

Federal timber should be offered for sale at prices and under terms and conditions which will foster a continuously healthy industry; support employment; and stabilize dependent communities. At the same time, government recreation programs should be geared to demonstrated public interest and not to subjective estimates of recreational demand.

We are pleased to note that the Public Land Law Review Commission's Study No. 15 on Outdoor Recreation will place "emphasis on testing criteria employed in allocating public lands to various kinds of outdoor recreation, and examining the effects of the policies and practices under which such recreation opportunity is made available to the public." This particular study would undoubtedly make a valuable contribution to the Congress' deliberations in making a decision as to whether or not additional revenues should be earmarked to the land and water conservation fund. The ultimate decision should be made in the light of the desirability of policies which will insure a high degree of multiple use of lands under government ownership, and, to the extent feasible, a conversion of such lands so as to achieve the same multiple use under private ownership. The decision should also give full recognition to the economic and social desirability of forest-based industrial operations in the rural areas of the United States.

Although Secretary Udall asked for additional revenues to be paid into the fund, he nevertheless claims that the fund has accomplished much, been remarkably successful, and is not a failure. The fund certainly has been successful if it is evaluated in terms of whether it has substantially added to the already excessive land ownership of the Federal Government. Secretary Udall has stated "For example, the three Federal agencies—National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—have acquired about 310 thousand acres with an expenditure of \$880 million since the initiation of the fund." It should be pointed out that this is at an average price of \$285 per acre. Secretary Udall has also pointed out that the 89th Congress authorized 23 new Federal recreation areas involving the acquisition of 250 thousand acres at the total cost of \$119 million. It should be pointed out that this is an average cost of over \$475 per acre.

Secretary Udall has also stated that "Our minimum estimate is that established and recently authorized areas of the National Park System need about \$318 million for acquisition, and new areas which the Administration is supporting before the Congress would need an additional \$160 million or a total of \$478 million." This perhaps would purchase an additional 1 million acres of land for recreational purposes.

Secretary Udall has referred to the great escalation of land prices and supports a provision for two years advance contract authority up to \$30 million per year for the acquisition of property within authorized areas. The Secretary stated:

"Such authority will enable the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to negotiate land purchase contracts as soon as new recreation areas are authorized or in other authorized areas where there is need to move swiftly.

"The need for advance land purchase contract authority for federal agencies participating in the Land and Water Conservation Fund arises from the normally unavoidable time lag between authorization of an area by Congress and the first appropriation for such area. The lag for recent authorizations has averaged about 9 months. This is a critical period when land values often rise most sharply.

"The escalation problem would be reduced and substantial savings made if agencies were authorized to proceed with mapping, land title search and other acquisition planning and to acquire quickly or obtain options for key recreation tracts most in danger of rising land values."

There is a serious question as to the propriety of such advance authority to tie up land prior to the time when Congress has actually made an appropriation for its purchase. In addition, this dubious device carries with it no assurance against land price escalation. The rise in prices in great part is due to the operation of factors of supply and demand, and if the demand factor enters the picture sooner than it might otherwise, it is quite probable that the only result will be to accelerate the increases in the land values and prices.

Secretary Udall appears to recognize the concept of the compatibility of recreational uses with economic uses under proper multiple use management. However, he does not push this concept to its ultimate conclusion. He states that