

I think I should say that I did so as a private citizen, at my own expense, not for any private interests or claimants.

On the first day in the oil shale country of Garfield and Rio Blanco Counties I inspected the processes and plant for developing oil from shale at Anvil Points near Rifle, Colo. This was substantially the plant which the Bureau of Mines operated for approximately 10 years, which was closed down in 1954, the same time that the Louisiana Reserve was closed down, and which was started again, I believe, in 1962.

I went into the high up lateral mine at Anvil Points, and I may say it is striking to think of oil being several thousand feet in the air. I always thought of oil as being underground, but there it is in the air or at least some of it is in the air. And then I went down the mountain side 5 miles to the crushing and retorting process plant as well as that of first refining, which are on successively lower levels close together, and saw something of the process involved which I believe utilizes the so-called gas combustion process for the retorting.

I tried to do the same thing at the TOSCO plant—that is, the Shale Oil Corp. plant—a few miles away; but, in keeping with the common policy of that company, I was barred from entry. This the corporation had every legal right to do since it owns the land.

I also went up into the property formerly used by the Union Oil Co., which is now not used.

When I went to Colorado, I thought that the issues involved were primarily those which were discussed yesterday. I thought that the Government title to the land was clear, firm, undisputed, and that the problems involved were simply royalties in amount or system of payment, the question of patents, the problem of conservation, what to do with the ash from the rock which was crushed but not used for oil, the question of the definition of net income and a series of other measures which were touched on yesterday. In other words, I thought that the Government title was clear, firm, undisputed, and would not be subject to challenge.

I found that this may not be so. This was the great surprise and the great alarm which I experienced. As the chairman said, I shall not go into the pre-1920 claims except to say that it is the common knowledge that these are very extensive, and that there have been court decisions which seem to legitimize them, although they have not been worked or developed in many cases. I think in the majority of cases, they have apparently been abandoned, but they have been bought up for one reason or another by speculators, and which constitute valid claims is very undecided because of not only the decisions of the Supreme Court in the *Krushnic* case and the *Ickes v. Virginia and Colorado* case but also the decisions of the district courts as handed down by Judge Doyle and Judge Shelton.

But I shall not address myself to those claims in keeping with the very proper ruling of the chairman.

What surprised me was the large volume of recent claims, claims originally filed in 1966 and going on into 1967. I think I may say that my attention was first called to these claims by articles which appeared in Mr. J. R. Freeman's *Farmer & Miner Journal*, published in Frederick, and while I want to make it clear I do not agree with some of the personal judgments which Mr. Freeman has indulged in, I do think that taking up the cause has been of a very heroic nature.