

concessionaires on the Corps of Engineers lakes and reservoirs. The money so received goes to the concessionaires, as a result of the fee, and the concessionaire's fees go to the Corps of Engineers. Concessionaire fees do not go to the land and water conservation fund.

I assume that under the statute as written and as discussed at great length on the floor—and the Senator is far better able than I to recall this, I am sure—was that the fees were to be charged in the instances where the Government made a special investment in a particular area for purposes of recreation, and at that particular point, a user fee would be charged for those facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. It related directly to quid pro quo, as the basis for charging the fee. In other words, it was felt that it would help to finance additional improvements in the recreation areas by charging a user fee, which in turn would help to amortize the cost of that investment.

With this kind of a policy, it was the intent, at least, of the Congress to obtain more investments on the part of the Federal Government in developing facilities for recreational purposes.

Dr. SMITH. Well, this is why I was never completely oriented to S. 2828, because it appeared to me that the services that they were highlighting were not the services in which the Federal Government had made an investment or for which fees were charged. Receipts were accruing to particular concessionnaires who were there on the basis of a permit. In other words, the Government was not involved at all, except in the fashion of the money they received from the permit. Therefore, it was somewhat difficult for me to understand how we were going to cut out all the fees when we didn't have control over the establishment of them originally, and that is why I appreciated very much the Chair's colloquy this morning with other witnesses on this point.

Mr. Chairman, this is, in substance, our comments: We certainly do support S. 1401. We understand that another measure is to be considered later, and apparently, it hasn't been discussed very much. This is S. 1826. We would just comment upon this that this is an interesting observation—

The CHAIRMAN. We will take that up later, but I think it is appropriate for you to speak to it. You go ahead and comment on it.

Dr. SMITH. I was just going to say that there seems to be viable compromise on this measure, if we would use the total amount of receipts from the Outer Shelf in the land and water conservation fund for a period of 5 years, and at the end of that time, remove this allocation from the land and water conservation fund, and allow all 50 States to share equally in it, or something of that nature. But I would hope that this would not contravene the present posture of the land and water conservation fund in looking toward the receipts from the Outer Shelf as a source of revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Dr. Smith. Your entire statement will be included in the record in addition, of course, to your supplemental remarks.

As always, we appreciate having the benefit of your counsel and advice.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.