tinue to be available to a limited degree, and thus did not expect that the annual revenues accruing to the fund would be regarded as the ceiling on outlays. It is increasingly clear, however, that the Congress wants to limit outlays to what the land and water fund alone can sustain.

If this is the direction in which Congress feels it must move, then the only satisfactory answer for park funding is to seek augmentation of the land and water fund. The basic questions to be answered with respect to augmentation are: (1) from what sources; (2) in what amounts; (3) for how long.

The Interior Department estimates that $318 million will be necessary to complete acquisitions of national park units already authorized. This figure does not include another $43 million which will probably be necessary to complete Point Reyes National Seashore in California. The administration estimates the cost of currently pending proposals, which it is supporting, at $160 million. There are probably at least $100 million worth of other park projects pending before this Congress on which the administration has not yet announced its position. If all of these proposals should be regarded as meritorious—and the time is late to rescue these endangered pieces of American landscape—as much as $621 million would be required to buy the land.

On top of this amount, it is only realistic to foresee that deserving new bills for some additionally outstanding areas will be introduced in succeeding Congresses. Gradually the residue of qualifying areas will diminish—and the opportunities to rescue them will diminish ever faster; it is unrealistic, however, to expect that the job will be finished by the legislation now in view. Probably between $750 million and $1 billion will be necessary in funding for Federal park projects foreseeable in just the next few years. Though this amount is large, California alone is now looking at the possibility of financing a $4 billion open space preservation plan. The Federal Government also ought to be developing its national plan to preserve open space.

In view of the magnitude of the funding needed for Federal park and open space acquisitions, it is clear to us that this is the time to face up to the need to earmark enough revenues to the land and water fund. Consequently, we support earmarking all of the revenues included in S. 1401 and S. 531, including those derived under the Mineral Leasing Act, the Potash Leasing Acts, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and those revenues now remitted to the Treasury from programs of the Forest Service. Because the revenues accruing from some of these programs vary appreciably from year to year, it would seem desirable to include revenues from all of them to stabilize the flow of funds. Moreover, there is a basic equity in earmarking all of these funds to help buy new lands where scenery is protected, in that many of these mining and forestry programs diminish the scenic character of public holdings. By earmarking these revenues, the public will secure a rough type of replacement in kind.

With earmarking of revenues to the fund from all these sources, we hope that no less than $300 million will be available each year for distribution to Federal agencies and the States. The Interior Department admits that this amount will be needed in each of the next 5 years to meet an accumulated projected need of $1.5 billion during this period. If the administration's suggestion is adopted for changing the division of allocations to 50 percent each to the States and the Federal