

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Mott, for a very fine statement. I think what you have said dramatizes quite vividly the need for additional funds to assist the States.

I might mention that Senator Kuchel is a cosponsor on S. 1401. He regrets that he is not able to be here this afternoon. He was here this morning, as you know, and he is tied up in another meeting.

Mr. MOTT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Again I want to thank you for a very fine statement.

Mr. MOTT. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Spencer Smith, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources. Dr. Smith, it is always a pleasure to welcome you back to the committee, and we look forward to your statement.

STATEMENT OF SPENCER M. SMITH, JR., SECRETARY, CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Dr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Some of my statement is repetitious, and I shall avoid reading it anew, and simply highlight some of the aspects of it, commenting on one or two things.

There has been some discussion as to whether the fund has failed. I don't think the land and water conservation fund has failed, but I think there is general agreement that it has not come up to the level of attainment that most people thought that it would.

First, in not attaining the amount that had been anticipated because of the failure of user fees to come up to the levels that were generally estimated; second, the appreciation of land values, though everyone thought that land values would increase, no one suggested or even thought, not even the wisest, at the time the original act was being formulated, that they would rise as fast as they did; and third, the rapid increase in land values coupled with the delay between the time of authorization and the time of purchase is one of the reasons that the authorizations have been so inadequate to meet the Federal obligation.

I would also add another reason, the total dependence on the fund for financing only inholdings and certain special lands contiguous to already established areas, but also to require that the Federal Government be responsible totally for all purchases, in land acquisitions.

I should like to point out that the States, under the statute, were allowed to receive money on a matching basis for three primary purposes. First, for the planning and staffing that was necessary; second, for recreational development; and third, for land acquisition.

Now, it has been pointed out that, in many instances, the substantive amounts going to certain States were for land acquisition. I think it would be helpful, however, if the committee had before it what the total experience under the grants to the States have been, in terms of whether they have used 40, 50, or 60, or whatever percentage it was for land acquisition.

It occurred to me that, since the Federal Government under the statutes, is limited solely to land acquisition, that this has been one of the reasons causing the lapse of time between authorization and financing. The Secretary made the recommendation that this be 50-50 in order to alleviate this situation.