

affords protection of certain natural wonders. The major threat has been impoundments and the hope for some system that would designate or classify rivers as wild and scenic was paramount in our consideration. We were not fully conversant with the problems that contiguous lands presented. It may be that the committee in its wisdom would prefer to establish a system where the problem of land ownership is not a primary problem. Wherein such land use becomes a problem, these rivers may be incorporated into the system after serious consideration and proper hearings have been afforded all concerned.

May I add one other comment, Mr. Chairman? Two streams in which Trout Unlimited is particularly interested are the Middle Fork of the Feather, in California, and the Big Hole in Montana. Both are threatened by impoundments which we regard as currently unneeded. We would urge that the Feather and the Big Hole be given early consideration in any bill that is reported out of this committee.

May I thank you and the members of the committee for this opportunity to appear before you.

Mr. TAYLOR. You would recommend that Feather and the Big Hole be included in the study category.

Mr. BOVEY. Yes, very definitely.

Mr. TAYLOR. I commend you on a very fine statement. You recommend that the rivers and adjacent lands be opened for hunting.

Mr. BOVEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought you would add to that "and fishing."

Mr. BOVEY. We are interested in fishing, but many of our fishermen are also hunters, and we do not feel that there is anything inconsistent between having a lovely scenic river on which people are free to hunt birds or deer or other game. We think the two are completely compatible.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, open to fishing would be assumed.

Mr. BOVEY. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have any of the other members of the committee questions?

The gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to thank you for a very fine statement in connection with the legislation that is here before us now. In your first paragraph you talk about the quality of the fishing.

Mr. BOVEY. About what, sir?

Mr. JOHNSON. The quality of the fishing.

Mr. BOVEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. We in California must have a hatchery program in order to keep some fish in the rivers at certain places.

Mr. BOVEY. That is certainly true.

Mr. JOHNSON. So I presume that you do not want to place a ban on putting fish in any of these rivers from the hatcheries out there.

Mr. BOVEY. Sir, let me put it this way. It is Trout Unlimited's belief based on pretty sound biological information from our board of scientific advisers that a river that contains a native population of trout that is adequate to provide good fishing under the existing fishing pressure need not be stocked, indeed that stocking such a river is one of the greatest wastes of hatchery fish and taxpayers' money, licensed buyers' money, that there is. We want Mother Nature to do as much