



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 107

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1961

No. 154

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

* * *

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 15917 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 wilderness," 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.

* * *

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.

I close by urging the Senate to approve this wilderness bill. If it becomes law, 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.

* * *

SEPTEMBER 6, 1961

* * *

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment designated "8-18-61—D," the pending amendment. Before I discuss it, I should like to call attention to a section of the committee report which I think puts a little different emphasis on the uses of wilderness areas than has been put on them in the colloquy on the floor of the Senate a few minutes ago. At the bottom of page 20 of the report the following appears:

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. In the course of the debate on the bill there has been much reference to the fact that wilderness areas constitute some form of class legislation. It has been asserted and reasserted that it is the rich people who will get the major benefit to be derived from wilderness areas, apparently upon the theory that only the rich will be able to afford the horses, tents, and camping equipment that would be required for organized safaris into the primitive areas of the country.

I submit that such argument is nonsense. In Idaho there are 3 million acres of primitive areas. Every year thousands of people go back into the high country of the Idaho Primitive Area, the Bitterroot Primitive Area and the Sawtooth Primitive Area. They are ordinary farmers, ordinary working people, ordinary hunters and fishermen from the farms and cities of Idaho. They constitute the great majority of people who are enjoying these primitive areas. It is not an exclusive group of rich people, capable of affording all the paraphernalia of horses, equipment, and professional guides that we have heard so much about.

Of course, there are organized expeditions. As a Senator who represents a State to which people are attracted from

afar, by the unique values to be found in the primitive areas of Idaho, I believe that tourists, wherever they come from, are welcome in my State. Their presence constitutes good business for Idaho. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the great majority of people who go into the Idaho primitive areas are Idahoans, and not wealthy ones either. One need not go to the center of a primitive area to enjoy it. Where does such an area begin? It begins where the road ends; and if the roads never end, there never will be any wilderness.

Anyone can go into the wilderness as far as he wants to go. He may stay as long or as short a time as he desires, depending upon his own resources and the time available to him. The area is as much wilderness 3 miles inside the boundary as it is 30 miles inside.

So I reject the argument that the proposed legislation is class legislation for the privileged few.

It has been said that the wilderness areas will not be enjoyed by the majority of our people because the majority of our people have become car travelers. They like to take their vacations by automobile. They like to go into managed, organized camping grounds to pitch their tents or park their trailers.

It is said that most vacationers like motels, resort hotels, and dude ranches with the comparative comforts of organized life, and that only a minority of our people are interested in the spiritual values, the enrichment that comes from the solitude to be found in the wilderness.

I concede this to be the case. I suppose the majority of our people do like to go by automobile to campgrounds near paved roads. I suppose the majority do prefer the comforts of motels, resort hotels, and dude ranches.

But is it not a novel doctrine that the majority should thereby be entitled to trample upon the rights of the minority? Have the minority no entitlement? Have those who seek the sanctuary of the wilderness no right to it in a country as vast and rich as the United States? We will deny those people their right if

we fail to act in a timely fashion upon a wilderness bill.

Most of the people in the eastern United States are denied that right now because the wilderness has largely disappeared. It is vanishing in the West. Unless we take some action to establish legislative safeguards around it, within a few years it will disappear entirely. Once it has been dissipated, once roads have been built, once organized life starts, it is gone forever. It is not a renewable resource. So if we are to preserve for future generations the uplifting experience which has come to those of us who have known the wild lands, we must act now, else our children and grandchildren will be forever deprived.

So I say that, in a country which has come to be characterized by the congested life of cities, by the domesticated life of nicely clipped countrysides, let us reserve some place here and there and elsewhere around the country, where the land remains as God gave it to us, and make sure that it stays that way, so that those who want to escape from the banality of beer cans and cigarette commercials will have a chance to do so.

Mr. President, without wilderness this country will become a cage. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the fine statement that he has made.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his brilliant and eloquent statement. It mirrors the assertion that was made recently by Senator ANDERSON, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There is one other point which was made by the eloquent Senator from Idaho, which I should like to stress also. The President of the United States has emphasized to the country the importance of physical fitness.

As the Senator from Idaho has said, it is true that the American people no longer travel on foot or horseback; that they travel by automobile. The softness of too many Americans is becoming very evident to us. It is a great national shame. Some of us, I suppose, like to get our exercise by pushups, swimming, weightlifting, walking, running, farming, tennis, or golf. But there are people who

would rely on what is perhaps the most effective conditioner of all, and that is to go out into a wilderness area and camp, as the committee report points out, for a week or 10 days or 2 weeks. They do that not only to test their physical capacity and endurance and strength, but also their spiritual attitude. It seems to me that the argument in favor of preserving and extending the wilderness areas of America is especially overwhelming today in a nation in danger of going soft.

* * *

Mr. MORSE. I come from a section of the country where God has been most gracious, kind, and generous in providing us with a great heritage of natural resources. He has been kind to all America by providing the grandeur of this western country, from which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who are present on the floor at this time, also come.

Mr. President, I say you cannot go into the canyons, along the streams, through the primeval forests, you cannot associate with the grandeur of this great heritage which God Almighty has given the American people, and not come out of such a trip a better man or a better woman for having come that close to the spirit of the Creator himself.

We cannot justify, in our generation, the destruction of these great areas of wilderness. We owe to unborn generations of Americans to leave them the heritage which it has been our opportunity to enjoy. There is no timber interest, there is no mining interest, there is no grazing interest, there is no economic interest that, in my judgment, has any right to be placed above the great need of preserving one of the great spiritual strengths of America which is to be found in these untouched and untapped wilderness areas.

But as one reads this lobby mail, he would think that what we are proposing in this bill is to take over all the naturally wild areas of the States which now exist and turn them into wilderness areas. Those who would give that impression just have not read the bill. The total amount of the land area we are talking about is exceedingly small in comparison with the total amount available to the commercial interests for development—and I stress the word "development." I pray it may be development, and not exploitation. But we must judge by the past. The past shows that short-run interests very often predominate in the breast of man, and too frequently selfish purposes and selfish desires have resulted in the scuttling, ravaging, and destroying of great areas of natural resources which should have been developed, and not exploited.

So far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, he will not yield to the heavy demands which have been placed upon him by certain economic interests of my State, who sent a delegation not so many days ago, urging me to reconsider my position, and, none too tactfully, calling my attention to the fact I shall be up for reelection next year. I will let the voters of Oregon decide whether my position on this matter meets the favor of the overwhelming majority of the people of my State, but I am going to carry out my duty, as I see it, and I shall continue to support this bill. By doing so, I shall be helping to preserve a great intangible value that is so important in helping to maintain the strength of this Republic.

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

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Oregon for the very eloquent address he is making in support of the pending bill. It is typical of him that he would in this case, as he does in all other instances, place the public interest above any private interest.

I say to the Senator from Oregon that I, too, have been subjected to the threats of pressure groups in my own State, largely due to gross misconceptions of what the bill provides. They have warned me that I am digging my political grave in Idaho by choosing to support this bill.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield at that point for a very quick comment?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Usually when that argument is made the people who make it have lost all logic and all hope of being able to sell their bill of goods on its merits, because it lacks merit.

Mr. CHURCH. It is the scare technique. I deplore those who scatter the sagebrush once the sniping starts. If I am shot down, so to speak, it will not be in the back, deserting my duty, as I see it, to the people of Idaho.

As the Senator well knows, the bill in actuality constitutes no threat to any legitimate economic interest. It is based upon the wilderness type areas in national parks and national monuments, and those primitive areas which have already been withdrawn from the national forests, in which lumbering is already prohibited and in which there is very little or no mining activity.

In the whole of the wilderness system covered by the bill, throughout the entire country, only six mines are in operation, and these mines will continue, for the restrictions imposed by the bill within the wilderness system are made expressly subject to existing rights.

Moreover, such grazing as does exist will not be affected by passage of the bill. It will continue subject to the restrictions of existing law.

No one will be adversely affected by passage of the bill. It has been carefully drawn to give all possible protection to the economic interests of the West.

As the Senator from Oregon has so eloquently pointed out, the bill will establish the necessary statutory safeguards, while we still have some wild lands left intact, to make certain that future generations of Americans can experience the same enrichment we westerners have experienced.

This is the public interest which is served by the bill, the long-term interest of the Nation. Though there may not be organized, business groups here today in Washington, D.C., to support the bill, the great unorganized American public supports it, and those of us who vote for it will be acting in their interest and in the interests of generations of Americans yet unborn.

I commend the Senator for his splendid statement. I appreciate the support he is giving the proposed legislation.

* * *

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to express my very great appreciation of the wonderful way in which the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has handled the bill during the last several days. In one form or another, this bill has been pending in the Senate for several years. I believe it most commendable that the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho undertook to handle this very difficult piece of legislation. He has handled it in admirable fashion, and has demonstrated a complete grasp of this complex subject. All of us are indeed very proud of him. I also want to commend and thank the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for his outstanding efforts in behalf of the bill. He has indeed made a most valuable contribution during the long and arduous debate on this legislation.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to join the Senator from Washington in commending the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for the admirable way in which he has handled the bill, both on the floor of the Senate and in the committee.

I also wish to commend the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who—although unfortunately required to be absent at this time, because of illness—has guided the bill during this session. The bill represents the culmination of many years of work by a number of Senators, including the late Senator Tom Murray, of Montana, the late Senator Dick Neuberger, of Oregon, and other Senators. The bill is the result of their outstanding work. Their achievements in this respect have been very great, indeed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I wish to join in the congratulations and commendations of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for the admirable way in which he has handled this complex piece of legislation. We are deeply indebted to him for the action the Senate is about to take on the bill. It is a very happy culmination of the work of a number of us over a period of some 5 years.

Certainly this bill is very important in terms of the future of the Nation.

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, I should like to join in the commendations which Senators have expressed because of the fine work done by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] in managing the bill here on the floor of the Senate.

I know that the chairman of the committee, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would like very much to be here at this time, now that we have reached the point of taking final action on the wilderness bill. I commend him for his long and faithful service and for his brilliant leadership in bringing the bill out of committee and to the floor.

I also wish to comment on the political courage of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. The wilderness bill has not been well understood in the Mountain States, and interests there have brought great pressures on their congressional representatives, in connection with the bill. The junior Senator from Idaho has courageously guided the bill, which not only is in the interest of his State, but also is in the interest of all the other people of the United States. I am very proud and highly honored to stand with him as we are about to vote in favor of passage of the wilderness bill.

* * *

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I express my thanks to the Members of the Senate who have been so kind in their references to the part I have had to play in the passage of this legislation.

I should be remiss if I did not emphasize that the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. ANDERSON] is the man who really deserves the credit. He finally broke the logjam which held the bill in the committee for 5 long years. He brought the many questions to issue, and saw to it that the committee addressed itself to the vexatious problems which faced us, all of which resulted in the amended bill which was finally reported to the Senate. I am only sorry that the Senator from New Mexico could not be present, because of a temporary illness, to lead the debate in the Senate on a bill which is very close to his heart.

Madam President, I commend all the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, all the Senators from the States of the intermountain West, who are so directly affected by the bill, for the role they played in bringing this cause to final fruition.

I support the wilderness bill for the many reasons which I have stated during the course of the debate, but I must emphasize in closing that the ultimate reason, above all others, is a philosophical reason. Though we tend to feel that we are presently the owners of this country, we are not, in any true philosophical sense. We are the trustees of this country for a little time only. Our fathers and our grandfathers before us, though they may be dead and gone, still have a claim upon this country. Our children, our grandchildren, and generations yet unborn, who will come after us, have rights in this country. Our trusteeship will quickly pass, and we owe a responsibility to our forefathers before us and to our children after us to see to it that the trust is properly discharged.

Madam President, the proper discharge of that trust is partly within the province of this bill. Unless we enact a wilderness bill, we shall soon lose the opportunity to preserve intact wild lands which, once overrun, can never be repossessed.

The great purpose of the wilderness bill is to set aside a reasonable part of the vanishing wilderness, to make certain that generations of Americans yet unborn will know what it is to experience life on undeveloped, unoccupied land in the same form and character as the Creator fashioned it. This is an experience we in the West can still know.

The enactment of the bill will mean that our children will know it, too.

It is a great spiritual experience. I never knew a man who ever took a bed-roll onto an Idaho mountainside and slept there under a star-studded summer sky who felt self-important the next morning. Unless we preserve some opportunity for future generations to have the same experience, we shall have dishonored our trust to posterity.

I am very proud of the step the Senate is about to take. I think the wilderness bill will go down as one of the great conservation measures, in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt, of Gifford Pinchot, and all the dedicated conservationists who followed in their paths.

In this connection, I wish to say that the bill has had no partisan character. It has received widespread support from the Republican as well as from the Democratic side of the aisle. Time and time again, during the debate, we have relied upon the cogent arguments of the distinguished assistant minority leader from the great State of California [Mr. KUCHEL], who has given effective leadership to the cause.

To all who have had a part to play, I express my own appreciation. I think the Senate will take a noble and historic step by passing the wilderness bill.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am grateful for the generous comment of my friend the Senator from Idaho. I was glad in the debate today to be aligned with him and others from both sides of the aisle in producing a convincing majority for a piece of proposed legislation which he so eloquently described will be in the interest of the American people and future generations who come afterward. I thank my friend for his comment.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

* * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 188]
YEAS—78

Aiken	Gruening	Miller
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Beall	Hartke	Morton
Bible	Hayden	Moss
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Burdick	Hill	Muskie
Bush	Holland	Neuberger
Butler	Hruska	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Cannon	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston	Russell
Carroll	Jordan	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Keating	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smathers
Church	Kerr	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Lausche	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Eastland	Mansfield	Talmadge
Ellender	McCarthy	Wiley
Engle	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Williams, Del.
Fong	McNamara	Yarborough
Gore	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NAYS—8

Allott	Dodd	Thurmond
Bennett	Dworshak	Tower
Cotton	Schoeppel	

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Fulbright	Morse
Bridges	Goldwater	Prouty
Carlson	Hickey	Randolph
Chavez	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Magnuson	

So the bill (S. 174) was passed.

* * *

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the major provisions of S. 174, the wilderness bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR PROVISIONS OF S. 174—THE WILDERNESS BILL

1. What is the purpose of the bill? To establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, before our shrinking wildlands entirely disappear.

2. What may be included in the wilderness system? The system would be limited to Federal land already withdrawn for recreational use; made up from the following components:

(a) Areas in national forests classified as "wilderness," wild, or canoe, on effective date of act.

(b) Areas in national forests classified as primitive, on effective date of act.

(c) Areas in national parks and monuments, embracing at least 5,000 acres without roads, on effective date of act.

(d) Selected portions of wildlife refuges and game ranges established prior to effective date of act.

3. When and how would these areas become part of the wilderness system? Each of the four categories listed above are treated separately under the bill. Thus:

(a) Wilderness, wild, or canoe areas would become part of the system upon enactment of the bill.

(b) Primitive areas would be temporarily incorporated into the system upon enactment of the bill. However, the Forest Service would review each of these areas, during the 10 years following enactment, to exclude any part found to be more suitable for lumbering, mining, or other commercial use. Those parts having predominant wilderness values would then be recommended by the President to Congress for permanent retention in the system. Either the House or Senate could veto any such recommendation.

(c) Roadless areas within national parks and monuments will be incorporated into the system, during the 10 years following enactment, as recommended by the President to Congress, subject to veto by either House or Senate.

(d) Selected portions of wildlife refuges and game ranges will be incorporated into the system, during the 10 years following enactment, as the President may recommend to Congress, subject to the same congressional veto.

Once the wilderness system has been established as above provided, no new additions may be made to it, except by an affirmative act of Congress.

4. What restrictions would apply within the wilderness system? Subject to existing rights, there would be no commercial enterprise within the system, no roads, no buildings, and no use of motor vehicles, motorboats, or aircraft. However, these restrictions are subject to the following special exceptions:

(a) Aircraft and motorboats may continue to be used, wherever the practice has become established.

(b) Guides, with their pack strings, boats, and camping equipment, may continue to furnish their services for recreational purposes.

(c) Within national forest and public domain areas included within the wilderness system:

1. The grazing of livestock shall continue, wherever well established.

2. The President may authorize, within specific areas, prospecting, mining, reservoirs, water conservation works, transmission lines, and such roads as may be essential to develop and use them, wherever he determines such use will better serve the public interest than its denial.

5. What general exceptions are made by the bill? The bill expressly allows for the following:

(a) Such measures may be taken within the wilderness system as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and disease.

(b) The jurisdiction of the States with respect to fish and wildlife in the national forests is left untouched by the bill.

(c) Within national forest and public domain areas in the wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or water resources, will be lawful, if carried on in a manner not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

(d) Application of State water laws within the wilderness system are not affected by the bill.

(e) The jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission to license dam construction is not affected by the bill.

