

Mr. PENFOLD. I surely do.

Senator HANSEN. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ANDERSON. I do hope, Mr. Penfold, that all these organizations will pay some attention, and very heavy attention, to what Senator Allott has said. He serves on the Appropriations Committee. I have watched the results.

When you say that this ought to be doubled—\$400 million—it scares some people. I just want to underscore Senator Allott's statements. We can't have all the things at the present time.

Mr. PENFOLD. Senator Anderson, I think we are all conscious of this problem.

Mr. BURDICK. Thank you again.

Is Joseph Jaeger present?

If not, Charles Thompson, executive director, Landowners Protective Association, Harpers Ferry, Va., will be next.

**STATEMENT OF CHARLES P. THOMPSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
LANDOWNERS PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION**

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you for the chance to appear here today in opposition to S. 1401.

I have a full statement for the record, and also a supplemental statement for your information, upon State activity in land use policy in America, and I will confine my remarks to an outline.

Senator BURDICK. Your full statement will be made a part of the record at the end of your remarks.

Mr. THOMPSON. We oppose the bill because it does not provide the answer needed. We do not feel in this case that more dollars will do the job. We have heard during the progress of these hearings a statement that only by additional moneys can we solve the problems. We have heard also that we can't get enough money to solve the problem.

How far is it from that statement, then, to the statement that no amount of money will solve the problem?

It is our contention that the problem is so immense that it cannot be solved by calling into play all the resources available. Dollars alone cannot do the job, and the Government cannot afford to proceed on a "go it alone" policy in the matter of conservation and recreation. We think it is not wise to earmark those important funds. While the funds would, perhaps, act somewhat to counteract land price escalation, legal procedures are possible that perhaps could be more effective.

The proposals of the bill would not stop the escalating land management costs, which will become a real problem as this country acquires more land and attempts to keep it developed or properly managed.

So we would rather see these moneys left in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, where maximum flexibility is possible in their disposition. Perhaps it might be informative to apply the moneys for some fund where the States might set their priorities, and apply for the use of these funds. We should then see how many States would apply for funds for recreation.

There has been a question raised as to whether the States are lagging in the use of these funds by the commitment of counterpart funds.