

element in the economic evaluation of projects. Imposition of charges burdening recreational use will inevitably diminish the appeal of the project areas and discourage public interest in their use for recreation. As recreational values decrease, the economic justification of projects will be impaired, raising serious questions as to the feasibility and ultimate construction of projects involving important flood control, navigation and other public purposes.

The matter is especially serious with respect to the projects in chronically depressed areas where tourist attractions of Federal reservoirs and navigation pools are a significant element in economic recovery programs. Under these fee systems discouraging recreational use, the adverse impact will fall with particular severity on the very areas whose relief and improvement are the special concern of national policy. For those states and local communities which have confidently assumed that Federal reservoirs and other water resource projects in their areas would constitute important tourist attractions and especially where substantial investments of public and private funds have been made in facilities for tourists, these fee systems constitute a breach of faith.

The prohibitions against fees contained in the pending bill would not only rectify grave errors of policy, but, even more significant, they are urgently demanded if the good faith of the national government is to be honored.

It has been argued in support of these fee systems that they will assist in excluding undesirable and disorderly elements and, in the case of the fees on floating facilities, in helping to prevent unsightly clutter. As Chief Justice White of the Supreme Court used to say: "To state that proposition is to refute it". Such perverse logic would justify limiting access to the National Capitol to those able to pay fees for its upkeep.

In this country we have not considered economic status a dependable index of good conduct or good taste. Nor have we expended public funds solely for the benefit of those who could afford to pay for public facilities. The central and overriding purpose of water-oriented recreational development as a Federal undertaking is to bring healthful recreational opportunities within the reach of all our people. The pending legislation is fully consistent with that wise and humane public policy. Good order and beauty can be achieved through proper planning, supervision and administration. Fee systems devised to limit access to, and use of, basic public facilities to the more fortunate among us cannot and must not be tolerated.

We appreciate this opportunity to give our full endorsement to the pending legislation and urge most strongly its favorable consideration by the Committee and its prompt enactment into law.

Senator BURDICK. Is there anyone else at this time?

The committee will reconvene at 2:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12 o'clock (noon), the committee recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 p.m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator CHURCH (presiding). Our next witness is Joseph Fitzgerald, accompanied by Mr. B. L. Orell. Gentlemen, the Chair is happy to welcome you here this afternoon.

STATEMENTS OF JOSEPH J. FITZGERALD, CHAIRMAN OF THE FORESTRY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION, AND BERNARD L. ORELL, CHAIRMAN OF THE PUBLIC LAND LAW AND POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am Joseph J. Fitzgerald, executive vice president, Edward Hines Lumber Co., Chicago, Ill., and chairman of the Forestry Affairs Committee of the National Forest Products Association. Appearing with me is Mr. B. L. Orell, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash., and chairman of the Public Land Law and Policy Subcommittee of my committee.