## PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

Thank you very much.

Senator Church. Thank you very much, Mr. Orth. If there are no questions, our last witness is Mr. Daniel A. Poole, Secretary of the Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, D.C.

## STATEMENT OF DANIEL A. POOLE, SECRETARY, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Poole. Mr. Chairman, I am Daniel A. Poole, secretary of the Wildlife Management Institute, with headquarters in Washington, D.C. The institute's program has been devoted to the restoration and improved management of renewable natural resources in the public interest since 1911.

I wish to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that the Wilderness Society has read our statement and has asked that I inform the

committee that it desires to be associated with it.

Senator Church. Very well.

Mr. Poole. We are pleased to join other national conservation organizations in endorsing the objectives of S. 2255 and H.R. 12121. These bills would extend the life of the Public Land Law Review Commission for 18 months beyond its scheduled expiration and increase the authorized appropriation. We believe that this authority should be granted, Mr. Chairman, and that the Commission should

receive the funds with which to conduct its important work.

We know that the Commission is working diligently to complete its assignment, that several contract studies are underway, and that others are to be started soon. We know that the Commission has set a high level of objectivity in its work and that it intends to leave no aspect of its assignment unexamined. At best, the Commission's task is both diverse and complicated, and we urge that it be given the time and the funds with which to assure that it may conduct the kind of overall study that will add to our understanding of the strengths and shortcomings of public lands laws, policies, and practices.

The institute believes that the unprecedented social pressures being expressed in this country today—population growth, need for raw materials, water and the protection of watersheds, the expansion of industry, municipalities and highways, and the demands for open space and recreation—to name only a few, add urgency to the Commission's work. We need the best analysis possible so that appropriate recommendations can be developed for future courses of action. Tremendous values are involved, and we should have all available information so that the proper determinations can be made.

These are some of the reasons that the institute supports the objectives of S. 2255 and H.R. 12121. But at the same time, I want to point out that we believe that extension of the Public Land Law Review Commission is only one approach to the solution of the massive public lands problem. Congressional authorization of the Commission in 1964 was only one part of a three-stage attack on the problem.

In 1964, Congress enacted a Classification and Multiple Use Act and a Public Sales Act, temporary measures like the Commission itself. We believe that these important programs should continue and that the proposal before the committee should be amended to so provide.

At this point, I wish to read into the record a telegram sent on October 16, 1967, to Senator Jackson, the chairman of this committee,