

In summary: We find that setting rivers aside for scenic and recreational purposes would violate the concept of multipurpose use of water resources. Should such a system be established nevertheless, we urge that the safeguards as enumerated be incorporated into the legislation. Otherwise, the act will reach outside its boundaries to limit productive activities, and create uncertainties. There are today uncertainties enough—we hope to avoid adding to them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. You oppose any wild or scenic rivers legislation of any type.

Mr. SORENSON. This would be our basic position, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. You realize that the Senate bill passed the Senate by unanimous vote?

Mr. SORENSON. We do.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is strong indication that some legislation might be adopted.

Mr. SORENSON. It is, and I might say that is why we are here today.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have studied the bills, H.R. 8416, for example?

Mr. SORENSON. I have generally, and Mr. Brown has studied them in considerably more detail than I.

Mr. TAYLOR. Proceeding on the theory that we are going to adopt that bill, or a version of it, do you have any specific recommendations as to amendments?

Mr. SORENSON. I think we start off by saying that we certainly, as our testimony indicates, support a bill with a combination of many of the features that we find in the two House bills particularly that we have noted and the Senate bill that has come over.

I wonder if Mr. Brown might comment more specifically, if that is what you had in mind, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I would like to hear any specific recommendations for amendments or additional safeguards.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, sir.

In the testimony we list a series of paragraphs we think would go into any bill. Many of those are already in H.R. 8416. Some you will find referred to in S. 119. Those are simply an extension of your basic concept with regard to water rights.

There is another element specifically in H.R. 8416 on page 14, if you would care to refer to it, section 7, line 7. At the end of the line is the phrase, "directly affecting any river," and this is repeated again, also, with regard to incorporating future rivers.

We are concerned that we may have and elsewhere in the term "free flowing" specifically restrictions on a river which would extend beyond the boundaries designated in the act.

Specifically, one might go upstream outside a boundary and propose some kind of diversionary work, or a storage facility, and then we could say but that directly affects the area designated free flowing.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. Or it affects the free flow, either one. So, whereas the people would look at a segment of a river designated, actually the con-