

He bases this upon our concern that the full funding concept or interpretation being placed upon the act by the Bureau of the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations are not what was intended by the committees which passed this legislation earlier.

Certainly it was not the intention that the fund be required to finance all Federal acquisitions of properties for recreational purposes, as well as State programs.

I think the chairman of this committee pointed this out yesterday in his opening statement.

Yet the fund now constitutes a box. This box has now become so restrictive that some people say there is no need to authorize new areas because some of those already established are not funded. Yet, everyone is aware of the continuing need to acquire areas before prices escalate out of sight.

Frankly, we are distressed that too many people consider outdoor recreation a frill, not quite on a par with other human needs. Yet, we do not understand why the public's interests in and benefits from a national park or seashore or lakeshore are not as meritorious and reasonable as the public's interests in and benefits from a number of other programs, including navigational and flood control projects. Yet last week a sister committee to this committee began holding hearings on a host of water development projects. Most of these will be authorized, for specific amounts, later in the year in an omnibus rivers and harbors bill. Then next year, or subsequently, funds to plan, construct, maintain, and operate these projects will be sought from the Committees on Appropriations. Costs of some of these projects will be shared. Many will be borne entirely by the Federal Government. Decisions on how many to fund will be made by the Appropriations Committees.

This year it is likely that \$1 billion will be appropriated for these projects. Then why is outdoor recreation any different? What is there to prevent this committee from considering an "omnibus park and recreation area" bill to contain a specific financial ceiling for each project, one which the Appropriations Committees later could consider, piecemeal or together, in a similar manner?

Among the practical reasons and answers to that question, of course, is the limitation imposed by the full-funding concept. It is a box which automatically limits acquisitions in a manner the Congress itself did not express or intend. We hope the members of this committee, particularly those who also are members of the Appropriations Committee, can give this concept some real consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having made these observations, a few specific comments about S. 1401 are in order. As long as it is clearly understood the fund does not constitute a "box," we wholeheartedly support S. 1401. Therefore, we are in accord with the additions of revenues from all of the sources provided in the original version of S. 1401, preferring it above the administration-backed proposals. As long as the Appropriations Committees and the Budget Bureau consider the fund to be delimiting, we must support whatever additions are necessary to meet the Nation's present and future outdoor recreation needs.

We also support the provisions which will help meet the price acceleration problem, both through advance acquisitions and lease and sell back transactions. The present system is so cumbersome that the