



Family told: Move it or lose it

Six-year land dispute may end in demolition of house

They've been battling over the land for six years.

The Natales say the deed to their 42 acre property allowed them to build a farmhouse on the land as an accessory use to their crop farming operation.

Eleanor Morris, who along with her husband Samuel founded The French and Pkering Creeks Conservation Trust, says a restriction on the deed was clear. The land was to be used for farming, a wildlife sanctuary or the study of natural history.

The adversaries have wrestled through Chester County Court where a judge found in favor of the Natale family in April 1990. A month later, he denied the Trust's request for an injunction to stop them from building the house.

Ronald and Janet Natale built their house. But Morris didn't give up.

She took the battle to the state Superior Court. In October 1993, the panel of judges reversed then Chester County Judge Charles Smith's decision.

The Natales went to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court heard the appeal but dismissed it, saying it should be decided at the county level.

Now the feud is once again in county court.

The Trust has made its demand: Move the house.

But the Natales say they aren't moving.

"They don't care what happens to us," said Ron Natale, 41, of 514 Pughstown Road. "Just get the house off and they want the property back. They've destroyed this family. The kids are upset. They don't know where we're going to live. I'm tired of the way Sam and Eleanor seem to have a little fiefdom, like they are the ruling class."

Natale said he's going broke on legal fees trying to stop the Trust from taking his home. He isn't even farming the property anymore because he can't get loans while the property is in litigation.

Natale said the Trust has offered to give the Natales a two or three acre lot and \$50,000 to help them relocate the two-story colonial-style house. But he said the cost of engineering alone would cost about \$98,000 and the size of the house — 4,900 square feet — would make it virtually impossible to move through the winding country roads.

Moving would also be traumatic for their daughters, Nikki, 17, and Amber, 15, and Natale's elderly parents also live in the house.

Natale said he offered to let the Trust change the deed to make the restriction more specific, in exchange for letting them keep the house on the land. But the Trust refused.

"I worked many, many years and we sacrificed to pay for our farm equipment to get out here," Natale said. "We lived in a mobile home for 15 years. I'm all for preserving open space and saving the environment. The principles the Trust stands for, I'm all for them, but not at the destruction of the farmer."

Morris said the Natales knew when they purchased the land that it was restricted.

"They went ahead and willfully built the house when they knew that the tract was strictly for open space," Morris said.

The wording on the deed reads: "The property shall be restricted to farming or to use as a wildlife sanctuary or nature conservation area, and for study of natural history. No buildings or structure shall be placed thereon, other than small buildings or structures accessory to

such uses and for the exclusive use of the property and small signs advertising the property for sale or rent."

The property is very important to Morris. Back in the 1960s when the Trust was formed, the 42 acres was part of a larger farm straddling the Pughstown Road about 1 1/2 miles east of Rt. 100.

"It was the original tract on which the Trust was started—in that sense it's a very important tract," Morris said.

The tract is near the French Creek but does not border it. When another piece of land became available on the creek, the Trust had to sell the 42 acres to buy the new tract. The tract was sold to farmer Chester Soltys III, Morris said.

"It was to forever remain in open space," Morris said. "Everybody was aware of the restrictions."

In April 1989, Soltys sold the property to the Natales. When the Natales filed for a building permit with the township, the Trust pursued legal avenues to stop them.

"We filed all kinds of injunctions and papers—there's stacks of them," Morris said. "For some reason Judge Smith didn't see it this way."

A hearing on the matter is scheduled for September 25 in Chester County Court, this time before Judge Leonard Sagerman. Morris said the outcome would have a major impact on the future of the Trust.

"These cases are precedent setting," Morris said. "That's why they are so important."

Editor's Note: The Chester County Court hearing originally scheduled for September 25th has been delayed until November 2nd. PLA will attempt to report further developments in future editions of the *Landowner*.

By Katie Lee Bailey of *The Mercury*, 8/11/95. Reprinted with permission.

strengthening our organizational efforts in one of the following ways:



New Membership Recruitment

As a grassroots organization, our strength is in our numbers. Membership expansion provides a louder and clearer message to the preservationists, media and government officials. With the holiday season approaching, give a PLA membership as a gift. What a great way to spread the message! Included with your membership is our bi-monthly publication, *Pennsylvania Landowner*, which contains legislative, informative and common sense environmental information.



Corporate and Business Support

It makes good business sense to spread the PLA word through your occupational affiliations. It's effective and doesn't take a special skill or much time. As part of your commitment, purchase PLA memberships for clients or employees. Introduce a way to help protect your friends and employees private property rights for themselves, their families and their country. Be creative - offer your products or resources for the organization's financial benefit.



Membership Participation

When asked to participate in a letter writing campaign such as letters to the editor or specific legislators regarding a pending bill, DO IT!!!! Don't procrastinate - your letter will make a difference. Keep in mind, you do not need to be a scholar to offer your opinion. Don't depend on someone else to do it. And during the limited occasions when volunteers are recruited for community events such as fairs and local exhibits, offer yourself and your resources willingly.



Financial Commitment

If you are unable to participate in any of the above suggested areas, consider a contribution, in any dollar amount, to help facilitate the organization's goals and objectives. It will be money well spent and prudently utilized by PLA.

OUR FUTURE IS IN YOUR HANDS

The PLA Board of Directors and many volunteer members are tenaciously working to protect private property rights for all of us, including our most precious resource — our children.

Although we are faced with a powerful "green movement" and unaccountable bureaucrats who want to lock up the land and regulate people from utilizing our natural resources, our children are depending on each of us to provide them with the American Dream of owning and using one's property.

As emphatically stated many times in the past, it is our belief that a balance can be achieved for environmental preservation and protection of private property rights. With your help, we believe that we will be successful in striking that balance. Involvement by you at the grassroots level is more effective in protecting our families than employing lobbyists in Harrisburg and Washington, DC.

PLA is depending on you to help win this war. Consider your children's future by



Brookville Wood Products of Brookville, PA, has been a long-time supporter of PLA and its causes. The company has once again chosen to purchase PLA annual memberships for each of its new clients for the 1995-96 year in an effort to inform and educate others about pending property rights issues, while lending financial support to the organization.

Shown in photo is PLA Vice-President Robert Brace (left) greeting Lee Stützing, Brookville Wood Product's general manager (right) at a recent meeting in Brookville, PA.



Businesses such as Miss Caroline's Country Market of Waterford, PA, help to support PLA and the property rights cause by donating products for fund raising raffles at local events.

As in the past, Miss Caroline's again provided PLA with merchandise for one of this year's fund raisers. Shown in photo is Ramona Johnson, store proprietor, (left) and local artist Barb Hoffman (right) who, together, donated unique products for the event.

CLOSE IDAHO?

THEY CAN'T JUST CLOSE IDAHO, CAN THEY?

Editor's Note: Grassroots organizations throughout the country depend greatly upon their members to ensure positive results. That's what the "grassroots" movement is all about ... hearing from America's heart and soul ... YOU! Below is an article reprinted from *People For The West!*, just one of many grassroots organizations throughout the country who have made a real difference by speaking out. As you will witness from the article, membership involvement and recruitment is considered vital to the entire property rights movement, and especially for the future of our children and grandchildren.

Well, the Greens are trying. They won't be satisfied until rural America is locked up and turned into a park—a park for those healthy and wealthy enough to use it.

The only way to fight their elitist agenda is to ORGANIZE AND RECRUIT! If we're going to pass our way of life on to our children, we must strengthen our organization now. As a grassroots organization, our strength is in our numbers.

Spread the word about our struggle by giving memberships as gifts. Fight the distortions of the media by signing up new members in the east.

Your eastern friends and relatives will not get the facts about our situation if you do not inform them—and the *People for the West!* newspaper is a great way to do so. Our common sense message must get through to everyone in the country. The more we expand our membership, the louder and clearer that message gets.

Don't just think of people who work in the resource industries as potential members. Anyone who eats, anyone who uses metal products, anyone who enjoys camping, hunting, or fishing is a potential member.

The Greens are well financed and enjoy a sympathetic, uncritical press. The only way to fight them is with grassroots power. When we are complacent, when we stand by and let others carry on our struggle, we play into their hands.

Elite busy-bodies seem to do everything they can to ensure that the only jobs available to our children will be waiting on their tables. We must constantly recruit new members from all walks of life to fight their radical agenda and protect private property rights, public lands access, and natural resource production.

People for the West! has something much more powerful than a lobbyist stationed on Capitol Hill. We have legions of chapters and members who know how to work within the system to protect themselves and to gather strength.

RECRUIT! Spread the word about the PFW campaign everywhere you go. Use a membership application to sponsor a friend. Our grassroots movement must become national if we are to stand up to the powerful forces that would lock up the land and run our lives with regulations that are redundant, overbearing, intrusive, and ... often just plain stupid.

Reprint courtesy of People For The West!

We Need Letters ... Lots and Lots of Letters

In support of legislators from the U.S. House of Representatives who have had the foresight and courage to pass H.R. 961, the Clean Water Act Reauthorization, which includes wetland reforms, and to promote final passage of this bill, we encourage you to write a letter to your local newspaper favoring enactment of this bill.

Across the United States, legislators have been under fire from the environmental movement, who have deemed this bill "the dirty water bill." Misinformation and distortions regarding the intent of H.R. 961 have received high media profile. Negative advertisement campaigns have been promoted in many communities. The window of opportunity needed to pass comprehensive wetlands legislation is fast passing. We need your help now! You can help create a better understanding of this legislation in your community by writing a letter to the editor to clarify the contents of the bill, or simply voice your opinion regarding the current unfairness to property owners and why a bill like H.R. 961 is needed. For specific details regarding H.R. 961, see page 3 of the August, 1995 edition of the *Pennsylvania Landowner*, or call the PLA office for a fact sheet regarding this legislation.



Responsible congressmen such as Phil English (PA-21st), who have voiced support for wetland reform and H.R. 961, are taking a great deal of flak from the green movement. PLA Assistant Executive Director, Lorraine Bucklin (l) offers reassurance and appreciation on behalf of landowners to Representative English (r).

WHOSE PROPERTY IS IT?

DO WE REALLY HAVE TO ASK?

By Henry Ingram, Esq.

The emergence of property rights as a national and Pennsylvania political issue over the past five years has caused great hue and cry among environmental regulators, politicians and the anti-development/preservationist lobby. It was spawned in large measure by the growth of state and federal land use regulation over the past two decades, which has sparked a firestorm of grass roots agitation. Landowners around the country are upset with their government for denying them the free use of their land in the name of protecting endangered species, maintaining "wild and scenic" rivers, preserving wetlands, and establishing parks. Indeed, literally dozens of state and federal statutes and programs restrict the non-harmful use of private property.

Politicians and regulators are confused. They think: "Look at all the good we've done and now the voters are mad! What happened?" What happened is things just went too far and the system is out of balance.

Politicians began to wake up to the fact that ecosystems and biodiversity don't pay taxes; and the shrill voices of the large anti-development organizations don't always have the votes and they certainly don't pay taxes. In fact it's the other way around. They get tax dollars from you and me through direct government grants and other thinly disguised transfer payments. However it seems that the voices of hard working, tax paying, voting, ordinary citizens are being heard.

A good example can be found in Indiana County where recently the County Commissioners voted down a contract to conduct a Natural Heritage Inventory funded in part by Key '93 money. There was just too much public opposition. According to press reports, local citizens were concerned that an NHI would lead to even more excessive environmental regulations. This shows what can be accomplished if landowners stay awake and stay together. Ameri-

cans believe deeply in the right to private property. According to Competitive Enterprise Institute, Democratic pollster Celinda Lake found that two-thirds of Americans believe that property rights are inadequately protected under current law. Similarly, while polls seem to indicate broad public support for current environmental laws, those same polls show strong public sentiment in favor of compensation for regulatory takings. A 1995 Roper-Starch poll found that 66 percent of Americans think that "the government should be required to compensate" individuals and businesses who suffer land devaluations due to federal wetlands and species protection regulations. Only 26 percent said the government should not.

Property rights organizations are now active in every state in the nation. As of October 1994, a dozen states had enacted property rights protections of some kind and legislation is being pursued in dozens of others including Pennsylvania. Property rights were an issue in the last election cycle. It is clear that candidates were not helped if they appeared to oppose increased protection of private property. Many believe that the issue of property rights increased the Republican majority in the House by at least ten seats. Remember the Contract with America?

The two federal laws and state counterparts responsible for the lion's share of regulatory takings are the Endangered Species Act ("ESA") and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act ("CWA"), the source of regulations severely limiting the development of privately owned wetlands. However it would be a mistake to believe that these are the only two federal laws that unduly limit the use of private land. Any bill that seeks to protect the property rights of Americans must cover all laws that deprive landowners of the reasonable use of their land. There is no rational basis upon which to pick and choose which laws, environmental or otherwise, should be covered. Regrettably, the bill that passed the House as part of the Contract with America applies only to a handful of laws.

Nonetheless, because the ESA and the CWA's Section 404 are the primary focus of landowner ire, they merit special attention. According to the General Accounting Office, over 75 percent of those species currently

A 1995 Roper-Starch poll found that 66 percent of Americans think that "the government should be required to compensate" individuals and businesses who suffer land devaluations due to federal wetlands and species protection regulations. Only 26 percent said the government should not.

listed under the ESA rely upon private land for some or all of their habitat. In the case of wetlands, approximately three-fourths of the lands that meet the regulatory definition of "wetlands" are on private land.

Thus, as long as government continues to rely upon regulation to protect these so-called public resources, widespread conflicts with private landowners will continue. Despite the public uproar over excessive regulations, restrictions on land use continue to roll off the government red tape machines. Take a look at the draft management plan for the Allegheny River issued recently pursuant to the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act. It is certainly no model of sensitivity to private property rights. And proponents of "absolute protection" for the River are crying the blues because more federal (meaning taxpayer) money is not available to lock up even more riparian private property. And keep an eye on this: the new Pennsylvania Department of Conserva-

tion and Natural Resources has announced \$920,000 in "state grants" to governments and preservation groups for rails to trails projects in five counties in Southwest Pennsylvania. They call it state money but it is actually Key '93 money which comes from realty transfer taxes we pay. It will be used to facilitate the acquisition of more land for "public use." Why don't we fix our roads or existing parks first? And although the Ridge Administration has marginally altered the application of wetlands regulations so as to blunt their impact on private parties, particularly small lot developers, the reform doesn't go far enough.

The strongest opposition to the protection of property rights comes from representatives of the environmental, anti-development establishment. The standard charge against paying compensation for regulatory takings is that this would involve "paying polluters not to pollute" and lead to porn shops next to schools and liquor stores next to churches and therefore would undermine the protection of public health and safety. Who do these people think they're kidding? When is the last time readers of the *Landowner* tried to put a porn shop next to a church or school?! When someone starts lashing out with this kind of counterintuitive, *ad hominem* attack in debate on a public policy issue, you know you have him on the run!

The proper aim of government efforts to protect "the environment" is to prevent activities which harm the environment or thrust harmful substances upon unconsenting persons and their properties; and, failing that, to punish those who violate the rights of others in this manner. This is the aim of controlling pollution — controlling the unwanted imposition of wastes or toxins by one party on another.

Indeed, the current controversy over property rights should not be viewed as being about government pollution control efforts or protection of public health and safety. Most property rights advocates are rebelling against federal government regulations, largely environmental, that restrict the reasonable use of private land. Most "takings" cases arise not when public health is at risk, but when the rights of landowners are suppressed by the exercise of bureaucratic power for non-essential, usually aesthetic, purposes.

**Properly understood,
property rights do not
undermine sound
environmental
conservation, they are
its foundation.**

Groups opposing property rights legislation typically argue that federal environmental laws do not take private land, and that requiring compensation for regulatory takings would impose an extreme financial burden upon the government. These two arguments are contradictory, and takings opponents cannot have it both ways. Either property rights are not being violated, and a takings compensation requirement would be a superfluous enactment, or violations are rampant, and substantial amounts would have to be paid in compensation. Only one of these arguments can be true.

The Clinton Administration has implicitly acknowledged that the latter is more likely to be the case. In a June 7 letter to Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch, White House Office of Management and Budget Director Alice Rivlin claimed that the House property rights bill would cost \$28 billion over the next seven years. For the federal government to be exposed to such financial claims, federal regulations must be infringing upon the rights of landowners on an unprecedented scale.

Overblown claims about the potential cost of a takings compensation requirement obscure the more fundamental issue. Land-use restrictions inevitably entail costs. The real issue is who should bear those costs. In a recent newsletter, the Competitive Enterprise Institute cited James Huffman, Dean of the Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College on this point. He said:

The pervasive notion that society can avoid the costs of public action if government can avoid compensating for

property affected is simple self-deception. The costs of government action will be borne by someone. The compensation requirement, like a rule of liability, simply determines who that someone will be.

Under current policy, "public goods" provided by government such as military bases and highways are created by purchasing lands from private owners. On the other hand, "public goods" like wetland preserves and wildlife refuges are created by bureaucratic edicts that deny property owners the use of their land. If the public wants to protect the habitat of an endangered species or preserve an ancient stand of trees for some aesthetic, spiritual, or broad "environmental" value, then the public should be willing to pay for it, just as it pays for other "public goods." The costs should not be imposed on whoever is unfortunate enough to hold title to a piece of land coveted by some regulatory bureaucrat for some public purpose concocted by nameless persons elected by no one.

It is time to recognize that property rights are important for both economic and environmental reasons, and must be protected from both government and private malfeasance. Compensating landowners when they are deprived of the reasonable use of their land will not produce environmental catastrophe. Far from it. In many cases it will eliminate the negative environmental incentives created by the heavy hand of existing government regulations.

Properly understood, property rights do not undermine sound environmental conservation, they are its foundation.

Henry Ingram is Chairman of the Natural Resources & Environmental Law section of Buchanan Ingersoll, P.C. and has practiced environmental and natural resources law for over 25 years. Mr. Ingram also serves as legal counsel for PLA. Questions or comments regarding this article or any other legal issue may be directed to Mr. Ingram in Pittsburgh at (412) 562-1695.

Whitney Benefits Paid \$200 Million

Recently the U.S. Department of Justice quietly agreed to settle a 17 year old takings suit and pay Whitney Benefits and Peter Kiewit \$200 million because the Surface Mining Control & Reclamation Act of 1977 did not allow them to mine a coal area involving 1,327 acres in Wyoming. This is by far the largest award ever handed down by the U.S. Claims Court under the takings clause of the 5th Amendment. The award was based on \$60.3 million plus interest.

Klingler Takes Land-Use Concerns to CAC



PLA President Keith Klingler

Recently the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) held public hearings throughout the Commonwealth to determine what environmental and land use issues were on the minds of Pennsylvania residents.

Commenting at a public hearing held September 11th in Erie, PLA president Keith Klingler spoke to panel representatives about the need for major wetland reforms and the concern PLA has regarding the state's never ending appetite for purchasing more and more private property, adding to the already 5 million plus acres owned by the Commonwealth. Stated Klingler, "Quietly, millions of dollars were built into the legislation behind Key '93 to purchase more land when, admittedly, they can't adequately care for the land

already owned by the state. The legislation also provides for nearly a million dollars for rails-to-trails programs... when, in some cases, private property is taken to build these trails. Key '93 land purchasing monies should be directed solely toward protecting wetlands and not used as a yearly piggy bank for the conservancies and land trust groups to dip into every time they find a property to their liking."

PLUS Activists Still Going Strong

Participants of the 1st annual PLUS Conference held earlier this year in Harrisburg have demonstrated their commitment to private property rights protection by following through with conference promises of keeping the movement alive and well. The 200+ industry and land-use representatives attending the original Harrisburg function were determined to promote the absolute need for property rights protection to our elected officials and general public. A strong coalition of members has already been established and an aggressive agenda of issues is being pursued with wetland reform heading the list. Some of the PLUS participants include both grassroots and staff members of the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Buchanan Ingersoll, P.C., PA Association of Realtors, PA Coal Association, PA Builders Association and PA Farmers Association.

PLA Provides Legislators With Grassroots Concerns Over Wetlands

On August 25th PLA President Keith Klingler took the concerns of PLA members to a legislative committee in the Pocono area of Pennsylvania. Speaking before the Environmental Resources & Energy Committee, Klingler told committee members that the state legislature was long over-due in putting real effort and commitment into wetland reform. He described cases of abuse including 1/800th of an acre (ess than .55 square foot) classified as a wetland, even though it contained no standing water, as stopping a sewage facility plant from upgrading and expanding, costing a small town hundreds of thousands of dollars in delays. He also described a 1/2 acre near a ma-

JOR intersection which was classified as a wetland due to highway drainage and the owner's abandonment of plans to build a small craft shop because of being unable to obtain a permit.

Klingler also discussed the hardship surrounding mitigation costs for property owners and mentioned the Ridge Administration's recent policy proposal of requiring a lot owner to pay up to \$7,500 in order to use a 1/2 acre of wetland in established subdivisions.

Klingler also stated, "The new administration has shown a great ability to generate vast sums of money when it comes to more land purchases. Recently, the Ridge Administration doled out \$2.9 million dollars to several conservancies and a land trust group to purchase more private property, as if the current 5 million acres of government owned land within the Commonwealth isn't enough. If wetland protection is so critical, then why isn't this money being spent to compensate landowners whose land has been confiscated through wetland regulations?"

Appropriations Bill Passes The Senate With Mini-Wetlands Provision

On September 27, 1995, the Senate completed consideration of H.R. 2099, the fiscal year 1996 VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriations legislation. The spending bill which includes \$5.66 billion in funding for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and supports an increase of \$770 million over the House passed version remains 24% less than the President's request.

Included in this appropriations bill is a wetlands related provision, which prohibits EPA from using FY 1996 funds to administer its veto authority over wetlands permit decisions made by the Corps of Engineers as provided by Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act. The intention of this provision is to eliminate duplicative efforts within the permitting process and to streamline the decision-making procedure.

Even with this provision, EPA still retains authority in the Section 401 program to:

- Issue Section 404(b) (1) guidelines for the permitting process that are binding on the Corps and permit applicants.

It's that time of year...

Sportsmen Are Looking For The Perfect Hunting Spot



PLA members Jack Van Tassel (l) and Ron Troyer (r)

As the autumn season approaches, sportsmen across the Commonwealth are travelling many back roads searching for the perfect location to hunt for their game. The majority of these prime hunting areas are located on private property. Pennsylvania statistics indicate that 80% of all game harvested during the hunting season is on private property.

In an effort to promote organizational support and educational awareness to all sportsmen and recreationalists wanting to access private property for their personal enjoyment we encourage all PLA members to consider participating in the "posting for support" program. If you have any questions or need more information regarding the program, call the PLA office at (814)796-3578. For those members who currently participate in the program, we encourage you to make sure signs are up and clearly marked which will allow individuals wishing to access your property a means to contact you prior to accessing. It will also give you the opportunity to request their support by becoming a PLA member. PLA has always promoted "posting for support" as an educational program and not a "no trespassing" policy. As witnessed recently in Erie County, PLA's "posting for support" program worked to the ultimate level for both the landowner and sportsmen alike.

A few weeks ago, PLA member Jack Van Tassel stopped into the PLA office to renew his 95-96 membership. Conversation was initiated about ownership of a particular parcel of property which Jack had hunted on in the past and was trying to locate the owner to obtain permission to access the property again. However, the PLA signs were no longer visible, eliminating the name and telephone number of the landowner. In the PLA office, a land atlas and plat book, which is available at a nominal fee through individual county cooperative extension offices, was utilized to easily determine the owner. Subsequently, Jack personally contacted the landowner, which in this case was Ron Troyer of Waterford, and received permission to hunt on the property. Jack then volunteered to put the PLA signs back up for the landowner, which had been eliminated through natural deterioration and vandalism.

This illustration of sportsmen and landowner camaraderie is not a unique situation. Verification from different locations throughout the state reveal similar relationships for sportsmen and recreationalists alike. To achieve positive results for you, your land management and PLA — JOIN THE PROGRAM TODAY!

- Have final authority in determining the presence of jurisdictional wetlands.
- Approve state assumption of the Section 404 program.
- Enforce the Section 404 program.

This bill will now be considered in a conference between House and Senate. It is in conference committee that the House and Senate settle their differences between their versions of the legislation.

Don't Worry Greens ... Plenty of Open Space Still Available

According to an article written by economist Dr. Thomas Sowell, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution in Stanford, California, U.S. green activists need not worry about U.S. overpopulation. Sowell reports that the U.S. has only 71 people per square mile compared to Japan which has 814. He also reports that regions such as sub-Saharan Africa have an average of only 61 people per square mile while India has 757.

Also states Sowell, "Those spreading population hysteria love to tell us how long it will take for the world's population to double. But they don't tell us what country's standard of living fell the last time its population doubled."

BAD NEWS

Supreme Court Decides Fewest Cases In Over 40 Years

Statistics recently published regarding the Supreme Court term just ended reveal that the High Court heard only 82 cases, the fewest in over 40 years. There were 7,161 petitions for certiorari for those 82 opinions, and of those, the United States government was a party in 25 of the cases. Thus, private party litigants currently have only a 3/4 of 1% chance of having a case heard by the Supreme Court. The chances of being struck by lightning are probably better!

Pennsylvania Landowner Board Of Directors

Keith Klingler
President
Titusville, PA

Robert Brace
Vice President
Waterford, PA

Charles Bolgiano, Ph.D.
Lancaster, PA

Norm Clark
Springville, PA

Herman Espy
Spruce Creek, PA

Harry Fox, Jr.
Dillsburg, PA

Hank Ingram, Esq.
Pittsburgh, PA

Bob McColly
Ligonier, PA

Don Ranck
Paradise, PA

Mark Troyer
Waterford, PA

EXECUTIVE STAFF

Rhonda McAtee
Executive Director
Waterford, PA

Lorraine Bucklin
Asst. Executive Director
Harborcreek, PA

Pennsylvania Landowner is published as a member service by the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Inc. (PLA)

Reproduction or use of editorial or graphic contents in any manner is welcomed with permission. To reproduce or to comment on newsletter content, change of address notices or subscription, requests should be directed to the:

Pennsylvania Landowners'
Association, Inc.

P.O. Box 391
Waterford, PA 16441

Phone: 814/796-3578
Fax: 814/796-6757

PLA Membership Categories

Please indicate: New Member Renewal

- INDIVIDUAL I** 25.00
Any individual supportive of private property rights
(owning 0 to 15 acres)
- INDIVIDUAL II** 35.00
(owning 16 to 100 acres)
- INDIVIDUAL III** 50.00
(owning 101 to 250 acres)
- INDIVIDUAL IV** 100.00
(owning 251 to 500 acres)
- INDIVIDUAL V** 200.00
(owning over 500 acres)
- ASSOCIATE I** 100.00
Any business entity supporting the free
enterprise system and the principle of private
ownership (*local businesses in communities*)
- ASSOCIATE II** 250.00
Trade Associations (*state organizations
supportive of private property rights*)
- ASSOCIATE III** 300.00
Major suppliers to land use entities (*resource
development, construction, agriculture*)
- AFFILIATE** 50.00
Local or regional grass roots, non-profit
organizations
- BUSINESS I** 750.00
Corporations or other business entities whose
activities involve ownership, use and/or
development of acreage in excess of 100 acres
but less than 500 acres.
- BUSINESS II** 1,250.00
Same as I but in excess of 500 acres

Any land owning member (*excluding Individual I*) purchasing PLA signs and participating in the "Posting For Support" program is entitled to a 50% reduction in membership fees for the current membership year.

Membership dues and contributions may be deductible as a "Business" expense. Please consult your tax advisor regarding your particular situation.

PLA Educational Materials

POSTING FOR SUPPORT

Yes, I wish to become a participant in this program.

Please send me _____ signs.
I have enclosed 60¢ for each sign ordered.

- I am a current participant in the
"Posting for support" program
- I am a new participant in the
"Posting for support" program
- USA v. Brace & Brace Farms Videotape (VHS)**—
"One farmer's battle with federal wetland provisions."
\$15.00 donation.
- Wetlands Videotape (VHS)** Part I Part II
"Our Environment, Whose Property?" \$15.00
Donation each.

Please complete this information:

Name _____

Address _____

County _____

Acreage Owned _____

Phone Number (_____) _____

Township _____

How many acres of land posted? _____ acres

Membership Amount \$ _____

Less 50% reduction in fee if
"Posting for Support" participant - \$ _____

Amount of signs purchased + \$ _____

Additional contribution (If any) + \$ _____

Total remittance enclosed \$ _____

Enclose form with check or money order payable to:

Pennsylvania Landowners' Association

P. O. Box 391
Waterford, PA 16441

Please allow up to 4 weeks for delivery of membership card.

Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Inc.

P.O. Box 391
Waterford, PA 16441

Address Correction Requested

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 7
Waterford, PA