

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. But if they do not meet your regulations and standards, then what happens?

Mr. CRAFTS. Then I think it ought to be possible to condemn them if they are in key spots and this is a necessary component. I know this is a very unpopular posture today, but as a last resort, if they are in key spots, whether they be public or private, they need to be managed either in a way that fits the intent of the legislation or they need to be acquired and either leased back or sold back on appropriate terms and conditions. And I can cite you one example from my own experience, which goes back quite a few years when I was in the Forest Service. In the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, with which you are undoubtedly familiar, there was no provision for condemnation. We negotiated and negotiated and negotiated. Gradually we acquired most of the lands through negotiation over a period of time.

Every time we bought a piece of land through negotiation, we enhanced the value of the land of people who would not sell. What was left were high-priced resorts, private hunting lodges owned sometimes by major companies, other organizations of one sort or another, and ultimately we were at a stalemate—there was no further possibility.

So the situation we were in there—and it is not entirely comparable to what we have here because that was a big area. But we had a few resort people who were benefiting by the expenditure of Federal money, benefiting by the cooperativeness of the many other landowners, mostly the small ones.

They had what in effect was a national park or wilderness area around them. They enjoyed all the benefits from it.

We finally went to Congress and reviewed the history of these 10 or 15 years of negotiation, and asked them for condemnation authority—went before the Agriculture Committee. And it was given to us at that time.

The situation has been cleaned up. Without it, it never would have been cleaned up. I think the Federal Government paid more in the long run than it would otherwise pay.

Mr. ASPINALL. I did not make myself clear, Doctor. What I am trying to find out is what are you going to do if the State and the local political subdivisions do not cooperate with you.

Mr. CRAFTS. Under the bill, as we recommend it be amended, if the political subdivisions will not cooperate and the land involved is in a key spot, then we would exercise eminent domain.

Mr. ASPINALL. But you do not have it under this bill, as I understood your statement.

Mr. CRAFTS. We asked for it under this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Was your testimony to that effect?

Mr. CRAFTS. I believe so.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thought your testimony was to the effect that you wanted condemnation authority for private property, but not for State-owned land or public—

Mr. CRAFTS. Let me read the sentence, Mr. Chairman. It is in the middle of page 11.

The Department recommends that private lands be subject to eminent domain, but not state-owned lands or lands owned by a political subdivision of the state if it is following a plan of management and protection—consonant with the purposes of the Act.