

Mr. HOLUM. I shall do that.

Senator ANDERSON. There is a conflict and we might as well face it.

Mr. HOLUM. I shall do so.

(The information requested is as follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1968.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I am pleased to respond to the matter raised by Senator Len B. Jordan in connection with Assistant Secretary Kenneth Holum's testimony before your subcommittee on April 22, 1968.

Senator Jordan indicated he believes there is a conflict between the comprehensive planning program conducted under the provisions of the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) and the proposal to designate certain wild or scenic rivers in accordance with pending legislation.

The comprehensive study now being directed by the Pacific Northwest River Basin Commission has, as the basic objective, the formulation of a framework plan to provide a broad guide to the best use or combination of uses of water and related land resources of the region to meet foreseeable short- and long-term needs. Consideration will be given to development and management, as well as the preservation of resources. These studies were initiated in 1966 and are scheduled to terminate in 1971.

From the inception of the comprehensive study program in 1963, it was understood that no moratorium was declared on ongoing water resources programs. The preparation of comprehensive plans has not deterred the submission of individual project reports to the Congress or the construction of projects in the regions under study.

In my view, the proposed scenic rivers legislation is quite compatible with the comprehensive study program, in that one of the goals of such legislation is to highlight those rivers known to have outstanding attributes worthy of preserving in their natural condition. This is in consonance with objectives of planning set forth in Senate Document No. 97, 87th Congress, 2d Session, "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources."

Senator Jordan specifically mentions the Salmon River in Idaho as being an example of a conflict between the comprehensive studies and the scenic rivers program. While I appreciate his views, I believe there are adequate data developed by a specific study to justify scenic river status for segments of the Salmon River. This stretch of the Salmon is one of the finest scenic rivers in the United States. As you know, the Salmon River was included in S. 119 passed by the Senate on August 9, 1967.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to supplement the record on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Senator ANDERSON. Senator Moss?

Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I understand it, you are willing now to retain the ceiling on title II and title III as provided but wish to have no ceiling of expenditure at all on the title I functions.

Mr. HOLUM. That is correct.

Senator Moss. Do you consider it wise to abandon the ceiling entirely rather than just ask for an increase of ceiling?

Mr. HOLUM. Senator Moss, that is the decision as I well know that the Congress always makes, but the Congress will have the opportunity, through the appropriations process, to review the requests of the Council for funding under title I. I think that our experience has demonstrated the good work that the Council has done up to