

tee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, which has as its purpose the removal of fees pertaining to floating facilities as those fees would be collected by the Corps of Engineers.

While I believe S. 2828, here under consideration, encompasses the terms of the other bill, I am still supporting S. 2236 as well as the present bill. I believe that our bill under consideration today is more far-reaching and I support it because of my firm conviction that the American public should not be required to pay additional funds for use of the water controlled by the Corps of Engineers.

The Conservation Act of 1965, specifically as it relates to the collection of fees for entrance, admission, and otherwise as it relates to public user fees charged or collected around the Corps of Engineers projects, should therefore be revised. The water projects built by the Corps of Engineers have been, and are being, constructed with public funds and, to my mind, the projects belong to the public. These projects have had as their primary purpose, flood control, navigation, power generation, and other uses, all of which are primarily aimed at being investments in our natural resources. The projects attempt to make maximum use of the waters of the country and generally there is computed in the cost of these projects a certain return measured in terms of prevention of loss by flooding, crop or structural damage, as well as the direct income received from generation of power.

To my understanding, nowhere in the congressional consideration of these projects has the collection of fees charged recreational users been contemplated as a means of obtaining return on investment of these water projects. Using all the other methods of computation of return, the result has been favorable without computation of these fees.

May I depart from my prepared statement to say that it is my recollection—I believe the distinguished chairman can bear me out—that when the land and water conservation bill was before the Senate I offered an amendment which I discussed with many, including several leading members of this committee, which struck out the charge of user fees on Army Engineers projects. It was included in the bill by the committee and was sent to the Senate in that form. Unfortunately, in conference, the House version prevailed and I believe it was stricken out of the bill at that time.

I merely mention this to show that the Senate version of the bill did exactly what we are proposing to do, if my memory serves me correctly, in S. 2828.

Let me say that we get revenues and they are back up and will be of very little difficulty to replace. The, shall we say, nickels, dimes, quarters, and dollars that will be charged is an annoyance fee to the millions of people who frequent these public resorts seeking a brief vacation.

No. 1, the revenue from the offshore lands which will, as oil discoveries in the vast new areas—and all oilmen will confirm this—bring in huge amounts from royalties, as these are developed both in the gulf and in the offshore tidelands of the Atlantic coast. This would be backup.

We also have a backup of revenues, and I make no protest about this, and this is the collection of a fuel tax on the motorboats used on these vast areas of our public lakes. I do not think that you need to go to the objectionable entrance fees where people are charged a fee to