

Senator KUCHEL. I am familiar with the Muskie bill. I rather imagined that the public interest might well be served by our dealing with that problem in this legislation in a fashion that would supplement the legislation which has already passed the Senate. For example, the Muskie legislation.

I previously placed the entire text of the editorial in the record.

(The editorial referred to appears on p. 35.)

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the theory which is espoused by the Secretary and which is reflected in this bill is precisely that which, as the Secretary knows, was used by the government of California for many, many years during which the bulk of the tideland oil revenues in my State, which accumulate under State law, were earmarked for the acquisition of parks. This is one reason why we have an excellent system of State beaches and parks in California.

We observe that it is suggested in the next decade the fund presently would be deficient on the order of \$2.7 billion. We observe also the feelings of the administration that some ceiling should be put on the earmarking of moneys otherwise going into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and also the provisions of existing law that, where funds that accumulate in the land and water conservation fund are not subsequently appropriated within 2 years, they reenter the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

I am not so sure I approve that kind of provision in our bill. First of all, the \$200 million annual figure would, of course, at the end of 10 years represent only in round figures about two-thirds of what apparently would be the deficiency if no action were taken by the Congress at all.

I will say very frankly, Mr. Secretary, and I know you agree with me on this, that I have in the back of my mind an earnest and sincere desire to see the Redwood Park legislation enacted into law and then appropriate steps undertaken to acquire the properties which we wish to acquire as soon as possible. So, I shall, at the proper time when we consider this bill, raise the question of the wisdom of recommendations for a ceiling which the administration has sent to us.

I like very much the idea of giving to the head of an agency limited obligational authority by which he might contract in advance of the appropriation process to acquire park property. I think we ought to develop that, however, while we have a fair number of Senators here. Under the \$30 million authorization, Mr. Secretary, let us assume that you would feel the public interest might indicate that \$15 or \$20 millions of the moneys be used at a given moment to contract with the XYZ Co. to acquire certain property.

Let us assume we get into a hassle in the appropriations process where all the moneys which you in good faith, and with the approval of the committee, wish to obligate were not made available to you, what would happen? Would the contract simply lapse?

Secretary UDALL. Senator, you serve on the Appropriations Committee and you know how we function.

I think we are going to have a classic case if we get, as we must, a redwood bill before this Congress quits. Here we are going to have a park created with boundaries. There will be important forest products industries, companies that are affected. We will want to and they