

wild rivers. Out of that initial screening, some 22 rivers received detailed consideration and 67 rivers received preliminary reconnaissance. Although there has been some switching back and forth, in general the rivers that are proposed for establishment in the four so-called major bills were selected from the 22 that were studied in most depth by the two Departments and cooperating States.

In 1965, President Johnson in his message to the Congress on Natural Beauty suggested that it was time to " * * * preserve free flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers * * * " In March, 1965 an initial wild rivers system bill was submitted to the Congress by the Administration. Early in 1966, the Senate passed an amended version by a vote of 71 to 1. The House did not act in the 89th Congress.

In January, 1967, in his message to the Congress on protecting our natural heritage, the President reiterated his hope that a portion of the Nation's great scenic rivers might be preserved in their natural state.

On February 18, 1967, the Administration again recommended to the Congress legislation to implement the President's proposal. But prior to either of these 1967 actions of the Administration, Congressmen Saylor and Dingell introduced scenic river bills on January 10, 1967.

The following day, Senator Church with 38 co-sponsors reintroduced in the Senate S. 119, a wild rivers bill identical to that which the Senate had passed in the previous Congress.

In due course, on August 9, 1967, the Senate passed a revised version of S. 119 by a vote of 84 to 0. That bill is before you today.

Prior thereto, however, Chairman Aspinall on April 12, 1967, after most careful consideration of the various pending proposals, introduced H.R. 8416. Likewise, H.R. 6166, which is identical to the Administration's proposal of February 1967, was introduced by Congressman Reuss on February 27.

During the past five years, interest in the establishment of a National system of scenic or wild rivers or identification of individual rivers for such action has increased continuously and there are now before the House some 17 bills. However, the four principal bills proposing a National approach are H.R. 8416 by Mr. Aspinall, H.R. 90 by Mr. Saylor, S. 119 by Senator Church and 39 other Senators, and H.R. 6166 by Congressman Reuss. It is to these four bills that my testimony principally will be directed.

I have summarized the above chronology of pending bills because this is the first time to my knowledge that Departmental witnesses have appeared before this Committee in support of such legislation. The scope of the proposals and the variety of their provisions make their consideration complex and difficult.

In addition to the four so-called "primary" bills (and I say this without intending any adverse reflection whatsoever on the numerous other pending bills), the key documents include:

1. The Secretary of the Interior's letter of February 18, 1967, submitting the Administration proposal at that time.
2. The Secretary of the Interior's letters of August 14, 1967, and September 18, 1967, reporting on several pending House bills including the bills by Chairman Aspinall, Mr. Saylor, and Mr. Reuss, but not commenting on S. 119 as passed the Senate, except in the summarization of the principal differences between the bills attached to the September 18 letter.

The fact, therefore, is that up to this point, even though the report to Mr. Aspinall of August 14 followed by a few days the Senate action of August 9, the Administration has not expressed a position of preference as between S. 119 as it passed the Senate and the various pending House bills. I shall attempt to identify major differences and answer questions on specific points as between the various bills, if desired.

3. The attachment to this testimony summarizes the differences between the four major bills in more detail than heretofore presented. It includes not only the obvious questions such as which rivers are to be included in the system, and which rivers would be earmarked for further study, but also such other matters as methods of boundary designation, administration of designated rivers, State and local participation, effects on water rights, mining, the Federal Power Commission, acquisition and condemnation authorities, other uses including timbering and grazing, and estimated costs of acquisition by rivers scheduled for establishment as well as the relationship of these costs to the potential of the Land and Water Conservation Fund under the various levels of funding discussed at earlier testimony before this Committee on February 6 concerning H.R. 8578.