

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
140 Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D.C.
National 8-3120, Ext. 881

For Release: Thursday a.m.
February 14, 1957

DWINDLING TIMBER INCREASING PRESSURE TO 'EXPLOIT' PUBLIC LANDS

Foresters administering public lands "are going to be subjected to pressures that their predecessors never fully envisioned or experienced, as private timber disappears into the mills and the green gold of the national forests stands as the sole salvation for many of the 3,000 hungry saw mills of the west," Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) declared last night in an address before the Washington Section of the Society of American Foresters.

"It is going to take strong administration and well informed public opinion to insure that conservation principles, and our faith with future generations, are not beached," he warned.

Calling attention to Gifford Pinchot's warning of a half-century ago that control over natural resources gives control over the economic and political life of the nation, Senator Humphrey added:

"Make no mistake, gentlemen--the conservation battles of the last four years have been over the control of our National Forests, public lands and range, the water power sites, and oil-underlain wildlife refuges -- rather than over the technical applications and practices to the resources. This is a never-ending struggle.

"It should certainly surprise no one that this struggle becomes reflected in American political life, for political action is a means of achieving our aspirations and objectives in a democracy. Whatever our political affiliation, I think that all of us interested in the conservation movement had a right to be shocked by some of the excesses and deterioration of resource programs during the past four years."

Senator Humphrey said that leading foresters, soil conservationists, wildlife management specialists, and others in the conservation movement who were so concerned about what was happening under the existing Administration that they formed an organization "to get the story across to the voters" during the last campaign were actually "answering a high call to public duty".

"One of the functions of an American political campaign is to air issues for public discussion. We need more, not less, emphasis on these vital resource issues in our political campaigns -- and we need conservation leaders with courage enough to speak out boldly when they see the public's interest jeopardized by selfish grabs on the forest and range.

"This again is a time in the conservation movement when the strength of your ideals and convictions will be tested in the crucible of time," he told the foresters, "for I assure you the fires of the special interest groups are never banked.

"Preservation of a weak neutrality, at a time when the public interest is threatened, is equivalent to lining up on the wrong side. Pinchot could not do it in the Ballinger case, and it can not be done today."

LOOKING AHEAD ON FOREST POLICY

COPY

*File Copy
Returned to
Sen. Humphrey*

(Address by Senator Robert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) before
Washington Section of Society of American Foresters,
Wednesday night, February 13, 1957)

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to appear
before your Washington Section of the professional Society of
American Foresters, founded here just over fifty years ago by
Gifford Pinchot. His ideals still inspire and guide us today.

Our forest programs which assure us of our present
day timber supplies, are in large measure due to the dedication
of Pinchot and his fellow foresters to the philosophy that
government has an active responsibility for the custodianship
of our God-given resources.

All of us concerned with conservation need to keep that
philosophy to the forefront, and make sure our government does
not neglect its responsibilities.

Fortunately, ever since Pinchot's time foresters have
continued to give strong leadership to the conservation movement.

-2-
COPY

They have earned a distinguished place among the American professional groups.

Foresters have stood four-square in the public interest against those pressures from seekers of privilege who would corrupt governmental processes for personal gain. Never in the history of the Forest Service, which employs large numbers of you and which is responsible for custodianship of billions of dollars of national assets, has the breath of scandal touched a professional forester.

In the widely publicized Al Serena case which involved National Forest timber, not a single forester was involved. It was, in fact, a deal put over in spite of your opposition.

I sincerely hope the American people realize and appreciate your unselfish devotion to an ideal. And I hope that this great tradition among professional foresters in their devotion to the public interest will continue unchanged, despite mounting pressures from those seekers of special rights in the property belonging to all citizens.

COPY

I was particularly happy to hear, tonight, that your

Society is sponsoring a discussion next month of both the pros and cons on the Wilderness Bill which I have sponsored. That is as it should be.

Foresters as a profession must look farther ahead than most groups in American life, because of the time involved in growing trees. Perhaps that is one of the reasons you are a group of men with real vision and idealism. Too often today there is a tendency to fall into the rut of conformity and to consider differences of opinion as unpleasant -- or to allow personalities to blind us to the issues.

Discussion, debate, and dissention are the very stuff of which American democratic life is made. I have often referred to them as the "Three D's of Democracy". Never be afraid to dissent from popular ideas. History reveals that the unpopular dissenter

COPY

of today is often the prophet of tomorrow.

But do not make the mistake of thinking you will keep free from political turmoil, or that it is professionally undignified or unethical to stand up and be counted at a time when courage and decision are called for. Preservation of a weak neutrality, at a time when the public interest is threatened, is equivalent to lining up on the wrong side. Pinchot could not do it in the Ballinger case, and it can not be done today. And this again is a time in the conservation movement when the strength of your ideals and convictions will be tested in the crucible of time for I assure you the fires of the special interest groups are never banked.

In recent years, some have come to think that the battles over control over our natural resources have no application today. Perhaps we have lulled ourselves into a sense of false security because we have made great achievements in the widespread application of soil conservation, forest and wildlife management measures.

-5-
COPY

These technical applications are vital to sound conservation.

Nearly everyone today agrees that proper soil, water, and forest conservation techniques should be applied extensively.

But that is only a part of the conservation battle.

Pinchot observed fifty years ago that control over natural resources gives control over the economic and political life of the nation.

Make no mistake, gentlemen -- the conservation battles of the last four years have been over the control of our National Forests, public lands and range, the water power sites, and oil-underlain wildlife refuges -- rather than over the technical applications and practices to the resources.

This is a never-ending struggle.

It should certainly surprise no one that this struggle becomes reflected in American political life, for political action is a means of achieving our aspirations and objectives in a democracy.

-6-
COPY

Conservationists need the cooperation and support of elected officials or administrative officers of both political parties in our country to achieve conservation goals. This requires that they put a stamp of approval on the actions of their elected and appointed office holders when they are right, just as they must firmly repudiate whatever a political candidate or administration stands for that is not right.

For example, whatever our political affiliation, I think that we would not be honest if we did not recognize that the New Deal gave new impetus to the conservation movement that had lain dormant since Teddy Roosevelt's day.

And whatever our political affiliation, I think that all of us interested in the conservation movement had a right to be shocked by some of the excesses and deterioration of resource programs during the past four years.

Within my memory this last campaign was the first one which

COPY

found leading foresters, soil conservationists, wildlife management specialists, and others in the conservation movement -- concerned about what was happening under the existing Administration -- forming an organization to get the story across to the voter. They answered a high call to public duty. One of the functions of an American political campaign is to air issues of public discussion -- and this committee of conservationists did their job with dignity and responsibility. The Gore Committee has shown the affinity big business has for the Republican Party. When the conservationists, with limited funds, but lots of energy, started to tell the story of the last four years the Big Business Boys started to squeal.

Not one of the conservationists nine charges of misdirected resource policy was ever met, or denied by the Republican Administration. They made their charges stick. And make no mistake -- the effect is evident in the Congressional election results for the Administration to study.

COPY

I am afraid, however, they still have not fully learned

their lesson. Nomination of former Congressman Ellsworth as a member of the Civil Service Commission, after his involvement in the Al Serena case, will shock the sensibilities of most conservationists. I am sure quite a few will agree with me that his record hardly indicates a sense of values qualifying him to set the tone for our civil service structure.

We need more, not less, emphasis on these vital resource issues in our political campaigns -- and we need conservation leaders with courage enough to speak out boldly when they see the public's interest jeopardized by selfish grabs on the forest and range.

And, gentlemen, as one spokesman for the Democratic Party I say to you in all candor that if my party ever gets into a situation involving mismanagement of our public resource programs, I hope you will not spare us a vote of censure. We will have it coming.

COPY

You can count on me to do my best to prevent that kind of a situation from ever developing.

Now, let me make it clear that I am not professing to come before you as a forestry or resource expert. You are the experts. I am just a conservation-minded public official having to rely, to a great degree, on you experts and technicians for advice and guidance. However, I do have a responsibility of helping establish resource policies and I treat this as a serious trust.

As a United States Senator from the great state of Minnesota which has 20 million acres of forest land, including two of our oldest National Forests -- the Superior and the Chippewa -- I have made it my business to learn something about forestry, wildlife, water, and soil conservation.

We in Minnesota have in some degree most of the forest problems found fairly generally over the United States. We have large paper and other wood cellulose converting plants and many

COPY

sawmills supplied by thousands of small farmer-loggers who depend upon pulpwood and other forest products for part of their winter income.

Our forest fire control and reforestation programs are making real headway in restoring commercial forests to the barren cutover lands left after the first wave of logging. Our state and county-owned and managed forests of the north are steadily supplying industry with needed raw material, while at the same time assuring an independent livelihood to many of our people. We have national forests, public domain, and Indian lands. Thus, we in Minnesota face not only federal, state, and county forest management problems but those of private owners -- small and large -- which are in most respects similar over the country.

Forest policy is a broadfield to try and cover in a limited time, so primarily tonight I am going to outline what I feel should be some of the important objectives in forestry which

COPY

we in our generation should reach -- and to suggest some of the policies which I feel will work in the direction of assuring adequate timber supplies, watershed protection, wildlife and other recreational benefits from our forest land resources.

We are the posterity which Pinchot, Teddy Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, and other foresighted leaders prepared for when they set aside the National Forests, extended fire protection programs, put unemployed boys to work planting trees and improving timber stands.

Now, upon our shoulders, rests the task of providing for the posterity to the year 2,000 and beyond. And, gentlemen, we have no vast forests of virgin timber to bequeath our grandchildren. We must grow timber -- lots more of it than we are today -- if they are to continue to enjoy the fruits of our high American standard of living. And a timber cropping economy takes some real effort, as you foresters are only too well aware.

-12-
COPY

According to figures which I have seen from the Forest

Service's Timber Resource Review, we are going to need a lot more timber to supply our rapidly expanding population -- almost half again as much as we now have when the year 2,000 arrives.

Either we begin to grow this timber today, or our children will have to pay absurdly high prices for what little there is left by then.

I realize that the style lately has been to scoff at Pinchot's prediction of a timber famine.

But if we look at lumber production figures, which have stayed nearly constant for 50 years while prices have risen much faster than for other commodities, I think we will find Pinchot closer to being right than his critics.

Of course, the decision on how much timber we will need is one for the foresters and economists to make. But it is up to those of us in political life to translate those goals into policies and programs which you omen can carry out.

COPY

Our political economy is so complex today that in this field as in most others, we need to have the advice of technical people in making our decisions. I hope that foresters will not shun this duty under some sort of mistaken assumption that it is "improper" to advise your Congressmen and Senators, or to take a position in favor of what you believe to be sound forest policy.

I am absolutely opposed to the Executive offices limiting the testimony of officials so that they can not tell the full story but are restricted to an "administration line". We in the Congress do not propose to become a rubber stamp because we are weakened by a spoon feed diet to the extent that we lack the moral strength to make up our own mind.

In making our plans for the next fifty years in forestry, we have to develop one set for use on the greater areas of public forests occupying one fourth of our forest land, and another set for the large area of private forest land. The first calls for direct action by public agencies, while the second for cooperative

-14-
COPY

working relationships with private owners -- large and small.

We in the Congress, and in the State Legislatures, too, must continue to assure that sufficient funds become available for management of public lands, including tree planting, protection from insects and diseases and stand improvement measures. We must make sure that the federal government's share of the cooperative programs with the states for fire protection, nurseries, and extension work are properly met --- and on a scale which will expand tree growth to meet our future needs.

But the job does not stop with federal appropriations, and the government is not in the business of dictating to private owners what they should do.

The proper role of government toward private forest lands seems to me, in our democratic political economy, to be one of providing a favorable economic and social climate for individual owners to do these things on their forests which are in the public

-15-
COPY

interest, while advancing their own position.

Both the public forests and the larger industrial tracts are apparently being fairly well managed, and such management will improve as your professional techniques improve. But I am told that lack of a solution of the small owner forestry problem is one which is giving foresters much concern. And well it should, for such lands make up the majority of our commercial forest area.

Apparently, more experimental research along the lines of cooperative action is needed to achieve a solution. I should like to offer my help for sound proposals which include research efforts on this difficult problem, at any time it is possible to do so.

The plain facts are, gentlemen, that none of us have all the answers to the small owner problem. The Congress is willing to do all it can to help, but the ideas must come from the forestry profession. One thing seems clear: If we are to have a strong and

COPY

vital forest economy, greater research effort must be given to the problems of the small owner and independent logging operator. For example, forest products marketing data were almost absent from the U.S.D.A. 1954 Yearbook on "Marketing". I might be so bold as to suggest that one reason you are so far along in the solution of your public and industrial forestry problem is because you foresters have done an excellent job in those fields. But, conversely, your lack of success in extending forest management to small ownerships is because you are devoting comparatively little research to this problem.

Because it does embrace several millions of small owners and thousands of independent farmer-loggers, our forest economy is a vital part of rural America.

It represents one of the remaining parts of our economy which has not been swallowed up by huge combinations of corporate enterprise. I hope it will never be.

⁻¹⁷⁻ COPY

Our forest industries -- even the large ones -- are

highly decentralized and provide markets for the products of the self-employed logger. Our public forests and those under the smaller ownerships will continue, I hope, to assure that this great group of independent woodsmen will have free access to raw material which will not have to be cleared through a Washington Bureau office of a New York corporation office. If that ever happens, I think American will have lost more of her free and independent spirit than I care to contemplate.

That is one reason I introduced my price reporting measure last year in Congress. I know of instances in Minnesota where farmers have worked hard all winter to produce pulpwood at a certain price quoted by a dealer or buyer, only to find in the spring, when the farmer was ready to ship, that the buyer would not pay his figure -- saying that "the price has dropped." How is the farmer-logger to know whether or not he is just being "taken"?

18 COPY

They ask me why does newsprint go up to \$134.00 a ton while pulpwood prices stay the same.

A price and market program for forest products would have kept such a producer regularly informed of price changes and the demand situation. He would know whether it paid him to cut his timber or just let it grow. I am sure, gentlemen, that forestry on private land will have to pay its way or you will not have much forestry. If a man does not know what price his timber will bring, he will never get very interested in growing it.

We have heard a lot of talk about free enterprise over the years. It has become a catch-all slogan which means many things to many men, but it is seldom defined. Let's think for a minute what free enterprise in forestry means. To most people it means freedom to buy and sell at the market place without crippling interference by government or by monopoly. It means further that buyer and seller have equal access to market and price information.

COPY

So it seems ~~to be~~ independent forest owners and timbermen have a right to such information as well as farmers, stock brokers, packing houses and paper mills. Yet this simple information is not fully available to them.

If we are to have a free forest economy, price data should be available to buyers and sellers alike, and I cannot understand why some of those who give lip service to free enterprise ~~go~~ to such efforts to deny this rightful information to a large group of people.

These same groups have opposed adequate forest fire appropriations, the farm forestry cooperative program, tree planting in the soil bank law, and now price reporting -- everything that would help the small owner and operator.

All through our debates in the Senate, and later in conference with the House, heavy pressure was put upon us bemoaning the tremendous burden which would be placed upon the small operator

⁸⁰⁻COPY

I think you know what groups were behind the great flurry of telegrams which reached conferring Congressmen -- and whether or not their real concern was to help the small operator. The groups which went to such lengths to block price reporting by distorting its intent and purpose may have a representative or two here tonight. I hope that they will use better judgment in the future and argue this issue on its merits, rather than try and mislead members of Congress. You will recall that some oil and gas interests which used inspired telegrams to Congress ended up thoroughly discredited.

But I will tell you what the real worry of these groups was and is. They are afraid that objective price data in the hands of small timber-owners will enable them to fully understand the real value of their forest.

Too often one large buyer can take advantage of many small sellers under conditions where the buyer has all the information. If that is free enterprise, then the definition has been badly abused.

COPY

Other things that we need to shore up the small forest

economy are better access to credit and research in marketing to find out more about all the elements involved in buying and selling our timber products. All of these measures and programs have been available to agriculture for years, and there is no longer any reason for withholding them from forestry owners embarking on a timber farming program. I would hope to see more foresters speak up for these very necessary programs.

So far, I have discussed primarily some of my views on objectives for public policy in relation to private forests.

Let's now consider our public forests.

Generally, our federal forestry picture looks better now than it did two years ago. In my opinion, the 84th Congress, and particularly that good conservationist Senator Carl Hayden, deserves the credit for this. The record seems crystal clear that during the last four years the Executive Branch has not requested

COPY

the funds needed for the expanded role our national forests and other federal forests are now required to fill. The record also shows the Congress increased the funds. Now in this year's budget the situation has changed somewhat and I want to say that I am delighted. I hope this reflects a real change in heart.

There are still some weak spots in our federal programs, and these should be corrected.

First, foresters need to convince the top level people that certain minimum expenditures are necessary. Future generations are entitled to receive our federal forests with the benefits of conservation management plainly evident on every hillside. This is the duty of our generation.

Further, these forests can be profitable to us today -- providing industry with the sinews of trade, recreationists with enjoyment, and our people with pure water from unsilted streams.

We also need to reduce the duplication and waste of

COPY

productive effort that exists because our federal forestry functions are not consolidated. I am glad that last year the Congress endorsed again the principle of consolidation along the lines of the Hoover Commission report. I think that the President should send up a consolidation plan -- and if he fails to, the Congress should act.

Let me say quite frankly, however, that I feel it would be far better for the President to use the authority he has under the Reorganization Act so that he has a full opportunity to iron out all the wrinkles himself.

One needed measure is to permit some minor adjustments in the pattern of national forest ownership in a manner which promotes consolidation of these holdings. I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized under appropriate safeguard to revise national forest boundaries and dispose of the isolated fringe tracts by sale. These funds should go into a special account to be used to purchase lands inside the national forest boundaries.

COPY

In my humble opinion this would be a far better approach than the present reliance upon land for land exchanges. I think it would also be vastly superior to timber for land exchanges which are in reality a restricted type of sale and an augmentation of appropriations.

In the operation of our public forests there is a growing need for greater sensitivity to the needs of small business. Our federal forests came out of the custodial era because private timber has been diminished. During the custodial period, many small businessmen cooperated with the Federal Agencies. They brought public timber in small sales and helped the forester rid the land of diseased and dying trees. Even if this had not often been the case, our policy must preserve the ability of small business to grow and foster in a competitive economy.

Our forest policy now should be directed toward obtaining the full sustained yield cut from the forest. In doing this we must get more timber access roads, adequate properly compensated

personnel and develop the highest efficiency in administration.

COPY

We again have an access road bill before the Congress and it is a good one. It will do two things -- provide funds for a sound construction program and give the Forest Service the legal authority it needs to promote the best development of the forests.

Now I know the other Humphrey -- the one who does not want his hair in curlers -- would say the expenditure of 50 million dollars a year for these roads is inflationary. He also wants a balanced budget.

A real budget balancer looks at income and expenditure and he should realize this fact. These roads will be built by timber purchasers through a reduction in the price of the timber if they are not built by the well equipped private contractors under appropriated funds. If we use the latter method for expensive roads we increase the government's income from the competitive sale of timber and get a better road at a lower cost. This is sound business. To those who express concern for "small business" I would also point out that these roads allow smaller sales. One axiom that applies to

COPY

timber just as in everything else is that big sales can be bid on only by big business. To those who think of multiple use, I say that these roads provide for multiple use and for those who want our forests to provide more wood at a low cost, I say these roads are one of the necessities.

New demands are already facing our public forests and as more and more mills turn toward our public forests, these problems will be aggravated.

Over-cutting or allocation of timber will be urged, and acres set aside for special uses will be marked for elimination. I think that these three factors form the hub upon which our federal forest policy will spin for the next several years.

Let me discuss these points briefly. First, let me say that I believe these problems will occur mainly in the Far West, where the forest industry is vigorous and often geared to use four times the timber it grows in a year. In addition, it is

COPY

out there where federal timber is such a big factor that it will be a target.

As local communities near federal timber find that adjacent communities which have run out of private timber are coming over to bid upon the Federal timber near them, the demand to allocate timber or restrict bidding will probably arise.

In other communities, with productive capacity beyond the ability of private and public timber combined, as the private timber is cut out, some may seek allocation or they may seek to overcut the federal timber.

It is going to take strong administration and well-informed public opinion to insure that conservation principles and our faith with future generations are not breached.

I am not down here tonight to deal in platitudes but to talk about policy, and policy must be fashioned in the face of realities that exist. You cannot put up a Tree Farm sign then make a speech about more timber and "presto" there it is. So I say to you

COPY

that the foresters administering public land are going to be subjected to pressures to overcut that their predecessors never fully envisioned or experienced, as private timber disappears into the mills and the green gold of the national forests stands as the sole salvation for many of the 3,000 hungry saw mills of the west.

And thus in any consideration of federal policy we come down to a discussion of why did we create our national forests, and what uses do we in this generation envision will be made of them.

As foresters, I am sure you will agree these forests shall not be sawed down as rapidly as possible. When the national forests were created, the Congress, with some wisdom, set forth their purposes: to improve and protect the forest and waters and to furnish a continuous supply of timber.

In the process of operating the forests certain sound use patterns have been developed. Foresters have coined the phrase "multiple use" to describe it. In operation "multiple use" has never

COPY

meant that on every acre of the forest we will obtain timber, water, forage, and recreation. Many areas provide only one or two resources. Water is produced from ever acre, yet very often immediately after logging there is a temporary change in the quality and yield. As the forest is replaced the water picture continues to change. Before the forest is cut it may contain many ideal undeveloped recreational areas. After logging picnic areas are changed, vistas altered, game populations may climb and fishing of some types decrease. Grazing may result in some soil compaction which adversely affects water or logging may change grazing capacity. In some areas, sheep, cattle, and hogs, if admitted to the forest, may do damage to young trees. While in other places this may not be true. Therefore, "multiple use" is not applied to every acre, but to a large forest area.

Foresters have set aside special areas where they have recognized one or two uses as superior to other possible uses.

Western communities and 600 hydroelectric plants depend upon

COPY

the national forest for water. There are 21 million acres irrigated by water from the national forests. These users must be protected, and lumbering, grazing, and recreational use must be compatible with water production.

On many western forests the watersheds are set aside and recreation is even excluded, although perhaps these uses need not be. In some areas the Forest Service is conducting experiments to determine how these watersheds can best be logged without damaging soil and streamflow and how logging may increase water supplies.

I think this multiple use program is vital for we need the water, the wood, and the recreation these areas can provide.

In addition to numerous camp grounds in our national forests, there are some 79 acres embracing 14 million acres set aside for specialized types of recreation. These 14 million acres, less than 8% of the national forests, are the network of primitive, roadless, wilderness and wild areas where to varying degrees recreation is the primary use. When the areas were originally created, the national

31
COPY

forests were operated mainly on a custodial basis, and there was no problem of conflicting use. Today this is not true.

Senator Morse was telling me that in the 1940's a company acquired a large timber tract in the Willamette National Forest near his home that had gone begging on the market for some time. Today the Secretary of Agriculture has yielded to demands made to eliminate 50,000 acres of timberland from the nearby Three Sisters Wilderness Area to make more timber available locally. I have not heard of a case that more dramatically illustrates the change in the demand for timber that has taken place.

This brings me to the avenue of approach to getting more timber that, in my judgment, will be widely tried.

For example, Rayonier, Inc., has been sponsoring ads in national magazines as a part of its private campaign to get more timber. They recommend a reduction of the size of the Olympic National Park.

COPY

Those of us in the Congress who are vitally interested in multiple use and conservation are worried, and I think with good cause. We see the pressure that is coming, and as elected representatives it is our clear duty to do something before these areas are a sea of stumps. There seems to be a crisis every day in the world in which we live, and the only way we are going to change this is by looking ahead and taking timely action.

That is what my wilderness bill proposes that we do. Instead of waiting until the crisis has engulfed us, I proposed that we make secure the preservation of those areas that do now in fact constitute our national wilderness system -- the areas that are now in fact being handled as wilderness, even though they serve other and consistent purposes also. Doing that now means providing security for what we already have. This will perpetuate the multiple purpose programs we now have on these areas, and it will make sure that multiple purpose on these lands always includes wilderness preservation.

COPY

Let's look at the bill. The preamble describes the

impending problem, declares a policy, and defines wilderness type areas. The bill then lists all of the present areas.

I would like to say here -- and note this well --- the national forest areas have all been set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture on what he deemed sufficient authority in the broad language of statutes that do not mention wilderness as such.

What one Secretary thinks he can do, another may think he can not do.

Secretary Chapman thought, at the very least, he did not have to issue the Al Sereña mining patents until the claimants complied with the Administration Practices Procedures. Assistant Secretary Davis brushed this contention aside, and issued the patents without a word to even the Secretary of Agriculture.

Similarly, a future Secretary of Agriculture could brush aside the position adopted by the several Secretaries that preceded

him. If you doubt me, ~~listen to what Assistant Secretary Peterson~~ recently said to the Association of State Foresters when he spoke of conservation. I quote:

"To me there is one thing it doesn't mean: preservation. Resource conservation means resource use. It does not mean locking up - no use. Our great natural heritage has no meaning and significance except as it is used to provide the materials and services which as a people we must have to enlarge and enrich our living. In a very real sense, our very lives depend on our basic natural resources. Resources unused are sterile -- of little value."

I quote no more. I hope Secretary Peterson recognizes that as far as our areas of wilderness are concerned, preservation is use -- the very best use that we can possibly make of these particular areas of outdoor America. If he does not so recognize, I say to you that his statement is a clear warning that we may be closer than we think to the danger of having our entire system of national forest wilderness areas thrown out the window to satisfy

535
COPY

our desires for material things.

You know, I read this in the same issue of American Forests with a letter to the editor from Professor Chapman in which he wrote that the persons associated with the Wilderness Bill, and I quote:

"had no confidence whatever in the integrity, wisdom, or public spirit of trained forestry executives."

I say to you that this is not true. I have the highest confidence in our foresters. This would indeed be shaken if Assistant Secretary Peterson's words were the words of the Chief of the Forest Service. But they are not! This is the word of a political leader in the Administration. Of course, the Chief of the Forest Service is responsible for carrying out the policies that the Secretary of Agriculture directs be carried out.

The fact is the Wilderness Bill has been prepared in accordance with the wilderness policies, programs, and practices

COPY

of the Forest Service, and in administration for them. The bill is designed to strengthen the Forest Service's hands in carrying out these policies and programs.

The national forest areas that will be included in the wilderness system are those that have been designated by the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or roadless. And the bill provides that these areas shall be administered under regulations that would be drawn up in the Forest Service.

The Wilderness Bill, I emphasize, will not interfere with, but will perpetuate, the present multiple-purpose administration of these national forest areas. Its central concept is that our present areas of wilderness can be preserved within the existing land-management pattern if this preservation purpose is made a matter of fundamental policy.

Rather than upsetting the multiple-purpose program of the Forest Service, the effect of this legislation will be to prevent

COPY

the upset in this program that will result if the wilderness areas are not protected from the uses that would destroy them as wilderness.

How what are the bogey men in this bill?

The bill authorizes all the existing wilderness and wild areas and provides for the addition before January 1, 1966, of the primitive areas, but only after the Forest Service has determined what their boundaries are to be.

Section 2 -- (a) and (f) -- states that the Secretary of Agriculture can make additions, modifications, or eliminations -- and I repeat, additions, modifications, or eliminations -- to the System, and that these will take effect within 120 days unless either House of Congress passes a resolution opposing the proposed action.

In a nutshell this bill then does these things. It sets forth a policy that will protect the wilderness system, and it provides a sound procedure for making changes. It gives the technicians full authority to recommend whatever action they feel is warranted, and it prevents abuse by the executive heads.

COPY

It gives the people a chance to secure a real referendum through the action of their elected representatives, and protects them from the whims of a political appointee who does not have to face the voters.

It maintains the wilderness areas as integral parts of the national forests, serving their important multiple purposes just as they now do.

Finally, as regards the Wilderness Bill, I wish to make clear that it is in no sense in conflict with, or in competition with forestry for forest products. On the contrary it actually is dependent on foresters for its success. If ever the American people come to the borders of our wilderness areas with a need for timber that cannot be met elsewhere, then, gentlemen, I say to you our wilderness areas are doomed. It is to the foresters of America and their effective programs for sustained yield cutting, on our production forests, that we shall have to look eventually for success in wilderness

COPY

preservation. We recognize this, and we face our present program in a spirit of cooperation and with a feeling of dependence on the intelligent foresters of America for support.

I think that all true conservationists should consider the bill in this light. In my judgment it will provide a means for making orderly changes in our wilderness system so that these areas will truly fulfill our needs and not one bit more. It will give us a chance to provide a really sound wilderness system by truly democratic processes.

In summing up my discussion, I want to emphasize my conviction that the policies and objectives which I have advocated are consistent with the ideals set forth by Gifford Pinchot -- and are necessary, in fact, if we are to live up to the goals he set for us.

Let me just give you a brief quotation from Pinchot's autobiography, "Breaking New Ground", which I accept as my guide for resource policy:

Conservation policy, Pinchot said, has three great purposes:

COPY

"First, wisely to use, protect, preserve and renew the natural resources of the earth.

"Second, to control the use of the natural resources and their products in the common interest, and to secure their distribution to the people at fair and reasonable charges for goods and service.

"And, third, to see to it that the rights of the people to govern themselves shall not be controlled by the great monopolies through their power over natural resources."

That is the end of his quote. His advice is as urgently needed today as it was fifty years ago. We would do well to heed it better than we have. I urge each of you, tonight, to re-read the warning contained in the last chapter of Pinchot's autobiography -- and apply it to conditions we face today.

Conservation is where it is today because so many people have made genuine contributions to this unselfish course. Over the

COPY
years we in the Congress have helped fight the battle for conservation along with the technicians who have made solid advances in the field.

Team work is a part of everything we do, and it takes dedicated people in the field backed up by conscientious and far-sighted people in the top offices of the Executive Branch, the Congress and our Courts, too, to forge ahead on the road to a better future for America.

I would like to close on this note, and to assure you that Forest Policy will receive increasingly more considerate attention by the Congress. We are proud of you foresters in public and private employ who are so dedicated to our nation's priceless heritage. We will back you up with the needed improvements in forest policy.

February 13, 1957



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org