

Area and as a resident of the State of Idaho. It is also made as a representative of other substantial landowners in the area.

It is most important to recognize two factors in the evaluation of S. 1267 or any similar legislation.

First, that there is a growing emphasis and even need for recreational facilities and the preservation of natural beauty for this and future generations.

Secondly, that the residents of the sparsely populated and scenic Western States will be proportionately more affected by this problem, and further, that in terms of numerical representation in Congress, they will be in the poorest position to defend themselves and their property rights in the event of a Federal acquisition.

In the light of these two factors, it becomes increasingly important that special care be exercised in drafting this comparatively new legislation which may well serve as a pattern for future legislation.

The response of the honorable Senators from Idaho to the opinions and needs of the deeded landowners in the Stanley area has been most gratifying. Senate bill 1267 represents a direct and equitable reaction to the testimony at the Sun Valley hearing on the original Senate bills 3294 and 3295. It recognizes a very basic principle necessary to this type of legislation; namely, that the protection, operation, and administration of the area will be the responsibility of the Forest Service; here their discretion should end. Whatever they might be, they are not a judicial or legislative body and the rights and dignity of deeded property owners should not be subject to their judicious whims. Theirs should be the responsibility to answer to the landowners beyond the rights which have been taken from the owners and given to the Forest Service under this law.

By so testifying, I do not mean to discredit the many commendable accomplishments of the Forest Service. I do mean to be realistic. I do not believe that the Forest Service is being forced into the protection of the area. I do believe that their authority and control will be a growing and demanding thing. This may even be by necessity but whatever the reason or however meritorious their reasons, the fact is that as they take so gives the deeded landowner. It is for this reason that I urge you to draw a distinct line between the administration of the land and the protection of the landowners in the wording of this legislation.

In theory, the right to exchange and the right to hearings offer some protection, but these are more theoretical than practical. Exchanges under the proposed law, if desired by the landowner, would be strictly at the discretion and generosity of the Forest Service. Hearings are the slow, tedious, and costly tools of the unhurried.

The real protection of the landowner lies in the sections dealing with scenic easements and compulsory Government acquisitions at the owners' demand. There is considerable livestock business in the area but the most economic use of this land will ultimately be related to its scenic beauty and recreational potential. The current land values are substantially higher than the current capitalized agricultural earnings of that land.

The right to capitalize on this beauty is as valuable to the Stanley landowner as the oil rights on a Texas ranch. If these values are not real, then the Federal Government has no business moving into this area as a protector and administrator. The scenic values and the