Government, $150 million would be distributed annually to Federal agencies at this level of funding.

At the current level of funding, only about $48 million is available for such distribution. When the land and water fund was orignally authorized, it was expected that about $92 million each year would now be available for Federal use from the fund. Not only is the fund failing to keep pace with needs, it is even falling sadly behind its projected levels. The lesson to be learned is to give the fund enough flexible resources to do its job. We hope the committee will not accept the administration's suggestion that a $200 million ceiling be placed on the fund. This level alone falls short of the Interior Department's own estimate of need.

The last basic question which S. 1401 and S. 531 raise is the question of how long revenues should be earmarked to the fund. Over a 5-year period, funding at the level of $300 million will produce $750 million for Federal use under a 50–50 State-Federal allocation. This amount would barely meet the projected needs which the Interior Department can now foresee during this period. A 5-year limitation on earmarking would not provide leeway to plan acquisitions over a longer period. Over a 10-year period, the Department foresees the need for as much as $1.8 billion in Federal allocations ($3.6 billion in total funding, counting allocations to the States as well as to the Federal agencies). Funding at a $300 million level with a 50–50 split over a 10-year period would produce only a $1.5 billion for Federal use, leaving us still $0.3 billion short. In view of the fact that needs can be foreseen over as long as a 10-year period and that even annual revenues at a $300 million level will run short of foreseen needs—let alone unforeseen needs—we strongly recommend that no limit be placed on the duration of earmarking. In this respect, we prefer the approach taken in S. 531. Admittedly, the greatest challenge will be in the next 5-year period. Land acquisition must move forward vigorously before prices rise. But we should not foreclose the chance to pursue new opportunities as need grows with an increasingly adverse man-land ratio in this Nation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we would like to make it clear that we fully support the general authorities conveyed in S. 1401 which allow the Secretary of the Interior and others to enter into contractual commitments for purchase in advance of appropriations, though we hope these authorities can be renewed for periods of more than 2 years. And we fully support authorization of sale and lease back arrangements under appropriate protective restrictions, though we believe that priority in land purchase should be given to those areas where the full fee will be retained.

In summary, the Sierra Club strongly supports S. 1401, except that it urges that no limit be placed on the duration of earmarking. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Senator BURDICK. Melvin O. Steen, Nebraska State liaison officer, and director of the game and parks commission, has submitted a statement. Also William J. Hull, chairman of the legislative committee, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., has asked that his testimony be included in the hearing record. Without objection, those statements will be printed at this point.