

their counterpart funds. With the States lagging it is foreseen that more emphasis will be put on federal acquisition.

It is appropriate to readjudicate our land acquisition policies and the climate under which they were established. Land prices are only one thing that is escalating—land management costs are skyrocketing. Early buying may reduce one but not the other. We must not act in haste lest earlybuy become overbuy.

And so to return to the two questions asked at the beginning, it now becomes apparent that we must answer the second before the first. We must clearly know what our needs are before committing our limited assets. In determining what our needs are we must ask two more questions:

- (1) How are we using the lands that we have (in public ownership)?
- (2) Who is responsible for conserving natural resources?

In considering the first of these questions we must realize that the potential of developed lands may be far greater than envisioned at present. Should this prove true, it could and should affect our land acquisition policies with regard to how much land we need to own publicly. Yet in the haste to acquire brought about by fear of Land Price Escalation, we are devoting our assets to acquisition and not sufficiently to much needed development.

In considering the second question as to who bears the burden—we may answer—we all do. But it is one thing to acknowledge this fact and another to act properly upon this knowledge. If we are operating today under a climate where the government is dominant in the field of natural resource conservation then perhaps we may question whether a partnership might not be more beneficial for all. We know what the problems are. Let us then appraise the climate under which they seek solution.

In my statement before the Public Land Law Review Commission (submitted here also for the record) I described the present climate as being one in which the federal government found itself forced to move in to fill a vacuum—a lack of willingness on the part of many lesser jurisdictions to come to grips with their natural resource problems. I also stated that this vacuum was created by the government itself and by this I did not mean it was done in a conscious effort to do so, but rather that it came about as a result of our internal economic policies which have acted to leave these jurisdictions wanting the means with which to solve such problems. I have earlier cited a good example: the slowness with which the States are moving to commit their counterpart funds for land acquisition under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Investigation will show no lack of desire but rather a lack of means to do the job.

The American Landowner sees these three things:

- (1) Natural Resource problems are growing, not declining.
- (2) The term Public Purpose is receiving ever widening definition.
- (3) Land acquisition programs are on the increase.

In addition to fearing for his dominion over his land, the American Landowner does not believe the government can go it alone in solving natural resource problems. This country cannot afford to own all the land and water resources which are in some way endangered. Economically we cannot afford it—politically we dare not try it.

In light of the serious question about the climate today it is appropriate for us to request that this bill and others with the same purpose be defeated, that the funds in question be left in the miscellaneous receipts of the treasury where Congress shall have maximum flexibility in their disbursement. It is hoped that these funds will be devoted to programs, the direction of which is not in such grave question. We would not make such a suggestion if we believed that today's climate were the only possible one.

But we foresee another climate, one in which a true partnership will exist between public and private enterprise. When this climate is fully established the government will need and ask for less land. Much land now in public ownership will be returned to the private domain. The government, freed from increased acquisition and management costs, will be enabled to advance other beneficial programs. Private enterprise, freed from the fear of government encroachment, cognizant of its responsibilities and the penalties attendant upon the failure to meet them, will assume its rightful and just partnership. Both parties shall then bring about that association which always and everywhere leads to the total enrichment of the State.

And so now we have some answers to the questions we have considered here today. Natural resource problems can be solved only by calling on the full range of human resources at our command. All must share the burden and all must be given the chance to define and take up their role. In looking to this climate