

One is that the argument for the urgent need for immediate action is open to question. In the past several years, the Park Service has made estimates as to the number of their annual stickers that they sell, and according to the figures I have read, the amount is going to be only a small fraction, 20 to 30 percent, of what they had estimated, indicating that their future estimates of recreational needs may not always be sufficiently conservative.

Further, in the park closest to my home, the Harpers Ferry National Park, I am convinced that the claimed figure of over 700,000 individuals annually is greatly inflated by the goings and comings of local people.

I have tried to study this by watching the numbers of cars in the park as I go by there, which is frequently. It is not conceivable that they could add up anywhere near 700,000 and I think this is a case of an inaccurate method of making a statistical record of how many people go there. I just don't think it is possible. I talked this over with Mr. McGantz before I came up here, and from his knowledge of the park, he says it sounds as if my figures on this are reasonable.

I suspect that figures on the nationwide use of the parks are distorted by statistical error.

I feel the need for urgent haste is far from proven, and this is true of the area of Washington. The Park Service has had the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal for 30 years, and little use has been made of it. In Warren County, Va., it owns about 23,000 acres, most of which lies idle, while the administration demands more land acquisition. In neither of these cases is there indication that there are plans for prompt and effective use for existing Government land.

Second, the park program being planned would remove substantial portions of the land from the tax rolls. In my home county, the urgently needed program of school buildings would require the maximum possible bond issue under the law, and that is based on a percentage of the total assessed valuation of the land. If the park land program that the Interior Department is promoting were to be carried out, it is entirely probable that this program would be stalled, because it would then be legally impossible to raise the amount of money needed. I think this kind of problem would exist in other counties also, and it has to be considered in the acquisition of land.

We feel that the urgency isn't great enough, and other problems are great enough so that they should go a little slower than they have been going on this. To guard against such a danger, we propose that the bills, S. 1401 and H.R. 8578, be changed as follows: Title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 should be amended by adding at the end thereof—

SEC. 9. Moneys derived from the sources listed in Section 2 of this Act as amended shall not be used to acquire land or waters or interests in land or water by condemnation by any level of government without the prior written consent of the owner or owners. This same restriction shall apply to matching State funds required under Section 5(c) of this Act.

With regard to section 2 of S. 1401 and H.R. 8578 we also have serious reservations. We think it ill becomes the Federal Government to complain of escalation in land prices and then plan to make money by playing the same game. In Secretary Udall's letter of January 4, 1968, to Senator Jackson, he says on page 8 that Sec. 2(a) of the bill permits