

Land and water conservation fund money, assuming there is money in the fund, would also be made available for the purpose of acquisition of fee title or easements of the private lands.

It would, of course, bring tourism and recreation to the area through the congressional establishment of a national recreation area which has become a very popular instrument or vehicle of congressional recognition in the last several years.

Hunting and fishing would continue in the area and water rights would be unaffected.

I do want to underscore the fact that a national recreation area is intended to be something more than above the normal multiple use of the national forests. I would hope that the record and the legislative history that is made here would recognize and support this.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to add, unless there are some questions.

Senator BIBLE. I think that is a very fine statement. Certainly I share all the views that you have expressed. I am not quite clear as to this halfway house between the Forest Service and the National Park concept. And I hope that the legislative history is such that we are clear as we read it in the future that what is being done here does largely use the multiple-use concept.

You can fish on the area just as you can in a national park. You can hunt there, which you cannot in a national park. You can develop a mining claim there, which you cannot on a national park. And you can have grazing and permit the running of cattle and sheep, which you cannot on a national park.

Senator CHURCH. And you can keep your private land.

Senator BIBLE. And you can keep the private land, which you can do in a national recreation area such as Cape Cod. But what else is there that is really different? I don't know that the record is too clear on this halfway business.

Mr. CRAFTS. The primary difference, Senator, as I see it, is that recreation becomes the primary purpose of management of the national recreation area. And in the national forest recreation is one of five coequal purposes of management. And the management of the timber and the grazing and the water and the other multiple uses of the area are to be handled in a way that does not impair or infringe upon the primary purpose of managing that area for recreation enjoyment. There is a fundamental distinction between a national recreation area and a national forest.

Senator BIBLE. Maybe it is a change of emphasis. I continue to be somewhat mystified by the Bureau of Land Management, which originally was set up largely to administer the Taylor Grazing Act. And now it seems to me they are bending more and more toward recreational uses, acquiring land. And so again I hope we are avoiding—and you are a good catalyst in the field—the competing agencies all running where the popular demand is, to the recreationists, and all trying to get in the same general field. It leaves me just a little perplexed as to how you draw the lines. Because certainly there is great recreation within the Forest Service right today. You know that. And there certainly is with BLM. At least they are trying to get their foot in the door, and to become more and more recreationally oriented rather than their prime objective of administering the Taylor Grazing Act.