

Evidently they do have other priorities. We do not attempt to downgrade recreation, but ask that it be placed in its proper perspective.

This country cannot own all the land and water resources which need conservation or direction toward conservation. Economically, we cannot afford it. Politically, we dare not try it.

We ask, then, in conclusion, that the Federal Government, which has looked to the States and the counties for help in advancing these programs, perhaps look to some other parties in this country for help. Many of these parties which we might mention control more moneys than some of the political jurisdictions do and we would hope, in the future, consideration be given to the possible role that private enterprise might play in solving the national resource, environmental, and recreational problems of America.

Gentlemen, I thank you.

Senator BURDICK. Senator Jordan.

Senator JORDAN. I have no questions.

Senator BURDICK. Senator Hansen.

Senator HANSEN. I have no questions. I think you made a very good statement.

(The statement referred to follows:)

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

The bill under consideration today as well as other bills of the same nature, would act to speed up land acquisition within the framework of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Before Congress gives up its control of the monies under discussion it would be well to consider two questions:

- (1) Could these monies be directed to some more useful purpose?
- (2) How much land must the public own?

We do not ask how much land is needed to meet proper land and water conservation goals, for it would be a gross error to define how much land was necessary to meet such goals and then to set that figure as the sum of acres which must be transferred to public ownership. Can these goals be met only by public authorities?

Following, as it is necessary to do, the basic tenets of standards business practice, we ought to take inventory of our assets and clearly define our needs before expending any of our assets. It seems to me that we have done neither. A vast area of human resources has not been brought into play and our needs have been projected but not adequately defined. This definition must be a precise one to guard against overbuy. The consequences of this overbuy are only too apparent to those of us who watch anxiously as the tax-paying private domain is daily diminished and try to foresee the results when this country disturbs the balance between public and private ownership.

We are faced with natural resource problems and we are faced with limited means with which to cope with such problems. The natural resource problems we will have until the correct method of dealing with them is devised. The problem of means will not be solved until we revise our ideas as to just who must bear the burden for solving our natural resource difficulties. A government got it alone policy is neither desired by nor feasible for our government.

Last year we reported to our members that Interior had given a House Subcommittee on appropriations a report on Land Price Escalation. This report was the result of 6 months study by various agencies of Interior—chiefly the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Its purpose was to examine the effect of price escalation in connection with needed purchase of recreational lands and waters for public purposes. The report suggested a 10 year program within the framework of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and supported those portions of the President's budget document calling for an advance payment to the fund to make money for acquisition available quickly. With \$110 millions in estimated receipts the document proposed the Fund be advanced \$32 million—this in spite of administration admission of the fact that the States were lagging in committing