

For example, such a logical nexus might exist in the use of admission fees to federal recreation areas for improving recreational facilities in these areas. However, we objected to the earmarking of proceeds from the sales of surplus real property and related personal property for payment into the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and we still do not see the connection. In fact, as we stated in 1963:

"The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 was a laudable piece of legislation, an outgrowth of recommendations of the Commission for the Organization of the Executive Branch. It will be unfortunate if its purpose to achieve economy in government is distorted so as to make possible a great expansion of presently excessive governmental land ownership. In addition, there appears to be no logically valid reason why proceeds from disposal of surplus property should be earmarked for recreational purposes."

We also said:

"It is ironic to note that, in connection with real property, the 1962 Annual Report states at page 12 that: 'GSA further accelerated the disposal of surplus real property in order to place such property in the civilian economy, add the property to local tax rolls, and return sales proceeds to the Federal Treasury.'"

"Every one of the objectives would be frustrated or negated if the proceeds were devoted to buying up other lands for Federal Government ownership." (Statement to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of United States Senate, March 15, 1963.)

Likewise, we do not see the justification for earmarking revenues received under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953, the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and the Potash Leasing Acts of 1927 and 1948, and by the Forest Service for the purchase of additional land for recreational purposes.

The "Alternative Level III" endorsed by the Administration calls for outlays of \$200 million per year for 5 years to be split equally between Federal and State expenditures. This would require additional annual amounts of from \$100 million to \$128 million to be earmarked out of revenues from Outer Continental Shelf Lands. Thus, curtailment of Federal land acquisition would appear to cancel out very neatly the need for additional earmarked revenues. This would not require any amendment to the basic law, inasmuch as Section 4(b) of the Act provides that the Federal-State ratio shall prevail "In the absence of a provision to the contrary in the act making an appropriation from the fund. . . ."

An alternative suggestion is to amend the act so as to devote the Federal allotment to recreational development purposes alone rather than solely to land acquisition purposes.

Therefore, we respectively urge this distinguished Committee not to report S. 1401 or any other bills which would earmark additional revenues for payment into the land and water conservation fund. We appreciate this opportunity to express our views.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

The Nation's cities are becoming increasingly concerned about the availability of recreation space for their citizens, for the Nation's accelerating trend toward urbanization is placing ever greater demands on land suitable for recreational purposes in and around our cities. A stepped up effort is needed to preserve land for recreational purposes.

The National League of Cities supports S. 1401 and H.R. 8578 which will accelerate the Federal program to preserve and protect recreation areas for all citizens by amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to increase funds available for property acquisition and to expedite acquisition procedures to avoid costs added through appreciation in value of land designated as a recreational area. An increase in the land and water conservation fund is particularly necessary to permit the Federal Government to acquire major national facilities and to maintain State and local programs. It is estimated that, at current prices, \$3.6 billion in Federal aid will be needed to support Federal, State and local recreation programs in the next decade. Only about \$1 billion will be available if the land and water conservation fund is continued at current revenue levels.

Availability of land for a variety of recreational uses is of vital importance to cities. Recreational areas in and around cities must be preserved now if they are to be available to meet future needs. By 1980 three-quarters of our citizens will