

I have the letter from the manager of the REA sustaining the findings of the Midvale Irrigation District, and I would like to introduce that in the record.

Senator HANSEN. Without objection, it will be received.

Mr. DAVISON. Talking about the Wyoming Fish and Game Commission in this way, this is one of the best spots in our area for all-around sports, fishing and all that. By all means let's not give that up. Let's not let anybody have that. It is close to the lake, close to the highway, it is the best tourist attraction that we have in our area.

There are other places where the same thing can be done in the Riverton project and should be done, and this \$1,100,000 that is to be charged to recreation, the \$50,000 that our State has offered to pay, is just chickenfeed in my book for what we could develop on the river project for hunting and fishing. So let's not lose that. Let's keep that. They can lose us farmers but they can't get rid of that.

On behalf of the Cottonwood Bench Improvement Association and the Riverton Valley Electric Association, I respectfully request that this committee favorably consider the Riverton reauthorization legislation.

Thank you.

(The documents referred to follow:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Riverton, Wyo., October 9, 1967.

Mr. G. W. DAVISON,
Route 1,
Riverton, Wyo.

DEAR MR. DAVISON: You recently inquired about the status of the Third Division lands, in regards to their being eligible for cost-shares under the Agricultural Conservation Program. This land at present belongs to the United States Government.

Crop land, owned by the United States, or a Cooperation wholly owned by it, is eligible for cost-shares, *only* if a "private person" is farming it. A private person excludes State or Federal Agencies.

As you realize, since the United States Government purchased back the lands in Third Division, they have in turn leased this land to private individuals for one year at a time. These leases have been renewed yearly since the ground was repurchased. Since the government gives only one year leases to private individuals, the individuals are reluctant to spend their own funds carrying out needed conservation work on these units. This is particularly true in regards to the more permanent type practices, such as ditch lining, land leveling and drainage. Therefore, as you can see, individuals leasing these lands with a one year lease, are not going to carry out the needed conservation work. Another factor that would enter into the carrying out of conservation practices on this land would be the reluctance of the County ASC Committee to cost-share on these practices when they do not know the future status of this land. The County Committee, due to a limited amount of ACP funds, is careful to allocate these funds to where they feel the most beneficial results will be received towards soil and water conservation. Naturally, they would be hesitant to approve cost-shares, should a lessee request such, for carrying out conservation work in this area. When these lands were owned by private individuals, they had received approximately \$100,000.00 in cost-shares through the ACP program for carrying out conservation work. Much of this was for land leveling, ditch lining, etc. Naturally, all persons concerned would like to see this investment protected. Some of the conservation practices carried out, need normal maintenance, which they have not had during the last few years.

Should the Congress make a decision to return these lands to private ownership, there is no reason that I can foresee, why these lands would not be eligible for cost-sharing in carrying out conservation practices under our program. I feel that should they be returned to private ownership, the individuals acquir-