care for the aged their big campaign issue studiously neglected it and did nothing about it. They felt they had to talk us out of an effort to present an amendment on this subject to another bill when we did not have the votes to bring the issue directly to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. It is unfortunate when the President sees fit to put this important issue off until just before another election. No one knows in how many elections medical care insurance for the aged would prove to be a good issue, but sooner or later the people of this country will realize that some of us tried to do something to correct the situation by providing for the needs of these 16½ million older people more than a year ago. I join with the Senator from New York in saying that we must continue this work. I should like to get it out of politics. I do not like to see this subject brought up as a party issue every 2 or 4 years. There would be much greater satisfaction in seeing this objective reached than in having an issue left over to be used for political purposes every 2 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I am extremely proud of the fact that I have been able to exercise a role on this question, and that the Senator from Vermont, for whom I have the greatest respect, has seen fit to join in it.

I feel we are very close to agreements with those who represent the views espoused by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. In colloquy in the Senate Chamber in February 1961 and in colloquy a few weeks ago again in the Chamber, the Senator from New Mexico and I both indicated that we were close together, and the only restraint upon coming to the kind of agreement which could result very quickly in legislation that would be far less controversial than the wilderness bill, we are taking up today, is the fact that the administration has been unwilling to give the bill the green light for 1961.

I have been with the President in connection with many things he has tried to do. I have suffered a good deal of criticism, even from my own side of the aisle, when I have been on his side, because I thought to do so was right in the interest of the country, the free world, or my own State. But I would be less than honest, when criticism is justly and richly deserved, if I failed to make such criticism with the same vigor and conviction with which I have evidenced my agreement on other occasions.

I think it is sad and unfortunate—and the country should mark it well—that a whole year has gone by and, notwithstanding all the protestations of concern, absolutely nothing has been done on this subject except to have a hearing over in the other body.

If the President cannot succeed in the effort, that is a failure of leadership which the country must mark. If the President can do it, that is all the more reason why it should have been done in the year 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed as a part of my remarks a number of charts to show the rate of progress, which is extremely small, under the MAA program—the Kerr-Mills program—and also an analysis of the costs of the Anderson-King social security bill, and an article from the Journal of Commerce, which sums up the principle points of our own alternative bill on this side.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*States participating in Kerr-Mills*

States with program in effect: [1] Idaho (July), Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, S. Carolina (July), Tennessee (July), Utah (July), Virgin Islands, Washington, West Virginia.

States with plans submitted to HEW (not in effect): Arkansas (approved) [2], Oregon (approved). In regional office: Louisiana (effective Oct. 1, 1961), North Dakota (effective July 1, 1961).

Legislation enacted but no plans submitted: California (effective Jan. 1, 1962), Connecticut (effective April 15, 1962), Hawaii (effective July 1, 1961), Illinois (effective July 1, 1961), Maine (effective July 1, 1961), New Hampshire (effective October 10, 1961), Pennsylvania,[3] Vermont (1962).

Legislation in process to give basis for program or to provide appropriation: Passed one house: Alabama, Wisconsin; bill introduced: Delaware,[4] New Jersey.[5]

Considering possible legislation: District of Columbia.

Need legislation: No action anticipated: Alaska,[4] Arizona,[4] Colorado, Florida, Guam,[4] Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas,[4 6] Wyoming, Mississippi (session in 1962), Virginia (session in 1962).

States that have authority for MAA, but not implemented: Georgia,[4] enacted 1961 but no funds available; Iowa, enacted 1961 but no appropriation; New Mexico, enacted but plan withdrawn; no appropriation.

[1] Plans of these States are approved but not all in operation.

[2] Funds expected in September 1961.

[3] Effective month following approval.

[4] Do not have in operation vendor payment for medical care under OAA.

[5] Intermittently in session; now in recess.

[6] Constitutional amendment proposed.

TABLE 2.—*Medical assistance for the aged: Recipients and payments for recipients, by State, May 1961* [1]

State	Number of recipients	Payments for recipients	
		Total	Average
Total	41,388	$8,295,631	$200.44
Kentucky	38	1,587	(2)
Massachusetts	15,272	[3] 3,019,037	197.68
Michigan	3,115	791,041	253.95
New York	*16,537*	*3,931,676*	*240.66*
Oklahoma	176	33,672	191.32
Virgin Islands	[4] 204	1,972	9.67
Washington	[4] 875	174,770	199.74
West Virginia	5,371	341,876	63.65

[1] Figures italicized represent program under State plan not yet approved by the Social Security Administration. All data subject to revision.

[2] Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients.

[3] Excludes $95,152 in money payments not subject to Federal participation.

[4] Estimated.

COST OF ANDERSON-KING BILL (H.R. 4222)

The cost of the administration's medicare bill was initially estimated at 0.60 percent of covered payroll. It was subsequently estimated at 10 percent higher because of increased cost factors (largely higher pay by hospitals for nonmedical staff) and higher estimates on costs of nursing homes and other services. Thus it was estimated that 0.66 percent of covered payroll (at $4,800) would be necessary to cover all increased social security costs including medicare (0.65 percent, if $5,200 is the base).

In dollars, H.R. 4222 is estimated by social security to cost:

	Millions
Social security:	
1962	$152
1963	1,062
1964	1,098
1965	1,134
1975	1,557
1990	2,308
2000	2,640
Insurance companies:	
1963	2,179
1964	2,483
1983	5,438

In the testimony of H. Lewis Reitz on behalf of the major insurance associations, the costs of H.R. 4222 were estimated as above. Level premium was estimated at 1.73 percent on a $5,000 base. (See H.R. 4222 level premiums above.)

Please note that the estimate for the health care bill S. 937 in which Senator JAVITS was joined by 10 other Republican Senators and which provided for Federal-State financing out of general revenue was at the annual cost of $1.1 billion.

It is likely that both sets of statistics are substantially correct, because the sources differ from which they are derived. The administration's statistics were established by Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, on the basis of National Health Survey reports, which include the experience of the entire aging population in the country.

The insurance company basis is much more selective. Its tables are based on the actual claim experience under Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans. It estimates hospital costs in 1963 at $37 per diem, while the administration figure is $32. It includes railroad retirees; H.R. 4222 does not. The probabilities are that in its estimates—and some of these statistics are based on estimates—the insurance companies err on the

generous side; the social security figures are likely to be on the low side.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, June 16, 1961]

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGING

(By JACOB K. JAVITS, U.S. Senator from New York)

There is substantial agreement that the Federal Government must help provide adequate health care for our senior citizens, most of whom cannot afford it. The fact that a majority of the 16 million who are 65 and over have incomes of less than $1,000 annually is a major factor in the mounting demand on Congress and on State legislatures to enact legislation to help assure the aged of adequate medical care. I firmly believe that there must be a Federal program to make this care available.

An adequate program to meet the needs of our senior citizens should give top priority to preventive medical care. Medical experts agree that adequate preventive medical care would lead to a sharp reduction in the occurrence of chronic illness and long stays in the hospital. This can best be done by a first cost program, making physician's care readily available at home or in the office.

The administration proposal which Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, New Mexico, embodied in the bill he introduced in this 87th Congress does not meet the objections to the Kennedy-Anderson bill which the Senate defeated last August. It fails to include the millions over 65 not covered under the social security system; it does not emphasize the preventive care that senior citizens need most; it fails to enable individual States to use their medical resources to provide more than minimum care; and it makes no suitable provision for voluntary health plans.

WORK DIFFERENTLY

Americans live and work differently from each other, and what may be a first-class health care plan for one person does not necessarily fill the bill for another man in another State. A satisfactory program should make provision for freedom of choice among health insurance programs including existing private nonprofit and cooperative health plans.

In the bill which I presented to the Congress, there were three options from which the individual could choose one. One was the minimum preventive medicare program which includes 12 physician's visits, 21 days of hospital care, 63 days of nursing home care less any days of hospitalization at the ratio of 3 nursing home days to 1 day in hospital, 24 home nurse service calls as prescribed and the first $100 of ambulatory diagnostic laboratory or X-ray services.

SECOND OPTION

The second option is a catastrophic illness program for those who can afford to pay for their own preventive care but want to be insured against long-term high-cost illnesses. Its benefits form the most complete and comprehensive medical and hospitalization program so far devised after the insured person has incurred the first $250 of cost.

The third option would help those who prefer a private health insurance plan or—as in the case of many retired workers—are already covered by a group plan. This option calls for payment of the premium cost of such a noncancellable insurance plan up to a maximum per year of the per capita cost of the program.

Similar freedom and flexibility must be offered to our States in a satisfactory health care insurance program. Our States are not all 50 identical miniatures of the Federal Government. Geography, history, resources, and experience have all gone into the creation of substantial differences, particularly with respect to medical facilities, costs, and care. There must be a margin of flexibility for each of the States to work from and in any sound medicare plan this must be taken into account.

GENERAL REVENUE

The funds to pay for this program would come from general revenue to which all taxpayers contribute. This is a sound and equitable manner of financing and has the merit of letting all the taxpayers share the cost of the medical care program for the senior citizen who has given his best years to the community.

We have a responsibility toward the growing number of senior citizens to help them meet the high costs of adequate medical care with dignity. I intend to continue my effort to develop a satisfactory program that can be enacted into law. Even if the program takes the social security tax method of financing in order to get a final result, the other considerations I have set forth are essential to enlisting the needed Republican support.

Mr. JAVITS. I close on the same note upon which I opened. There is not too much use in crying over spilled milk, in the sense that a year has gone by and nothing has been done. The thing to do is to improve the present occasion if we can. It is for that reason that I urge the following:

First, that the President not only give his support in a letter to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] saying, "We give highest priority," but that the President give his support audibly, and in view of the entire country, about the fact that the Special Committee on the Aging, on which both Republican and Democratic Members are adequately represented, should now do its utmost, in the intervening period between now and the time Congress returns in January, to agree upon a program of medical care insurance for the aged which will solve some of the problems between the social security proponents and the general revenue proponents.

Again I say that everything I have said, everything the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has said, and everything we have heard on the floor of the Senate indicates that we are very close to agreement. We need some support from the White House. I think this program can be successful with the support of a great majority of the Members of Congress.

Second, that the program be given the highest priority by being the subject of the first bill called up in January 1962. I think it can be made ready to be called up within a week after we return.

Third, that the President himself recognize the fact that the measure cannot be passed except on a bipartisan basis. As I said, when he was a Senator he saw that point evidenced on the floor of the Senate; and, therefore, the Republicans should be invited to make their contribution to the effort by agreeing upon a bill for medical care for the aged which we can pass at the very opening of the 1962 session.

I yield the floor.

EXPANSION AND EXTENSION OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7916) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agree to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S.174) to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 8–23–61—A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 2, beginning with ", and" strike out all to the period in line 8.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to bring into line the other types of land that are being considered for wilderness purposes, lands of wildlife refuges and game ranges.

In the evolution of the bill in committee, the forest lands that are already in public ownership and have the classification of wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe, and lands that are in national parks and monuments had a limitation placed on them, providing that no additional land can be added by the Executive between the date of the enactment of the bill and the time when the review period would run. However, with respect to national wildlife refuges and game ranges, this limitation was not presented.

So the bill as it is now written would permit the President, after the enactment of the bill, to continue to add acreage to our wildlife refuges and game ranges, and that area might be presented as wilderness and might go into the wilderness system.

One of the objections of some people, particularly in the western part of our country, has been the fear that great additional blocks of land might go into the wilderness system through this executive procedure.

If the amendment is adopted there will be no way to enlarge the amount of land that can be considered beyond the land already classified under the statute in existence. Therefore I believe it is a desirable and worthwhile limitation. If we enact the pending bill and it becomes law, we will know precisely the lands about which we are talking and those that will become a part of the wilderness system.

If after the bill becomes law, at a future date, there is a desire to add an area to the wilderness system, or to take an area out of the wilderness system, we must proceed by regular congressional act being enacted just as any other law is enacted. Therefore I urge strongly that the amendment be adopted to make the bill restrictive in the area of wildlife refuges and game ranges, as it is in other areas of the public land.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator for his statement. His amendment is a constructive one. It helps to implement the purposes of the committee in reporting the bill. As the Senator knows and as he has so well stated, we have tried in the bill to confine the wilderness system to certain existing categories of land. We confine it to the wilderness areas within the national parks and national monuments, and provide a method for bringing these areas into the system. We confine it, secondly, to primitive areas in national forests, and provide a method for permanently retaining such portions of these areas as are finally reviewed and approved, in the wilderness system.

The same thing is true of the national wildlife refuges and game ranges. The language in the bill beginning at page 8, line 21 reads:

> There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within 10 years following the effective date of this act.

That language alone is sufficient for purposes of the bill. It makes it perfectly clear that the game ranges and wildlife refuges are meant to be those existing at the date of the enactment of the bill, and then such portions of these as the Secretary of the Interior might recommend for incorporation into the system to the President, and the President to the Congress.

The Senator's amendment is consistent with the purposes of the bill. We did not mean to extend this particular provision beyond the effective date of the act. It is inconsistent with the treatment that we have given to the primitive areas and to the national parks and monuments in the bill.

I commend the Senator. He has offered a constructive amendment. I see no objection to it. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to speak to this matter very briefly. I believe I understand what effect is intended. I propose an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, which I believe is in accord with the statement the Senator from Idaho has just made. I propose on page 8, line 24, after the word "ranges" to add the words "established prior to the effective date of this act".

I believe this would make the intent very clear. As I understand the feeling of the Senator who is in charge of the bill at the present time, this would be in accordance with the objectives of the amendment. I offer my amendment to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MOSS. I see no objection at all to the amendment. I am glad to accept it as an addition to my amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. I believe the Senator's amendment to the amendment makes the point emphatically clear and eliminates any possibility of ambiguity. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his contribution.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may accept the additional wording proposed by the Senator from Colorado and that it be incorporated as a part of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator need unanimous consent for that purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The language refers to another place in the bill, and, therefore, unanimous consent is required.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "8–28–61—A," and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, after line 8, it is proposed to add the following:

> SEC. 10. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and descriptions of the areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this is an additional section and is simply by way of clarification and rounding out of the bill.

When the wilderness bill was being considered in committee, a provision of this sort was included. It was stricken, I think, rather inadvertently in the making of other amendments. At least, as I recall the discussion in committee, there was no discussion of this particular section or about taking it out. That is why I conclude that it was rather by inadvertence than by design that it was taken out. I believe the language should be restored to the bill because it provides a worthwhile requirement that an annual report shall be made to the President and to Congress by the Secretaries who are concerned with the public lands and would be concerned with the wilderness system. This would enable the committees of the Senate and House to be informed each year of the management of the system, any regulations which were promulgated, and of any information concerning the operation of the wilderness system. The committees would be enabled to receive regular, annual information, and would be in a position to take affirmative action, if need be, by way of legislation to regulate the wilderness system or to suggest additions or deletions that might be made in the system.

I urge the adoption of the amendment, so that information concerning the operation of the wilderness system may be submitted regularly to Congress.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not true that the text of the Senator's amendment was originally contained in the bill as introduced?

Mr. MOSS. It is my recollection that this identical language was in the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. It is not the Senator's feeling that the language was dropped through inadvertence, by virtue of an amendment which was made to section 8 of the bill, which replaced the original section 8, but which did not contain the language of this amendment?

Mr. MOSS. That is correct. The bill was amended extensively in committee. It is more of an aside right now to mention that the bill as finally reported was changed so greatly from the bill on which we started our consideration that it is sometimes difficult to recognize original sections of it. It is my firm conviction that the elimination of this language occurred simply through inadvertence or oversight. It was eliminated from one of the very extensive amendments which the committee adopted.

Mr. CHURCH. That is my recollection, as well. The language of the amendment was omitted inadvertently, but it ought now to be restored. The amendment would provide that "At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and description of the areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make."

I think this language will enable Congress to keep fully and currently advised as to the status of the system, and also will be a useful method of furnishing the public with information concerning the current status of the wilderness system.

I do not know of any opposition to the amendment. So far as I am concerned,

is is perfectly acceptable. I hope the Senate will approve it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a little more than 2 years ago the State of Montana placed in Statuary Hall a statue of Charles M. Russell. My venerated predecessor, Senator James E. Murray, accepted the statue, and the majority leader also participated in the ceremony. One of the tributes placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the late Senator Neuberger was an editorial published in the Portland Oregonian. A part of the editorial is as follows:

> Congress took a few minutes off this week to pay tribute to a great American, Charles Russell, the Montana cowboy whose paintings are unsurpassed as a record of the Old West.
>
> Charlie Russell's work hangs in saloons as well as the most exclusive museums. He was no impressionist, no abstractionist. But like all great artists he painted his subjects as he saw them through an artist's eye. And his eye could see things hidden from the best of cameras—the tragedy of the American Indian, the loneliness and ruggedness of the life of the cattle range, the majesty of the common features of a western landscape, the poetry in the flowing lines of a fine animal.

Charlie Russell painted people, Indians, cowboys, hunters; he painted animals, cow ponies, grizzly bears, deer, and elk. The only manmade things Russell liked to paint were the working clothes, the saddles, the guns, and bows and arrows. He hated the influx of the homesteaders, the trails plowed under, the railroads, and the automobiles.

One time Charlie Russell was prevailed upon to make a speech to some chamber of commerce gathering. The toastmaster introduced him as a pioneer. Charlie responded:

> I have been called a pioneer. In my book a pioneer is a man who comes to a virgin country, traps off all the fur, kills off all the wild meat, plows the roots up, and strings 10 million miles of barbed wire. A pioneer destroys things and calls it civilization. I wish to God that this country was just like it was when I first saw it and that none of you folks were here at all.

If Charlie Russell could come to life today and get down off that plinth in Statuary Hall, he would be lobbying for the wilderness bill.

If we are going to be able to understand the work of men like Charlie Russell, and preserve the spiritual values that inspired our ancestors, we must save the few remaining areas where the mountains and the trees, the grass and the streams are as God made them.

Therefore I support this bill today. I can recall when the first wilderness bill was introduced 5 years ago here in the Senate by the late Senator Murray and I was one of the cosponsors in the House of Representatives. The bill was introduced late in the session for study and there were features in the original text with which I disagreed. But we left them in for discussion purposes. As the Senator from Idaho has pointed out, subsequently other versions have been introduced, and the bill before the Senate today is a vastly different bill from that presented then. Such things as the Wilderness Council and the Indian wilderness have been deleted. Constructive criticisms of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and other administrative agencies have been received and the bill reflects the changes. Objections voiced by the mining, the lumbering, the grazing industries have been received and considered and many of the changes in the bill were made to reasonably meet these objections. Every effort has been made to meet particular needs and avoid disruption of established practices and at the same time preserve a small portion of our undeveloped area as a living museum for the future.

Chief credit for the present bill must go to its principal author, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The Senator from New Mexico was one of the first men in Congress to recognize the urgency of planning intelligently to meet our growing needs for outdoor recreation facilities. In 1957, he proposed and Congress enacted the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission bill. Pursuant to that measure, the Commission, in January of next year, will give Congress a documented study and recommendations to meet the outdoor recreation resource needs in the decades ahead.

Mr. President, it has been said on the floor of the Senate today that the passage of the bill will operate as a slap in the face at that Commission, which the Senator from New Mexico played so important a part in sponsoring, and of which he is so important a member.

I have been reading the hearings of both the Senate and the House with respect to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The men who favored the establishment of the Commission testified unanimously before the committees in support of the bill. The great service organizations, including the Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League, the Garden Clubs of America, and others, were for both. Their representatives testified that there was no conflict between the creation and establishment of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and the principle of the wilderness bill.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said on the floor of the Senate at the time the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission bill was passed that there was no conflict. One of the noted sponsors of the wilderness bill, in his testimony before the House committee, stated that both bills were wanted; both the wilderness bill and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission bill were desired. That was Mr. Howard Zahniser, of the Wilderness Association.

So today, when it is said that we are slapping the face of that Commission, the history of the legislation and the testimony before the committees before the legislation was enacted, and the activities of the members of the Commission themselves, have demonstrated that there is no conflict, and that this very specialized part of the bill can go forward while we are awaiting the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission next January.

With his usual thoroughness, the chairman of the Interior Committee has followed up his successful Commission proposal with this bill to move ahead, in an orderly way, programs which are sorely needed and should not be permitted to lag.

It is going to cost a great deal of money to acquire the shorelines, the national park areas, and other recreational areas that are being considered. But this bill requires no expenditure of money. We merely set aside for wilderness use some of the land that Uncle Sam now owns. Had we been as farsighted in the past, we would have retained some of the seashores that we are now having to buy back. We would have retained some of the scenic areas in the national parks and national monuments that we are buying back at considerable cost.

We owe the Senator from New Mexico a vote of confidence for the work he is doing and the contribution he has made to outdoor recreation. We owe him a great deal for his patience and his wisdom in working out the details of the bill now before the Senate. I think he is going to get it in the vote on his wilderness bill, which will give the Nation a wilderness preservation system without cost to the Treasury.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in his comprehensive opening address on this bill, last week, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] clearly made the points that true wilderness is not a renewable resource; that once altered, it can never be restored to its original state; that today we have a very limited number of wilderness areas; and that we must take immediate action if we are to preserve any of these for the use of future generations.

Under these circumstances, and in view of the increasing pressure on our lands, it is the obligation of responsible statesmanship to take immediately the steps provided by this bill.

I came to the Senate in 1959, and began to participate in official consideration of the wilderness bill after it had been before the Senate Interior Committee for several years. I have been most impressed with the careful consideration the committee has given every phase of this question, and particularly impressed with the detailed attention paid to the vital resource industries of the West—lumbering, grazing, and mining.

The bill as presented provides as little disturbance of the present status of these industries as is possible if we are to establish a wilderness system. In addi-

tion, we are assuring future stability to these industries by removing authority of the executive to classify forest and public land areas as "wilderness," "wild," and "primitive."

In his opening address, Senator ANDERSON discussed clearly the question of congressional authority over the public lands. He showed how, rather than abrogate any portion of our constitutional authority, we are, under S. 174, instituting a review of actions which the executive branch may take under previous delegations of authority.

Senator ANDERSON said:

The widespread effort of some of the critics of the wilderness bill to alarm the people with charges that it bestows new and unusual dictatorial powers on the executive branch could not be further from the fact than it is.

S. 174 does not extend any new powers to the executive branch. It recaptures for Congress a right to review what has been done in the past and full authority and initiative over establishment of any new wilderness system areas.

I call attention to these statements of the chairman because the irresponsible and inaccurate charges of which he spoke have been widely circulated in my State of Utah.

I believe that by now most of the people of Utah know the facts about this bill. I am sure that the bill will pass; that the wilderness areas will be set aside; and that, within a few years, the wisdom of its passage will be apparent to all.

I do feel, however, that some of the intemperate and alarming statements that have been made on this legislation should be made a part of the record of this debate, and I ask unanimous consent that a number of newspaper articles and other items be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ogden Standard-Examiner, July 13, 1961]

BENNETT SINKS BARB IN WILDERNESS BILL

WASHINGTON.—Utah Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT says the wilderness bill which cleared the Senate Interior Committee Thursday is a power grab by the Kennedy administration, and he'll oppose it.

Senator BENNETT, a Republican, thus finds himself ranged against Utah's other Senator, Democrat FRANK E. MOSS. Senator MOSS is a member of the Interior Committee and favors the bill.

The measure would establish a wilderness preservation area covering about 35 million acres.

Senator BENNETT called it a threat to the future of the Western public land States, including Utah.

He added, in a statement:

LOCK UP

"The bill provides that wilderness proposals made by the Secretaries of Agriculture or Interior shall become the law of the land unless either the Senate or the House rejects them.

"In Utah, over 70 percent of our land area belongs to the Federal Government. The bill gives Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall power to lock up immense sections of the State. * * *

"I shall oppose this power grab by the Kennedy administration on the floor of the Senate.

"I will not entrust any bureaucrat with such life-and-death control over the future of Utah and the West.

"However, if an amendment correcting this giveaway of our public lands is adopted, together with others, I shall support the bill."

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, July 28, 1961]

CLYDE'S STAND GAINS

(By Jerome K. Full)

Gov. George D. Clyde Thursday took his case for opposing large, new single-purpose Federal reserves to a Capitol Hill audience of nearly 160 Utahans.

He won their nearly unanimous endorsement. Representatives of the Utah Wildlife Federation and the Wasatch Mountain Club supported in large part the measures Governor Clyde opposed.

But the Governor won backing from stockmen, farmers, bankers, industrialists, mining company officials, local government officials, chambers of commerce, lawyers, and others.

At issue were a bill before the U.S. Senate which would allow creation by Presidential order of wilderness areas as Federal lands, requiring an adverse resolution of Congress to block; a proposal of Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall that a mammoth national park of up to 1 million acres be created in southern Utah.

Governor Clyde said his opposition to both measures was one of degree. Wilderness areas are needed, he said. And so is a national park in the area described by Mr. Udall.

But they must be controlled in area, in location, and in administration so that their resources may be developed, he said. Wilderness areas which limit roads and facilities, the Governor stated, will serve only the few who have time and money for pack trips or boat trips.

Before resources are irrevocably contained in wilderness areas which preclude their development, we should think in terms of the needs of the people 2,000 and 5,000 years from now.

The Governor made his presentation to the invited audience representing groups concerned with land use. A resolution offered in support of Governor Clyde's position was passed over a scattering of "no" votes.

A resolution calling for appointment of a committee by the Governor to seek the State's objectives was passed without dissent.

The Governor said later he would name a committee of seven or nine persons representing divergent interests to frame a position for the State to take in dealing with Congress and the Federal executive departments.

The committee will then seek the State's objectives through petition, personal contact, committee testimony and other means.

Speakers compared the State's position in opposition to expansion of Federal enclaves dedicated to single purposes as similar to the State's fight for authorization by Congress of the upper Colorado River storage project.

Utah's position, as presented by the Governor in his hour-long talk, is made acute because the Federal Government already owns about 37 million of the State's 54⅓ million acres.

Additions to Federal holdings, and closure of Federal land to water and mineral resource development threaten the future of the State's economy and the rights of its citizens, he said.

The wilderness proposal in its present form constitutes an abrogation of congressional authority by limiting its role to a veto power, Governor Clyde said. He criticized Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, for his role in supporting the bill in that form.

Mr. Udall, the Governor reported, had offered concessions in the administration of lands by the National Park Service—indicating that multiple use might be allowed in some areas.

"His compromises are not enough," the Governor said. "We must retain the right to development of our resources."

The Governor's presentation brought these comments from his State office building auditorium audience:

James A. Hooper, Utah Woolgrowers' secretary: "There is nothing in the proposed wilderness law that can't be accomplished by existing law."

Frederick P. Champ, Logan banker: "Federal parks and wilderness areas should be limited in size so they may be controlled in use." The result of unlimited expansion, he said, might be for Yellowstone Lake to become an irrigation reservoir.

J. P. O'Keefe, general manager, Utah Copper Division, Kennecott Copper Corp.: "There's just no way to get into these wilderness areas for development. The proposed law would result in denying ourselves jobs and a tax base."

Charles Redd, LaSal rancher: "The extension of single-purpose Federal areas is sinister and dishonest."

Gale Dick, representing the Wasatch Mountain Club: "We advocate the preservation of priceless and irreplaceable land through a wilderness system and the development of a new national park in southern Utah."

Miles P. Romney, manager of the Utah Mining Association: "We object to a lockout of these wilderness areas before we know what's in them. Provision should be made so resources may be developed under the multiple-use philosophy."

Jack Allshouse, president, Utah Wildlife Federation: "There should be changes in the National Park Service administration to allow for multiple use under controlled conditions, but as to wilderness areas, there should be places in the State which we and our children and our children's children will have the right to enjoy."

Mitchell Melich, Moab lawyer: "A national park should be created in the Needles area, but the philosophy of the wilderness bill is wrong."

E. M. Naughton, Utah Power & Light Co., president, proposed the motion for the Governor to create a special committee supporting the Governor's position.

[From the Ogden Standard-Examiner, Aug. 6, 1961]

CASE AGAINST THE WILDERNESS BILL

Strong arguments against the proposed wilderness bill are voiced by Gov. George D. Clyde and Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT. Even casual study of the bill turns up ample evidence to support their case.

While the bill has some appealing phrases it is rife with serious dangers that should worry every Utah citizen. Among the more serious dangers are these:

The President could turn any national forest, park or monument into a wilderness area without approval of Congress or the people.

Legislative power would be transferred from Congress to the President.

Every national park or monument of 5,000 acres or more without roads would automatically become a wilderness area.

The Secretary of the Interior could turn any wildlife refuge or game range into a wilderness. He could enlarge wilderness areas as he wishes.

Picnic grounds, overnight facilities, roads, trails or boats are forbidden in the wilderness areas—you have to go in on foot or horseback.

Supporters of the bill point to provisions that do not prevent multiple use of a wilderness area or development of its natural resources. But there are other provisions that make beneficial use of the resources of such areas practically impossible.

For example, the bill permits continuation of present timber and grazing rights but stipulates these rights must not interfere with the basic principle of the legislation—that of preserving an area as a wilderness. And these rights would expire on the death of the present permitholder.

Prospecting with modern equipment and methods would not be permitted. Prospectors would have to revert to the burro and hand pick. The Aneth oilfield or Moab potash mines—so important to Utah's overall economic growth—would not have been discovered under these conditions.

And if a prospector did make an important mineral discovery, he would have to get special permission from the President himself to develop it.

In effect, the bill says man can enter a wilderness area only as a visitor and must leave it as he found it. A zealous administrator could interpret this as no hunting, fishing, camping or other recreational activities.

The wilderness area bill would restrict, if not completely prevent, use or development of the natural or mineral resources our State must have to continue and expand its economic and industrial growth.

Utahans could prevent the President from turning a part of the State into a wilderness area only by getting Congress to pass a resolution against such an order. Past experience indicates this would be extremely difficult to accomplish.

There is a boobytrap hidden in the provision giving the President authority to turn any national forest, park or monument into a wilderness area.

The President already has authority to designate any Federal land as a national monument. The Federal Government owns 72 percent of the land area of Utah. Of Utah's 83 million acres, only about 12 million acres are privately owned and 10 million of these are desertland belonging to the railroads.

Therefore approval of the wilderness bill would in effect give one man power to turn 72 percent of our State into a wilderness.

We do not imply that a President would ever designate all Federal land in Utah as a monument and then turn it into wilderness area, although such would be possible.

But this is not the basic issue. The issue is, Should one man have such vast power? Should we give one man—even our President—powers that he must never use?

Seriously, can we give one man that much power and still call our United States a Republic?

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, July 30, 1961]

BENNETT SLAPS PARK PLANS

WASHINGTON, July 29.—The proposed wilderness bill and plans to establish a new national park in southeastern Utah were described Saturday as "a threat to the future of the State of Utah" by the State's Republican Senator.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT made the statement in a telegram he sent to Gov. George D. Clyde, congratulating the Governor on a meeting held Thursday in Salt Lake City regarding the two proposals.

The Senator's message declared that "if the present Kennedy administration policies had been adopted even so recently as one decade ago, there would now be no upper Colorado River project, no Aneth and McCracken oil developments, no uranium industry and there would be no $30 million potash plant on the Colorado near Moab."

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Aug. 24, 1961]

BENNETT ANALYZES WILDERNESS MEASURE

EDITOR, TRIBUNE: The wilderness bill now before the Senate is of special concern to the people of Utah. Unfortunately, much misinformation has been circulated about the bill and about my position on it. I think the people of the State are entitled to know the facts.

The wilderness concept is a sound one, and I support it completely.

Last year I voted for the bill which gave congressional approval to the wilderness program of the Forest Service, and I support congressional wilderness designation for all existing wilderness, wild, or canoe areas administered by the Forest Service.

In addition, I intend to sponsor an amendment to the wilderness bill making the 241,000-acre High Uintas Primitive Area in Utah a wilderness area immediately, rather than requiring an extensive review period.

With respect to national parks, I certainly do not wish to lower their standards, and of course 90 percent of the land area in national parks and national monuments is administered as wilderness. But I do feel that in certain parks, and under certain circumstances, carefully controlled big game hunting should be permitted, particularly where deer herds are so large that the existing forage is inadequate. The alternative is starvation of the animals, and erosion of the watershed through overgrazing.

I also feel that the Dinosaur National Monument should be excluded from the wilderness bill; otherwise a statutory barrier will be erected to construction of the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams. The 1938 Executive order creating Dinosaur expressly provided for such dams within the monument.

The wilderness bill has several serious defects. One of the foremost is a loophole permitting the Secretary of Interior to bypass Congress in adding new areas to the wilderness system through the creation of national wildlife refuges and game ranges. Before such permanent and far-reaching actions are taken, Congress should give its affirmative approval, in keeping with the Constitution. I have cosponsored the Allott amendment to the bill which would close this loophole.

Virtually unlimited authority given to the Secretary of the Interior under the present version of the bill is not a matter of idle concern, in view of several recent developments.

First of all, former Secretary of Interior Seaton withdrew 11 million acres by Executive order in 1960 for wildlife ranges. Secondly, by unilateral action, Secretary Stewart Udall suspended virtually all of the public laws of the United States for an 18-month period on 180 million acres without notice, without hearings, and without consulting Congress. Thirdly, Secretary Udall has indicated that he is prepared to withdraw by Executive order from 1 million to 6 million acres in southern Utah as a national monument if the people of Utah refuse to support the new national parks he wants.

So congressional control over creation of new wilderness areas is necessary if the interests of the West are to be protected, and if we are to have something to say about the administration of public lands.

We must not surrender this control to unfettered bureaucratic discretion.

WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senator From Utah.

[From the Ogden Standard-Examiner, Aug. 23, 1961]

WILDERNESS BILL COULD HURT UTAH'S FUTURE, GOVERNOR SAYS IN OGDEN

Gov. George D. Clyde said today Utah's biggest challenge is accelerating its industrial-economic development to provide opportunity for its youth.

He said this can be done if the natural resources the State must have to continue its industrial development are not locked up in huge wilderness areas and national parks.

Governor Clyde explained his stand on proposed Federal wilderness areas and national parks at a chamber of commerce sponsored meeting on the development of Utah natural resources.

The Governor said he is not opposed to all wilderness areas or national parks and monuments.

But these areas should be large enough only to preserve the unique historical, scenic, or geological features of our State, Governor Clyde declared.

BACKS BUREAU

He told the group he favors the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management concept of multipurpose use of Federal lands for the greatest benefit of the people.

"The limitation of use placed on Federal lands is important to the future of our State," he said. "What we do with our resources today will affect the State even 100 years from now.

"That is why it is time to stop, take stock of the present situation, and plan for the distant as well as immediate future."

Governor Clyde said the State's agricultural and livestock potential are almost fully developed, leaving only its natural and mineral resources for development to create the jobs to support the "population explosion we are experiencing which it has been estimated will increase our population 200,000 in the next decade.

"Our mineral and natural resources are largely on Federal lands which comprise about 72 percent of the State's total land area," that is why we must guard so zealously what happens to these lands and how they are controlled and administered.

"The people of Utah ought to be apprised of the plans and proposals being put forth for the use of these lands by people outside the State, many of whom have never set foot inside Utah."

GO TOO FAR

Governor Clyde said that while he favors wilderness areas and national parks where they are needed, present proposals go far beyond any need.

For instance, he said the Dinosaur National Monument is a unique feature that ought to be preserved. "The dinosaur beds cover 80 acres, yet the President, with no thought of the people, increased this monument to 209,000 acres.

"It is now proposed to increase the National Bridges Monument from 160 acres to 360,000 acres," Governor Clyde said.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, these statements include a few references to another matter, the proposed new Canyonlands National Park in Utah. This is because these two measures—the proposed park and the wilderness—have been lumped together by Utah opponents.

It is remarkable that such strong attacks have been mounted by Utahans against the wilderness proposal, for the wilderness bill concerns less than 1 percent of the area of my State. Of the 11 continental Western States, only 1

other—Nevada—will also contribute to the wilderness areas less than 1 percent. The other nine States will provide from 2 to 7 percent of their area for the wilderness system.

There has also been in Utah, of course, much factual discussion of the bill. The Salt Lake City Tribune, while it has not agreed with my position in every detail, has uniformly urged objective consideration of the proposal. It has suggested that citizens write for the bill and study it before making up their minds or issuing statements concerning it. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Salt Lake City Tribune be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAIT FOR OUTDOOR RESOURCES REPORT

The wilderness debate continues with the fury of a California forest fire, and some of the arguments are just about as senseless.

Now that a compromise bill to establish a national wilderness system has passed the Senate Interior Committee by a 12-to-3 vote, we urge again that all interested persons acquire a copy of Senate bill 174 from a Member of Congress and study it.

Many of the most vociferous opponents of the bill are still battling against provisions of the measure as introduced 6 years ago and amended many times. And the advocates too often imply that no wildernesses and national areas exist now or that they are bound to disappear unless this particular legislation is quickly adopted.

John Bird suggested in the Saturday Evening Post recently that the issues in the wilderness foray could be simplified by taking extreme views on either side and moving toward the middle. Unhappily the middle view is extremely unpopular with the zealots of both sides.

Some facts to keep in mind:

More than 160 wildernesses and related areas are already being administered reasonably well in the United States today.

The major part of national parks and monuments are managed as wilderness or roadless areas. Except under special circumstances, grazing, hunting, mining, timbering, dam building, and other uses hostile to recreation and preservation of natural conditions are already generally forbidden in national parks and monuments. Hence most of the controversy involves national forests and their multiple-use concept.

Of the 180 million acres currently in the 151 national forests, some 14 million acres are already managed as wildernesses, primitive, wild, and roadless areas. Of these, 42 areas totaling 5,800,000 acres are in the highest classification—wilderness.

Gradually, after extensive studies and public hearings, classification of certain areas are changed by the Forest Service. For example, within the past year the 383,300-acre Bridger Primitive Area in western Wyoming was raised to wilderness status by administrative fiat. No doubt the 240,717-acre High Uintas Primitive Area east of Kamas eventually also will be given the higher classification.

This, by the way, is the only primitive area in Utah outside of national parks and monuments.

Along with other existing primitive areas in the country, it would be taken into the national system initially under S. 174.

Timbering, mining, roads, and construction are generally barred from wilderness areas, but existing livestock grazing would be continued in national forest wilderness areas. State water laws and State jurisdiction over fish and wildlife would continue. Hunting and fishing would be permitted. If the President found an overriding public need existed, he could open specific areas for mining, oil drilling, and dams in wilderness areas. Water production would not be adversely affected.

Thus the main difference between the present system and the new proposal is that wilderness areas would be uniformly controlled by law instead of by administrative order of the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, as at present. The bill also would speed the process of upgrading natural areas and facilitate boundary adjustments.

Under the bill, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior would designate each year, for 10 years, recommended additions to or exclusions from the wilderness system. Congress would have power to veto the action by concurrent resolution within a year after the designation.

An amendment whereby affirmative action by Congress was required to add or subtract from the wilderness areas lost by a narrow vote in the Senate Interior Committee.

We urge that the House give thoughtful consideration to this practical amendment.

The need for protection of unspoiled natural areas in this rapidly urbanizing society should be clear to everybody. The therapeutic, educational, and esthetic values of quiet natural museums is almost universally recognized.

The Tribune is not convinced, however, that an emergency exists calling for pushing this measure through Congress now. We think it would be unseemly to pass the wilderness bill before the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission makes its report to Congress next January 31. The vast amount of information on needs and resources being collected on the total outdoor-recreation picture needs to be digested before Congress takes such an important step.

Meantime, however, spokesmen for the Intermountain West would do well to present a positive face toward the wilderness issue. We need—must have—natural areas. They are vital to our economy as well as to our general welfare, but they shouldn't be frozen into unreasonably hard patterns and boundaries.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I believe it should be pointed out that this bill is only one facet of a comprehensive program of land conservation and classification that is vitally needed, and on which the Congress and the administration are moving forward.

We are making widespread improvement in our existing national park system, and have under consideration several new park areas. We are, after many years of costly delay, setting aside some irreplaceable national seashore areas, and are investigating the feasibility of setting aside more lake and seashore areas. In this bill we establish a permanent wilderness system. And, while making all these improvements, we shall provide greater congressional control over the determination of the uses of our public lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield for that purpose?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, provided I retain my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in his message to Congress on December 3, 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt said:

To waste, to destroy our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them amplified and developed.

Fifty-four years later, these words serve as a timely reminder that we must never cease taking stock of the resources upon which we have drawn to establish this county in its preeminent position in our present community of nations. Our national wealth, gaged today in terms of the gross national product, is forceful evidence that a careful, selective and conscientious application of our coal, water, timber, mineral and other resources, translates itself into an economy which today reflects an index of $516.1 billlion.

Speaking as the man who, at the turn of the century, launched the conservation movement, President Teddy Roosevelt set forth the true meaning of conservation in a message to the 57th Congress. He said:

Public opinion throughout the United States has moved steadily toward a just appreciation of the value of forest whether planted or of natural growth. The great part played by them in the creation and maintenance of national wealth is now more fully realized than ever before. The practical usefulness of the forest reserve to the mining, grazing, irrigation and other interests of the regions in which the reserves lie has led to a widespread demand by the people of the West for their protection and extension. The forest reserves will inevitably be of still greater use in the future than in the past. Additions should be made to them whenever practicable and their usefulness should be increased by thoroughly business-like management.

In the same message he also stated:

The forest reserve should be set apart forever for the use and benefit of our people as a whole and not sacrificed to the short-sighted greed of a few.

S. 174 seeks to apply the wilderness concept and superimpose it upon lands which are now located either within the jurisdiction of the national parks or the national forests. Therefore, it behooves us to reexamine these agencies in order to have clearly in mind the purpose for which each was established. By the act of June 4, 1897, the national forests were created for the following purpose:

To improve and protect the forest within the boundaries, or for the purpose of securing favorable condition of water flows and to furnish a continuous supply of timber

for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States.

The National Park Service was established by act of August 25, 1916:

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

Bearing in mind, then, that the forests are a living stockpile, cut as the need obtains and as sound conservation practice dictates, and that the national parks are primarily a showcase to display this country's scenic wares for the use and enjoyment of all the people, the bill before us represents a use and a purpose inconsistent with the objectives of either agency. S. 174 is exclusively a measure intended to meld lands within the national parks and the national forests into a vast timeless vacuum known as wilderness. It is a fact that, as of the moment, portions of the national forests are classified by the Forest Service as "wilderness," but this bill goes much further and eventually will place in a wilderness inventory, locked up and available in only a limited way, 65 million acres of land. Urged upon the Congress in the name of conservation, heralded in the name of recreation, wilderness legislation, unamended, represents a giant step backward. In its present form it is neither conservation nor recreation.

In examining the bill, I am able to find the word "conservation" on only one page, page 13. In another place the phrase "water conservation" is used in a restricted sense. So let us not be mistaken—this is not a conservation bill.

In its present form it is neither a conservation nor a recreation measure. Those of us who strongly oppose S. 174 as offered emphatically deny that it is a conservation measure. In the Western States, which are annually plagued by literally dozens of destructive forest fires, this bill would effectively prohibit adequate fire prevention and firefighting measures in some of the wilderness areas by prohibiting the construction of roads in areas within the wilderness system. It would also forbid the use of machinery except under certain emergency conditions.

Mr. President, I clipped from the Washington Evening Star last night an article, the headline of which is "Three Die as California Fires Sweep 142,000 Acres."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE DIE AS CALIFORNIA FIRES SWEEP 142,000 ACRES

SAN FRANCISCO, September 4.—Grime-covered firefighters were warned today to be prepared for a new wave of explosive brush and timber fires which already have burned 142,000 acres in California and resulted in the deaths of three men.

More than 1,000 men on firelines from the famed Mother Lode mining country in the north to San Diego near the Mexican border appeared to be gaining the upper hand on the first outbreak of fires. Since Saturday, 165 fires have been reported.

But a State division of forestry spokesman said high temperatures and low humidity, combined with severe drought and a swarm of Labor Day vacationers, put the danger of new fires at a critical level.

TWELVE OUT OF CONTROL NOW

Early today at least 12 major fires were burning out of control. The State spokesman said, "Our overall situation is nip and tuck. The north may be clearing up, but the southern part of the State is expected to get higher winds that can carry fires out of control quickly.

"We're overextended (on manpower) everywhere, but so far we are not contemplating calling for out-of-State help."

The biggest fire covered 25,000 acres in the Sierra near the gold rush towns of Sutter Creek, Amador City, Volcano and Fiddletown. Earlier, the fire briefly entered Sutter Creek and Amador City, but was beaten back.

At last word it was 80-percent controlled and burning toward an uninhabited wilderness area 100 miles northeast of San Francisco.

Potentially one of the most dangerous fires roared out of control near Lakeside, 15 miles northeast of San Diego. More than a dozen homes were threatened and several were evacuated. Winds up to 30 miles an hour fanned the fire, which quickly spread over almost 1,200 acres. More than 200 men fought the blaze and got it about 50-percent controlled today as the wind slackened.

MUSHROOM CLOUD

Residents said the fire sent up a mushroom of smoke that looked like the cloud from a nuclear blast when borate solution was dumped on it by planes.

In the Challenge-Brownsville area 120 miles north northeast of San Francisco, Waldo John Hackman, 40, of Red Bluff, was killed when his plane crashed yesterday while on a mission to drop borate into twin fires totaling 1,300 acres.

Two motorists were killed when their cars collided with fire equipment.

Firefighters had about 80-percent control of the Guerneville fire, which drove hundreds of vacationers from the resort area on the Russian River, about 55 miles north of San Francisco.

An unknown number of homes burned, but the immediate threat to major resorts was at least temporarily ended, an official at the scene said.

With the exception of the Lakeside blaze, no fires were heading uncontrolled for populated areas, the division of forestry said.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, land treatment and flood prevention measures are precluded. Water conservation structures are virtually prohibited, making the utilization of water resources impossible. Insect, disease, and weed control measures are either prohibited or severely restricted. All development of timber, minerals, gas and oil, and water will be banned except that on very urgent demand it might be possible to obtain a Presidential order making an exception in a special case. Despite the contentions of the proponents of this bill, S. 174 as presently drafted, is a lock-up measure, and not a conservation measure.

To oppose S. 174 in its present form is in reality to favor recreation, and there is, and will continue to be, a growing national need for outdoor recreational participation by the American people. The contention, widely circulated, that S. 174 is a measure to encourage outdoor recreation belies the facts. The facts are that the restrictions now contained in this bill would preclude the development of designated wilderness areas for mass recreation, such as fishing lakes, camping grounds, ski areas, and other facilities. By prohibiting even the construction of temporary roads, the bill would deny to all but an infinitesimal fraction of the people of this country—less than 1 percent by actual count—their rights to land which belongs to them all. In my own State of Colorado, the people are not opposed to the concept of preserving the primitive and wilderness aspects of certain public lands in our State for the permanent enjoyment of future generations of Americans. In this I join. We know that throughout vast areas of rugged terrain in the Western States at least a semi-wilderness environment will prevail no matter what man might do. Nevertheless, we favor active steps to preserve the vast public lands which will comprise over 50 percent of the 11 Western States and Alaska. Vigorous conservation activities are favored in order to preserve these lands and their natural resources for present and future generations.

Mr. President, probably one of the very significant features about the great State of Colorado and, in fact, the entire West, is its abundance of natural beauty. The fame of many of our State's scenic attractions has long been well-known throughout the world. We in Colorado have never sought to reserve this heritage to ourselves alone. Since the earliest settlements in Colorado over 100 years ago visitors not only have been welcome but also have been vigorously encouraged to share with us the enjoyment of the State's 54 mountain peaks which tower above 14,000 feet—to view the Royal Gorge, the Black Canyon, the San Juan, the Rocky Mountain National Park, Mesa Narde and all of the rest, to enjoy our numerous mountain streams—or to experience the isolation and stillness of the endless wilderness which extends throughout the State's rugged terrain. The response has been very gratifying, and millions have accepted our invitation and experienced the enjoyment of these majestic surroundings. In these surroundings and in this climate, national parks, national forests, recreation, and conservation have coexisted.

At this point, one might ask whether in light of my remarks, I am opposed to wilderness, to which I am prepared to reply unequivocally and vociferously, "No." Albeit the figures indicate that such wilderness areas as presently exist are used by less than 1 percent of our total population, I feel that there is a place for such a concept and that it can exist in harmony with, and alongside, our national parks and forests. In fact, as I have indicated, many areas embraced within park and forest lands are such as to constitute a wilderness simply by virtue of their location, the fact that they are inaccessible or removed from the main arteries of travel and are enjoyed by those who have an interest in packing in by horseback or on foot. But my word of caution is simply this: S. 174, as presently drawn, will set apart

vast areas, render them impenetrable, henceforth, save by the foot of man or a beast of burden, before the Departments of Interior and Agriculture have the opportunity to survey them and inventory them to determine their potential worth in terms of resources. This would be a tragic mistake.

In the national forests today the principle of sustained yield is in practice, the doctrine of multiple use prevails, as well as the Mineral Leasing Act. Geological and geophysical exploration is permitted in order to establish the use to which such land ought properly to be put. But not so in the case of wilderness. Once these areas are "locked" up—and that word accurately describes the fate of these 65 million acres—they will be forever barred insofar as any use is concerned, with a slight exception which I will cover very carefully in my discussion of the bill. Suffice it to say that before we set this enormous area aside and render it untouchable, would it not be wise for us to know exactly what we are relegating to this status?

My position is unalterably opposed to the measure as it now stands. For that reason, I have offered and will urge the adoption of the amendments which attempt to clarify that particular situation, and they will be treated later. Suffice it to say that before we create a haven for the use and enjoyment of approximately half a million people annually, we should also consider the needs of the remaining 180 million people of this country. The national parks are for the benefit of everyone to enjoy, the national forests are for the welfare of the Nation, but wilderness is for only a handful to use and for many to deplore unless tempered by the amendments which I feel are vital. I can, and will, vote for passage of wilderness legislation when the requisite amendments are adopted.

Mr. President, I turn now to a discussion of the bill itself. The wilderness bill, essentially, proposes to set aside as much as 65 million acres of land in a wilderness system. I shall discuss in a few moments how it is proposed and to what extent it is proposed to lock up the areas in the wilderness system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table entitled "Land Areas Subject to Inclusion in the Wilderness System."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Land area subject to inclusion in the wilderness system

[Acres]

State	Lands permanently withdrawn from resource use		Lands not now permanently withdrawn from resource use		Total area subject to wilderness classification
	National forest wild, wilderness, and canoe areas [1]	National park system areas [2]	National forest primitive areas [1]	National wildlife refuges and game areas [3]	
Alabama				34,988	34,988
Alaska		6,911,206		18,980,032	25,891,238
Arizona	422,990	1,391,008	287,519	1,596,428	3,697,945
Arkansas				126,193	126,193
California	463,658	4,026,457	1,094,164	194,155	5,778,434
Colorado	207,079	518,429	592,313	11,581	1,329,402
Delaware				13,810	13,810
Florida		1,301,291		245,872	1,547,163
Georgia				374,080	374,080
Hawaii		246,748			246,748
Idaho		69,492	3,294,874	46,960	3,421,326
Illinois				78,723	78,723
Iowa				61,035	61,035
Kansas				17,280	17,280
Kentucky		61,374		65,759	127,133
Louisiana				235,494	235,494
Maine		30,847		22,566	53,413
Maryland				11,216	11,216
Massachusetts				6,403	6,403
Michigan		539,339		95,531	634,870
Minnesota	886,673			144,102	1,030,775
Mississippi				44,765	44,765
Missouri				39,134	39,134
Montana	978,562	1,151,812	651,980	1,095,665	3,878,019
Nebraska				142,279	142,279
Nevada	64,667	115,240		2,854,053	3,033,960
New Hampshire	5,400				5,400
New Jersey				12,854	12,854
New Mexico	678,661	233,992	298,826	138,491	1,349,970
New York				6,777	6,777
North Carolina	7,655	271,479		71,558	350,692
North Dakota		68,681		205,124	273,805
Oklahoma				108,070	108,070
Oregon	662,527	160,290	86,700	438,069	1,347,586
South Carolina				160,826	160,826
South Dakota		127,127		44,573	171,700
Tennessee		236,828		59,911	296,739
Texas		698,621		113,822	812,443
Utah		289,045	240,717	96,852	626,614
Virginia		196,232		9,030	205,262
Washington	583,196	1,136,751	801,000	94,252	2,615,199
Wisconsin				148,390	148,390
Wyoming	1,812,012	2,307,060	542,880	70,131	4,732,083
Total	[4] 6,773,080	[5] 22,099,349	[6] 7,890,973	[7] 28,316,834	[8] 65,080,236

[1] As of July 17, 1961. Source: S. Rept. 635, 87th Cong., 1st sess., July 27, 1961.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1957. Source: Conservation Yearbook, 1958. Erle Kauffman.
[3] As of Jan. 20, 1961. Source: Directory, National Wildlife Refuges. U.S. Department of the Interior (January 1961) as supplemented by addendum sheet of Jan. 20, 1961.
[4] State of comparable size: Maryland.
[5] State of comparable size: Maine.
[6] States of comparable size: Connecticut and New Jersey combined.
[7] State of comparable size: Pennsylvania.
[8] States of comparable size: Washington and Indiana combined.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this table was discussed this morning. The figures have been checked for accuracy.

As the table shows the lands now permanently withdrawn from resource use consist of two kinds; national forest wild, wilderness, and canoe areas; and national park system areas.

I might say, the wild, wilderness, and canoe areas are each in a separate category.

The national forest wild, wilderness, and canoe areas now set aside as wilderness areas total 6,773,080 acres. The national park system areas now total 22,099,349 acres.

The primitive areas in the national forests now total 7,890,973 acres. The national wildlife refuges and game areas now total 28,316,834 acres.

All of these total 65,080,236 acres.

It will be seen that we are not talking about only the area now locked up in wilderness, which comprises about 8 percent of the public land and which is used by 1 percent of the people visiting the national forest and park land, but we are talking about locking in 65 million acres of land permanently.

The Department of Agriculture presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated September 10, 1959, shown on page 67 of the hearings, setting out the source of its authority over these lands. The letter contains the following:

The regulation provides that upon recommendation of the Chief, Forest Service, the Secretary may designate tracts of national forest lands as "wilderness areas."

This is the authority for the wilderness areas themselves.

Later in the same letter it is stated:

We have no record of any formal opinion of this office as to the legal power of the Secretary to designate a wilderness area, but regulation U–1 was approved by this office for legal sufficiency. Likewise, we know of no formal opinion of the Attorney General or decision of any court passing upon the specific question.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Department of Agriculture contained on pages 67 and 68 of the hearings be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, September 10, 1959.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.
(Attention Mr. Stewart French, Chief Counsel.)

GENTLEMEN: This is in response to Mr. French's letter of August 4, 1959, in which he stated that the committee has requested that this Department furnish a statement as to the basis of the asserted authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to set aside and declare certain areas of the lands of the United States to be "wilderness areas."

The action of the Secretary of Agriculture in designating wilderness areas within the national forests is not based upon statutory

authority expressly covering such areas. The action is taken under the broad general authority vested in the Secretary in connection with the administration of the national forests.

The general authority stems from article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the act of March 3, 1891, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471), and the act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 551). Briefly it may be outlined as follows:

The constitutional authorization gives Congress the power to dispose of and make needful regulations respecting property belonging to the United States. Accordingly, no appropriation of public land can be made for any purpose except by authority of Congress. The act of March 3, 1891, as amended, vested in the President authority to appropriate or reserve national forest lands from the public domain. With respect to the administration and regulation of lands so appropriated or reserved, Congress vested authority in the Secretary of Agriculture by the act of June 4, 1897, as amended.

Pursuant to this general authority the Secretary of Agriculture, on September 19, 1939, promulgated a regulation designated by the Forest Service as "regulation U–1" (36 CFR 251.20). The regulation provides that upon recommendation of the Chief, Forest Service, the Secretary may designate tracts of national forest lands as "wilderness areas."

The action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture to designate a "wilderness area" is not considered an appropriation or disposition of land within the meaning of the constitutional provision mentioned above. Instead, it is considered an action with respect to land which has previously been appropriated by the President, pursuant to authority granted by Congress, within that meaning. It is a designation of the appropriated land for purposes determined by the Secretary to be proper in carrying out the responsibilities given him to regulate the occupancy and use of the national forests.

We have no record of any formal opinion of this Office as to the legal power of the Secretary to designate a wilderness area, but regulation U–1 was approved by this Office for legal sufficiency. Likewise, we know of no formal opinion of the Attorney General or decision of any court passing upon the specific question.

With respect to a very similar situation, however, consideration was given by the court in *United States* v. *Perko*, 133 F. Supp. 564 (D.C., D. Minn., 1955), to rights relative to use of a roadless area. The action was one to enjoin the defendants from operating motor vehicles and otherwise trespassing on the Superior Roadless Area within the Superior National Forest. A temporary injunction was granted and later made permanent. *United States* v. *Perko*, 141 F. Supp. 372 (D.C., D. Minn., 1956). The Superior Roadless Area had been established by the Secretary of Agriculture under authority of the act of June 4, 1897, supra, and his regulation U–3 (36 CFR 251.22). In reviewing the action for injunction and commenting on the authority of the Secretary, the court recognized the authority under the 1897 act, as amended, and also commented that there seemed to be nothing unconstitutional about the methods used in establishing the Superior Roadless Area, the action being one in which the Secretary was pursuing the dictation of Congress in ordering him to carry out a policy for the use and occupancy of the Superior National Forest.

We trust that the above will satisfactorily serve as an outline of the basis on which wilderness areas are designated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. BARRETT,
General Counsel.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, with respect to the question of where the authority comes from, I refer also to a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, dated February 24, 1961, which is found on pages 13, 14, and 15 of the record of the hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: This is in response to your request of January 17 for a report on S. 174, a bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good for the whole people, and for other purposes.

We strongly recommend that the bill be enacted insofar as it affects this Department.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

retary of Agriculture, whereas the Chief of the Forest Service may establish wild areas.

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

Kind of area	Number	Acreage
Wilderness	14	4,888,173
Wild	28	979,154
Primitive	40	7,907,416
Canoe	1	886,673
Total	83	14,661,416

In the restudy and reclassification of primitive areas, boundary adjustments have been made to eliminate portions not predominantly of wilderness value or add to adjacent national forest lands that are predominantly of wilderness value. Some new areas have been established, including two established within the last year. Taking into consideration the transfers to national parks of lands previously within primitive or wilderness areas in the national forests and corrections in area calculations, the total area of national forest land classified for administration as wilderness has remained about the same as it was in 1939.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the letter states:

The areas classified at that time as primitive would be reviewed within 15 years as to their suitability.

Then further along the letter states:

The bill would provide that the addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for in the bill could be made only after specific authorization by law.

Further on the Secretary of Agriculture says:

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

Skipping a little, the Secretary says further:

No new primitive areas were established after 1939. Since that time, primitive areas have been managed in accordance with the regulations applicable to wilderness areas. The Department has been restudying primitive areas and reclassifying those areas or parts of areas which are predominantly valuable for wilderness as wilderness areas.

Any logical person must immediately ask himself the following question: If the power to establish such areas has existed over all these years, and if since 1939 primitive areas have not been classified into wilderness areas, why, without any action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, should Congress suddenly transfer approximately 8 million additional acres into wilderness? The primitive areas are set aside now but not classified as wilderness areas.

I invite attention to the two maps which are on the east side of the Senate Chamber. The large map standing on the floor, for the convenience of Senators, shows in green all the park areas in the United States. As anyone examining the black and white map can see, not only is the total amount of Federal land in the various States of the West shown, but also the location of wilderness and wild areas. The wild areas, of course, are those under 100,000 acres. The wilderness areas are those over 100,000 acres.

At this time, I should like to have printed in the RECORD table No. 1, shown on page 96 of the hearings entitled "Federal Ownership or Management of Land in 11 Western States."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Federal ownership or management of land in 11 Western States*

	Total land area (thousand acres)	Federally owned land [1] (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area	Managed by Federal Government Indian tribal lands (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area	Federally owned or managed lands (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area
Arizona	72,688	32,396	44.6	19,383	26.7	51,779	71.3
California	100,314	45,071	44.9	496	.5	45,567	45.4
Colorado	66,510	24,156	36.3	746	1.1	24,902	37.4
Idaho	52,972	34,050	64.3	409	.8	34,459	65.1
Montana	93,362	27,815	29.8	1,557	1.7	29,372	31.5
Nevada	70,265	60,726	86.4	1,062	1.5	61,788	87.9
New Mexico	77,767	27,300	35.1	5,815	7.5	33,115	42.6
Oregon	61,642	31,580	51.2	1,208	2.0	32,788	53.2
Utah	52,701	36,466	69.2	2,253	4.3	38,719	73.5
Washington	42,743	12,666	29.6	1,813	4.2	14,479	33.8
Wyoming	62,404	30,219	48.4	1,753	2.8	31,972	51.2
Total	753,368	362,445	48.1	36,495	4.8	398,940	52.9

[1] Excludes trust properties, Indian tribal lands.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960.

Mr. ALLOTT. The table shows that the percentage of federally owned land in the 11 Western States runs from a high of 87 percent for Nevada down to 31 percent for Idaho. This is why the wilderness bill is so significant to the Western States.

I ask unanimous consent that table 2 on page 96 entitled "National forest receipts and disbursements to counties in 11 Western States, fiscal year 1960," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 2.—*National forest receipts and disbursements to counties in 11 Western States, fiscal year 1960*

	National forest total receipts	25-percent fund disbursed to States
Arizona	$2,245,735	[1] $700,356
California	23,203,580	5,800,895
Colorado	1,567,860	391,965
Idaho	7,628,592	1,907,148
Montana	5,167,296	1,291,824
Nevada	238,660	59,665
New Mexico	1,322,394	[1] 331,402

[1] Includes school section fund, act of June 20, 1910.

TABLE 2.—*National forest receipts and disbursements to counties in 11 Western States, fiscal year 1960*—Continued

	National forest total receipts	25-percent fund disbursed to States
Oregon	$50, 516, 828	$12, 629, 207
Utah	757, 512	189, 378
Washington	25, 954, 844	6, 488, 711
Wyoming	890, 448	222, 612
Total	119, 493, 749	30, 013, 163

Source: U.S. Forest Service.

Mr. ALLOTT. In that table, both the total forest receipts and the 25-percent fund which is disbursed to the States is shown in detail for each of the States. I ask unanimous consent that table 3, on page 97 of the hearings, entitled "Bureau of Land Management Receipts Under Mineral Leasing Act, 1959," which shows the receipts for the various Western States, together with the share to the State and the share to the reclamation fund, be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the footnotes to the table.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 3.—*Bureau of Land Management receipts under Mineral Leasing Act, 1959*

	Total receipts	Share to State [1]	Share to reclamation fund [1]
Arizona	$413, 000	$154, 875	$216, 825
California	7, 552, 000	2, 832, 000	3, 964, 800
Colorado	9, 690, 000	3, 633, 750	5, 087, 250
Idaho	296, 000	111, 000	155, 400
Montana	4, 694, 000	1, 760, 250	2, 464, 350
Nevada	400, 000	150, 000	210, 000
New Mexico	14, 787, 000	5, 545, 125	7, 763, 175
Oregon	38, 000	14, 250	19, 950
Utah	6, 908, 000	2, 590, 500	3, 626, 700
Washington	1, 000	375	525
Wyoming	32, 015, 000	12, 005, 625	16, 807, 875
Total	76, 794, 000	28, 797, 750	40, 316, 850

[1] Receipts under the Mineral Leasing Act are distributed 37½ percent to States, 52½ percent to reclamation fund, and 10 percent to U.S. Treasury.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960.

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask unanimous consent that table 4, entitled "Projection of Population of 11 Western States," appearing on page 97 of the hearings, be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the footnotes to that table.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 4.—*Projection of population of 11 Western States*

[Thousands]

	1960 [1]	1970 projection [2]	Percent increase, 1960-70
Arizona	1, 302	1, 802	38. 4
California	15, 717	20, 296	29. 1
Colorado	1, 754	2, 197	25. 3
Idaho	667	700	4. 9
Montana	675	755	11. 9
Nevada	285	453	58. 9
New Mexico	951	1, 126	18. 4
Oregon	1, 769	2, 317	31. 0
Utah	891	1, 151	29. 2
Washington	2, 853	3, 459	21. 2
Wyoming	330	379	14. 8
Total	27, 194	34, 653	27. 4

[1] Source: 1960 Census of Population—Final Population Counts, Nov. 15, 1960, Bureau of Census.

[2] Source: Current Population Reports—Population Estimates, Aug. 9, 1957. Series P-25, No. 160, Bureau of Census.

Mr. ALLOTT. The figures in the table were taken from the 1960 census. The projection of population shows that in the 11 Western States, from 1960 to 1970 a growth of 27.4 percent is expected.

I point out that almost everyone in the West knows that the great pressures upon the West at this time are not only for the use of its resources in timber and minerals, but particularly for the use of its water and its water resources. When I come to that part of my remarks in which I shall discuss the bill, I shall point out again that the bill is not a conservation bill, although the people who want it most vociferously call it a conservation bill. At only one place in the entire bill is the word "conservation" used. It is not a conservation bill. With the great population explosion which is expected to take place in the Western States, I think it is perfectly obvious that we must utilize every resource we can, and particularly our water resources, so as to develop our Western States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table appearing on page 98 of the hearings entitled "Value of Farm, Mine, and Forest Products of 11 Western States, 1958," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 6.—*Value of farm, mine, and forest products of 11 Western States, 1958*

	Value, all farm products sold	Value, all mineral production [1]	Estimated value, all forest products [2]
Arizona	$440, 700, 000	$314, 520, 000	$55, 000, 000
California	2, 852, 800, 000	1, 502, 660, 000	890, 000, 000
Colorado	589, 000, 000	305, 284, 000	35, 000, 000
Idaho	414, 100, 000	64, 456, 000	210, 000, 000
Montana	453, 800, 000	177, 240, 000	125, 000, 000
Nevada	53, 300, 000	68, 293, 000	10, 000, 000
New Mexico	238, 600, 000	558, 866, 000	30, 000, 000
Oregon	407, 000, 000	45, 053, 000	1, 100, 000, 000
Utah	166, 900, 000	365, 960, 000	10, 000, 000
Washington	579, 600, 000	60, 897, 000	820, 000, 000
Wyoming	173, 600, 000	369, 938, 000	15, 000, 000
Total	6, 369, 400, 000	3, 833, 167, 000	3, 300, 000, 000

[1] Including oil and gas.

[2] Industrial Forestry Association.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960.

Mr. ALLOTT. The table shows the value of all farm products sold in 1958 was $6.369 billion. The table shows further that the value of all mineral production was $3.833 billion. The table shows also that the estimated value of all forest products was $3.3 billion.

So we in the West have a vested interest in the conservation of our resources, and we have an interest in the development of our resources. We cannot permit the West to cling on the vine and stagnate. We must develop our mines, our mineral potential, and our resources, which the bill would deny, and we must develop our forests if we expect to go forward.

Mr. Hagenstein testified in the hearings before the committee with these words, at page 98:

Mr. HAGENSTEIN. The West, with few exceptions, is the most rapid growing part of our Nation. We believe any proposal to create a blanket, single-use land system ignores the problems posed by the steady rise of our western population. More people need more jobs. More people need more food. More people need more water. More people need more wood. More people need more hides. More people need more gas and oil. More people need more minerals. And yet it is proposed to lock up and prohibit development, management, and use of a large area of unsurveyed, unexplored, and virtually unknown Federal lands when all studies indicate we are going to need more of everything. The 1960 census reveals a population in the 11 Western States of more than 27 million. The most recent projections for the year 1970 show an increase of 7.5 million more (table 4). This is an increase of more than 27 percent in the next decade. How can we provide the jobs and essential commodities from these lands if we limit their productiveness?

On June 16, 1958, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the former Senator from Montana, Mr. Murray, published a Memorandum of the Chairman entitled "Full Development of Public Resources."

In the transmittal letter of this document he makes some very realistic statements. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF THE CHAIRMAN

To Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

The Federal Government today is the proprietor of 21 percent of the land in the continental United States. In 10 Western States its average ownership equals about one-half of the land area. The greater part of this land has always been in Federal ownership. The Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Park Service, and other natural resource management agencies have the responsibility for most of this land. These lands are the resource base for about 9 percent of the gross national product. The policies that are pursued in the development of these lands and resources in large measure guide the economic destiny of the West.

Over the years the Federal Government has not followed a realistic course in furthering the development of these lands. Investments needed to assure economic development of the timber, grass, recreation, water, and minerals, have been made within the criteria used for normal governmental operations. No effort has been made to consciously distinguish between investment and operating requirements. Business-type financial presentations and economic analyses have been lacking.

The spark of the idea that the Government could and should develop these great public resources was kindled by Theodore Roosevelt some 60 years ago. Yet, today, well-conceived investments in forest and range as well as in mineral and water resources are sorely needed. Frequently we have economized on public resource budgets without regard to consequent deterioration of our resource assets, loss of revenue, or losses in economic growth.

As a first step to exploring more adequate planning, budgeting, and accounting for resources, the three agencies with prime resource and land management functions were selected. The Forest Service administers 180 million acres which contain three-fourths of a trillion board-feet of timber. Last year these lands produced a sustained yield harvest of almost 7 billion board-feet of timber, 3,800,000 livestock grazed on the range, 3,400,000 big-game animals roamed these forests, over 55 million people enjoyed the recreational facilities on these forest lands. Substantial mineral operations were con-

ducted and vast amounts of watershed were protected to assure water for millions of people.

The Bureau of Land Management administers 468 million acres and mineral resources on another 242 million acres including the Outer Continental Shelf. The mineral resources produced total, among other things—135 million barrels of petroleum; 330 million cubic feet of gas; 100 million gallons of gasoline. There are over 5,500,000 tons of coal; 9 million tons of potassium and sodium sales; and 1 million tons of phosphate rock. Over 11,800,000 livestock and 1 million big-game animals grazed the range, and 781 million board-feet of timber were contributed to the Nation's economy.

The national parks, containing 17 million acres attracted over 55 million visitors in 1957. Included in this total are participants in a variety of special recreational programs including mountain climbing, river runs, and cave explorations. Special historic areas attracted 13 million people to see shrines of democracy.

In order to get the financial facts in focus, I asked the Comptroller General "to develop an initial financial statement, laid out on a business basis" for these agencies, pointing out that "without good knowledge of the assets the Federal lands and their resources represent, the Congress and the Executive lack a base for gaging proper investment levels, earning capacity, and opportunities for improved management."

The result is the attached report. It reveals clearly how little these agencies do know about reporting the total worth of the great resources they administer. The statements of financial conditions, or balance sheets, show that the fixed assets of these agencies exclude from consideration any value of the public domain land under their jurisdiction. The agencies have reported what is supposed to be "market value" for public domain land to the House Government Operations Committee. The Comptroller General has pointed out that in the report to the House the entire national forest holdings were valued at $6.5 billion, Bureau of Land Management lands at $2.7 billion, and national park lands at about $642 million. The reports understate the value of the real property assets under the jurisdiction of these agencies by about $9 billion. In addition, the agencies have not valued minerals, water, and recreation which, in all probability, have a capitalized value of an even greater amount.

A second deficiency in accounting is the failure to fully utilize depreciation and depletion, thus, improperly stating net worth. Accrual and cost accounting are not equally and fully applied, but such records are being developed.

These reports show that the agencies do not have a business-type report indicating revenue potentialities or even properly matching expenditures and revenues. For example, funds allocated to activities such as watershed management, recreation and timber use are not matched to revenue. The Forest Service excludes payments to States from its statements of receipts and expenditures, while the Bureau of Land Management includes these payments. The Forest Service capitalizes roads constructed by timber purchasers in its financial statement, but does not report these as noncash income.

Recognizing these deficiencies, I submitted the material supplied by the agencies to the Comptroller General to Mr. Marion Clawson, a land management specialist with Resources for the Future, a research foundation. He has been kind enough to amplify the financial report and set forth some considerations deserving attention. His comments appear after the Comptroller General's report.

The authority placed in our committee for matters affecting public lands requires that we keep informed, and that we keep the public informed, on matters which affect these lands. The growing need to develop our public lands resources requires more adequate information. We need to acquaint the people of our Nation with the tremendous value of the Federal assets belonging to them so amounts budgeted to protecting resources, and amounts of investment made to expand use of the public lands can be related to the value of the assets with which we are dealing and potential revenues and benefits.

It is my hope that this report will stimulate interest in adequate financial support to enhance the value of our public lands to our economy.

This report is transmitted in a form suitable for limited distribution to enable us to lay the situation, factually, before people interested in resource development, and to encourage comments from the public and agencies of Government on steps that should be taken to better inform the Nation on the development potential and needs for our public natural resources.

We might later publish comments received from all sources and then discuss steps which will secure the adoption of improvements.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

Mr. ALLOTT. I point out that in the letter the chairman said:

These lands are the resource base for about 9 percent of the gross national product. The policies that are pursued in the development of these lands and resources in large measure guide the economic destiny of the West.

Then at another point in the letter he said:

The spark of the idea that the Government could and should develop these great public resources was kindled by Theodore Roosevelt some 60 years ago.

Again, he says, in another place:

Last year these lands produced a sustained yield harvest of almost 7 billion board-feet of timber, 3,800,000 livestock grazed on the range, 3,400,000 big game animals roamed these forests, over 55 million people enjoyed the recreational facilities on these forest lands. Substantial mineral operations were conducted and vast amounts of watershed were protected to assure water for millions of people.

Again, he said:

The mineral resources produced total—among other things—135 million barrels of petroleum; 330 million cubic feet of gas; 100 million gallons of gasoline. There are over 5,500,000 tons of coal; 9 million tons of potassium sales—

The point is that in this letter the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1958 specifically set forth in a very dramatic fashion why we must properly protect and develop the land of the West. If we do not do it, we will be responsible for a throttling of progress in the West which might never be overcome.

I wish to comment about the feeling of the people in the West regarding this matter. If I may use a colloquial term, it is our ox that is being gored. This despite the fact that some Senators from the West, in good faith, are in favor of the bill.

I am not opposed to a limited wilderness area or the inclusion of more areas, provided they are classified and studied, and provided Congress has a right to act affirmatively in establishing them.

I have before me letters from State officials in Alaska of February 1961, relating to S. 174 in the 87th Congress, registering opposition to the bill.

I have in my hand a memorial from the year 1959 relating to S. 1123 in the 86th Congress, passed by the Arizona Legislature. S. 1123 is not the same bill as the one before the Senate, but it contained many of the significant features of the present bill.

I have in my hand a resolution from California, dated April 1960, relating to S. 1123 in the 86th Congress. It is a resolution of the California State Board of Forestry.

I have in my hand, also, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, dated March 1961, relating to S. 174 in the 87th Congress. My recollection is that this is the third unanimous memorial from the State of Colorado in opposition to this bill.

I have in my hand a joint memorial of the Idaho House of Representatives dated February 1961, in opposition to S. 174 in the 87th Congress.

I have in my hand a memorial of the State of Nevada, dated May 1961, in opposition to S. 174.

I have in my hand a memorial from the State of New Mexico adopted in March 1959, relating to the previous bill, S. 1123 of the 86th Congress, many provisions of which are incorporated in S. 174.

I have in my hand a resolution from the State of Utah of March 1961, in opposition to S. 174.

I have in my hand a letter dated February 1961, concerning S. 174 of the 87th Congress, which comes from the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Washington, and is in opposition to the present bill.

I have a memorial from the State of Wyoming, adopted in January 1961, opposing S. 174 of the 87th Congress. I also have a memorial which was passed by the Oregon House of Representatives, in opposition to S. 174. The memorial, so far as I know, did not pass the Senate of the State of Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these memorials, resolutions, and letters in opposition to the bill may be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALLOTT. I suppose we wonder sometimes how significant these matters are with respect to our economics. On page 211 of the hearing there is a table, offered by Mr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, entitled "National Forests, Commercial Forest Land, Allowable Annual Cut, and Fiscal Year 1960 Volume of National Forest Timber Cut in States Which Have Wilderness, Wild, Primitive, and Canoe Areas." The table continues from that page to page 213. I ask unanimous consent that the table, together with the footnotes explaining the various items, be included

as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield for a question.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has just asked to have placed in the RECORD a table which was supplied to me by Mr. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service. There is also a second table, which shows what the wilderness areas would produce. They are both a part of the same correspondence. I ask the Senator if he will place the second table, also, in the RECORD.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have no objection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table referred to, which continues through page 215, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National forests, commercial forest land, allowable annual cut, and fiscal year 1960 volume of national-forest timber cut in States which have wilderness, wild, primitive, and canoe areas

State and National forest	National forests, commercial forest area, exclusive wilderness, etc., areas [1]	Allowable annual cut [2]	Cut in fiscal year 1960 [1]
Arizona:			
Apache [3]	530	69.7	49.7
Coconino	687	56.8	47.1
Coronado [3]	51	6.0	2.4
Kaibab	501	44.3	43.3
Prescott	66	6.0	3.6
Sitgreaves	415	56.2	49.8
Tonto	136	7.0	7.9
Subtotal	2,386	246.0	203.8
California:			
Angeles [4]			3.2
Cleveland [4]			
Eldorado [5]	401	93.1	138.0
Inyo [5]	150	19.2	11.6
Klamath [6]	1,129	170.8	194.7
Lassen	669	101.5	98.3
Los Padres [4]			3.2
Mendocino	344	75.3	58.1
Modoc	573	50.7	56.4
Plumas	859	160.0	166.2
San Bernardino [4]			11.9
Sequoia	453	85.6	45.4
Shasta-Trinity	1,455	203.9	289.9
Sierra	451	87.4	117.7
Six Rivers	756	162.3	115.6
Stanislaus	477	94.2	96.3
Tahoe	568	95.0	99.9
Subtotal	8,285	1,399.0	1,506.4
Colorado:			
Arapaho	450	21.5	17.7
Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre	336	17.5	20.7
Gunnison	737	29.5	9.2
Pike	346	4.7	3.4
Rio Grande	803	28.8	16.8
Roosevelt	595	21.0	7.4
Routt	552	26.9	22.2
San Isabel	427	9.0	1.5
San Juan	1,225	50.0	43.3
White River	791	9.0	14.4
Subtotal	6,272	217.9	156.6
Idaho:			
Boise	1,353	129.9	129.2
Caribou [7]	176	8.0	3.0
Challis	742	10.0	3.8
Clearwater	1,026	170.9	137.8
Coeur d'Alene [8]	958	141.5	114.9
Kaniksu [9]	1,227	148.9	113.6
Nezperce	1,230	150.0	88.4
Payette	690	91.5	83.0
Salmon	663	30.0	23.5
Sawtooth [10]	327	21.0	12.0
St. Joe	760	73.4	66.7
Targhee [11]	894	50.0	14.7
Subtotal	10,046	1,025.1	790.6
Minnesota:			
Superior	1,662	176.0	101.9
Chippewa	531	48.0	38.7
Subtotal	2,193	224.0	140.6
Montana:			
Beaverhead	1,069	88.5	3.6
Bitterroot [12]	581	61.0	29.4
Custer [13]	328	12.0	4.6
Deerlodge	829	65.7	6.0
Montana—Continued			
Flathead	1,135	134.0	98.7
Gallatin	783	69.0	24.8
Helena	722	68.1	12.9
Kootenai [12]	1,758	236.0	171.7
Lewis and Clark	1,149	76.9	16.1
Lolo [12]	1,772	191.1	110.0
Subtotal	10,126	1,002.3	477.8
Nevada:			
Humboldt	39	.1	.1
Toiyabe [14]	165	7.0	5.4
Subtotal	204	7.1	5.5
New Hampshire: White Mountain [15]	503	23.0	19.6
New Mexico:			
Carson	676	21.9	13.1
Cibola	743	18.0	5.9
Gila	621	30.3	23.4
Lincoln	450	11.0	6.0
Santa Fe	464	43.6	38.2
Subtotal	2,954	124.8	86.6
North Carolina: North Carolina	975	40.6	42.0
Oregon:			
Deschutes	1,335	140.0	184.9
Fremont	928	120.0	106.5
Malheur	1,091	120.0	136.6
Mount Hood	854	314.8	365.8
Ochoco	660	95.0	134.4
Rogue River [16]	642	180.2	170.0
Siskiyou [16]	778	153.0	228.8
Siuslaw	549	315.0	355.7
Umatilla [17]	1,120	100.0	89.0
Umpqua	882	303.0	377.5
Wallowa-Whitman	1,361	123.0	126.2
Willamette	1,083	529.0	578.9
Subtotal	11,283	2,493.0	2,854.3
Utah:			
Ashley	602	24.2	15.6
Cache [18]	132	8.0	2.3
Dixie	657	38.0	24.1
Fishlake	215	3.0	1.8
Manti-LaSal [19]	318	7.5	1.5
Uinta	22	3.5	10.7
Wasatch [20]	300	20.0	9.6
Subtotal	2,246	104.2	65.6
Washington:			
Colville	824	95.0	62.0
Gifford Pinchot	909	395.0	440.0
Mount Baker	696	222.0	256.9
Okanogan	815	47.5	76.0
Olympic	528	346.0	317.9
Snoqualmie	714	206.2	146.1
Wenatchee	763	105.0	103.5
Subtotal	5,249	1,416.7	1,402.4
Wyoming: [21]			
Bighorn	580	15.0	4.3
Bridger	728	54.8	15.5
Medicine Bow	802	50.0	51.3
Shoshone	386	15.0	11.3
Teton	611	20.0	2.7
Subtotal	3,107	154.8	85.1

[1] Thousands of acres.
[2] Millions of board feet.
[3] Includes part of forest in New Mexico.
[4] Estimates of the commercial area and allowable cuts not available.
[5] Includes part of forest in Nevada.
[6] Includes part of forest in Oregon.
[7] Includes part of forest in Utah and Wyoming.
[8] Includes part of forest in Montana.
[9] Includes part of forest in Washington and Montana.
[10] Includes part of forest in Utah.
[11] Includes part of forest in Wyoming.
[12] Includes part of forest in Idaho.
[13] Includes part of forest in South Dakota.
[14] Includes part of forest in California.
[15] Includes part of forest in Maine.
[16] Includes part of forest in California.
[17] Includes part of forest in Washington.
[18] Includes part of forest in Idaho.
[19] Includes part of forest in Colorado.
[20] Includes part of forest in Wyoming.
[21] Excludes part of Black Hills National Forest which is largely in South Dakota.

Wild, wilderness, primitive, and canoe areas

State and forest	Area	Area in thousand acres		
		Total national forest	Reserved commercial forest land	Noncommercial forest land
Arizona:				
Apache	Blue Range Primitive Area [1]	180	34.5	3.0
Do	Mount Baldy Primitive Area	7	6.4	.7
Coconino, Kaibab, Prescott.	Sycamore Canyon Primitive Area.	46	.2	5.7
Coronado	Chiricahua Wild Area	18	8.8	9.0
Do	Galiuro Wild Area	55		.8
Prescott and Tonto	Pine Mountain Primitive Area	18		1.0
Tonto	Mazatzal Wilderness Area	205		.7
Do	Sierra Ancha Wild Area	21	3.0	7.1
Do	Superstition Wilderness Area	124		1.3
Total		674	52.9	29.3
California:				
Angeles	Devil Canyon-Bear Canyon Primitive Area.	36	1.0	3.0
Cleveland	Agua Tibia Primitive Area	26	.6	4.5
Eldorado	Desolation Valley Primitive Area.	41	3.3	6.6
Inyo, Sierra	Mount Dana-Minarets Primitive Area.	82	2.2	15.9
Inyo, Sierra, Sequoia	High Sierra Primitive Area	394	10.2	108.6
Klamath	Marble Mountain Wilderness Area.	213	109.6	78.3
Klamath, Shasta-Trinity.	Salmon Trinity Alps Primitive Area.	223	71.4	57.3
Lassen	Caribou Peak Primitive Area	16	1.0	10.5
Do	Thousand Lakes Wild Area	16	3.0	5.4
Los Padres	San Rafael Primitive Area	74		3.6
Do	Ventana Primitive Area	52		1.0
Mendocino, Shasta-Trinity.	Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness Area.	109	39.9	27.5
Modoc	South Warner Primitive Area	69	21.0	7.6
San Bernardino	Cucamonga Wild Area	9		6.5
Do	San Gorgonio Wild Area	34	20.0	5.0
Do	San Jacinto Wild Area	21		8.6
Stanislaus	Emigrant Basin Primitive Area	97	1.1	4.2
Toiyabe, Inyo	Hoover Wild Area	43	2.2	5.1
Total		1,555	286.5	359.2
Colorado:				
Arapaho, White River.	Gore Range-Eagle Nest Primitive Area.	61	9.9	24.4
Gunnison	West Elk Wild Area	62	8.0	34.0
Rio Grande	LaGarita-Sheep Mountain Primitive Area.	38	5.0	14.6
Do	Upper Rio Grande Primitive Area.	57	22.1	7.1
Roosevelt	Rawah Wild Area	26	9.8	2.2
Routt	Mount Zirkel Dome Peak Wild Area.	53	2.6	32.9
San Juan	San Juan Primitive Area	238	53.1	58.0
San Juan, Uncompahgre.	Wilson Mountains Primitive Area.	27	10.4	.7
Uncompahgre Primitive Area.	Uncompahgre Primitive Area	53	12.5	2.1
White River	Flat Tops Primitive Area	118	39.3	5.4
Do	Maroon Bells-Snowmass Wild Area.	66	20.0	17.9
Total		799	192.7	199.3
Idaho:				
Boise, Challis, Sawtooth.	Sawtooth Primitive Area	201	63.2	86.3
Challis, Salmon, Payette.	Idaho Primitive Area	1,225	935.3	175.1
Clearwater, Nezperce, Lolo, Bitterroot.	Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area.[2]	1,578	568.0	732.0
Total		3,004	1,566.6	993.4
Minnesota: Superior	Boundary Waters Canoe Area	887	648.0	13.1
Total		887	648.0	13.1
Montana:				
Beaverhead, Bitterroot, Deerlodge.	Anaconda Pintlar	145	89.4	30.0
Bitterroot, Lolo	Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area.[2]	291	132.0	185.0
Flathead	Mission Mountains Primitive Area.	73	16.0	50.0
Montana—Continued				
Flathead, Lewis and Clark.	Bob Marshall Wilderness Area	950	500.0	200.0
Gallatin	Absaroka Primitive Area	64	29.4	20.5
Gallatin, Custer	Beartooth Primitive Area	230	4.6	69.0
Gallatin	Spanish Peaks Primitive Area	50	20.0	21.6
Helena	Gates of the Mountains Wild Area.	28	2.0	18.0
Kootenai, Lolo Kaniksu.	Cabient Mountains Primitive Area.	90	38.0	33.9
Total		1,921	831.4	628.0
Nevada: Humboldt	Jarbidge Wild Area	65		20.0
Total		65		20.0
New Hampshire: White Mountain.	Great Gulf Wild Area	5	0.6	2.7
Total		5	.6	2.7
New Mexico:				
Apache	Blue Range Primitive Area [1]	37	6.8	.7
Carson	Wheeler Peak Wild Area	6		2.1
Gila	Black Range Mountain Area	169	49.0	99.0
Do	Gila Primitive Area	130	30.0	34.8
Do	Gila Wilderness Area	438	50.0	213.0
Lincoln	White Mountain Wild Area	28		8.0
Santa Fe	San Pedro Parks Wild Area	41	12.0	22.1
Santa Fe, Carson	Pecos Wilderness Area	165	54.5	56.8
Total		1,014	202.3	436.5
North Carolina: Pisgah	Linville Gorge Wild Area	8	4.6	
Total		8	4.6	
Oregon:				
Deschutes, Mount Hood, Willamette.	Mount Jefferson Primitive Area	87	4.6	61.3
Deschutes, Willamette.	Diamond Peak Wild Area	35	11.4	22.2
Do	Three Sisters Wilderness Area	197	143.0	30.2
Do	Mount Washington Wild Area	47	23.9	11.6
Fremont	Gearhart Mountain Wild Area	19	13.9	4.3
Malheur	Strawberry Mountain Wild Area.	33	12.1	17.9
Mount Hood	Mount Hood Wild Area	14	4.5	2.7
Rogue River	Mountain Lakes Wild Area	23	16.9	4.7
Siskiyou	Kalmiopsis Wild Area	78	21.2	37.3
Wallowa-Whitman	Eagle Cap Wilderness Area	216	.5	127.2
Total		749	252.0	319.4
Utah: Ashley, Wasatch	High Uintas Primitive Area	241	76.5	4.0
Total		241	76.5	4.0
Washington:				
Gifford Pinchot	Mount Adams Wild Area	42	8.3	11.1
Gifford Pinchot, Snoqualmie.	Goat Rocks Wild Area	83	47.0	17.9
Mount Baker, Wenatchee.	Glacier Peak Wilderness Area	458	93.7	120.8
Okanogan, Mount Baker.	North Cascade Primitive Area	801	50.7	474.1
Total		1,384	199.7	623.9
Wyoming:				
Bighorn	Cloud Peak Primitive Area	94	7.5	17.5
Bridger	Bridger Wilderness Area	383	14.0	8.0
Shoshone	Glacier Primitive Area	177		43.4
Do	North Absaroka Wilderness Area.	360	55.0	153.7
Do	Popo Agie Primitive Area	70		19.0
Do	South Absaroka Wilderness Area.	506	79.0	161.3
Do	Stratified Primitive Area	202	8.9	56.6
Teton	Teton Wilderness Area	563	212.5	57.7
Total		2,355	376.9	517.2
Grand total		14,661	4,690.7	4,146.0

[1] Blue Range Primitive Area lies in both Arizona and New Mexico.

[2] Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area lies in both Idaho and Montana.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think one of the questions we must consider in connection with the entire bill is that of power. We hear much said in the West about the development of power. Most of the big power development has taken place under the reclamation statutes. However, on page 16 of the hearings is a report by the Federal Power Commission to the 87th Congress. The report states, in part:

Section 4(e) of the Power Act provides that licenses shall be issued within reserved lands of the United States "only after a finding by the Commission that the license will not interfere or be inconsistent with the purpose for which such reservation was created or acquired, and shall be subject to and contain such conditions as the Secretary of the Department" having jurisdiction "shall deem necessary for the adequate protection and utilization of such reservation."

The report further states:

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

Capacity under license:	*Kilowatts*
Existing	748,900
Under construction	257,000
Other potential capacity	2,870,300
Total	3,876,200

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

I skip a paragraph and quote as follows:

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

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

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

Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment at the appropriate time to correct that situation.

In order to understand exactly what we are dealing with in the bill, I call attention to the Forest Manual, a part of which is reprinted beginning on page 51 of the hearings. I shall refer to it briefly, in order to conserve space in the RECORD. The entire section is quite lengthy. One paragraph refers to the wilderness areas; namely, areas in excess of 100,000 acres, and provides that they may be set aside by the Chief of the Forest Service. In these areas—

There shall be no roads or other provision for motorized transportation, no commercial timber cutting, and no occupancy under special-use permit for hotels, stores, resorts, summer homes, organization camps, hunting and fishing lodges, or similar uses: *Provided*, That roads over national forest lands reserved from the public domain and necessary for ingress and egress to or from privately owned property shall be allowed under appropriate conditions determined by the forest supervisor, and upon allowance of such roads the boundary of the wilderness area may be modified to exclude the portion affected by the roads.

(b) Grazing of domestic livestock, development of water-storage projects which do not involve road construction, and improvements necessary for the protection of the forest may be permitted subject to such restrictions as the Chief deems desirable. Within such designated wildernesses when the use is for other than administrative needs and emergencies, the landing of airplanes and the use of motorboats are prohibited on national-forest land or water, unless such use by airplanes or motorboats has already become well established; and the use of motor vehicles is prohibited unless the use is in accordance with a statutory right of ingress and egress.

The wild areas, those of less than 100,000 acres and more than 5,000 acres, are prescribed under regulation U–2. The areas comprising more than 100,000 acres come under regulation U–1.

Under section 2321.21, the manual describes primitive areas as follows:

All existing primitive areas established under former regulation L–20 will be managed under regulation U–1 just as though they actually established under regulation U–1 or U–2.

Further, the manual provides for occupancy and use. That section contains the same restrictive covenants as are now in the bill.

Further, we find that grazing may be permitted under certain restrictions, and mineral exploration and development, as well. I read:

Since mineral development in wilderness and wild areas would be contrary to the purpose for which they were set aside, the Forest Service will not approve or recommend approval of any applications to lease minerals in established wilderness, wild, and primitive areas.

That states pretty clearly for anyone what we mean when we say that the bill will lock up a good portion of the West.

I have just referred to certain regulations contained in the U.S. Forest Service Manual. I think it is obvious to anyone that with the lockup powers of the U.S. Forest Service there is really no need for the bill at all. However, I do not object to there being a wilderness bill, provided certain precautions are afforded us, precautions which we need.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to the area proposed to be included in the wilderness bill, what disposition will be made of the private property rights of various kinds which may exist in the areas, or are there any existing in such areas?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, some private property rights exist in these areas; and in my opinion there is no doubt that it is the intention of the Secretary of Agriculture and, of course, of the Secretary of the Interior, to extinguish these private property rights as rapidly as they can, by condemnation.

Mr. CURTIS. Would that include a valuable right which had vested but perhaps had not been developed?

Mr. ALLOTT. If the right has vested, I would say the bill could not divest the owners of the right without a condemnation suit. But the question would be whether the right had vested.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose the value of the property right—and I shall not attempt to particularize, because there are various kinds—were dependent to a considerable extent on accessibility. If the bill were enacted, what would be the measure of damages: the value after the land was surrounded by wilderness which no man could cross, or the value before the enactment of the bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Nebraska, who is a very able lawyer, has asked me a very technical question. I am not sure that I can answer it immediately.

Mr. CURTIS. But this relates to a matter the Senator has been discussing; namely, that this point is vital from the standpoint of public opinion throughout the West.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, and such situations exist in many places. I am under the impression that the bill includes a sentence which protects ingress and egress——

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator from Montana wish to refer to this point?

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Very well; I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Let me point out that on page 3 of the bill, section 3(a) provides:

SEC. 3. (a) The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this Act as the wilderness system) shall comprise (subject to existing private rights) such federally owned areas as are established as part of such system under the provisions of this Act.

It applies to such federally owned areas—the areas Senators have described—and they are to be subject to existing private rights—in other words, private rights for grazing—which are in existence in some of the primitive areas, and also the six mining rights which are in existence in the vast area the Senator has mentioned. The private rights are protected, and the intention is to protect them as these areas are converted into wilderness.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Montana.

I may say that the part I had in mind a moment ago is on page 14, beginning in line 2:

(b) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system—

And so forth. I do not see that that guarantees them a road—although I believe the regulations do provide for roads through the national forests to private lands. But there is no question that if a man owns land in the middle of one of these areas and if he has not used it, he cannot, after the bill is enacted, put on it a commercial enterprise of any kind. Or let us assume he had used it for himself and his friends, by perhaps having a small home or lodge there. After enactment of the bill, he could not expand that use. In other words, this program would prevent any expansion of such use; the bill would forever shut it off. I think that is a fair statement in regard to that point.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the Senator from Colorado and I are mem-

bers, has been greatly concerned for several years with trying to stabilize the domestic minerals industry and to solve some of the problems which have caused widespread distress and unemployment throughout the mining industry. Will the Senator from Colorado state what is proposed to be done by this bill to safeguard mining interests?

Mr. ALLOTT. In my opinion the bill would do nothing to preserve mining. I propose to discuss that point in connection with my analysis of the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Very well; I shall wait until then to ask my questions.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in further answer to the Senator from Idaho, I recall that during the hearings there was considerable discussion—and I am sure the Senator recalls it, because he participated in it—which illustrates how confused are some of those in the Department of Agriculture. I shall read part of the hearings into the RECORD at this time:

Senator DWORSHAK. Mr. McArdle, you said since 1924 the Department of Agriculture has steadfastly maintained its policy of administering selected areas of national forest land for their wilderness values and that you have always considered this policy consistent with the principle of administering the national forests for multiple use and sustained yield. Do you believe that any changes in this concept of multiple uses will be made if S. 174 is enacted?

Mr. MCARDLE. No, Senator DWORSHAK, I do not.

I wish to say that is an absolute contradiction, because there is no question that the wilderness concept itself violates multiple use. Those areas in wilderness would be confined to wilderness use as the only use. So there would be no multiple use; the land could not be used for watershed production or conservation or mining or forestry. So there would be no multiple use. Thus, the witness' first answer to the question is a contradiction in itself.

I read further from the hearing:

Senator DWORSHAK. It will preserve intact the same principles of multiple use which your Department has followed in the past?

Mr. MCARDLE. We believe that, Senator.

Again I call attention to the contradiction. I read further from the hearing:

Senator DWORSHAK. Even in mining?

Mr. MCARDLE. Mining is included in a broad general way in multiple use, but I would assume that you are talking about the sustained yield and multiple use act which Congress passed last year.

Senator DWORSHAK. Yes, and also your multiple use theory which has been in effect since 1924 under which I am sure mining has been carried on in wilderness areas.

Mr. MCARDLE. That is correct and this bill would limit mining. It would also limit the use of water. It would limit timber cutting.

Senator DWORSHAK. How would it limit the use of water?

Mr. MCARDLE. Through the prohibition of construction of reservoirs, to be specific on one point, unless the President declared that it was in the public interest.

Senator DWORSHAK. Then you are not entirely accurate when you say that you feel that the multiple use theory will be continued under S. 174.

Mr. MCARDLE. Senator, perhaps this is our difficulty here. The concept of multiple use which the Forest Service has held for so long, and also the formal definition of multiple use on the national forest which Congress wrote into the multiple use bill last summer, specifies that not all uses are required to take place simultaneously on the same area, but it does require two or more uses.

Although the land could be used only as wilderness, at the same time an attempt is made to state that the bill serves the multiple-use purpose.

I read further from the hearing:

Senator DWORSHAK. You permit all mining activity within wilderness areas now, or primitive areas?

Mr. MCARDLE. Congress permits it. We have nothing to say about it in wilderness areas and outside as long as it is public domain land.

So that is a prime example of the confusion which has existed even in the Department of Agriculture, which for many years has been administering these areas, for the witness contradicted himself when he replied to the questions asked by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Colorado has enumerated many prohibitions in connection with the multiple use of our forests, which would be made under the concept of the wilderness preservation system. He did not state specifically, as I recall, that no roads would be permitted to be constructed, to penetrate these areas.

Although I do not know exactly the forest-fire situation in Colorado during the past year, I wish to state that in Idaho we had the most devastating forest fires that we have had in many decades—with losses in excess of $5 million, four lives lost, and many other problems resulting from the inability effectively to fight and control forest fires, because no roads penetrated the wilderness areas. That situation would be even more greatly aggravated under the concept of the wilderness system which is now included in the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. There is no question about it, and I must say, in this respect, the proponents of the bill are totally unrealistic, because a little while ago I placed in the RECORD a news clipping concerning a 142,000-acre fire in California, which resulted in the death of three persons. Somewhere in our thinking we must decide whether it is better to preserve an absolute wilderness area for those few people to commune with their own souls and be by themselves, as against the necessity of having access to the areas in order to fight fires and preserve lives such as were lost in the last week or two in Idaho, and in California this week.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. As the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] has suggested, we have had one of the most disastrous fire seasons in Montana, Idaho, and the Northwest, almost the worst in history. Tens of thousands of acres have been burned in western Montana, especially, and in the panhandle of Idaho. But I think, if the Senator will look over the locations of those fires, he will see that only two small fires were in the Selway primitive area, which would be incorporated into the Wilderness System, one of the large fires was at the Salmon River area where there is an access road, and the largest fire was in the Sleeping Child-Hot Springs area, across the border in Montana, where 60,000 acres burned, and it was not in any primitive or wilderness, or wild area.

There are millions of acres in Idaho and Montana, as well as other parts of national forests, that are inaccessible, and that are not in primitive or wilderness areas, and which will never be incorporated in the areas contemplated by the bill, and which have not been tapped for lumber because they are too remote and inaccessible. The national forests have 160,000 miles of road. Outside the proposed Wilderness System the access roads in the forests need to be increased by 380,000 miles to a total of 540,000 miles.

The fires this season have pointed out how difficult it is to get into many areas which are primitive or wilderness areas. But it is provided in the bill that for the purposes of this act such measures as are necessary will be taken for the control of fire, insects, and disease, subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable. If the Secretary of Agriculture deemed it desirable to have an access road in order to control fires, he could do it under section 14 of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Secretary of Agriculture were to construct an access road into any of the wilderness areas for fire protection, he would be attacked by the proponents of the bill for having violated the sanctity of those areas. I believe the Senator will agree that once the fire starts, a road cannot be built into the area.

Mr. METCALF. That is correct, but we have not been able to build roads into millions of acres that are not in any of the primitive areas or national forests.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct. One does not know where fire may come next, because fires do not result from careless campers alone.

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. Most of the fires this year were the result of lightning striking in the very dry, tinderlike forests.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not think the Department of Agriculture will ever build a road into any of these areas, and if a fire were sparked by lightning, it would be too late to build a road then, even if it were in an area where one could be built. Many of these primitive areas are places which are not susceptible to roadbuilding.

Mr. METCALF. I merely wanted to point out, since the Senator from Idaho had pointed out that we had experienced one of the worst fire seasons in years, that most of them have not occurred in primitive areas or wilderness areas, and would not have been affected by the bill, except for two small areas.

Mr. ALLOTT. But I merely point out that an act of God caused those fires, and the next time they can happen there.

Mr. METCALF. Most of the inaccessible fires that occurred this year occurred in areas that were not wilderness or primitive areas.

Mr. ALLOTT. I repeat, it was an act of God, and we do not know where it will occur next.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to read from an article published in the Clearwater Tribune, of Orofino, Idaho, which refers to an area specifically mentioned by the Senator from Idaho. It is from the issue of Thursday, August 10, 1961:

Second big fire was the Surprise Creek blaze high in the Lochsa-Selway primitive area where lack of any roads made it a 16-mile walking chance for 300 men. They were supplied by packmules and helicopters. Louis Hartig, fire boss, said dead spruce was chief fuel burned in this 2,700-acre blaze.

Mr. METCALF. That was one of the two fires I commented upon, but the most serious fire was on 60,000 acres. A 2,700-acre fire is a serious one, but with our smokejumpers and modern firefighting equipment being developed in the laboratory we fortunately have in Missoula, Mont., we are finding ways to fight fire in remote areas. It was not in the wilderness areas that we have had the disastrous fire season this year.

Mr. ALLOTT. The response, in my opinion, does not necessarily prove the case. The Senator has said these fires were the result of lightning in most cases. Just because they happened not to strike in wilderness areas this year does not mean they will not next time. It did happen in one or two cases.

Mr. President, I want to move on to a brief analysis of the bill.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE WILDERNESS BILL

Section 1 is the title, "The Wilderness Act."

Section 2(a) contains a statement of congressional policy of securing for present and future generations an enduring "resource" of wilderness through the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system.

Section 2(b) provides a definition of wilderness which is actually more obscure than the term being defined. This definition is as follows: "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where, etc."

Section 3 describes in a general way, the area to be included in the wilderness system.

Section 3(b) deals with areas in the National Forest Service which have previously been designated by administrative action under four separate categories; i.e., wilderness, wild, canoe, and primitive. These areas, totaling over 14,600,000 acres of our national forests, would be included in the wilderness system. These lands would all be included in the wilderness system notwithstanding the fact that the 39 primitive areas, which comprise more than 50 percent of all these lands, have admittedly not been sufficiently studied by the Secretary of Agriculture to warrant a wilderness classification.

This section does provide that, once included within the wilderness system, these primitive areas comprising almost 8 million acres must be reviewed within 10 years and a recommendation for either the continued inclusion or the exclusion of such areas from the wilderness system shall be submitted to Congress. Any such executive recommendation would have force of law subject to veto rights reserved by Congress and described in a later section, 3(f).

I might say at this point that some of my colleagues and I feel quite strongly that until the Secretary of Agriculture has completed his study of these areas and is ready to make a recommendation with respect to their classification, Congress should not at this time blindly throw 8 million acres of our national forests into a wilderness system which would have the effect of imposing almost complete restrictions against any normal use of such lands.

For this reason, we will propose an amendment to section 3(b) providing that primitive areas would not be included in the wilderness system until they have first been studied and the President is in a position to make a recommendation for their inclusion.

Section (c) provides that each area, within each national park, monument, or other unit in the national park system, which contains a continuous area of 5,000 acres or more without roads, shall be incorporated into the wilderness system upon recommendation of the President, again subject to a veto right reserved by Congress.

Section 3(d) provides for incorporation into the wilderness system, upon recommendation of the President, of areas within the wildlife refuges and game ranges, which are not only presently under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, but also those added to his jurisdiction within the next 15 years. Again, a recommendation of the President would have the effect of law, subject to a veto right reserved by Congress.

I feel that this section should also be amended so as to apply only to wildlife refuges and game ranges presently in existence and should not relate to those that may be created within the next 15 years.

Section 3(e), dealing with modification or adjustment of boundaries within a wilderness area, again provides that the recommendation of the President shall become law, subject to a veto right reserved by Congress.

Section 3(f) is the description of the veto power reserved by Congress. This section provides:

"(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment, neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided*, That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided. Any such concurrent resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C., secs. 133z-12—133z-15) for a resolution of either House of Congress."

In my opinion, this is one of the most objectionable features of the entire bill. It represents a further example of congressional delegation of power to the executive branch. Several of my colleagues and I will propose an 8-18-61—D to this section which will provide that the recommendations of the President will be effective only if approved by a concurrent resolution of Congress.

Section 3(g) provides that any area proposed for incorporation into the wilderness system shall be segregated and withdrawn from the operation of the public land laws.

Section 3(h) provides that the addition or elimination of any area not provided for in this act could be made only by affirmative congressional action.

Section 4 pertains to acquisition of certain privately owned lands within the wilderness system.

Section 5 pertains to gifts or bequests of land.

Section 6(a) provides that any agency administering an area within the wilderness system shall administer it so as to preserve the wilderness character of the area.

To the extent that they are consistent with the basic goal of preserving the wilderness environment, the "public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use" would be permitted.

Section 6(b) contains the broad prohibition of uses within the wilderness which would make the impact of the bill so drastic when it is considered that over 65 million acres of public lands are potentially involved in such prohibition. This section provides:

"(b) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas."

Section 6(c) contains a few very limited exceptions to the prohibited uses, the most significant of which are found in section 6(c)(2). This subsection would authorize the President to permit certain activities in wilderness areas "upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interest of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial."

These uses, which may be permitted by the President, upon such determination, include prospecting, mining, and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, and transmission lines.

In view of the tremendous pressures that will likely be brought to bear to prevent any such uses within an area designated as wilderness, and because of the great responsibilities already falling upon the President, some of my colleagues and I feel that this authority to permit excepted uses should lie with the appropriate Secretary, rather than with the President, and we propose to offer an amendment to that effect.

Section 6(c)(3) contains an interesting exception which relates only to the boundary waters canoe area in Minnesota. This subsection provides that the area shall be managed under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining the primitive character of the area "without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber."

I do not wish to be critical of this particular language. I think it is a decided improvement upon the general language of the bill. But, if it is good for Minnesota to have an area managed "without unnecessary restrictions upon other uses," then why isn't it good for areas in Colorado, or in Montana, or in Idaho?

In addition to the amendments which I have already mentioned and discussed to some extent, there are a few additional amendments which I think should be adopted if this bill is to become law. Briefly, these amendments are as follows:

Amendment 8-18-61—C: This amendment would permit within the wilderness

areas activity designed to gather information relating to water resources and would permit the construction of tunnels which are completely underground in wilderness areas or under portions of wilderness areas. This amendment will be necessary in order to permit cities like Denver, in the State of Colorado, to construct water tunnels, parts of which might pass underneath wilderness areas, without the necessity of obtaining permission from the President.

Amendment 8–18–61—F: This is an amendment which would provide for obtaining the views of the Governor with respect to inclusion of any area within his State in the wilderness system. It would provide also that the views of the Governor, if so obtained, would accompany the recommendations of the President to the Congress, with respect to an area within that State. In view of the fact that Congress will have only limited time in which to exercise its "veto right" on such recommendations, it is extremely important that the views of the people within the State involved be obtained at an early date.

Amendment 8–25–61—C: This amendment would provide that nothing in this act would affect the authority of the Federal Power Commission. During the hearings there was a conflict of opinion between officials from the Department of Agriculture on the one hand and those of the FPC on the other as to the effect of this bill upon the licensing authority of the FPC. This amendment would clarify that ambiguity.

Amendment 8–25–61—D: This is just a clarifying amendment which is made necessary because of a language change made by the committee in subsection (f) on page 10 of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Before the Senator from Colorado moved on to a general analysis of the entire bill, I wanted to try to clear up one point which he mentioned, the fact that there has been no appreciable increase in the desire of people to spend their time in the type of wilderness area this bill envisions. I believe the Senator made some kind of remark like that.

Mr. ALLOTT. I did not quite say it that way. I said I felt that half a million people were affected and less than 1 percent of the people were using 8 percent of the public lands for these particular purposes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Colorado recall that the Director of the National Park Service said that "90 percent of the national park system qualifies under a reasonable definition of wilderness and it is the National Park Service's plan to keep it that way"?

Mr. ALLOTT. I recall that testimony.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is intimately acquainted with national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas in his own State, as I am with those in mine. Can the Senator visualize an individual wanting to get "away from it all" more than he could by going into Estes National Park or Grand Canyon?

Mr. ALLOTT. It would be quite difficult to do.

I was handed a copy of the Saturday Evening Post, the issue of September 2, 1961, in which Richard Thruelsen wrote an article on Utah's spectacular and little known southeast corner, common to the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. I propose to quote from the article a little later, but it concerns the conservationist from Utah, Mr. Fabian. He emphasizes time and again that the trouble with this area is that there are no roads by which people can gain access.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am intimately acquainted with the land described in the Saturday Evening Post article, which is a very excellent article and which should be read by Members of this body.

Most of the area is in Utah, but some is in Colorado and some in northern Arizona. In that area there are about 50,000 square miles of land. If we should exclude the trips down the Colorado River, which have become quite popular since the war, I would seriously doubt if more than 100 men in the history of this country know that area in a way to be intimate with it.

I would say that there are literally dozens of unexplored canyons, undiscovered natural bridges, and undiscovered Indian ruins. This is an area in which a man can get away from it all, if he wishes to do so, but he has to do a lot of walking or he has to get a mule, because there are no roads. In fact, I would not like to have the Government undertake to build roads in that area. I do not think there is enough money in the United States Treasury to build roads through that red sandstone canyon country.

My position all along with respect to the bill has been that I am a great believer in camping and in getting away from things, but I think there is a lot of land on which one can do that now, without putting the Federal Government more and more into the business.

The moment we set aside the wilderness areas, roads will be cut into them. That will remove so far as this particular person who is interested in the outdoors is concerned, the existence of a wilderness area, because it will open it up. The next thing to happen will be that other individuals will come—those we call dudes—who will not drive on any highway unless it is paved. They will complain. Then there will be paved highways. Then what was once a beautiful section of the United States will be overrun by people who have no desire at all to go into a wilderness.

This is that type of area. There are 50,000 square miles with only the Henry Mountains and the Blue Mountains and the peak of Navajo Mountain, where one can find any timber growth. The rest is all desertland. Many of us like desertland. We do not wish to see it defiled. The quickest way to spoil an area is to put it under this kind of protection.

For many, many years I visited and fished the Middle Fork of the Salmon River. The senior Senator from Idaho is on the floor. I am sure he is well acquainted with this area. It was a delightful place. One could get away from things. It was necessary to pack in for a day and a half, and if one wished to fish, one had to pack down the river or go in a rubber boat or a wooden boat.

When areas such as those are made into wilderness areas they are completely changed. I have seen more dead fish and whisky bottles and beer cans left by people who have no business going out of doors than I could count. These people ruin what was once a beautiful area of the United States.

I think we ought to proceed very cautiously. As a westerner who loves the West, I thank my friend from Colorado for what he is trying to do to make the bill a workable bill, acceptable by all of us. I do not think the time has yet come when a handful of people in this country can dictate what we must do with many millions of acres of land of the Far West. I think this whole program should come under the positive control of this body for a determination as to what should be done with these lands, and what lands should be taken in or left out.

I am simply trying to buttress the point the Senator made, that there are ample lands in the national parks and monuments, if a person really wishes to get away from it all and has a willingness to do so—the ambition and the willingness to make a special effort, to suffer a few sore muscles, to skin his shins a bit and to skin his hands a bit. Anyone willing to make the effort can live in the great outdoors.

These are not Abercrombie & Fitch excursions. However, if a man sincerely wishes to get away from things, out in the West, he can get away from it all. I can show him a few places to go, and if he goes there he will find he has never been happier in his life.

I dread the day when the Federal Government will start putting sewerlines, gaslines, waterlines, and paved roads into some of the canyon lands in the general area about which I have been speaking.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I do not believe there is a more ardent conservationist in the entire U.S. Senate than the Senator from Arizona. Certainly there is no other Senator who has a deeper esthetic appreciation for the great Southwest country, in which he was born and in which he has lived most of his life—which he has photographed, flown over, driven over, and walked over—than the Senator from Arizona. There are probably few men in the United States who know this country as well as he. He knows of what he speaks.

I could not help thinking, while the Senator was talking, how utterly ridiculous it would be if we got into a situation of trying to put a complete "tenderfoot" into some of this country, such as Monument Valley or any of that great territory. We could supply him with all of the canteens possible, yet he would probably be dead in a couple of days, no matter what we did for him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One of the great problems in the Grand Canyon National Park today is the problem of taking care of the people who go into the wilder parts of the park without permission and, more important, without knowledge

of how to camp out or to stay out of doors.

I think in the past year or 2 years at least three people have died of thirst in the Grand Canyon, where there is water available if one knows where to look for it.

A helicopter is kept on duty at Luke Air Force Base, Ariz., for the purpose of dragging people out of the Grand Canyon. Those people have no business going in, because they have not learned how to enjoy the wilderness, which it is now proposed be set up all over the West.

My argument coincides with that of the Senator from Colorado. We already have enough of these areas. We have far, far more than we could ever use.

I remember a statistic, which may not be correct, but which is a typical chamber of commerce statistic. It is that one could put all of the people in the world in the Grand Canyon. That is rather difficult to believe, but I think it is true. If 10 times the number of people who like to do these things were put into the Grand Canyon, they would not run into each other. They could get lost in several of these areas.

In Colorado there are many beautiful areas, on the western slopes of the Rockies, from which we get water, and for which we thank Colorado for its generosity.

Mr. ALLOTT. I merely say, it is not always willingly given.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Fortunately, water flows downhill. We are fortunate in that regard.

Many of these areas are today protected for the use of people all over the States of Utah, Idaho, Nevada, California, Oregon, and Washington; the entire Far West. The whole Rocky Mountain West is available. For some peculiar reason—probably the ingenuity of God—the beauties of the United States were concentrated in the Rocky Mountain West. There are people who wish to take more and more of this land away from us.

In my own State we have faced the rather horrendous task of developing taxes to take care of the fastest growing population of the country, based upon only 12 percent of the land area of the State. I think Arizona is still the fifth largest State in the Union, without pineapples or glaciers; way up near the top.

The Western States should be able to look forward to an opportunity to develop themselves. Instead, each Western State is faced with the problem of what to do about a tax base, when the Federal Government and State governments own from 75 percent to as high as 99 percent of the land area, as is true in the case of Alaska.

This is the problem of which I think we must be cognizant. People from other parts of the country look to our area and say, "We wish to take more of your land." We soon will reach the point that perhaps we shall not be able to handle our own problems, as we have been able to do.

This perhaps is made as an economic plea, but certainly one can look at a map of my State and see plenty of wilderness areas and wildlife areas, enough to satisfy everybody who wishes to take advantage of the natural beauty of those areas. I see no need for expanding the areas, and particularly not in the way suggested by the bill, which would require a negative action rather than a positive action of the Congress in order to accomplish anything.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I agree with what he says.

I had printed in the RECORD a few moments ago five tables which showed not only the growth of population but also the economic impact, the relative number of acres owned by the Federal Government in the Western States, and certain other items which I think gave a pretty clear picture of that particular problem.

While I am engaged in this colloquy with my good friend from Arizona, I should like to quote a few statements from an article which was published recently in the Saturday Evening Post, and to which I have already referred. In the first paragraph of the article the following statement appears:

> Fabian wants to find ways and means to introduce the traveling, recreation-minded public to a solid block of wilderness large enough to swallow nearly half a dozen of our smaller States.

The article continued:

> Utah's earnest but belated drive to move in on its wide-open spaces—it was the last State to establish a park and recreation area, in 1957—is the product of fewer frustrations. As a State with 75 percent of its territory owned by the Federal Government, Utah has always been, in a manner of speaking, a guest in its own house. The result was a general state of immobility in developing land for public use; what the Federal Government wouldn't do, the State couldn't do.

I see the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in the Chamber. I am happy that he is present. I was happy to have had an opportunity to participate in the long conference committee report which enabled Utah to get part of these public lands for its State parks.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Over the weekend I have been in Utah and heard our Governor talk about this entire problem. He coined a phrase that has remained in my mind. He said, "Utah is only three-quarters of a State since the other one-quarter belongs to the Federal Government, and the State of Utah has no control over it—certainly no power to tax."

Mr. ALLOTT. That is true. I should like to quote a few more portions of the article by Mr. Fabian, whom I am sure the Senator from Utah knows. He said:

> Fabian believes that improved access roads and trails and provision for water-storage points, guide signs, and rescue facilities will encourage amateur explorers to prowl where perhaps no man has ever prowled before.

I think it is necessary to point out here that what he is saying is that we must have roads and access to those places. It is perfectly logical that in this day and age when most of us spend our time in sedentary jobs, few people will be able to put 50-pound packs on their backs, march very far into a wilderness area, and spend a night. They might go 10 miles, but that is about the limit.

Further in the article the author stated:

> Here, once the access problems are solved, lie hundreds of square miles of exploring for the vacationer who can take care of himself in a wilderness.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Opening up the country to modern travel is the biggest single problem.

The article continues:

> In most cases, this first big step involves convincing the Federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM), which owns 50 percent of Utah, or the National Forest Service, which controls about 16 percent of the State, to part with a piece of the empire or, alternatively, develop it for public recreational use. The course of sweet reason in either case is generally beset by legal and contrived obstacles.

I thought that the article, which portrays my neighboring State of Utah, an area which I think is the most fantastic I have ever seen in my life—was worthy of reference to show that we are not really serving the people in their recreational needs by freezing and locking up in wilderness 65 million acres of land where the people are already very generously treated.

I wish to discuss briefly some of the provisions of the bill. Section 2 contains a statement of policy. Actually there are seven criteria stated within the paragraph, but there are only four set out by number. If someone wishes to get an idea what wilderness is, the bill states:

> An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

Then the next main section of the bill, which is section 3, provides:

> SEC. 3. (a) The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereinafter referred to in this Act as the wilderness system) shall comprise (subject to existing private rights) such federally owned areas as are established as part of such system under the provisions of this Act.

The next section is the national forest areas section, which provides that all wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe areas be included within the wilderness section.

Later in this section the bill provides how the primitive areas shall be included by the President. The bill provides that the President shall advise the Congress of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or the exclusion thereof, of any of the primitive areas.

The bill also provides for the effective date of this action.

The next provision refers to the national wildlife refuges and provides how those may be included in a wilderness area and how they shall be handled.

On page 9 is a provision for modification of boundaries.

On page 10 is set forth the effective date of the President's recommendation. It is stated that the action will be effective after the next session of Congress has concluded.

Then on page 11 is the effect of a public notice of a proposed addition to the wilderness system.

Then we come to some of the really tough parts of the bill. I wish to discuss briefly the use of the wilderness, which is covered in section 6, of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes as also to preserve its wilderness character.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use.

If we refer to a wilderness use, I do not know where history comes in, because if it is a true wilderness, the area can be considered to be untrammeled by man, under the definition contained in the bill. So I do not know where history would come in. But introducing history would probably bring in a few people to support the measure who otherwise would not do so.

I am happy to see that the proponents of the bill finally got into this one paragraph the word "conservation," because it is the only place in the bill that there is a thing done about conserving the natural resources of our country.

I say unequivocally that the bill is not a conservation measure. It never was intended to be and it never will be.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. If the areas which are wooded and covered with forests are locked up, in the spirit of the bill, the policies and programs for the conservation of the growing timber in those forests, which have been developed over many years and are in use in our national forests, would in fact be denied. Is that true?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is true. I recall Mr. McArdle coming before the Appropriations Committee 2 years ago and again last year for the purpose of justifying the expenditure of money for a sustained yield of the national forests, and explaining to us how we actually increase growth by cutting timber in these places. Yet what we are trying to do is to take not just the 8 million acres here, but to expand the area, with no sustained yield and no new growth and no cutting, and nothing being done that would preserve it.

Mr. BENNETT. With no protection against the pests that have come into our forests as a result of the natural imbalance that has been created.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is no protection against pests, except as one might get it under the emergency provisions of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Ordinarily, these stands of timber would be left there for the beetles and porcupines and the other things that injure our growing forests.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is entirely correct.

We come now to what I believe is one of the particularly unfortunate portions of the bill. On page 14, there appears a section headed "Special Provisions." It reads:

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Within national forest areas included in the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become well established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable. In addition, such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable.

Then the next section provides:

(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including exploration for oil and gas), mining (including the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial;

Mr. President, that is the biggest joker in the bill, because we are actually holding out to the people of the country the idea that the bill does authorize all of these things. This would really appear to be a multiple use, if we do not read that the President may do these things. In other words, we are holding out prospecting—including the exploration for oil and gas—and mining—including the production of oil and gas—and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, and so forth, as permissible uses.

This means that if people in Colorado want to construct a system for the storage of water for the use by the people of the State of Colorado, or if we want to undertake other development in the wilderness system, we must come to the President of the United States to get the specific authority to do it. Mr. President, let us be practical. Let us take the case of a man who thinks he has found beryllium in a Western State. The bill provides that he must get the consent of the President to mine it. Beryllium is one of the new ores. It is one of the many new fantastic ores we are finding in this country, and on which a great deal of research work is being done. It is only one of many. Yet, how would an individual miner ever get to the President of the United States to get the President's permission to go in and prospect or mine it? The answer is that this is just another piece of sugar held out to make people believe that we are not going to suffer under the bill.

As a practical matter, only in rare situations would an individual ever get to the President of the United States to get the President's consent. Even some Senators I am sure, have found it is pretty hard at times to do that. So a State, city, or county, or any of these people who need water conservation works—who need transmission lines—would all be forbidden to go in wilderness areas for that purpose without special Presidential authority.

We have a situation in Colorado where it is probable that a transmission line might have to go over a part of the wilderness area. Yet in order to put the transmission line through that area—and the line would be owned by the REA people or by the public—we would have to come to the President to get his express consent in order to do it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The new transmission lines proposed from Glen Canyon up into Colorado travel almost exclusively over wilderness area land. From the four corners of the distribution points to the general central area, and to Denver itself, and back into northeastern Utah and Wyoming, the lines will travel about 50 percent of the time over the type of land we are discussing now.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am now pointing, on the chart in the rear of the Chamber, to the southwestern corner of Colorado. Some of those lines would come up to the San Juan Primitive Area. There is no question that the bill will produce a problem in the construction of the transmission system for Glen Canyon. I intend later to offer an amendment to prevent an actual conflict in the State of Colorado, where it would be impossible for the city of Denver to develop its water system unless we adopt the amendment, without coming to the President and getting his special permission to do so. I shall talk about this a little later, but we should note that when we get to the canoe area—the Boundary Waters Canoe Area—in Minnesota, the bill would abandon the concept of single use for wilderness, and it would give the State of Minnesota special treatment in this respect. The bill would permit continued use of the timber resources in Minnesota, as long as there is made some effort to keep the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages.

I do not know why what is sauce for the goose is not also sauce for the gander. I do not know why we should continue to permit lumbering in Minnesota and not permit it to other areas. We also have timber areas in the West that are valuable to us.

The bill generally forbids commercial enterprises in these areas, although

within national parks there is a limitation on that to some extent.

Various States preserve their rights that govern hunting and fishing. The provision of the bill pertaining to this subject states:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

We come now to another great paradox in the bill, and that is represented by the committee amendment on page 18, which provides that "the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each maintain available to the public, records of portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction."

People wonder why some of us have objected to the hasty passage of this bill. After considering the bill for 4 years, the former Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney, and I prepared a substitute bill which set forth, after many months of research, what purported to be the exact descriptions of the wilderness areas which we were going to put into the bill. To the best of our knowledge and according to the best figures that we could get from the Department of Agriculture, these were the areas that were to be within the wilderness system. Now we come to the hearings this year, and counsel for the committee, or one of them, was informed that there were no less than 75 separate errors in those descriptions. So instead of the exact descriptions of what is to be put into the wilderness system, we have here a general provision that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall keep maps and legal descriptions at various points.

The record shows that after they worked on it for months, even the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior do not know today what lands will be frozen into the wilderness system by the bill.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HICKEY. Could the Senator from Colorado speak a little more completely about the objections which were raised to specifically describing and permitting those interested in the wilderness to have an exact description of the wilderness in their own States, if it could be adequately ascertained?

Mr. ALLOTT. Do I correctly understand the Senator's question to mean the reason which was given why the descriptions could not be given?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. The reason given was that there is not always a legal description available where an area ends on a mountain or a stream. It is a very peculiar situation, and those who attempted to get the descriptions for us, including the Department of Agriculture, still have never informed the Senator from Colorado that there were any errors in that description. I learned through the back door that there were alleged errors, but it seems to me that the least the Department of Agriculture could have done, if there were actually errors in the descriptions they worked out for the former senior Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney, and me, was to have notified us of such errors. I do not know that there were any such errors in the description, because no one besides committee counsel has told me that this has been charged. The present language of the bill—the committee amendment—is probably the best that has been suggested. However, I say unequivocally that this demonstrates how foolish it would be to lock up in a wilderness system areas the boundaries of which we do not even know. We cannot even get legal descriptions of the areas.

If we were to stop the proceedings on the bill today, right at this hour, or right at this minute, and simply set it aside for some other business, I would guarantee that within the next 4 months it would not be possible to get from the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture a legal description of the land which is proposed to be frozen and locked in a wilderness system by the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Colorado has referred to the vagueness which pervades several sections of the bill. I have listened with great interest to the Senator's analysis of the various sections of the bill. I do not recall that he referred to section 4, on page 12, which deals with the acquisition of certain privately owned lands within the wilderness system.

Section 4 provides:

> The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system any privately owned land within any portion of such system under his jurisdiction * * *.

That was the language of the original bill. I ask the Senator if his interpretation of that language would not be that the sky would have been the limit; that as we talk about deficits and expanded Federal spending, it is conceivable that the two Secretaries might have purchased hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of land for incorporation within the wilderness area.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is no doubt about that. As a matter of fact, this provision goes further than I would like to go now. It is, however, subject to the necessary appropriations by Congress.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That amendment was offered by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct. I think the appropriations will be hidden by the Department of Agriculture and the Park Service, so that we will never really be aware of the lands which will be purchased under the authority of the act. Of this I have no doubt.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not possible that the entire area of the United States might be incorporated within the vast wilderness preserve area; and that then Americans could locate in Australia or some far-removed continent, and on weekends might commute in jetplanes to the United States to enjoy some of the bounties of the wilderness area?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not believe the bill goes quite that far. We have large wilderness areas, and this creates a problem. I have sympathy for those who wish to have access to the great natural scenic areas of this country. However it seems to me that the bill goes a little too far.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the Senator leaves that subject, the Senator from Utah wishes to point out 14 weaknesses in the bill. If the Senator from Colorado would be willing, I should like to ask permission that I might place them in the RECORD at this point, without the Senator from Colorado losing his right to the floor; or, if he prefers, I will wait until I can obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. ALLOTT. How long does the Senator from Utah think he will take?

Mr. BENNETT. Ten minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to the Senator from Utah for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on August 28, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] voiced criticism of an amendment to the wilderness bill, S. 174, which I had submitted to the Senate for consideration. On August 25, 3 days prior to the speech of my colleague, I wrote Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, advising him that I did not intend to call up my amendment when S. 174 was debated. On the morning of August 28, the day on which my colleague from Utah spoke, I issued a public statement to the same effect.

The objection of my colleague to the amendment was well founded, as I had already discovered. It related to the point which the Senator from Colorado made; namely, that the departments did not know the boundaries of the land which they were including.

The amendment was based upon inaccurate information furnished me by a Forest Service official from region four in Odgen, Utah. I was told that only "minor" boundary changes were contemplated for the High Uintas Primitive Area in Utah. This misinformation was swiftly corrected; so I withdrew my amendment which would have made the High Uintas a wilderness area. As a matter of fact, many thousand additional acres would have been included, under the statement of "minor" boundary changes.

In the course of his remarks, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] made the following comments:

> Under the provisions and procedure of S. 174, the establishment of wilderness is going to be carefully done, with Congress right to pass on expansion of the total areas carefully guarded.
>
> This situation illustrates the wisdom of proposed wilderness legislation, and gives the Senate an example of the care with which it has been drafted.

In my opinion, these two statements of my colleagues are not borne out by the facts. There are serious loopholes in

S. 174 which deprive Congress of any meaningful control over creation of wilderness areas. Moreover, there are at least 13 other defects in the bill. I hope that my colleague from Utah and other Senators will recognize the validity of my comments on S. 174, for which he voted as a member of the Interior Committee, just as I recognized the validity of his views on my amendment.

A summary of some of the principal loopholes in S. 174 follows:

The first loophole is the big one, as to which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] will offer his amendment to correct the situation.

First. Section 3(f) bypasses Congress and the Constitution by giving the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior the power to create wilderness areas. The executive branch would, in effect, propose wilderness legislation while the Senate or the House would retain only a weak, inadequate veto over executive proposals. But the Constitution clearly provides that Congress shall control our public lands, not the President, and that Congress shall legislate, not bureaucrats in the executive branch. Yet, 54 million acres could be included within the wilderness system with no hearings and without positive approval of Congress under section 3(f) of S. 174.

Second. Section 3(d) gives the Secretary of Interior power to unilaterally withdraw millions of acres of public land in the future for national wildlife refuges and game ranges, and then blanket the areas into the wilderness system under section 3(f), thus bypassing Congress. In other words, Congress would abdicate its control of the public lands to the Secretary of Interior, a man not elected by nor responsible to the people. Over 46 percent of the land area of Utah could be locked up under this shockingly loose procedure.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Perhaps my colleague was not on the floor when the Senate adopted my amendment to section 3(d), which has to do with national wildlife refuges and game ranges. The amendment was adopted unanimously, and it limits the area which may be considered wilderness to the existing game ranges and wildlife refuges as they exist on the effective date of the bill. So there is no possibility that additional lands could be brought in, if they are not already included in these ranges.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am in the same fix that my colleague was in when he commented on my amendment. I had not known that his amendment had been offered. Was it adopted today?

Mr. MOSS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I am very happy to know that, because that closes an important loophole which had been repeatedly called to the attention of the Interior Committee prior to the reporting of S. 174. However, there are still other loopholes to which I wish to call attention.

Mr. MOSS. I agree that that was a possible loophole whereby additional acreage might have been brought in. The purpose of the amendment was to prevent the inclusion of any land other than that already classified as land in the parks or wildlife refuges or the game ranges.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad the amendment was adopted, and I congratulate my colleague on taking that action in this situation. If the amendment had not been adopted, over 46 percent of the land in Utah could have been locked up under this procedure.

Third. Section 3(b) permits the inclusion within the wilderness system of 7,890,973 acres of national forest lands now designated as "primitive" areas without positive approval by Congress. A majority of the Senate or the House would have only an inadequate veto power over the inclusion of these "primitive" areas which have never been reviewed by Congress to determine whether or not they are suitable for wilderness purposes, and few have been reviewed by the Forest Service.

Fourth. There is no provision in the bill for consultation with the affected State governments except for Alaska. Federal bureaucrats are given life-or-death control over the future of the western public land States, without any voice given to the States. This constitutes wilderness creation without representation.

Fifth. Section 3(c) makes it possible to blanket into the wilderness system "each portion of each park, monument, or other unit in the national park system which on the effective date of this act embraces a continuous area of 5,000 acres or more without roads." Thus, nearly every acre now embraced within the national park system in Utah and nearly all the other States could be declared wilderness without affirmative congressional approval. Little thought is given to 99 percent of the people who visit our national parks who either cannot afford or do not wish to rough it in a wilderness area. The wilderness bill may therefore retard, not enhance, tourist development.

The Senator from Colorado discussed this point very fully.

Sixth. As noted in loophole 5 above, all units of the national park system could be made wilderness without congressional approval. Under the definition, "continuous area of 5,000 acres or more without roads," almost the entire land area of the Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area which are "units" of the national park system could be blanketed into the wilderness system without affirmative congressional approval. They were never intended to be wilderness areas; rather, they were intended to be recreation areas. This provision could effectively stifle tourist and recreational development in both national recreation areas.

Likewise, a bureaucrat with a wilderness monomania could easily interpret S. 174 and conclude that both Lake Powell and the lake created by the Flaming Gorge Dam are wilderness areas, since each of them consist of a continuous area of 5,000 acres or more without roads.

Seventh. Under 3(c) the 209,000-acre Dinosaur National Monument could also be made a wilderness area without affirmative congressional approval. No provision whatever is made for subsequent water conservation projects in units of the national park system. S. 174 could therefore create a major barrier to the eventual construction of the vital Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams. The Executive order setting aside the Dinosaur Monument area expressly provided that the order would not interfere with future reclamation and power projects within the borders of the monument. If water-parched Utah is ever to develop its precious share of the waters from the Green, Yampa, and Colorado Rivers, these two dams someday will have to be built.

Eighth. Section 3(c) cited in No. 5 above states that the areas in the national park system "on the effective date of the act" can be blanketed into the wilderness system. Between the time when the Senate passes the bill and the time when the President signs it, millions of acres of public land could be withdrawn through Executive order by the Secretary of Interior for national monument purposes. He could then blanket the areas into the wilderness system without congressional approval under section 3(f). The Secretary has already threatened to withdraw by Executive order from 1 to 6 million acres in Utah for such purposes if our people do not support his vast national park proposals. Again, over 46 percent of Utah could be locked up in this fashion.

Ninth. The same "on the effective date of the act" provision applies in the case of wilderness-type areas in the national forests, with the same opportunity for abuse. A potential 15 percent of Utah's land area is thus involved in section 3(b).

Tenth. Section 3(e) allows the affected Cabinet member to modify the boundaries of wilderness areas without the affirmative approval of Congress. Moreover, there is no limitation on the size of the proposed modifications. The committee report does say such revisions shall be "relatively small." But what does that mean?

In contrast, a specific limit is placed on the size of boundary revisions for primitive areas in section 3(b). This is just another of the inconsistent provisions of the bill.

Eleventh. While section 3(b) limits the size of revisions in the boundaries of primitive areas in national forests, there could still be over a 99-percent change in the land area finally included in the area under the loose language of the bill. This again could be done without hearings or congressional approval.

Twelfth. Section 3(g) permits the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to lock up proposed new wilderness areas for up to 5 years. Such recommendations could be made repeatedly for the same area. Congress could only reject such proposals if a resolution were passed by both Houses. This is even

worse than the end run around Congress and the Constitution already described in section 3(f). In the latter section, either the Senate or the House may veto; but in 3(g), both bodies of Congress must pass resolutions of rejection. These sections are hardly consistent. Moreover, both are dangerous.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I believe the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is prepared to submit an amendment to make them consistent, and it was intended by the committee that they be consistent. This provision was inadvertent, and the members of the committee are prepared to accept such an amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to know that the committee recognizes that loophole in the bill as it has come to us.

Mr. METCALF. That was omitted when the amendment was made in section 3(f), changing to the new kind of ratification and veto power.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to know the committee is prepared to go that far in making the provisions of the bill consistent.

Mr. METCALF. As soon as the Senator from Colorado returns to the floor, I am sure the members of the committee now handling the bill will accept the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well.

Thirteenth. No provision is made in S. 174 to preserve the right of access to State school sections or other lands. This should certainly be done or, alternatively, the States should be permitted to choose Federal lands in another location in lieu of the land isolated within wilderness areas.

Fourteenth. As the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, water and soil conservation are conspicuously ignored by S. 174. The possibility of such conservation activities is so circumscribed by limitations and redtape that it would require a miracle to obtain consideration for them. The same is true for prospecting, mining, and oil and gas activity. I favor protecting existing wilderness-type areas, but the limitations also apply to areas brought into the wilderness system under the loopholes that I have described above.

After carefully studying the bill, the report and the committee hearings, I am convinced that S. 174 is not carefully drafted; that little or no thought is given to the future of the western public land States; that the only interests considered are those of the less than 2 percent of our population who can afford the great expense of visiting isolated wilderness areas; and that the interests of the remaining 98 percent are ignored.

It can hardly be said that the right of "Congress to pass on expansion" of wilderness areas is "carefully guarded." Rather, it is "carefully" given away. S. 174 seems to me to call for Congress to abdicate its constitutional responsibility over the public lands to bureaucrats in the executive branch who are not elected and who are not responsible to the people.

The bill as it stands is a menace to the future of Utah and of the West, and I cannot support it unless the loopholes I have cited are removed from the bill. I am sponsoring or cosponsoring amendments to do so and urge the Senate to adopt them.

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I am sure my colleague is aware of the procedure by which wild, wilderness, and primitive areas are now created in the national forests—by simple order of the Department.

Mr. BENNETT. That is right.

Mr. MOSS. So it seems to me that the bill provides an extra step which must be taken, because if the Secretary then proposes to keep in the wilderness any lands he has now classified as primitive, he must submit that to Congress, and it must stay before Congress for a full session—from the first day to the last—during which time either House may by resolution overrule him. Therefore, we have taken away from the Secretary some of the power he now has over these areas.

But at the same time we are giving him vast new powers. I think it is time that we looked at the whole problem and determined whether Congress should pass initially on these programs, rather than continue in the present situation. That is the position I take. I see no reason for Congress to continue to abdicate its powers even though the abdication may be slightly less than it was before.

It is not clear to me what new powers the Secretary of Agriculture would be given. The Secretary of Agriculture presently has the power to classify parts of national forests in certain ways. Barring some action by Congress, that power goes on. How would we give him any more power under this bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will permit me, I believe we give the Secretary of Agriculture new powers. Some time ago, when I was discussing the general act, I pointed out there was a real question as to whether he has all the powers he has assumed under regulations U–1 and U–2. This was pointed out in the letter of the counsel of the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he said there was no clear decision on this matter. We would expand the powers of the Secretary by the bill.

Also, in this respect, whereas the Secretary may have previously assumed that he had the power to designate wilderness areas, this bill, which would permit him to include all this land in wilderness areas, would give him more than a mere regulatory power, which he had been utilizing under a previous act. This bill would give him a confirmed statutory authority which is made specific. Heretofore, it was only a power which he assumed he had.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not a fact that we shall be exercising our congressional authority to classify lands by saying we now, as the Congress, classify the land in this manner? Up to now the authority has been with the Secretary. There has been no appeal from his decision or any way to get at it. Now the Congress steps in and says, "We will classify it by reason of putting this language in the bill."

Mr. ALLOTT. That is the exact reason for the opposition. Although the Secretary has claimed this power for many years, between 1939 and this date, which is 22 years, the remaining 39 primitive areas have not been reclassified as wilderness areas. He has had that power all this time. Therefore, there has not been sufficient study upon the subject so that all the land could properly be blanketed into the wilderness system. This is one of the main points to which the objection of the senior Senator from Colorado goes with respect to his amendments. I shall offer such amendments later and discuss those matters more fully.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me on that point?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. One of the complaints many of us have had with respect to the primitive areas is that, under the present law, they are not being incorporated into the wilderness areas rapidly enough or that adjacent areas have been discarded. At my suggestion, the Secretary of Agriculture has held a hearing on the very important area of Selway-Bitter Root Primitive Area to determine whether or not that area should be incorporated into the wilderness system.

Many of us believe a good many thousand acres should be left out of the primitive areas and should be returned to national forests for the benefit of some small reclamation projects, development of timber, and perhaps some mining operations; but such activity has not been going along fast enough. One of the advantages I see in the bill is that it will require, in the next 10 years, an orderly reclassification and appraisal and a request to Congress to cut back and chop off some of these areas that have been for some 20 years classified as wilderness areas, and set aside out of remote, high, scenic land, wilderness areas.

I am sure the Senator from Idaho will agree with me that thousands of acres of Selway-Bitter Root area should be carved up and removed from the classification of primitive area and returned to national forest management.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has the floor at the sufferance of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. No; I yielded to the Senator for this purpose.

I will say to the Senator from Montana that this will probably result in eliminating some areas, I hope, but I do not think it will eliminate many. If the Senator really wants to eliminate areas, he can vote for one of my amendments, which will strike out the initial blanket inclusion of primitive areas into the wilderness system. We can then bring each such area in as Congress desires. We can do it by direct legisla-

tion. I do not think many primitive areas will be eliminated by the process provided in the bill, although, strangely enough that has been one of the arguments for the bill.

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, the senior Senator from Colorado indicated earlier that all the primitive areas had been created by 1939 and nothing had happened since then, that there had been a long period of blank activity. As a matter of fact, since 1939, when 83 areas were created, 34 have been reclassified as either wild or wilderness by the Secretary of Agriculture. Since the first wilderness bill was introduced, there has been one such reclassification. So the Secretary of Agriculture is going along, using his power at this time. If the bill does not pass, and the status quo is maintained, we can assume that matters will continue as they have been going since 1939.

Mr. BENNETT. Under the present regulations, the Department holds hearings before these wilderness or wild areas are established. So far as I know, there is no requirement that these hearings be continued.

Mr. METCALF. Yes, there is.

Mr. ALLOTT. I was not talking off the top of my head. If the Senator will refer to page 15 of the hearings, which contains the letter from the Secretary, it is stated in the top paragraph:

> Taking into consideration the transfers to national parks of lands previously within primitive or wilderness areas in the national forests and corrections in area calculations, the total area of national forest land classified for administration as wilderness has remained about the same as it was in 1939.

On the previous page it is stated specifically that there have been no new classifications of primitive areas since 1939. In fact, the last paragraph on page 14 of the hearings begins:

> No new primitive areas were established after 1939.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. On page 3 of the bill, beginning on line 24, it is stated:

> Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area,

And so forth. That provision states that for the creation of a wilderness area 90 days' notice must be given, there must be publication of the notice, and, upon demand of any individual, a hearing must be held.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is that in the bill?

Mr. METCALF. The reference is paragraph C, section 251.20 of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959. It appears on page 4, lines 1 and 2 of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Does this refer only to areas already in the primitive area system?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. The bill refers to the creation of wilderness areas from primitive areas. It requires the hearing the Senator from Utah suggested would be needed. That can be called upon the demand of any person. It would be a public hearing, after a 90-day notice.

Mr. BENNETT. I am surely happy to know that is behind the language on this page. To a person who is not a member of the committee and not familiar with section 251.20, this reference to a hearing is buried pretty deep.

Mr. METCALF. Especially since it is a reference not to the statutes but to the Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Madam President, I express appreciation to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, before concluding my remarks on the bill I wish to refer briefly to two things. I do not wish to discuss them in detail at this time, because I propose to do so later.

On page 10 of the bill a method is provided for making additional primitive areas wilderness. This is my greatest objection to the bill, that the Congress is permitted to act only in a negative way. The Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior have full power to act, and the bill provides that a Presidential recommendation based upon such action will become law if neither House of Congress adopts a resolution of disapproval. I do not intend to go beyond this statement now, other than to say that to me this seems a further surrendering of the legislative power of the Congress. It is impossible for me to imagine that we would surrender congressional authority to this extent and not retain control over the areas which have failed to be recognized as wilderness areas after so many years.

On page 14 of the bill there is a prohibition of uses which I think ought to be read into the RECORD, and I shall do that:

> Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas.

I do not know what the latter portion means. I presume it means the Secretary, in case a person were dying in the middle of a wilderness, could authorize a helicopter to go in to pick the person up. Certainly a jeep, truck, or car could not get into these areas without roads.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator has read the first half of page 14, which says what cannot be done.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have already read the remainder.

Mr. METCALF. The remainder of page 14, all of page 15, all of page 16, and half of page 17, provide what can be done.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have already discussed those.

Mr. METCALF. It seems to me the Senator should discuss both the prohibitions and what is allowed, in context.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think I have a right to follow the trend of my own argument.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator certainly does.

Mr. ALLOTT. I certainly do not object to the allowing of aircraft or motorboats where they have already been used.

I discussed in great detail subparagraph (2) of that provision. I pointed out what a golden lily was being dangled before the eyes of western people, when the only way some of the other uses in wilderness areas could be obtained was by going to the President personally.

The grazing of livestock, when it is well established, is provided for.

I have already pointed out that special treatment is provided for the Minnesota canoe area, where the people will be permitted to continue lumbering, although that is prohibited in all other wilderness areas of the country.

I have discussed all these things at some length.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may address a question to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator, provided I do not lost my right to the floor by so doing, Madam President.

Mr. BENNETT. When we were talking about a hearing, the Senator referred to the language on the top of page 4. This of course was an unexpected situation, so far as I was concerned.

I should like to ask whether the hearing referred to, made possible by section 251.20, will happen in advance of a declaration of the areas to be wilderness areas, or whether it will be a review after the Secretary has set the area aside, to give people an opportunity to come in to express themselves?

Mr. METCALF. The hearings must be held in advance. When the Secretary decides to set aside an area as a wilderness area he must give a 90-day notice. During that 90-day period, in advance of the final decision on the wilderness area, public hearings will be held on demand.

I wish I had brought along the hearings which took place on the Selway. There were several thousand pages of hearings, held in three different areas, upon demand of the people of those areas, as to what should be incorporated in the wilderness and what should be left out.

Mr. BENNETT. The thing which puzzles the Senator from Utah is the word on the first line of page 4, "review." One does not "review" in advance. One reviews after the fact. The language says:

> Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, * * * the suitability of each primitive area.

That is what makes it difficult for the Senator from Utah to understand how one can review in advance.

Mr. METCALF. I wish I had with me—I shall try to get it before the debate is over—the Code of Federal Regulations, to show the Senator there must be a 90-day notice, so that people will have an opportunity to know what is contemplated.

Mr. BENNETT. I can understand a 90-day notice of hearing. The question is whether it is a hearing to review something which has already happened. That is the way I read the language.

Mr. METCALF. It is my understanding of the bill that the primitive area will be incorporated into the wilderness system subject to the review as provided in the bill.

When the Senator from Louisiana this morning talked about the national forest areas, he was quite correct in saying that the only areas which are to be incorporated into this group are the national forest areas. Under the provisions of the bill, they are subject to the review. In the next 10 years the Secretary of Agriculture must, under the provisions in the bill, hold hearings and decide what will be in the wilderness system, and then make the recommendation to the Congress.

I wish to read paragraph (C) of section 251.20.

Wilderness areas will not be modified or eliminated except by order of the Secretary.

Mr. BENNETT. That does not say "created." It says "modified or eliminated."

Mr. METCALF. May I read all of the section:

Except as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, notice of every proposed establishment, modification, or elimination will be published or publicly posted by the Forest Service for a period of at least 90 days prior to the approval of the contemplated order—

I repeat:

prior to the approval of the contemplated order and if there is any demand for a public hearing, the regional forester shall hold such hearing and make full report thereon to the Chief of the Forest Service, who will submit it with his recommendations to the Secretary.

Mr. BENNETT. That would seem to be a provision which permits a hearing in advance of the establishment, modification, or elimination of the area.

Mr. METCALF. I should think so. It is the understanding of the Senator from Montana that it would. I hope that is the legislative history we are writing.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, may I intervene? What the Senator has stated is not a proviso of the bill.

Mr. METCALF. Yes, it is a proviso of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. The bill might contain that language, but the facts are that on page 3, line 19 of the bill, the statement appears that—

The wilderness system shall include * * * wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. So it is all frozen in.

Mr. METCALF. That provision in the bill, "wilderness, wild and canoe areas," is incorporated automatically.

Mr. ALLOTT. As well as "primitive."

Mr. METCALF. To be kept frozen in and incorporated under the bill, the primitive areas must be subject to the procedure outlined in the proviso beginning on line 23.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is true, but only partially true. On page 3, line 22, of the bill primitive areas are frozen into the wilderness system.

Mr. METCALF. Subject to the proviso beginning on line 23.

Mr. ALLOTT. Subsequently a review is provided. The area must be reclassified one way or the other by the Secretary during the next 10 years.

Mr. METCALF. On every recommendation the President makes to Congress there must be a hearing in the area if a demand therefor is made, under the provisions of the first three lines on page 4.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. But it would still be a review after the fact, because we are already putting the primitive areas into the wilderness system.

Madam President, I should like to talk about two or three other things that the bill might do. One of the things that it is contended the bill would do is to preserve wild game and animal life. I wish to add at this point only that in my opinion the bill would bring about the reverse. I think most people are acquainted with present-day practices of wildlife management whereby most of our wildlife are counted through the use of either a helicopter or an airplane. We must have a continuous cropping, because various side effects of civilization permit wild animals to grow and to reproduce themselves to a point at which they can constitute an actual conservation hazard.

For example, we do not have tribes of Indians roaming our mountains and deserts shooting wild animals, and thus constantly cropping them, as was the case at one time.

In addition, through the inroads of civilization there has been a great killing off of wildcats, mountain lions, and wolves, which are the natural enemies of game animals. So we have a constantly increasing crop of deer, elk, and moose. These animals must be continually cropped so that they will not constitute a hazard.

To use an analogy, the Forest Service has very stringent regulations with respect to grazing upon forest lands. Why do they have such regulations? They have them because they do not want the lands overgrazed. If sheep or cattle are permitted to graze vegetation to its very roots, the foliage is destroyed. Water cannot be held back. Consequently, erosion of the land by both wind and water is increased.

In order to maintain and keep adequate counts of herds within the wilderness area, it is necessary that helicopters be used. Unless they are used, there will be an increase in herds which, in the long run, will create a very definite conservation problem.

I should like to turn to another phase of this proposed program, which is the subject of recreation and tourism. For whom would the wilderness areas be created? I have already pointed out that 8 percent of our public land has been set aside for the use of 1 percent of our people. So upon the basis of equity those people already have eight times as much land for their use as others have. I do not object to setting aside a certain amount of land for wilderness use, because one enjoying such an area would require more land than would a person who uses an automobile or some like means of getting into an area. But let us remember that there would be no roads into the areas covered by the bill. For whom would we set aside the wilderness areas? We would set them aside for a selected and privileged few of our population. First, we would set aside the wilderness areas for the wealthy—men who can take their families, hire pack trains, horses, and guides for a period of 10 days or 2 weeks. That is one group for which we would set aside wilderness areas.

Secondly, we would set aside wilderness areas for a relatively small group of people who have led a fairly rugged outdoor life all of their lives. They are the ones who can put a pack on their backs and walk into an area for 15, 20, 30, or 40 miles.

But whom would we eliminate? We would eliminate the great bulk of Americans—those in the middle and lower income class, who do not have the money to afford the facilities of a pack train and riding horses to go into wilderness areas. First, we would eliminate such people, with their children, who cannot afford to go into wilderness areas under those circumstances because they cannot afford to equip and outfit themselves to go into wilderness areas. We would eliminate the great bulk of Americans.

Who else would be eliminated? We would eliminate all people over 60 years of age, or the great bulk of them, because in that entire group of people only a relatively small number have the physical stamina to pick up a 50-pound pack, which is about what would be needed to sustain themselves for a week or two—put it on their backs, and hike 20, 30, or 40 miles into an area. We would eliminate those people.

Through this bill in its present form, we would set aside, and lock up the most beautiful areas of our country for a few.

Those of us who oppose the bill are told that we are unreasonable and that we are trying to defeat conservation. Conservation is not involved. We are not unreasonable. But when the most beautiful sections of our country are locked up for a handful of people, we have a right at least to think about the other people in the United States, those who do not have the wealth to outfit themselves extravagantly, to hire horses for themselves and their families, and to hire guides. We must think about those people. We must think about the older people. More and more people are retiring all the time. What becomes of a

man who has worked on an assembly line all his life? Is he able to put a 50-pound pack on his back, and a 50-pound pack on the back of his wife, and walk 15 or 20 miles into a wilderness area? By locking up such areas we would deny them to the people I have described.

Then there is another great segment of our population that is denied the wilderness area also. That is the group of people who are physically incapacitated. There will be no roads, there will be no airplanes, there will be no helicopters, and there will be no boats or motors in this area; so all the people who are incapacitated—and these of course will include a great many of the elderly citizens of the country—will also be refused the opportunity to use these areas.

I should like, Madam President, because there have been so many remarks about this matter, to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Forestry Digest. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Advocates of Wilderness Already Receive Lavish Treatment, Conservationist Says." In it Virlis L. Fischer, a member of the Sierra Club and former president of the Mazamas, an outdoor mountaineering club headquartered in Portland, Oreg., makes that statement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVOCATES OF WILDERNESS ALREADY RECEIVE LAVISH TREATMENT, CONSERVATIONIST SAYS

[A Las Vegas, Nev., outdoor conservationist says that wilderness advocates already have received lavish recreational treatment by the very nature of the rugged terrain of western forests.

[The statement was made in a speech to the 50th Western Forestry and Conservation Association conference by Virlis L. Fischer, a member of the Sierra Club and former president of the Mazamas, an outdoor mountaineering club headquartered in Portland, Oreg.]

"Between the wilderness portions of the national parks and the wilderness system of the national forest, I would say that no other segment of the American public is receiving so much for so little," Fischer told more than 800 delegates and wives representing private and public forestry and conservation agencies.

Fischer took exception to wilderness recommendations advanced by some groups and contended that some of the methods used to advance these recommendations have been "unscrupulous."

"Multiple use and national forests are in danger and need your help," he said. "I appreciate the recreational opportunities that multiple use makes possible, as well as the access it provides to the back country, which I and my fellow hikers have never been known to refuse," Fischer said.

Keynote Speaker John L. Aram, vice president of the Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, said the forest industries' greatest opportunity during the next 50 years would be developing methods for extracting and using new materials from forest crops.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have another article published in the Forestry Digest printed in the RECORD at this point. The article points out, as I have stated several times, in quoting Mr. McArdle, that 8 percent of the national forests had only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the overall recreation visits for the year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS VISITS TO NATIONAL FORESTS LESS THAN 1 PERCENT OF TOTAL

A total of 68.4 million recreation visits to the nearly 181 million acres of national forests in 1958 has been reported by R. E. McArdle, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service.

Of that number, McArdle's report showed, there was a total of 556,100 visits to 14 million acres preserved as wilderness.

That means that wilderness areas—totaling nearly 8 percent of the national forests—had only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the overall recreation visits for the year.

Thus more than 99 percent of the year's recreation visits to national forests were made to areas managed by the Forest Service under the multiple use concept.

The 14 million wilderness acres are in 82 areas on 73 national forests in 13 States. California had the largest number of wilderness visits, 197,400; Minnesota was second with 104,000. Each of the other 11 States tallied less than 50,000 visits. Nevada had the smallest number, 100.

McArdle said the total number of recreation visits is a 12-percent increase over 1957—and an increase of 100 percent over the last 8 years. The wilderness area visits represented a 4-percent increase over the 534,500 visits in 1957.

"Demand for more facilities has been growing much faster than anticipated," he said. "In 1955 it was estimated that by 1962 there would be 66 million annual visits. But the 1958 total topped that figure by more than 2 million.

"A conservative revised forecast now indicates that recreation use will be 92 million visits by 1962, or 36 percent higher than the original estimate."

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, a very eminent gentleman, professor of forestry emeritus of the University of California, Emanuel Fritz, made a statement from which I wish to read portions into the RECORD. He says:

Our western wilderness areas are administered and protected by the Federal Government. In the Eastern United States the only large public wilderness area is the great Adirondack Preserve in New York. All the people of the United States have to pay for the extravagant area of wilderness set aside in the West. For the Adirondack Preserve, New Yorkers alone, without Federal help, must pay for the luxury. And yet, despite the concentrated population of that State and its neighbors, the Adirondack Preserve is used by a very small segment of their population. How long will the people east of the Rockies stand for footing the bill for our millions of acres of wilderness areas in the West and the protection of the watersheds from which we get our water, while they have to pay for their own in addition?

What is a wilderness? If it is an area of hundreds of thousands of acres without roads and trails it is a luxury for a very small number paid for by many. If steps should be taken to entice out into the wilderness the many people who need outdoor recreation, the wilderness area ceases to be a wilderness. If additional people are not so encouraged then the locking up of our present wilderness areas to use by more people can be described only as selfishness. One wilderness enthusiast wrote: "These areas are in jeopardy not only from exploitation—but also from development for recreation, even from efforts to protect and manage them as wilderness." This statement lets the cat out of the bag. The present constituted wilderness areas are not for the many but exclusively for a few who want no other human being within 50 miles of them. If wilderness areas are a real need, and they are, then they must be made accessible to those who should use them but cannot spare the time and money for extended time away from their work.

Then he goes on to speak about Switzerland and how that country has not suffered from development even though roads have been built in them. I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the quotations, as marked, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What is the situation in Europe? In Switzerland, for example, there are mountains the equal of ours, yet they are made as accessible as the terrain permits. If some of our mountain valleys were in Switzerland, they doubtless would hold permanent villages. Many of the Swiss mountain valleys support villages and the lower slopes are intensively grazed or used for commercial tree farming. Yet, the scenery remains superb, while accessibility draws people from the world over.

Since we have, in the West, such unsurpassed opportunities for areas specifically set aside as wilderness, let's take advantage of them. But let us not be selfish. Let us be reasonable as to their extent and the resources they lock up, and as to making them accessible to millions rather than only a few hundred. Let us have a few summer access roads and stopping places, so that those who desire to enjoy a wilderness but have not the time to go afoot can drive to a central spot, park their cars and take a day or 2-day hike. Such a road, wisely located, cannot damage the area. In fact, it might become a necessity for protection purposes. May I cite the famous Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia and North Carolina. That parkway has made an inspiring wild area accessible to millions and it has not taken away from the wilderness enthusiast the pleasure of using the old Appalachian Trail if he wishes.

Something important would be lost to America should we permit the extinction of our wilderness. More will be lost if we do not make it possible for more of our people to enjoy it. In a high-pressure civilization we need the inspiration of the great outdoors.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator has made reference, I believe, to the Adirondack preserve in the quoted material from which he has read.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator know that each time the question of the repeal of the Adirondack wilderness has come up, the people of New York have rejected it overwhelmingly?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am quite well aware of that.

Mr. CHURCH. Does not the Senator feel that the people by their vote have thus indicated their approval of the Adirondack wilderness?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. If the Senator had listened to all of my statement, he would have heard me say that Dr. Fritz also approves of wilderness, but he thinks it cannot be locked up for a few. With him I agree.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Reference has been made to the interest of the people of New York State in wilderness areas. In the statement which was prepared at the request of the Senator from Colorado, I note that while the State of Idaho has a total of 3,421,326 acres of total area subject to wilderness classification, the great Empire State of New York has a total of only 6,777 acres. When we think about the millions of people who live in New York State having an interest in recreational facilities it would appear that they are unwilling to create new areas within the confines of their State, but prefer to lock up areas in the State of Idaho and in other States of the West, so they can come out to the West and enjoy the recreational facilities out there, while at the same time they are stagnating the economic development of the Western States.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the Senator yield for a correction? I believe a correction needs to be made here.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will yield in a moment. I wanted to say something first. I think the point should be made, that, as I understand the situation, the Adirondack preserve is entirely purchased for and paid for by the State of New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. It is my understanding that the Adirondack and Catskill preserves comprise some 2½ million acres.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. The tourist industry is such a happy, good industry for States, we mean to encourage it, and we would not like to discourage it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The statement to which I have referred is in a column headed "Total area subject to wilderness classification." I presume that is under Federal supervision. The State of New York has 6,777 acres. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; that is correct. This is an entirely different situation. The Adirondack and Catskill wilderness areas, if my recollection is correct, were purchased by the State of New York and established as such. The 6,777-acre figure in the statement included in the RECORD is also correct, because that comes under the national wildlife refuge and game areas, and under the bill they are subject to classification as wilderness areas.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The constitution of the State of New York contains the so-called forever wild clause, protecting these State-owned areas. It has been one of the most dearly defended provisions of the constitution of the State of New York against attack for decades.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. At pages 14 and 15 of the bill, the bill reads:

(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including exploration for oil and gas), mining (including the production of oil and gas).

The junior Senator from South Dakota feels that that might be susceptible to interpretation, by specifying exploration for oil and gas and specifying production of oil and gas, that it would limit the prospecting to oil and gas, and mining to oil and gas.

I think the Senator from Colorado, much more than the Senator from South Dakota, is familiar with the general rule of interpretation that when something is specified, all other things are excluded.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at that point?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has raised a question, and the legislative history should be made perfectly clear. The parenthetical language, "including exploration for oil and gas," and "including the production of oil and gas," relates to prospecting and mining, which includes the other activities. So it is an inclusive clause, rather than an exclusive clause. The Senators in charge of the bill are on the floor. I am sure they would agree with this interpretation. This is what the language is intended to mean.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On page 8 there is a similar situation in lines 14 and 15, where the phrase occurs, "including, but not limited to."

I was about to suggest that similar language be inserted on page 15. After the word "including", in both instances, insert a comma and the words "not limited to,".

I have discussed this proposal with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. I had hoped that to avoid any possibility of misinterpretation, it might be agreed that the words "but not limited to" might be inserted after the word "including" in lines 1 and 2.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate the suggestion which has been made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. However, I feel that there is no ambiguity in the language; that the parenthesized words in each case are meant to make it clear that the exploration for oil and gas is included in the term "prospecting"; while the production of oil and gas is included in the term "mining."

I should think this colloquy on the floor of the Senate, if there is any ambiguity in the language of the bill, would make the congressional intent plain and thus eliminate the possibility that any court might misconstrue the language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it would be helpful if the court ever went back to the debate in the Senate. However, the debate in the House might not cover this point. Someone might argue to the contrary there.

Since the general rule of construction is that where there is specification, what is not specified is excluded, I should think the surest way would be to insert, on page 8, on lines 1 and 2, the words "but not limited to." Then we would have avoided any possibility of misinterpretation.

Mr. CHURCH. Has the Senator from South Dakota prepared an amendment to this effect?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. I have sent such an amendment to the desk.

Mr. CHURCH. I would have no objection to the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Dakota for the purpose of enabling him to present his amendment, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I ask to have my amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, lines 1 and 2, after the word "including", where it twice appears, it is proposed to insert, in each instance, a comma and "but not limited to,".

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the purpose of the amendment has been clearly stated. It would make the language then read:

(2) within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including, but not limited to, exploration for oil and gas), mining (including, but not limited to, the production of oil and gas),

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Colorado and the Senators who are in charge of the bill for their willingness to accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I am about to conclude my remarks on the bill, but there are one or two items I think should be discussed a little further.

Previously Congress passed a bill providing for an Outdoor Recreation and Resource Review Commission, which includes several Members of the Senate. We are asked in the bill to lock up approximately 65 million acres in a wilderness system. Yet the Outdoor Recreation and Resource Review Commission is to meet this month in Colorado Springs to prepare its final report, after having worked on it for some 3 years. The report is due in January 1962. This is another case of putting the cart before the horse, because in the proceedings of the third joint meeting of this advisory council, in August 1960, there appears, on pages 23 and 24, a paragraph with respect to the wilderness studies, which reads:

Work has been underway several months at Wildland Research Center, University of California. The contract study should fur-

nish: (1) Basic information on purposes of wilderness preservation; (2) an inventory of wilderness-type areas; (3) an analysis and projection of wilderness use—both recreational and nonrecreational; (4) an analysis of problems of wilderness preservation; (5) a compilation and evaluation of legislation and administrative regulations relating to wilderness preservation; and finally (6) an appraisal of the place of wilderness in the national pattern of outdoor recreation.

On pages 107 through 120 there is a discussion of the report of Study Group II, "Wilderness as a National Recreation Source." Here again, another study group discusses wilderness as a national recreation source. They say:

We have a wilderness study set up in one of our (ORRRC) budgets. We have had before the Congress this wilderness bill. We have had a hard time trying to pin down what wilderness ought to be and what it ought to include.

On page 118 the statement occurs:

But I believe we ought to have something come from these studies so that when Congress tackles the wilderness bill again, which I hope will be after this committee reports, it may have clearly in mind what is the thought, at least, of most of the people who are devoted to conservation and devoted to recreation.

I may say that it was the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who made the statement I last quoted.

The progress report of this committee speaks again about the integration of all uses. On page 11, the same report discusses the essential, fundamental questions involved.

Chapter III deals with "Inventory and Evaluation Studies," including wilderness preservation.

Chapter IV provides information on "Forecasts and Economic Studies," including each type of outdoor recreation.

Chapter V, page 61, relates to "Policy and Program Considerations." Again there is a discussion of wilderness recreation.

So there can be no question that we are putting the hind end to, so far as the Outdoor Recreation and Resource Review Commission is concerned.

The fact is that Congress has authorized $2,500,000 and has appropriated about $2 million for this study. Three years have been spent in making this study. Contracts have been made with universities and other State groups all over the country on the selfsame problem. Yet here we are rushing to legislate on the bill in the last few days of the session, when the very last meeting, or at least the meeting which is supposed to formulate the final report of the Commission, will occur in Colorado Springs within just a few days from now. We are bent on legislating in this area before the Commission ever has a chance to make its report. I cannot understand this procedure. It is one of those things that goes on constantly. Certainly it should not be condoned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On page 3 of the bill, under the heading "National Wildlife Preservation System, National Forest Areas," I read from line 19:

The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe.

Does the committee have, to the Senator's knowledge, any understanding from or statement by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as to whether there might be included, between the time the bill is considered by the Senate or Congress and the effective date of the act, which would be the date the President signed the bill, some additional areas to be designated for the wilderness system by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall yield to the floor manager of the bill, so that he may answer for himself. But, before doing so, I should like to address myself to that question. I have never had such an understanding, and I do not believe there is such an understanding. If there has been, it has not been disclosed to me.

Now I am happy to yield to the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. I will say that no primitive area has been created in more than 20 years. The last one was created in 1939. And there has been no indication from either the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service that there is any intention to add additional primitive areas before the effective date of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I raise the question because earlier in the day, when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], was reading an analysis he had made of the bill, he stated this as a possibility—in other words, that theoretically there would be a possibility that between the time when Congress acted and the time when the President signed the bill, additional areas might be classified as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe. I thought that in order to establish the legislative history, if the committee believes that the Secretary does not have that in mind, it would be well for the managers of the bill to have an opportunity to state that.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate that very much. It is a theoretical possibility only. In view of the stated position of the Department and the fact that no new primitive areas have been created in more than 20 years, I think there is no basis for alarm.

But I believe this colloquy is helpful, because it makes clear the understanding of the members of the Interior Committee who have dealt with the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, the Senator from Colorado has already inserted in the RECORD the sections of the Forest Service handbook which state the regulations in regard to how primitive areas may be changed into wilderness areas, and how they are to be administered. But nothing in that connection calls for the creation of new primitive areas. The only regulation at the present time is in connection with the administration of the existing primitive areas and for the creation of wilderness areas out of primitive areas. It is our understanding, and also the understanding as stated in conversations with members of the Forest Service, who have stated this as their understanding, that they wish to eliminate completely the classification of primitive areas, and that no new primitive areas will be created between the present time and the effective date of this measure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think this colloquy is important in connection with establishing the legislative history of the bill. In view of what has been stated, I judge that there will be no intent on the part of the Department of Agriculture to slip in something of the sort after Congress has acted and before the effective date of the bill. I would not expect that to be done in any case, because the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service, whoever they may be at any given time, are certain to be responsible public officials who would not attempt to slip something in in the course of a few days. But I raised the question because the Senator from Colorado has pointed out that a study is now being made, and we do not know what recommendations will result from it.

But if the managers of the bill state that it is not anticipated or intended that there be any immediate or sudden classification of that sort between the time of the action by Congress and the effective date of the act, I would think that statement in all good faith is all that is necessary.

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree; and I do not think it is likely to occur, especially in view of the circumstances. However, by keeping silent we might have been understood as agreeing with the Senator in one respect. In other words, I believe that additional primitive areas could be designated under existing law, although I do not think that will be done. But under the law of 1897, primitive areas were designated, and more could be, if that were desired.

Mr. METCALF. I agree with the Senator; by publishing it in the directory, they could create a new regulation. But I wished to point out that they have no regulation for the creation of primitive areas; the regulation is merely for their administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And during the hearings there was no suggestion or indication that they anticipate creating new ones?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct; none at all.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, none at all.

Mr. METCALF. In fact, today when the Senator from Utah submitted his amendment, it forestalled the making of any effort, during the period between the time of the passage of the bill and its effective date, to create additional fish

and wildlife areas; and during the course of the colloquy which was had it was stated that the only purpose of the committee is to maintain the status quo of the areas known at the time of the debate—the primitive areas, the national forest areas, and so forth—so that we know what is going into the system.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was under the impression that the amendment of the Senator from Utah related more particularly to lands under the administration of the Department of the Interior; and therefore I wished to raise this question in regard to the national forest lands, which would be under the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. METCALF. That is correct, and in this way I think the Senator from South Dakota has made a real contribution to the debate on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, in concluding my remarks, I wish to refer to two arguments made by the chairman of the Interior Committee in his statement on the floor of the Senate on August 24. The first related to the fact that if there is to be affirmative review by the Congress, Congress will never get through with its work. I should like to point out that there are only 39 primitive areas, and, under the provisions of the bill, they could be dealt with by Congress in blocs or groups. There are at present 29 national parks, all created by affirmative action of Congress. In addition Congress established 22 of the 83 national monuments. So, all in all, Congress seems to have been able to handle this work. In the latter part of his argument the Senator referred to the cost of the seashore areas, and used that point in a rather reverse way. It is true that we shall spend considerable sums of money on the seashore areas, but I merely wish to point out that we are not going to have to pay for the areas which are dealt with by this bill. So the point that the cost later on might be great is not a valid argument, because the areas which are the subject of this bill already belong to the Federal Government and cannot be disposed of. So they will cost the Federal Government no more 5 years from now than they cost it today. This is an important point.

Madam President, in conclusion I wish to state that I believe one of the most important statements made in regard to this matter was the one made by Mr. Hagenstein, during his appearance before our committee, as follows:

It is our opinion that the issue at stake in the wilderness bill is not wilderness itself but the idea of establishing a blanket wilderness system on millions of acres of Federal lands which as yet have not been inventoried as to their highest contribution to society. In these days when we plan everything else, how can we ignore the imperative necessity of inventories before deciding how to manage land? That is the crux of the wilderness bill. We think it entirely unnecessary because of the job which both the Forest Service and National Park Service are doing through formal means on the national forests, by the Secretary of Agriculture under his administrative regulations, and by administrative decisions of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to which portions of national parks are left roadless and otherwise undeveloped. As circumstances change, these officials, to discharge their obligations under the laws which established management policies for the national forests and national parks, must have flexibility to decide what use is to be made of what lands.

Madam President, I repeat that the issue before us is not the wilderness concept itself, but is the idea of establishing a blanket wilderness over which Congress would have only a veto power.

EXHIBIT I

ALASKA

Letters of February 1961 relating to S. 174 in the 87th Congress:

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
February 25, 1961.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Re S. 174 State of Alaska is concerned that lacking positive action by the Congress in the form of a concurrent resolution opposing such recommendations, 46 million acres of national forests, parks, monuments, wildlife refuges and game ranges in Alaska could be committed to the wilderness system by administrative action of the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. Request provision that nature and boundaries of area considered for inclusion in the system be subject to cooperative study and classification of the land on the local State level prior to recommendations to the President and the Congress. Would urge your presentation of these views at Senate committee hearings February 27–28.

WILLIAM A. EGAN, *Governor.*

STATE OF ALASKA,
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
DIVISION OF MINES AND MINERALS,
Juneau, February 24, 1961.

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

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: The pending measure is contrary to the expressed intent of Congress in a number of acts passed in recent years for the multiple use of public lands wherever possible. Mineral production need not destroy wilderness values, and will not under proper safeguards. Even though the proposed act may specify that the circumstances under which an area to be included will not be interferred with, we have found through actual experience that governmental restrictions have destroyed the multiple use concept and will continue to do so under the administration of measures such as the proposal.

In Alaska, where we are particularly desperate for the establishment of industry to support an economy which Federal defense spending has largely created and is now apparently leaving, we stand to lose much by such legislation. Over 80 million acres are presently withdrawn or highly restricted to the development of mineral resources in our State already. This legislation would tighten the restrictions in these areas and add more areas to the same category, not even allowing for prior evaluation of the areas to learn if mineral possibilities exist. It is not in the public interest to close off areas for a single use before an effort is made to determine what uses might be most beneficial and compatible. I have personally worked in one mining camp in a wild area that contributed large amounts of copper to the World War II effort, and that camp did not affect the wilderness values of the surrounding country.

For the good of the Nation and of the State of Alaska, we urge that this bill be not enacted or else amended to provide for true multiple use after a study of each area by all interested persons or a representative commission or other body established for that purpose.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. WILLIAMS,
Director.

ARIZONA

Memorial of 1959 relating to S. 1123 in the 86th Congress:

"Arizona Senate Joint Memorial 3

"A joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to prevent enactment of a proposed bill establishing a national wilderness preservation system and designating certain areas to be maintained as a wilderness

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"A bill has been introduced into the Congress of the United States providing for the designation and maintenance of wilderness areas within the States, and such areas shall be supervised and maintained by the Federal Government.

"It is acknowledged that the Government of the United States now owns approximately 70 percent of the land in Arizona. The enactment of this oppressive legislation would have the tendency to either increase the Federal lands within this State or to cause the Federal Government to exercise more stringent regulations over the land it already owns and controls.

"Federal lands within this State now include an abundant supply of wilderness reservations. It is entirely possible that rigid regulations, which might well be imposed, would deny the scenic wonders of these areas to many thousands of visitors annually. Moreover, such regulation might make fire protection difficult or more expensive or it might encroach upon the water rights of the State of Arizona. All these factors would retard the economic development of this State.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress of the United States consider carefully the impact of the proposed legislation relating to a national wilderness system since it appears to the Legislature of the State of Arizona that enactment of such a measure will unduly restrict the use of the wilderness areas and retard the economic development of this State. Moreover, the U.S. Government now controls vast areas of land within this State and any approach to this problem should be in the direction of relinquishing control rather than subjecting additional areas of land within this State to Federal control or cumbersome regulations."

CALIFORNIA

Resolution of April 1960 relating to S. 1123 in the 86th Congress:

"Resolution of the California State Board of Forestry pertaining to national wilderness preservation systems

"Whereas section 505 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California states in part 'the board is charged with the responsibility to represent the State's interest in Federal land matters pertaining to forestry and to maintain an adequate forest policy'; and

"Whereas it has come to the attention of this board that there has been introduced, in the current session of the Congress, S. 1123, H.R. 5523, and numerous other bills for the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system; and

"Whereas the State of California contains the largest area of federally owned lands which would be affected by such legislation; and

"Whereas the act of 1897 creating the national forests provides for the reservation of

forest preserves for the protection and production of timber and water; and

"Whereas such administration has been carried on through the years under the principle of multiple use to the end that such areas are adequately administered under this system, including the setting aside of special areas as wild areas, wilderness areas, and primitive areas; and

"Whereas the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has contracted with the University of California for an exhaustive study and report on wilderness areas: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the California State Board of Forestry hereby declares it to be to the best interests of the State of California to oppose the passage of S. 1123 and other similar so-called wilderness bills, and does hereby maintain the position that legislation establishing a national wilderness preservation system is unnecessary and particularly that such legislation should not be given consideration until sufficient time has been allowed for the completion of studies now in progress and a mature consideration of the problem including the constitutionality of the proposals now made; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the State forester, secretary of this board, be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the California delegation in Congress, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to other interested persons.

"Dated, Sacramento, Calif., April 22, 1960."

COLORADO

Resolution of March 1961 relating to S. 174 in the 87th Congress:

"A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"'*House Joint Memorial 10*

"'Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation which establishes a blanket policy of single use for Federal lands which would result in lessening the State of Colorado's resource base and preclude recreation for the multitudes

"'Whereas the Federal Government owns in excess of 1 out of every 3 acres of land in the State of Colorado; and

"'Whereas forestry, agriculture, mining, water development, oil and gas drilling, and recreation are the six basic industries of the State of Colorado; and

"'Whereas Federal lands are of great importance to our forest industry and provide a significant proportion of its raw material; and

"'Whereas Federal lands are an important source of water for our agriculture, industry, and domestic use; and

"'Whereas Federal lands provide countless opportunities for outdoor recreation; and

"'Whereas Federal lands are important present and potential sources of minerals and oil and gas; and

"'Whereas there is legislation now pending in the Congress of the United States which would establish a national wilderness preservation system and which would establish single purpose use for 50 million acres of western Federal lands; and

"'Whereas such legislation would preclude forestry, mining, grazing, and water development, and motorized recreation and other resource development, use and management: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein)*, That this general assembly hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation which establishes a blanket policy of single use for our Federal lands which would result in lessening the State of Colorado's resource base, and preclude recreation for the multitudes; and be it further

"'*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"'ALBERT J. TOMSIC,
"'*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"'ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"'*President of the Senate.*
"'GENE MANZANARES,
"'*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*
"'LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
"'*Secretary of the Senate.*'"

IDAHO

Memorial adopted in February 1961 relating to S. 174 in the 87th Congress:

"*Idaho House Joint Memorial 6*

"A Joint Memorial

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the economy of the State of Idaho is based upon its agriculture, lumber, mining, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas approximately two-thirds of the land area of the State of Idaho is federally owned and contains approximately 3 million acres set aside for primitive and wilderness areas; and

"Whereas these designations are restrictive to full utilization and deny to the natural resources industries of the State of Idaho the right to wisely develop the natural resources contained in these large primitive and wilderness areas of the State and further deny ready access to these areas to millions of American citizens, all to the detriment of said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State of Idaho is its tourist trade and wildlife attractions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho (the Senate concurring)*, That we are most respectfully opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive or wilderness areas in the State of Idaho and respectfully request that all primitive and wilderness areas in the State of Idaho be reviewed and studied with the view of eliminating all lands which have a higher or greater multiple use potential than that of single use dedication as primitive or wilderness; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we oppose Federal enactment of future wilderness legislation embodying the principle of locked-up areas for single-purpose use which would deny to the natural resources industries the right to wisely develop such natural resources and would also be to the detriment of said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the present agencies administering all Federal lands do so with the view of developing the full multiple use of the lands to further the general welfare and the economy of the State of Idaho; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the speaker of the house and to the president of the senate of the following States: Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and that these States are hereby urged to take similar action in this respective legislative bodies."

NEVADA

Resolution of May 1961 relating to S. 174 in the 87th Congress:

"A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"'*Senate Joint Resolution 6*

"'Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent the designation of any Federal lands in Nevada as primitive or wilderness areas

"'Whereas the economy of the State of Nevada is based upon its agriculture, mining, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and related purposes; and

"'Whereas more than 86 percent of the land area of the State of Nevada is federally owned; and

"'Whereas the designation as wilderness or primitive areas of any of such federally owned lands would restrict the full utilization of natural resources and deny to the natural resources industries of the State of Nevada the right to develop wisely the natural resources contained in such areas within the State, and would also deny ready access to these areas to millions of American citizens, all to the detriment of such industries and to the people of the State of Nevada; and

"'Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State of Nevada is its tourist trade and wildlife attractions: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to prevent the designation of any lands in Nevada as primitive or wilderness areas and the creation of locked-up areas for a single-purpose use which would deny to the natural resources industries the right to develop wisely the natural resources of such areas and would be to the detriment of such industries and to the people of the State of Nevada; and be it further

"'*Resolved,* That all agencies administering Federal lands do so with the view of developing the full multiple use of the lands to further the general welfare and the economy of the State of Nevada; and be it further

"'*Resolved,* That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to the Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of Nevada's congressional delegation, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

"'Passed by the assembly March 13, 1961.

"'CHESTER S. CHRISTENSEN,
"'*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"'NATHAN. T. HURST,
"'*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*

"'Passed by the senate March 2, 1961.

"'REX BELL,
"'*President of the Senate.*
"'LEOLA H. ARMSTRONG,
"'*Secretary of the Senate.*
"'GRANT SAWYER,
"'*Governor of the State of Nevada.*'"

NEW MEXICO

Memorial adopted in March 1959 relating to S. 1123 in the 86th Congress:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to decline passage of a bill establishing a national wilderness preservation system and designating certain areas to be maintained as a wilderness

"Whereas a bill is now under consideration by the Congress of the United States, which provides for useless and expensive regulations concerning the maintenance of wilderness areas and is generally burdensome upon the people of New Mexico and of the United States; and

"Whereas there is already an abundant supply of wilderness reservations in the Federal lands; and

"Whereas maintenance of lands as a wilderness area would make scenic wonders of the West inaccessible to many millions of people, and, as well, make such areas prey for insect pests and diseases, and, as well, make fire protection difficult and expensive; and

"Whereas it would encroach upon the water rights of the Western States, and retard their economic development; and

"Whereas the proposed National Wilderness Preservation Council does not seem necessary because it would duplicate and complicate existing services now capably administered; and

"Whereas the proposed legislation is premature until the Recreation Resources Review Commission has made its study of outdoor recreation needs and resources; and

"Whereas the proposed national wilderness preservation system is especially detrimental to New Mexico because of the unusually vast amount of federally controlled land within its boundaries; and

"Whereas this legislature and the responsible officials of the State of New Mexico recognize—

"That the social and economic welfare of New Mexico is best served by the present uses allowed of federally controlled land;

"That New Mexico has an abundance of scenic wonders of which access would be deprived by the proposed legislation;

"That the proposed legislation is burdensome and expensive to administer and will cause great inconvenience and financial hardship to the people of New Mexico;

"That the proposed legislation unduly restricts the use of federally controlled lands, and encroaches upon the water rights of New Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 24th Legislature of the State of New Mexico does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to insure that the proposed legislation or similar legislation relating to establishing a national wilderness system and designating certain areas to be maintained as a wilderness does not become law; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress, and to such other officials as the Governor of the State of New Mexico shall deem advisable."

UTAH

Resolution of March 1961 relating to S. 174 in the 87th Congress:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose national preservation acts

"Whereas a bill (S. 174) in its original form was introduced in the Senate of the United States of America, 87th Congress, 1st session, to establish a national wilderness preservation system, and it is anticipated that an identical bill will be introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America during the same session; and

"Whereas said bills, each to be known as a wilderness act authorize the withdrawal of large areas of federally owned lands and the continued withdrawal of federally owned or controlled lands in the future, upon decision of Federal officials into a national wilderness preservation system to be so protected and administered as to preserve the wilderness character of the lands withdrawn and contained therein; and

"Whereas approximately 72 percent of the land in the State of Utah is owned and controlled by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas any development of lands withdrawn inconsistent with the preservation of said lands for the single purpose of wilderness area is prohibited by the act; and

"Whereas Utah stands at the threshold of a new era of prosperity through the multiple development of mineral, water, agricultural, industrial, recreational and wilderness resources of its federally owned lands as presently permitted under law; and

"Whereas there was in fact legislation enacted in 1957 by the Congress of the United States establishing an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to inventory our wilderness resource and report to the Congress in 1961: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 34th Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That the 87th Congress of the United States of America be and is hereby memorialized to oppose and vote against S. 174 in its original form as inimical to the future development of the State of Utah and the prosperity of those U.S. citizens residing therein, and as premature and unnecessary legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the above be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, U.S. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, U.S. Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Representative DAVID S. KING, Representative M. BLAINE PETERSON, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming."

WASHINGTON

(Letter of February 1961 relating to S. 174 in the 87th Cong.)

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Olympia, Wash., February 24, 1961.

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

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: With reference to hearings on the wilderness system bill (S. 174), I regret that due to demands of our current Washington State legislative session, I will be unable to appear before your committee on February 27 and 28.

I do wish, however, to include in the record of your hearings, my statement of opposition to the enactment of S. 174 or any similar wilderness proposals prior to a complete analysis and report of our recreational needs by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Furthermore, the land managers and professional technicians within existing Federal agencies are adequately prepared and have available legal machinery to assess area demands on land use and to determine such use for the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Due to the tremendous adverse economic implications in the establishment of oversize wilderness areas in Washington State, I cannot urge too strongly the need to refrain from any premature legislation on this matter. It appears entirely unwise and illogical to rush action on S. 174 while the Resource Review Commission is studying the circumstance involved.

As a matter of record, I wish to point out that in the State of Washington, the following groups have voiced opposition to the enactment of wilderness system legislation:

Washington State Grange.
Washington State Cattlemen's Association.
West Coast Mineral Association.
Northwest Mining Association.
Society of American Foresters.
State game department.
State department of commerce and economic development.
Chambers of commerce.
Western Washington Resources Council.
State department of natural resources.
Public power groups.
Various forest products associations.
County commissioners.
Washington State School Directors' Association.
Various sportsmen's clubs.
Western States Land Commissioners' Association.
Railway companies.

Further, I wish to call your attention to Senate Joint Memorial 17, a copy of which is attached. This memorial is now under consideration in the regular session of the Washington State Legislature.

Yours very truly,

BERT L. COLE,
Commissioner of Public Lands.

"Proposed Washington Senate Joint Memorial 17

"To the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the Federal Government owns approximately 3 out of every 10 acres of land in the State of Washington; and

"Whereas forestry, agriculture, mining, water developing, and all types of recreation are the basic industries of our State; and

"Whereas Federal lands are especially important to our forest industry for a significant proportion of its raw materials; and

"Whereas Federal lands are an important source of water for our agriculture, industry, and domestic use; and

"Whereas Federal lands provide countless opportunities for outdoor recreation; and

"Whereas Federal lands are important present and potential sources of minerals; and

"Whereas S. 174 and other bills now pending in the 87th Congress would establish a national wilderness preservation system which would require single purpose use for 50 million acres of western Federal lands which would preclude forestry, mining, grazing, water development, motorized recreation, and other resource development, use and management: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialists petition to the Congress of the United States not to enact S. 174 or any other bill which establishes a blanket policy and single use for our Federal lands which tend to lessen the State of Washington's resource base and to preclude recreation for the multitudes; and be it.

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State send copies of this memorial to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

WYOMING

Memorial adopted in January 1961 relating to S. 174 in 87th Congress:

"Wyoming House Joint Memorial 7

"A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming

"Whereas, bills have been introduced in the last two sessions of the U.S. Congress to establish a national wilderness preservation system; and

"Whereas, these bills would create wilderness areas in Wyoming; and

"Whereas, the creation of such wilderness areas would interfere with the development of the State's water resources, and would jeopardize the multiple-use concept of the areas for the projection of water, forage, timber, minerals, and recreational opportunities, which multiple-use concept policy has been in effect for over 50 years, and has shaped the economy of the West; and

"Whereas, the welfare and interest of the citizens of Wyoming demand that there shall not be any further extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming; that, furthermore, if such wilderness areas are necessary and desired in other States, that areas adjacent to centers of population be purchased and returned to the wilderness state, believing that such a program would make wilderness areas available to more people of the country than the creation of such areas in the West; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator J. J. HICKEY, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON."

Passed only Oregon House of Representatives relating to S. 174:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

"Whereas there has been proposed in the Congress of the United States, Senate bill 174 to create a national wilderness preservation system, the effect of which would be to establish policies and procedures whereby existing wild, wilderness, primitive and roadless areas, as now established under Administrative regulations, would be made more rigid and inflexible in management, and under which vast acreages of other Federal lands could be added to existing wilderness areas without regard for the necessity or desirability of reserving such large acreages for the single purpose of wilderness use; and

"Whereas the establishment and maintenance of such inflexible restrictions on the use of federally owned lands denies access to vast areas which can and should be made accessible or developed for use by the vast majority of hunters, fishermen, and the vacationing public; and

"Whereas maintenance of such areas as proposed makes protection of these areas against destruction by fire and other natural and manmade hazards difficult and expensive; and

"Whereas any extension of existing wilderness areas, or the establishment of more stringent regulation of existing areas will unnecessarily and unwisely restrict the development and economic strength of many essential western industries including the forest products, mining, agricultural, oil and gas, tourist and other industries; and

"Whereas American wilderness is currently receiving the most thorough study in history by the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission established by Public Law 85–470 of the U.S. Congress whose findings will provide answers to how much and what kind of wilderness is needed to meet increasing population demands on America's limited land resources; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the people of the State of Oregon, speaking through the elected representatives, to seek the wise and beneficial development of God-given resources for the greatest benefit of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring)—

"1. We urge the Congress of the United States to:

"(a) Decline passage of Senate bill 174;

"(b) Decline passage of any legislation which would encourage extension of, or increase the rigidity of regulation of existing wilderness, wild, or primitive areas;

"(c) Decline passage of any legislation which would set aside any area of federally owned land for a limited and restricted use regardless of the need of such areas for other wise and beneficial use.

"2. Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the members of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to all interested agencies and departments of the State of Oregon."

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, at this time I wish to call up my amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Before the Senator from Colorado calls up his amendment, will he yield, so that I may make a unanimous consent request?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, the Senator from Colorado has discussed the bill, and has stated that he does not believe it is a conservation measure. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, immediately after the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, a statement made by the chief sponsor of the bill, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], which points up the relationship between conservation and multiple use and the relationship between wilderness and conservation, as he understands it, in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of conservation philosophy by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, prepared for the use of the Arizona Game Protective Association.

When your association asked me to make a statement of philosophy on conservation, I thought at first that it would be an easy task. But as I started to write, I realized that your request reached into almost every area of my background and into most of my present interests. I hope you will find acceptable these few words that I have sorted out and attempted to organize into this general statement.

There is a spiritual value to conservation, and wilderness typifies this. Wilderness is a demonstration by our people that we can put aside a portion of this which we have as a tribute to the Maker and say—this we will leave as we found it.

Wilderness is an anchor to windward. Knowing it is there, we can also know that we are still a rich Nation, tending to our resources as we should—not a people in despair searching every last nook and cranny of our land for a board of lumber, a barrel of oil, a blade of grass or a tank of water.

In my boyhood on a South Dakota farm I learned from my father the true meaning of conservation. This philosophy was instilled in me daily by him as he sought to make land on the Dakota prairies, and the philosophy I hold today reflects those early formative years in a family that loved the soil and all of nature's wonders.

Conservation is to a democratic government by free men as the roots of a tree are to its leaves. We must be willing wisely to nurture and use our resources if we are going to keep viable the inner strengths of democracy.

For as we have and hold dear our practices of conservation, we say to the other peoples of the world that ours is not an exploitive society—solely materialistic in outlook. We take a positive position—conservation means we have the faith that our way of life will go on and we are surely building for those who we know will follow.

The materialistic philosophy denies aspirations for the future. It would destroy the economic base upon which a successful society must rest.

It was close to 40 years ago that Aldo Leopold explained to me his wilderness ideas and helped me bring into focus my philosophy on conservation.

As I proceeded through life, and in particular when I was Secretary of Agriculture, I learned most forcefully that the practice of conservation involves some hard choices.

Many well intentioned citizens, honestly and sincerely motivated, make powerful and persuasive cases for following their suggestions to achieve conservation goals.

I believe that we have as our basic responsibility the preservation of a fertile mantle of soil on our Nation. To do this I believe that we must protect our water resources by controlling runoff and conserving its use.

I believe we must carefully harvest our renewable resources so that the amount we remove over any period balances the growth. The timber, the grass and the wildlife are rich examples.

I believe we must do more than just balance growth and harvest. We must replace what we take with a new crop high in quality and utility to mankind.

For the sportsmen this means wildlife whose species, size, and number provide a sound biologic grouping. For the stockmen, this means that the grass cover must feed his cattle and sheep so that their time on the range is profitable—not only this year but every year. For the forester this means the harvest of timber in a way that assures a new growth of usable wood.

Conservation applies also to nonrenewable resources such as our minerals. Here the choices are even harder because our knowledge of what more lies beneath the earth's huge surface is so woefully deficient.

Over a century ago there crossed the American scene a man from Massachusetts. He was an educator who achieved a national stature based upon the work he did in his native State. His name was Horace Mann. The admonition he passed on was to "be ashamed to die until you have done something for humanity."

A dedication to the cause of conservation is the highest cause to which we can dedicate our interest.

In so doing we dedicate ourselves to mankind's future and the full realization of our fondest hopes not only for ourselves but also for our fellow man.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from North Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], and myself, I call up my amendment 8–18–61—C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado, offered for himself and other Senators, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 17, to strike out all of lines 6 through 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

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

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, the amendment would merely permit within wilderness areas the gathering of information about water resources and would authorize the construction of underground tunnels under portions of a wilderness area where such facilities in no way disturb the surface.

In the bill as presently written, such activity is not permitted. There is actually a case today in the State of Colorado in which a tunnel should be built under a proposed wilderness area, although both portals would be outside the wilderness area. I refer to a tunnel to provide water for the city of Denver.

Under a literal interpretation of the bill, such activity would not be permitted. The amendment is to cure that specific situation and others like it. I think we may have to do more of this kind of thing later, but the amendment will improve the situation now.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Colorado has much to commend it. In the course of the committee's deliberations on the pending bill, we discussed and added the very section which the Senator from Colorado seeks now to amend. We added the provision in order that it might be possible for limited prospecting to take place within wilderness areas, without the need to secure permission of any kind.

We took care to provide that such prospecting should be for the purpose of gathering information about mineral resources and that it should take a form not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

As I understand, the Senator from Colorado seeks to add "water resources" to "mineral resources." I see no reason why the addition should not be made.

He also seeks to add any activity confined to subsurface use which is not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment. Here again I can see no objection to the addendum.

I think on the whole the amendment improves the original section by broadening it sufficiently to cover water resources, and by allowing subsurface activities that would not interfere with the wilderness environment on the surface, and therefore would constitute no intrusion upon the wilderness character of the area.

Therefore, Madam President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be accepted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and myself, I call up my amendment 8–18–61—F.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGLISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 12, between lines 6 and 7, to insert a new subsection as follows:

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO RECOMMENDATIONS

(I) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall each, in submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention in or incorporation into the wilderness system, include with such recommendations the independent views of the Governor of the State in which such area is located with respect to the Secretary's recommendations generally, unless no reply is received from such Governor within ninety days after such recommendations are submitted to him and his views thereon requested.

(2) Views submitted to the President under the provisions of (1) of this subsection with respect to any area shall be included with any recommendations to Congress with respect to such area.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, the amendment relates to that portion of the bill which specifies the procedure to be followed when a new area is brought under the wilderness bill. The amendment provides—and it was a provision that was in a former proposed draft—that the views of the Governor shall be obtained, if possible, and shall accompany any recommendations by the President to Congress for the designation of an area within that particular State as a part of the wilderness system.

Because this bill gives Congress a limited time in which to veto a Presidential recommendation for locking up additional areas in the wilderness, Congress should at the earliest opportunity have the benefit of the view of the affected State on such matters as:

First. The desirability and need for additional wilderness areas within the State.

Second. The nature and extent of any adverse effect upon existing or prospective development of all the resources of the area.

Third. The necessity for special provisions to accomplish special local situations, if any.

Therefore, Madam President, the amendment is offered to accomplish that purpose.

In my substitute bill there were other provisions for securing the advice of various departments of Government, most of which the committee discarded, on the basis that they were too unworkable and time consuming.

I think this amendment is wholly reasonable. It would be unwise not to solicit the views of the Governor of a State to be affected by a proposal for an addition to the wilderness system. He should be entitled, and properly so, to state the official position of his State.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, the case for the pending amendment has been well stated by the Senator from Colorado. The majority view of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would not in any way conflict with the submission of recommendations on the part of Governors of those States affected by the bill. On the whole we think this recommendation would be both pertinent and desirable. Therefore I see no reason to object to the pending amendment, and I express the hope the Senate will see fit to adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 19, after the word "proposed" it is proposed to insert the word "minor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I have discussed the amendment with those opposing the bill on the other side of the aisle, who are members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No objection has been raised to the amendment. It is essentially intended to clarify section (e) of the bill, beginning at line 19 of page 9. The present language reads:

Any proposed modification or adjustment of boundaries of any portion of the wilderness system established in accordance with this Act shall be made by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the vicinity of such boundaries and public hearing to be held in such vicinity not less than ninety days after such notice if there is sufficient demand dur-

ing such ninety days for such hearing. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

This provision was intended by the committee to make it possible to work minor adjustments in the boundaries of a wilderness area once established, so as to make it unnecessary to come to the Congress and obtain a special bill any time a minor alteration of a boundary became necessary or desirable. It is not the intention of the committee that this should be an escape hatch to permit the addition of large new tracts to the wilderness system, once established under other applicable provisions of the bill. Indeed, the committee took the precaution to expressly require in the bill an affirmative enactment of the Congress for the addition of new areas once the wilderness system is established. The purpose of the amendment is merely to make certain that this provision of the bill will not become an escape hatch, and to confine it to such minor adjustments of boundaries as time may make necessary.

The amendment would accomplish this purpose by inserting the word "minor" after the word "proposed" on line 19, page 9, of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 15, it is proposed to strike the words "national forest areas included in"; on line 18 after the word "the" it is proposed to insert the word "appropriate"; on line 19 it is proposed to strike the words "of Agriculture"; and on line 22 it is proposed to insert the word "appropriate" at the beginning of the line and strike the words "of Agriculture".

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, the purpose of this amendment will be at once clear if I read the section proposed to be amended in its present form and explain how the amendment will affect the language as it now exists.

The provision reads:

Within national forest areas included in the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become well established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable.

It is my feeling, and I think the feeling is shared by most members of the committee—I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished Senator from Colorado and other interested Senators on the opposite side of the aisle—that there is no reason to confine the stated exception to wilderness areas which are carved out of national forests.

In the Yellowstone National Park, for example, wilderness areas will be established as the result of enactment of the bill. In some of these wilderness areas the practice of motorboating, on some arms of Jackson Lake, for instance, may have become well established. There is no reason why the stated exception in the bill should not extend to wilderness areas in national parks as well as to wilderness areas carved out of the national forests.

There is no purpose here to open up the wilderness areas to uses which have not already become established. The only purpose is to permit the continuation of use of aircraft or motorboats when the practice has been clearly established.

The effect of the amendment is to extend such an exception to the general rule to all of the wilderness areas equally, rather than to confine it to the wilderness areas carved out of national forests.

I think the provision is equitable. I think it accords with the majority view of the committee. I have not heard any objection to the amendment. I hope there will be none, and that the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I offer an amendment to S. 174 which would give the States access to State lands within wilderness areas established under the bill, or indemnify the States for loss of such access.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, between lines 6 and 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

STATE SELECTION OF LANDS

(i) The incorporation into the wilderness system of any land otherwise available for selection by a State under Federal law shall not be deemed to prevent such selection.

STATE LANDS SURROUNDED BY WILDERNESS SYSTEM

(j) In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by lands incorporated into the wilderness system such State shall be given (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) land in the same State, not exceeding the value of the surrounded land, in exchange for the surrounded land. Exchanges of land under the provisions of this subsection shall be accomplished in the manner provided for the exchange of lands in national forests except that there shall be no reservation of minerals in any land patented to a State under the provisions of this subsection.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, the Western Association of State Land Commissioners unanimously adopted a resolution calling for indemnification to the States which will lose access to State lands in wilderness areas established under S. 174. Where State school sections or other State lands are isolated by wilderness areas, the State should be given an opportunity, if access is denied, to make in lieu selections of Federal lands in other areas.

My amendment would accomplish this objective, and I urge its immediate adoption. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by the Western State Land Commissioners be included following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION A

Whereas the Western States Land Commissioners Association has reviewed the purposes of S. 174, 87th Congress, 1st session, relating to the establishment of a wilderness system of lands; and

Whereas it appears that the adoption of this legislation as introduced could result in administrative difficulties for the respective affected States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western States Land Commissioners Association in convention in Seattle, Wash., on August 10, 1961, hereby recommends in the best interest of the 18 western member States that the aforesaid S. 174, 87th Congress, 1st session, be amended as follows:

1. Add subsection (i) to section 3:

"(i) The incorporation into the wilderness system of lands, otherwise available for selection by the States under the provision of applicable U.S. statutes, shall not be deemed such an appropriation as to foreclose or impede State selection thereof."

2. Add subparagraph (1) to subsection (g) of section 6:

"(1) Whenever an area including State-owned land is incorporated in the wilderness system, provision shall be made for access to such land adequate for the reasonable exercise of its rights therein by the State and those claiming under it, and the agencies administering lands within the wilderness system are hereby directed to cooperate with the State in establishing such access and authorized to grant, for reasonable consideration, the easements necessary therefor: *Provided, however*, That, if the recommendation by which an area including State-owned land is incorporated in the wilderness system shall fail to provide for access to the State-owned land therein, then the owning State may, at its election, use the included State land as base in making indemnity selection of lands including the mineral rights therein as provided in applicable U.S. statutes."

3. Add:

"Prior to permanent establishment of wilderness area boundaries, Federal, State, and private technicians shall be directed to make a detailed study of proposed boundaries in order to prevent inclusion therein of areas which have value for public benefits higher than wilderness use."

Resolution A was approved by the following land commissioners at their annual conference in Seattle, Wash., on August 10, 1961:

Alaska: Roscoe E. Bell, director, division of lands.

Arizona: Obed M. Lassen, land and water commissioner.

California: Frank J. Hortig, executive officer, State lands commission.

Colorado: A. M. Ramsey, president, Colorado State Land Board.

Hawaii: James J. Detor, chief, land management division.

Idaho: John G. Walters, commissioner, State land department.

Montana: Mons L. Teigen, commissioner, department of State lands and investments.

Nebraska: Elmer H. Mahlin, secretary, board of educational lands and funds.

Nevada: Joyce Maddaford, deputy State land register, representing Hugh A. Shamberger.
New Mexico: E. S. Walker, commissioner of public lands.
North Dakota: Anton J. Schmidt, commissioner, State land department.
Oklahoma: Woodrow George, secretary, commissioners of the land office.
Oregon: E. T. Pierce, clerk, office of State land board.
South Dakota: Bernard Linn, commissioner of school and public land.
Texas: Not represented.
Utah: Lee Young, director, State land office.
Washington: Bert L. Cole, commissioner of public lands.
Wyoming: Ken Bell, commissioner of public lands.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, it is important for all the public-land States in the West to have this privilege, and I hope the manager of the bill is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. As I read the amendment hastily, it applies only to State-owned land.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. It is the land now owned by the States which, because of the pattern of school section selection, lies largely within wilderness areas.

Mr. METCALF. No other privately owned land would be affected.

Mr. BENNETT. The amendment is not concerned with privately owned land.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. This is the first time I have seen the amendment. I really have not had an opportunity to study it. I should like to ask the Senator a question relating to the last sentence in the proposed amendment:

Exchanges of land under the provisions of this subsection shall be accomplished in the manner provided for the exchange of lands in national forests, except that there shall be no reservation of minerals in any land patented to a State under the provisions of this subsection.

Now, I am personally sympathetic with the acquisition of mineral rights by the States, wherever "in lieu" lands may be involved. I am hopeful that we can work such changes as may be necessary in the Federal laws to permit the States to acquire such mineral rights. But the provision in the Senator's amendment is contrary to the present law and policy. I think it would be far better if proposed legislation of this kind were presented to the appropriate committee where it could be studied in the context of the whole problem, and where appropriate remedial legislation could be considered in the proper way.

I am concerned about the last sentence of the Senator's amendment and wonder if the part that refers to the reservation of mineral rights might not be stricken from the amendment so that this subject could come up in the ordinary course before the proper Senate committee?

Mr. BENNETT. The problem is that there may be land inside an area which is to be added or included in the wilderness area which is known as mineral land, and under those circumstances I think a State should have the right to obtain mineral land in exchange for it, rather than leaving the Federal Government the right to say, "Take this land, whether it has any mineral in it or not."

The theory of the State school sections is, of course, that the State has such a right, and unless the State were given an opportunity to exchange land for land or value for value, we could have a situation in which State land with mineral value is locked up inside a wilderness area; and the State, though it would retain title to the land, would be denied access to it.

The proposed language, even though it may be different from existing law, would change the language in the new wilderness bill. I think a requirement for special consideration would be set up.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not argue the merits of the Senator's proposal. If a State is denied land with mineral content and must exchange that land for Federal land, I think the State is entitled to receive from the Federal Government land of comparable mineral content. But such will not necessarily be the case in every instance. There may be State land with no mineral value relinquished to the Federal Government, and under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from Utah it would be necessary for the Federal Government to exchange land without reserving mineral rights, and so we would have an unequal exchange, which I am not sure would serve the public interest.

I believe the amendment serves to point out the propriety of bringing a subject of this kind, which goes to a question of general policy, to the appropriate committee of the Senate in which it can be given the necessary study.

While I might be willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Utah and take it to conference, without the last sentence, I feel I would have to oppose the amendment unless that sentence were omitted, because it relates to a question that should properly be brought before a Senate committee and given the necessary study.

Mr. BENNETT. The State land commissioners, from whose resolution the Senator from Utah drew this idea, are anxious to be protected in their right to acquire mineral rights.

The Senator from Utah does not feel that any point would be served in agreeing to set up an exchange of lands without preserving that right. So if the manager of the bill feels that he cannot accept the amendment, perhaps the Senate should vote on it.

Mr. CHURCH. Existing law fully protects the rights of States wherever land involving mineral rights has been lost to them. They have the right of selection. It is based upon careful surveys. There is no reason to assume that existing law is deficient. If changes in existing law are needed, the way to obtain them is not by tacking onto an amendment a sentence that otherwise is not related to the bill.

I urge the Senator from Utah to conclude his amendment at the point at which it reads:

Exchanges of land under the provisions of this subsection shall be accomplished in the manner provided for the exchange of lands in national forests.

That would relate the question to existing law. Changes proposed in existing law can then be taken up at the proper time by the proper committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have had no opportunity until now to study the amendment. I believe I see the situation with which the Senator is concerned. Under present law, in the case of such an exchange as is proposed, the State would not get the minerals under the land it would receive; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct, though there may be minerals under the land the State acquired under the school section law.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the State exchanged such land, it might exchange land with minerals under it, but would not receive the minerals under the land exchanged by the Federal Government.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I suggest to the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho, who is in charge of the bill, that I believe a problem has been presented. I do not believe the specific question was raised in the committee. At least I do not recall it. Does the Senator recall it?

Mr. CHURCH. No, I do not recall the particular question arising in the committee.

Mr. HICKEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask the Senator from Wyoming to permit me to finish, if I may.

I really see no objection to the amendment. It would merely guarantee that in an exchange a State would obtain the minerals on any land that it received. If there were serious objection, we could certainly iron it out in conference.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to state my position on the amendment. In the first place, the wilderness bill in no way affects States rights in the matter of selection of Federal lands. Therefore it is inappropriate to attempt in an amendment to the wilderness bill to change existing policy. If we are to change existing law and policy, we ought to do it in a proper way. We ought to take it up, carefully consider it in committee, and bring to the Senate a bill designed to accomplish that objective.

I might take the amendment as far as it goes without injection of a question that really is unrelated to the wilderness bill. I suggest to the proponent, the distinguished Senator from Utah, that he accept a modification of this amendment that would substitute in place of the final sentence two sentences, the first to read:

Exchanges of land under the provisions of this subsection shall be accomplished in the

manner provided for the exchange of lands in national forests.

The second sentence would read:

Nothing in this bill shall defeat the State's right to select lands under the applicable land laws.

Such a provision would make perfectly clear that States would have all the rights they have under existing law, and it would leave the question of changing fundamental Federal law and policy to the consideration of the appropriate committee having jurisdiction. I believe that, if so amended, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah might then be acceptable.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the Senator's comment. I should like to hear from the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HICKEY. I discussed this problem with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Certain lands located in wilderness areas in Wyoming are surrounded by wilderness areas, and I discussed the subject with the chairman of the committee. He took up the question with the Department of the Interior. The letter he received from the Department was then forwarded to me. As I recall, the analysis was that the problem which the Senator from Utah has confronting him in connection with the amendment, and which is disturbing to him, is the very problem that we in the West have had over a number of years.

We have been permitted in connection with these lands to make an exchange of lands, but this has never been accomplished. There is the problem of the State agreeing with the Federal Government as to the value of the exchange. It was the opinion of the Department of the Interior at that time that this could not be accomplished by legislation; that it was a problem of administration, that is, the determination between the State agency and the Federal agency of the exchange value.

I do not know how this could effect an equitable exchange, but I believe the problem the Senator from Utah is confronted with is the problem of all of our Western States, where we have lost some State lands by virtue of some acquisition on the part of the Department of the Interior. Our remedy is an exchange. However, the exchange is never effected, because there can never be agreement upon the value between the State agency and the Federal agency. Is that the basic problem, in the Senator's opinion?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. The State land commissioners of the Western States feel that if the law provides that they shall have a right to exchange mineral lands for mineral lands, they will be in a better position than they are in now.

Mr. HICKEY. I am sure that is true.

Mr. BENNETT. However, in this situation we lock up the State land. The situation is different if it is in open territory and accessible. Here the land would be locked up in the middle of a wilderness area. If an obdurate department head says, "We will not exchange mineral lands for the mineral lands you have," the State is effectively deprived of some of the values which in our State of Utah help support our educational system.

I have sympathy for the position of the Senator from Idaho, who is in charge of the bill on the floor of the Senate. I am wondering whether there is any way by which this can be accomplished through the conference process. If I accept the language he suggests, then, of course, there is no problem for the Federal Government, but the State problem remains. The State is still unable to get value for value unless the Federal Government is willing to provide it.

Mr. CHURCH. If we were to amend the amendment as I have suggested, the amendment would accomplish the principal objective the Senator has in mind, for it would read:

The incorporation into the wilderness system of any land otherwise available for selection by a State under Federal law shall not be deemed to prevent such selection.

It would further provide:

In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by lands incorporated into the wilderness system such State shall be given (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) land in the same State, not exceeding the value of the surrounded land, in exchange for the surrounded land.

That is the objective. But with respect to retaining mineral rights, I respectfully suggest to the Senator that this is a question for appropriate legislative action, after careful study by the appropriate committee, and has no place in this wilderness bill. The modification I propose would merely leave the States in statu quo, and would make it clear that there is no diminution of States rights in any way resulting from the enactment of the pending bill.

Mr. BENNETT. The first choice, providing that the State shall have adequate access, would in fact defeat the value of the wilderness bill, assuming there were a very valuable mineral in a State school section, and the State were to decide that it was worth money to drive a road through the wilderness to get to it. This would change the situation with respect to existing law, because we would be imposing particular restrictions, in spirit, at least, with respect to access to the land.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate this discussion. I suggest that the following language might resolve the problem, and would provide a permissive situation. I suggest that after "(2)" and following the word "land" we insert a comma and add the words: "which may include minerals in the same State," then follow the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho by putting a period after the word "forests," and by striking the rest of the language. That would accomplish the purpose, I believe.

Mr. BENNETT. How would the language then read?

Mr. ALLOTT. It would read:

(1) Such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) land, which may include minerals, in the same State, not exceeding the value of the surrounded land, in exchange for the surrounded land. Exchanges of land under the provisions of this said section shall be accomplished in the manner provided for the exchange of lands in national forests.

I would strike the rest of the language.

Mr. BENNETT. If we do that we are simply moving the words up further in the sentence, it seems to me.

Mr. CHURCH. I believe the proposed revision of the amendment does not reach the situation where the State relinquishes land that has no mineral value and seeks Federal land with mineral value in exchange.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is permissive.

Mr. CHURCH. My modification makes it clear that the present law continues in this situation. We ought not to write a change into the present law except by the appropriate committee processes and on an appropriate bill. The pending bill is not an appropriate bill for that purpose. Therefore, I ask the the Senator to accept the modification I have urged, because under the modification the major objectives he seeks are accomplished, and we do not have the other problem at all.

Mr. ALLOTT. Would the Senator read his suggestion?

Mr. CHURCH. The suggestion I have made is that the last sentence of the proposed amendment be stricken and that in lieu thereof two new sentences be added. The first one would read:

Exchanges of land under the provisions of this subsection shall be accomplished in the manner provided for the exchange of lands in national forests.

The second sentence would read:

Nothing in this Act shall defeat the State's rights to select lands under the applicable land laws.

I believe that would accomplish the major purposes of the amendment, but it would not involve us in the other difficult question.

Mr. ALLOTT. If I am mistaken, I would like to be corrected, but I understand at the present time the applicable State laws to which the Senator's last sentence refers would not in any instance give the State the right to any of the minerals under the act.

Mr. CHURCH. The law that I have referred to is the applicable Federal law.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct. However, under that law, if they received a patent from the Federal Government, they would not receive the minerals. The State may have lands with respect to which it has no mineral title. If it were seeking to trade such lands for lands which do involve a mineral title, this might be fair or unfair to the Federal Government. On the other hand, if the State has a piece of land with minerals under it, what the Senator from Utah and I are trying to suggest is that it should be entitled to trade for land with minerals under it. However, the present applicable law would not permit it to do so.

Mr. CHURCH. I am in disagreement with that statement. I have studied this field rather carefully, because I am interested in legislation which would relate to it.

My understanding of the present Federal law is that where a State has been deprived of lands having mineral content, the State may select "in lieu" lands which have mineral content, and that in such a case neither the present law nor regulations prevent the State from acquiring mineral lands. This only points up the extent of the complexity in this whole field, and the importance of legislating on it in a proper way.

The modification I propose eliminates this vexing question, yet accomplishes the principal objectives which the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] has in mind. I urge him to accept my proposed revision.

Mr. BENNETT. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Idaho, let me pursue the question from the point of view of making a little legislative history? Do I correctly understand the Senator from Idaho to say that under the present Federal law and policy, if there is mineral under a piece of State land, the Federal Government may undertake, in exchange, to see that the land taken in exchange also is mineralized?

Mr. CHURCH. The selection of any "in lieu" land is left to the State. But under present Federal law and policy, it is my understanding that, where the Federal Government has acquired State land which has mineral value, it is permissible for the State to select "in lieu" lands having comparable mineral values. This has not always been Federal policy, but it has been the Federal policy for a number of years.

There may be a need for further correction in the Federal law to take care of earlier cases, but that is a proper subject for careful committee inquiry. I favor bringing a separate bill to the floor of the Senate to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. So far as I am concerned with respect to this amendment—and I am not concerned now with the exact language—if in the case of State school sections surrounded by wilderness area the land which now belongs to the State inside the area is mineralized, the State should have the right to select mineral land in its place. If it is not mineralized, I do not think the State wants the right to select mineral land in its place. If it were possible to write words at the end of this section which would indicate that it is the purpose of the amendment to protect both the law and the policy, the Senator from Utah would be glad to accept such language. I am not trying to give the State something it does not have. I am trying to protect the State in the value it now has.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. It seems to me that as the amendment is written it makes new law, because it allows the States to go into the primitive areas and make selections, and then in lieu of that land in the primitive area——

Mr. BENNETT. No.

Mr. METCALF. Yes. The language in paragraph (i) reads "otherwise available for selection." The State could say that it wanted to make a selection in the primitive area, and then in the exchange the reservation of minerals would not be applicable. So they exchange land outside the primitive area or outside the wilderness area, and there would be no exchange of minerals or reservation of minerals, which is a departure from the present law and a departure from the agreement which the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] have reached.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, rather than continue the discussion, I suggest that I be allowed to withdraw my amendment temporarily. The Senator from Idaho, the Senator from Montana, and I can confer between now and some time tomorrow to see if we can devise language which will more effectively protect the present rights of the States.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate that suggestion. I wish to cooperate with the Senator in any way I can. I must say, though, in order that the RECORD may be clear, that the first part of the amendment also is objectionable. I had not had sufficient time to study it carefully enough, in the first instance, to raise objection, but I must say that I think the first part of the amendment would not be acceptable, and we would have to discuss that question, too, between now and tomorrow.

Mr. BENNETT. I shall be happy to discuss the entire amendment.

Madam President, I ask permission to withdraw my amendment from consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the privilege of withdrawing his amendment, and the amendment is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, during the discussion of the hearing procedure, the Senator from Utah outlined some procedure by which the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area would be taken out of the present primitive area. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brochure which was prepared by the Forest Service describing the land to be taken, and also the public notice of hearings concerning the proposed establishment of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area.

There being no objection, the brochure and public notice were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELWAY-BITTERROOT WILDERNESS PROPOSAL

The proposed plan is in accord with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's policy of reviewing all national forest primitive areas and establishing as wilderness those portions predominately valuable for that purpose.

The proposed wilderness boundaries for the Selway-Bitterroot area will eliminate weaknesses posed by existing roads and by the established use of motor vehicles on those roads. For the most part, the changes in boundaries are required because of roads which penetrate parts of the present primitive area or which cross it completely.

Under the proposal, a 1,163,555-acre wilderness area, encompassing the major features of the present primitive area, will be established from the existing 1,876,000-acre area heretofore classified as a primitive area.

The Forest Service proposal will establish boundaries which include the logical parts of a wilderness. For the most part these boundaries are placed on well defined topographic features which are easily identifiable on the ground. The proposed boundaries are also located to eliminate or minimize the threat of future conflict with other land uses.

The proposed Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area includes much of the Bitterroot Mountains, a 45-mile roadless section of the Selway River, and a portion of the Lochsa River drainage. It lies in four national forests: The Lolo, Bitterroot, Nez Perce, and Clearwater in Idaho and the Lolo and Bitterroot in Montana. It averages nearly 50 miles long from north to south and 40 miles wide from east to west.

The purpose of the proposal may be better understood against a brief background of history. In 1929 the Secretary of Agriculture put into effect regulation L–20. It provided for experimental forests and ranges and for a "series of areas to be known as primitive areas within which will be maintained primitive conditions of environment transportation, habitation, and subsistence with a view to conserving the value of such areas for purposes of public education and recreation." The regulation prohibited construction of permanent improvements other than for administrative needs and certain types of occupancy. It allowed continued use of roads and of improvements in place.

During the next 10 years, 73 primitive areas totaling 13½ million acres were established under regulation L–20. Many of these areas, including the Selway-Bitterroot, were selected with the idea that further study and possible changes would be necessary before some could be completely qualified as having true primitive conditions.

Boundaries were drawn to include all parts of an area which might qualify. The boundary lines were, of necessity, based on then existing general knowledge of the area rather than on thorough, on-the-ground surveys. Also, at that time, there was less activity near the borders; little thought was given to establishing boundary lines that would protect the primitive environment from nearby developments.

In 1939, after 10 years of experience in administering primitive areas, the Secretary of Agriculture issued new regulations. These provided for studies of existing primitive areas and directed that portions which qualified and whose greatest values were as wilderness be classified as either wilderness or wild areas under the new regulations, U–1 and U–2. These regulations defined "wilderness" more clearly and they require higher standards of wilderness areas. They also give added assurance of permanence.

In 1934, just 2 years before the primitive area was set aside, two fires burned nearly a quarter of a million acres. These fires had been preceded by huge burns in 1919 and 1910. Considering the fire history of the area at a time before aerial fire control had become effective, the Forest Service had planned a network of fire roads. When the area was set aside, it was decided that roads already in the area would be used and maintained. Roads under construction would be finished, at least to logical stopping places. This was done except for the roads in Running Creek and below Paradise along the Selway River which were never completed. Plans for additional fire control roads were canceled in keeping with the new designation of the area.

Since the road over Nez Perce Pass to the Magruder Ranger Station and Elk City, Idaho, completely traversed the head of the Selway drainage, it was considered by some to be the logical south boundary of the primitive area. But, because of the undeveloped country south of the road and the desire to keep that country undeveloped pending fur-

ther studies, it was included in the primitive area.

When the primitive area was established in 1936, there were 46 irrigation reservoirs in use on the east face of the Bitterroot Mountains within the boundaries. Twenty-five are still under special use permits. However, history indicates that a number of those still in use, especially the very small ones high up in the inaccessible canyons, will be abandoned. Reservoir users are entitled to reasonable access. If a permanent road should be needed to service a reservoir, the part of the drainage affected by the road would be removed from the proposed wilderness area by boundary adjustment. Even though several drainages could be affected in this manner, the east face of the Bitterroot Range remains highly desirable as wilderness.

Much of the Selway River drainage is covered by power withdrawals. The only project included in the latest Corps of Engineers' recommendations is the Penny Cliffs Dam. This would back water a short distance inside the proposed wilderness. A simple boundary adjustment could remove this part of the reservoir from the proposed wilderness area. This project is not considered serious in its possible impact on the proposed wilderness area.

One of the largest elk herds in the United States is found in the proposed wilderness. Large fires in 1910 and 1919 created large brush fields which were further increased by the fires in 1934. As a result of increased food supplies in the burns, the number of elk in the area increased considerably. Most of the old burns serve as summer range for the elk. There is a shortage of winter range, especially along the Selway River, where heavy losses of elk occur during severe winters.

Increased harvest, limited now by inaccessibility, is needed in order to maintain a healthy and reproductive elk herd, to insure adequate winter forage, and to prevent soil damage and erosion. The proposed boundary adjustments should help make a more adequate harvest possible. The connecting links between the road at Paradise and the Running Creek road will provide areas for packer base camps and jumping off points for general public hunting in the wilderness area. A part of the present primitive area lying along the south side of the Lochsa is excluded from the proposed wilderness because of the proximity of the highway. This excluded land will provide access to additional hunting area. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Forest Service are working together to manage and protect the elk range and the highly important herd which depends on it.

The proposed Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area is also the home for other big game such as moose, mountain goats, white tail deer, mule deer, and black bear.

The greatest recreation use in the proposed wilderness is hunting, largely for elk on the side drainages of the Selway and Lochsa Rivers. While much of the area has light recreation use, fishing is increasing on the Selway River and in the high Bitterroot lakes. There are many miles of trout streams and numerous lakes which provide good fishing. There is a small but steady increase in the number of persons whose main purpose in visiting the area is simply to enjoy wilderness atmosphere, or to indulge in photography or other esthetic or educational interests.

Visitors seeking a wilderness atmosphere can find numerous and varied opportunities among the variety of land forms in the proposed area. There is little similarity between a trip along the 45-mile roadless stretch of the Selway River and a trip along the backbone of the Bitterroot Range. Mountain climbers can find many challenging peaks, while the canyons on the east face of the Bitterroot Range are readily accessible in relatively short walks or rides. One-day trips into these canyons from Highway 93 can be enjoyable wilderness experiences. A 3-day trip permits a full day at one of the high lakes, while visitors with more time can spend an interesting week in such drainages as Big Creek, Blodgett, Rock or Tin Cup Creeks. Trails connecting some of these drainages make interesting loop trips possible. The Lewis and Clark Highway down the Lochsa River will make more country accessible for short trips similar to those up the east face of the Bitterroots. The area is large enough that a year of exploration would still leave many parts of it unseen. Except during the elk hunting season, there are few encounters with other persons and few evidences of the presence of men.

Livestock grazing, except for the horses and mules of wilderness visitors, is confined to one permit for 100 head of cattle which graze only part time in the proposed wilderness. Recreation users require horses for the most desirable enjoyment of the wilderness and horse feed for this use is a high priority need.

There are about 3½ billion board feet of commercial timber which, if not reserved by wilderness classification, would eventually be merchantable. Because of the long distances to market, however, and the expensive logging roads needed for harvest, little of the timber can be considered marketable at present.

There are no known mining claims within the proposed wilderness area that might pose a threat to its classification. Seven tracts of private land totaling 1,161 acres lie along the Selway River and lower Moose Creek within the proposed wilderness. Two of these holdings are operated as guest ranches. Two are commercial camps which serve as bases for hunting. The operators of these four tracts depend on airplanes for most of their transportation and supply. While these holdings now serve an important place in facilitating the needed elk harvest, it is imperative that they be acquired in order to assure wilderness preservation.

Administrative facilities in the proposed wilderness consist of a ranger station and airfield at Moose Creek, a guard station, landing strips at Shearer, and Fish Lake, and trails, lookouts, telephone lines, and helicopter landing spots. These helicopter spots, used for fire control, are mostly on ridgetops and are inconspicuous and generally not noticeable.

The following table gives the major boundary adjustments:

Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area:	*Acres*
Primitive area to be classified as wilderness	1,137,295
South Fork Lolo-Storm Creek addition	10,700
East face Bitterroot additions	15,560
Total of Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area (area A)	1,163,555
Area B, Salmon River face (retain as primitive area)	188,796
Total to be managed as wilderness or primitive area	1,352,351
Areas not qualifying for inclusion in the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area:	
Area E, upper Selway	310,412
Area D, east face Bitterroot	54,331
Area F, Lochsa face	71,129
Area G, Buck Lake Creek	7,424
Area H, Fog Mountain	32,709
Area I, White Sand-Hoodoo Creek	73,210
Total	549,215
Total area studied	1,901,566
Less additions listed above	−26,260
Total	1,875,306

You will note that the table shows an addition of 10,700 acres in the South Fork Lolo-Storm Creek area and a total addition of 15,560 acres along the east face of the Bitterroot Range. The former contains 2,200 acres of Northern Pacific Railroad land which the company has indicated a willingness to exchange. If this proposal is adopted, action will be started to carry out this exchange. This will be a highly valuable addition to the wilderness.

The other additions are near the south end of the proposed area and are valuable additions uncomplicated by conflicts with established rights and uses. The largest part of this additional acreage is in the vicinity of Boulder Point and Watchtower Creek.

Figure 1 also shows the southern part of the present primitive area. The road from near Darby, Mont., to Elk City, Idaho, traverses this portion of the area and influences future plans for it. Management recommendations are as follows:

Area B, Salmon River face, 188,796 acres: This is the part of the primitive area which drains into the Salmon River. It is separated from the proposed wilderness by roads. It is a logical unit for study with the rest of the Salmon River drainage. The large Idaho primitive area lies across the river to the south. The Forest Service recommends that the undeveloped part of the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area in the Salmon drainage be held in primitive status pending a joint study with the adjoining forest region of both sides of the Salmon River.

Area E, upper Selway, 310,412 acres: Figure 1 (not printed in RECORD) illustrates how this area is separated from the proposed wilderness by existing roads and a much-needed and long-considered connecting link down Running Creek and up the Selway River to Paradise guard station. This area has many recreation values but does not qualify for inclusion in the proposed wilderness area. Multiple-use plans for the area will recognize:

1. Recreation values including wilderness-type recreation.

2. Management of commercial forest lands for timber production.

3. Need for an access corridor through the Bitterroot Mountains for transmission lines and other possible uses.

Area D, East Face Bitterroot, 54,331 acres: This includes the Lost Horse and Fred Burr drainages which have public roads. It also includes minor adjustments which place the boundary on topographic features where the wilderness is removed from the possibility of disturbing influences.

Area F, Lochsa face: This area on the south side of the Lochsa River is adjacent to the new Lewis and Clark Highway. The strip of land along the south side of the river is nonwilderness in character because of the presence of a transcontinental highway in sight and hearing distance. There will also be a need for facilities for the traveling public and takeoff points for wilderness travel for which space is too limited on the north side of the river. There are advantages as far as administration goes but the main reason for moving the boundary back to the first easily identified ridge is that this area lacks wilderness qualification.

Area G, Buck Lake Creek, 7,424 acres: The logical boundary of the proposed wilderness is the ridgetop separating the Selway River from Meadow Creek.

Area H, Fog Mountain, 32,709 acres: This boundary adjustment would remove the Fog Mountain road and its influence from the proposed wilderness and place the boundary on a more logical and more easily identifiable location.

Area I, White Sand-Hoodoo Creek, 73,210 acres: This area lies south of Powell Ranger Station. It is traversed by several roads which are heavily used by hunters and other recreation visitors. The area supports heavy stands of timber and includes 2,520 acres of

Northern Pacific Railroad land, some of which was logged during the spruce bark beetle epidemic. This area has about 420 million board feet of merchantable timber, all within reasonable hauling distance to established mills. Because of the established roads and the benefits of timber production, the Forest Service recommends that this area be managed according to the multiple-use plans that will be prepared for it.

Further specific information concerning the proposal to alter the boundaries and change the classification of the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area may be obtained from the following:

Forest supervisor, Lolo National Forest, Missoula, Mont.

Forest supervisor, Bitterroot National Forest, Hamilton, Mont.

Forest supervisor, Clearwater National Forest, Orofino, Idaho.

Forest supervisor, Nez Perce National Forest, Grangeville, Idaho.

Regional forester, Federal Building, Missoula, Mont.

Persons wanting to submit oral or written views may do so in person at hearings at Missoula, Mont., on March 7, or at Lewiston, Idaho, on March 9, 1961. Written comments may be sent to the regional forester, Federal Building, Missoula, Mont., before March 27, 1961, with the request that they be included in the official hearing record.

PUBLIC NOTICE—HEARINGS ON PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF SELWAY-BITTERROOT WILDERNESS AREA

Public hearings on the proposed establishment of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area referred to in the public notice posted August 29, 1960, will be held as follows:

Missoula, Mont., Yellowstone Room, University Lodge, Tuesday, March 7, 1961, 9 a.m., m.s.t.

Lewiston, Idaho, Lewis and Clark Hotel, Thursday, March 9, 1961, 9 a.m., p.s.t.

An additional hearing has been scheduled as follows: Grangeville, Idaho, armory, Tuesday, March 14, 1961, 9 a.m., p.s.t.

Persons desiring to express their oral or written views may do so in person at these hearings, or they may submit their written comments to the regional forester, Federal Building, Missoula, Mont., not later than March 27, 1961, with the request that their statements be included in the official hearing record.

JANUARY 25, 1961.

CHAS. L. TEBBE,
Regional Forester.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and myself, I call up my amendment designated "8-18-61—D" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 12, it is proposed to strike out all through line 7 on page 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment Congress approves a concurrent resolution declaring itself in favor of such recommendation: *Provided,* That, in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution may be limited to one or more of the areas covered or parts thereof.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has asked that his name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1962, AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, after consulting with interested Senators on the minority side and on this side of the aisle, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 845, S. 2481.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2481) to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of the fiscal year 1962 (Public Law 87-98) by increasing the amount allotted to "Various locations" (part of "Construction of facilities") in that act by $60 million to a new total of $206,186,000.

The following table summarizes the differences:

	Public Law 87-98	S. 2481	Difference
Salaries and expenses	$226,686,000	$226,686,000	
Research and development	1,305,539,000	1,305,539,000	
Construction of facilities	252,075,000	312,075,000	$60,000,000
Total	1,784,300,000	1,844,300,000	60,000,000

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

In his appearance before the committee on the authorizing bill for fiscal year 1962, Maj. Gen. Don R. Ostrander, former director of launch vehicle programs for NASA, testified that development of facilities for the Nova vehicle would constitute one of the major "pacing" items for the entire vehicle development program. He also testified that "in view of the unique requirements that will be encountered in launch operations for vehicles of this size, it is essential that site surveys and criteria studies be initiated at the earliest possible date."

SURVEY TEAM ANALYZED LAUNCH REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with this policy, a survey team jointly headed by the Director, Launch Operations Directorate (NASA), and the Commander, Air Force Missile Test Center (DOD), was directed to analyze launch requirements to implement a manned lunar landing program and to establish a basis for the selection of a launching site for the new, very large launch vehicles required in the execution of the program.

In the conduct of its study, this team established the technical criteria required of the launching site. First of all, launchings must be made in an easterly direction to take advantage of the rotation of the earth. Other criteria were as follows:

1. National ownership.
2. Launch vehicle impact hazard.
3. Overflight hazard.
4. Water transportation.
5. Interruption of Intracoastal Waterway.
6. Proximity to existing facilities.
7. Relative facilities cost.

Initially, the survey team considered a great many sites. Through application of the above criteria, it was possible to narrow these down to seven sites that received intensive analysis.

In alphabetical order these were: (1) Site on the mainland of the gulf coast near Brownsville, Tex.; (2) an area adjacent to the existing launch site at Cape Canaveral, Fla.; (3) Christmas Island in the mid-Pacific south of Hawaii; (4) Cumberland Island, Ga.; (5) a site at South Point, island of Hawaii; (6) Mayaguana Island in the Bahamas group; and (7) White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex. The evaluation of each site as compared with the criteria is indicated in table 1 and the conclusions for each criterion are discussed below.

TABLE 1.—*Evaluation of launch sites*

	National ownership	Launch vehicle impact hazard	Overflight hazard	Water transportation	Interrupt intracoastal waterway	Proximity to existing facilities	Relative facilities cost
Brownsville, Tex.	United States	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	1.07
Cape Canaveral, Fla.	do	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	1.02
Christmas Island	United Nations	No	No	Yes		No	3.00
Cumberland Island, Ga.	United States	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	1.07
Hawaii	do	No	No	Yes		No	1.87
Mayaguana, Bahama Islands	Great Britain	No	No	Yes		No	2.41
White Sands Missile Range	United States	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	1.00

1. National ownership

The question of national ownership was considered in terms of the speed with which necessary land acquisition for site development could be consummated. The only potential problem areas exist at Christmas Island, which is under United Nations trusteeship, and at Mayaguana Island which is

owned by Great Britain. In these two cases, international agreements would have to be achieved before site development work could actually proceed.

2. Launch vehicle impact hazard

The study considered the normal booster impact hazards associated with fallout of first and second stage launch vehicles. It was considered that launch azimuths from 60° to 120° would be desirable to accommodate various mission profiles and the booster impact zones were considered for this entire launch fan. The impact hazard was not considered a serious problem for any of the sites except for (a) Brownsville, Tex., site where the launch azimuth would have to be limited to between approximately 80° and 90° in order to minimize land impact of the first and second stages and (b) the White Sands Missile Range where it was determined that the first stage for both the Saturn C–3 and the Nova vehicles would impact on land regardless of the launch azimuth within the fan desired. Several cities such as Big Spring, Midland, Fort Worth, Dallas, Austin, Galveston, and Houston, Tex., are included within this fan. To minimize land impact hazards, it would be necessary to severely limit the launch azimuth in order to avoid highly populated areas. Although the second stage of the Nova vehicle would for normal flight be expected to impact in the Atlantic Ocean, the Saturn C–3 second stage impact zone could include portions of the Eastern United States.

3. Overflight hazard

In addition to considering the normal impact zones for the booster stages, it is necessary to consider possible impact areas resulting from launch vehicle malfunctions. It was determined that there was no serious overflight hazard for any of the launching sites except—

(a) Brownsville, Tex., where large portions of the United States, and in some cases Cuba, would be overflown through second stage burnout. With the possibility of abort during first or second stage burning, especially during the early phases of the program, some sizable population centers, such as Tampa, St. Petersburg, Palm Beach, and Miami, Fla., might be endangered.

(b) A hazard also existed for launches from the White Sands Missile Range where each flight mission would have to be carefully reviewed on a case-by-case basis to minimize endangering population centers such as Memphis, Tenn.; Birmingham, Ala.; Atlanta, Ga.; New Orleans, La.; Jacksonville, Fla.; and Dallas or Fort Worth, Tex., in the event of booster malfunction.

4. Water transportation

The study considered as desirable the present concept for transporting large launch vehicles and spacecraft on a transport barge from the missile assembly plant to the launch area. This procedure is economical and allows flexibility of location of the fabrication and test sites relative to the launch site. All of the sites considered would allow water access except the White Sands Missile Range. Use of the White Sands Missile Range would require some other method of vehicle transportation and, more importantly, would probably dictate that the launch vehicle assembly plant and static test stands be located near the launch site.

5. Interruption of Intracoastal Waterway

Three of the sites evaluated are contiguous to the Intracoastal Waterway. In these cases an evaluation was made to determine if the necessary blast damage and sound exclusion zones would interrupt the waterway and thereby require closure of the waterway during launch operations. At Cape Canaveral, Fla., it was determined that such interruption would not be necessary. However, at Brownsville, Tex., and Cumberland Island, Ga., it would be necessary to interrupt waterway access. In the case of Cumberland Island there is an annual traffic rate through the waterway of about 16,000 vehicles or approximately 50 per day on the average. Over 20 miles of the waterway would have to be closed for considerable periods of time at each launching operation.

6. Proximity to existing facilities

Primarily launching operations are now conducted at the three national missile ranges—Atlantic Missile Range, Pacific Missile Range, and White Sands Missile Range. The study team considered that the most direct utilization of the manpower and physical resources now existing at these sites would be advantageous. Of the sites evaluated, Cape Canaveral and the White Sands Missile Range would yield the greatest advantage in terms of utilizing or expanding existing physical plants and technical organizations. In particular, many missions within the overall manned lunar landing program will be conducted from Cape Canaveral using Atlas-Agena, Centaur, and Saturn C–1 launch vehicles. These missions will in many cases utilize the same contractors and supporting NASA personnel as the missions involving the Saturn C–3 and Nova launch vehicles. It was therefore concluded that important economy of resources could be achieved through a site near present Cape Canaveral.

7. Relative facilities cost

The survey team made detailed estimates of the total capital costs at each site including land acquisition costs for an operational facility with three Saturn C–3 and three Nova launch complexes including launch pads, assembly and checkout facilities, and transport facilities; spacecraft assembly operations and support facilities; industrial support area; centralized communication facilities; and range support facilities of the sites considered, the White Sands Missile Range, an expansion of Cape Canaveral, the site at Brownsville, Tex., and the site at Cumberland Island, Ga., were all at a comparable cost level for the total project. (The costs were within 7 percent of the lowest estimate which was for White Sands Missile Range.) The sites at Hawaii, Mayaguana Island, and Christmas Island would all be considerably more expensive for final development.

From a consideration of the foregoing criteria, it was concluded by the Administrator that the selection of the launching site adjacent to the existing Cape Canaveral area would be the most advantageous choice. There are no unsuitable features within the evaluation criteria. The eventual site development cost including land acquisition is a minimum. These costs by principal category are:

Mission facilities	$700,000,000
Launch support facilities	125,000,000
Real estate	60,000,000
Total	885,000,000

The mission facilities are the six launching complexes and required supporting facilities. The launch support facilities are of the extensions to existing AMR facilities required for the launch and tracking through injection of the spacecraft. The $60 million real estate cost is the cost, estimated by the Army Corps of Engineers, of acquiring approximately 80,000 acres of land necessary at this site.

It is this $60 million that the current request for authorization is now being made. Postponement of this authorization until the regular fiscal year 1963 might seriously delay the success of the manned lunar program within the desired target dates.

The site selection has been concurred in by the Secretary of Defense and the current request has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I support S. 2481. The purpose of the bill, which was reported unanimously by the Space Committee, is to authorize the appropriation to the NASA of $60 million for land acquisition adjacent to Cape Canaveral to provide a site for the launch complexes for the large Saturn and Nova vehicles.

The location of this site was decided after an intensive survey by a joint NASA-Department of Defense team. Their findings are covered in the accompanying report.

NASA stated that they were unable to include this item in the general authorization bill because it was hoped that DOD might already own a suitable area; if not a site would have to be found and approved. The immediate consideration of the bill is necessary to enable NASA to proceed to acquire the land so that construction can commence within the next 6 to 12 months.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the statement of Mr. Webb, Administrator of NASA, before the committee in support of this measure, and I urge the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES, SEPTEMBER 1, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in order to accomplish the missions of the expanded national space program, it will be necessary that we employ launch vehicles much larger than those currently in use or under development. The technical specifications for these vehicles are now under intensive study, but it is already obvious that we will have to use boosters having as much as 12 to 20 million pounds of thrust, or more than 8 to 13 times as large as the Saturn C–1.

One of the most serious problems that confronts us in the utilization of these very large boosters is the selection of an adequate launching site. In addition to considering the hazards that would accompany explosions of the vehicles on or near the launch pads, we must consider the hazards from the tremendous noises that will be generated in the early stages of flight. These considerations have led to a determination that exclusion zones of 7 to 10 miles will be necessary in the vicinity of the launch pads—zones which must be under strict control and in which the general public cannot be present. The existing launching areas at Cape Canaveral cannot accommodate the necessary exclusion zones.

A survey team was established early this summer under the joint direction of NASA and the Department of Defense to analyze these and other launch requirements for the manned lunar landing program, to establish criteria for the selection of an adquate launch site, and to evaluate potential launching sites. This team established general criteria for guidance of their study activities. These criteria included the requirements:

(a) that it be possible to launch in an easterly direction in order to make maximum utilization of the earth's rotation;

(b) that the impact areas for the first and second stage boosters be uninhabited;

(c) that the initial flight path not be over areas that could suffer severe life and property damage in the event of vehicle malfunction during the boost phase of flight;

(d) that the launch site be accessible to water transport of the very large booster components that are to be fabricated and static-tested elsewhere; and

(e) that the launching sites make maximum utilization of existing NASA and DOD resources.

The survey team initially considered a great many sites. Through application of the above criteria, it was possible to narrow these down to seven sites that received intensive analysis. From this analysis, and considering the costs required to bring the launch site to a full operational capability, it was concluded that the most advantageous location would be immediately adjacent to the existing Cape Canaveral missile test area.

The bill before you is a request for authorization for appropriations of $60 million to acquire the approximately 80,000 acres determined to be necessary for the expanded launching area.

The 1962 authorization act enacted by the Congress earlier this year provided initial authorizations for the launch site. There was no request at that time for funds to acquire the launch site because, in the absence of definitive criteria and site evaluations, it was thought that the Department of Defense might be able to furnish the required area as part of their national missile range facilities. This was not possible and it was, therefore, decided that NASA should acquire and develop the necessary area.

The acquisition of the proposed launching site adjacent to Cape Canaveral is an urgent requirement for the timely conduct of the expanded space program. It is estimated that construction of the launch facilities for the very large launch vehicles will require as much as 4 years or more. This construction must proceed in the very near future if we are to be ready to flight test the new vehicles at the earliest possible time. Passage of the bill before you will allow NASA to proceed at once with the acquisition of land for the launching area so that the facility construction can be initiated in the near future. We can temporarily finance the early land acquisition costs within our present appropriation. I indicated, however, in my letter to the Congress that NASA will seek a supplemental appropriation for the land acquisition in January.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes", approved July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216), is amended by:

(1) striking out, in section 1 thereof, the figure "$1,784,300,000", and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$1,844,300,000";

"(2) striking out, in subsection 1(c) thereof, the figure "$252,075,000", and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$312,075,000";

(3) striking out, in paragraph 1(c)(10) thereof, the figure "$146,186,000", and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$206,186,000"; and

(4) striking out, in section 2 thereof, the figure "$252,075,000", and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$312,075,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from Idaho yield briefly to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I wish to make a brief comment. I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for handling the bill so expeditiously. While it does involve my State, it also involves in a much greater way the entire Nation; and I think the speed of the Senator from Oklahoma in getting the measure to the floor of the Senate and getting the measure passed is to be greatly commended by all of us who know him intimately. This measure is involved with the matters of tremendous import which our Nation is undertaking in the field of space activities, guided missiles, and the like; and I want the record to show my appreciation and deep respect for the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Florida. Praise is due to all the other members of the committee and to the committee staff for the fine work they have done in making it possible to bring the bill to the floor of the Senate.

Madam President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 174) to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President. As we discuss the merits of S. 174, the wilderness preservation system bill, I find that many persons have little knowledge of the measure and what it would do. This, I am certain, will be cleared up by the debate today. However, another point that I think should be made clear is the attitude of the people who live in and near the areas that will be affected by the provisions of this bill.

Concerning the latter point, I have been deluged with letters and petitions from local unions, individual workers, recreation enthusiasts, farmers, and small and large businesses in the Western States. All have one point in common: they oppose the locking up of such a large area of land as is now proposed in the wilderness bill.

Madam President, as illustrative of the protests I have received, I hold in my hand a petition signed by 1,737 woodworkers and loggers in Nez Perce, Latah, and Clearwater Counties, in Idaho. The signers of the petition take the following position:

We respectfully urge that before any area is included in the wilderness system, it must be specifically approved by an act of Congress.

In addition, we urge that public hearings be held in the locality of the area proposed to be set aside as a wilderness area before any action is taken by Congress.

Madam President, I am calling attention to these petitions primarily because although it is all very well to make claims about the esthetic need to create more wilderness areas for recreational purposes, basically the people who reside in these areas must first earn a livelihood; and the signers of these petitions point out that their livelihood is almost entirely dependent upon the multiple use of our national forests, because they rely upon the lumber and timber industry to make a living.

Madam President, I should like to read a letter I have received from Bert L. Cole, secretary of the Western States Land Commissioners, which include the top land administrators of 18 Western States where much of the proposed wilderness area is located. The letter reads as follows:

THE WESTERN STATES LAND COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION,
Olympia, Wash., August 21, 1961.

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: The Western States land commissioners, in their annual conference in Seattle, Wash., on August 10, 1961, passed the enclosed Resolution A unanimously.

We State officials who have a land management responsibility feel very keenly about setting aside excessive acreages of public land for single purpose usage. We strongly feel that there is no urgency to pass S. 174 until the O.R.R.R.C. report is made to Congress. Certainly a few more months will not be detrimental to the public's interest in determining the wisest and best use of our public domain lands in the interests of all of the people.

We are very hopeful that you will delay passage of this bill until we have had the benefit of the study made by technicians which will be incorporated in the O.R.R.R.C. report.

Yours very truly,

BERT L. COLE,
Commissioner of Public Lands, State of Washington, and Secretary, Western States Land Commissioners Association.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have Resolution A printed at this point in the RECORD. It was adopted unanimously by these Western States land commissioners; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement showing the names of the land commissioners and their respective offices.

There being no objection, the resolution and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION A

Whereas the Western States Land Commissioners Association has reviewed the purposes of S. 174, 87th Congress, 1st session, relating to the establishment of a wilderness system of lands; and

Whereas it appears that the adoption of this legislation as introduced, could result in administrative difficulties for the respective affected States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western States Land Commissioners Association in convention in Seattle, Wash., on August 10, 1961, hereby recommends in the best interest of the 18 western member States that the aforesaid S. 174, 87th Congress, 1st session, be amended as follows:

1. Add subsection (i) to section 3:

"(i) The incorporation into the wilderness system of lands, otherwise available for selection by the States under the provisions of applicable United States statutes shall not be deemed such an appropriation as to foreclose or impede State selection thereof."

2. Add subparagraph (1) to subsection (g) of section 6:

"(1) Whenever an area including State-owned land is incorporated in the wilderness system, provision shall be made for access to such land adequate for the reasonable exercise of its rights therein by the State and those claiming under it, and the agencies administering lands within the wilderness system are hereby directed to cooperate with the States in establishing such access and authorized to grant, for reasonable consideration, the easements necessary therefor;

"Provided, however, That, if the recommendation by which an area including State-owned land is incorporated in the wilderness system shall fail to provide for access to the State-owned land therein, then the owning State may, at its election, use the included State land as base in making indemnity selection of lands including the mineral rights therein as provided in applicable U.S. statutes."

3. Add:

"Prior to permanent establishment of wilderness area boundaries, Federal, State, and private technicians shall be directed to make a detailed study of proposed boundaries in order to prevent inclusion therein of areas which have value for public benefits higher than wilderness use."

Resolution A was approved by the following land commissioners at their annual conference in Seattle, Wash., on August 10, 1961:

Alaska: Roscoe E. Bell, director, division of lands.

Arizona: Obed M. Lassen, land and water commissioner.

California: Frank J. Hortig, executive officer, State lands commission.

Colorado: A. M. Ramsey, president, Colorado Etate Land Board.

Hawaii: James J. Detor, chief, land management division.

Idaho: John G. Walters, commissioner, State land department.

Montana: Mons L. Teigen, commissioner, department of State lands and investments.

Nebraska: Elmer H. Mahlin, secretary, board of educational lands and funds.

Nevada: Joyce Maddaford, deputy State land register, representing Hugh A. Shamberger.

New Mexico: E. S. Walker, commissioner of public lands.

North Dakota: Anton J. Schmidt, commissioner, State land department.

Oklahoma: Woodrow George, secretary, commissioners of the land office.

Oregon: E. T. Pierce, clerk, office of State land board.

South Dakota: Bernard Linn, commissioner of school and public land.

Texas: Not represented.

Utah: Lee Young, director, State land office.

Washington: Bert L. Cole, commissioner of public lands.

Wyoming: Ken Bell, commissioner of public lands.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, at this point I should like to remind my colleagues that there will be no roads or other habitation in these proposed vast wilderness areas. I am in agreement with proponents of the wilderness measure that we should have some areas kept in their natural state, for study of our heritage and enjoyment by future generations. And we have some such areas in Idaho—in fact, more than 3 million acres, and many more acres in other Western States. But to blanket in areas as large as the States of Washington and Indiana combined to get this type of area is sheer folly.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune of July 14, 1961, which sums up some of the economic factors involved.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS BILL POOR FOR IDAHO

BOEHL'S CABIN.—Idaho is hardest hit of all States by the wilderness system bill as now written, said H. R. Glascock, Jr., Portland, forest counsel for Western Forestry and Conservation Association.

Of the State's 3 million acres of primitive areas, more than one-half are commercial forest land, according to U.S. Forest Service data, and would be put into the currently proposed national wilderness preservation system.

Glascock made these statements during the Idaho Land Board tour Thursday.

He said Idaho, like other Western States, is dependent upon the most productive uses of its renewable natural resources for the creation of basic wealth.

The wilderness system bill as written puts Idaho's wealth-producing potential in a straitjacket and leads to a future deficit of commercial forest lands, he said.

WOULDN'T THRIVE

"Neither the counties nor the State of Idaho nor the Nation can long thrive under an artificial shortage of renewable resources due to failure to assign significant tracts of forest lands to their most productive uses," Glascock asserted. This is what would happen if current wilderness system legislation is enacted, he said.

"Fortunately," he said, "there are generous reaches of land in Idaho and other States which are valuable primarily as roadless wilderness without zoning together with them lands more valuable for other uses.

"In Western States, such as Idaho, having a high percentage of public land, the mineral, water, grazing, timber, and motoring recreation potentials will be curtailed needlessly if due care is not taken in the permanent assignment of such lands to highest use," he said.

Glascock said the Forest Service estimates the Nation will require double the present volume of timber resources by the year 2000.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, I also wish to call attention to some of the other protests which I have received from very important groups in Idaho.

First, I should like to call attention to House Joint Memorial No. 6, adopted unanimously in February 1961, by both the Senate and the House of the Idaho State Legislature. I shall read one of the paragraphs of the memorial, but I ask unanimous consent to have the entire memorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, I now read one of the paragraphs of the House joint memorial:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho, (the Senate concurring), That we are most respectfully opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive or wilderness areas in the State of Idaho and respectfully request that all primitive and wilderness areas in the State of Idaho be reviewed and studied with the view of eliminating all lands which have a higher or greater multiple-use potential than that of single use dedication as primitive or wilderness.

The resolution submitted by Senator DWORSHAK is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the economy of the State of Idaho is based upon its agriculture, lumber, mining, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and hydroelectric power; and

Whereas approximately two-thirds of the land area of the State of Idaho is federally owned and contains approximately 3 million acres set aside for primitive and wilderness areas; and

Whereas these designations are restrictive to full utilization and deny to the natural resources industries of the State of Idaho the right to wisely develop the natural resources contained in these large primitive and wilderness areas of the State and further deny ready access to these areas to millions of American citizens, all to the detriment of said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and

Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State of Idaho is its tourist trade and wildlife attractions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we are most respectfully opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive or wilderness areas in the State of Idaho and respectfully request that all primitive and wilderness areas in the State of Idaho be reviewed and studied with the view of eliminating all lands which have a higher or greater multiple use potential than that of single use dedication as primitive or wilderness; and be it further

Resolved, That we oppose Federal enactment of future wilderness legislation embodying the principle of locked-up areas for single purpose use which would deny to the natural resources industries the right to wisely develop such natural resources and would also be to the detriment of said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and be it further

Resolved, That the present agencies administering all Federal lands do so with the view of developing the full multiple use of the lands to further the general welfare and the economy of the State of Idaho; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is

hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the speaker of the house and to the president of the senate of the following States: Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and that these States are hereby urged to take similar action in their respective legislative bodies.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, I also wish to read several telegrams from economic groups in Idaho, so that Senators will know of the intense interest being taken in this proposed legislation.

I hold in my hand a telegram sent to me by A. J. Teske, secretary of the Idaho Mining Association. The telegram is dated August 27, 1961; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, *August 27, 1961.*

Senator HENRY DWORSHAK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We have been advised that wilderness bill S. 174, amended, will be brought up for consideration before the Senate early in the week of August 28.

The Idaho mining industry is strongly opposed to this legislation on the grounds that its enactment into law would be extremely detrimental to the future development of the basic natural resource economy of Idaho and other western public land States. A similar view has been expressed by Governor Smylie, the State legislature and practically all other interests which with mining represent the backbone of the State's economy, including the timber products industry, the livestock and farming industry, the State chamber of commerce and numerous local chambers. Opposition has also been recorded by unanimous vote of the Western Governors' Conference and by the legislatures or natural resources officials of most of the Western States.

We respectfully and earnestly urge that you support this view and oppose this legislation unless further amended to: (1) preserve the right of mineral entry into all public lands adjudged by competent geological authorities to have potential for mineral deposition; (2) assure that no areas would be permanently set aside for single-purpose wilderness use without affirmative action by both Houses of Congress; and (3) require that the citizens of the State in which the public lands are located, either through their Governor, legislature or other officials, have a voice in the determination of what constitutes the best and highest use or uses of these lands.

Idaho has a tremendous stake in this legislation. More than 20 percent of the 14 million acres of national forest land that it would immediately close to all uses except wilderness use are in this State.

A. J. TESKE,
Secretary, Idaho Mining Association.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, I have received a telegram from the acting president of the Idaho State Reclamation Association, Tom Olsted. The telegram was sent from Twin Falls, Idaho, and reads as follows:

TWIN FALLS, IDAHO, *August 15, 1961.*

Hon. HENRY DWORSHAK,
Senator from Idaho, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Idaho State Reclamation Association at its annual meeting last fall adopted a resolution opposing so-called wilderness legislation. At a meeting of the board of directors on August 12 this position was reaffirmed and the board went on record in opposition to Senate bill 174. In the event Congress does take any action on S. 174 the board respectfully urges that it be amended to provide that before any area is included in the wilderness systems that it be specifically approved by act of Congress.

TOM OLSTED,
Acting President, Idaho State Reclamation Association.

Madam President, I have received a telegram from Ira Anderson, secretary of the Idaho Resource Development Council. The telegram is dated August 25, 1961, and was sent from Boise, Idaho. It reads as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, *August 25, 1961.*

Senator HENRY DWORSHAK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Firmly believe it should require congressional action to include any primitive area lands in wilderness in the future. Congress should not be deprived of its present powers. Also, primitive areas should be out of wilderness system. Forest Service finds about half of the 3 million acres in Idaho to be commercial forest land, very important to this State.

IRA ANDERSON,
Secretary, Idaho Resource Development Council.

I have also received a telegram signed by I. H. Harris, president, Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, dated August 28, from Boise, Idaho, which reads as follows:

Understand S. 174, wilderness bill, scheduled for Senate action today. Idaho State chamber reaffirms its opposition to this legislation and respectfully urges you, as Senators representating a State whose economy based on full use of all of its natural resources, to oppose this bill to favor a single use for a limited group.

Proposal defeats its purpose when it sets aside vast areas that would be inaccessible to the great majority of those who rely on the family car for transportation to outdoor vacations.

We repeat Idaho State chamber position that we do not oppose wilderness use for certain areas of public land, but to allow any area to be set aside for single use without complete inventory and full utilization of its potential is a waste that is contrary to the public interest.

Madam President, I have a telegram signed by Wilbur F. Wilson, president, Idaho Wool Growers Association, under date of August 26, from Boise, Idaho, which reads as follows:

Informed Senate will consider wilderness legislation. May we urge you to support Senator ALLOTT's amendment if impossible to delay Senate action. Idaho should be accorded the same privilege as that provided for Alaska because if it is fair to one area, it should be fair to all. Thank you for all the help you can give in delaying action on this bill.

Madam President, I have a telegram signed by Royce G. Cox, chairman, Inland Empire Multiple Use Committee, under date of August 26, from Lewiston, Idaho, which reads as follows:

Congratulations on your participation in minority report on S. 174. Understand bill coming to floor next week. We still oppose S. 174 as amended because of adverse effect on Western States. Urge delay until ORRRC report on two amendments, one to exclude existing national forest primitive areas from wilderness system until after adequate study and to provide positive congressional action on President's recommendations. Present amendments inadequate. Recent fires in Idaho and Montana demonstrate that inaccessibility is severe handicap in suppression. This problem would be amplified under S. 174 as proposed.

I have another telegram, signed by S. G. Merryman, manager, Timber and Western Lands, under date of August 24, which reads as follows:

Disastrous fires now burning in wilderness-type country in Montana, Idaho, and Washington are vivid illustrations of high cost in life and money to protect undeveloped areas. Study and positive action by Congress is essential before any large areas are dedicated to limited use. Greatest danger to wilderness is from fire and insects, not man's activities. Experience indicates fire and insects are best controlled when access roads are available. S. 174 is not in the best interest of the people or economy of the State or Nation. There is no demonstrated need for hasty action as nearly all such areas are now being managed to preserve wilderness values.

Madam President, much has been said today during the debate about the tragic and rather devastating forest fires which have ravaged millions of acres of valuable timberland owned by the Federal Government in some of the Western States, with particular emphasis upon western Montana and eastern Idaho. I referred to those fires in remarks I made earlier today, pointing out that when we prevent the building of roads into wilderness areas, we make it extremely difficult for the Forest Service to fight fires and to prevent the loss of valuable timberlands.

In recent fires four persons lost their lives while fighting fires in some of the remote and inaccessible areas of my State and of Montana.

Recently I received a letter from A. B. Curtis, of Orofino, Idaho, who is the State fire warden, with responsibility to prevent, control, and fight fires on State, Federal, and privately owned land.

I read his letter, which was received on August 14, as follows:

I am sending you herewith a front page of Werner's Clearwater Tribune which tells of the raging forest fires in the Selway-Bitterroot primitive area.

The point here is that wilderness areas may not always be wilderness areas unless they are maintained and managed. Without accessibility these vast areas will surely burn and create large acreages of snags instead of valuable forest crops for the good of our State and Nation. Unless wilderness areas have maintenance they cease to be wilderness areas. You cannot have maintenance without accessibility. In this instance the Selway-Bitterroot area is very vast and too large for men to hike into for forest protection. They are virtually impossible to protect from fire. I thought that this front page of Werner's paper brings out a very significant point which you may wish to place before the committee or perhaps into the RECORD.

I call attention to the clipping from the Clearwater Tribune which was enclosed with the letter, the newspaper being dated August 10, 1961, and the headline being "Remote Fires Sear 7,000 Acres of Forest Lands."

The article points out the difficulties encountered in combating costly and

devastating forest fires in some of the primitive areas which do not have roads that make it possible to have forest fire fighters engage in their work without being flown into the area by helicopter and, in a few instances, by airplanes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the article from the Clearwater Tribune concerning the devastating forest fires to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMOTE FIRES SEAR 7,000 ACRES OF FOREST LANDS—WILDERNESS BURNS PUT CRITICAL LOAD ON FOREST SERVICE MANPOWER

(Late bulletins from fire front: Horseshoe Lake fire has probably burned half of the 70 million feet in the Gravy Creek area for a loss of over $350,000, forest officials said Wednesday. Kelly Creek district hopes to have control of this mammoth blaze and of the Never Creek fire by 10 a.m. today if decent weather holds. A lightning storm missed the north end of the forest last night by a few miles heading toward the St. Joe. Supervisory personnel has been flown to the Clearwater from nearly every region west of the Mississippi and some farther away.)

Lightning played a disastrous sequel to the man-caused fires that plagued the Clearwater Forest last week and before 1,700 men could hold three broad fire fronts, another 7,000 acres of woodlands had burned.

Supervisor Ralph Space said new high area burns on the Lochsa and Kelly districts brought the Clearwater the worst fire loss since 1934 when many thousands of acres of forest were on fire.

Another 300 men were being added to the fire lines last night to bring the total operations to 2,000.

A lightning storm Friday afternoon hit the Clearwater with 12 strikes and although eight were brought under immediate control, three turned into "project" fires and a fourth on Boulder Creek in the primitive area gave a lot of trouble.

Biggest fire of the year was the 3,000-acre Horseshoe Lake blaze near Gravy Creek, north of the Lolo trail.

By Monday it had spread through a bug-infested spruce area, too remote for salvage action when the spruce bark beetle hit here in 1953 and 1954. Although the dead spruce had no value, substantial white pine stumpage was lost in the stand. Seven dozers were hauled in up the Squaw Creek Road from the Lewis Clark Highway and then walked in 6 miles on the old Lolo trail to the fire area.

WILDERNESS TOO BIG

Second big fire was the Surprise Creek blaze high in the Lochsa-Selway primitive area where lack of any roads made it a 16-mile walking chance for 300 men. They were supplied by packmules and helicopters. Louis Hartig, fire boss, said dead spruce was chief fuel burned in this 2700-acre blaze.

Both this and the Higgins Ridge fire dramatized the senselessness of "too big" wilderness areas where nature often conspires to leave blackened ruins instead of a usable outdoors.

This fire of over 1,200 acres is 8 miles east of Moose Creek. Another smaller fire at Boulder Creek is under control in the Lochsa wilds.

Third big fire was on Never Creek 3 miles above Cayuse landing field which has spread to more than 1,200 acres and has 600 men and 5 dozers in the fray.

Initial efforts at control were just beginning to show success on the lightning fires Saturday when a forecast predicted up to 70 mile winds on a stretch from Boise to Helena, and the forest officers ordered men back from the fronts to wait out the 6-hour-long holocaust. The wind hit about 40 miles an hour in gusts.

By dark, the three fires had tripled in size with the Never Creek fire spotting up to three-fourths mile. Men moved back into action as the wind died down and both Saturday night and Sunday brought cool humid weather and less spreading.

Orofino's official 116° temperature Friday reflected almost impossible working conditions but the high winds brought a temporary respite from the heat wave and cooler air.

By Wednesday the firefighters had built 18 miles of line but sustained a major setback when sharp winds Tuesday spread the fires to an additional 2,500 acres.

Forest personnel were confronted with the task of building over 15 miles of fire line on the big fires, much in country without roads and trails.

Orofino's new forest warehouse was brought into active use to relay food from Spokane and crews and clerks were working around the clock shifts in the dispatcher's office and in payroll control.

Biggest success of the mobilization effort was control of another fire on Brady Creek which spread to 180 acres before it was stopped Tuesday. Ranger Ted Hay used 300 men and had Mick Koppang of the CTPA supply extra tankers and other mobile equipment to hold the lines during critical wind periods.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I called the attention of the Senator from Idaho to the notice of a hearing for the creation of a wilderness area from the Selway-Bitterroot primitive area to point out that one of the questions that was a subject of public hearing was the accessibility of some of these areas. There is before the hearing a proposal to carve out of that area about 600,000 acres and return it to access roads, lumbering, and so forth.

It seems to me such an orderly procedure would encourage the development and carving out of lands in many other primitive areas and at the same time secure high, remote, and rather sparsely forested lands for primitive areas.

I also point out that the reason why many of the fires are not in the wilderness areas is that the latter are the highest and most remote, and therefore the least subject to fire. They do not dry out as fast as the low areas. The snows there last longer. Moisture is retained longer. By virtue of the very fact that the timber is damper, smaller, and not subject to the same diseases and same effects as is timber at lower levels, which is more accessible, the same dangers are therefore not involved.

(At this point Mr. CLARK took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. DWORSHAK. I assure the Senator from Montana that both he and I, who come from States with large and extensive U.S. forest areas, are in accord on the primary objective of multiple use of our forests and public domain. The Senator from Montana takes a strong position in favor of the wilderness preservation system, I assume, because he sincerely believes that is the best way to cope with the problem. The Senator from Idaho takes the opposite position in the belief that we should not delegate additional authority to the Department of the Interior or to the Department of Agriculture to set up the wilderness areas. I strongly believe in the constitutional power granted to the legislative branch, and I do not think we would be advancing in any way the multiple purpose use of our forest lands in the Western States by following the course proposed.

Mr. President, I reaffirm what I said earlier in the debate. Four years ago the Congress enacted legislation establishing the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, with 16 members: 7 laymen, 4 Senators, and 4 Representatives. More than $2 million has been appropriated and expended during the past 3 years by the Commission, its staff, qualified university groups, and other economic groups throughout the country in making extensive and thorough surveys of the recreation potential of our country.

It has been pointed out that later this month the Commission will hold a meeting at Colorado Springs, Colo., to draft its final report which, under the law, will be submitted to the Congress in January of 1962.

I can see no defensible arguments for contending that the wilderness area bill should be passed during the remaining weeks of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, when we know the other body has not even considered the proposal and could not take any action during the remaining weeks of this session. It seems to me to be more desirable and more logical in every way to defer action until early next year, when the Senate and House committees will have available the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. We can then utilize to the best advantage all the information which will be contained in the studies which have been made during 3 years and in the final report which will be submitted by the Commission to the Congress.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

THE WEST IS CONCERNED ABOUT WILDERNESS AREAS

Mr. HICKEY. A review of the discussion and debate before the Senate today indicates that history shows the public lands States are extremely similar in background. It indicates the various industries which show concern in this bill are livestock raising and farming, mineral exploration and development, oil and gas development, transportation facilities, the forest and timber industries, and recreation and tourism.

My State is a public lands State. Basically, as indicated in the discussion today, the Rocky Mountain States, with the exception of perhaps three, are the States in which are located large areas of public lands.

The area has been for many years the great frontier, the new frontier for an ever-expanding population in this country; this is evidenced by the westward movement of the center of population.

As the debate on this bill goes into its final stages I think it is only reasonable to invite attention to the fact that

the people in my State particularly recognize there is a wilderness area in the great Rocky Mountain region.

It has been well stated by a publication in my State which directs itself to the history of the industries of the State, "Wyoming has virtually every requisite except population to become one of the greatest industrial States in the Union. Population will be attracted as the opportunities offered by the State become better known throughout the Nation."

The basic understanding I have described has directed all the industries I have enumerated to express themselves with regard to the wilderness bill. I should like to offer for the RECORD some of the statements of these groups. The first industry I mentioned, which was basically the first industry in the State, resulted from a historic accident. Some early pioneers traveling across what was to be Wyoming, were caught in a storm and were forced to turn their oxen loose and to camp for the winter. They expected to find the animals dead in the spring, but found, instead, that they had fared well on the lush pasture of the land. Thus began the great livestock grazing industry of Wyoming.

WYOMING RESOURCES BOARD SPEAKS

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the testimony of Mr. Sam C. Hyatt, one of the leading livestock growers and operators in the State, and who testified before the Senate Interior Committee as a representative of the State natural resource board.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF WYOMING NATURAL RESOURCE BOARD ON S. 174, A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 27–28, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I extend my appreciation and that of our board for the privilege of appearing before your committee today.

My name is Sam C. Hyatt, my address is Worland, Wyo. I am a member of the Wyoming Natural Resource Board.

May I briefly explain the history and duties of the natural resource board. The natural resource board was created by an act of the State legislature in 1951, and is a department of the executive branch of government. The natural resource board is composed of nine members, representing each of the seven judicial districts, plus two members at large. Ex-officio members of our board are the Governor, State engineer, State highway commissioner, commissioner of agriculture, the game and fish commissioner, and the president of the University of Wyoming. The board is charged with the fullest development of our State's natural resources and maintains a full-time office and staff at 215 Supreme Court Building, Cheyenne, Wyo.

PRINCIPLE OF MULTIPLE USE IS VITAL TO WYOMING

When our board was established, the first, and for a time the sole, responsibility was for water resources development.

Wyoming is a unique State in regard to water resources. Significant tributaries of three great river systems, the Columbia, the Colorado, and the Missouri rise in Wyoming and flow all four directions across its borders. The full development of the use of the water which arises in Wyoming's mountains not only is a necessity to the future welfare and growth of our State but has a direct bearing on the well-being of the river basin States. Naturally as a board we are concerned with any legislation which would place the multiple-use concept in danger and which might in any manner postpone or deny us the opportunity to make full development of our water which we will need to have in the years ahead.

Our board has endorsed the principle of multiple use, the management of each acre for the highest uses for which it is suitable, for we consider that a balance of uses is the most effective utilization of our resources. These practices on Federal domain lands are of direct and indirect benefit to each person who resides in the United States.

To the stockman, multiple use means grass upon which to graze his cattle and sheep. To the man on the street, it means a place to picnic, fish, hunt, hike, and ski. To the merchant, it means added sales in sporting goods. To the filling station operator, it means extra sales of gasoline to the local man and the ever-increasing number of tourists. To the hotel and motel operator these tourists are a livelihood. To the mining and timber men, multiple use means a potential reservoir of raw materials. To those concerned with present and future water needs of families, industry, and agriculture, it means water development programs to meet an ever-increasing demand.

What are the principal objections to the present administration of our wilderness areas? The best wilderness lands are in the National Park System where they are protected from commercial development of their natural resources, for only 5 percent of our national park area is developed at all. The 1916 National Park Act directs the service to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historical objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

The administration of the wilderness areas in the national forests and wildlife refuges is based on recognition that their primeval character represents their optimum use, and other uses are allowed only when they do not unduly interfere with this wilderness character.

WILDERNESS SYSTEM WOULD HAMPER LOCAL JURISDICTION

The administration of Federal lands should be sufficiently flexible to allow for changing conditions, and we should not freeze the administration, and remove local jurisdiction, so that desirable changes would be difficult if not impossible as would be the case if lands administered by three Federal agencies for different purposes, as is now the case, are lumped together in a new huge wilderness system. This system would be, moreover, fair game for a future Congress to logically place under one agency specialized in wilderness.

Wilderness areas, then, are not going to disappear, as the agencies now administering them are going to continue to preserve them. Our opposition to this bill does not mean opposition to the maintenance of existing wilderness areas under the present administrative agencies. Passage of this bill could, however, mean that we jeopardize the interests of all by enacting legislation without due consideration, for it is folly to remove actual multiple use from large areas before an adequate study can be made.

Nature and natural resources are dynamic—not static. Even in areas now classified and used in wilderness sense, catastrophic happenings are entirely possible, such as devastating storms, fires from natural or human causes, insect epidemics, and serious overpopulation of animal life.

BILL NEGLECTS PROTECTION OF AREAS

Preparation for, prevention of, and control of such happenings are of vital concern. For example, the Bridger National Forest wilderness area, one of the areas involved in this matter, had, in 1960, one of its most severe fire seasons that it has ever experienced. In their report, they state that roads, trails, radio communications, fences, and buildings are vital in protecting forest resources. In this bill under special provisions, it establishes two separate procedures to provide for protection and future possible multiple use. First it states that within national forest areas included in the wilderness system such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable. Then it states that the President may within national forests and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, within specified areas, authorize mining, reservoir and road construction, and other activities if the specified area will serve the interests of the people of the United States. However, these special provisions are, interestingly enough, in direct conflict with the rest of the bill. But, nowhere in the bill do I find where there is a proviso to take care of fire, insects, diseases, or overpopulation of wildlife within the national parks or national wildlife refuges and game ranges that are incorporated into the wilderness system.

WYOMING OPPOSES EXTENSION OF WILDERNESS IN STATE

This legislation affects the West more than any other section of the country because the lion's share of the lands involved are situated in the 11 Western States. The feelings of one of the Western States has already been expressed by the signing on February 7 of a memorial to the President and the Congress by Governor Gage, of Wyoming. The text of the memorial is as follows:

"This memorial proposes to memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to the effect that the people of Wyoming oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming and that if such areas are necessary and desired in other States that wilderness areas be created in such other States to make the same available to more people of the country than can be the case with wilderness areas only in the West."

The economy of Wyoming is closely tied to the future of forest, grazing, mineral, or water resources in the presently undeveloped primitive and wilderness areas within its boundaries, such areas now totaling about 1,430,000 acres classified as wilderness and 871,000 acres as primitive. And further, there are 2,349,637 acres in national parks and monuments.

The board, representing the State of Wyoming, believes that adequate recognition is now given to the wilderness concept through existing departmental regulations and through legislation already in existence which has established national forests, national parks and monuments, and wildlife refuges and ranges. We feel, and I repeat this, that there is no present need for additional legislation, and that any consideration of a bill such as S. 174 should at least await the report to come out of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, created by the 85th Congress to study this issue and due to report later this year. Too often, as past experience shows, have areas been assigned to a certain category without sufficient study and investigation. We do not wish to see this happen again.

AN EXAMPLE OF SUCCESSFUL MULTIPLE USE

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Are Oil and Wildlife Compatible?" published in a recent issue of The Link. It is a two-page account of the historical compatibility of the development of our wilderness areas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE OIL AND WILDLIFE COMPATIBLE?

John Muir, back in 1898, wrote:

"Thousands of nerve-shaken, overcivilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home; that wilderness is a necessity; and that mountain parks are useful not only as fountains of timber and irrigating rivers but as fountains of life."

In 1872, Yellowstone was officially set aside as a "pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." In 1959, an estimated 60 million persons flocked to Yellowstone and other national vacation areas. Currently, the oil industry is supporting generously the National Park Service Mission 66 program to provide new and better park roads, trails, parkways, museums, campsites and other services by 1966.

The conservation and wise use of these natural resources and wildlife have long been recognized as essential to the well-being of America. Every responsible citizen appreciates this necessity and the broad objectives of America's conservation activities.

Consequently, the American Petroleum Institute advocates that the petroleum industry conduct its operations on both public and private lands in a manner which will preserve wildlife, recreational, and scenic values. It is the policy of the institute to cooperate actively with other organizations and agencies devoted to this purpose.

While there is universal agreement as to the need for resource conservation, there exist honest differences of opinion between Government, industry, and conservation groups regarding the means of achieving the desired goals.

An example of these differences is found in a bill (S. 174) now pending in Congress which would bar oil exploration from an estimated 35 to 40 million acres of U.S. land. This vast area, where there are known possibilities for oil production, would be legally off limits.

Now, oilmen don't oppose reasonable legislation designed to preserve portions of this country in their primitive state for purposes of recreation, education, and research.

The American Petroleum Institute, however, firmly believes in and strongly supports the concept of multiple use of publicly owned lands under which two or more functions may be carried on compatibly. This policy will provide the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people. The institute further affirms that exploration for and development of petroleum reserves, when properly conducted, are fully compatible with other uses of public lands, including recreation, wildlife preservation and water management.

The institute supports enactment and enforcement of appropriate statutes and regulations necessary to assure that in the orderly development of petroleum and other natural resources on public lands, these lands will be protected from pollution, and from damage to wildlife, wildlife habitat and other natural values.

As speakers on the political platform often say: "Let's look at the record." Just how compatible are petroleum exploration and producing operations and wildlife?

Oil actually is one of the most conservation-minded industries in the United States. Oil companies take prompt and effective action to preserve and protect wildlife in areas adjacent to drilling.

Nor is this surprising. Oilmen are outdoor people. Their work takes them close to nature and to remote and faraway places. From the drillers and pumpers in the field to executives behind office desks a heavy percentage of them are either hunters or fishermen or both. They have a deep personal interest in preserving our streams and our forests, not only for the present but for their children in the future.

The Bayou Choctaw field near Plaquemine, La., provides a good example of the compatibility of wildlife and oil drilling and production. Oil production and drilling operations have gone on continuously in the field since 1929, and yet alligators, fish and other wildlife abound in the bayous and canals which interlace the field. C. F. Mosely, a Humble district foreman, has even made pets of alligators in the bayous. He has had several so tame they would come out on the bayou bank at his call of "Gros cocodrie," and take hunks of beef off a pointed stick. One small 'gator even spent a winter in the Mosely garage recovering from a puny spell.

During recent years there has been considerable controversy over the opening of Federal lands for oil exploration in Alaska. Some sportsmen charged that exploration and oil production on the moose range on the Kenai Peninsula would cause irreparable damage to wildlife.

What happened?

The facts, attested to by Alaskan officials, prove otherwise. Oilmen's roadbuilding projects, for example, have actually benefitted the moose by opening up forage areas and migration routes. And timber clearance has enabled the moose to get at the very young and tender vegetation on which they thrive.

The erection of offshore oil rigs along the gulf coast and the California shoreline brought a barrage of complaints from professional and amateur fishermen. Today the complaints have changed to compliments. Not only have the rigs failed to cause damage, they have actually lured fish into areas they once ignored.

Small fish have been attracted by the barnacles which grow on the legs of the oil rigs. Small plants grow at the base and rock chips brought up by the drilling form shelter. When there are small fish the big fish come after them.

When Louisiana oystermen claimed that offshore drilling was destroying their oysterbeds, oil companies hired marine biologists to make an exhaustive investigation. Universities and colleges undertook separate studies to determine what was depopulating the beds. Six years and $2 million later, the scientists were able to prove that a microscopic ocean parasite, not the drilling, was causing the oyster woes.

In 1959 this company had some well locations which fell in a Colorado duck club lake. Instead the locations were moved back away from the lake and holes drilled directionally to bottom under the lake. Tanks and roads and quiet gas lift pumps were installed so as to avoid interference with duck hunters' shooting.

And speaking of ducks, the most impressive example of the compatibility of wildlife and oil can be found in Louisiana, the Nation's second largest oil producing State. Much of the petroleum produced comes from the State's coastal marshes and tidal flats, the sites of one of the Nation's greatest concentrations of migratory waterfowl.

Avery Island is known throughout the world as a wildlife sanctuary. It is also a prolific oilfield. The man who started Avery Island was Edward Avery McIlhenny, hunter, explorer, naturalist, author, philanthropist, and sportsman. Some years ago, when Florida was concerned over the entrance of oilmen in wildlife areas, McIlhenny said:

"Oil is found only under small areas, and these can be completely protected if the proper regulations to ward against damage are enforced. I don't think there is any oil company in existence which would knowingly allow any damage to wildlife or scenic beauty. The oil development at Avery Island has not in the least disturbed the wildlife sanctuary."

In the field of forestry, Humble, in 1956 began an extensive reforestation program on 46,000 acres of company land in Louisiana. Humble bought the cutover and burned-over property in 1932 from a large lumber company. A multiphase forest management program was set up to remove and sell pine stumps and prepare the land for aerial seeding and planting of pine seedlings by more conventional plow methods. Fire protection and control, timber stand improvement and selective harvesting were other phases of the program. Someday, parts of this reforested tract also may prove productive of oil and gas.

The whole idea of Humble's woodland project was to make the land green and productive—not for timber alone, but for a variety of worthwhile purposes: to build a better soil, prevent erosion, protect watersheds, provide a haven for fish and game and establish recreational areas. Hunters and picnickers are welcome. In deadening hardwoods to encourage growth of pines, den trees of squirrels and coons were left untouched.

The so-called wilderness bill does not take facts like these into account. For all practical purposes it would remove millions of acres of land from oil and gas exploration.

Nobody in this country can predict to what heights the Nation's future energy needs may arise. More oil and gas have been used in the United States in the last 20 years than in all of mankind's previous history.

A sensible balance between our country's recreational and wildlife needs and its economic and defense requirements should be maintained. Petroleum exploration and production and wildlife conservation can coexist happily, side by side. This has been demonstrated over and over again in recent years. Oil and wildlife are compatible.

VIEWS OF SPORTSMEN'S ORGANIZATION

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two letters I received from Mr. Burton W. Marston, the president of the Izaak Walton League of America, with regard to the pending bill. One letter is dated May 25, 1961, and the other August 20, 1961.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Laramie, Wyo., May 25, 1961.

Hon. JOSEPH J. HICKEY,
U.S. Senator from Wyoming,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HICKEY: This will acknowledge your letter of May 16, written in reply to my letter of May 7 pertaining to the wilderness bill. May I also thank you for sending me a copy of the publication on the hearings held on S. 174 by the Senate Interior Committee on February 27 and 28. This is very interesting reading although some of the extremely narrow viewpoints outlined by some who testified before the committee are, to me, quite distressing. I appreciate your remarks about your concern for what may happen to Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain region under this legislation and if you will permit me I would like to comment briefly on some of them.

As to the extremists, who may be somewhat identifed with the east coast and the west coast, I think we all know pretty much who they are and their background and I am confident that any efforts they may try to make in locking up the whole Rocky Mountain region and make it an area devoid of people, industry, homes, and property is something that would be totally impossible of coming about. I am inclined to consider that an extreme view of what the extremists would or could do. Under the carefully thought out provisions and the safeguards that are already in S. 174 I cannot see how any such a lockup could possibly take place. Actually the wilderness, primitive and wild areas which are designated in our national forests here in Wyoming and in other Western States with which I am familiar, are so presently inaccessible one can hardly conceive of anyone being locked out as a place to live, operate a business other than a resort or have other kinds of property.

As to your receiving a map of the wilderness, primitive or wild areas, I could not venture an opinion as to what the problem may be unless it might be the difficulty involved in preparing a single map that would be large enough to show the details necessary to give a clear picture. Individual maps of each national forest and national park are of course available. I have on my desk as I am writing this letter maps of the Shoshone, Bridger, Teton, and Big Horn National Forests in Wyoming, each of which shows the boundaries of the wilderness, primitive and wild areas within the respective forests. These of course are irregular and do not follow township lines, rather they follow the divides and drainages or the topography of the high mountain areas. I am sure that detailed descriptions of these boundaries and the lands included are on file in the local and regional forestry offices, as established under the Forest Service regulations. I am confident you could get these separate maps if you requested them.

As to the matter of access of these wilderness areas to motor transportation I think you will find that there are very few places now classified as wilderness, primitive or wild areas where a person could go on a picnic with his family in an ordinary motorcar, at the present time. They are mostly that inaccessible. Of course, it is true, that with modern four-wheel-drive jeeps a person can go almost anywhere there is a trail and he can still keep four wheels on the ground and there may be a few places where rough roads are needed for forest fire and insect protection, but under the present bill these exceptional situations are provided for. In the main, we can hardly have a true wilderness if we are going to allow every possible kind of access and use. The people who are opposing this legislation all seem to profess that they are in favor of having wildernesses, but their interpretation of wilderness is something where each may still pursue his own special interest, uninterrupted, whatever it may be. They say we must have "multiple use," but their interpretation of "multiple use" is, after all, a "single use."

As to your second and last objection, in which you state your belief that the Congress should have the positive right to include or exclude designated areas in the wilderness system I can go along with you, although I think we all must realize that Congress itself is sometimes subject to pressures and influences that do not work for the best interests of the people of a particular State or region. I am afraid that if some leeway is not given to the departments which administer these areas to take the initiative in studying and determining what are the best and most practical allocations or designations we are apt to have an unworkable law. Under the present bill Congress does have the initial determination of the wilderness areas when it passes the bill, and if the Congress wants each area specifically outlined and described in the bill as they are not set up by department regulations that could be done, although I personally feel that it is needless detail to be added to the bill.

Again, may I express my appreciation of your taking time to answer my letter and for your very frank statement of your position. I will appreciate your taking time to consider the points I have reiterated in this letter and that you may see your way clear to help us get this bill enacted into a law at this session of Congress. I shall be very happy to have any further comment you may care to make on this matter or to receive any further information you feel will be helpful to me.

Sincerely yours,

BURTON W. MARTSON,
President, Wyoming Division, IWLA.

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Laramie, Wyo., August 20, 1961.

The Honorable J. J. HICKEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HICKEY: Your letter of August 15 has been received and I want to thank you for taking time from a busy schedule to reply to my inquiry and give your reasons for your stand against S. 174, the wilderness bill. I also thank you for sending a copy of the amended bill as it has been introduced—or rather reported back to the Senate—and the copy of the printed committee report, which I have read with much interest, particularly the minority report included and to which you and the three other Senators have subscribed.

I am indeed sorry that you are in opposition to the bill. I still feel that it is a good piece of legislation, perhaps much better, as you stated, than the original bill. I do feel that its possible impact on competitive industries such as lumbering, mining, mineral exploration, grazing, and power development is considerably overdrawn, that the amended provisions of the bill do take care of these interests in such a way that the public is adequately protected, and we can still have wilderness, despite the light which the minority group makes of its definition.

As to the amendment which your group on the committee states would make the bill acceptable to you, I am sorry to state that I cannot agree that it deprives Congress of any Constitution-given authority when, under provisions now in the bill, either the Senate or the House can separately disapprove of any recommendations the President may make for inclusion of more areas in the wilderness system and thereby prevent such inclusion. To require affirmative action of Congress on every piece and parcel of land proposed for inclusion, no matter how small, would so seriously hamstring the additions to the wilderness system that it is doubtful if any expansion could ever be accomplished.

I do not doubt the sincerity of your minority group in your contention, but one cannot help but feel that no better way could be devised of preventing any future expansion than by adding such an amendment to the bill. With the difficulty that is encountered nowadays in getting bills onto the calendar in either Senate or House, and of having them considered on the floor, it is doubtful if Congress would ever get around to taking positive action on such bills. The only possible justification for such an amendment might be to apply to tracts of not less than 100,000 acres, and even that would be of doubtful value.

You state that you have no objection whatsoever to that part of S. 174 which would incorporate into the wilderness system the nearly 7 million acres already classified as "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe," which statement I am indeed glad to see. However, if these acres presently classified as such are satisfactory, what objection could there reasonably be to taking from 10 to 15 years, or any years up to that amount, as provided for in this bill, to study additional areas now held in primitive or similar status (a large part of which is in Alaska) which may be found to have equal value as wilderness areas and perhaps be best suited to serve in that status. We do not maintain that all these primitive areas should be necessarily put into the wilderness system, but, from my knowledge of these areas in Wyoming, I am confident that some of them might be favorably considered in the future. Are we ready for a four-lane highway to circle Cloud Peak in the Big Horns? Under present setup I don't think it would be too difficult to get such a highway built. But I, for one, would certainly hate to see it.

Congress is jealous of its prerogatives, and perhaps rightly so, but one cannot help but be reminded that we also elect a President of the United States, by popular vote, who as a candidate runs on a platform of his party, carefully thought out and well stated. Incidentally, I am reminded that both political parties had platforms including planks dealing with conservation, natural resources, recreation, etc., which were quite similar, during the last election.

Under these circumstances it is not likely that a President will go far off base in making recommendations affecting our public lands and their resources. These recommendations have to be carefully thought out in the executive department prior to such recommendations. It has been my experience and observation that a high percentage of the people who staff these departments are sincere, conscientious, and dedicated people working for the public good. As such they are unlikely to come up with and try to push through the President or anyone else, any half-baked recommendations. So, there are a number of checks and balances that operate to provide good legislation, good administration, and, it might be added, not all of them are within the Government itself.

Your minority group also makes a point that only a limited number of people, particularly those that are well heeled, can utilize a wilderness area, and that oldsters (and I realize that I am fast getting into this group) will be deprived of pleasures and benefits they might otherwise enjoy if they cannot have mobile access to all the wilderness areas. For one, I am not at all concerned about this and I think it is beside the issue.

In this connection, I do feel that there is need to be concerned about a much larger segment of our population, the youth and the middle aged, which is fast losing the use of its legs through the dependency on the motorcar, the motorboat, and the airplane—in other words, their physical fitness. Might there not be some justification for our taking strong measures to encourage vigorous outdoor exercise, such as hiking, mountain climbing, and other outdoor living involving considerable physical exercise? The provision of an adequate amount of wilderness and other outdoor recreation areas seems to be one of the answers to this serious problem.

Senator HICKEY, I regret burdening you with such a long letter at this time, but I do want you to know my reactions to the stand of yourself and the others in your minority group on the committee and of how important we feel this legislation is. I am confident I am speaking also for all members of our Wyoming division. I do hope that you may still find a way in which you can support this legislation in its pres-

ent form and help to bring about its passage at this session of Congress. I shall be pleased to keep in touch with you on its progress.

Sincerely,

BURTON W. MARSTON,
President, Wyoming Division.

STATE DEPARTMENT ADVOCATES MULTIPLE USE

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, a letter directed to me by W. T. Kirk, commissioner of the Wyoming Department of Agriculture, pointing out the concern of the State soil and water conservation committee with the wilderness bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 14, 1961.

Hon. J. J. HICKEY,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: I want to thank you for your reply to our wire sent in from the meeting at Rock Springs a week ago.

There was considerable discussion with reference to Senate file No. 174 when the State soil and water conservation committee met at Rock Springs. I am of the opinion that many people realize there is legislation needed in this area, but how it can best be carried on for the multiple-use interests, as well as the agricultural interests, is a different question.

You may be sure that we appreciate your interest and sincerity in this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

W. T. KIRK,
Commissioner.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I have asked that these particular statements be printed in the RECORD in order that the Senators may review them and come to the conclusion at which I have arrived that the people in my State desire moderation in consideration of the wilderness bill.

QUESTION IS: WHO SHALL CONTROL PUTTING LAND IN WILDERNESS AREA?

It has become crystal clear to me that the various segments of our society recognize that there is a God-given wilderness in the Rocky Mountain area; no matter what we attempt to do by way of legislation or control, the wilderness areas will remain. So the question seems to me to be twofold. First, there is the question of the degree of control. Second, there is the question of who will control the expansion or diminution of wilderness areas?

On these questions I find no violent disagreement between the groups whose communications have been made a part of the RECORD. They respect the views of one another, and it occurs to me that the basic concern which so directly attracts the attention of the people in the West is the question of who shall have the authority to determine the diminution or expansion of a wilderness system?

TO PROTECT WESTERN STATES CONGRESS MUST RETAIN CONTROL

With those who presented minority views I must say that in its present form the bill has gone a step toward giving the Congress of the United States control over the expansion or diminution of the wilderness system. But it is not a long enough step. It is my contention that if we are to consider including in a wilderness system some of our great primitive areas—the great frontier that for years has provided for the expansion of our country—then the Congress of the United States should determine what these areas are to be.

I make that statement for the reason that those of us from States that are large in area and small in population have the honor of representing a small number of people in a great body in which we have equality. My State has two representatives in the Senate, and there are two representatives from the State of the distinguished occupant of the Chair [Mr. CLARK]; yet there is a far greater population in his State than there is in mine.

Recognizing that fact, it is essential, in order to protect the interests of the people in my State, that the Senate of the United States have an opportunity to take positive action when the question of an increase or decrease of a wilderness area in that State, or in any of the various Rocky Mountain States, is contemplated.

ONLY A VERY FEW PEOPLE CAN ENJOY WILDERNESS AREAS

It is true that tourism and recreation in our State and in the Rocky Mountain region represent a growing industry, and it is noteworthy that when we look at the studies made of tourism and recreation we find that the purpose for which most people go into the West is basically vacationing.

This year we had prepared in the State of Wyoming, under the auspices of the Division of Business and Economic Research, College of Commerce and Industry, University of Wyoming, a study of the tourists who come to our State.

It is interesting to note that most of the people who come to our State for vacations seek to go into our national forests. They seek camping facilities; they want to fish; and to go horseback riding. The records indicate that those who come into our State to vacation, to drive in our forests, to set up their tents in the campgrounds, come back year after year, because they can bring their families and enjoy all these pleasures. However, when we consider the statistics on packing into wilderness areas, we find that an extremely small number of people seek to do that. And those who do come to go into the wilderness area, either to pack in on a saddle horse or walk in on foot, come once in a lifetime.

I have had the rare privilege of going into two of our wilderness areas. I went in on a saddle horse, and I took a pack train with me. I doubt seriously that again in my lifetime I will have the opportunity of doing that. Nevertheless, it was a great experience, and this great experience is recognized by all segments of society in our State.

However, like all others, we are concerned about who is going to control the setting aside of areas in Wyoming as wilderness. I am sure that an examination of the statements which are a part of this record will indicate that many of us in the Rocky Mountain area do take a moderate view, and that we want the elected representatives of the people to have an opportunity to determine whether the wilderness area should be increased or diminished.

AMENDMENT OF LAW ESTABLISHING THE INDIAN REVOLVING LOAN FUND

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1540) to amend the law establishing the Indian revolving loan fund, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the appropriation authorization in section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), is hereby amended by increasing it from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000.

Mr. CHURCH. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, that it agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHURCH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

FAVORABLE REACTION TO EICHMANN TRIAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the magazine Editor & Publisher for August 26, 1961, contains an article entitled "Favorable Reaction to Eichmann Trial." The conclusion of favorable reaction to the Eichmann trial was drawn by the Anti-Defamation League following a survey which was made of 1,800 newspapers all over the world. The survey included the reaction of newspapers behind the Iron Curtain and gave a report of the unfavorable reaction of some of those newspapers. Generally, the survey gave a balanced picture of world opinion concerning the Eichmann trial.

I ask unanimous consent that the report published in the magazine Editor & Publisher of August 26, 1961, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAVORABLE REACTION TO EICHMANN TRIAL

A large segment of the Western World's mass media reacted favorably to the conduct of the Adolf Eichmann genocide trial, despite their earlier criticism of the circumstances and legality to Israel's capture of the former Nazi.

This was the conclusion drawn by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith following a just-completed survey made by a team of researchers headed by Arnold Forster, general counsel and civil rights director of ADL. The survey studied editorial viewpoints of some 1,800 newspapers in the United States, Western Europe, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America, plus news coverage of 400 dailies in this country.

A separate check was made of magazines, radio, television, and the religious press.

The survey was made public this week in Facts, a periodic report of ADL, and covered

the period from April 11, when the trial began, to July 31, just before it closed. The Israeli court is scheduled to return its verdict in November.

A breakdown of 1,033 editorials in American newspapers during the trial showed:

Seven hundred and fifty-five (73.1 percent) generally in favor of the trial.

Two hundred and fifteen (20.8 percent) despite what they believed to be irregularities, thought the trial should take place.

Sixty-three (6.1 percent) opposed to the trial or unconvinced that Israel had a right to hold the trial.

Said the ADL report: "It is significant, perhaps, that as the trial began to unfold, negative editorials began to disappear from the press. Not a single negative editorial could be found in June or July."

SPACE IN MAGAZINES

The report said that just before and in the week following the start of the trial, American magazines devoted substantial amounts of space to the subject. The overwhelming number of articles about Eichmann's capture and subsequent trial were highly favorable in their approach.

But a number of magazines were editorially opposed to the trial, among them the Reporter and U.S. News & World Report. Among those favorably inclined editorially was Newsweek.

"Only after the trial began," said Facts, "did editorial comment become slightly more favorable. Many magazines seemed to generalize and moralize about the situation avoiding the hard facts of the case."

The most consistent television coverage, according to the report, was a half hour every week night to local stations within the New York City radius. It was put on by the American Broadcasting Co., and was in a prime evening spot with a real estate corporation as a sponsor. The program featured tapes of the trial and attracted a wide audience.

ABC also put on a Sunday afternoon network program over 60 stations, the report continued. This did not attract a sponsor. In the first days of the trial the station asked its New York audience to request a copy of the full indictment. It received 10,000 responses the first week; 8,000 the second week; and 6,000 the third week.

Four weeks after the trial began the National Broadcasting Co. gave an hour, from 10 to 11 p.m. on a Monday, to a special trial broadcast. About 180 stations in the country picked up the program. NBC, in addition, carried a number of special programs.

Newscasts of all stations devoted spot coverage to the trial, the report said, adding "but TV officials seemed to feel that the public was either uninterested or unwilling to watch the resurrected horrors of the Nazi atrocities. Advertisers, by their response, were in accord. No one offered to sponsor a national network show on the trial."

The ADL survey country by country is as follows:

CANADA

The reaction was similar to that in the United States, with the bulk of press, radio, television, and letters to the editor overwhelmingly in favor of the trial.

An estimated 90 percent of the Canadian press was favorable in editorial comment, but there were a number of publications which voiced criticism over the manner in which Eichmann was brought to trial and the basis in which legal charges were brought against him.

ISRAEL

Newspapers gave a considerable proportion of their total space to the trial. The Israel broadcasting service, Kol Yisrael, relayed the trial from the courtroom on opening day, and a survey showed that 60 percent of the population over the age of 14 listened in. A number of subsequent sessions were also broadcast, and each evening at the peak listening hour, Kol Yisrael provided a 30-minute review of the proceedings.

Facts reported that extensive coverage by the mass media produced a feeling of profound unity among the people—a unity not experienced since the establishment of the state. Equally significant was the impact on the youth of the country who for the first time learned what their parents had experienced in Hitler Europe.

WEST GERMANY

Extensive coverage by the press spared readers none of the details. Twice a week the West German television network gave summaries and commentaries.

The barrage of press reports and comments together with the radio and TV coverage had a great initial shock effect on the youth of Germany.

A poll taken in West Germany showed that the trial elicited a strong interest and wasn't taboo among the West German people. It also showed that practically every German family had to concern itself with the past because of the extensive German press, television, and radio coverage of the trial.

The majority of the press considered as the central issue the moral responsibility of the German people for the crimes of the Nazi regime which were symbolized in the figure of Eichmann. Practically without exception, they appealed to their readers' consciences to face the facts as they were revealed by the trial.

Facts noted that up to the conclusion of the survey the German press continued to devote to the Eichmann trial much space and editorial comment. Fifty German journalists attended the proceedings, including such highly qualified historians as Dr. Albert Wucher, who reports for the Sudeutsche Zeitung of Munich.

Leading periodicals and illustrated weeklies also published extensive studies of the Eichmann case.

The West German nationalist press, representing the views of neo-Nazis and Nazi apologists, attempted to play down the evidence and the impact of the trial. But, the report noted, the total circulation of these newspapers was only about 75,000 to 80,000.

EAST GERMANY

The press used the trial to embarrass the West German Government. They played up alleged former Nazis still or again in the service of the Bonn government, particularly Dr. Hans Globke, Konrad Adenauer's state secretary.

ENGLAND

The reaction was similar to that of the American press. Extended and comprehensive coverage was given to the trial, and legalisms which had taken up considerable space before the trial, diminished and disappeared after it began.

As the trial wore on, editorial comment dropped off.

Television provided substantial coverage with one channel showing films flown from Jerusalem two or three times a week.

One important development, the report noted, was the reversal of position by many who had been critical of Israel's seizure of Eichmann and the competence of the Israeli court to try him.

FRANCE

The reaction of the press was one of utter repugnance for Eichmann and the Nazis and the warmest sympathy for Israel in its effort to bring Eichmann to justice and to make the world once more aware of the Nazi system.

The French press, from the time of Eichmann's capture, gave extensive coverage to the pretrial developments and to the trial itself, Facts said, even with the major difficulties of its own: Algeria, military mutinies, public service strikes, etc.

HOLLAND

Wide coverage of the trial in all its aspects was given in the press. There was a great deal of opinion which maintained that Israel more than any other nation had the right to try Eichmann.

ITALY

Reports of the trial were given full distribution. The semiofficial news agency and all leading newspapers assigned their best correspondents to Jerusalem. Condemnation of Eichmann was virtually unanimous in the Italian press.

SPAIN

Spanish press accounts were superficial, giving the impression that the Franco government (since the press was state controlled) didn't want to reveal to Spaniards, the full horror of the Hitler era. There were publicized and officially condoned pro-Fascist outbursts but they made no impact on Spaniards in general, who were neither Fascists nor anti-Semitic. One such report claimed the wrong side won the Second World War.

SOVIET RUSSIA

The press charged Israelis with acting as accomplices of the Bonn government by suppressing evidence about supposed Eichmann relations concerning present-day Bonn leaders, particularly Dr. Globke. The Western governments were also accused of protecting Nazi war criminals.

There was a general minimizing of Eichmann's crimes against Jews as compared to his crimes against humanity.

POLAND

The press gave the trial and its preliminaries extensive documentary reporting. Eichmann's role was elaborated upon in considerable detail. While criticism of the current West German Government was found in the press coverage, Jewish martyrdom was a dominant theme.

Some papers defended Israel's right to try Eichmann.

HUNGARY

Press and radio coverage was as affirmatively impressive as in Poland, concentrating on Jewish martyrdom but adding its indictment of the West German Government. Criticism was also directed against Austria as a hiding place for war criminals.

At the trial's beginning, the press carried extensive, factual reporting with a minimum of editorializing. As the trial wore on, the amount of space given it diminished and the criticism of West Germany grew.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Press coverage, while extensive and revealing (in that additional documentation of Eichmann's activities against both Jews and Czechs was provided), focused principally on alleged interconnections between Eichmann and high West German officials. Jewish martyrdom was played down. The Vatican was also singled out for alleged connections with Nazi war criminals.

BULGARIA AND RUMANIA

Both gave little attention to the trial, although the Rumanian press was more anti-Israel than the Bulgarian press.

(Facts, commenting on the Soviet bloc countries, said: "It is obvious that external considerations—the strategic placement of each country in relation to West Germany and the particular attitude of each to Israel—controlled the decision of each in its handling of the Eichmann case.")

THE ARAB NATIONS

Everything in the way of anti-Jewish comment was forthcoming, ranging from bitter attacks on Ben-Gurion as a Jewish prototype of Adolf Eichmann, to a glorification of the defendant as a Nazi hero.

LATIN AMERICA

In spite of initial strong resentment and criticism of Israel for her method of apprehension of Eichmann, extensive and favorable press coverage was given to the trial.

The Argentine press featured the proceedings prominently on the front pages, and even the Cuban invasion and Algerian uprisings failed to push the story into the background.

In Colombia, on the opening day of the trial, all reports were favorable to Israel. Bitterly critical articles on the Nazis and Eichmann continued to appear although information reaching the press was generally poor.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE CARL ALBERT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one of my colleagues on the House side manages to work hard and produce amazing results most of the time without any fanfare, but occasionally his efforts are discovered and he receives headlines. It happened this week to CARL ALBERT, Democratic whip of the House, who is serving during Speaker SAM RAYBURN'S temporary absence as acting majority leader of the other body. This is the highest office an Oklahoman has attained in the Congress, and all of us are proud of CARL ALBERT.

I am happy that Roy Stewart, who writes a "Country Boy" column for the Daily Oklahoman in Oklahoma City, refused to be quieted by CARL'S modesty. He has written a story about "The Little Giant from Little Dixie," which rated bold headlines and which gives Representative ALBERT of the Third Oklahoma District part of the honor he deserves. I ask unanimous consent that the story be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Sept. 3, 1961]

SOUTHEASTERN HILLS TURN OUT LITTLE GIANT TO TACKLE BIG JOB

(By Roy P. Stewart)

The hilly coal country down southeast has produced two most unusual people—Pat Hurley and CARL ALBERT.

One of them, partially because of his own swashbuckling mannerisms, you have heard more about. The other, being a complete opposite in personal characteristics, you may know little about.

Hurley is a dismounted Patton. His early ambition went much further than popping a whip at a mine mule. It carried him into a President's Cabinet and into international councils.

A distinguished looking fellow, you always know when he is in a group, for he is that sort of person. Nature endowed him also with intelligence and a broad streak of humanness.

ALBERT is small in size but far taller by stature in the Congress of the United States than most of his constituents are aware. He would be the last one to tell them about it—how his newest job of acting majority leader of the House is the highest yet held by an Oklahoman—or of steps on the long road to that chair.

CARL is stuck with his 5-feet, 4-inch height just like I'm stuck with my face. In the cruel days of childhood, when teasing was overdone, it meant nothing at all to him to know that Napoleon was no taller. He did learn early that except for some physical encounter, brain can outpoint brawn.

These days when he is referred to as "the Little Giant of Little Dixie" there is a mixture of truth, respect, and admiration for him in the label. There has grown up around him on Capitol Hill a reputation unequaled by any 6-footer in the Congress.

There must have been some predestination in all this. CARL was looking for something a long time, perhaps without knowing exactly what he sought except a chance to prove himself, but in being elected to Congress in 1946 he found it.

ALBERT and the Congress fit each other like biscuits and molasses. In the drudging work of committees he worked as long as he once hoed cotton in the Flowery Mound community near McAlester. This is the real work of the House and often about as spectacular as chopping cotton.

It can, in time, give a Member a fine reputation among his fellows. But unless he tends to his knitting in the home district at the same time, he can be the most eager needleworker on the hill and get beat at home. CARL knows this—that is why he always runs scared—those Washington laurels might look wilted by the time he gets home.

In 1954 when ALBERT was named Democratic whip of the Congress it was obvious that the selection had the approval of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, even though it is an elective post. Mr. SAM didn't set the record for longevity as Speaker without knowing people pretty well.

The whip has little glory outside the cloakroom and little publicity anywhere. He has to have one velvet glove and one imaginary club. He has to count, check, sense, and feel sentiment among Members for particular measures, then on occasion beg, plead, threaten, backscratch, trade, or make fast chess play moves to win a teller vote.

The whip must know everyone and they must know him—but he does little work on the cocktail circuit. He must know which Member likes to duck out Thursday afternoon and go home, or habitually overstay a weekend on Monday. He has to know their hideouts, their habits, their pets, and sacred cows in legislation. Above all he must have their confidence.

Since Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, the Massachusetts Catholic and experienced majority leader, is taking RAYBURN'S post as Speaker for a time, it was natural that CARL moved up when the past 7-year record is scanned.

Since he is 17 years younger than MCCORMACK you can make book now that when RAYBURN eventually steps down—and he is 79 now—CARL will be leading contender for the speakership—providing of course, that Democrats are in command of the House at that time and that the Third District continues to send CARL to Congress. Even in a Republican administration the minority leadership is extremely important.

This is all a long way from that country school at Flowery Mound. It's a long way, too, from the high school days at McAlester when CARL worked to the point of physical strain developing an oratorical style. That eventually was to make him "The Boy Orator of Bug Tussle" and national oratorical champion.

His first try in a district meeting was a flop. He came back to win two State titles in a contest on the U.S. Constitution, sponsored by the Daily Oklahoman, to win at the regional in Kansas City and place in the national. He won a trip to Europe in 1927 as an 18-year-old senior.

Backed enthusiastically by the late Ted Beaird, of Norman, and others, CARL won the national intercollegiate as a freshman at the University of Oklahoma.

The $1,500 prize helped put him through school, with other self-aid, and the honors of Phi Beta Kappa and outstanding student followed a 4-year top average. He was awarded a Rhodes scholarship to Oxford and added two more degrees.

Although he took ROTC in university CARL did not have a Reserve commission in mid-1941 and was drafted. He spent 8 months as an enlisted man before starting toward officer rank, did 2 years in the humid Pacific campaigns, came out in 1946 with a Bronze Star and a light colonel's leaves.

ALBERT'S mother (Leona Scott Albert) died when he was a high school senior. His father, Ernest, a farmer and coal miner, was deep in the ground working the day CARL won the national oratorical championship. CARL married the former Mary Harmon. They have a daughter, Mary Frances, 13, and a son, David, 7.

THE GOOD SIDE OF THE SOUTH

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Sunday issue of the New York Times magazine features a timely and illuminating article by the articulate and dedicated senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. Entitled "The Good Side of the South," it was written by the able Senator after that publication accepted his challenge to the newspapers of the North and West to lift their "paper curtain which has been shrouded around the good side of the South."

In his scholarly and thoroughly documented presentation, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service presents in historical and economic perspective the factors which have shaped the modern South. He makes out a compelling case for the right of southern people, who raised themselves from defeat to prosperity by their own bootstraps, to enjoy the fruits of their labors without outside interference.

The Senator is fair and objective in his facts and conclusions and his thesis cannot help but be persuasive to those outside the South who, being unfamiliar with those facts, will read it with open minds before reaching their own conclusions.

The Senator from South Carolina has performed a great public service in writing this article, Mr. President, as has the New York Times magazine done likewise in printing it. I hope the example will be emulated by other news media outside the South, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this particular article be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 3, 1961]

THE GOOD SIDE OF THE SOUTH

(By OLIN D. JOHNSTON)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In a speech recently, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, challenged northern newspapers to lift "the paper curtain which has been shrouded around the good side of the South," and "start telling the world of our wonderful works." Therefore, Senator JOHNSTON was invited by the New York Times magazine to describe the South's "good side" as he sees it. The following is his response.)

"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—John viii: 32.

The truth is that 84 years ago the South was a burned-out, broken, starving, conquered land, ruled by bayonets and carpetbag governments, carrying around its neck the mass of freed slaves who depended upon this barren area for subsistence along with millions of destitute whites. Out of the rubble and chaos of the Civil War emerged the Nation's No 1 economic and social problem.

The truth is that today, 84 years after the end of the postwar area of so-called Reconstruction, there live in the South millions of Negroes who, together with millions of whites, enjoy a growing economy, an educational system for both races, and a social and cultural life which not only is held with great pride by southerners of both races, but also is the envy of many people in other areas of our Nation and the world.

One hundred years ago the Negro in the South was in slavery. One hundred years after the opening of the Civil War the Negro is free, prospering, with every opportunity for education, and enjoying a standard of living in many instances far above that of Negroes in some other areas of our Nation—certainly far superior to the Negroes in many African lands now just emerging from colonialism.

From abject poverty and in the face of a multiplicity of handicaps, ranging from freight rate, tariff, and other commercial differentials, through extravagant carpetbag governments which left it financially prostrate, the South has raised itself back into the national picture by its own bootstraps. The South is stepping forward at a phenomenal pace and today is cited by industrialists and investors as one of the foremost "lands of opportunity" in our Nation. In achieving that, the South has uplifted not only the whites but also the Negroes.

The truth is the progress that has been made, in the absence of anything from the outside but criticism, has been one of the most glorious stories of perseverance, humanitarianism, and sacrifice ever told.

The carpetbaggers and Federal troops did not uplift the Negro in the South; the Abolitionists and Reconstructionists did nothing for the welfare of the Negro after the glory of the movement had passed following the war. There was no Marshall plan; there was no foreign aid; and there was no mutual security program.

It was not the freedom riders, the Yankee industrialists, nor the U.S. Government which helped the Negro to progress financially, educationally, and culturally in the South through those dark years. It was the white southerner who shrugged off his bitterness of the Civil War and his humiliation of the Reconstruction period, and worked with the Negro to help the Negro.

The Reconstruction period, with its excesses of corrupt carpetbag government, left an extremely bitter legacy with white southerners who were disenfranchised of all rights and systematically robbed of their property. Many of the critics of the South today berate us because of our system of education, which calls for segregated schools. Ironically, the Freedmen's Act of 1865, enacted by a vengeful Republican Congress, by its very essence solidified the practice of racial segregation in schools. The Freedmen's Bureau was directed at aiding the Negro at a time when the white southerners were being exploited and robbed at the point of Federal bayonets. The Freedmen's Bureau launched a project to establish 4,000 elementary schools for Negroes in the South, but allowed nothing for white southerners.

Following Reconstruction, when whites regained their right to vote and the governmental processes were recaptured by southern whites, the natural reaction was to build a school system for whites. But despite the bitterness which existed during this period, southern whites continued, long after the Freedmen's Act went out of existence, to provide schools for Negroes.

I do not wish to use the Reconstruction era as a wailing wall for the South. But it is impossible to point up our progress unless we go back to the watershed of Reconstruction as a basis for comparison.

Readers, to understand what the South has been through, should know that by 1870 the total value of farm property had declined 48 percent; not a single bank or insurance company was solvent; the transportation system was in a state of collapse; and starvation was imminent in certain areas.

During Reconstruction, according to Morison and Commager, in "The Growth of the American Republic," "State treasuries were systematically looted and credit of the States pledged to the railroad companies and other corporations while taxes and debts mounted to dizzy figures. In South Carolina, for example, the radicals raised the State property tax until it was confiscatory, increased State debts from $7 to $29 million, multiplied legislative expenditures sixfold and sold charters to corporations. * * * Under the head of legislative supply, members were furnished at public expense with such articles at Westphalia hams, perfumes, wines and whiskies, Brussels carpets, gold watches, carriages, and ornamental cuspidors."

These are some of the truths which should set free from prejudice the minds of those who today write about the "backward" South, the "reactionary" South, and the "problem" of the South.

Throughout the 19th century and into the 20th the South still had to contend with one of the major problems that had been a source of friction since 1832 and a major contributing factor to the South's move toward secession in 1860–61. That is, the South had to cope with extraordinary tariff rates which protected the manufactured products of the North to the detriment of southern farmers who were forced to buy their finished products on the most protected market in the world, and sell their agricultural products on a free market.

These tariff rates, which mounted higher and higher through the years, added to discriminatory freight rates, placed the southern farmer at the mercy of forces beyond his control. Considering that the South was practically all agricultural at that time, it meant the entire South was at the mercy of Republican exploitation.

For at least two generations, every Governor of South Carolina has fought to get freight rates equalized for the South. Even today freight differentials still stand like ghostly memories of the Reconstruction era, handicapping industrial growth in the South.

There grew up an agricultural crop lien system under which farmers pledged their unplanted crops for credit in the form of supplies—pork, plow points, calico, hay, etc. It was practically universal in the South that there were two sets of prices—cash and credit. The credit price ranged from 30 to 70 percent higher than the cash price which, of course, actually constituted a huge increase in the interest rates on the loans. It is said that agricultural creditors in the South would have laughed off as relatively low the 43.5 percent interest then being charged by English creditors to Irish peasants.

The 11 States that were to become the Confederacy had a white population in 1860 of roughly 5.5 million, and a slave population of roughly 3.5 million. The four border States of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri had a white population of roughly 2.5 million and a slave population of 0.5 million. Thus, in round figures, the 8 million white people of the South, after years of war, exploitation and depression, had to take over the job of the economic development and education of roughly 4 million Negroes who, for the most part, were both illiterate and without property holdings. The Abolitionists and northern radicals tended to lose interest in the South after Reconstruction.

It should be remembered by everyone who would judge the South that one of our good works and one of our basic points of progress has been the overcoming of handicaps, together with the Negro. The white southerners at no point in history, after the bitterness of the Reconstruction era wore off, ever left the Negro by the wayside to starve and die off neglected.

Southerners who had regained control of the State legislatures and governments could have easily turned to a spirit of revenge, and excluded Negroes from education, jobs, and any number of things. But, to the contrary, the Negro has grown with the South, economically, educationally, and culturally.

The people of the South in every State have spent billions of dollars through the years repairing, regenerating, improving, and rebuilding their public school systems to meet the demands of a growing white and Negro population. The sole bone of contention of many critics of the South has been that the South harbors a system of separate-but-equal facilities for schools. It should be pointed out that after the Civil War and well into the 20th century the Supreme Court was not one of the institutions which felt that the educational systems of the States were its business. As a matter of fact, in 1896, the Supreme Court upheld, in Plessy against Ferguson, the doctrine of separate-but-equal facilities.

It was not until May 1954 that the Supreme Court rendered its sociological decision declaring it was unconstitutional for a school system to compel students to go to separate-but-equal facilities. Many of the writers who have waged war against the South's separate-but-equal doctrine in education have, in fact, misinterpreted the Supreme Court's 1954 ruling to mean that the Supreme Court had declared that segregation was unconstitutional.

This is not the case. Actually, the Supreme Court only said that compulsory segregation was unconstitutional. It did not specifically forbid people in a State to continue a voluntary system of separate-but-equal facilities for the races.

I believe the Supreme Court had no business reversing its historic separate-but-equal doctrine. I hold the practice or nonpractice of segregation is a matter for local people to determine for themselves. As the Republican educator William Graham Sumner once said: "State ways cannot change folkways."

When the Government forces people of different races to mix against their will in educational or social areas, then it takes on a risky role. When people are left alone to integrate voluntarily if they desire, then that is their business. The results, in some instances, are harmonious, as we can find in the State of Hawaii where probably every race known to man has integrated.

But when people of an area, such as the South, have lived for generations on a basis of separate-but-equal facilities and then are forced to turn their society upside down and reverse every practice they have ever known, trouble can be the only result.

Even before there was any Supreme Court ruling, the people of the South in every State had maintained a reasonable educational system for Negroes under then-existing circumstances. For example, between 1916 and 1928 the number of Negro high schools in the South increased from 67 to 1,860. But, not satisfied, the people began a great school-rejuvenation program in the 1930's and again in 1951.

When this latest school-rejuvenation program began in South Carolina, the State education finance commission agreed to

spend on Negro schools a vast majority of its income from a special school sales-tax levy. Priority for construction of Negro schools has been the policy of the commission in spending $205,744,112 since 1951. There is many a school district where school facilities for Negroes are far more modern, roomy, and better equipped in every way than the schools in the same district for white students. The requirements for teaching and the pay received by teachers in South Carolina are the same for Negroes as for whites.

One of the problems the South has faced up to uncomplainingly has been the educating of nonresident Negro pupils. Thousands of northern Negro children attend South Carolina public schools at the expense of South Carolina taxpayers. As an example, one school district in my State—and I am assured by school officials that similar conditions exist in many of the school districts of the Deep South—is Marlboro County.

This school district in the 1950–51 session had 4,550 Negro children enrolled. In the 1960–61 session the Negro children numbered 4,587, demonstrating an actual increase in Negro children in the schools of this district while at the same time, according to the census, the Negro population of the district has decreased by approximately 2,500.

Where are many of these Negro children coming from? They are coming to the segregated schools of the South from districts in the North where schools are integrated. Of the present Negro school population of Marlboro County, 1,009 children are listed whose parents live in Northern States and who are being educated in this school district at the expense of local school funds. In this one district alone the presence of these children requires 30 additional teachers, not to mention the classroom space, the school lunches, the school buses, and the other expenses involved in educating them.

The school board chairman of this county told me that he was advised by a local leader of the NAACP that parents of these northern schoolchildren were sending them to schools in the South partially because of an economic problem but more particularly because of the "immoral conditions of the northern integrated schools" to which they did not want their children exposed. This is something for the critics of the South to chew on.

If integration is such an all-fired important aspect of education, then why, I ask our northern critics, do these parents continue to send these children southward to segregated schools? It would seem, if southern Negroes were as unsatisfied with segregation as the northern critics would lead us to believe, southern Negro children would be traveling northward to attend the integrated schools of that area. Regardless, southerners continue to pay the cost of educating northern Negro school children who are leaving something they do not want or who are migrating to obtain something they lack.

There has been the question of voting rights in the South. I would not be honest if I did not admit right here that there have been some instances in the past 84 years where Negroes (and whites) have been disenfranchised. But looking at the South during the past 20 years, there is not much evidence of discrimination against voters. In South Carolina, with which I am, of course, most familiar, there has not been one case where a Negro has been denied the right to register or vote since records have been maintained showing the race of voters.

Two years ago, with great fanfare, the Republican U.S. Attorney General announced a probe of alleged disenfranchisement of Negroes in several South Carolina counties. For months this probe was conducted. Time and time again I called on the Attorney General to file his report publicly. Time and time again the Justice Department said it was confidential. No report was ever filed, to my knowledge, and no case ever resulted from this probe.

Much of the talk about voting discrimination is politics, designed to influence the passions of minority groups and promote bloc voting. Certainly progress has been made in this field from the days of carpetbaggers, red shirts, and Klansmen. This progress, it should be pointed out, was achieved by the people of the South and not by outside agitators. I, for one, think every qualified citizen should have, and exercise, the right to vote.

We of the South do not claim perfection, but we do claim honesty of belief, integrity of principle, and candor of conviction. When in our travels we observe the teeming slums, the high crime rates, and the shortcomings in other parts of our own Nation which were never handicapped with defeat in war, we are convinced that the story of the South—with its millions of white and Negro people living together in peace and prosperity—is a story of progress unsurpassed. We have come a long way, and we intend to go further into an even better life for all of our people.

We cannot measure the progress of the South only by boasting of our textile industries in the Carolinas, the steel mills in Alabama, the productive fields of cotton and other crops, the vast oilfields of Texas and Louisiana, or the bustling seaports of which we are so proud. The progress of the South must be judged by the fact that such achievements have been accomplished by a people who emerged from humiliating and devastating circumstances only a relatively short time ago in our national history.

ROBERT E. GROSS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the people of Georgia are particularly saddened by the death of the illustrious industrialist and financier, Robert E. Gross.

As founder and board chairman of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Mr. Gross demonstrated a faith in Georgia and Georgia people which has given our State its largest industrial employer—the Georgia division of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., at Marietta, Ga.

While I did not have the privilege of knowing Mr. Gross intimately, I had long been profoundly impressed by his sound philosophy of business and his progressive attitude which are reflected in the good citizenship practiced by Lockheed plants wherever they are located. His vision for the future of aviation, his adherence to free enterprise economics and his dedication to worthy civic and religious causes made him an outstanding example of the American ideal of success through one's own efforts.

The contribution which Mr. Gross, his brother, Lockheed President Courtland S. Gross, and their associates in the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. made to the economic advancement of the State of Georgia will long be remembered in deepest gratitude.

For myself and all Georgians I extend to his family sincerest sympathy in the great loss which they and the Nation have suffered in his passing.

PROPOSED AGENCY FOR DISARMAMENT AND WORLD PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Friday, August 25, 1961, the Minneapolis Star published an editorial entitled "One Road to Peace." The editorial relates to President Kennedy's proposal to establish a permanent U.S. Agency for Disarmament and World Peace and Security. The editorial favors the proposed legislation and makes some constructive suggestions.

I am happy to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations has been holding hearings on the bill, as has the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the other body. In the past week the Committee on Foreign Relations has held several sessions to mark up the bill and make refinements. Today we completed our basic work on the bill. It is hoped that tomorrow morning, at 10 o'clock, the Committee on Foreign Relations will report favorably the bill to establish a permanent U.S. Agency for Disarmament and World Peace and Security.

It was my privilege, along with many cosponsors, to introduce the bill in the Senate. I believe the passage of the bill would be a distinct contribution to U.S. foreign policy and to the Nation's overall program of national security.

There will be those who will ask, "Why do we talk about establishing a U.S. Disarmament Agency at the very time we are calling upon our people to pay more for national defense and security in the form of modern weapons?"

It appears to me that if ever there was a time when we ought to look forward to the hope of peace and ought to be planting our steps in pursuit of peace carefully and methodically, it is now. The arms race does not offer a solution to the world's programs. The arms race may offer a way to dissolve the world through combustion, heat, and explosion, but it does not offer a way to solve the problems which confront mankind.

I believe the Government of the United States will be taking a very worthy and notable step if it pioneers in the field of searching for a workable, effective system of disarmament. I am happy to say that our country will be the first to establish such an agency. One of the real weaknesses in U.S. foreign policy in recent years has been our lack of adequate preparation for the negotiations which have been underway for several years with the Soviet Union on the subject of disarmament.

It should be noted that the officials of this administration, including the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and other prominent persons, have strongly supported the proposed legislation.

It should be noted also that the former President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has supported such legislation. Former Secretary of State Christian Herter, former Secretary of Defense Gates, the former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Lodge, the former U.S. representative to the United Nations and to the Geneva Conference on Nuclear Test Suspension,

Mr. Wadsworth, all have supported the proposed legislation.

Also, General Gruenther, the former commander of the NATO forces, and General Lemnitzer, the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, support the proposed legislation.

One of the most moving pieces of testimony was that of General Gruenther, who testified as to the importance of the United States of America not only equipping itself to defend itself by means of an adequate national defense, but also equipping itself to search relentlessly, effectively, and perseveringly for peace through disarmament, through effective programs of inspection and control over disarmament.

I had the privilege of sitting through the hearings and found them to be one of the most reassuring expressions of public policy on the part of the leading citizens of our country that I have heard in recent years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Minneapolis Star printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star, Aug. 25, 1961]

ONE ROAD TO PEACE

With the Soviet Union stepping up its pressures against the United States and the West, some people have questioned the wisdom of President Kennedy's proposal to set up a permanent U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security.

They argue that the proposal appears to be a defensive move at the very time that the United States is under new Soviet pressure and propaganda attacks in West Berlin and in other crisis areas.

It is true that prospects for peace and disarmament are not very bright in times of tension, but the United States must be ready for peace as well as war. President Kennedy in his May 25 message to Congress said, for example:

"Our arms do not prepare for war. They are efforts to discourage and resist the adventures of others that could end in war. That is why it is consistent with these efforts that we continue to press for properly safeguarded measures."

Under the current proposal—offered in the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and several colleagues and in the House by a group of Congressmen including Minnesota Representatives WALTER JUDD, JOHN BLATNIK, and JOSEPH KARTH—the new U.S. Disarmament Agency would be concerned not only with ways and means of controlling and limiting armaments. It would be part of an overall peace program, and its Director would sit in on National Security Council meetings reaching decisions on disarmament and related issues.

Arthur Dean, one of America's current disarmament negotiators, recently pointed out that since 1945 at least 19 different people have had the responsibility at one time or another for America's disarmament negotiations. The result has been a lack of consistency, a lack of continuity, a lack of expert advice, a lack of research, and a general lack of information that hurt the United States when negotiations were undertaken.

The new Agency would be a concrete expression of the American Government's continuing efforts to examine every possible route to peace. It also would be a permanent Agency with its own appropriation, its own employees, and its own specialists, scientists, and technical personnel to deal with the technical, political, economic, and legal problems involved. These people would have a dedication and responsibility to a permanent Agency that those who have been "on loan" from other Government agencies to the temporary disarmament office never have had.

Former President Eisenhower, in supporting the proposal, said in a letter to President Kennedy:

"While any progress toward real disarmament can be achieved only where the opposing sides genuinely pursue the ideal of peace, yet it is futile to speculate as to whether progress toward peace or disarmament should take priority in such effort. It is clear that they must progress in step-by-step coordination, as otherwise nothing will be accomplished."

With the arms race continuing, with the Communists keeping their pressure on the non-Communist world, with weapons becoming increasingly destructive and complex, the danger of an accidental beginning to a new world war increases day by day. The United States can take the lead in showing its responsible concern for peace and disarmament by making the Disarmament Agency a permanent arm of Government. Congress ought to do so before winding up its current session.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

RESOLUTION

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ACCIDENTAL WAR

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a resolution—Senate Resolution 203—relative to safeguards against accidental war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

SOVIET RESUMPTION OF NUCLEAR TESTS UNDERLINES NEED FOR SOVIET REPORT TO U.N. ON SAFEGUARDS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Tass announcement of Soviet plans for resumption of nuclear tests contains a deeper and grimmer significance to mankind than first analysis might indicate.

For one thing, the Soviet decision adds immense complications to the problem of avoiding accidental thermonuclear war.

Why? Because now, the sheer number of Soviet nuclear explosions, and the immense, complex preparations for their tests will multiply the number of possibilities that someone, somewhere, may press the wrong button, or forget to do the right thing, or misinterpret radar blips, infrared, or other signals.

The whole international atmosphere has become charged by the Soviet announcement in a way that puts nerves on edge to a dangerous degree.

Meanwhile, there remains worldwide hair-trigger balance of early warning systems. These systems involve man-to-man, machine-to-machine, machine-to-man communication. The systems could be upset by unforeseen contingencies which are now multiplied by the regrettable Soviet decision.

It is for this reason, among others, that I am introducing today for appropriate reference a resolution to achieve a goal which I cited to the Senate on July 31. The resolution would express the sense of the Senate that the U.S. representative to the United Nations ask each of the major powers possessing capability of nuclear and thermonuclear warfare to report on measures which they have taken as safeguards against accidental conflict.

Since my statement of July 31, the intensification of the Berlin crisis has itself underlined the danger of accidental war by "escalation."

MY REQUEST TO DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Since then, too, at hearings conducted on the pending legislation to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security, I asked that the Department of Defense supply certain information—which might be available in the open literature. I asked what has been reported, if anything, as regards steps the Sino-Soviet bloc may have taken to prevent unauthorized or accidental use of nuclear weapons.

In the subsequent reply from Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, I was informed—as I anticipated:

> The Soviet Union has characteristically cloaked in secrecy any technical procedures or other measures it may have adopted to control and prevent unauthorized or accidental use of nuclear weapons.

The same letter stated with respect to fail-safe procedures:

> The Soviets have not disclosed whether they employ any such control and safety procedures themselves.

This letter will be printed in the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee on the U.S. Disarmament Agency, shortly to be released.

ONE-TIME REPORT WILL NOT SUFFICE

Now, let me stress this fact: The type of report which I believe should be made to the United Nations cannot be assumed to consist of only a one-time statement. Actually, safeguard procedures which might be reported and which might be regarded as adequate in, say, September 1961, may prove utterly futile within a few months from now because of technologial developments.

Updating the reports to the U.N. will therefore be essential. The fundamental situation which disturbs others and myself is that, right now, the world does not have the slightest notion as to any safeguards whatsoever—whether obsolete or up to the minute—on the Sino-Soviet bloc's part.

THE DILEMMA OF AN OVERELABORATE SYSTEM OF BALANCE

The plain fact, too, is that the United States itself faces a critical and chronic dilemma: how to build sufficient safeguards so as to avoid accidental triggering of an international holocaust, while at the same time not encumbering reasonable speed of response to a genuine attack in such a way as to result in national suicide.

To resolve this dilemma, the United States must constantly reevaluate its own safeguard system. To build in so safe a system that it is overelaborate might mean that we deprive ourselves of the capacity to retaliate promptly. Yet, to permit too unsafe a system would be to run the risk of accidental triggering of war.

This is a fearsome problem. It demonstrates that we will probably be living for the rest of our lives in a situation of particularly delicate balance in which both sides adapt their system of precautions so as to cope with unforeseen technological breakthroughs.

Does not mankind have the right to know about the safeguards which both sides have already instituted?

Does the world only want to know about the safeguards which have already been revealed in such large measure—wholly voluntarily—by this open society of the free world?

Should mankind be silent while a closed system—the Communist system—denies mankind even the most elementary data as to its safeguards?

PRECEDENT FOR U.N. REQUEST OF REPORT

There is ample precedent for the type of report which I suggest.

The United Nations and its specialized agencies request of all member states a great many types of information, concerning activities within the latter's respective borders. For example, trusteeship information is required on trust territories. Health information, data on education and a wide variety of other information is requested routinely by WHO, UNESCO, and so forth.

Does the world believe that the United Nations should be interested in requesting routine data for, say, the "U.N. Demographic Yearbook," but that the U.N. should not be interested in requesting life-or-death data, which may help determine whether the human race may be accidentally blown to pieces?

MEANING OF FAILURE TO ACT

Let me point out that if the Senate were to fail to act on this resolution, or if we acted favorably and the United Nations were thereafter to fail to act, such failure might in effect be regarded as tacit acquiesence in the present silence of the Sino-Soviet bloc on this crucial subject.

By contrast, if this resolution were to be favorably acted upon both in the Senate and the United Nations, it would attest to mankind's right to know, indeed, its insistence on knowing.

RESOLUTION IS NOT UNREALISTIC

Now, I well recognize that the reaction of some individuals to my resolution may be that it is allegedly unrealistic to expect the Soviet Union to report on even a portion of its safeguards.

That negative appraisal does not, however, constitute an argument against enactment of the resolution. Indeed, the chances may not really be favorable for this or a great many other worthy objectives which we seek for the safety of the human race. But that is no argument against making the effort.

National and international survival are too crucial for us to hold back on any sound effort for peace, regardless of its chances of success.

A point which I wish to stress, too, is that, the very act of asking the United Nations that a report be requested on this subject is itself a constructive contribution to mankind's safety.

For Senate passage of the resolution would put all powers on notice that the Senate feels that the substantive issue of safeguards had best receive undivided attention on both sides, whether or not the Sino-Soviet bloc ever chooses to make a report.

EXCERPTS FROM HERMAN KAHN BOOK

Now, as I reported on July 31, I have made a diligent search of the literature and find no facts bearing upon Sino-Soviet bloc precautions. There has not even been much discussion or speculation as to what the Sino-Soviet bloc may or may not have done.

One of the relatively few analyses of the problem may be found in the book "On Thermonuclear War," by the distinguished observer, Herman Kahn, published by the Princeton University Press.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of my resolution, followed by a few excerpts from Mr. Kahn's notable volume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 203) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the people and the Government of the United States are unalterably committed to exploring every possible means to prevent the holocaust of war; and

Whereas a third world war might involve incalculable destruction by nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, resulting in widespread loss of life and suffering among not only the combatant powers but among vast additional sections of the human race; and

Whereas a danger exists that such a war could occur by accident, as through mechanical error, faulty human interpretation of warning signals, issuance of irreversible commands by an undesignated individual, or through a wide variety of other unplanned possibilities; and

Whereas localized conflict by conventional weapons might, without the decision of supreme authority, start a chain reaction leading unintentionally to a combatant's use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons; and

Whereas the United States Government has taken elaborate precautions against any deficiency or error which could lead to accidental nuclear war and has voluntarily informed the people of this Nation and of the world through press, radio, television, and other means concerning many of these safeguards; and

Whereas other governments of the free world have similarly released information concerning safeguards against accidental nuclear conflict; and

Whereas the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, Communist China, and states within the Communist bloc have released no information concerning their precautions to prevent accidental conflict: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate respectfully recommends that the President instruct the United States representative to the United Nations to propose in the Security Council, and to press for adoption by the Council, a resolution calling upon the member states which possess weapons or capabilities in nuclear warfare to report at the earliest possible date, to the extent consistent with the reasonable requirements of national and international security, on the organizational, procedural, mechanical, and other precautions or safeguards which they have taken to prevent accidental nuclear conflict.

The excerpts presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM BOOK, "ON THERMONUCLEAR WAR," BY HERMAN KAHN, MEMBER OF THE PHYSICS DIVISION, THE RAND CORP.

(P. 205:)

AN "ACCIDENTAL" ACCIDENT

Let us now turn to the second of our eight basic situations. There may be an appreciable possibility of an accidental or otherwise unpremeditated war even when the situation is not tense. Almost all military planners believe that unless forces are much more alert and dispersed in the future than they have been in the past they will be extremely vulnerable to surprise attacks. As a result, there are all kinds of proposals to use extremely quick reaction or extreme dispersal with correspondingly dispersed control as a protection. But many who have studied the situation think that some proposals calling for forces of this kind can make us dangerously prone to accidents. For example, many studies indicate that unless a strategic force occasionally reacts in some appropriate way to false alarms, it runs a risk of not reacting at all when the real thing comes along. Some of the proposals advocated for quick-reacting or dispersed control systems could not survive many false alarms without some appreciable risk of setting off an accidental war. Even the current relatively reliable fail-safe or positive control systems may become dangerous if the Soviets adopt similar measures and either of the two sides is so careless in his operating practices that a self-fulfilling prophesy is set into motion.

* * * * *

Therefore in some sense the Russians have a legitimate right to ask certain kinds of questions about our operations, and we should be willing to answer these questions. Insofar as our system depends on things which cannot be explained to the Russians and which they may worry about, the system has a serious inadequacy. It is to our interest to convince the Russians that they do not have to be trigger happy. (They ought to do the same with us.) To the extent that they raise serious issues, they should be treated seriously, and we should even give careful consideration to their relatively clumsy propaganda campaigns. Unfortunately, the Soviets do not seem to be as interested in this problem as they ought to be. The U.S. technical experts at the 1958 Geneva Conference on Safeguards against Surprise Attack tried to discuss with the Soviet delegates measures that would reduce the risk of misunderstandings that might lead to an accidental war, but the Soviet delegates stressed the larger issues and refused to look at narrow technical problems. (However, our own position may have been excessively narrow.)

Fortunately, if proper preparations have been made, it is not necessary to take off on a false alarm just because the other side has done so. On the other hand, unless both sides make preparations for some kind of "hold" ability—for example, by refueling the airborne planes or bringing reserve planes to an alert status—it could be dangerous to call back the bombers unless it were certain that the triggering signal was a false alarm. Even with preparations, there may be some degradation if the timing is interrupted. Once this force has turned back or tried

some temporizing measure, schedules are deranged. Some bombers will lack fuel to turn back again. A large number of those planes that land may for some time be unavailable for a coordinated strike for various reasons connected with maintenance, crew fatigue, timing, and so on.

Unless we are properly prepared, fear of accidental war may lead to crippling restraints. Most people, when asked to choose between (1) a force which is invulnerable but achieves this invulnerability by having (every year) one chance in a hundred of starting a war accidentally, or (2) a force which is nonaccident prone, but at a result is so handicapped that it is vulnerable to clever attacks, will choose the second. They do not believe anyone would be so insane as to launch a deliberate attack, but the thought of accidental war is all too real. (A psychologist friend tells me that if one asks a 10 year old what he expects to be he will often answer, "An engineer, unless some fool accidentally presses a button, in which case I'll be nothing.") Therefore, unless non-accident-prone reactions are designed into the system, this could mean that the buttons will not be fully connected. If a surprise attack actually occurs, an appreciable portion of the offense may be destroyed on the ground. While this would not disturb the facade school, the possibility does disturb those who believe that as much of the offensive force as possible should play a role in punishing the enemy or in limiting damage.

* * * * *

(Pp. 227–228:)

It will be well at this point to list systematically ways in which a war could arise. This will remind us of some of the specifics that have to be considered. Table 36 covers basically the same area covered by the five classes of wars in table 33, but this time the viewpoint is that of the arms controller rather than the strategist. While the two viewpoints should be much closer than they have been in the past since both are trying to enhance security, it is almost inevitable in this world of parochial interests and bureaucratic specialization that they should differ. Table 36 tries to take account of the differences. The strategist is mainly trying to improve his nation's military position and international influence; the arms controller is trying to reduce the risks of war. However, the best members of both occupations may find their outlooks quite close, and in some ways, perhaps identical.

TABLE 36.—*The arms controller's view of war*

1. Accident:
   - (a) False preemption.
   - (b) Unauthorized behavior.
   - (c) True mechanical or human error.
2. Miscalculation:
   - (a) Escalation.
   - (b) Rationality of irrationality.
   - (c) Overconfidence.
3. Calculation:
   - (a) Reciprocal fear of suprise attack.
   - (b) Type II deterrence situation.
   - (c) Other crisis (internal or external).
   - (d) Preventive war.
   - (e) World domination.
4. Catalytic:
   - (a) Ambitious third nation.
   - (b) Desperate third nation.

The foregoing list is neither exhaustive nor disjoint. It is not exhaustive because our weapons systems are so new and their impact on each other and on international relations are so unknown that it would not be surprising if a war could start in some unforeseen manner. They are not disjoint because the causes of a war can occur in series or overlap in subtle ways. The four major topics are listed in the author's personal order of decreasing probability of actually being a cause of war in the next decade or so.

The first item on table 36, "False preemption," is the most publicized possibility and one difficult to consider objectively. I have pointed out that in a properly designed system it is most unlikely that this could be caused by a simple false alarm, but such an attack could be triggered by a series of false alarms if a chain of self-fulfilling prophesies should be set into motion. The prevention of this last possibility may be one of the most important objectives of arms control. It is also conceivable that a pathological individual will deliberately try to start a war. The Soviets have made much of the possibility that a deranged American pilot on airborne alert would take it in his head to attack the Soviet Union. However, there are many safeguards against this behavior. Also it is most unlikely that an attack by a lone plane would touch off a war. Another possibility is given by Peter Bryant (in "Red Alert," Ace Books, Inc., New York, 1958). He discusses how a determined SAC general, who, unknown to his superiors, is incurably ill and whose judgment and sense of discipline are affected by this knowledge, decides to end the Soviet problem. Bryant is most interesting when he discusses the clever way the general negates the elaborate system set up to prevent unauthorized behavior. And last there is the possibility of a genuine accident—a switch failing, some ICBM's being launched through some mechancial or human error, some stockpile weapons accidentally exploding—any of which might, in spite of the safeguards, set off a self-fulfilling prophesy. These possibilities (unauthorized behavior and true mechanical or human error) can be influenced by collaboration with potential enemies in the sense that the degree of alertness or decentralized control that is required for one's force may be dependent on the overall strategic environment. Basically, however, the problem of unauthorized behavior or true mechanical or human error must be handled by unilateral action. Accident proneness may increase somewhat simply as a byproduct of the number of alert weapons. However, the really dangerous intensification is likely to come from the proliferation of independent capabilities, each with its own standards of training, reliability of personnel, and safety practices.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to be transacted, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 6, 1961, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 5, 1961:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Raymond F. Lynn, Brewton, Ala., in place of W. H. Schad, transferred.

William F. Salter, Evergreen, Ala., in place of M. R. Cunningham, retired.

Margaret E. Matthews, Gallion, Ala., in place of G. L. Collins, retired.

ALASKA

Marjorie L. Sharnbroich, Wrangell, Alaska, in place of E. R. Sharnbroich, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Lucille U. Mink, Bay, Ark., in place of M. L. Cherry, retired.

Cleveland L. Hodges, Earle, Ark., in place of L. F. Harris, retired.

Mary E. Ingram, Hazen, Ark., in place of L. A. Tyson, resigned.

Elizabeth A. Anderson, Monticello, Ark., in place of G. W. Stephenson, retired.

Vivian R. Craig, Newark, Ark., in place of R. M. Craig, retired.

John S. Buttry, Pea Ridge, Ark., in place of F. F. Wood, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Carl C. Courtney, Alhambra, Calif., in place of H. P. Dowdell, deceased.

Charles W. Spencer, Aptos, Calif., in place of A. L. Weiser, resigned.

Robert N. Kisner, Buena Park, Calif., in place of M. F. Inskeep, transferred.

John Santana, Cloverdale, Calif., in place of P. S. Kinsey, removed.

Dolores L. Sprague, Fulton, Calif., in place of Stella Sprague, retired.

Elbridge W. Skeahan, Grass Valley, Calif., in place of W. J. Wieger, retired.

Ruby M. Ambrosini, Korbel, Calif., in place of M. M. Morrison, retired.

E. Howard Stinson, Lindsay, Calif., in place of E. M. Bandy, retired.

Leslie S. Brown, Monterey, Calif., in place of K. U. Brown, retired.

Vernon G. Dingley, Monterey Park., Calif., in place of A. J. O'Sullivan, retired.

H. Norman Green, Shell Beach, Calif., in place of G. L. Mays, retired.

Richard T. Higgins, Truckee, Calif., in place of Elizabeth Bavier, retired.

Clifford J. Sorem, Ventura, Calif., in place of E. C. Ortega, retired.

COLORADO

Dale E. Pralle, Burlington, Colo., in place of M. E. Vogt, retired.

William H. Farnum, Jr., Glenwood Springs, Colo., in place of J. B. Schutte, retired.

Clara W. Dennison, Hesperus, Colo., in place of Ethel Dunn, retired.

Hugh L. Grauerholz, Yuma, Colo., in place of P. L. Kohlmeier, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

Walter M. McGinniss, Brookfield, Conn., in place of V. C. Geddes, resigned.

Eugene D. Lynch, New Milford, Conn., in place of J. J. Berger, resigned.

DELAWARE

Hazel D. Grier, Woodside, Del., in place of H. M. Jones, deceased.

FLORIDA

V. Paige Pinnell, Gainesville, Fla., in place of J. G. Davis, retired.

Mabel J. Wolfe, Key Largo, Fla., in place of G. H. Brown, retired.

Roy C. Arnold, Okeechobee, Fla., in place of H. L. Stokes, retired.

Clestelle W. Wadsworth, Wimauma, Fla., in place of A. A. Wadsworth, retired.

GEORGIA

James M. Groover, Boston, Ga., in place of D. R. Adams, retired.

Lois B. Bryan, Brooklet, Ga., in place of T. R. Bryan, Jr., removed.

Fred H. Tanner, Commerce, Ga., in place of L. L. Ward, retired.

Oscar M. Roberts, Donalsonville, Ga., in place of C. W. Beardsley, retired.

Leonard E. Smith, Lyerly, Ga., in place of J. C. Williams, deceased.

Susie G. Ellington, Montrose, Ga., in place of J. E. Custer, retired.

ILLINOIS

Hazel M. Craig, Alma, Ill., in place of Myron Craig, retired.

Henry T. Verfurth, Morris, Ill., in place of J. T. Donahoe, retired.

Theodore C. Geocaris, Mount Prospect, Ill., in place of Joseph Knuth, retired.

Thomas D. Neal, Sandoval, Ill., in place of M. M. Hawley, retired.
Warden D. White, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezouche, retired.
Clifford L. Shipman, Fowler, Ind., in place of P. J. Lockhart, retired.

INDIANA

Howard K. Sundheimer, Wabash, Ind., in place of A. E. Reynolds, deceased.
S. Wayne Hillyer, Williamsport, Ind., in place of L. J. Etnire, retired.

IOWA

Leo W. Dodd, Conrad, Iowa, in place of J. F. Alexander, retired.
Eleanora B. Sofranko, Lovilia, Iowa, in place of W. F. Gaddis, deceased.
Joseph C. Chervenka, Tama, Iowa, in place of G. J. Svacina, transferred.

KANSAS

Norbert F. Eisenbarth, Corning, Kans., in place of L. E. Kempin, retired.
Isaac M. Wilson, Easton, Kans., in place of B. M. Stafford, retired.
Paul J. O'Connell, Jr., Shawnee Mission, Kans., office established August 1, 1960.
Thomas B. Tichenor, Brandenburg, Ky., in place of T. W. Wilson, resigned.
Lawrence H. Framme, Jr., Carrollton, Ky., in place of S. R. Hill, retired.
Fay J. Hampton, McRoberts, Ky., in place of M. B. Johnson, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Ivy J. Miller, Church Point, La., in place of Stephen Bellard, retired.
Mary Jo McCutcheon, Clinton, La., in place of H. H. Phares, retired.
Lonnie J. Cryer, De Quincy, La., in place of M. A. Kent, retired.

MARYLAND

James E. Gault, Bishopville, Md., in place of H. R. Ringler, retired.
Rebecca T. Groton, Glencoe, Md., in place of T. C. Groton, deceased.
William L. Harbstreet, Lutherville-Timonium, Md., in place of E. W. Sperry, resigned.
Sylvia L. Golden, Nanjemoy, Md., in place of M. C. Ward, retired.
Elma K. Goodhand, Queenstown, Md., in place of M. S. Cross, retired.
Charles H. Ross, Smithsburg, Md., in place of E. L. Bachtell, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Irene F. Christian, Cataumet, Mass., in place of M. N. Bowman, retired.
Daniel N. McCarthy, Groton, Mass., in place of W. H. Folkins, retired.
James W. Griffin, Swansea, Mass., in place of H. E. Lenon, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Victor Batt, Allen, Mich., in place of W. Z. Todd, transferred.
Thomas A. Dowell, Battle Creek, Mich., in place of J. O. Curry, retired.
James V. Baese, Elsie, Mich., in place of C. S. Goodrich, retired.
Arlene B. Dolehanty, Gaines, Mich., in place of E. R. Stevenson, retired.
Donald E. Fish, Grand Blanc, Mich., in place of M. M. Blower, removed.
Peter V. Pini, Lake Linden, Mich., in place of R. S. Eddy, retired.
Eugene J. Jones, Mendon, Mich., in place of M. C. Travis, removed.
Evar J. Villemure, Newberry, Mich., in place of Joseph Villemure, retired.
Leonard E. VanSickle, Prudenville, Mich., in place of L. L. Malcomson, retired.
Richard L. Finkbeiner, Wayland, Mich., in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.

MINNESOTA

Arol D. Hansen, Askov, Minn., in place of Svend Petersen, deceased.
Oliver A. Herrick, Austin, Minn., in place of Elmer Requa, deceased.
Gerald J. Den Ouden, Edgerton, Minn., in place of A. F. Bolluyt, transferred.
Ione A. Slattery, Kilkenny, Minn., in place of Alice Gillespie, retired.
Clayton C. Linn, Kimball, Minn., in place of R. W. Adkins, deceased.
John G. Askew, Wadena, Minn., in place of R. H. Ireland, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

J. Kyle Lindsey, Booneville, Miss., in place of F. J. Fugitt, retired.
John M. McGowan, Sr., Camden, Miss., in place of S. L. Mansell, transferred.
Travis N. Holman, Tishomingo, Miss., in place of J. R. Trimm, retired.

MISSOURI

Ward Dennis, Huntsville, Mo., in place of C. E. Burkhart, transferred.
Robert L. Hurst, Rushville, Mo., in place of A. N. Cooper, retired.

MONTANA

Harry M. Halverson, Glasgow, Mont., in place of E. B. Pease, retired.
Dorothy Lechner, Winifred, Mont., in place of M. J. Lechner, deceased.

NEVADA

Ernest J. Arch, Reno, Nev., in place of Pete Petersen, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Richard M. Johnson, Ridgefield, N.J., in place of H. J. Formon, deceased.

NEW YORK

John P. Frey, Atlantic Beach, N.Y., in place of Catherine Damme, retired.
John M. Edwards, Chester, N.Y., in place of J. J. Diffily, deceased.
Donald F. Andrews, Conklin, N.Y., in place of N. S. Andrews, retired.
Helen S. Victor, Grand Gorge, N.Y., in place of A. V. Joslyn, retired.
John W. Carroll, Jr., Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.
George F. Longyear, La Fayette, N.Y., in place of I. B. Locke, retired.
Gerard R. T. O'Grady, Malverne, N.Y., in place of K. R. Brewer, retired.
James D. Donahue, North Creek, N.Y., in place of M. R. Rattigan, retired.
Kessler B. Baldwin, South Otselic, N.Y., in place of C. B. Baldwin, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Lester I. Carpenter, Belmont, N.C., in place of J. M. Armstrong, retired.
Robert E. Williams, Black Mountain, N.C., in place of H. A. Kerlee, removed.
Belle Cable, Fontana Dam, N.C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.
Willis Q. Moore, Hayesville, N.C., in place of F. R. Jones, retired.
Daniel A. Swindell, Robbins, N.C., in place of G. E. Walker, deceased.
Stanley L. West, Weaverville, N.C., in place of Kate Reagan, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Donald A. Supler, Verona, N. Dak., in place of A. F. Jones, retired.
Dale C. Nesemeier, West Fargo, N. Dak., in place of K. A. Peterson, deceased.

OHIO

Erva L. Sibrel, Gypsum, Ohio, in place of J. A. Wierzba, removed.
Richard L. Rizor, Mount Victory, Ohio, in place of Helen Shilts, retired.
Kenneth W. Bailey, New Albany, Ohio, in place of V. E. Clouse, retired.
Paul Sutch, Painesville, Ohio, in place of J. J. Cawley, retired.
George G. Walters, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, in place of C. G. Roshon, retired.
Harold M. Brown, Waverly, Ohio, in place of E. H. Jackson, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Volney B. Howell, Fort Gibson, Okla., in place of L. B. Rogers, deceased.
Billy L. Humphreys, Grandfield, Okla., in place of H. N. Patterson, retired.
Wendall D. Berry, Granite, Okla., in place of J. C. R. Boyd, transferred.
Anna J. Stepp, Headrick, Okla., in place of W. W. Stepp, deceased.

OREGON

Frederick L. Langston, Cottage Grove., Oreg., in place of K. V. Richards, retired.
Robert M. Buck, Lake Oswego, Oreg., in place of G. H. Carl, deceased.
Gerald J. McGlinn, St. Helens, Oreg., in place of C. W. Wickman, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

John C. McCurdy, Adamsville, Pa., in place of J. H. Neese, retired.
Howard V. Strasser, Albion, Pa., in place of M. A. Rood, retired.
Joseph R. Walsh, Carbondale, Pa., in place of John Nally, retired.
Agnes M. Smith, Dunlo, Pa., in place of M. J. Musilek, retired.
Bertram L. Ream, Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.
W. Armour Fegely, Fleetwood, Pa., in place of W. M. Bauscher, retired.
Ross P. Petrone, Jr., Wildwood, Pa., in place of E. C. Hardt, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Pascasio Vidal-Chacon, Ensenada, P.R., in place of Julia Chacon de Vidal, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Harry Kizirian, Providence, R.I., in place of R. A. Creekan, retired.
John E. Conley, Warren, R.I., in place of Fred Beauchaine, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William O. Callahan, Columbia, S.C., in place of E. C. Goza, retired.

TENNESSEE

Hybernia C. McMillan, Charlotte, Tenn., in place of H. B. Crow, removed.
Edward A. Riordan, Dickson, Tenn., in place of H. N. Reeves, retired.
Hazel E. Seward, Eads, Tenn., in place of J. K. Tynes, removed.
Lucille J. Lovell, Hampshire, Tenn., in place of S. A. Leftwich, transferred.
Guilford S. Ligon, Mount Pleasant, Tenn., in place of M. S. Stewart, retired.
Raymond B. Gibson, Spring City, Tenn., in place of C. G. McCuistion, resigned.

TEXAS

Thomas M. Yarrell, Belton, Tex., in place of E. L. Upshaw, removed.
Elvin C. Moehlman, Bryan, Tex., in place of J. P. Carroll, deceased.
Laura B. Stringer, Buda, Tex., in place of J. M. Barber, retired.
Ernest Gregg, College Station, Tex., in place of T. O. Walton, retired.
M. Forrest Brooks, Columbus, Tex., in place of A. I. Chapman, retired.
Thomas F. Calhoon, Jr., Liberty, Tex., in place of Tom Calhoon, deceased.
James H. Mecklin, Marfa, Tex., in place of A. L. Logan, retired.

UTAH

Ethel N. Jones, Corinne, Utah, in place of M. C. Hatch, retired.

VIRGINIA

T. Coleman Musgrove, Bedford, Va., in place of W. L. Skinnell, retired.
Virginia L. Fowler, Burke, Va., in place of R. R. Carter, retired.
Walter R. Hines, Jonesville, Va., in place of W. F. Cox, removed.
William E. Doxey, Portsmouth, Va., in place of S. F. Kirby, retired.
Will R. Wilson, Raphine, Va., in place of W. S. Wilson, retired.
Melvin S. Raikes, Roanoke, Va., in place of R. L. Via, retired.

WASHINGTON

Elizabeth L. Goodpaster, Hoodsport, Wash., in place of W. A. Oliver, retired.
Joseph Fosnick, Sumner, Wash., in place of W. L. Barnard, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mary J. Hafer, Elkview, W. Va., in place of J. E. Hafer, retired.

Robert H. Blackwood, Milton, W. Va., in place of D. J. Blackwood, retired.

Stanley A. Hehle, Parsons, W. Va., in place of Myrtle Blackman, retired.

J. Eugene Knowlton, Ravenswood, W. Va., in place of W. S. Myers, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Lillian A. Newton, Augusta, Wis., in place of T. F. Boehrer, retired.

Walter A. Post, Mount Horeb, Wis., in place of C. J. Sorenson, retired.

WYOMING

Reginald J. O'Neill, Basin, Wyo., in place of O. R. Booker, retired.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers, to be president and senior member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Brig. Gen. Robert G. MacDonnell, U.S. Army, reassigned.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Robert F. Corrigan, of Ohio, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Sidney Schmukler, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James H. Brown, Jr., of New Jersey.
David J. Carpenter, of Vermont.
Charles W. Lyons, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

John B. Perkey, Jr., of West Virginia.
Robert C. Texido, of Rhode Island.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

James T. Doyle, of Florida.
George W. Heatley, of California.
Edward G. Ruoff, of Ohio.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John D. Blacken, of Washington.
Donald C. Lautz, of Illinois.
Michael B. Peceri, of Florida.
Miss Jeanette M. Rebuth, of New York.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Jolahna D. Ballard, of California.
Richard Irving Burnham, of New York.
Stephen W. Bosworth, of Michigan.
Hobart Harrington Cleveland, of Florida.
John S. Davison, of Michigan.
Dale Alan Diefenbach, of Ohio.
Jerrold Mark Dion, of Minnesota.
David A. Engel, of New Jersey.
Jonathan W. Ewing, of Pennsylvania.
Anthony G. Freeman, of New Jersey.
Frank Ralph Golino, of Pennsylvania.
Donald Keith Guthrie, of New Mexico.
Frank G. Helman, of Pennsylvania.
Herbert A. Hoffman, of Pennsylvania.
Kenneth C. Keller, of Idaho.
Edmund H. Kelly, of Ohio.
William L. Lee, of California.
John J. MacDougall, of Massachusetts.
Robert S. McClellan, of New York.
William H. Metzger, of Ohio.
Glenn A. Munro, of Maryland.
Robert F. Ober, Jr., of Illinois.
Charlton M. Pettus, of Missouri.
Ralph C. Porter III, of New Jersey.
Jerrold C. Rodesch, of Wisconsin.
Leon Morange Selig, of New York.
Merle W. Shoemaker, of Pennsylvania.
N. Shaw Smith, of Virginia.
Robert R. Strand, of Ohio.
Gerry Eastman Studds, of Massachusetts.
Peter A. Sutherland, of Massachusetts.
Elroy Thiel, of Wisconsin.
John William Warnock, Jr., of Ohio.
Keith W. Wheelock, of Maryland.
Theodore S. Wilkinson III, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas Edward Williams, of Kansas.
Miss Hanna W. H. Woods, of Arkansas.
Ronald E. Woods, of Arizona.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Clarence H. Alspaugh, Jr., of Virginia.
Phillips Bradley, of Maine.
John DeNoia, of New Jersey.
Richard Erstein, of Massachusetts.
Evan Fotos, of Massachusetts.
Carl L. Gebuhr, of Iowa.
Edwin P. Kennedy, Jr., of Ohio.
Mortimer C. Love, of Pennsylvania.
Jack H. Mower, of California.
James G. Rogers, of California.
Terry T. Shima, of the District of Columbia.
Fred W. Trembour, of Virginia.
Neely G. Turner, of the District of Columbia.
Charles S. Whitehurst, of Florida.
Throop M. Wilder, Jr., of the District of of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be Vice Consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Stella E. Davis, of Georgia.
David W. Doyle, of the District of Columbia.
Douglas S. Elleby, Minnesota.
Stuart P. Lillico, of the District of Columbia.
Malcolm McLean, of Minnesota.
Donald E. McNertney, of Iowa.
Charles T. Magee, of Michigan.
William G. Meader, Jr., of Vermont.
Martin Prochnik, of Colorado.
John W. Shirley, of Maryland.
Charles G. Waters, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert D. Aitken, of New Jersey.
Robert L. Brown, of Tennessee.
George S. Gerhard, of Pennsylvania.
Vasia C. Gmirkin, of California.
James J. Halsema, of Pennsylvania.
William J. Handley, of the District of Columbia.
William S. Harrington, of Florida.
Albert H. Kline, Jr., of New Jersey.
Wallace W. Littell, of Maryland.
Leslie A. Squires, of Hawaii.
Donald J. Venute, of New Jersey.
Richard T. Whistler, of Florida.
Sam B. Southwell, of Texas, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior surgeon

Harold C. Woodworth

To be senior assistant surgeon

Winsor V. Morrison

To be senior sanitary engineer

Morris L. Shoss

To be assistant sanitary engineer

James H. Eagen

To be assistant pharmacist

Gerald R. Stowe

To be scientist director

Trygve O. Berge

To be senior veterinary officer

U. S. Grant Kuhn III

To be dietitian

Mildred Kaufman

To be senior assistant therapist

Lamont B. Smith

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Campbell, Robert A.	Wolverton, George D.
Payne, John S.	Peters, Herbert A.
Maguire, James B., Jr.	Walter, Howard L.
Prowell, James P.	Richards, Samuel, Jr.
Peltzer, Vernon A.	Hollowell, George L.
Sachs, Carl A.	Dawes, George M.
Hahn, Peter H.	Blackmun, Arvid W.
Baughman, Lewis D.	Mahon, John L.
Hay, Hardy	Hill, Homer S.
Doswell, Gelon H.	Lemke, Willard C.
Maas, John B., Jr.	Read, Robert R.
Teller, Robert W.	Moore, Clarence H.
Irish, Hugh J.	Nehf, Arthur N., Jr.
Leineweber, Thomas M.	Herzog, Lawrence L.
	Johnson, James E.
Fisher, Theil H.	Pierce, Richard H.
Matsinger, Henry	Cook, Milton M., Jr.
Grady, Thomas T.	Grow, Lowell D.
Curtis, William W.	Winters, Jack B.
Wolf, George P., Jr.	Dukes, William P.
Hood, Webster R.	Noble, John D.
Anderson, Robert W.	Babashanian, John G.
Bartram, Vernon L.	McDonald, Jay E.
Neville, Robert B.	Hood, Harlan E.
Codrea, George	Wagner, Joseph F., Jr.
Dutton, Thomas C.	Etheridge, James A.
Fairburn, Robert R.	Schutt, Richard W.
McBroom, Robert B.	Joslin, Henry V.
Reynolds, Walter E., Jr.	London, Lyle K.
	Cuenin, Walter H.
Juett, James G.	Hadd, Harry A.
Barrett, Drew J., Jr.	Johnson, Floyd M., Jr.
Cochran, Robert L.	Douglass, Graham T.
Barrett, Charles D., Jr.	Hoffman, Carl W.
Armitage, Gerard T.	Weir, Robert R.
Lawrence, James F., Jr.	Bale, Edward L., Jr.
	Thomas, Robert L.
Ridlon, Walter J., Jr.	Hartley, Dean S., Jr.
Bright, Cruger L.	McCombs, Grant W.
Sims, William J.	

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

T. Emmett Clarie, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut, vice a new position.

Elmer Gordon West, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice a new position.

Richard J. Putnam, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Louisiana, vice a new position.

George C. Young, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida, vice George W. Whitehurst, retired.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years, vice Leonard G. Hagner.

Hosea M. Ray, of Mississippi, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years, vice Thomas R. Ethridge.

U.S. MARSHAL

Donald F. Miller, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice William B. Parsons.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 5, 1961:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named persons to the office indicated:

Dr. Norman Q. Brill, of California, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term of 4 years expiring August 3, 1965.

Dr. Saul W. Jarcho, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term of 4 years expiring August 3, 1965.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to the office indicated:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

OMAR BURLESON, U.S. Representative from the State of Texas, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, U.S. Representative from the State of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

Arthur H. Dean, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

Clifton R. Wharton, of California, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Peter 3:13: *Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*

O Thou Eternal God, whose treasury of grace and goodness is inexhaustible, fill us with a humble spirit and a contrite heart as we now turn to Thee in prayer.

We penitently confess that our faith is frequently very feeble and we are tempted to lose hope when our labors and endeavors for world peace seem to end in frustration.

Grant that our President and all who counsel with him may be richly blessed with clear judgment and wise decision as they seek to solve the difficult international problems.

May our Speaker and the Members of Congress feel Thy presence in this Chamber, girding them with confidence and courage as they strive to build our shattered and storm-tossed civilization on the foundation of righteousness and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 1, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2457. An act to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to clarify the construction subsidy provisions with respect to reconstruction, reconditioning and conversion, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4539. An act to amend section 723 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for immediate payment of dividends on issuance heretofore issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 which has been converted or exchanged for new insurance under such section, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 32. An act authorizing the establishment of the Fort Smith National Historic Site, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4317. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H.R. 4998. An act to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6309. An act to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to increase certain limitations in payments on account of operating-differential subsidy under such title;

H.R. 6732. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to encourage the construction and maintenance of American-flag vessels built in American shipyards; and

H.R. 6974. An act to amend section 607(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos;

S. 486. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia;

S. 557. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1899, as amended;

S. 560. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 653. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 902. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

S. 1037. An act to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities;

S. 1123. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes;

S. 1132. An act to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor";

S. 1328. An act to authorize the establishment of a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes;

S. 1368. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent ocean freight forwarders, and for other purposes;

S. 1529. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, as amended;

S. 1537. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renee Deri;

S. 1762. An act to regulate the practice of physical therapy in the District of Columbia;

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Pedro Adan Generao;

S. 2070. An act for the relief of Kabalan Farris;

S. 2085. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds;

S. 2132. An act to approve the revised June 1957 reclassification of land for the Fort Shaw division of the Sun River project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with Fort Shaw Irrigation District;

S. 2135. An act to authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to delegate certain functions;

S. 2236. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity;

S. 2321. An act to encourage and aid the development of reconstruction medicine and surgery and the development of medic-surgical research by authorizing the licensing of tissue banks in the District of Columbia, by facilitating antemortem and postmortem donations of human tissue for tissue bank purposes, and for other purposes;

S. 2356. An act to amend the act known as the "Life Insurance Act" of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the "Fire and Casualty Act" of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;