

Under the sell-back and lease-back program authorized by section 2, we could, for example, acquire the farmlands back of the river shore at Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri, and sell the land subject to a condition that if it is used for other than farming, title will automatically revert to the Federal Government. We will save money this way and we will preserve the natural scene as it is.

An alternative would be to lease the land for an annual rental subject to cancellation of the lease upon the same condition.

We have studied other applications of the sell-back and lease-back land management program. It has been used with success by private realtors in connection with recreation land. It is used also by universities and other institutions as a method of assuring a quality environment.

The other bill which I am advised the committee is considering today is S. 2828 by Senator Harris and Senator Monroney and others. There is an adverse administration report before you which speaks for itself. The bill, in effect, would repeal the authority in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act for the Corps of Engineers to charge recreation fees at areas under its administration. This, I think, would be inequitable.

It would erect a double standard and we have discussed that many times before the committee here.

If there are to be Federal recreation fees, they should be applicable to the Federal recreation agencies across the board.

The propriety of exempting one of the largest of the recreation administering agencies is, to me highly questionable. Although recreation fees are not measured up to expectations, it is our belief they should be continued and the user of Federal recreation facilities should pay directly a reasonable price for his enjoyment of those facilities.

I would like to say with the progress we have made we have a degree of acceptance. The people are accepting the fee and the Golden Passport and it is working much better than it was 2 years ago.

This philosophy should include the corps as well as agencies in other departments. It is significant that most States apply some type of recreation fee to areas under their administration, including numerous State-leased areas at corps projects. These basically are the reasons why the administration opposes S. 2828.

As far as I am aware, there is widespread support for S. 1401 in the Congress, among the Federal agencies, the States, local governments, and conservation groups. I think it no exaggeration that action on this bill may very well make or break the effectiveness of the land and water conservation fund program during the next several years. I commend it to you for favorable consideration.

(The following chart accompanied the statement :)