

the techniques were far enough advanced now so that a simple land disposal program could be initiated, that is what we would have proposed. But we did not feel that we could make the resource available for the purpose of developing the technology without guaranteeing that the technology would be available to develop the resource over the long-term future.

In sum, under point 3 we proposed to purchase for the public, with a limited amount of oil shale resources, technology which all thereafter could use. We proposed to purchase technology on terms that would induce the substantial risk capital involved, while returning to the public fair market value for the resources disposed of. We examined a variety of alternatives—those that would hold back the development of the resources were as unacceptable as those that would open all the lands when so much had to be learned about how to best protect the long-term public interest.

Before concluding, there is another aspect of oil shale development which I want to discuss. On April 25, 1967, the Department of the Interior transmitted to the Congress a proposed bill to provide for the recordation of mining claims. The bill was introduced by the chairman of this committee by request on April 27, 1967, as S. 1651.

That bill has an important bearing on the ultimate objectives of the Department's 5-point program for the development of oil shale resources. The oil shale development program requires action to clear titles to Federal lands and to determine the validity of oil shale mining claims. In fact, this is our big threshold problem, and it is a very serious one. We estimate that location certificates for about 30,000 to 60,000 oil shale mining claims were filed in local county recorders' offices under the 1872 Mining Act, prior to passage of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, which precluded further locations for oil shale. Location certificates for an additional estimated 10,000 claims have been filed recently, within the last 18 months, in oil shale areas for various minerals.

Under the present Mining Law, with a few exceptions, the mining claimant is required to file notice of his claim only in the local county recorder's office. No filing with the Federal Government is required. Many of the mining claims now on record in county recorders' offices describe the claims in terms of corners tied to rocks, blazes on trees, and other natural monuments. The physical site of the claims may be ascertained, if at all, only by actual inspection on the ground. It would take a whole army of people if our Department were to have to undertake this. Additionally, the identification and location of the claimants in many cases has long been out of date and obtaining current information is costly, and in some instances may be impossible. The Department's proposed mining recordation bill will go a long way towards solving the title problems. It would tremendously hasten the whole process, and I am aware of the fact, I might as well be blunt about it, that some of the mining industry people who are attached to the oil law and do not want it changed are opposed to this. They have said so quite directly. I want to make it clear, too, that their opposition is holding back shale oil development, in my opinion.

It would materially enhance the process of locating and serving claimants, closing out abandoned claims, bringing title questions to