

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, if we put these trams in, how are you or the Director of the Park Service or the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation going to be able to resist the pressures from the ski groups who insist that there be cut through the timber areas slopes where they can ski down from the top down to the bottom?

Secretary UDALL. Well, this doesn't bother me at all. There is hardly a year has gone by since I have been Secretary that there hasn't been some kind of proposal to put a tram in the Grand Canyon, and this I know would cause a furor, a conservation controversy of the first magnitude. I think we just have to recognize that this is a very special area and that this is a good solution in this unique area and that we are not opening the door or providing an opening wedge to anything else.

Mr. SAYLOR. The reason I am asking these questions, I don't say that I am opposed to it, but I just think we ought to establish the record right now so that somebody can't come along at some later date and say that this committee by its authorization of this park, in the concept that has been given by you, Mr. Hartzog and Dr. Crafts, was so broad that you or Mr. Hartzog or Dr. Crafts or your successors next year, 10 years from now, or 20 years from now, did not contemplate that other uses and other clearings, which are completely inconsistent with the purpose of putting in the tram, this is the reason I am asking these questions. I am delighted to hear this. Of course, I might say to you that putting a tramway may have caused the controversy. Putting a couple of dams or threatening to put a dam caused a little controversy in another area and I just want at this time to congratulate you for taking it out.

Secretary UDALL. Well, I want to help the gentleman make the record that he is trying to make. I have a rather short life span in my office. George Hartzog, if he takes care of his health, I hope will be around a decade or more. I think we ought to hear his views with regard to looking at the park system as a whole whether he sees any areas where there should be trams or ski lifts or things of that kind.

Mr. SAYLOR. Now, Mr. Secretary, if this park is established, is there any other agency of Government that at the present time or in their present plans, that you know of, are threatening to invade this proposed park by any dam or reservoir?

Dr. CRAFTS. No; not under the Senate-passed bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. All right. What about the bill that has been proposed here in the North Cascades report which we have before us here under date of March 1967, which indicates that we have two sections to our national park? Is there any threatened invasion of this national park by any license granted to anybody for a reservoir?

Dr. CRAFTS. No license granted at the time that report was issued, no FPC license. So the answer to your question, as I understand it, is no.

However, there is a proposed FPC application which, to the best of my knowledge, has not yet been filed with the FPC and which may be many years—several years off and maybe many years off, for a possible small reservoir I think about a mile or less in length in this part of Thunder Creek, to augment the water supply of Seattle City Light & Power.