

ought to be prepared to go the full way and defend the cost of it. I do not have that information because I was testifying from the point of view of the consumer of these kinds of things. I recognize it costs money. I think, however, if I may say this, that the cost of this is something that need not be immediate. That is to say, the designation of these areas would be the immediate action required.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague—if the chairman—will yield, this is what we are up against all the time. This is where the prices begin to escalate. Private developers go in there and the first thing you know, we are way up in the millions of dollars. I am with my friend on what he desires as far as that is concerned, but we have got to be practical about this and we have got to be able to say when we go before the House, as we will have to do on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this is another addition to the backlog of authorizations and this is what we are going to say if—

Mr. FRASER. I appreciate what the chairman is saying. I might say I appreciate the chairman's deep interest in the general problem of conservation. I know the committee will want this information and should have it and I am sure will get it from the executive branch. These are difficult judgments to make when you are weighing scenic value, wilderness areas, against dollars and cents. The only thing is that there is a sort of a one-way process here. If these things do not go forward I know they get more expensive in the future, and we have this opportunity now because the power company has this large amount of land and expressed a willingness that this wild rivers project go forward.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, thank you very much.

The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The earlier witness referred to the fact, and you have just now referred to the fact, that the power company owns this land along the upper or the wild portions of the river. Is there any utilization of resource values in that area now, such as lumbering?

Mr. FRASER. I do not believe so, at least not right on the banks of the river. If there is lumbering back some distance I would not know about it. I think my impression is that they had acquired this property not for exploitation but to meet the contingency that they themselves might be interested in a dam development someday and they would have needed the land that would be involved in the additional flooding.

Mr. McCLURE. What is your understanding of the difference between the terms "wild" and "scenic"?

Mr. FRASER. My understanding is that the wild river is one in which its state or condition is more nearly the way it was before many arrived on the scene, that it has the character of wilderness, and it does not have any important or substantial development along the banks of the river.

A scenic river, on the other hand, may have a relatively greater degree of development but a development which is not incompatible with the scenic nature of the river but where you could have powerboats, you would have a wider recreational use without impairing the scenic value. The wild rivers, I should add, at least this one, is not susceptible to things like water skiing or use of powerboats. It is not that large or deep a river. It has a different character to it.