

Mr. SAYLOR. You probably could answer, Mr. Hartzog, but you are afraid it would be embarrassing and might stop the North Cascades from being considered and we would get off on another tangent. You won't even have to provide it for the record. We can get it if we want to.

Mr. HARTZOG. Thank you.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, I am a little disturbed with this idea of lifts because the original act of 1916, which has not been changed by the Congress from that time to this, says the following:

Service thus established shall promote and regulate use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purposes of said parks, monuments and reservations which purpose is to conserve the scenery, the natural and historic objects, the wild life 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.

Now, how can you, as the Secretary of Interior, and your counterpart, the Secretary of Agriculture, come before this committee and say that in your plans for the development of the North Cascades you intend to build three aerial tramways into this proposed national park when the Secretary of Agriculture has come before this committee, along with the Director of the Forest Service, and said that in the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area the people in southern California who want to put a ski lift in are not permitted to do so because it is inconsistent with their usage? It seems to me that we have ourselves and the other members of this committee in an impasse that is going to be embarrassing in the days to come. Now you may comment, Mr. Secretary, if you will?

Secretary UDALL. Well, there is no question but that the policy, with I think very few exceptions, of the national park administration—I don't think the act compels this, the act is broad and is general in its language—the policy has been not to keep machines out of national parks because we build roads in most of our national parks. You drive up to the rim of the Grand Canyon and look at it. You have in most parks a big loop, a highway such as you have in Rocky Mountain. In other words, we haven't kept machines out of our parks. We put them in. This would be a large national park, half million acres.

There would not be a road in it, and we propose a substitute for a road and this is something that has been given a great deal of attention. I think they very wisely propose that the terminus or the base of these be in a national recreation area. There is no problem with that because this is a compatible use in a national recreation area. Two of them, according to the plans as Director Hartzog presented a moment ago, would have their terminus in the national park. Now, there is nothing in the bill that tells us to do this or not to do this. The Congress in its wisdom could ask us to report back and pass its judgment on this issue. You could even make a little bend in the boundary and keep all of it in the national recreation area if you wanted to. But I think, myself, this is a very creative solution in that rather than go in and hack out roads to get people in where they can get the one big look that you have in most national parks, in practically all national parks. I know the type of tram, a ski lift which is deliberately—deliberately has to be built out in the open, it is visible. What we are talking about here is something that can be designed that is hidden, that