

by us, but it is only reasonable to assume that the defense items are mostly of a temporary nature, and that they will decrease before long.

For this reason, I feel sure that the majority of conservationists would prefer to see the fund amended as proposed in S. 1401 even if all the money is not immediately forthcoming.

The need has been demonstrated. The facts and figures are in reports before the committees. The \$200 million ceiling suggested in the Interior Department's report falls far short of what is known to be necessary.

We would prefer to see the act amended on the basis of what is right and proper rather than on the basis of an arbitrary and clearly inadequate ceiling.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the base of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act should be broadened, and we support the amendment suggested in S. 1401.

Thank you very much.

Senator BURDICK. Senator Hansen?

Senator HANSEN. I have no questions.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF C. R. GUTERMUTH, VICE PRESIDENT, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

Mr. Chairman, I am C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, with headquarters in Washington, D.C. The Institute is one of the older national conservation organizations. Its program has been devoted to the restoration and improved management of natural resources in the public interest since 1911.

The Institute is pleased to join other conservation groups in expressing support for the objectives of S. 1401. Time and experience have shown that the Land and Water Conservation Fund is in desperate need of revision. It is inadequate to do what Congress itself intended.

There are a number of reasons for the Fund's deficiency, including some that obviously were not anticipated at the time of its enactment. Project costs have been understated, while estimates of revenues have been too optimistic. Congress has looked upon the Fund as the sole means of financing new federal projects rather than as a supplement to federal activities in existence at the time the imaginative program was enacted. And finally, land acquisition costs have spiraled upwards under the twin stimuli of routine legislative and appropriations delays, and the inability of federal agencies to contract in advance of appropriations for lands within authorized projects.

It now is admitted that the Fund requires larger and more reliable sources of financing, along with other revisions. Augmentation of the Fund will enable federal agencies, mainly the National Park Service, to make swifter progress in reducing the backlog of the many costly projects that have been authorized. All participating federal agencies can make some progress in acquiring inholdings and in pursuing other authorized work. Delay in correcting the Fund weaknesses only will increase the ultimate costs of the many worthwhile recreation projects.

As a word of caution, however, Congress must not let the absolute necessity for broadening the base of the Fund confuse the manner in which this is accomplished. Consideration should be given to the various changes that are proposed so as to select the combination of financial support and program revisions that holds the most promise of accommodating the need that actually exists.

If the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act is to be amended, and I hope that it is, we want the amendments to overcome the miscalculations and the timidity of the past. The Fund should be made whole; it should be adequate to meet the demands that Congress is placing against it. The inadequacy of the Fund is detailed in the Department of the Interior's study report, "Recreation Land Price Escalation." If history is any guide, I fully expect that the report's projections will prove to be too optimistic. Land acquisition costs will be greater than estimated, Congress undoubtedly will continue to authorize new recreation areas, and the backlog of authorized, but uncompleted, projects may be as