the level that the subcommittee reported the other day to the full committee.

Mr. Aspinall's bill has an estimated acquisition cost of something over $5 million. So there is some leeway in there.

For example, if it were decided to add the upper Missouri, an additional cost of $2 million, if this figure is right, could be handled. If it were decided to add the St. Croix in there, at least a portion of it could be handled. We would come to the committee for appropriations—assuming my $50,000 per river is right on the average for study rivers—we would come to the committee for appropriations out of the general funds of the Treasury. Then after the Congress acts and designates the river, or directs that it be designated, then the Park Service would make its master plan.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is what I am trying to get straightened out. When do you start the master plan? Seemingly the master plan is already started on a river that is questionable whether it will go in or not. And then say we pick up the other rivers, if we put in four or five—how do they come along as far as priorities are concerned?

Mr. CRAFTS. We are scheduling the master plan on the Missouri for a number of reasons. The Missouri has been studied and studied and studied. The Park Service has a report on it several years old. We have been studying it for about 2 years. It has just about been studied to death. We thought it was pretty certain that if any of these bills are going to pass, be established, this upper Missouri, this wilderness section of Missouri, was a prime candidate and would probably be included. So they went ahead on that basis.

Now, Mr. Swem will have to answer why the master plan on the St. Croix was undertaken.

Mr. SWEM. Well, that has involved quite a history, too. As brought out earlier today, the State has been interested in this river for some time. It was one of the first rivers studied in the overall wild rivers study.

We have been asked for more detailed information, particularly as it pertained to costs for the St. Croix River. And we feel that in order to supply that, we should make a master plan study of any river that we would be administering.

Mr. CRAFTS. Part of that goes back to Senator Nelson's point this morning. He felt that on the section of the river below Taylor Falls, down to the junction with the Mississippi, that the Park Service preliminary estimates were unreasonably high. And he envisioned isolated tracts to be acquired and this sort of thing. I do not know what the basis of the Park Service estimates were. But he made the statement this morning that he felt that the Park Service estimates as initially developed were unreasonably high. And I think this probably motivated the Service in undertaking the master plan.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentlemen testifying this morning were asking that the upper reaches be included as one being authorized at this particular time, and the other set aside for study. I presume you do not have a master plan on the lower reaches of the St. Croix River.

Mr. SWEM. We do not. We are studying that right now. That will all be pulled together within a relatively short period of time.