

Klamath through that wild section to the mouth of the river, rather than go upriver to Klamath Falls. So, if I am correct, I think the intent would be to strike the word "Falls."

We also have around the room individual maps for each of the rivers that would be designated in any of the four major bills. We have overlays of them so you can see how the bills differ, both as to length of the river that would be designated, which ones, and so forth. This would take considerable time. You have other witnesses. We can leave these here. We can come up and explain them to you at another time. Or if there are specific ones, we can go into them now.

I think our homework has been done pretty well on these 17 rivers.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, just to show you by ready contrast the difference here visually between these four bills. Do you wish me to do that?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, go ahead.

Mr. CRAFT. This is H.R. 8416, the chairman's bill, and the orange shows the four rivers that would be designated immediately, and the black are the rivers on which study would be directed. Of course this bill, and I believe all the other bills, make it possible for the Secretary of the Interior, and I believe the Secretary of Agriculture, in their discretion, to study other rivers of their selection, and to make recommendations to Congress.

The significance of the naming of them for study is that we are directed to study these, and by a certain time.

Now, this is what you might call the difference to the fullest extent in the other direction. You can see the difference. This is Mr. Saylor's bill. The orange, again, are the ones that would be designated now, and the black are the ones on which studies would be directed. There is a very substantial difference between these two bills as is apparent by just a quick look at the map.

This is the administration's proposal, which you see in a sense is sort of halfway between measure. It would designate more than the chairman's bill, it would study a few more, as the figures in the testimony show. It would not be as inclusive as Mr. Saylor's bill.

And this is the Senate-passed bill, which, as far as designations—is somewhat different than Mr. Aspinall's bill, but it is closer to that than are the other bills, and it designates a few more rivers for study.

As I say, the mileage of the designated rivers and the names of the rivers are shown on about the middle of my testimony.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that completes my prepared remarks. I shall try to answer questions as you wish.

May I say one more thing before I stop. I did not go into an explanation of the attachment.

There is a lot of detail in here, but it is significant. If you turn to the last page, the very last page, this relates to the rivers to be established under the four different bills, it relates to the mileage proposed in the four different bills, and it shows an estimated cost of acquisition. And because it seemed to me that this question would come up, and it already has come up, as to how can these acquisition costs be funded within the Land and Water Conservation Fund. If you recall, when we testified on that legislation, we explained that the administration considered the alternative levels of funding for the next 5