

witnesses. I personally am familiar with the area, and can certify to its outstanding characteristics.

The joint Forest Service-Park Service report of about a year ago outlined two alternative approaches. One was for a national park and the other one was a national recreation area. The Sawtooth area is one of the areas that have been under consideration by the two departments during their efforts to work out an agreement over administration of areas for recreational purposes that in the past have been the subject of controversy or disagreement between the two departments. I am happy to say with respect to the Sawtooth area that the Interior Department supports the creation of a recreation area and its administration by the Forest Service.

You will note that the report of the Department of Interior on S. 1267 states that it has no objection to the enactment of the bill. I have been authorized by Secretary Udall to modify that statement, and to say on the contrary that the Department supports and recommends the enactment of the bill.

I am also instructed to advise you, as the report states, that the National Parks Advisory Board did express an interest in the Sawtooths as a possible national park last October, and had planned to designate a subcommittee to visit and look at the area.

However, this was almost a year ago, and has not occurred. And it may or may not occur.

If they make a visit to the area, it may include the White Cloud and Castle Peaks area to the east of the Sawtooth Valley.

But I am making these remarks to clarify the record and not in any way to throw a cloud on the progress of this bill or to suggest—

Senator CHURCH. Not even a White Cloud?

Mr. CRAFTS (continuing). Or to suggest that there be any deferment on the passage of this bill, not even on White Cloud.

However, I would say that, since national recreation areas are somewhat new, up to now the administration of such areas has been divided between the Park Service and the Forest Service. The national recreation areas are sort of what you might call a halfway house between a national forest and a national park. I think that a national recreation area should be more than simply changing the name of an existing national forest area and putting a new name on the same thing and managing it in the same way as it has been managed in the past.

I do believe that this bill and the testimony this morning makes clear that this national recreation area would be something more than the normal multiple-use national forest administration.

Among other things, it would make recreation the primary purpose of the management of the area and it would authorize acquisition by fee and easement of certain private lands within the Sawtooth Valley and the Stanley Basin which are now outside the boundaries of the national forest. It would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to establish certain regulations with respect to the conforming use of private lands in the area. With respect to the 10,000 acres of BLM land that have been mentioned by previous witnesses, I believe it is reasonable to expect that the Secretary of the Interior, upon request to the Secretary of Agriculture, would transfer those lands to the Department of Agriculture, and they would become national forest lands and part of the national recreation area.