

We think it makes sense to combine the two. If a person canoes on them he is not going to care which agency is administering it. And one part of our designation that is affected here with the respect to both our amendment on the Allagash and the Wolf is that the amendment as so drafted would apply the Federal Power Commission restrictions that are otherwise in the bill to these two rivers.

Now, if I may proceed to the differences between the Senate-passed bill and the chairman's bill in the light of the amendments which we have offered.

There are, I think, six of those that we consider significant.

On the classification of rivers, the Senate-passed bill, and the House bill—when I say the House bill I am talking about the chairman's bill as the administration would recommend it be amended.

The House bill proposes that these rivers be classified into these various types, and provide for the designation of high density use areas and so on. The Senate-passed bill is simpler. It provides for only two general types—wild and scenic.

In the light of the chairman's question, if he asks our preference, I think the best statement is to say that we do not consider this to be a highly consequential matter, but in the long run, I think we would prefer the House version.

The second difference is restrictions on acquisition of lands by condemnation proceedings. The Senate-passed bill is rather complex. It precludes condemnation of any lands and interests therein except "scenic easements," without the owner's consent, if 50 percent or more of the whole area is in public ownership.

There is no such provision in the House bill.

The Senate-passed bill also precludes condemnation of State-owned lands and under certain conditions, county-owned lands, and lands within incorporated cities where less than 50 percent of the whole area is in public ownership.

The House bill is simpler. As we recommended the bill be amended, it precludes condemnation of State-owned lands and lands owned by any political subdivisions if they follow a management plan that is acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

We prefer the House provisions as we recommend H.R. 8416 be amended.

On the applicability of the mining and mineral leasing laws, there are differences between the House bill as we would recommend it be amended and the Senate passed bill. Both bills continue the applicability of the mining laws.

Neither bill affects the valid mining claims existing at the date of enactment. If, however, the claim is validated after that date, both bills make mining operations subject to appropriate regulations. Mineral leases issued after the date of enactment would also be subject to such regulations under both bills.

But in addition, the House bill provides that the mining claims validated after the date of the act would give the claimant title only to the mineral deposits in the claim, and the right to use the land surface as needed for mining purposes.

The House bill also includes provisions with respect to the withdrawal of Federal lands that constitute the bed and banks of a river,