

While speaking on S. 1401, it is an opportunity to comment on some of the ideas now current that are annoying the people.

Some of these are—

- the population explosion is upon us.
- we will need huge acreages of land for recreation.
- we must get the lands before the developers do.
- we must buy now before prices escalate.

The population explosion needs comparison. While the United States has a population of 200 million, Japan has a population of 100 million on a land-area the size of Montana.

Do we need huge acreages of land for recreational purposes? Recreation is the frosting on the cake of life. While camping and hunting and fishing are growing in numbers of enthusiasts, still 90 percent of the American people, according to a report by a U.S. Department of Commerce, would rather be spectators.

The question must also be raised. Is the government wise to urge people to invest heavily in recreation facilities when the industry will contract abruptly with the slightest economic strain.

We must get the lands before the developers do. Some old fellow whose name I don't recall said it isn't what one does in this life, it is the *way* it is done. It is the *way* it is done that is annoying the property owners. An educational program pointing out the necessity of county planning in rural areas and planning methods, not federal zoning, could take care of most of this problem but there is a suspicion on the part of the property-owner that the government plans to enter the real estate market for the benefit of the real estate developer and at the expense of the property-owner.

We must buy now before prices escalate. At the mean niggardly prices now being offered the property-owner, the government can acquire the property at any time-period in history and with the same increment of hatred. Land prices move up and down in relation to the market demand and the condition of the economy.

As for escalation after a park area is established by Congress, there are several ways of dealing with the speculators and of adjusting the inequities.

Has this Committee ever taken all of the land-acquisition acts and placed their powers and areas together to see just what is being done to this country?

With the Appalachian Commission, the Soil and Water Fund, the forests, the minerals under them, the national parks, wildlife refuges, waterfowl grazing areas, the shorelines of our streams and rivers and beaches, it would appear the federal government would assume ownership of the Appalachians from Mississippi to Maine.

America must retain her economic capability to produce food and fiber. Just when—under what conditions—do we decide the government has taken enough land?

Just when—under what conditions—dare we Not take anymore land resources away from the owner of a highly efficient food-producing business.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF LARRY L. CHAMBERS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Larry L. Chambers, a director of the Upper Potomac River Basin Protective Association, and vice president of the Potomac Basin Federation. I wish to express my appreciation at being allowed to testify here today.

This committee, having two bills to consider, S. 1401 and S. 1826, both of which can allocate the same funds for two different purposes, must determine which is the more critical purpose. The essential need of education or the luxury of recreation!

A representative of West Virginia appeared before this committee recently and gave testimony in favor of S. 1401. He stated that over the next 5 years \$42 million would be necessary for acquisition of land and development of recreational facilities in West Virginia. At the same time in the West Virginia Legislature a bill was being considered that would allow horseracing on Sunday and the justification was that it would provide \$1½ million annually for an increase in teacher's salaries. The bill was defeated and our educators are still in need of higher salaries.

My own hometown of Martinsburg could not provide a mechanical drawing teacher this past year, as the salary was so low that no one would accept the position. Entrance requirements in most college engineering courses demand that students have had this subject in their high school curriculum.