

able income, and new leisure time. I submit that the scientific, technological and economic progress we have made has as its real objective but one target, and that is the better life. We do not exist to serve Science, Technology, Industry, or Economics; they exist to serve us. Let us use them to build a better environment for ourselves and for the Americans of tomorrow.

In comparison with other public expenditures, the sums needed to adequately fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program at a level which meets the outdoor recreation needs of our people is minute; surely it is of no great economic concern. We recommend and urge, therefore, that the Land and Water Conservation Fund program be financed at the level proposed by the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers, as submitted in the presentation of its president, R. A. MacMullen, of the State of Michigan. Finally, we believe that no grant-in-aid program authorized by Congress has been more popular nor more effective in meeting critical needs and in building for the future than the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. We should not permit this splendid program to operate at half-pace any longer; the social welfare of the American people requires that it be put on an *adequate* operational basis for the balance of its authorized life span.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. HULL, CHAIRMAN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
OHIO VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, founded in 1895, is composed of civic and agricultural groups, and industries such as coal, oil, steel, aluminum, chemicals and electric power, as well as financial institutions, shippers, river operators, merchants and individual citizens who support its work and program. It is dedicated to the development and more effective use of water resources in the Ohio River Basin.

In the light of its commitment to water resource development, this Association, while sympathetic with the purposes of Public Law 88-578, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, to encourage development of outdoor recreational opportunities, was strongly opposed to the admission and user charge systems authorized by that legislation.

We were, of course, gratified that in the final version of the Act, Federal agencies were prohibited from charging any fee under the Act "for use of any waters." But fees for entrance, admission or access to designated land or water areas were authorized under certain circumstances as well as fees for use within an area of "sites, facilities equipment or services provided by the United States", excluding of course, fees for the use of any waters.

Application of this fee system to project areas traditionally free of such Federal charges, as in the case of Corps of Engineers water resource projects, represents our principal concern. Moreover, it has become increasingly clear that the statutory prohibition against fees for the use of waters cannot be made fully effective unless charges upon access to water areas are specifically forbidden.

As the Committee is well aware, the provision for entrance fees and user charges as to projects administered by the Secretary of the Army constitutes an extreme departure from long-established precedent. Indeed, implementation of the policy of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, required a specific amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended (16 USC 460d), by deleting the words "without charge" in the portion assuring free access for recreational purposes to the water areas of Corps of Engineers reservoirs.

We are now confronted with still another precedent-shattering fee system in the form of Corps of Engineers circular No. 1130-2-25 (issued 17 November, 1966) as amended, to require collection of fees for permits covering any "private boat mooring facility (boathouse, buoy, dock or pier), duck blind, ski-jump float, swimming or diving platform or raft, or any similar facility upon the water area of any water resource development project". Not only are permits for new facilities subject to the fee system but all existing permits for such purposes are to be revoked effective 31 December, 1968 and permittees must remove their facilities or obtain a new permit prior to 1 January, 1969, for facilities to remain in place. This novel policy purports to be based upon the Act of Congress approved August 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 290; 31 U.S.C., Sec. 483a), an appropriations act, authorizing Federal agencies to prescribe fees for licenses or permits granted (among other things), except in cases where such charges are prohibited by law.