

ferring to that, and will try to explain any of our statements there.

It is the first real comparison that I am aware of that has been put before the committee with respect to these four major bills. We attempted to cover not only the obvious differences, such as the differences in the rivers to be designated in the system, and those which would be earmarked for further study, but also methods of boundary designation, administration of the rivers, State and local participation, the effects on water rights, mining, FPC, acquisition, condemnation authorities, other uses, such as timber harvesting and grazing and so on, as well as the relationship of the costs of the different bills to the potential of the Land and Water Conservation Fund as ordered reported out by this committee, I believe, yesterday or the day before.

And I can get into that.

I see little point in describing the bills. The cogent differences are summarized in the back.

But it seems to me the most significant questions which frequently come up are (a) the differences in the rivers to be immediately designated, (b) the more significant recommendations of the Department for amendments in the chairman's bill, H.R. 8416, and (c) the significant differences between the Senate-passed bill and H.R. 8416 if amended as the Department recommends.

On the next page is a little tabular summary of the four bills, which may be helpful. The first column shows the difference in the number of rivers for immediate designation. They range from four in H.R. 8416 to a maximum of 16 in H.R. 90; in the next column estimated costs of acquisition for the designated rivers; followed by the percent that estimated fee title acquisition cost would be of total acquisition cost; the estimated cost of development. But we do not have in here, and I am not sure we could get it until we came down a little more specifically on boundaries—maybe we could give you an estimate if you want it—the annual maintenance and operation costs.

The acres to be acquired, both in fee and less than fee, are shown, and the comparison between the different bills as to the number of rivers to be studied is likewise contrasted.

It seemed to me that this little one-page sheet summarizes the differences pretty effectively—the number of rivers, estimated cost, estimated land involvement, and the rivers which would be ordered for study within a specified time.

The following page relates only to the rivers named for immediate and doah River down appear only in Mr. Saylor's bill.

I would like to point out some significant differences in mileages between the bills, even though the names are the same. So the fact that the Saint Croix-Namekagon is named in the Senate-passed bill, and is likewise named in Mr. Saylor's bill, the two bills provide for a considerable difference in mileage. The same applies as between the administration bill and Mr. Saylor's bill on the Cacapon. The Illinois appears in the designated category only in the Senate-passed bill. Even in the first four rivers, there is a 10-mile difference in boundary of the Rogue as between—two bills have 85 miles, two bills have 95 miles.

There is a very substantial difference in the Salmon. This is prob-