I should like to particularly call to the attention of the members of the committee the fact that we have been able through the use of the fund and particularly the contingent part of the fund that this committee allowed, to get some outstanding projects started in the States and State projects that they could not have begun.

For example, I would refer to the east side of Lake Tahoe where we are cooperating with Nevada on a State park; the $2 million that I gave the State of California as a special grant for State redwood parks 3 months ago; the Allagash River in Maine where we are sharing in saving that fabulous stream.

We have had many projects with some of the cities in this country.

Senator Hatfield will be interested to know I just had a communication from Governor McCall about the Willamette project as a special project under the fund.

The bill has strong bipartisan sponsorship in this committee. This fact, coupled with the favorable administration report of January 4, plus the President's endorsement of it in his budget message of January 29, encourages me to hope that Congress will complete action on the bill in 1968.

Each of you should have before you not only the administration's report, but also a brief statement explaining activities under the fund for the first 3 years and a series of graphic pie charts that emphasize certain highlights.

The basic problem is that existing sources of revenue have not come up to either expectations or needs, particularly the entrance and user fees. Even if they had, the financial requirements posed by States, by new Federal authorizations, and the escalation in real estate prices are so great that the fund as conceived when enacted by the Congress in September 1964 is not adequate to do the job.

There are a number of approaches. One is to leave the Fund Act as is and supplement it by appropriations from the general funds of the Treasury. This is not favored by the administration because funding for Federal land acquisitions for recreation purposes prior to the fund was dismally small.

Another choice is to do away with the fund and rely entirely on general funding from the Treasury as sources of Federal financing. This also is not favored for the same reason.

The third choice—and I am pleased that the Bureau of the Budget went along with this—which is our preference and that of the authors of this legislation, is to strengthen the fund to the degree necessary for it to do the job as originally contemplated.

Let me say first that in my opinion the fund in its short life has accomplished much and has been remarkably successful. Those who refer to it as a "failure" cannot be aware of just how much progress