

is the advancement of intelligent management and use of our forests, soils, water, wildlife, and all other natural resources necessary for a quality environment, healthy outdoor recreation, and the well-being of all citizens.

Our interests in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act date back to the inception of legislation to create this fund and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. From both a State administrator's level and from my position with a national conservation organization I have watched many worthwhile outdoor recreation projects become reality because of the fund. Great progress is being made in federal acquisition of recreational lands as well as acquisition and development of recreational facilities by state and local governments. Matching incentives provided by the fund have stimulated increased effort by local governments in financing of recreational projects.

A major weakness in the present fund, however, is that there is not enough money to meet demands of the States and local units of government or to keep pace with authorizations by the Congress for new Federal parks and recreation areas. If the fund is not increased, it would be almost meaningless for the Congress to authorize more new conservation areas unless it also approved appropriations from general revenue sources to finance them. Additional revenues in the land and water fund would be achieved with the passage of S. 1401.

I am aware that there is considerable concern about earmarking of funds even for worthwhile conservation projects and I share this concern, but the existing land and water conservation fund already is from earmarked sources. As a general rule, I feel that earmarked funds should be dedicated to the lands or projects from which they are derived and not diverted to unrelated projects.

We support the administrator's viewpoint that receipts under the Mineral Leasing Act and from national forests' sales and leases should not be diverted into the land and water fund, but rather that a portion of revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf be used to supplement the fund. We also approve the idea of a limit, both in amount and time, as proposed by the Secretary of Interior. A \$200 million ceiling for a period of 5 years should aid greatly in catching up on Federal acquisition and be a big boost to the States. At the end of that time a review of needs and backlogs would reveal whether the amount was in need of increase or decrease.

If, however, Congress does not find it desirable to increase the Land and Water Conservation Fund through Outer Continental Shelf revenues, as recommended, then I would urge very strongly that new national parks, seashores, recreation areas or other Federal projects now being financed or backlogged for financing by the fund be authorized for purchase from other revenue sources. The land and water fund has been a valuable conservation tool but it will become a limiting factor on how rapidly the Nation can proceed on conservation and recreation projects unless the fund can be significantly increased.

Other provisions of S. 1401 appear to be very desirable. The advance obligational authority to permit contract for purchase before actual appropriation of funds should help to hold down prices. And, the sell-back and lease-back authority will enable the Federal Government to recoup land acquisition costs on some land transactions to replenish the land and water conservation fund.