

Mr. CAULFIELD. The proposal before you, sir; would remove the limitation of \$300,000.

Senator ANDERSON. How much of a burden is that now? You do not have enough money?

Mr. CAULFIELD. Pardon me?

Senator ANDERSON. You are \$11,000 short?

Mr. CAULFIELD. At the present time, in terms of 1969, but we feel that in terms of the future, sir, the President should be in a position to be able to request more. It is not just the technical question of the \$11,000 needed in terms of the 1969 budget, but further, the point that we have attempted to make in analysis of the Council's functions, is that we just do not have the critical minimum of staff needed to perform well the functions that Congress set out for us in the Water Resources Planning Act.

Senator ANDERSON. Senator Jordan?

Senator JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had hoped the Secretary would be here to help me orient myself to some of the programs that are going on here. First, let me say I approve wholeheartedly the work that is being done by the Water Resources Council under this act.

As you have indicated, Mr. Secretary, under title II, several river basin commissions have already been established at the request of the Governors of the concerned States. Such a commission has been established for the Pacific Northwest, under title II of the act—the Pacific Northwest Basin Commission—and it is operating very effectively. Mr. Charles W. Hoddy is chairman. The vice chairman is William S. Holden. He is also a member for Idaho.

Under the provisions of this act we are going forward in the Pacific Northwest, at least, with a comprehensive river basin plan. Repeatedly throughout your statements, both of you this morning have emphasized the need for comprehensive planning studies that require economic projections well into the future for the basin or basins that they cover in order to provide the basis for determining long run water and related land resource requirements.

I am leading up to a question now because I cannot understand how the Department in one instance can recommend thorough research and investigation of land and water resources and on the other hand come out with the wild rivers bill that completely counteracts the effect of the long-range studies that you recommend here.

In my State, for instance, the Department insists on including the Salmon River as a wild river, thus guaranteeing that this wholly Idaho River, which drains 30 percent of the water resources of my State, shall leave the State undiminished. You do not give time for the effects of these studies to be taken into account, for the great research that is already being set up and being implemented under this act to become effective. You prejudge the results and would determine, without the economic study that you have advocated here, that certain rivers will be so dedicated and removed from further study by the Wild Rivers Act.

Now, I would ask you, Mr. Secretary, in the instance of a conflict between making a thorough investigation, research joined in by the States and Federal Government with respect to the best uses for the waters of the river basin and related land resources, and a preemptory