

that this would be incompatible. I do not know if I am being responsive or not.

Mr. KYL. Well, I think you are, sir, and I thank you. Is it the goal of people supporting this legislation to preserve these rivers, these scenic values, so that they might construct summer homes near the rivers?

Mr. FRASER. No. This raises another problem, to be truthful about it. The St. Croix River is such a useful river for recreational and scenic value that it is unfortunate that there has not in the past been acquired more public ownership along the beaches so that people who are boating or canoeing or sailing might have a public place to land.

The problem we have today is that a person who takes his boat out for a weekend and puts it in the river is hard put to find a place where he can picnic or land for purposes of water skiing, et cetera.

Mr. KYL. Is our purpose then primarily to develop it as a recreation area?

Mr. FRASER. No. What I would say is this. Two things. One is the character of the river still remains essentially as it is, a scenic river. I am talking about the lower stretch from Taylors Falls down, below the wild river portion. That has been fairly well developed as a summer or recreational kind of environment.

There are two things that need to happen. One is that the beginnings of industrialization, which is represented by the powerplant, not lead to further industrialization along that river so as to destroy its scenic and recreational value. That is No. 1.

No. 2, hopefully, some day there would be more public ownership acquired along it, so as to enhance the enjoyment that people who do not have cabins can get from the river, because there would be a place for them to land their boats or do the things that are associated with water recreation.

So those would be the two objectives that I would have in mind in this arrangement.

Mr. KYL. Could we possibly achieve purpose No. 1 through State zoning or county zoning regulations? It would be a much simpler proposition than this whole process in which we are engaged.

Mr. FRASER. Well, the problem is, frankly, related to the ways that local communities find themselves required to derive their tax revenues. One of the reasons that there was support generated for the powerplant that went in was that the community immediately involved saw this as a way to easing the burden of supporting their local schools and local governments. So they were very much for it. The farther you got from that community, the more people were interested in other aspects of the problem, namely, the scenic and recreational use.

If you leave it up to each community, what they are often confronted with is this decision whether they should let industry locate because of its tax advantage or whether they should abstain in the larger public interest. This is a difficult decision for a local community to make.

Mr. KYL. This is not simply a problem for the local community. As I remember it, one of the chief sponsors and hardnosed advocates of a