

rivers under certain specific conditions and/or restrictions. We support this procedure. Since the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, States have accelerated their interest and activities in providing necessary recreation lands and waters. It would seem only appropriate to effect the States' cooperation and respect their initiative in this matter. We would feel, however, that particular restrictions would be necessary if such State-designated rivers, wholly within the boundaries of that State, were to become a part of a Federal system. We have no quarrel with the proviso that where the waters are wholly contained that acquisition or encompassing into the system by the Federal Government could be achieved only with the consent of the State. By the same token, the rivers should not be included into the scenic rivers system without the consent of the Federal Government. Our attitude in no way demeans or restrains the fullest cooperation that can be effected by the Secretary and the various local political subdivisions.

We are appreciative and not without understanding of the difficult decisions with which this committee is confronted. We wish to add all of our encouragement to the committee's efforts in resolving a number of these difficulties which appear inherent in all legislation that seeks to break new ground, for we feel the purposes of the legislation rank with the most important achievements in the history of natural resources policy.

Primarily we feel that the logic of this legislation, and its various forms—and it is somewhat complex because of the number of bills before the committee with different provisions—we feel the logic certainly does support the basic purposes of the legislation.

There are two features with which we have had great difficulty in the past. We can present our cases either for or against impoundments. It is often the latter. But we are not in a posture except by negativism to really establish any forward-looking and basic understanding of protection of some of the values that we think are very important.

I think the logic of the legislation is important in the second instance. If we dam a river or if we otherwise develop it and we find out at a later date that the public interest would best be served in its free-flowing form, there is nothing we can do to change that situation. It is an irrevocable situation.

On the other hand, if we declare a river a preserve in scenic form in one of the many classifications, and at a later time it is determined that there is a water shortage, there is need for impoundment, there is need for other type of development, the burden of proof then, Mr. Chairman, is on the developer, if this act becomes law, and then a full forum is convened and before this committee an analysis is made as to which of the various uses to which this water and land can be put is then determined. It appears to me that specifically this is extremely important.

In developing the whole wild river system Dr. Crafts mentioned yesterday—and I was in the chamber and heard him say—that this kind of a measure has to go through a series of stages and ultimately matures. Well, I think maturation is about complete, and I think that in all probability, and hopefully, we will be able to see this legislation become law in some form.