

own certificates of beneficial ownership. So that happily, land transfers are not going to involve vast cadastral studies and endless litigation.

Mr. McCLURE. Do these reports you refer to contain a reference to the language in terms of such a scenic easement?

Mr. REUSS. No; they do not. But—

Mr. McCLURE. I wonder could you furnish such a proposal or copy of such a proposal for us?

Mr. REUSS. I will be glad to. I will have to ask the Department for its proposed form but I will be delighted to do it.

Mr. McCLURE. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you very much, Mr. Reuss. We will give careful consideration to your recommendations.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The statement of Mr. Reuss and information he was asked to supply for the record follows:)

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today in support of H.R. 6166, the proposed "Scenic Rivers Act." It is always a pleasure to appear before your subcommittee which works so diligently to provide the Nation with the finest of outdoor recreation areas and facilities.

Who shall own the two or three dozen unspoiled rivers life in this vast continent of ours? Will it be the American people, or will it be the land developers, the power companies, and industries which would churn and pollute their waters and blight their shores? That is the question before this subcommittee.

The Scenic Rivers bill in its House (H.R. 6166) or Senate (S. 119) versions would deed these rivers over to the American people for their enjoyment.

I strongly endorse this answer. It is the only alternative to the destruction of the beauty of this handful of remaining gems among the Nation's rivers.

The cost of the preservation of these rivers is really quite small. To save the 8 rivers in the Senate bill some \$40 million would be authorized over the next 10 years.

In other words, for \$4 million a year, the Nation would be preventing the destruction of eight of its remaining irreplaceable pristine rivers—waters which at this late date through luck and happenstance still run pure.

Among the rivers authorized for preservation in both S. 119 and H.R. 6166 are two rivers which grace my State of Wisconsin—the Wolf River and the St. Croix River, with its Namekagon tributary.

I wish to spend any time here presenting what I believe to be the excellent case for the preservation of one of these waterways—the Wolf. In their joint testimony to be presented later today Senator Nelson and Senator Mondale will concentrate their attention on the other—the St. Croix-Namekagon. I strongly endorse what they will have to say with regard to the St. Croix. Recognizing the many claims on the time of the Subcommittee, I shall not repeat the case for preservation of the St. Croix.

THE WOLF RIVER—A PREEMINENTLY SCENIC RIVER

The adjectives "wild" and "scenic" naturally attach to the Wolf River. It is preeminently both a wild and a scenic waterway.

While running its 220 mile course, from source to mouth, the Wolf most fully displays its beauty over a 48 mile run through Langlade and Menominee Counties. Over this stretch the River drops 700 feet through granite boulders.

Here is rushing white water in a beautiful green wilderness setting.

By the river side grow everything from lichens and ferns to the tallest white pine, hemlock, and arbor vitae. Songbirds and waterfowl, deer and bear, muskrat and mink inhabit the banks.

Trout fill the waters. Eighteen to 20 inch long brown trout are the fisherman's prize; while brook trout of 12 inches or better quite commonly fill his creek.