

Further confirmation of the intent of Congress is shown by the contemporaneous interpretation voiced in House hearings on the San Rafael Wilderness Act on June 19, 20, and 21, 1967.

Reference is made to pages 40 and 51 through 63 for evidence of the intent of Congress that there be meaningful mineral exploration of the proposed wilderness area.

The entire problem and solution thereto are stated succinctly in the questions of Chairman Aspinall and the statement and answers of Mr. Stewart M. Brandborg, executive director, the Wilderness Society, on pages 118 and 119 of said hearings, as set forth on exhibit A attached hereto.

In brief it was recognized that there would have been no Wilderness Act without providing for a meaningful period of mineral value exploration and development.

Additional confirmation as to congressional intent is contained in the statements of Congressman Walter Baring and Craig Hosmer at the House floor debate in the proposed San Rafael Wilderness (H.R. 5161) (Congressional Record—House, Oct. 16, 1967, p. H13405) attached hereto as exhibit B.

(The documents referred to follows:)

EXHIBIT A

[From House Hearings on the San Rafael Wilderness Act on June 19, 20 and 21, 1967—pp. 118 and 119]

Mr. ASPINALL. I have one other question. This has to do with this matter of mineral survey.

Wouldn't you folks who are backing additional acreage in the Wilderness System rather see complete surveys and then have those areas nailed down as wilderness areas without the right of subsequent mineral development, or would you rather see inadequate surveys and let them remain open to mineral development, and in many cases open to the filing of claims as well as mineral leasing the application for patents under our mining laws?

Mr. BRANDBORG. Mr. Aspinall, as you remember in order to gain approval of the wilderness law in 1964 it was necessary for the supporters of the wilderness bill to recognize that such a bill could not be enacted unless the section 4 provisions calling for mineral studies and mineral development . . .

Mr. ASPINALL. You recognize the situation.

Mr. BRANDBORG. Unless conservationists agree to this mining provision, the measure would not move through the Congress. It could not be passed into law. We, as one organization which wants very much to see the wilderness law through to a successful start and to see it function properly in providing for orderly additions to the National Wilderness Preservation System, are trying hard to make it work. We believe that we should in all good faith apply those provisions, prepare for the hearings, do the necessary work ourselves, enlist the cooperation of the people in the field who know the areas, and encourage them to work closely with the agencies administering these areas.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Congressional Record, Oct. 16, 1967]

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the legislation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, but I believe there is a question as to the interpretation of the Wilderness Act of 1964 under which San Rafael would be created that definitely should be cleared up. During