

funded pristine areas system where some of the most crucial sites may be foregone.

The history of protected areas is replete with stories of exceptionally important pristine natural sites proposed for protection which were deemed at the time to be too costly and therefore were not acquired. Now that they have been developed and lost as intact areas - and with no similar sites remaining now to consider as alternatives - one can only question the wisdom of such past frugality.

To counter this inadequacy, there are two budgetary means of facilitating pristine areas acquisition:

- 1) reduce the cost of acquisition
- 2) increase the resources needed to enable acquisition

Given the scale of task involved in pristine areas systems completion and the limited time in which to accomplish it, both strategies must be pursued. Each are discussed below.

1) Reducing Acquisition Cost

Theoretically, when lands proposed for pristine areas are in Crown Land status, the cost of acquisition to government would seem to be minimal. The factors that obviate this are compensation costs and transfer costs.

i) Compensation Costs: The tenure rights already conferred by government to other land users within individual candidate sites may have to be compensated in the course of the preservation process. Forestry, mining, grazing, access are just some of the rights conferred via leases, licenses and permits to land users. Such compensation has the potential to drastically price up the cost of protecting individual sites and completing the pristine areas agenda.

Two questions arise. The first obviously is: Does an existing user require compensation if his rights to land use are to be withdrawn? Usually the answer is yes, although governments do have the legal power to pass legislation that limits or denies compensation for specific preservation actions if they so choose. Given the political risks of doing such, this option may often not be deemed viable. Therefore the operative question becomes: How much compensation is owed?

Clearly parties being "expropriated" through the preservation process want to get the maximum they can. When South Moresby National Park Reserve was created, the logging companies said they were owed the net value of standing timber or \$300 million. In the end they were paid \$31 million (for lost quota value). Even if this latter