

the Wilderness Act. The basic thrust of all these bills is to preserve certain segments of these rivers in their relatively free flowing and unpolluted condition with minimum shoreline strips so we will know what the rivers of America looked like in the years to come, certain portions of them.

The pattern of designating a few initially, establishing the system, and then requiring subsequent additions be by act of Congress, follows the pattern of the Wilderness Act.

Conservation groups I think, as would be expected, support this legislation strongly, as do many Members of the Congress.

But Federal legislation has come to the point where it is over a period of years, going back about 6 years when the concept was perhaps originally advanced. And it takes time for legislation of this character and this significance and this complexity to shake down and mature, and receive the appropriate consideration that it merits in both the executive and legislative branches. And in due course, something usually comes out that is really meritorious, such as the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Fund Act.

I think we are about at that point now.

I should in all fairness point out the bills are not without opposition. Sometimes this opposition is due to a lack of understanding. And in view of the number of bills and the differences in the provisions, it takes a great deal of intensive study to understand these bills and their differences and just what they would do.

Sometimes the opposition is a philosophical objection to additional Federal acquisition of any sort—although as the table in the middle of my testimony shows, this would be relatively small. Sometimes it is due to concern about the particular resource, minerals or grazing, or water or timbering. And sometimes, as it came out this morning, it is about the conflicting approach of building dams in these segments, water impoundments for water supply, or flood control, or irrigation or power.

All of these matters have been considered, and the total pattern of the rivers of the United States, what is being proposed here, either the maximum bill, Mr. Saylor's bill, or any of the bills that do not go so far in the total context of our national system of rivers I believe is relatively modest.

This bill does rank high on the list of priority conservation measures. I say this bill—I mean a scenic rivers system bill ranks high. It has been mentioned last time I think in the budget message. And I urge your favorable consideration of one of these four major bills. I have indicated our preferences. I have indicated how we feel about the rivers for immediate designation.

Now, we have here, if you want us to go through this, these maps—there are four maps here that we can flip for you, that show you at a glance really the difference in the impact between these four major bills. I really would like to do that.

Before I do that, I missed one thing. On page 9—this is purely perfecting, but it is not in the Department's report—on page 9 of the chairman's bill, line 15—and we just noticed this yesterday—I think the river is to Klamath rather than Klamath Falls, because we believe the intent was to go from the junction of Scott River downriver on the