

increased, but at a slow rate because sufficient attractive facilities have not been provided. The budgets approved for the Board have barely permitted maintenance and operation. For the 1962-64 biennium, the budget was only \$542,726. In 1964-66, it was only \$686,166. Although it increased to \$797,088 for 1966-68, it was quite inadequate for the tremendous development job needed. The budget of \$850,251 requested for 1968-70 again falls short of providing for the minimum needs. Many states have available annually for one of their facilities more funds than are provided annually for the entire State of Mississippi.

The problem of inadequacy of funds provided by the state has been compounded by the contingent nature of the development funds provided by the law now in effect. The formation of long range plans has been hampered by uncertainty about the amounts of funds that would become available. Implementation of plans, especially acquisition of lands, has also been hampered. Bill S. 1401, by providing a stabilized minimum annual sum for development for five years, would largely solve this problem.

Mississippi's failure to provide adequate recreational facilities has not been due to lack of interest on the part of its leadership. On the contrary, the interest has been steady and intense. The need has been recognized, but the resources available could not be stretched to cover recreational needs.

The fact that the per capita income in Mississippi is the lowest in the nation is well known. Actually, its per capita income is only sixty per cent of that for the United States.

The pressure of basic needs, especially those of education and the highway system, upon the state's resources are great. The percentage of per capita income spent on education in Mississippi ranks high among the several states; however, Mississippi's expenditure per student places it at the bottom of the array of states. Educational needs for the next biennium are estimated by educational leaders to exceed the recommended budget by eighty million dollars.

The state highway system was built, for the most part, in the 1930's. Not only have additions to the system been too few to meet the growing demands, but maintenance of the existing system has been substandard. The pressure of these highway needs has made difficult the allocation of funds for recreational purposes. In fact, pressures of education, the highway system and operation of the state government have kept the state's recreational developments at the survival level.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Many of Mississippi's potential recreational facilities offer promise of becoming attractive to tourists from all corners of the nation. The undeveloped offshore islands in the Gulf of Mexico and the proposed Great River Road Scenic Highway along the Mississippi River are examples. Mississippi has water resources, both streams and lakes, to an extent equalled in few states. Preservation of and development of these resources will provide the state and the nation with an outstanding recreational resource. These streams and lakes are now largely in their natural state, but cannot remain thus for long. In a short time the public may well be excluded from their use, unless action is planned now and plans implemented quickly.

Bill S. 1401 may provide for Mississippi the only hope for preservation for the enjoyment of all of the people the great opportunities that are now available for development within its boundaries.

Sincerely,

SWEP T. DAVIS, *President.*

WESTERN FORESTRY & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., February 21, 1968.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Reference is made to S. 1401, a bill to amend Title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

Western Forestry and Conservation Association submitted a statement to your Committee in a letter to you under date of March 5, 1963, in which the general idea of recreation user fees was supported and the establishment of a Land and Water Conservation Fund approved. In this testimony, however, a strong plea was made for consideration of the use of such funds in developing recreation areas and for maintenance of facilities and administration of these