

Senator HANSEN. Next we will hear from Louis S. Clapper, chief, division of conservation education, National Wildlife Federation.

Mr. Clapper, please be seated. We are delighted to have you.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS S. CLAPPER, CHIEF, DIVISION OF CONSERVATION EDUCATION, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. CLAPPER. I will try to make this as brief as I can.

I am Louis S. Clapper, chief of the division of conservation education, National Wildlife Federation. Our organization has its national headquarters here in Washington, D.C., at 1412 16th Street NW.

By way of identification, the National Wildlife Federation is a private organization which seeks to attain conservation objectives through educational means. The federation has affiliates in 49 States.

These affiliates, in turn, are composed of local groups and individuals who, when combined with associate members and other supporters of the National Wildlife Federation, number an estimated 2 million persons.

We are pleased to be invited to comment upon these bills which would add three significant areas to the national wilderness preservation system, in accordance with procedures set out in Public Law 88-577 of 1964.

A few explanatory remarks should be made here at this time before going briefly into details of the proposals.

The National Wildlife Federation endeavors to pursue a policy of reasonableness in the management of natural resources. Our organization was active among the original supporters of the wilderness concept, believing substantial amounts of this type of land must be set aside and preserved for a multitude of public benefits.

Complementing this position, we have recommended that suitable streams be set aside as wild or scenic rivers. Then, in a somewhat similar manner, we were among the initial proponents of multiple-use management, recognizing that other types of outdoor recreation, including fish and wildlife, livestock grazing, irrigation, lumbering, mining, and hydroelectric power production, as well as watershed protection, are legitimate and desirable activities or uses for certain types of public lands, including national forests.

Of course, some of these uses are compatible. Some are not. However, we recognize and appreciate the often difficult task that the Forest Service has in reviewing areas for possible addition to the wilderness system.

Many decisions must go into the development of recommendations for wildernesses. For the convenience of the public, and for ease of administration, there is a question about whether wilderness area boundaries should be located along easily identifiable physical features.

If so, should these be located along mountain crests, or at the base of escarpments, or located along slopes? Are elk disturbed and driven out of areas by vehicular traffic? Where should roads be located to help hunters gain reasonable access to game ranges, including those inside protected wildernesses? How much timber should be set aside for lumbering, an activity important to local economies? What about second-growth wilderness, and all-but-obliterated, one-time human developments? Should the same conditions apply equally to potential wildernesses in the Eastern United States as to those in the West?