

Federal Government pays more for property than would a private individual or firm under the same circumstances.

Now, to make a comment or two about S. 2828 on the recreation fees: We believe it is essential that a distinction be made between the recreation fees proposed by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, and those proposed by the Corps of Engineers in a now-suspended directive EC 1130-2-25, based upon a 1951 act and the Bureau of the Budget Circular A-25, 1959.

Testimony in the House last fall indicates that a widespread confusion exists between the two types of fees and much of the opposition leveled at land and water conservation fund fees are more accurately centered on the proposed permits. We still believe it is right and proper for modest fees to be imposed for special facilities, thereby charging those who benefit directly.

However, if alternate means of financing can be assured, we would agree generally to the removal of all fees, but cannot understand why the Corps of Engineers projects should constitute special exemptions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BURDICK. Thank you.

Senator HANSEN?

Senator HANSEN. I want to compliment you on your statement. I appreciate your touching upon user fees and addressing yourself to the problem of escalating land values.

Would you care to make a comment upon the votes that the State of Washington has taken to meet this escalation of land values?

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, certainly this is a very meritorious program they have embarked upon, and several other States have done the same thing in a similar manner. We think this is the kind of cooperation needed from all levels of government.

Senator HANSEN. Thank you.

(The full statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF LOUIS S. CLAPPER ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE
FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman, I am Louis S. Clapper, Chief of Conservation Education for the National Wildlife Federation, which has its headquarters here in Washington, D.C., at 1412 Sixteenth Street, N.W.

By way of identification, the National Wildlife Federation is a private, non-profit organization which seeks to attain conservation goals through educational means. The Federation has affiliates in 49 States. These affiliates, in turn, are composed of local groups and individuals who, when combined with associate members and other supporters of the National Wildlife Federation, number an estimated 2,000,000 persons.

We welcome the invitation to comment briefly upon S. 1401 and S. 2828, relating to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. Chairman, our organization was one of the original supporters of the concept embodied in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We believe the Fund has been of tremendous value in stimulating the establishment and development of highly desirable public programs for outdoor recreation, particularly on the State level. We hope it will be continued, but in the form and for the function as originally intended. This latter qualification is for the express purpose of making a significant point.

Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director of the National Wildlife Federation, recently authored an article (a copy of which is attached) entitled: "Milestone or Millstone?" This article poses a basic question: is the Land and Water Conservation Fund more a millstone around the neck of conservation progress than it has been a milestone of conservation achievement? Although having reserva-