

Grealy 4/16/80

OPENING STATEMENT FOR HCRS/NATIONAL HERITAGE POLICY ACT HEARINGS

The President has failed to follow through his commitment to energy conservation and renewable resource programs. His revised 81 budget request eliminates the conservation bank, and reduces funding for the solar bank from \$450 million to \$47.5 million.

In addition, the President has failed to back up his commitment to a national heritage policy. He has proposed rescission of \$352.5 million from the 80 HCRS budget and elimination of \$492 million from the 81 HCRS budget.

I consider energy conservation, and natural and historic conservation top priorities, and I will be working actively to restore these cuts. I do not want to take up a lot of time on the budget issues, because we are here to discuss an important HCRS legislative proposal, but I want to put our discussions on that proposal in context.

There are many fine ideas in the Administration bill and in the discussion draft which was prepared by the Subcommittee staff. I am anxious to work on the details of the Heritage Act, and on the development of a comprehensive historic preservation and natural preservation policy. I think that this Subcommittee, with the assistance of the Administration and the environmental and historic preservation communities, can produce a first rate document.

But we should not kid ourselves. This will simply be an academic exercise unless the President's proposed reductions in funding for HCRS are overturned.

## National Heritage Act (Subcommittee Draft)

The purpose of the act is to develop a comprehensive heritage policy for both natural and historic/cultural resources. (e.g., Natural resources are generally well funded and protected once they are identified, but there is no systematic method for identification and selection. Historic/cultural resources are fairly well identified, through the National Register of Historic Places, but they require more stringent protection, more and varied financial assistance (e.g., loan guarantees).

There were several drafts of S. 1842, the Administration Bill, and there have been several counter-bills on the house side. (e.g., Seiberling's bill, which ignores "natural" preservation and establishes a separate historic preservation agency. The Subcommittee draft, while in need of some work, is the best effort to date. It is not important to endorse one bill over the other today.



grealy 4/16/80

HERITAGE CONSERVATION RECREATION SERVICE BUDGET CUTS  
PERCENT REDUCTION IN BUDGET REQUEST BETWEEN JANUARY  
AND APRIL BY PROGRAM AREA

1980	1981
LWCF FEDERAL -50%	-70%
LWCF STATE -50%	-53%
URBAN PARKS RECOVERY PROGRAM -68%	-100%
HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND -30%	-44%
TOTALS -53.4%	-66%

HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND RECREATION SERVICE  
DOLLAR AMOUNTS OF BUDGET CUTS BETWEEN JANUARY  
AND APRIL BY PROGRAM AREA.

	1980	1981
LWCF		
FEDERAL		
JANUARY	201.8	252.3
DECREASE	101	177
NOW	100.8	75.3
LWCF		
STATE		
JANUARY	299.7	320
DECREASE	150	170
NOW	149.7	150
URPARKS		
STATE		
JANUARY	125	125
DECREASE	85	125
NOW	40	0
HISTORIC		
PRESERVATION		
FUND		
JANUARY	55	45
DECREASE	16.5	20
NOW	38.5	25
TOTALS	690.5	
JANUARY	690.5	742
DECREASE	352.5	492
NOW	329	250.3