

**STATEMENT OF DAVID BROWER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
THE SIERRA CLUB, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.**

Mr. BROWER. Madam Chairman, I am David Brower, of San Francisco. I am executive director of the Sierra Club and have come along with Bruce M. Kilgore, our editor, to represent the views of the 19,000 members of our 70-year-old organization.

Late yesterday afternoon a group of proponents saw the burden confronting the committee and the problem involved in hearing all of the witnesses. We were mindful of the request of the chairman of the full committee that all organizations, groups, and individuals, with a similar interest and position designate their one spokesman to speak for the group or groups concerned. We had no chance before this hearing to designate a spokesman this way.

Last evening, after yesterday's testimony, we felt that the conservation case had been made and wish to submit our statements for the record as if they had been read, and a number of us are available now for questions if the members of the committee wish to ask them.

We are sure the opponents are anxious to testify, and we are also sure you would not wish to continue this hearing beyond the time you have already scheduled for all witnesses.

Accordingly, Madam Chairman, I submit for the record several statements here of scheduled witnesses, and ask approval to submit others.

Mr. ASPINALL. Madam Chairman, I object to this proposal. The reason I object, Dave, is because I was told last week by a proponent of this legislation that this committee had made up its mind already as to what we were going to do. I took umbrage at that, because this committee writes a record, and if you do not believe it, or any of your friends do not believe it, you go back through the record of the last several years and you will find that we do not write up legislation until we have had the hearings analyzed, and that our legislation pretty much depends upon our interpretation of those hearings.

Now we are in no particular hurry to get this through and to deny to the people the right to be questioned. If they want to submit their statements individually, and in order, like we have asked them to do, or, if they have had to go home, and they cannot be here, then that is something else. But to have an omnibus request at this time, I object.

Mr. BROWER. The request, Mr. Aspinall, is something that we put together last night. Most of these people——

Mr. ASPINALL. You did not speak to the chairman of the full committee——

Mrs. FOST. Nor to me.

Mr. ASPINALL. Nor to the chairman of the subcommittee. Let us keep this thing in order. We are running the committee and we will take care of the procedures. If you want to get your statement in here, that will be perfectly all right and we will question you.

Mr. BROWER. Very well.

Mr. SAYLOR. Madam Chairman, the request has been objected to, of course, but I ask to be recognized to merely say that the request was that the statements of the people who are proponents of this legislation whose names appear here as witnesses be presented, and that they are here for questioning. There is no attempt whatsoever in the

request, as I heard it, to say the committee could not ask any one of the people who are here questions. I want to point out that all of these statements have been on file here with the committee in accordance with the request sent out.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my good friend will yield to me?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. My friend knows it only takes about 30 seconds for a man sitting down there to come up with his own statement and present himself before this committee, and if he sees fit to pass his statement in to us, he certainly can accept that little responsibility of presenting himself here and letting us look over his statement for a short time to see if we have any question. Let us be perfectly practical with this operation.

Mrs. FROST. The request has been objected to and is denied.

Mr. Brower, do you wish to present your statement?

Mr. BROWER. I have a statement of my own.

Mrs. FROST. You may proceed.

Mr. BROWER. As I said, I appear before this committee as representative of the 19,000 members of the Sierra Club, founded by John Muir 70 years ago to explore, enjoy, and protect the Nation's scenic resources. Our membership is nationwide. We are pleased to associate ourselves with the detailed statement of the Wilderness Society and the inspired leadership of Howard Zahniser. We are for the wilderness bill.

It is asserted by some that legislation is not really necessary to preserve wilderness. The chief land-managing agencies of the executive branch have testified otherwise. The topography that once provided much protection is no longer enough. Encroachment is now nearing the borders of the wilderness and the agencies need help to protect irreplaceable resources against future encroachment. It is not reassuring enough to know that excessive damage has not yet been done. You can't claim a dropping egg is safe merely because it hasn't broken yet. You try to catch it. We can measure the need for the wilderness bill by the very intensity of the effort to defeat it.

Outdoor recreation is one of the Sierra Club's major interests, but it is only one and not even a predominant value of wilderness identified in the recent special study No. 3 of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC). It has been noted that there are immense scientific values to be gained from wilderness areas, not to mention their importance as watersheds. The April 1962 bulletin of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, for an example, among many, carries a review of opportunities and challenges in the plant sciences, prepared by the National Academy of Sciences. It makes an urgent plea for the preservation of wilderness areas:

To preserve from extinction and to make available many of the higher and lower plants, many additional wilderness areas should be set aside in a number of climatic situations. Any serious delay may result in a complete loss of valuable species.

This statement does not even consider recreation—nor do I wish to dwell on it long. I would urge that the attempt to evaluate wilderness by counting the number of people who walk inside it is not an attempt that makes much sense. The very existence of wilderness adds quality to what surrounds it and to what people experience as

they merely look inside. It means quality in recreation even if wilderness is just the backdrop for it. Wilderness adds quality in roadside scenery. Wilderness lets a place have a beyond to it. Wilderness symbolizes the freedom to choose what kind of terrain you want to look at, or hope some day to enter or to save for your children to enter. Without it, the world's a cage. To paraphrase a friend of mine, the difference between recreation with a wilderness setting and recreation without it is as there is between the kiss of a bride and the kiss of a mother-in-law. America is big enough for both.

A major conflict between commercial resources and wilderness which the bill brings to a head is the conflict with timber. Here the special ORRRC study shows that the amount of timber standing in national forest wilderness, wild, and primitive areas is equal to only 1 year's national production. The report notes that the allowable cut from national forests could be substantially increased from land already under management. The report notes that no local community is presently dependent for its economic stability on timber in wilderness, wild, or primitive areas. The report notes that considerable expansion of the timber industry in the West could come about through better management of land already partly logged or allocated to logging. And finally the report notes that land presently reserved in wilderness, wild, and primitive areas is of generally lower productivity and subsequent crops of timber would take much longer to grow—which means that on a sustained-yield basis, this timber would be much less than a single year's supply. The report concludes that timber values in reserve national forest wilderness are negligible from a national perspective. All this is consistent with the conclusion reached 10 years ago in the President's Materials Policy Commission Report, *Resources for Freedom*:

Another long-range result of the widespread application of good forest management will be the possibility of confining harvesting operations pretty largely to the more accessible lands, the better sites and the terrain that is easy to log. This is so because, with intensive management of the more productive lands, the Nation can grow all the timber it is likely to use without taking much from the poorest land or the land that is most difficult to operate. This means a reversal of the spiral of increasing costs which has plagued the industry as it has pushed the margin of available timber further and further back into the mountains and into the regions which have been last to attract development.

It might be pertinent at this point also to quote the remarks of Senator Wayne Morse, who said in the Congressional Record of March 1 this year that the timber industry of this Nation has systematically refused access across its land by the Government to 700 million board feet of Federal timber. This is one-quarter again as much timber as in all national forest wilderness, wild, and primitive areas. The private timber owners have been, in the Senator's words, "locking up more timber by their own policies than the wilderness bill could possibly lock up, * * *"

We are driving through our wilderness too fast. Some scouts, way out in front of us half a century ago, saw the brink ahead and the need for a sharp change in direction and speed. They put up some signs, like the National Park Act, which said "Go Slow, Sharp Turn." But we have hardly diminished the speed with which we rush through our inheritance.

As recently as 1926, L. F. Kneipp, Assistant Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, prepared an inventory of wilderness in the national forests. His definition of wilderness was generous by today's standards: an area greater than 360 square miles without roads. He found 74 separate tracts with a total area of 55 million acres. In subsequent years, the Forest Service classified some of this land in primitive areas and later in wilderness and wild areas. A small portion of the acreage was transferred to the National Park Service. But by far the largest part was logged, mined, penetrated by roads, grazed, inundated by reservoirs, and so forth. In 1961, a comparable study by the Wildland Research Center of the University of California found the number of areas satisfying Kneipp's definition reduced from 74 to 19, the total acreage reduced from 55 to 17 million. And the size of individual areas was reduced also. The largest unit in Mr. Kneipp's inventory contained 7 million acres. The largest unit in the 1961 study contained 1.8 million.

That's hardly a generation's time. In it we spared essentially all the big national park wilderness, but we drove over or otherwise dismembered 38 million acres of big national forest wilderness. Our speed was slightly in excess of a million acres cut up per year. And we aren't slowing down for the turn. We are accelerating.

So in the story of our 300 years of America's conquest of its birthplace, most of the action is taking place in the last chapter, and we are still clearcutting a swath on the last page.

The friends of wilderness—the public at large—need this legislation. We in our time are losing a great deal because we have been slow to understand the real meaning of wilderness. The future will lose enormously unless we protect the future's rights today—one of those rights being the right to know wilderness.

We urge the wilderness bill even though it may make more difficult the dedication of new wilderness areas. Good things cost something and it is important that the Congress itself be involved in what happens to our most fragile natural resource and one of the scarcest—wilderness. As the hearing proceeds, we are listening hard. This is our children's last chance too. So much has been used in our short past; so little is left for the long future. Our ability to keep wilderness alive in our days will be the measure of what we have learned from the history of man's abuse of the land—and as our children appraise the history we are writing, no harm will come from our decision to be generous in saving their wilderness.

Mrs. PROST. Thank you. Are there questions?

Mr. ASPINALL. Madam Chairman, I wish to welcome Mr. Brower before the committee and to also tell him I consider his statement to be a very fine statement as one of the supporters of this legislation.

How long have you been interested in wilderness areas, Mr. Brower?

Mr. BROWER. I have been interested in wilderness areas since 1930 when I first went into one.

Mr. ASPINALL. How old were you at that time?

Mr. BROWER. Now you are asking me to give my age away.

Mr. ASPINALL. All right. But you were a young man?

Mr. BROWER. I was 18 at the time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Since that time you have not only been visiting these wilderness areas yourself, but you have also been interested in seeing that other people get to visit the areas. Is that not right?

Mr. BROWER. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Has this been done as a profit or nonprofit operation?

Mr. BROWER. This has been done as a nonprofit operation.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is all. Thank you.

Mrs. FOST. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Brower, I want to commend you for your statement and tell you that I appreciate the interest that you and your organization have shown in this legislation.

Do you feel that the prohibitions with regard to mining that were placed in the bill on the Senate floor should be eliminated from consideration by this committee?

Mr. BROWER. Do I understand, Mr. Saylor, this is the provision providing for prospecting without damage to the wilderness itself?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. BROWER. We like the way the bill went in in the first place better, but we realize that adjustments are made in these things, and that seems to us an equitable adjustment.

Mr. SAYLOR. I was interested in your quoting to us Senator Morse's statement. Have you seen anywhere in any publication any challenge of the correctness of the statement which Senator Morse made respecting the timber interests?

Mr. BROWER. I have not seen that yet, Mr. Saylor. I think there is probably an error, however, on page 6 where it says 700 million board feet, and that figure must be checked back. That does not sound like very much lumber. My statement should have said a 700-million-board-foot annual allowable cut; 55 billion board feet is "locked up."

A VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Could the witness talk louder? We cannot hear him back here.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have no further questions.

Mrs. FOST. The gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. BARING. No questions.

Mrs. FOST. The gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS. No questions.

Mrs. FOST. The gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. No questions.

Mrs. FOST. Mr. Brower, what is your opinion of the provision of the Senate bill, as passed, which allows grazing in the areas that have been established previously?

Mr. BROWER. We have alined ourselves with the views of Howard Zahniser and the Wilderness Society on this, and concur in that provision to protect existing rights or privileges.

Mrs. FOST. What is your opinion regarding water conservation in these areas?

For instance, let me draw an illustration. Near the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area in Idaho the Army Engineers have recommended a dam for flood control purposes. This dam would flood several miles on the Selway and Lochsa Rivers inside the primitive area which is scheduled to be included in the wilderness area. Do you feel that before this area is actually taken into a wilderness that the area encompassing storage waters should provide for river regulation and necessary flood control be deleted from the primitive area; or do you feel that we must hold to the original boundaries and envelop these areas in the wilderness and fight that battle later on?

Mr. BROWER. That is a difficult question, Mrs. Pfost. I have been quite interested in the water development problems in the whole Columbia Basin, and our detailed views on that have been published. I think that we would be willing to let this be considered in the normal reconsideration that is provided for in the equivalent language of S. 174 in the course of the reclassification of the primitive area, to wilderness.

Mrs. PFOST. In other words, you would not make a hard and fast rule. You are saying that if it is necessary to develop these projects for flood control and river regulation, or for water conservation, you would recognize that this may be a priority use, and therefore you would be willing to accept the decision then and not put up the type of a fuss we have had in some areas when water development became necessary?

Mr. BROWER. That is a difficult one, too, Mrs. Pfost. The question, as you put it, would probably define the word "necessary," and we might wish to argue a bit about that, but we would want to be reasonable.

Mrs. PFOST. I can understand there might be a different interpretation by people of the word "necessary." But some of these areas like Idaho and other Northwest States do find that there must be some development of these natural resources if we are to continue to grow and prosper. Also where flood control projects are involved, it is a matter in some instances of saving lives. Therefore, one project has been designated by the Army Engineers as a very necessary project from that standpoint. I did want your views on it. Thank you very much.

There is one other question I would like to ask and this is prompted also by your many years of experience. I recognize your dedication to your work and to the wildlife groups. I am wondering what your opinion is regarding these airfields that we have in various primitive and possible wilderness areas. I can speak of Idaho from personal experience. We have several airfields in the primitive area that will be encompassed in the wilderness later. Do you see any real objection to those remaining in where they are already established, Mr. Brower?

Mr. BROWER. Yes, I understand.

Mrs. PFOST. I am not speaking of new ones.

Mr. BROWER. We understand that, and we approve the accommodation of that kind of use that exists, as in S. 174, at this time.

Mrs. PFOST. If we find transmission lines need to cross the wilderness and it would save hundreds of miles of lines that would otherwise be required to go around the boundaries of the wilderness area, and the longer lines mean a greater loss of electricity, too, what are your views on this? I asked this question yesterday of Mr. Zahniser.

Mr. BROWER. Again our views are alined very closely with those of Howard Zahniser. We would not want it done, possibly, just because it was expedient. We would say, if it was essential, bearing in mind that you are losing something that is irreplaceable. If you can spend a little bit more money and find an alternate route, that possibly would be a better choice, a little more expenditure in order to keep what cannot be replaced.

Mrs. PFOST. I have one other question, and that is that the Forest Service gave us the mileage of roads in primitive areas within three

of the States, Idaho, Colorado, and California. In Idaho there are 192 miles of roads that penetrate into the primitive areas; some of them, we will say, 28 or 30 miles deep, and another one possibly only 11 or 12 miles deep. There has been great debate out there, and I have discussed it with quite a few people in the wildlife and conservation groups, and having inquired of them what their opinion would be, or what their recommendation would be on these roads, whether we must, out at the edge of the primitive area encompass this in the wilderness, or would they be willing for the boundaries to drop back to the end of the road and meander around so that the established road that is being used at the present time may remain, in other words, just shrink the boundaries that much. What would be your recommendation, Mr. Brower?

Mr. BROWER. Inasmuch as the boundaries cannot unshrink once shrunk, we would rather have that kind of road encompassed within the boundaries as a nonconforming use to provide better protection of the roadside.

Mrs. PROSR. Then would you recommend that those roads be blocked at the edge of the primitive areas so that no traffic could be on them?

Mr. BROWER. Depending on the situation and the terrain, which we used to say in the army, we would hope that this eventually might happen, but we would not know now. It has happened successfully from time to time in our primitive areas in California.

Mrs. PROSR. I happen to be getting older all the time, and I am a little bit gray over my temples. My husband and I used to like to drive to the end of these short roads, and then we would hike with our cooking equipment and possibly a bedroll up to some lake and fish. And those were glorious days and nights spent around the lake. But, if I had to hike that 25 or even 10 extra miles from where the road now happens to be, on top of hiking in from the end of that road to the lake, I probably would not have either the time or the physical strength to hike into some of the areas that I should like to frequent.

So, I can see some real problems arising when you block a road off out at the boundary of an area like this. Many people who are either hunting or fishing have over the years established practices of driving in on the same road and then establishing a camp from there and going out.

Do you still feel that the road should be blocked out at the edge of the boundary?

Mr. BROWER. Time is doing the same thing to me, Mrs. Pfof, but it has not yet done it to my children, and I would like to have a few places that they can walk to.

Mrs. PROSR. Do you think, though, if they can ride in on the road and then hike from there in to the high country or in to the lakes, that that is any particular detriment? It gets them deeper into these primitive areas, and out where the road happens to be constructed, it is generally a rolling type of area, probably the timber is rather sparse in comparison to what it is in the deeper areas.

Mr. BROWER. I am lucky. My children can do it either way. If the road happens to have a chain across, which one in the High Sierra Primitive Area does, they are perfectly willing to walk and this is one of my happiest achievements.

Mrs. FROST. Even though the road is 27 miles deep, plus the 13 miles into the lake, you will elect to walk 40 miles rather than riding 27 and hiking 13? That is your decision, is it?

Mr. BROWER. If that is necessary to keep some adequate primitive area for the future. I am not saying that should be done tomorrow, but I am saying that is something we should look forward to on less than major, paved access roads.

Mrs. FROST. One group in Idaho told me they were perfectly willing for us to meander the boundaries at the ends of the roads which penetrate the area. However, another one suggested that we bring the boundary around the road, go out to the end of the road and come back, and simply zag the edge of the boundary to accommodate the roads.

Do you think we can have roads in this area and simply draft by metes and bounds a description to exclude just the road from the primitive area? Do you think that is a practical way to do it?

Mr. BROWER. This is pushing me a little hard about country I do not really know. I can talk about the High Sierra Primitive Area because I have been there and know what has happened when roads are closed. I have not, unfortunately, been in your area yet. I hope to, and hope I have a chance to get there.

Mrs. FROST. You do see what I mean?

Mr. BROWER. I do. It is a difficult question and I know that the people interested in wilderness have been of two minds on exactly whether you include or do not include a road, and it is a very hard one to solve. I would gladly try to write a little piece on that sometime and send it to you.

Mrs. FROST. It is one of the things that is troubling the committee, and we will have to make a decision on it. There are roads in many of the primitive areas that have to be taken into consideration. We have the mileage for three States and the Secretary of Agriculture will furnish the mileage for other States having primitive areas.

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—See p. 1226.)

Now what do you think is a practical sized wilderness? What would you say would be a minimum size that should go into a wilderness area?

Mr. BROWER. I do not know that I would set a minimum below that which is encompassed in the bill now, the 5,000 for the wild areas and for the roadless parts within the national parks and from there on to as big a unit as you can get that has its integrity respected in the various zones. This can vary quite a bit. There is no fixed rule except an arbitrary one that you may need for administrative purposes.

Mrs. FROST. You would accept the measure as written, then, 5,000 acres?

Mr. BROWER. Yes.

Mrs. FROST. Thank you very much.

Are there further questions of Mr. Brower?

We appreciate very much your cooperation, Mr. Brower.

Mr. BROWER. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. FROST. Our next witness is Mr. Ernest M. Dickerman, in behalf of the Smoky Mountains Hiking Club, Knoxville, Tenn., the Carolina Mountain Club, Asheville, N.C., and the Georgia Appalachian Trail Club, Atlanta, Ga.

You may proceed.