

Mr. Chairman, the people of Kerr County simply do not want to be covered by this legislation, and obviously there is no sound reason or justification for its being done. Federal or State intervention, with authority to condemn a maximum of 100 acres per mile on both sides of the stream, in fee simple, along with rights of condemnation for purposes of easements related to use and control, would disrupt the livelihood of thousands and jeopardize the continued development and best use of the affected area. By subjecting the riverside areas to such oppressive actions, land values would decline, investments and developments would become hazardous, and irreparable damage would thereby be wrought. Just the possibility of such actions being taken by the government would of itself create a depressing air of uncertainty.

The Guadalupe in Kerr County is now dotted by a series of small dams—incidentally, all built *exclusively* with local non-federal funds. The mountain reservoirs thus created add immeasurably to the natural attractiveness and enchantment of the rugged hillsides and the pastoral landscapes of the valleys. If this legislation is enacted there would be a prohibition against the construction of additional dams, without high-level authority—whether for recreational uses or in order to supplement the municipal water supply, or for flood control.

Mr. Chairman the Guadalupe river is not a "wild" river, as that term is defined in this legislation. It has no place in this bill. I am speaking at the moment in particular for Kerr County. If any other county through which the Guadalupe runs desires to be included in the legislation I am sure that can be arranged when adequate proof of the desires of the people affected is provided.

I shall not belabor the issue further at this time. A number of witnesses from Kerr County have asked permission to be heard. They will be prepared to implement what I have said, and their testimony will throw much more light on the issue. Kerr County wants out.

Mr. TAYLOR. Our next witness is our colleague, Representative Henry Reuss.

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY S. REUSS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Chairman Aspinall, gentlemen. I have a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, which I should like to offer for the record and then proceed briefly.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the absence of objection, the statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

Mr. REUSS. While I appear here, Mr. Chairman, in full support of the principle of the scenic rivers bill introduced by so many members of this committee and its distinguished chairman, I want to address myself principally to the Wolf River in Wisconsin which is included in H.R. 6166, which has been favorably reported by the Department of the Interior, and it is also included in the Senate-passed version, S. 119.

The Wolf River is one of our great fresh unspoiled treasures in the Midwest. The scenic portions of it flow through two counties, Langlade and Menominee Counties. This committee is particularly familiar with Menominee County because this was the ancestral home of the Menominee Indians. One of the great monuments, Mr. Chairman, to this committee is legislation passed by this committee a few years ago which provides that the great forest of the Menominees, the finest remaining stand between the Rockies and the Appalachians of virgin timber, shall be preserved under a sustained yield management program while grass grows and water flows, which is quite a long time.