

April 12, 1984

Update to Governor

April 11th Al Wilson from AOI called asking for a report on the Opal Creek area for the Wilderness Proposal. It was his information that you had notified Senator Hatfield asking that Opal Creek be made a part of his Wilderness Proposal.

Governor, a terrible amount of concern has been coming in about the rumor of you making this request of Senator Hatfield. I believe Pat probably visited with you upon her arrival in Israel. Obviously, AOI is also concerned, in fact somewhat angered. I refused to confirm or discuss the subject with them until your return. I simply told them I had heard a similar rumor but had no confirmation of it.

Al indicated to me that several timber company owners in the Opal Creek area are very angry and it would be my guess that AOI is preparing to cause a ruckus. Al also indicated to me that their information is that Hatfield will discuss this bill on the floor next week and they are preparing to do the mark up.

GT/dr

Hatfield, McClure wrangle over wilderness bills

By JAMES C. FLANIGAN
of The Oregonian staff

WASHINGTON — Oregon Sen. Mark O. Hatfield and Idaho Sen. James McClure traded charges Wednesday over wilderness bills drawn for their respective states.

The two Republicans exchanged sharp words when Hatfield and Sen. Dan Evans, R-Wash., tried to seek quick legislative action on wilderness measures for Oregon and Washington.

Hatfield said he wanted to resolve a 20-year deadlock in Congress over which national forest lands should be protected and which should be freed for multiple-use management.

McClure, chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, resisted, explaining that he first wants to settle with the House the question of what to do with roadless areas declared non-wilderness.

"I have a very strong feeling that we are now playing a game of hostage," Hatfield said.

Hatfield said Oregon should not be made a part of any intransigence problem McClure has with the House, and he compared the state's position to an innocent bystander caught between a bank teller and a holdup man.

"I'm a little bit impatient today because I've been

unable to move on this bill for some time," he said. "I can go along with a game plan if I can get a time frame, but the economy of my state is hanging in the balance."

"The senator can say turn me loose, don't hold me hostage," McClure said. "But he permits us to be held hostage by the House."

McClure, contending the House was picking and

"I'm a little bit impatient today because I've been unable to move on this bill for some time."

choosing wilderness bills on which to act, appealed for more time to negotiate on uniform language.

"There is a logjam (of bills) and down in the middle of that logjam there is a key log," McClure said. "Sometimes it takes a keg of dynamite to move it. Sometimes it only takes one or two sticks."

Evans, who thought McClure was prepared to

allow committee action on both Oregon and Washington bills Wednesday, displayed obvious frustration.

"If a keg of dynamite is needed, my fuse is lit," the usually calm Evans said. "To say I'm disappointed is an understatement of major proportions. Intransigence is a two-way street."

The main difference is over language in the bills for the three states dealing with how government timberland should be managed. Oregon's and Washington's bills allow for another government wilderness review within the next 10 years for lands not included now in the wilderness system. Idaho's bill prevents further wilderness consideration until the turn of the century.

Hatfield and Evans told McClure they are willing to support Idaho's bill as written and they expected the same courtesy.

Sen. John Melcher, D-Mont., who supports McClure's position, said he thought the problem could be worked out once Congress returned from an Easter recess period.

"If we're not a bunch of wimps in this committee, we're going to resolve this in the next five to six weeks," Melcher said.

An angry Hatfield responded that five weeks was too long.

"Your making us hostage," he repeated. "That's it,

pure and simple."

"What's five weeks if it will yield results?" McClure asked. "The senator from Oregon has expressed concern and impatience. But this is a two-way street, and there are several pieces of traffic on the two-way street."

McClure and Sen. Malcolm Wallop, R-Wyo whose wilderness bill for that state is held up in the House because it contains the same provisions as the Idaho bill, claimed progress in negotiations with House members.

But House Interior Committee members wrote McClure Tuesday that they weren't buying his compromise.

"We find it unacceptable in every major respect," they said.

The letter, signed by Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Ariz chairman of the committee, and Rep. John F. Seiberling, D-Ohio, chairman of the House subcommittee on public lands, said McClure was trying to rewrite the National Forest Management Act of 1976.

"Your proposal affects not just wilderness matters but significantly amends two of the major provisions of (the act) pertaining to marginal lands and departures from sustained yield, not to mention several other problems," their letter said.