Mr. Cliff. It is our thought, Mr. McClure, that most of those developments could be maintained. There is some need for controlling developments, and there may be a need to remove some for scenic preservation, but that is a very minor part of our total program.

Mr. Baker. Congressman McClure, just to tie this point down a little further, in our recommended amendments to Chairman Aspinall's bill, we recommended that section 2(b), the beginning language, be amended to insert after the words "following types of rivers" the words "or river segments," so that each river segment would be considered separately for classification into the several types that you and Chief Cliff have been discussing. Specifically we recommend that segments of the Salmon River, be classified in accordance with section 2(b) of the bill instead of the entire river being assigned one classification or the other.

Mr. McClure. And that would require an amendment in section 3

and section 4 also, would it not?

Mr. Baker. If the bill is amended as suggested in the departmental reports, subsection 3(a)(3), "Salmon River," and subsection 3(a)4, "Clearwater," would both be amended to accomplish this.

Mr. McClure. Yes. I thank the gentleman for making that

It would also be your intention in the main to follow a pattern of multiple-use management of these segments where they are within the administrative authority of your department?

Mr. Cliff. Yes, sir; where they are in a wilderness, we would manage the lands according to wilderness principles, of course. Wilderness

is considered to be a part of multiple-use management.

Outside the wilderness areas, we would continue to manage the land for other resources, but would give emphasis to the protection of the scenic and recreational values along the river itself.

Mr. McClure. And when you speak of "within the wilderness areas"

you mean a presently designated wilderness area?

Mr. Cliff. Yes; and, of course, within the primitive areas until a

final determination is made on their reclassification.

Mr. McClure. You would manage the banks of these rivers in the same way which you are presently managing the banks of the rivers within the area of your authority?

Mr. Cliff. That is correct.

Mr. McClure. And under existing laws?

Mr. Cliff. That is correct.

Mr. McClure. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from California has a question.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Baker, and Mr. Cliff, in the reference to the Klamath River in California, I think the reference in both the House versions here, the chairman's bill, 8416 and the bill H.R. 90, the reference in there as far as the Klamath it says, "Study from Scott River downstream to Klamath Falls." I think that is an improper reference in both the bills. Now, in the Senate bill it says this, and it comes under the study provision:

Klamath in California segment from the Scott River downstream to the point 3 miles upstream from the United States crossing.