My own feeling is that here we are, it has been 3½ years since the act passed, we are back with you reviewing it and changing it. My anticipation will be that every 3 or 4 years we will have to come back and see how is it working and what is needed. It seems to us in the immediate period ahead we will need more money on the Federal side in order to catch up and to do the big jobs and projects which Congress has authorized.

Senator ALLOTT. We had plenty of discussions with Mr. Beatty on the division of those funds between the Federal Government and State government, and you are quite correct that it was not a mandatory division. Unfortunately, I think it should have been.

May I inquire as to what has been the actual division based upon your experience so far?

Dr. CRAFTS. It has been almost exactly 60–40. I think it has been 61–39.

Senator ALLOTT. In general, you have adhered to what was I am sure the intent of Congress at that time even though the act did not strictly require you to adhere to that?

Dr. CRAFTS. That is correct.

Senator ALLOTT. I think that is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Church.

Senator CHURCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I want to commend you and Senator Kuchel for including this legislation which I think follows along the original pattern of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and provides for the necessary expansion of that fund to meet the increasing outdoor recreation needs of the country.

I have, Mr. Chairman, prepared a short statement in general support of the legislation. I would like, with your permission, to include it at an appropriate place in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will follow Senator Kuchel's statement.

Senator CHURCH. I have one question which I would like to ask. That has to do with your recommendation, Mr. Secretary, that the additional money that will be raised should be split 50–50 between the Federal Government and the State government. This departs from the 60–40 guideline in the original fund.

If there are many States like mine that now are in a position to implement a recreational program and have the State money available, Isn't it important that we continue to adhere to the original formula?

I question seriously the advisability of departing now from the 60–40 formula since we have established it and we have adhered to it up to now.

Secretary UDALL. Senator, I certainly understand that many of the States have been aggressive, and I agree with you that this has been one of the finest things out of the program. I call the attention of the committee to the map that we have here. It looks a little bit like smallpox but shows what has been done in 3 years with Federal, local, and State projects with a few hundred million dollars. We could change the whole face of the land in the future if we should continue this for another decade or two.

I certainly welcome the strong State leadership which has been forthcoming. We should understand if we double the fund there is