

the *Cameron* case. We challenged the claim and established it was an invalid claim. Cameron ran a livery stable at the head of Bright Angel Trail on the south rim of the Grand Canyon and the Park Service was a little outraged, I guess. So we finally brought a suit in a court to enjoin him from occupying it. It was, in effect, an eviction suit and it was at that time the court said the Department of the Interior had the power to declare a claim null and void and to interpret the statutes.

Now, I agree, incidentally, with something else that Senator Douglas said, and that is that there ought to be some kind of limitation on the number of claims that a person can locate.

In 1872 this act was passed, you know, and this was right in the middle of this period—I was not here yesterday, but somebody alluded to that kind of thing as Karl Marxism—when we passed the Homestead law which had an acreage limitation of 160 acres. In 1877 we passed the desert land law which had a limitation of a half a section. In 1902 we passed the reclamation law which had a 160-acre limitation.

In 1866 the law which was displaced by the 1872 act was passed. In that law a claim could only be 200 feet along the length of the vein, unless you were the discoverer, in which case you could get 400 feet. No person could get more than one claim on one vein. Of course, you could locate on different veins and I presume get more, but that was the 1866 act.

So there was an acreage limitation but I have read the legislative history of these acts and there is no acreage limitation in the 1872 act and there is none in the legislative history, and I have no authority to declare that there ought to be a limitation. Congress has the authority to decide whether there should be a limitation on the number of claims that anyone can locate.

Perhaps a situation such as that which confronts us with Zweifel, where he alleges that he has located 20,000 claims, and we know from the evidence that in one county in Colorado he has located 2,577 claims, Congress might be well advised to address itself to some revisions of that law.

The CHAIRMAN. How could we go ahead with an orderly development of the oil shale program when there is the long series of clouds over titles to lands that may well have rich deposits of oil shale? How could a private investor properly commit capital with that kind of litigation hanging over him? The very fact that Mr. Zweifel has a claim may have some value, because he can delay development and it requires affirmative action by the Federal Government to do something about it. That could become a very valuable asset in Mr. Zweifel's hands, I would think.

Mr. BARRY. I should say I think the companies will generally disregard it; not to say they disregard all claims. They make some kind of an investigation, if they get a piece of land from us. For example, Mr. Zweifel located claims on areas later leased on the Outer Continental Shelf.

The CHAIRMAN. But should we not have——

Mr. BARRY. We got the biggest bonus bids on that property that we have ever had.

The CHAIRMAN. Should there not be legislation making it clear that the Outer Continental Shelf is not open to entry?