

less. Would you rather have a bill with the review board or no bill at all, if it should come to that?

Mr. SMITH. I am always reluctant to respond candidly to these iffy questions because they always get me in trouble, but I will try to be as responsive as I can.

Obviously, though, I am very much against this review board procedure, I would not sacrifice the bill because of it. I think this would be highly irresponsible, if a decision came to that.

I am not even criticizing the framers, the people who put the review board in. I heard some of the colloquy in the Senate, and I understand their thinking on the matter, and if it would work that way, I do not think I would be quite so hostile to it. But I just think as a matter of pragmatics it just is not going to work that way.

Mr. McCLURE. I believe you were present this morning when Senator Church testified?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I was present when Senator Church and Senator Jordan testified, and I have great affection for both of them. They worked at this long and many hours in trying to hammer this out.

While I respect them and understand what they are trying to do, I just do not think their section 6 is going to do what they want it to do. This is all I am saying.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

What you are saying is that the veto power that goes into this would more than likely be harmful to any kind of program.

Mr. SMITH. I am afraid this would be the result.

Mr. ASPINALL. Let me ask you one other question for complete understanding. You heard yesterday the statement by the representatives of the Bureau and the Department that they had some 600-plus rivers recommended to them and that they cut them down and they cut them down and they cut them down. Did you or your organization take any part in these recommendations in the first place or in the final operation?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, we did discuss some of these rivers with the Department. At what stage it was or what stage they were at in their thinking, I could not really tell you—whether we were at the 650 level or the 40 level or where we were—but we did.

Mr. ASPINALL. Did you discuss them or did you name the rivers or did you do both?

Mr. SMITH. I think we did both. I am a little hazy on this. For example, we had one problem regarding the Eleven Point River in Arkansas. I know the gentleman who represents this district was before you and I know the people from the Eleven Point Basin will be in here on the 18th and 19th to discuss this for themselves so I will be brief. Part of the difficulties in this instance and others is trying to obtain from knowledgeable people information about these rivers and what the contiguous land use is.

When you have this number of studies, it seems to me this is where we have gotten into difficulties. Now the original bill started out with the idea to put the burden of proof on people who were going to build impoundments. This was our idea. But we ran into all of the varied problems of contiguous land use that becomes immediately apparent,