

Mr. ASPINALL. Isn't it true, Mr. Baker and Chief Cliff, that in your overall authority to supervise the National Forest System, you can keep these rivers clean, you can keep them freeflowing, and that your real difficulty perhaps is whether or not a license is granted upon the river for power installation?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, to the extent that the river is completely surrounded by national forest lands, that is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. You have no responsibility outside of the area which comes under your jurisdiction in the National Forest Service?

Mr. BAKER. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Where there is some adjacent land which is controlled by the State or some other Federal agency, you might have some interest in that particular part of the river as it relates to the river that is within your jurisdiction, is that not right?

Mr. BAKER. Particularly, Mr. Chairman, where it would be the eye in a doughnut or an inholding, otherwise surrounded by national forest land.

Mr. ASPINALL. You already have the authority, Mr. Secretary, as I understand it, to exchange wherever possible and get rid of that inholding, or to purchase it with moneys that are now at your disposal, perhaps not timely moneys, but moneys that are at your disposal for some type of use, isn't that correct?

Mr. BAKER. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. No further questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Subject to the amendments that you suggested and which are suggested in the departmental report, are you satisfied with the provisions of H.R. 8416?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. SKUBITZ. No questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any other members of the subcommittee have any questions?

The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. You indicate you are satisfied with H.R. 8416. I would direct this question to you concerning at least one of the rivers in Idaho, the Salmon River, which is under the provisions of this bill included down to the town of Riggins as a wild river. Under the definition of that bill, it is to be managed as a portion of a true wilderness environment, and all private properties purchased, all inholdings extinguished, all buildings eradicated.

Your understanding of that river would not fit with this concept, would it, in at least the lower reaches of that river?

Mr. BAKER. Congressman McClure, we would prefer the language as we have recommended and would prefer to have the main stem of the Salmon down to Riggins in the instant provisions of the legislation. However, it is quite true that if a segment, as the Senators and you have suggested this morning, were included in the study section of the bill rather than the instant section of the bill, it would still be protected from dam construction until such time as the study is completed, up to 5 years, so that we could not really object to such an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCLURE. Would it be your preference that these buildings that do exist and have for years, be eradicated from that area?