

from the operation of the mining laws, and here again we prefer the House bill.

On the proposed water resources projects, H.R. 8416, as we recommend it be amended, precludes the Federal agencies from assisting any water resource projects having a direct and adverse effect. Such provision also would apply to rivers under study. On this point, the Senate bill is silent. We prefer the House bill.

The Senate-passed bill establishes a National Wild and Scenic Rivers Review Board. It would be a high level board to conduct continuing studies and furnish reports to the Congress on the development of these rivers.

This is absent from the House bill.

The origin of this proposal was with Senator Jordan of Idaho. I have talked with Senator Jordan who is one of my many friends in Congress, and I know his concern. This is one reason why the Senate cut down the length of the Salmon so substantially. This again was a compromise.

But I am fearful that the review board as established in the Senate bill would move us in the direction of attempting to develop a cost-benefit ratio to put on the scales the value of wilderness or wilderness river against the much more readily tangible evaluation of the worth of water for irrigation and power. And it seems to me that if at any time the Congress in its wisdom decides that a river that has been designated needs to be de-designated, this can be done—although I recognize that it is harder to accomplish this than not to designate it in the first place, because you do not de-establish national parks, you normally do not de-designate wilderness areas.

This was the purpose behind this amendment. I understand the problem. But we would prefer that it not be included. Because we think in the consideration of these bills, as we go through Congress, what this may lead to can be done without the formality of the procedure provided in this bill.

The last difference is the appropriation authorization difference. The House bill has a specific limitation on the amount authorized to be appropriated and the Senate bill is open ended. The classic posture of the Department is that it prefers an open ended appropriation authorization. But I realize that this is not the pattern of recent legislation.

Now, on these other individual bills—the St. Croix, the Wolf, the Buffalo, Mr. Kyl's bill on the Lewis and Clark, I think you have a recommendation from the administration on Mr. Kyl's bill. I would like to talk of that in a moment.

St. Croix and Wolf have been discussed at length. It is in the Senate passed bill. We would like to see it in.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does that apply to both?

Mr. CRAFTS. The St. Croix and the Wolf—yes, sir; it applies to both.

The Buffalo, we are just not quite ready on that one. But I think we should have a report up to you on the Buffalo within the near future.

It seems to me, as the chairman pointed out, there is some significant relationship between the pattern that is developing on these bills and