

on out, and that the time after the presentation be divided between the members of the committee if they wish to ask questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Smith, will you proceed.

**STATEMENT OF SPENCER M. SMITH, SECRETARY, CITIZENS
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with offices in Washington, D.C.

The declaration of policy contained in the several proposals the committee has under consideration is of such significance that it is almost sufficient reason unto itself to support the legislation. Though one may have reservations relative to particular details and prefer one section of one bill to another, in certain instances, the passage of this legislation would be another significant milestone because of this declared policy.

Our organization, in cooperation with many other conservation organizations, has opposed the construction of certain dams and reservoirs from time to time but our position has not been doctrinaire opposition to any and all such construction, such as flood control, hydroelectric power, et cetera. We have been concerned for some time, however, that other values of our water resources have not been considered fully and our efforts to articulate the merits of such values have been constrained because of their negative posture. The scenic rivers bills should not only be commended for their intrinsic worth but also for the opportunity of evaluating and discussing the many values involved in water resources that have heretofore not been weighed sufficiently.

The establishment of any such system as proposed is difficult. First, as to whether the uses to which the free-flowing rivers or parts thereof are paramount to uses that are not allowed. Second, the complexity of administration in evolving fully the system in all its aspects.

The logic appears evident in support of the legislation. No system of rivers preserved in their free-flowing state can be guaranteed against some future necessity for impoundments or similar development. If at some subsequent time such development is necessary, no determination by this Congress can prevent such a possibility. We hasten to point out, however, that the contrary is not true. If no preservation or reservation of these rivers from the various plans of development are made and construction does take place, a subsequent determination that the interests of the public could best be served if the river was free flowing has been precluded. In short, the Congress can at any time authorize an undeveloped river to be developed. It cannot, however, authorize a developed river to be undeveloped. It would appear, therefore, that though the enactment of this legislation would make construction more difficult, it would not make it impossible. The legislation, in making development more difficult, would place the burden for development on those who supported development because of the irrevocable nature of the development decision. It would appear to us that this is a proper placement of the burden of responsibility.