

and protected with the pride and the care that applies to the Guadalupe in my district, you would not have any point in considering this kind of legislation anywhere. It is that sort of a situation. So, every organized group in that county where it originates, where much of this resort and recreation concentration is, is opposed to the inclusion. There is no need for it.

Mr. MORTON. I think this is important to have in the record.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will my colleague yield? But my colleague from Texas would not state that there are no conservation societies or organizations within the State of Texas that would be favorable to inclusion?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, I would not go that far, Mr. Chairman. I can speak only for those up in the hill country that have to live with these things and pay the taxes and make the proper use of the land that lies along the Guadalupe. A few people in Comal County have favored including the Guadalupe. I will explain that Comal County adjoins Kerr. The Guadalupe originates in Kerr County, runs through Comal, thence onward toward the gulf. A few people who live in Comal County have indicated they would prefer that their county be kept in the scenic rivers program. In response, I have informed them that if it should be the consensus of the people there that they want the Guadalupe and its tributaries in that county kept in the bill, an effort will be made to have that done.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the chairman very much. I have no further questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you very much, Mr. Fisher.

(The full statement of Mr. Fisher follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. O. C. FISHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, I appear here today to respectfully urge this committee to amend the pending legislation by striking from Sec. 5(a) the Guadalupe river in Texas. That stream has no place in this bill. I know that is true of the upper stretches of the stream—for which I am authorized to speak. I have made some inquiries about it but no one seems to know why this river was included in the Senate version. And I am sure you will agree—after you have examined the facts—that this stream does not fit into this legislation at all. There is nothing in the pending legislation which could enhance the preservation of the natural beauty and the recreational qualities of this river basin—nothing that is not now being done by local interests or which has not already been done.

The Guadalupe—particularly the upper stretches with which I am more familiar—is already highly developed. It is already widely known as the playground of Texas. All the land along the meanderings of the stream is highly valued and carefully preserved. There is no pollution and no danger of pollution in the Kerr County area. The people would not stand for it. And so proud are the people of the appearance of their resort areas and countryside that I suspect if a litterbug were apprehended there he would be treated rather harshly.

In Kerr County alone—where the river originates—there are some 30 summer camps, patronized by more than 25,000 youngsters each year who go there, under careful supervision, to enjoy the pure air and the rugged mountain scenery and participate in outdoor sports such as fishing, boating, swimming, mountain climbing, horseback riding, and the like.

What I am trying to do is to impress this committee with the fact that the valley of the Guadalupe—that portion with which I am familiar—is too highly developed to lend itself to any government program such as is envisioned in the pending legislation. In fact, for more than half a century the people there have left no stones unturned in their efforts to preserve the natural beauty of the terrain and the water resources of that river basin. In other words, if all streams in America were so treated, there would be no excuse for this legislation as applied to any of them.