

Colonel BLACK. Mr. Aspinall, I may add that the total of 12 rivers we are proposing for our State, including these, we estimate will be \$1,700 million for acquisition fees and easement, not development.

Mr. ASPINALL. Which you think the Federal Government should put out?

Colonel BLACK. How much?

Mr. ASPINALL. Which you think the Federal Government should take care of?

Colonel BLACK. Sir, I think they would have a similar condition to what we have in parks. We have some Federal, some national parks in the State of Tennessee and we have 21, so I think maybe nine and three would be a fair division, sir. The State—

Mr. ASPINALL. We just got through listening to some people from Florida who said they wanted to do it on their own. My only question was do you think this is a proper charge against the Federal Government?

Colonel BLACK. For three, yes, sir. We will put up nine, the State will put up nine, and we think the Federal Government maybe should three.

Mr. ASPINALL. Thank you.

Colonel BLACK. Because we certainly expect a lot of visitors from Detroit, Cleveland, since naturally, we hope they will come.

Mr. ASPINALL. Charge them.

Colonel BLACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you could get a statement from TVA in regard to this we would be glad to make it a part of the record.

Colonel BLACK. I wouldn't guarantee that, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Kansas. Any other questions? The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Just two questions: Sir, do you contemplate that the inclusion of these rivers in the scenic or wild rivers category would see their development for recreational purposes?

Colonel BLACK. We go along with the categories or the criteria in either Mr. Aspinall's bill or Congressman Saylor's. Some of them we would be—would be developed as more or less wild, others as pastoral, and we use a third definition category of partially developed. But some of them would be, some segments or some of these rivers would still be, open for agriculture, for instance.

Mrs. RUSSELL. May I add to this that the Buffalo would fit into the pastoral category in Mr. Aspinall's bill.

Mr. KYL. Perhaps I didn't make myself clear. I am not particularly interested in the verbiage on categories. You say you want a lot of people from Detroit and Chicago or some other places to come down there and visit the river. Is it your purpose in seeking this legislation to preserve these rivers in a natural state or is it your purpose to develop them for recreation?

Mrs. RUSSELL. It is our purpose to preserve them in as natural a state as we can, since they are among the wildest rivers we have in the East.

Mr. KYL. You see there is a difference here, and it is a point about which all of you people have to be concerned. If we are setting up a river primarily to preserve it in a free, open flowing, clean condition this in and of itself limits the recreational use you can make of that