

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Kennedy, for a very fine statement. I want to commend you for the fine support you have given to quite a long list of conservation measures. Your statement was most helpful.

Any questions?

Senator ANDERSON. I want to say you won't decide too quickly to take away the Continental Shelf revenues. Back when the bill was passed, Senator Hill and I and others joined in a motion to divert these funds to education. It was passed in the Senate and lost in conference.

I hope we still keep alive the question of education and not just recreation.

Senator KENNEDY. I think your point is well made. But I also think that the thrust, the purpose, and scope of this legislation is that we must determine priorities.

Education, of course, is essential. I think education certainly should have a place among our priorities although we must know whether the revenues from the Continental Shelf would be significant.

Senator ANDERSON. I appreciate that statement of yours, and I know you have been very careful about it. I appreciate very much your statement here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Church?

Senator CHURCH. First of all, I like what you have to say on this subject. As a matter of fact, I liked your statements recently on some other subjects, too.

One of the purposes of this fund, in fact its major objective, was to stimulate State participation in the development of outdoor recreation. We had testimony yesterday from a number of different people coming from different States which indicated that in this respect the fund had been highly successful. I know in my own State it has been.

To what extent in Massachusetts has the availability, for the first time, of Federal matching funds enlarged the activity of the State government in procuring and developing suitable areas for outdoor recreation? Has it had that effect?

Senator KENNEDY. Well, it has had some effect. Recreation now in Massachusetts is our third biggest industry, and there is an increasing appreciation for the potential of recreation in the State and by the State officials.

But I do not think we have moved nearly as far—or as rapidly or as imaginatively—as some of the other States, which have a much stronger tradition in recreation than we do. In fact, it was only last year that Massachusetts passed the necessary enabling legislation to permit the State to participate in the land and water conservation program.

For too long we have relied almost completely on industrial production as an industrial State, and it has only really been in the very recent years, the last 7 or 8 years, that we have really begun to focus in on our recreation potential. In short, I really don't think that we have been as imaginative as we should have been. But we have made some progress.