

Just what *are* those specific research problems, in *what* scientific and technologic areas, that are of *such* long-range importance, or are *so* broad in scope, as to be *beyond* the reach of private industry? Just *which* government official, under *what* Congressional authority, is empowered to arrive at such all encompassing conclusions?

3. In Section VII these two sentences appear:

"It is in the public interest to advance the technology not only for oil shale but for competing sources also. What is called for is a diversified research and development effort by both government and private industry, with the several energy sources viewed as part of an inter-related energy industry."

These vague, all-inclusive words *can* be interpreted at some future date to mean absolutely *anything*! Until they *are* interpreted by some responsible government official, I am unable to comment on them.

I wouldn't think they'd bring any cheer to *any* executive in *any* of our energy industries, however. Their concrete meaning needs to be clarified. What *is* the specific "development effort" and what *is* the specific "research effort" on the part of government that these words are intended to identify?

4. Toward the end of the last paragraph in Section VII this sentence appears: "Improvements of R and D programming within the Department would be desirable."

I have no notion of what this means in specific terms, since it was never discussed at Board meetings.

CONCLUSION

Nothing in our Board's Report *can* be very specific on the exact terms of any contract which the Interior Department might offer private industry to develop our shale-oil resources on government controlled lands. Alternative No. 2 in Section IV comes closest to being fairly specific.

Under the body of this Report as it now stands, however, some future administration *could* impose contract terms for shale-oil development so onerous that private industry would *have* to decline. Government, under this Report as now written, could then claim that it *had* to proceed on its own account due to development being "beyond the reach of private industry."

This is not an imaginary fear in the minds of many business men nor in my own mind. Fuzzy, imprecise language encourages these fears, particularly when it appears from time to time in official documents. This is why I have fought so hard, even if unsuccessfully, for an Interim Report that was specific concerning the *one* major controversy that confronted us.

I can't conceive of any private company making the vast expenditures which would be necessary to extract, refine, transport and sell oil from shale if it feared that somewhere down the road it *might* have to compete with a government dominated shale-oil industry. On reading this Report, the Secretary himself may wish we had been more specific in our recommendations to him—especially in connection with the *one* conflict we Board members have been unable to resolve.

I have tried to be temperate and forthright in my own dissent and I'm sure my Board colleagues will express *their* genuine dissents in the same spirit. Secretary Udall made his own position clear on this matter, however, at a dinner meeting with our Board on last November 30th.

He was quite aware of differing judgments within the Board. He said that he welcomed them; that they helped to sharpen the issues for his consideration. He then asked us to reconvene in mid-January and see how near we could come to a meeting of minds.

But he also said that if there were some areas where differences could not be resolved that he would expect us to state our varying positions temperately but with frankness. I certainly admired his objective approach. I have tried in this statement to stay within the spirit of his guidelines for all of us as Board members.

JOSEPH L. FISHER, *Chairman*,
ORLO E. CHILDS,
BENJAMIN V. COHEN,
JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH,
H. BYRON MOCK,
MILO PERKINS, *Members*.