trols of this bill could extend all the way up to all the contributing areas, and this disturbs us.

If that could be corrected in here, there are many other aspects of this we think are fine.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. ASPINALL. Of course I can't understand that last statement. You make a very constructive criticism of part of the bill and I can understand that and then you state, after Mr. Sorenson said you oppose it in its entirety, that there are many aspects of the bill that are fine.

Mr. BROWN. May I explain, sir?

I was responding to the question if we were to take this specific bill, what would we have wrong with it, and related with that are the factors or paragraphs that we have enumerated in our testimony, which we think are right.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would simply state this, and I take no offense at the position the NRA wishes to present before the committee, but it just so happens that that position is not a practical position in my opinion, and I doubt if it, the Reclamation Association, has a better friend than the chairman.

You take the position that if a client takes a little bit of strychnine he will kill himself; if he takes a lot he will be able to survive, so you are willing to take a whole lot of strychnine, is that it?

Mr. SORENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if I might respond to Congressman Aspinall's comment, or inquiry, I think our position here and our appearance is probably a practical recognition of certain things that are liable to happen, and while we would basically oppose a single-purpose use, particularly without study, we say if this, however, is going to become law, we say these safeguards should be put in.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is what we have tried to do in at least two of these bills. Maybe we haven't done it completely, and we always like suggestions from individuals interested. That is the reason we have hearings, and we will pay attention to the suggestions made by Mr. Brown.

My whole thought is not that the single-purpose concept is a concept not to be suggested in certain instances, because we do recognize it in certain instances just as we recognize the multipurpose concept in certain instances. But I would have felt a little bit better personally if this great organization had come up and said, instead of just saying, "We oppose it"—that is what the statement is—if you have said you oppose it "unless" or that you oppose certain sections of it. It would have meant a little bit more to me than just waving the flag and stopping the race.

Mr. SORENSEN. I think our effort here has been basically to say we believe in mutipurpose concepts as opposed to single-purpose concepts, and then it is almost like saying, nevertheless, in the event that there is to be such legislation, we have suggested particular things that we think ought to be worked into it, and certainly we are trying to be constructive, I would certainly assure the committee.