

Already several properties have been condemned and the people can see the kind of prices that they will receive. For instance one family was offered \$1,400 for a property for which they paid \$8,000 three years ago. They can see that they cannot go out and buy another \$8,000 property with that \$1,400. What does a man do when he has lost his business-farm and he has young children to support?

To illustrate the discontent—here is a statement by Mr. George Trumbo of Pendleton County and a petition signed by approximately 300 persons in Grant County, West Virginia. Please note that this petition was taken around by two ladies and these 300 signatures were acquired in just one day. Their comment was they could have gotten a thousand names with a little more time. Only two persons refused to sign.

The Seneca Rocks-Spruce Knob project should be reconsidered. The plans should be held up until a re-evaluation can be made. Congress should go to see for itself and should hold hearings in Grant and Pendleton Counties.

These men and women are trained in one business—the food-producing business. They cannot pick up and go to the city easily and you do not want them there—to compound the city's problems.

City people sometimes do not understand that farmers always eat when city people don't; that the food-and-fiber producers is the only business that must buy supplies and equipment at retail prices and sell their products at wholesale prices; that the money remaining at the end of the year represents *savings*.

If you plan to pay such extremely low prices for their farms, why not set up a revolving fund by which they could borrow the necessary funds to match the amount above the condemnation price paid them for their farm to buy another and perhaps a better farm with more acreage.

The loan would be a non-interest-bearing loan for ten years and amortized in thirty years.

However, perhaps a better way would be to pay the full market price going in the community for the property plus ten percent for the inconvenience. This would give the owner leeway to negotiate for another place and would take the sting out of being dispossessed of property into which he had put his hopes and ambitions.

The government is going to pay out this money anyway either in welfare checks or in repairs for vandalism. These people were trained for specialist jobs in their food-producing businesses and unable to get another business-site, they would gravitate to the cities and to infrequent low-paid laborer's jobs.

Either long-term loans or higher prices would be more equitable and would ease parting with historic farms that their great-great-grandfathers literally carved out of the forest.

The discontent is not only in West Virginia. It is in every state where land is being acquired. The feeling of animosity toward the government is strong and deep—so strong it makes it doubtful whether it is desirable for the Congress to try to authorize this expenditure of funds during an election year.

Now for S. 1401. Section D would be an open faucet of funds for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Funds would be enormous from the Mineral Leasing Act, from leases of the off-shore shale-oils including the Louisiana funds and from the sales of forest products and leases. There is an estimated \$400 million in the Louisiana funds alone.

Even the Budget Bureau's proposal of a limitation of \$200 million a year for five years is too much for these times.

It is a time to set priorities. Even without the Vietnam War, it is time to decide what is most important to our people—land for food or land for play?

Money for play lands or money for education?

Now for the freehold, leasehold and exchange of property provisions. Where persons agree willingly to such arrangements there are no problems. It is when a person is paid \$2,000 for his farm against his will, then he is permitted to buy it back two years later. He must meet the top price bid by his competitors who now bid \$6,000. Thirty days is hardly time in which to learn of the opportunity, find the cash and notify the Secretary.

The exchange of property is a little ambiguous. Does this mean that a person within the confines of the national forest could ask the government to acquire a property outside the confines against the owner's will and then trade the properties?

This is a hornet's nest and is bound to stir up more resentment and animosity against the federal government.