

feet, and then bulge out at other places. The Department prefers this as a policy position. It is not as specific as individual maps. I do not believe we are in a position to present more than the maps before you. We have maps on every one of the designated rivers around the back of the room. But whether we are prepared to come down and say this is where the boundary ought to be, at this particular point, right now, we are not in that position.

The question has also been raised whether the intent of the administration here is 320 acres per mile, or an average of 320 acres per mile over the full length of the river per mile.

In other words, if you applied the 320 acres on a per mile basis, this gives you less in and out room than if you had a hundred mile strip and applied the 320 acre-mile average over the full hundred miles.

There has been some difference of opinion within the Department on this, both as to intent and as to what it should be. I am instructed to indicate to you today that the Secretary's preference—and he told me this personally—would be to apply an average, if this approach is used, of 320 acres per mile on the whole stretch of the river rather than on the per mile basis.

I am also advised—although I am not prepared to go into detail on this—that there is a precedent for this in the width designation of some of the parkways that have been established.

I think that is all I can say about that amendment.

But this is a substantive difference.

The second difference is that the chairman's bill provides for four classifications, and for some, I believe, subclassifications, or two subtypes in addition to these classifications.

We have no objection to this classification. In fact, we think it is desirable.

But we think it would be better to make the classification again after there has been what I guess the Park Service formally terms a master plan made, that we would be in a better position to make the classification than we would to indicate it at the present time. So our suggestion is that the administering agency be directed to classify according to the classes and to the definitions of those classes as soon as they can after the rivers are included in the system, but not now, because we do not feel we know quite enough about it.

The fourth amendment, as I understand it, would prevent the Secretary from acquiring land, either public or private, within the boundaries of any political subdivision of a State without the consent of that political subdivision.

Now, this may be a question of understanding or interpretation.

Our attorneys interpreted this provision of H.R. 8416 to apply, not only to the acquisition of public lands within a political subdivision of a State, but also the acquisition of private lands. This may or may not have been intended. If it was intended to apply to both public and private lands, it gives, in effect, a veto power to the county or the city over acquisition of any lands. As I say, we may have misinterpreted this, but this is the way our attorneys read the bill.

We recommend, therefore, that the private lands be subject to eminent domain, but not the State-owned lands, or the lands owned by a political subdivision of the State if that political subdivision is follow-