

No. 2:

An advisory board should be established by the Director of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources to provide local representation and augment the State's role in administering the project.

The third sentence:

It is recommended that federal wild or scenic river legislation include provision for grants that cover up to 100 percent of the land acquisition and easement costs.

That is a pretty honest summation of what the States are looking for, to do a State job with 100-percent Federal funds. And I am afraid that this legislation may very effectively stop a lot of State activity, and especially when we consider all of the hundreds of rivers that should in some respect be preserved or kept clean or in some other way safe for future generations.

Let me get to these questions.

According to your testimony, in 1965 President Johnson in his message to the Congress on natural beauty suggested it was time to "reserve free flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers."

Now, that is the general gist, that is the beginning. We want to keep these rivers free flowing, which means we do not want to put dams on them. We heard this morning testimony about a river that floods, but not because of the river.

If Stillwater, Minn., should have a tragic flood, do you think the designation of the river through this town as a natural or scenic or wild river would make one bit of difference insofar as reconsideration of dams is concerned?

Mr. CRAFTS. If I follow you, you mean if they have a flood, are the people going to want a dam to see they do not have a flood again?

Mr. KYL. Yes.

Mr. CRAFTS. I think so. They are going to want a dam.

Mr. KYL. They are going to want a dam.

Mr. CRAFTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KYL. And the Congress can at any time it desires change the status of any of these streams from free-flowing streams to a stream which is protected for flood control and river stabilization.

Mr. CRAFTS. That is right. And I made that statement here today.

Mr. KYL. Now, so far as your office is concerned, is the real purpose of this act to preserve these rivers, or is it recreation?

Mr. CRAFTS. Well, I do not know. I am not sure I get the full distinction. There is not much point in preserving just for the sake of preserving. You have ecological remnants, you have natural areas. But even those, you reserve them for scientific study and this sort of thing. It depends how broadly you consider recreation. If you consider it to encompass the enjoyment of the rivers by canoeing, by walking, by looking, even by the fact of knowing that they are there, then I would say that recreation is a principal purpose.

Mr. KYL. The point I want to make absolutely clear is this. Your answer to the question will help establish the point.

We have a category of streams now possible, a category which also includes land areas, and we call them national recreation areas. Now, when we consider this bill, any of the bills which are introduced on the subject, are we talking about developing national recreation areas or