We have no strong reactions to the differences of the bills excepting in terms of what rivers are included in the study section and what rivers are included in the instant section as it has been referred to. We do feel, however, that the four major rivers that are included in all the measures—H.R. 8416, S. 119, H.R. 90, H.R. 6166—certainly are classic types, and if the system is to start off, we can think of no better way of starting it off than with these rivers.

Hopefully there may be others that could be added. The Wolf River that was discussed seems to in a very good posture. It also is helpful because this is indicative of a State showing initiative, which I am sure this committee wants to foster. The problems that are in the process of being worked out regarding the Namekagon and the St. Croix, hopefully this may be something, before the committee completes deliberation, that they will want to act upon, but in any event we feel strongly that this is an important measure, and we would recommend certainly the passage of either H.R. 8416 as modified let us say by some features of H.R. 90, and I am not going to take the committee's time to go into detail. By this time they are far more familiar with it than I, I am sure, but we would prefer either of the House bills in strong preference to the Senate bill, Mr. Chairman.

One of the reasons for this primarily is we are very much opposed to section 6 in the Senate bill, which establishes a National Wild Rivers Review Board to make reviews and furnish reports to the Congress as herein approved.

The chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member convinced me some years ago about the inadvisability of these kinds of boards, especially as they applied to the old Wilderness Council which was discussed.

I will say one thing very candidly, for which I may come under some serious criticism later. But we have, as citizens groups, had access to these boards.

Now this makes a very fine sounding democratic procedure by which all of these individuals are to be on the board: The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, and the chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the Governors of the several States. But my experience has been that these gentlemen will never get together. These meetings will be attended by the bureaucratic professional meeting-goers, who go to these particular meetings, and they sit and they protect each other's particular rights or provinces, and there is no real review that takes place.

I would much prefer to have the bureaus that have this responsibility make their recommendations and come to this committee, and this committee has oversight in most instances here, and I would trust my luck on whatever happens in terms of these rivers under this process rather than putting in this other layer, which to me is relatively meaningless.

That completes my comments, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. We commend you on a very fine statement. I think you are the first witness who has spoken out in opposition to this review board.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have been on more review boards, citizen advisory boards, and most of them are not worth a wit.