

tension of the Classification and Multiple Use Acts of 1964. Instead of reading it I would like to take just a minute or two to tell you something about our association, its composition and the specific reasons why we are interested in this legislation.

Senator CHURCH. The statement will be included in the hearing record at this point and then you may make any comments you wish regarding the legislation.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF KENNETH B. POMEROY, CHIEF FORESTER, THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Kenneth B. Pomeroy, Chief Forester of The American Forestry Association.

This organization strongly supported the legislation which established the Public Land Law Review Commission. We have been deeply interested in the activities of the Commission ever since that date.

In our opinion the Public Land Law Review Commission is engaged in a very worthwhile review of laws pertaining to the Public Lands. Of special interest will be ultimate Committee recommendations regarding modernization of mining laws, land exchanges to achieve better balance between private and public management of natural resources, and clarification of the Taylor Grazing Act.

These and other equally important questions require more study than the Commission now has time for. Therefore, we recommend extension of the Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 982) to June 30, 1970.

Mr. POMEROY. Our organization was established back in 1875 and since its beginning we have been deeply interested in the public lands.

Our membership, which now numbers about 55,000, is composed of housewives, urban dwellers, small landowners, a few industry people, some of the timber industry, and some in the public utilities industries. We even have a few members of Congress among our membership.

In 1947 and again in 1953 we convened American Forest Congresses to try and decide what the major problems of the public lands were. In each instance the No. 1 recommendation of each Congress was that studies be made by the States and the Federal Government of the public lands and how they should best be managed. Our membership endorsed these recommendations by more than 90 percent of those who cast their votes. When no State or the Federal Government proceeded to make such a study we went ahead ourselves and made studies in the States of California, Minnesota, and North Carolina. I served as staff member for the California and Minnesota ones and I conducted the North Carolina study myself.

In California we found that the major problem was the checker-board ownership and, because many of the landlines were not properly identified, some of the public land surveys had never been made. There was a big problem of timber trespass on some lands, and I wrote a story about that. In Minnesota we found that the public domain lands consisted of about 80,000 acres scattered over some two dozen counties and that in the main these were small tracts of 40 acres or half a section. The nearest administrative office of the Bureau of Land Management was at Little Rock, Ark., at that time. Consequently these lands were not receiving protection and local pulpwood buyers and others were taking timber as they saw fit. We felt that the property should either be turned over to the State of Minnesota for that reason or else should be disposed of to private interests so that it could be properly managed. With this background you can see that we were delighted when the proposal was made to establish a Public Land Law