

Mr. ASPINALL. On the other hand, you don't want a saloon in the Ford Theater nowadays, do you?

Mr. SORENSEN. Certainly not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the gentleman from Idaho have any questions?

Mr. McCLURE. I have no questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. SORENSEN. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. This ends our list of witnesses.

In the absence of objection, I would like to make a part of the record at this point a statement of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

This will be placed in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, PRESENTED BY
HERBERT A. WATKINS, ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR

We appreciate the opportunity to present the views of our organization with respect to the many bills which are known as "Scenic and Wild Rivers" legislation.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is composed of Farm Bureaus in 49 States and Puerto Rico, representing 2,770 County Farm Bureaus having a combined membership of over 1,750,000 member families.

In preparing our testimony, we noted that the Department of Interior in its report to this Committee, on August 14, 1967, and its supplement dated September 18, 1967, with regard to H.R. 90, H.R. 493, H.R. 3996, H.R. 6166, H.R. 6588, H.R. 8416 and S. 119 recommended enactment of H.R. 8416, with amendments. Therefore, we have used H.R. 8416 as our focal point in the preparation of our statement.

Delegates to the American Farm Bureau Federation's annual meeting said with respect to this matter:

We are opposed to any proposal which would prevent the economic development of a stretch of river which has potential resource value for water supply, flood control, agriculture, forestry, recreation, tax income, or other economic use; or which would necessitate the taking of fee title to privately owned land; or which would unnecessarily involve federal responsibility for a river which is being adequately managed by a state.

PREVENTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Water supply

This legislation provides for an absolute halt to water development, . . . "on or directly affecting any river which is designated. . . ." Further, where State action is involved in establishing an area under the act, ". . . scenic rivers . . . are to be permanently administered as scenic rivers. . . ." One can only conclude that once an area is established under the purposes of this Act, by Congressional or State legislative action, that it shall remain so "*permanently*." Will the scenic or wild river use be in the best interest of a state and its people as well as the nation? Which rivers are set aside? They are the Rogue, Oregon; the Rio Grande, New Mexico; the Salmon and the Clearwater in Idaho. In Section 5 of the bill there are an additional 20 rivers set aside for study. Is this the best use of these resources?

I would direct the attention of the members of the Committee to the highlights of the House of Representatives Report Number 376, 90th Congress, 1st Session on S. 20, dated June 21, 1967:

Purpose

. . . to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs . . .