tions about some few projects which have been included in State master outdoor recreation plans, we generally commend the agencies which have implemented and administered the program. Getting such a massive program "off the ground" is a remarkable achievement in a relatively short period of time. Our concern is centered mostly upon the "full-funding" concept or interpretation being placed upon the Act by the Bureau of the Budget and the Committees on Appropriations.

Certainly, it was not the intention that the Fund be required to finance all Federal acquisitions of properties for recreational purposes, as well as the State programs. Examination of the legislative history fails to reveal any other organizations or agencies that proposed such a concept or limitation. The Fund never was intended to provide more than a limited reservoir of financing, one which would be supplemented with appropriations for particular projects. Yet, the Fund, under the "full-funding" concept, now constitutes a box. This box now has 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 needs to acquire areas before they are lost or before prices escalate "out of sight."

Frankly, we are distressed that too many people still consider outdoor recreation a "frill," something not quite on a par with other human needs. Yet, we do not understand why the public's interests in and 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 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 proposal. 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 Federal Government pays more for property than would a private individual or firm under the same circumstances. We also would favor the establishment of a revolving fund whereby Federal agencies can act swiftly to acquire in-holding in parks or forests when they come on the market. Arrangements could be made to keep the Committees fully informed of these negotiations to ensure against any improper or unauthorized acquisitions.

And, now, Mr. Chairman, we should like to comment even more briefly upon S. 2828, prohibiting the charging of recreation fees at Corps of Engineers installations.

Hearings on identical proposals were conducted last fall by the House Committee on Public Works and testimony by a respesentative of the Corps of Engineers on an identical bill, S. 2236, was received by the Senate Committee on Public Works last week.

It is essential that a distinction be made between recreation fees imposed under authority of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and those proposed by the Corps of Engineers in a now-suspended directive EC 1130–2–25, based upon