

ing, are price estimates based on the assumption that you not only will acquire the 100 acres a mile in fee but also that you will acquire easements on the additional 220 acres a mile along the whole length of the river.

My own view is that it is not necessary and not desirable to acquire 100 acres in fee and another 220 acres in easements along the whole length of a river. Some places, yes, you protect it with easements for the extra 220 acres. Some places you protect it with easements for an extra 100 acres. Some places you don't need to protect it at all beyond the first 100 acres.

So all I want to make clear is that the price tag on these rivers involves the assumption which I suppose Interior had to make that the total cost if you acquire 100 acres a mile by fee and 220 acres a mile by easement would be a certain figure. Actually, the cost is probably going to be less than that figure because I am sure that you wouldn't need more than half of that additional easement acquisition.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that covers what I have to say on the St. Croix recognizing that you have had previous witnesses who have addressed themselves to it. The details of the ownership along this river—county, Federal, State, and private—will be spelled out later by the Interior Department.

I have the figures here but they are their figures, so there is no use in me cluttering up the record with them at this time.

I might make one more point. The public support in my State, and in Minnesota too, for this proposal is remarkable. To my knowledge, there is not a single organization that I know of in the field of conservation or any other kind of an organization that has notified us that they are opposed to it. We have a long list of endorsements from almost every conservation organization in the State of Wisconsin. We have endorsements from city councils, and chambers of commerce and so forth.

This isn't to say that you may not run at some stage into a town board or county board who has reservations about it or who is concerned because it takes land off the tax rolls. Over the years, representatives of the Interior Department have met with county boards on both sides to explain to them what this scenic river concept was, what it would do for their community, and how it would enhance the quality of living there. I think we have practically unanimous support for this proposal with, of course, some individual exceptions, but I have been amazed at how broadly and enthusiastically this concept has been supported in my State.

Mr. TAYLOR. Senator, we thank you for a very fine statement.

The bill we have before us, H.R. 8416, designates four rivers, one in Oregon, one in New Mexico, and two in Idaho, as natural scenic rivers. It places many other rivers in the study stage, the potential additional stage.

The St. Croix River is in the latter stage. Are you satisfied with that designation?

Senator NELSON. No, I am not. We passed the bill, as you know, twice in the Senate with the St. Croix in it. Actually the St. Croix is the best studied river you have got. None of the other rivers in your bill have been studied as intensively as this one.