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Long before environmentalism became fashionable, John Phillips Saylor, a Republican congressman from Johnstown, Pennsylvania, gained national acclaim as an advocate of wilderness preservation. During the 1950s and 1960s he served on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and played an instrumental role in the enactment of the Wilderness Bill which preserved approximately nine million acres of remote, pristine land in the American West. By the mid-1960s, protecting long stretches of major American rivers from dam building also had become a major concern of the Pennsylvania lawmaker. He proposed the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Bill which sought to keep untamed more than two dozen rivers, including sizable segments of the Delaware, Susquehanna, and Clarion in Pennsylvania. Eleventh-hour opposition from Pennsylvania’s governor and congressional delegation nearly proved calamitous, but a scaled-down version of the bill was enacted in 1968.

One might expect a congressman from Johnstown to have an aversion toward dam builders. After all, in 1889, nearly two decades before Saylor’s birth, a privately constructed dam north of the city gave way drowning about 2000 people. Another devastating flood occurred in 1936 when dams again collapsed. Saylor’s antipathy toward federally-financed hydroelectric dams is also understandable because publicly financed hydropower competed with privately produced Pennsylvania gas and coal. But Saylor was not just against dams; he was for the preservation of wild lands, unharnessed rivers, and national parks.1

It is difficult to reconstruct the development of Saylor’s preservationist perspective. Probably it was shaped during his formative years in Johnstown. Area coal mines and steel mills blighted the landscape, fouled rivers, and smudged the air. Industrial degradation may have made Saylor more appreciative of primeval lands, sparkling streams, and abundant wildlife. Remarkably, western Pennsylvania produced four nationally renowned environmentalists during the postwar period. Saylor was the preeminent preservationist in congress. Howard Zahniser, who grew up along the upper Allegheny River in Tionesta, served as executive director of the influential Wilderness Society and dedicated his life to the enactment of legislation preserving wilderness areas. Rachel Carson, who triggered the modern environmental movement by exposing the dangers of pesticides in Silent Spring, was born and raised along the lower Allegheny River. And the environmental cult hero Edward Abbey, before moving to Arizona to write literary classics such as Desert Solitaire and Appalachian Wilderness, grew up as a Saylor constituent in Indiana County.2
Saylor was born in 1908 on a farm outside Johnstown. He attended Mercersburg Academy and Franklin and Marshall College. He seems to have inherited his preservationist values from his parents. He once wrote a constituent that he was for wild rivers long before he entered congress. His mother, a former school teacher, was a thrifty woman who revered nature. His father, an attorney, was an avid hiker, hunter, and angler who instilled a passion for those outdoor activities in his sons. The family joined a Sportsmen's Association that owned a hunting and fishing camp in Potter County and throughout his life John Saylor took periodic refuge at “Lost Cabin.” His father also fostered his love for national parks. Saylor recalled in a speech that his father took him at the age of twelve to Yellowstone National Park and that experience helped to mold him into a life-long champion of wilderness and the national park system. As a parent himself, Saylor often took his family to national parks for summer vacations. His son and daughter recalled visits to Glacier, Yellowstone, and the Petrified Forest National Parks. At the latter site, Saylor spotted a man pilfering a petrified rock as a souvenir. “Hey, put that back, it’s mine,” he ordered. “What’ya mean it’s yours?” came the reply. Saylor pointed out that the artifact was part of a national preserve that belonged to all citizens and if every visitor took a sample the supply would quickly disappear. The culprit returned the treasure.

After graduating from college Saylor went on to Dickinson College Law School and joined his father’s firm in Johnstown in 1933. When the United States entered World War II he enlisted in the navy and served as a communications officer aboard the USS Missoula, a troopship that participated in the invasions of Iwo Jima and Okinawa. After the war, Saylor returned to his wife, young son, and law practice. In 1949 he won a special election to congress following the death of the Democratic incumbent. Predominantly Republican, Pennsylvania’s 26th congressional district included Cambria, Armstrong, and Indiana counties. Its constituents were mainly farmers and blue collar families who earned their livelihood from coal mining and steel making. Johnstown, the district’s largest city with 60,000 residents, was home to a Bethlehem Steel plant. One-third of the district’s 154,000 registered voters belonged to unions.

Saylor entered congress about the time that the conservation movement was undergoing a transformation initiated by World War II. In the four decades before the war, American conservation had been driven essentially by the impulses of efficiency and esthetics. At the turn of the century, progressives, notably President Theodore Roosevelt and his Chief of Forestry Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania, espoused the efficient use of natural resources. That utilitarian perspective affirmed that experts in the federal bureaucracy could scientifically administer the public domain to minimize waste and plunder by corporate raiders. Progressives also gave heed to esthetics. Scenic treasures should
be preserved, not for their ecological value, but to serve humankind by pro-
viding recreation, regenerating the spirit, and relieving stress. But when utili-
tarian and preservationist interests conflicted, as they did with a controversial
proposal to invade Yosemite National Park with the Hetch Hetchy Dam in
the 1910s, esthetic values usually gave way. After World War II, conserva-
tionists began to question resource policies that seemed to be more concerned
with life's riches than the enrichment of life. The use of nuclear weapons dem-
onstrated the friability of humankind. Unrestrained scientific advances might
endanger the human species. The surges in population and tourism, the eco-

C
omy emergence of the American West, and the press for natural resources to
fuel the military-industrial establishment during the Cold War threatened
existing national preserves. Conservationists began to reassess the relationship
between humans and their planet. Increasingly they were drawn to an eco-
cological concept that emphasized that humans were not lords of the environment
realm, but merely partners in the web of life.5

Conservationists also reevaluated the works of John Muir, who had co-
founded the Sierra Club and helped to establish Yosemite Park in the 1890s.
He championed the intrinsic value of wilderness. Aldo Leopold's Sand County
Almanac, which appeared in 1949, carried an ecological message that urged
readers to cease viewing nature as a commodity and to practice earth steward-
ship. People belonged to nature, not vice versa. Conservationists also became
better organized and more assertive in their defense of wilderness values. The
Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, National Parks Association, and the National
Wildlife Federation, all became influential political protagonists for preserva-
tion. Possessing sound environmental instincts, Saylor befriended leading con-
servationists, joined the Sierra Club and Wilderness Society, and gravitated
toward the emerging ecological outlook that stressed wilderness preservation,
environmental protection, safeguarding the national parks, and the
interconnectedness of the natural world. His views were reinforced by his top
administrative assistant, Ann Dunbar, a Johnstown native who was awarded
with an honorary lifetime membership in the Wilderness Society.6

By the time Saylor entered Congress in 1949, his once lanky 6' 4" frame
had filled out to 240 pounds. He was on crutches having broken his toe kick-
ing a football barefoot, but his husky physique and booming voice made him
an imposing and, at times, intimidating figure. "He was a large man, with a
large voice, and he liked to use it," recalled one associate. When he became
angry, he could grow caustic or explode in a torrent of swearing, but generally
he was slow to anger and quick to laugh. His affability, ebullience, honesty,
and sense of humor made him popular on both sides of the aisle and with
constituents. After serving an abbreviated first term, he was reelected in 1950
and remained in the House until his death in 1973.7
Representing a mining area, Saylor was assigned to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. As a young member on a committee made up mainly of veteran, development-oriented westerners, Saylor did not immediately assert himself on conservation issues. But an emerging conservation battle, the proposal to construct a hydroelectric dam at Echo Park in Dinosaur National Monument on the Colorado-Utah border, soon demanded his attention. The Echo Park controversy, according to its able historian Mark Harvey, “was the first major clash between preservationists and the dam builders in the postwar American West.” Saylor first made his mark as an advocate of park protection and wilderness preservation during that fray.8

In the late 1940s the interior department’s Bureau of Reclamation had devised an ambitious scheme to provide water storage, irrigation, and hydroelectric power to the upper Colorado River basin states of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming. The Colorado River Storage Project (CRSP) proposed gagging the main channel and some of its principal tributaries with a series of multi-purpose dams. A major, “high” dam was to be located at Echo Park near the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers in Dinosaur National Monument. Another “low” dam was proposed farther down the Colorado at Glen Canyon in northern Arizona. By the mid-fifties the plan to flood part of the national monument had come under attack by the interior department’s National Park Service, by influential writers like Bernard DeVoto and Wallace Stegner, and by conservation groups such as the Wilderness Society, the National Parks Association, the Izaak Walton League, and the Sierra Club.9

The Echo Park proposal prompted Saylor to visit Dinosaur National Monument in 1953. The trip was arranged by an opponent of the scheme, Joe Penfold, a Coloradan who served as western representative of the Izaak Walton League. The party, which also consisted of Penfold’s son Mike, and Saylor’s son Phil, took a Yampa River float trip through remote, rugged canyon lands with master rivermen Bus and Don Hatch. That experience, Penfold later related, made a lasting impression and may have heightened Saylor’s commitment to wilderness, undisciplined rivers, and the inviolability of national monuments and parklands. Shortly after the trip Bus Hatch wrote David Brower of the Sierra Club that he believed “Congressman Saylor is going to help us out.” Little did preservationists realize that his help would grow to become so encompassing, persistent, and effective in the pursuit of wilderness and “an over-all sane view toward a beautiful planet.”10

When the CRSP reached the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the mid-fifties, Saylor denounced it on several grounds. First, it would defile a “beauteous stretch of wilderness.” Flooding the magnificent canyonlands to create a huge lake at Echo Park “would be like applying an air hammer to the chiseled features of Venus de Milo, or using a house painter’s
brush on a Reubens' masterpiece." Second, it violated the sanctity of a "cherished national monument," thereby setting a reckless precedent that might endanger the entire national park system. Third, he recoiled at the projected cost of $1.6 billion. Finally, he considered it unfair to expect the taxpayers in the other 44 states to subsidize the cost of projects that would benefit the residents of just four states.1

Saylor preferred an alternative plan, suggested by conservation groups, of constructing a high dam farther downstream at Glen Canyon. The substitute facility would satisfy the power and water demands of development-minded westerners and preserve the integrity of the national monument. After two years of deliberation, Congress surrendered to the persistent pressure of preservationists. The revised bill, enacted in late March, 1956, deleted Echo Park dam from the CRSP and called for multi-purpose dams on the river at Glen Canyon, Arizona; Flaming Gorge, Utah; and Navajo, New Mexico at a cost of $750 million. It also contained two special stipulations to ease the fears of park preservationists. One stated that no reservoir created by the CRSP should intrude upon any national preserve. Another instructed the Secretary of the Interior "to take adequate protective measures" to prevent the impounded waters of Glen Canyon Dam from invading Rainbow Bridge National Monument in southern Utah. Despite those concessions, Saylor opposed the bill. The scaled-down project, he argued, would never earn sufficient power revenues to pay for itself and proponents eventually would be compelled to seek to restore Echo Park Dam.2

In leading the House fight against an administration-sponsored reclamation project that had little practical impact on his district, Saylor earned recognition for perseverance, integrity and independent-mindedness. Moreover, his defense of wilderness and dedication to the sanctity of national parks and monuments won the respect of David Brower of the Sierra Club, Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society and other prominent preservationists. The National Parks Association honored him with an award in 1954 and influential publications such as the New York Times began referring to him as a "leading conservationist."3

Following the enactment of the CRSP, Saylor continued to guard against renewed efforts to create Echo Park Dam. In April, 1956 he and Representative Wayne Aspinall of western Colorado introduced legislation elevating Dinosaur Monument to national park status. Their proposal had widespread public support, but it was blocked by Utah's congressional delegation, which still had hopes for Echo Park Dam. For the next three years Saylor tried to gain park status for the monument but without success.4

River development projects closer to home also drew Saylor's attention. To the dismay of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, Saylor in 1957 came out against the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River in western Pennsyl-
vania. Following the St. Patrick's Day flood in Pittsburgh that claimed 47 lives and $50 million in property damage, Congress had passed the Flood Control Act of 1936. That measure authorized the construction of a series of dams along two hundred miles of the Allegheny River above Pittsburgh. Kinzua, the uppermost of the nine scheduled dams, was to be located north of the town of Warren near the New York state border. Congressional appropriations for the Kinzua project had been delayed because of World War II and because Seneca Indians objected to having their homes, burial grounds, and about 9,000 productive acres of reservation land in southwestern New York submerged by the impounded water at Kinzua. The Seneca Nation argued that the government was bound by the Pickering Treaty of 1794 which entitled them to their lands in perpetuity.\textsuperscript{15}

The Omnibus Public Works Bill of 1957 contained a provision calling for an initial $1 million for the $120 million Kinzua Dam project. Saylor decried the size and cost of the proposed dam. When the United States Army Corps of Engineers first planned the facility in 1936, he pointed out, it had recommended a modest flood control dam with local interests paying for two-thirds of the projected cost of $9 million. Over the years the army engineers had revised the plans so that by the mid-1950s the estimated cost of the largest water storage facility in the northeast had risen to more than $100 million with no contribution from local interests. “That growth is so fantastic it is almost impossible to believe,” Saylor lamented.\textsuperscript{16}

The Johnstown congressman questioned the need for the mammoth dam. Proponents argued that the facility was necessary to protect Pittsburgh from rampaging floods. Saylor contended that the eight existing dams offered sufficient protection. He also used army engineers reports to show that if a dam had existed at Kinzua in 1936, it would have reduced the floodwaters in Pittsburgh by an inconsequential amount. He maintained that proponents were being disingenuous when they claimed flood control as the primary purpose of the project. The alleged secondary purposes of increased water supply and pollution abatement, he charged, were actually of paramount importance. Impounded water in the Allegheny Reservoir at Kinzua could be released for industrial and municipal use and to help cleanse the river of industrial and human waste near Pittsburgh. “Neither water supply nor pollution control is properly a responsibility of the Federal Government,” Saylor contended. Water users in western Pennsylvania should contribute to the cost of the project.\textsuperscript{17}

Saylor’s stance dumbfounded his Pennsylvania colleagues. Robert J. Corbett of Pittsburgh portrayed him as a nature-loving obstructionist. The Allegheny Valley, Corbett boasted, was becoming the world’s industrial heartland and its businesses would pay in taxes ten times the cost of the project. Rivers could not be left untamed. If Pennsylvania and the nation expected to progress economically and maintain their positions of industrial pre-eminence
then they would “have to harness every drop of water that falls in America and use it over and over.” Elmer J. Holland, another Pittsburgh congressman, “was shocked to see a representative from Pennsylvania, and from Johnstown particularly, . . . talk against flood control.” He observed that “there is only one member of the entire Pennsylvania group, either Republican or Democrat, that is opposing the building of this dam,” and that Saylor was not representing the sentiments of his constituents. Saylor insisted that he was not opposed to flood control “but where a project is for other purposes,” then the Pennsylvania delegation should have “the moral courage” to admit it. Other representatives outside the Keystone State shared Saylor’s concerns, but hesitated to “enter into the internecine struggle in Pennsylvania” for fear of jeopardizing proposed projects in their own states.18

Saylor also frustrated his colleagues by siding with the Indians. Constructing Kinzua Dam would “violate one of the oldest treaties of the United States and deprive the Seneca Nation their guaranteed treaty rights,” he charged. Such a violation by congress would be immoral and dishonorable. It also would be a foreign policy blunder because the United States would be discredited in the eyes of the world. How could the United States accuse the Soviet Union of treaty violations if Congress could not keep its word to the Senecas? How could allies during the Cold War expect the United States to honor its military commitments if it disregarded a treaty that had existed since 1794?19

Saylor supported an amendment to the public works bill offered by John Taber of New York, proposing the excision of the Kinzua project from the bill. That amendment was rejected. The Senecas hired engineers who proposed an alternative plan that would have saved their reservation lands, but the army engineers rejected it as too costly. The Senecas also pursued legal action but federal judges, in decisions that eventually reached the United States Supreme Court, ruled that the right of eminent domain superseded a treaty. Construction began at Kinzua in 1961 and the dam opened in 1966. The Seneca Nation received from the government $15 million in compensatory damages.20

Kinzua dam was controversial more for its disruptive effect on the Seneca Nation than for its deleterious impact on a free-flowing river. The Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen’s Clubs, allied with the National Wildlife Federation, wondered about the project’s influence on the ecology of the upper Allegheny Valley and unanimously passed a resolution protesting the loss of fishing and canoeing opportunities. But overall, national organizations did not see the development of the river as a major concern.21

Howard Zahnizer of the Wilderness Society considered the valley where he was raised “one of the outstanding stretches of rural loveliness” in the nation and as an individual he protested its flooding. But the project, unlike Echo Park, did not threaten any national preserve so he did not trumpet Kinzua as an organizational cause. He always regretted not having done more to save
the river valley, but he and other national conservation leaders, having raised a
stir over Echo Park, were reluctant to be portrayed as opponents of all resource
development. Then, too, Zahniser had his eyes on the larger prize: the enact-
ment of legislation that would preserve millions of acres of wilderness. He
could not gather sufficient support for the Wilderness Bill unless he appeared
to be accommodating on some resource use. By the early 1960s, especially
after the submergence of the magnificent, primeval country at Glen Canyon
on the Colorado River, national conservation groups would become more
proactive in their opposition to dam building on untamed rivers outside na-
tional preserves. They would have an able and dedicated ally in Saylor. But
their more aggressive stance in behalf of pristine rivers came too late for the
upper Allegheny River and the Seneca Nation.22

While the Wilderness Society focused on the enactment of wilderness
legislation, an effort that would take nine years, other preservationists took up
the cause of preserving wild rivers. Wildlife biologists John and Frank Craighead
sought national protection for the upper Missouri and Flathead rivers in Mont-
tana. The National Park Service in 1957 sought to safeguard the Jack's Fork
and Current rivers in the Missouri Ozarks. Three years later interior depart-
ment planners notified congress that there were untamed streams “whose in-
tegrity might be preserved in the face of the water-control onslaught if conscien-
tious planning to this end were applied.” In 1961 the Senate Select Com-
mittee on Natural Resources proposed that “certain streams be preserved in
their free-flowing condition. . . .” And in 1962 the Outdoor Recreation Re-
sources Review Commission (ORRRC) gave its endorsement to a wild rivers
system. Headed by philanthropist Laurance Rockefeller, the ORRRC was a
bipartisan body created by congress in 1958 to study the future resource and
recreation needs of the nation. Saylor introduced legislation creating the com-
mission and served as one of its members.23

Stewart Udall, President John F. Kennedy's energetic Interior secretary,
also took up the cause. As a member of congress from arid Arizona he had
enthusiastically backed the water-development projects at Echo Park and Glen
Canyon. But as the concrete plopped into Glen Canyon, Udall, like the pres-
ervationists, began to have misgivings about flooding it. An outdoors enthusi-
ast and nature lover, he sympathized with the emerging preservationist per-
spective. As Interior secretary under Kennedy and then Lyndon Johnson, Udall
sought to create a conservation program “worthy of the two Roosevelts.” For
Udall that meant adhering to a traditional agenda that sought to balance re-
source use and scenic preservation. But it also departed from tradition by
advocating wilderness preservation. Udall never renounced dam-building (in-
deed he supported the Bridge and Marble Dam projects on the lower Colo-
rado River that would have flooded part of Grand Canyon National Monu-
ment), but he concluded that some rivers should forever flow free.24
Following Udall's recommendation in 1963, the Interior and Agricultural departments conducted studies of untamed rivers to determine which ones were worthy of permanent protection. The departments prepared a list of 650 waterways and considered sixty-seven deserving of field study. The field evaluations produced twenty-two recommendations. In 1965 President Johnson recommended river protection in his State of the Union address. Udall recalled that after that speech Wayne Aspinall left the floor and told a reporter that wild rivers legislation was a foolish idea. Realizing that Saylor completely supported the wild rivers idea, Udall informed him of Aspinall's comment. "We'll just wear him down," Saylor responded. Udall recalled that Saylor generally was able to "handle" Aspinall and "to bring him around" on important conservation issues.25

The first national wild river bill was drafted by the Interior department and introduced in March, 1965, by Democratic Senator Frank Church of Idaho. It sought immediate protection for the entire Suwanee River in Georgia and Florida and segments of five other streams: the Salmon and Clearwater in Idaho, the Rogue in Oregon, the upper Rio Grande in New Mexico, and the Green in Wyoming. Nine other waterways were to be evaluated for inclusion in the system by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior in cooperation with officials in the affected states. The cabinet secretaries also could nominate other streams for evaluation.26

Some senators supported the concept of wild rivers but not if the protected streams were located in their states. Economic development usually predominated over scenic preservation. Milward L. Simpson of Wyoming, for example, protested the inclusion of the Green and senators from Georgia and Florida objected to protection for the Suwanee. But some senators wanted waterways in their states to be included in the system, especially if there were no plans for development. As it played out, wild rivers legislation reflected what political scientist Craig Allin has termed the "pork barrel principle." As with river development projects, senators and representatives got what they wanted in their states and districts. The senate bill was reworked so that the Green and Suwanee Rivers were dropped from the instant protection category but the Cacapon and Shenandoah in West Virginia and the Eleven Point in Missouri were added. A total of seventeen rivers, including the West and North branches of the Susquehanna and portions of the Allegheny were included in the study group. The administration bill passed the Senate by a lopsided vote of 71 to 1.27

Protecting unharnessed rivers seemed to be as popular with the American public as it was with the Senate. Outdoor magazines such as The Naturalist, Better Camping, and National Wildlife devoted feature articles or entire issues to the subject. And the New York Times, Washington Post and numerous other newspapers boosted the idea in editorials.28
Despite widespread popular support, the wild rivers bill swirled eddy-like in the House. Forwarded for consideration to the House Interior Committee, Democratic chairman Wayne Aspinall expressed indifference. And after consulting with leading preservationists John Saylor, the ranking minority member on the committee, found the administration bill unacceptable.29

Saylor enthusiastically supported the protection of unspoiled rivers. Like the famous historian Frederick Jackson Turner, he believed that the frontier or wilderness experience had helped promote democracy, self-reliance, opportunity, and other characteristics that made Americans unique. Unruly rivers also allowed citizens to revisit the past of Champlain, Lewis and Clark, and other adventurers. Besides stirring the voyageur in all of us, undisciplined waterways regenerated the human spirit. Saylor quoted Carl Buchheister of the National Audubon Society who wrote that “the cares and tensions of human society evaporate” for anyone paddling a canoe and “no sleep is so refreshing as a slumber in a tent or sleeping bag on the banks of a wild river.”30

Saylor lauded President Johnson for speaking so eloquently for the need to create a rivers system in his conservation message of February 1966. But those who prepared the legislation “must not have been listening to their President or they grew fainthearted and beached their canoe before they reached the rapids.” The administration bill, he declared, was “timorous,” and “weak-kneed,” and the preservation of wilderness could not be gained by “half-baked measures.”31

Saylor introduced his own measure. Like most of the rivers it sought to protect, the Saylor bill was forceful, sweeping and rocked a few boats. Prepared with the cooperation of Edward Crafts of the Interior Department’s Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Charles Callison of the Audubon Society, and other conservation leaders, it was entitled the Scenic Rivers Bill. Saylor insisted upon the name change because the Senate-passed bill seemed too restrictive. Even by using the Senate’s vague definition, there were few streams that could be legitimately designated “wild.” He feared that scenic rivers would be denied protection because they did not qualify as remote or unspoiled. Additionally, protecting accessible, scenic rivers would give the bill more mass appeal.32

Waterways, unlike Forestry Service lands that had been protected by the Wilderness Act, had not been already classified according to their degree of wildness. So Saylor introduced a scenic river classification system. Class I areas consisted of streams that were free of pollution, dams, bridges, roads, and shoreline development. Class II comprised waterways with no dams, bridges, or shoreline developments, but some accessibility by roads. Class III rivers had limited shoreline intrusion, were easily accessible by road and rail, and may have had impoundments at one time. Saylor left it to the Interior and Agriculture secretaries to place a river in one of the three classifications.33
The administration or Senate bill seemed tame by comparison. It gave initial protective status to seven waterways, whereas Saylor’s measure gave scenic status to sixteen streams. The Senate named seventeen rivers for possible inclusion in the system, Saylor nominated sixty-six, including five in Pennsylvania. The Senate bill provided no timetable for a decision on the rivers placed in the study category. Saylor provided a schedule that compelled federal and state officials to make a determination within three years for sixteen rivers, including the five in Pennsylvania, and within ten years for the remaining fifty river segments. Both bills prevented the Federal Power Commission from licensing development projects on rivers immediately designated wild or scenic. But Saylor’s measure also prohibited the construction of dams on streams that were in the evaluation process. Both proposals called upon states to initiate river protection plans on their own, but Saylor’s version, unlike the Senate’s, prevented federal agencies from building dams on state scenic waterways such as the Allagash in Maine.

The Senate bill had no restrictions on road building, grazing, and commercial timbering. Saylor’s legislation outlawed those activities on unsullied streams and restricted them on Class II and Class III rivers. Neither bill had adequate regulations against mining. The Senate version placed no limits on mining, while Saylor’s insisted that operations not pollute the stream or unnecessarily spoil the landscape. Finally, both bills sought to minimize the amount of land taken by eminent domain by recommending scenic easements, a relatively new legal arrangement that permitted owners to retain title to property so long as they kept it in a natural state. The Senate legislation called for scenic easements of one quarter mile from each shore, while the Saylor proposal sought corridors of two miles from each riverbank. In areas where easements were not suitable, the Senate authorized the acquisition of lands within 300 feet from each shore, a beltway that Saylor termed “so inadequate as to border on the ridiculous.” He called for the acquisition of a scenic pathway of one mile on each side of the waterway.

Saylor’s bold bill grabbed national attention. “That nemesis of western reclamation, opponent of public power and ardent wilderness devotee,” wrote the political editor of the Idaho Daily Statesman, “has come up with a wild rivers bill that makes the one that passed the Senate last year a model of restraint in the field.” Letter writers from across the nation thanked Pennsylvania’s “voice for wilderness” for standing up to “scenic murderers,” and for having the “G-U-T-S to keep America beautiful.” One woman wrote that rushing rivers were important to her but “absolutely necessary to the survival of my husband.” In a similar vein a Michigan physician asserted that without “irreplaceable rivers we have nothing.” Correspondents offered additional rivers for inclusion in the system and Harper and Row publishers, perhaps with the popular Sierra Club titles in mind, wanted Saylor to promote the cause with a
book on wild rivers. Saylor passed on the book offer, but he did advance river protection by authoring an article for the popular magazine *Parks & Recreation*.

Reclamation proponents considered Saylor's bill too "far-reaching," especially if it touched anticipated projects in their states. In Tennessee supporters of the Tennessee Valley Authority's proposed Tellico Dam objected to the inclusion of theLittle Tennessee River in the three-year study group. Similarly, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources considered the bill "antithetical" to the state's interests and suggested an amendment permitting dams and roads on scenic streams such as the Little Miami. The proposed amendment would "completely contravene the purposes of the bill," Saylor retorted, and he saw no need to preserve scenic land "if a road or a well built highway follows within five feet of the area." Upset that the legislation had assigned scenic status to the upper Missouri, the Missouri River Development Association proposed making the entire Susquehanna a protected river. All bridges, dams, and shoreline developments would be removed and westerners would export thousands of pounds of sagebrush seed, and skunks, prairie dogs, elk, and antelope in order to transform the Susquehanna Valley into a wilderness paradise. Saylor initially termed the playful proposal as "asinine," but then mused that if his ancestors had taken protective measures, "how happy I would be."

Actually, Saylor had to concern himself more with his Pennsylvania contemporaries than with the distant past. Several of his colleagues, including fellow Republican Albert W. Johnson from Smethport, preferred development over preservation and were especially upset over the attempt to preserve the Susquehanna's West Branch from Clearfield to Lock Haven and its North Branch from Cooperstown, New York to Pittston, Pennsylvania. They would create problems for Saylor as the legislation progressed.

Saylor also had to deal with Aspinall, the fussy, development-minded chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He asked the Coloradan to move on the bill but the session ended without action. "The chairman apparently didn't understand President Johnson's direct statement in his conservation message earlier this year that the time had come to preserve free-flowing stretches of our rivers," Saylor grumbled to an outdoor writer. Saylor promised to "hit, kick and scratch" in his battle to obtain a scenic rivers bill. "We cannot afford the delay that allows our heritage of free-flowing rivers of beauty to be destroyed." One supporter, appropriately named Jack Bull, offered the use of his nine-foot bull whip to prod Aspinall. Another proposed ignoring Aspinall and moving ahead. Despite his bravado and bombast, Saylor was a realist who understood that he needed Aspinall's support to gain protection for rivers.
Along with thirty-eight co-sponsors, Senator Church reintroduced the administration's rivers bill in January, 1967. At the same time, Saylor reintroduced his bill in the House. The idea of protecting untamed rivers was popular and pressure mounted on congress, especially Aspinall, to move the legislation. Saylor informed a colleague that he had "received more favorable mail on this legislation than any other subject," except to oppose the Bureau of Reclamation's plan to build dams on the Colorado River that would have flooded part of Grand Canyon. To the surprise of preservationists and political observers, Aspinall introduced his own wild rivers bill in April. "He must have owed Saylor some real big favors," recalled Stewart Brandborg of the Wilderness Society. Actually, Aspinall had reached an understanding with Secretary of Interior Udall. Aspinall would support a national rivers system if the administration promised to proceed with water development projects in Colorado. Indeed, the administration delivered three more dams in Colorado than Aspinall had expected. 39

Of the three river proposals, Aspinall's was the most restrictive, Saylor's the most comprehensive. Prepared with the help of Coloradan Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League, Aspinall's measure gave instant protection to segments of only four rivers (the Rogue, Rio Grande, Salmon, and Clearwater) and placed portions of twenty others in the review category. The Senate bill preserved nine streams at once and designated thirty-five more for study. And Saylor's proposal immediately protected sixteen river segments and assigned sixty-six others for later consideration. The main attraction of Aspinall's bill, aside from the hope it gave that some legislation was likely, was its strong regulations against mining along protected waterways. 40

Saylor was pleased with the Aspinall bill because he believed that it would lead to some kind of compromise legislation. Interior Secretary Udall was also "delighted" with the turn of events. To the dismay of preservationists he disowned his own bill and came out in support of Aspinall's measure. 41

Because it protected more waterways, established a classification system, and set a definite timetable for the inclusion of additional rivers, most conservation groups preferred the Saylor bill. The Senate Interior Committee, no doubt influenced by conservationists, adopted various aspects of Saylor's proposal, principally the classification system. The amended Senate bill immediately designated seven rivers "wild," another five as "scenic." Twenty-seven streams were assigned for review at some future date. In August, 1967, the Senate bill passed by a vote of 84-0. 42

In the House, rivers legislation stalled yet again. Many members fretted over locking up rivers. Preservationists pointed out that congress could always unlock a preserved river, but once a waterway was dammed, the work could not be undone. Perhaps because they were unaware of the details, Pennsylvania congressmen were silent in 1967 over the inclusion in the study group of
portions of the Susquehanna, Delaware, Clarion, Allegheny, Pine Creek, and Youghiogheny Rivers. Legislators in other states were more vigilant. Congressman William Cramer of Florida opposed the bill because the Army Corps of Engineers was considering fifty rivers in his state for development. Saylor showed his disdain for the schemes of government engineers when he assured Cramer that “there is not a river basin or river in the entire United States which does not have a recommended comprehensive plan for optimum multiple use or development by either the Corps or the Bureau of Reclamation.”

Owing to the press of other conservation-related issues, especially the threat to the Grand Canyon, Aspinall failed to schedule hearings on river legislation in 1967. But Saylor was confident that a compromise river preservation bill would be crafted in 1968 by the Ninetieth Congress. He did not anticipate that Pennsylvania politicians would balk and nearly kill the bill.

The House Interior Committee faced a daunting agenda in 1968. Aspinall and Saylor gave river protection priority over bills to establish Redwoods National Park, North Cascades National Park, and a national trails system. Aspinall scheduled four days of hearings on the various river protection bills in mid-March. Roy A. Taylor of North Carolina chaired the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation where the bills were sent, but Aspinall, as was his custom, attended all subcommittee hearings. Saylor helped keep the sessions light with his humor, but at times proved a tough interrogator.

Only a few witnesses spoke out against the legislation. Predictably, the President of the National Reclamation Association opposed any bill that would prevent the development of any river. The subcommittee considered that position unrealistic given the fact that the Senate had unanimously approved a river bill. Other witnesses objected to the fact that they would lose their riverfront property to a grasping government that already held too much land. Despite his conservative philosophy, Saylor had little sympathy for the views of property owners when it came to the preservation of wildlands. They should yield to what he considered to be the greater good of scenic preservation. When he listened to their harangues against an intrusive government he began to wonder if he “was some kind of nut.” In a flip and insensitive moment, he reminded witnesses from West Virginia who opposed protection for the Cacapon and Shenandoah rivers that if these streams were not safeguarded, the army engineers would build dams which would submerge their property and he didn’t understand how anyone could mine or farm under 40 feet of water. He pointed out that the same right-to-private property argument had been made against the Blue Ridge Parkway but “the country is a great deal better off for having it.”

Most preservationists at the House hearings wanted to create a “legislative supernova” by merging the best features of the Aspinall and Saylor bills. Initially, however, it seemed that the two authors were unwilling to compro-
mise. Aspinall made it clear that preservationists would not get “the whole pie.” When Charles Callison of the Audubon Society expressed a preference for the Saylor bill because it designated sixteen rivers for instant protection, Aspinall advised him to prioritize “because I can tell you very frankly you are not going to get all 16.” Aspinall, to Saylor’s dismay, also watered down the bill by permitting members of congress to remove rivers in their districts from the protected list. Aspinall was amenable when E. C. Gatlings protested the inclusion of that stretch of the Eleven Point river that ran through Arkansas. Agitated, Saylor pointed out that Gatlings was not up for re-election and should not have “veto” power. Besides the opinion of the two senators, governor, and constituents should be considered. That comment prompted a scolding from Aspinall. He rebuked Saylor for being unyielding and for pushing his version of the bill in Colorado. “He has criss-crossed my State with his proposal like nobody’s business. Is he going to give on this?” “It depends on how much I get in return,” Saylor shot back. “I am a poker player. I have learned a good many tricks. I have watched him. I have sat at the feet of Gamaliel and I have learned. I hope he does not envy the fact that his student has been more than apt.”

Their differences were reconciled during the executive session of the subcommittee. The new bill retained Saylor’s river classification system but also incorporated Aspinall’s strong restrictions against mining. It granted immediate protection to six rivers that were truly undeveloped: the Salmon and Clearwater (Idaho), Rogue (Oregon), Rio Grande (New Mexico), Wolf (Wisconsin), and St. Croix (Wisconsin and Minnesota). Segments of twenty-eight other streams, including the five in Pennsylvania, were placed on the study list for possible inclusion in the system at a later date. Aspinall recommended that Saylor be given the honor of introducing the new, clean bill with more than twenty-co-sponsors. The full committee approved the compromise measure and forwarded it to the House on July 1, 1968.

Presumably because of time constraints—Congress was scheduled to recess in August for the national political conventions—Aspinall and Saylor asked House Speaker John McCormack for a suspension of the rules on scenic rivers and five other bills that had been reported by the House Interior Committee. Normally, a bill is given a rule and then sent to the floor for debate and amendments. (Suspending a rule, which requires a two-thirds vote from the members, means that the legislation is sent to the floor but cannot be amended.) Waiting for a rule took time and Aspinall and Saylor may have feared that Congress would adjourn without acting on the bill. Additionally, they may have wanted to suspend the rules so that their colleagues could not gut the bill with amendments. Legislators, after all, had been given an opportunity to remove rivers from the bill during the hearings or through correspondence. Another possibility, raised by disgruntled preservationists, is that Aspinall
John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania wanted to sabotage the bill and sought the unusual legislative procedure knowing that it would fail. He had used a similar legislative gimmick in 1962 to delay the Wilderness Bill. But the more reasonable interpretation is that Aspinall and Saylor had an ambitious conservation agenda, which included a strong scenic rivers bill, and wanted to enact as much legislation as they could before congress adjourned.49

On the evening of July 16, just before adjournment for the summer recess, the decision to suspend the rules came before the whole House. Representatives from Pennsylvania, New York, and a few other states raised objections. Upon instructions from Governor Raymond Shafer, Pennsylvania Congressmen Daniel Flood of Wilkes-Barre, Joseph McDade of Scranton, and William Green of Philadelphia balked at the procedure because they wanted to add amendments—deleting the Susquehanna and Clarion Rivers in Pennsylvania. Their position had been influenced by Maurice Goddard, the state’s Secretary of Forests and Waters. He had testified for the bill during the subcommittee hearings, but then reversed himself when he realized that water development projects were banned while a proposed scenic river was under study. Several projects were under consideration for the Susquehanna, including an atomic reactor on the North Branch and Interstate Highway 80 along the West Branch. And in the western part of the state, the Clarion River Organization for Water Development (CROWD) championed the Army Engineers proposal to build the St. Petersburg reservoir.50

Taken aback, proponents of the scenic rivers bill sought to save it by promising to remove any objectionable river from the study group when House and Senate conferees met to work out their differences. But opponents were not won over because the House might not be able to work its will on the Senate. The vote to suspend the rules failed and the scenic rivers bill seemed to have been “sunk without a trace.”51

Embarrassed and angered by the rebuff from Shafer and the Pennsylvania delegation, Saylor was not optimistic about the bill’s chances. After all, the session would end in mid-October. Udall and other proponents urged him to salvage the bill by seeking an ordinary rule and then offering amendments removing Pennsylvania’s rivers from the study category. Still brooding, Saylor refused. He could not in good conscience withdraw Pennsylvania waterways and retain streams in other states. The legislation, he told Udall, “is defeated for this Congress in my opinion, and I have no intention of seeking a rule to have its further consideration.”52

Then came a telegram from Shafer. Pennsylvania would withdraw its objections to the bill if amendments were approved that either eliminated the Susquehanna and Clarion Rivers or lifted the moratorium on development projects for study streams. Saylor’s sarcastic reply indicated that he might satisfy the demands. Was the governor aware, he asked, that the Clarion “is a part
of my Congressional District and neither you, your legislative staff nor your
department heads have had [the] courtesy to discuss the matter with me?”
Did Shafer understand that in committee hearings Pennsylvania’s Secretary of
Forest and Waters, who he assumed “spoke for” the administration, endorsed
the moratorium of the economic development of study streams, including the
Clarion and Susquehanna? Given the governor’s parochial preference for “opt-
timum impoundment and river development” over the national perspective
of protecting selected untamed waterways, he would offer an amendment, if
the bill were revived, removing all Pennsylvania waterways from the study
category. But he would take no action until the governor had the courtesy to
consult with him.53

It is not clear whether Saylor’s offer to remove all Pennsylvania rivers was
genuine. Since Congressmen McDade, Flood, and Johnson opposed study
status for the North and West Branches of the Susquehanna he realized that
those streams would be deleted from the bill. The upper Allegheny was in
Johnson’s district so that stream too would go. But the Clarion was in his
district and he was reluctant to remove it even though John Murtha, his Demo-
cratic congressional opponent, favored development of the waterway. At any
rate, Shafer never conferred directly so Saylor considered the arrangement
void.54

Meanwhile, conservation groups began to mobilize public opinion. In-
deed, Saylor told a friend that he delayed seeking a rule in order to give his
conservationist friends time to get out the message. And citizens were recep-
tive because it seemed that no river was safe from development. The year
before preservationists, with Saylor at the forefront, had successfully blocked
an attempt by the Bureau of Reclamation to construct dams on the Colorado
River that would have flooded part of Grand Canyon. Now it seemed that
water planners were trying to kill scenic rivers legislation. The New York Times
blasted those “parochial pork-barrel politicians” who had served a “death war-
rant” on the Susquehanna River and other unspoiled waterways. Conserva-
tion organizations urged Shafer to reconsider his position. The Wilderness
Society sought to shame the governor by pointing out that his stance was
contrary to the state’s “reputation for leadership” in the field of conservation.
“The Pinchot tradition has been deep and influential and we feel it is not
accidental that one of the outstanding conservationists of our time is a Penn-
sylvania and the author of the scenic rivers bill.” In a special memorandum
entitled “Position of Pennsylvania’s Governor Imperils Passage of National
Rivers System Bill,” it urged its 2000 Pennsylvania members to write Shafer
and members of congress recommending support for the “landmark conser-
vation measure.”55

Letters streamed into the governor’s office. Correspondents were “dis-
tressed,” “dismayed,” and “horrified” by Shafer’s “tragic,” “lamentable,” and
“absolutely incomprehensible” position. Even fellow Republican Frank Masland, a nationally respected conservationist who headed the governor’s Committee on Natural Resources, implored Shafer to reevaluate his position.56

Faced with a public relations fiasco, Shafer’s staff scrambled to minimize the damage. But their long-awaited explanation strained belief. In effect, they claimed that the state could better manage Pennsylvania’s rivers than the federal government. They wanted to develop some waterways such as the Allegheny, Clarion, and Susquehanna and preserve portions of others such as the Delaware, Pine and Youghiogheny. They could move more quickly to protect streams than congress. “We’re moving ahead in Pennsylvania,” claimed Goddard, “and we don’t want our progress halted.”57

On September 4, the first day that Congress returned from its recess, Aspinall and Saylor requested reconsideration of the bill. The Rules Committee agreed and scheduled the bill for debate under an open rule which allowed amendments. Conservation groups hailed the decision and endorsed the resurrected bill. So did Shafer, conditionally. Pennsylvania would support the legislation if the Susquehanna and Clarion were removed or if Congress permitted economic development on study streams.58

The House took up discussion of the bill on September 12. Aspinall and Saylor reviewed its history, explained its provisions, and recommended passage. Setting aside scenic rivers. Saylor acknowledged, seemed to contradict most peoples’ idea of progress. But “the real challenge of this society is to preserve what we know has been good and useful in our American way of life.” A national scenic rivers system would give all citizens, “and especially our children, an opportunity to appreciate: A sense of history, a sense of environment, a sense of national place, and a sense of joy for free-flowing water.” Having delivered an emotional plea for rivers, Saylor then left for Johnstown to attend the funeral of his younger brother Tillman who had died from a heart attack.59

During the floor debate several amendments were offered affecting six rivers from the study group. At the request of representatives from New York and Pennsylvania the Susquehanna—both the North Branch and West Branch—was removed from the bill. Saylor considered the Susquehanna, especially the West Branch, “one of the few scenic rivers left in the East” and had informed Aspinall that he was going to fight for its inclusion. Aspinall regretted the absence of the river’s champion, but he did not want “to upset any State or any group of States” and always deferred to the members of congress whose districts were affected. The amendments were approved and the Saylor bill, even without its sponsor there to support it, passed by a vote of 265 to 7.60

With the passage of the bill, both chambers appointed conferees to work out the differences between the House and Senate versions. Saylor served as
one of eight House conferees and was instrumental in shaping the final legislation. Renumbered S. 119 and entitled the Wild and Scenic Rivers Bill, the conferees essentially followed the House version. Several modifications, however, were added to address the Senate’s concerns. Saylor’s classification system was changed from the stark Class I, Class II, and Class III zones, to the more illustrative “wild river”, “scenic river”, and “recreational river” areas. As with the House bill, the executive branch would determine the stream’s classification, while the legislative branch made the decision to include a waterway in the system. The period allotted for a decision on the rivers placed in the study group was increased from five to ten years. Dam building and mining were prohibited. The conference committee shrunk the shoreline from one to one-quarter of a mile and slightly reduced the appropriation for the acquisition of river land and scenic easements from $17.3 to 17.0 million.  

Some conferees, including Saylor, sought protection for additional waterways. Two rivers, the Eleven Point in Missouri and the Middle Fork of the Feather in California were switched from the study list to the immediate designation category. Four streams were added to the study group, including two from Pennsylvania at Saylor’s request, the lower Allegheny and a portion of the Youghiogheny. He and Senator Joe Clark of Pennsylvania also sought to reinsert both branches of the Susquehanna in the study group but Aspinall insisted upon legislative prerogative and neither river made it. In all, the bill gave instant protection to eight rivers and placed portions of twenty-seven others, including five in Pennsylvania, in the study group. The House and Senate approved the work of the conference committee and President Johnson signed the bill into law on October 2, 1968. 

The National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was part of a congressional conservation package that included Redwoods National Park, North Cascades National Park, and the National Trails System. Preservationists hailed the “epochal” achievements of the Ninetieth Congress, especially the protection of rivers. Indeed, except for its companion, the Wilderness Act, after which it was patterned, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was the most sweeping and significant piece of preservationist legislation in the 1960s. Within a decade, nineteen rivers totaling 1,655 miles had been protected. With the expiration of the ten-year study period, additional legislation was passed in 1978 that eventually brought the list to sixty-six waterways covering 7300 miles. By the mid-1990s, the list had grown to 154 units totaling 10,500 miles. Three of those nationally protected river segments are the Allegheny, Clarion, and Delaware Rivers in Pennsylvania. As the original bill intended, individual states also safeguarded rivers. The state of Pennsylvania, for example, eventually designated as scenic thirteen rivers, including a segment of the Pine.
Saylor had worked closely with conservation leaders to craft an ambitious and effective rivers protection bill. He was forced to compromise, but the result was a stronger bill than the administration, the Senate, Committee Chairman Aspinall, Governor Shafer, and some Pennsylvania congressmen had intended. Recognizing Saylor for being of “inestimable value” in securing the conservation bills, President Johnson gave him one of the pens at the signing ceremony. The Democratic administration acknowledged privately that it wanted to honor the Republican member of Congress because for a decade he had served “as a lever to push Aspinall into action on ‘must’ legislation.” Congressional colleagues praised Saylor as “Mr. Conservation” for sponsoring a rivers bill that would “mark a place in the history of conservation for all time to come.” Conservation organizations also recognized his contributions. He became the first recipient of the Bernard Baruch Conservation Award and also received awards from the Pennsylvania Fish and Game Protective Association and the Izaak Walton League. Saylor did not live to see all of the study rivers brought into the system, but as the tenth anniversary of the bill approached, *National Geographic* devoted a special feature to “America’s Wild and Scenic Rivers.” It witnessed gangly waterways, pavilioned in natural splendor, crawling and rushing to their destinations. Some ran “clean and free, as of old,” and
others yielded “a respite to the modern soul.” In some remote regions, “that purest poetry of nature, the chiming of a mountain stream,” could be detected. There were also “dark-shadowed rivers” that recalled our pioneer heritage. That precious riverine legacy was bequeathed to the nation, in large measure, by John Saylor, a politically astute, environmentally-sensitive congressman from a Pennsylvania steel town.64
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