

efforts be confined to rivers flowing through land that is owned in large degree by the Federal government. When a system of management is perfected, then other streams can be added to the program.

The following suggestions are offered for your consideration.

*Page 3, line 1.*—It is suggested that the phrase "or within de facto wilderness areas" be deleted. This provision would tend to expand the Wilderness System beyond the intent of the Wilderness Act. Any area that qualifies as Wilderness can be added to the System under the provisions of the Act.

*Page 6, after line 10.*—Add the Wolf River in Wisconsin as identified in H.R. 6166. We are attracted to this proposal to classify the Wolf as a Scenic River because of the steps taken by the State of Wisconsin to protect this beautiful stream. Also, I am personally acquainted with this river having fished in its waters during the years when I lived in Wisconsin.

*Page 9, line 1.*—We recommend study of the Missouri portion of the Eleven Point River. We can understand why people in Arkansas might not wish to have the downstream portion classified as a scenic river. But there are a number of people in Missouri who would like to have the portion of the river in their state so classified.

*Page 10, after line 25.*—Add Smith River in California for study. A portion of this fast-flowing stream might be a good scenic addition to the Redwood Scenic Highway being planned by the State of California.

*Page 12, Section 6, regarding acquisition.*—We urge that maximum efforts be made to control the scenic rivers system by means of easements and zoning ordinances. Title in fee should only be taken when other means fail.

*Page 17, Section 9 regarding prospecting and mining.*—We concur in the provisions of this Section.

*Page 19, Section 10(a) regarding administration.*—We concur in this Section as written. But we hope the legislative history of the Act will show that this Section pertains to multiple use of commercial forest lands and that timber harvesting, when done judiciously, is an accepted use of the lands. In most instances buffer zones along stream banks and selective cutting at greater distances will protect scenic values.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, Each of these points are with relation to H.R. 8416?

Mr. POMEROY. Right.

Mr. McCLURE. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. You were here, I believe, when the opposition was presented to the Missouri River section of Eleven Point?

Mr. POMEROY. The Arkansas; yes, sir. We appreciate the feeling of those people, and our recommendation here just pertains to the Missouri portion of the Eleven Point.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about the Arkansas portion; are you leaving that in, too?

Mr. POMEROY. It is all right with us if you leave it out. We merely are suggesting that the Missouri portion be studied.

Mr. TAYLOR. The main opposition was to the Arkansas portion?

Mr. POMEROY. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any questions? The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. You make a reference here to selective cutting. Do you think selective cutting could be done within some distance of the banks of these streams but I would take it you would be opposed to clear-cutting in the same areas?

Mr. POMEROY. About 30 years ago it was my responsibility to draft a program for preservation of road-side strips along the major highways in the Manistee National Forest, and it is my opinion that judicious cutting can be carried out and it is also necessary in a place where people are going to travel because of dead snags and other health hazards.