

**STATEMENT OF HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO**

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of enthusiasm by certain conservation groups throughout the past years for legislation which is very well described in the titles of the various bills before this committee. There has been an attempt to handle this kind of a program by piecemeal legislation, individual bills, which largely result in a political operation. There has been a desire on the part of some to handle this sort of legislation by the approach which was finally used for the wilderness bill, setting up a formula, placing those particular units which are ready for consideration within the authorizing section of the bill and placing other units which are not ready at the present time, for study.

Legislation of this kind often generates more heat than it does value as far as the American public is concerned. It will be noted by the reports which we just filed that there are many jurisdictional questions involved here and that a number of departments of Government which have an interest in various proposals which are before this Congress.

This committee, of course, must take into consideration the positions of the various departments and agencies and we must give them a chance to make their position well known and, if it comes to a jurisdictional question, we must be able to cooperate with other committees in the Congress.

Ofttimes it seems as if there is a disregard in the consideration of legislation which crosses over into other committees. We are troubled presently by a bill before the Rules Committee which has a very decided jurisdictional problem to it, and we must be careful of that.

Also there is involved in this kind of legislation, of course, not only the interests of the recreationists. They seem to think that they have a right to enjoy themselves in any place possible where there is good enjoyment, and all of us must agree that there is a lot of enjoyment to be had out of the use of riverways and their attendant values.

There is also a lot of interest in this legislation by business groups—some that have used their business interests, ownership of lands, to the destruction of certain values in the rivers that are involved, others that are willing to comply with up-to-date and modern programs to see that the water is kept in potable, usable condition. All of these matters must be taken into consideration as we consider this legislation.

There is one other thing that has to be taken into consideration and this, too, will be a dominant matter as far as this committee is concerned, and that is the cost of this kind of legislation. As far as I am concerned, there is going to be no authorization of any facility whatsoever under the legislation now before us unless we know what it is going to cost the Federal taxpayer. So many people in the United States think all they have to do is to go ahead and grab something whether it belongs to the United States or belongs to the States or belongs to individuals—just take it and use it without considering what the ultimate cost is going to be. That is one reason for the general approach rather than a special or individual approach in this legislation, and it is at least going to be considered by this committee.