

Senator HATFIELD. But it is not on the basis of any of the qualms you have about using such forest receipts for recreational purposes?

Secretary UDALL. No; we recommended it a year ago. We still think this is another way to do it. Probably not as preferable.

Senator HATFIELD. Do you think there might be other priorities on such national forest receipts than those which would be included in this kind of program?

Secretary UDALL. No. I know of none but there might be a desire at some time in the future to use them. I am not aware of any.

Senator HATFIELD. Do you know of any other priorities that the national forest receipts could be used for other than for this kind of program?

Secretary UDALL. I can't think of any.

Senator HATFIELD. In other words, this type of program would have the priority?

Secretary UDALL. I think again you have logic there.

Senator HATFIELD. The point, Mr. Secretary, that I think is very pertinent to this that I am trying to develop with you is that, as we have been called upon in this bill to consider the whole question of user fees, I think we are also called upon in this bill to consider the whole proposition of priorities, receipts being used for recreational development and economic development, jobs and commercial resources. I don't think it is an either/or. I think it is a question of balance.

As you and I have discussed some times before, you and I disagree as to what is the best balance at a particular time under existing circumstances. But let me just for the record indicate to you that from the Federal Forest Service we have an estimate of some \$10 billion that they feel will be necessary in the next 28 years to develop our national forests in terms of access roads, in terms of control of disease, in terms of the needs of thinning, and other sound conservation practices which are not unrelated in all instances to recreational development because many times there is a very good and close relationship.

In my State of Oregon we have the need in the next 28 years of \$1,129,000,000 for this development because today all the access roads in our State are only 20 percent up to standard. Eighty percent of them are in need of reconstruction. We have 23,767 nonexistent access roads which could and should be undertaken and constructed.

Consequently, when you place priorities of using national forest receipts for other than the development of our forest resources I think it is not a good priority and I think that it is not keeping the balance. That is why I wanted to discuss this with you, because eventually we are going to come head-on to this again. As you know, we have been holding public hearings in the Small Business Committee of the Senate on the question of log exports. As eloquently brought out in those hearings, we are suffering a very deep economic problem now in the Pacific Northwest, particularly in my State, because of the undeveloped program of the Forest Service in access roads and other things could possibly increase the allowable cut.

I only inject that at this point because it does seem to me that we are talking about the same subject in terms of not only recreation but industrial and economic development, as well.