as a means of obtaining a return on the investment in these water projects. Using all the other methods of computation of return, the result has been favorable without computation of these fees.

To my mind these projects were constructed with public funds and belong to the public. I believe that the operation and maintenance of these projects for use of the public is a trust given by Congress to the American public and constitutes a vested right in them.

The public funds were, of course, derived from our process of taxation, and continuing efforts are being made to get additional funds for these projects by the various methods stated in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. I specifically refer to the motorboat fuels tax, which equally affects users of these bodies of water. I think that it is not a matter of taking from Peter to pay Paul; the collection of these fees makes it a matter of taking from both the left and right pockets to pay for the same service, and I am against it.

As I stated before the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, I am advised that the Corps of Engineers has shown by its own figures that in a great number of cases the costs of collecting fees and charges exceed the return. To me this is not just double taxation, but triple taxation, and I do not think the American people should be subjected to it.

Besides the financial aspects of this picture, there is another area which I believe warrants the consideration of this committee, and that is the antagonism brought about by the collection of fees for the use of these facilities.

In the case of Oklahoma, which has the finest lakes in the world, many of our guests travel great distances to make use of our waters, and they bring with them their boats, their families, their influence, and their needs. To insult them by the collection of an unnecessary, unfeasible charge to use those facilities, which they have a right to expect will be granted to them free of charge, can only result in a reduction in the number of users of our facilities, and a corresponding reduction in the amount Oklahomans will realize in value received from this traveling trade. Of course this applies not just to Oklahoma but all the states similarly situated.

To my mind it is wrong to station soldiers or employees of the Corps of Engineers at gates to projects that for all intents and purposes are public, implying by their presence total restriction and regulation, resulting in all the natural consequences that strict regulation implies. There is always the possibility that additional wardens will have to be employed to police the areas to stop the fee-jumpers. If the Corps of Engineers contemplates strict control of the parks and camping facilities, not to mention the water facilities, then we would also have to consider the extra costs of fencing and policing all the areas which are now budgeted, contemplated, or constructed.

The whole idea to me is wrong, it is an imposition, it is unjust, and certainly it creates the potentiality of greater evils than the public good that could be generated.

I feel very strongly that the creation of water facilities, with the attendant camping and recreational areas made possible by public projects, publicly funded, for the public use should be held in trust for the public. To do otherwise is to create a regulatory system at increased costs, and in some cases multiple taxation for the American people, and I believe the committee should carefully weigh all these factors.

The use of these facilities, and the waters involved, as well as the use of all that pertaining to these projects, is a trust with an unalienable right vested in the American people, and with all the sincerity at my command, I urge this committee to report favorably on passage of S. 2828.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it might be helpful if we could hear from Senator Harris and we could then ask questions of you two at the same time.

Senator Harris, we are happy to hear you in connection with the bill you have sponsored.