PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., October 24, 1967.

Hon. Frank Church, Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for your letter of October 19th inviting me to appear before your Subcommittee and testify on legislation to extend the term of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

Unfortunately, prior commitments prevents me from appearing, but I do appreciate your sincere invitation.

I know that testimony will be very ably presented by Mr. Milton Pearl, of the Public Land Law Review Commission, and that Mr. Pearl also will present Chairman Aspinall's statement. I am in complete agreement with the views expressed by Chairman Aspinall and stand in full support of his comments in support of this legislation and I would appreciate if you would convey this to the Members of your Subcommittee.

With thanks and very good wish, I am,

Sincerely.

WALTER S. BARING, Congressman for Nevada.

Senator Church. I have a letter here from Laurance Rockefeller. He regrets that he cannot be here in person today and also states that he heartily endorses this legislation. His letter will be included at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

NEW YORK, N.Y., October 25, 1967.

Hon. Frank Church, Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for your invitation to testify or submit a statement on the bills to extend the term of the Public Land Law Review

Commission. I heartily endorse this proposal, but I am sure that the Chairman and staff director will be on hand to explain it in detail. Unfortunately, my schedule will

not permit me to be with you. I greatly appreciate the courtesy of your invitation to be with you.

Sincerely,

LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER.

Senator Church. I also have a letter here from Mr. Spencer Smith, secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, that without objection will be included in the hearing record at this point. (The letter referred to follows:)

> CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, Washington, D.C., October 23, 1967.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SCOOP: We have supported the Public Land Law Review Commission from its inception and we also support the extension that would be authorized by H.R. 12121. We feel it would be inappropriate, however, to extend the Commission without extending the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 at the

If you will recall, both measures have been connected from the time that they were originally considered. The Public Land Law Review Commission had the task of historical appraisal and recommendations for public planning as to policy. It was generally considered, as indicated in the legislative history of both Acts, that the Classification and Multiple Use Act would not prejudice the Commission but was necessary to continue a much needed ongoing program. The coupling of these two Acts was to give assurance to any and all that needed programs would go forward concomitant with evaluation and planning.