

in section 4(b) of the Act, which limits the advances to an 8-year period and a total of \$480 million.

The purposes of the act, as extracted from section 1(b) are "to assist in preserving, developing, and assuring accessibility * * * [of] such quality and quantity of outdoor recreational resources as may be available and desirable for individual active participation in such recreation and to strengthen the health and vitality of the citizens of the United States by (1) providing funds for and authorizing Federal assistance to the States in planning, acquisition, and development of needed land and water areas and facilities and (2) providing funds for the Federal acquisition and development of certain lands and other areas."

Section 2 of the act describes the revenues to be placed in the separate fund. In general, they are entrance and user fees collected by certain federal agencies; proceeds from surplus property sales; and certain revenues from the motorboat fuel tax.

The present proposals appear to arise out of two circumstances:

1. There is not as much demand for recreational use of federal lands as the Congress was led to believe; consequently, revenues from entrance and user fees have not come up to expectations.

2. Intervention by the federal government as a purchaser in the real estate market is inflationary.

These two points are demonstrated by the fact that revenues from entrance and user fees have been running only 20% of estimate, and acquisition costs for various recreational projects have overrun estimates from 50% to 200%.

The answer proposed is not to tailor the program to the dimensions suggested by the amount of revenues coming into the fund, but to earmark additional sources of revenue for payment into the fund. It appears that the Administration has chosen the most conservative of what it regards as three alternative levels of revenue. However, it is questionable whether an additional source of revenue should be earmarked at all. At least, it is apparent that the Administration is not really motivated by a desire to hold the level of expenditures for those purposes to the lowest possible level. This has been indicated by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall's statement that:

"There are a number of approaches. One is to leave the Fund Act as is and supplement it by appropriations from the general funds of the Treasury. This is not favored by the Administration because the history of appropriations for Federal land acquisitions for recreation purposes prior to the Fund was dismally small."

Thus, the Administration appears to fear that, if the Congress were allowed to work its will in its traditional legislative processes, it would come to the conclusion that the level of expenditures for these purposes should be lower than that which would be available from the proposed new revenue sources. It appears that, at a time of severe fiscal problems, it is doubtful that any more revenues should be earmarked for specific purposes. Therefore, it seems to be a dubious course of action to earmark any additional revenues for payment into this Fund. Certainly, the Congress should evaluate all available Federal revenues as against all of the Federal objectives and allocate the available resources accordingly. Earmarking certain funds in advance for certain purposes tends to impede the free exercise of that proper legislative power of the Congress. Therefore, we are constrained to object to any further expansion of the earmarking of revenues beyond what has already been authorized by the Congress. At a time of serious military involvement and soaring government expenditures domestically, together with balance of payments problems in our international accounts, it would seem unwise to establish a forced draft system of raising expenditures for acquisition of land for recreational purposes.

Another very serious question is that of proper allocation of our available land resources among private owners on the one hand and the various levels of government on the other hand. The Federal Government already owns some 770 million acres of land. It seems apparent that some strong effort should be made in the direction of disposal of a significant portion of this acreage into tax-paying, job-creating, private ownership rather than encouraging further acquisition of land by the Federal Government. A statement released by Secretary Udall on February 5, 1968, indicates that the Federal, State, and local governments acquired for recreational purposes during the previous three-year period more than 4 million acres of land. The continued trend in this direction of removing land from the tax rolls and removing it from a possibility of further economic growth and de-