

twice as much money available under the formula presumably for the States. I would like Dr. Crafts to comment on this. It may very well be that this could be balanced out so that we do not penalize the States that have vigorous programs. Maybe if the States that have weak programs, if their money lapsed quicker so that we would in effect be penalizing them for getting into action and using that money on the Federal side that the committee might consider something like this but I can see that there is keen interest in this and I am sure the States are going to speak up loud and clear as to their own wishes and we don't want to get into a big argument with them. We have our problems and they have their problems, too.

Dr. CRAFTS. I might just add a couple of remarks, Senator.

Quite a number of the States are in the same situation as Idaho where their obligations are up to their allocations and they have more money, State money, than there is Federal money to match. On the other hand, there are quite a number of States that are not in that situation. Under the terms of the present law, the apportionment to the State is for a 3-year period after which time the unspent portion reverts to the Secretary for reallocation to the States. It can't be allocated to a Federal purpose.

This 3-year period is really going to occur significantly for the first time this coming July. While the States are rapidly increasing their obligations at the present time, I think it quite likely that there may be some monies to reallocate from previous appropriated monies on the first of July to those States which are able to spend more than they have previously received. This could be done within the framework of the 50-50.

Now, the 50-50 is purely a judgment situation. Under the ceiling which is being recommended, \$200 million annually, there simply is not enough money, frankly, to meet the State and local needs and the Federal needs. The escalation in real estate is occurring in State and county purchases just as it is in Federal purchases.

If there were not so many recent Federal authorizations or if we were further along the road in completing the acquisition among those Federal authorizations, I think we would not have made this proposal to give the Federal a little larger share. Of course, the States, I think without exception, object to this.

I would point out to you, however, what the effect would be over the 5-year period. Under the 50-50 split is compared to the present ratio the States would receive an increase of some \$221 million. Under the 60-40 split as compared to the present guidelines the States would receive an increase of \$321 million. Therefore, the difference between the 50-50 split and the 60-40 split amounts to about \$100 million, or about \$2 million per State spread over 5 years.

Senator CHURCH. The only reason I am a little skeptical about changing the formula is that if we change it in the direction of enlarging the Federal share on the grounds that there is not enough money anyhow to take care of our increasing recreational need, one could use that argument to keep all the money for Federal recreational needs.

I think we started the program for the purpose of enlarging the State activity. This was the idea, if the States could get matching money they would greatly enlarge the totality of the recreation program for the people of the country. This has been successful.