MINING LANDS ARE MULTIPLE-USE LANDS

"Our expanding economy is creating added demands for the use and development of the public lands and their resources. Not so long ago public land could be dedicated to a single purpose or use — it could be used exclusively for mining, grazing, logging, or for recreation. Now, however, the demand for public lands and resources is so great by individuals and corporations that single-purpose use is no longer generally satisfactory." So said Director Edward Woozley, whose Bureau of Land Management exclusively administers approximately 468 million acres of federal land and has the responsibility for the administration of mineral resources on some 800 million acres.

The occasion for the statement was a speech before the 1958 meeting of the American Mining Congress in San Francisco, September 24, 1958.

Mr. Woozley's statement caused very little comment at the meeting, for mining people are accepting as a fact that mining lands are multiple-use lands. In 1954 Public Law 585 cleared the way for developing locatable minerals in some 60 million acres of public land then under oil and gas leases and, conversely, permitted oil and gas development on land under mining location. In 1955 Public Laws 167 and 359 were passed. Public Law 359 restored to mining location about 7.2 million acres of land that had been previously set aside as water- and power-site withdrawals. Public Law 167 limited the use of a mining claim to prospecting, mining, and processing operations only. Under this law the government manages the timber resources just as if there were no mining claim location. Access can be had on and across the claim for timber, grazing, hunting, fishing, and recreation as long as it does not interfere with the actual mining operation. Public Law 167 also set forth a procedure whereby claims located prior to passage of the law could be examined and if certain requirements were not met by the claim holder the surface rights would be managed by the government.

Since enactment of Public Law 167 the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have examined and requested publication on approximately 33 million acres of land. Within this 33 million acres, mining claimants filed answers (verified statements to the effect that mining was the highest use of the land) covering approximately 9,300 claims, but subsequently, either by waiver or stipulation, about 650 claims were withdrawn by the claimants. In 1958, eleven hearings involving 35 claims were held to determine if the government was to manage the surface of claims. As of June 30, 1958, eighteen hearings involving 55 claims were pending. This number is much less than had been anticipated by the federal agencies.

In Oregon in the past 2½ years, the Forest Service has examined more than a million acres and made preparations for examining another 1 3/4 million acres. The Bureau of Land Management has examined parts or all of 102 townships, or an amount nearly the same as the Forest Service. (See following pages for progress report.) In addition to the examinations under Public Law 167, it should be noted that all mining locations in Oregon's Mount Hood National Forest (1,115,505 acres) have been on a multiple-use basis since 1934. The law establishing this even reserved the title to the surface of the lands and its products to the United States after patent.

Mining is not the only land user that has been forced to recognize the principle of multiple use. Public Law 337, passed in 1958, put a limitation (5,000 acres) on the amount of land that can be withdrawn by a Defense Department facility without an act of Congress and opened public land withdrawn or reserved for military purposes to mining. Owners of large blocks of private timber and grazing land open their lands to hunters and fishermen. Power and timber companies are doing an excellent job in developing recreational sites for public use. Mining companies have embarked upon reforestation programs, land-reclamation projects, and recreational-site development.

Increasing pressure from all sides has caused industry to recognize and accept the principle of multiple use of land. The cooperation shown in furthering the principle indicates that a major problem of an expanding population and industry can be successfully met. But this encouraging trend is not without inharmonious elements. Proposed contradictory legislation does crop up. The most publicized in recent weeks has been the Wilderness System bill. Hearings on this bill have brought out that a minimum of 50 million acres of public land would be set aside for single-purpose use. Advocates of this type legislation should take a long hard look to determine if this legislation will not jeopardize the multiple-use principle.

Hollis M. Dole, Director
### PROGRESS REPORT OF AREAS IN U. S. NATIONAL FORESTS APPROVED FOR DETERMINATION OF SURFACE RIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Name of Area</th>
<th>Nat'l Forest</th>
<th>Acres Land</th>
<th>Acres Examined</th>
<th>Approved for Examination</th>
<th>Date of First Publication</th>
<th>End of 150-day Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Chemult</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>5-17-1956</td>
<td>2-27-1957</td>
<td>7-29-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschutes</td>
<td>Chemult</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>5-4-1956</td>
<td>2-27-1957</td>
<td>7-29-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>27,760</td>
<td>5-1-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolo</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>5-1-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>5-1-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>Twin</td>
<td>55,200</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dixie</td>
<td>36,070</td>
<td>1-29-1958</td>
<td>9-25-1958</td>
<td>2-22-1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baldy</td>
<td>47,830</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>22,680</td>
<td>4-25-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochoco</td>
<td>Round &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>24,450</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td>11-20-1957</td>
<td>4-21-1958*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>14,015</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td>9-4-1958</td>
<td>2-1-1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>30,170</td>
<td>7-31-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Mountain</td>
<td>22,920</td>
<td>7-31-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue River</td>
<td>Applegate &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>113,250</td>
<td>17,785</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td>9-4-1958</td>
<td>2-1-1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>230,400</td>
<td>39,295</td>
<td>4-17-1957</td>
<td>9-17-1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou</td>
<td>Wildhorse</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>2-2-1956</td>
<td>2-21-1957</td>
<td>7-22-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elk &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>138,220</td>
<td>14,570</td>
<td>7-11-1956</td>
<td>9-12-1957</td>
<td>2-9-1958*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elk &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>110,700</td>
<td>9-11-1957</td>
<td>2-8-1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elk &quot;C&quot;</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>7-11-1956</td>
<td>2-21-1957</td>
<td>7-22-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>34,230</td>
<td>34,230</td>
<td>9-11-1957</td>
<td>9-11-1957</td>
<td>2-8-1958*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>45,350</td>
<td>7-11-1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pistol</td>
<td>39,950</td>
<td>39,950</td>
<td>7-11-1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua</td>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>157,460</td>
<td>157,460</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td>9-17-1958</td>
<td>2-14-1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steamboat</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>7-31-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cow Creek</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>7-31-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>Dooley Mountain-Buffalo</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>6-1-1956</td>
<td>2-27-1957</td>
<td>7-29-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>82,230</td>
<td>82,230</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td>2-21-1957</td>
<td>7-29-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodley</td>
<td>35,250</td>
<td>35,250</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td>2-27-1957</td>
<td>7-29-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td>2-21-1957</td>
<td>7-29-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bull Run</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>3-22-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>37,700</td>
<td>3-22-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>89,600</td>
<td>3-22-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limber Jim-Sheep Creek</td>
<td>39,780</td>
<td>39,780</td>
<td>3-22-1957</td>
<td>5-21-1958</td>
<td>10-20-1958*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snake River</td>
<td>31,750</td>
<td>31,750</td>
<td>3-22-1957</td>
<td>5-22-1958</td>
<td>10-20-1958*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>33,720</td>
<td>3-22-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette</td>
<td>Little N. Fork Santiam</td>
<td>22,600</td>
<td>22,600</td>
<td>2-21-1956</td>
<td>2-27-1957</td>
<td>7-29-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quartzville</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>2-2-1956</td>
<td>11-1-1956</td>
<td>4-1-1957*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>7-5-1956</td>
<td>9-25-1957</td>
<td>2-22-1958*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue River</td>
<td>170,200</td>
<td>7-8-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cascadia</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>7-8-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>281,950</td>
<td>7-8-1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL . . . 2,770,885 1,027,392**

* Determination completed (time expired for submitting verified statements).
RESUME OF U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PUBLIC LAW 167 WORK

DETERMINATION COMPLETED

### Baker and Wallowa Counties

- T. 11 S., R. 37 E.
- T. 12 S., R. 37 E.
- T. 8 S., R. 38 E.
- T. 11 S., R. 38 E.
- T. 12 S., R. 38 E.
- T. 11 S., R. 40 E.
- T. 12 S., R. 40 E.
- T. 9 S., R. 41 E.
- T. 11 S., R. 41 E.
- T. 12 S., R. 41 E.
- T. 7 S., R. 42 E.
- T. 7 S., R. 43 E.
- T. 11 S., R. 44 E.
- T. 11 S., R. 45 E.
- T. 5 S., R. 48 E.
- T. 6 S., R. 48 E.
- T. 7 S., R. 48 E.

### Douglas County

- T. 30 S., R. 2 W.
- T. 19 S., R. 9 W.
- T. 19 S., R. 8 W.

### Grant County

- T. 13 S., R. 30 E.
- T. 14 S., R. 30 E.
- T. 13 S., R. 31 E.
- T. 12 S., R. 32 E.
- T. 13 S., R. 32 E.
- T. 14 S., R. 32 E.
- T. 12 S., R. 33 E.
- T. 13 S., R. 33 E.
- T. 14 S., R. 33 E.
- T. 12 S., R. 34 E.
- T. 13 S., R. 34 E.
- T. 13 S., R. 35 E.

### Josephine County

- T. 34 S., R. 5 W.
- T. 34 S., R. 6 W.
- T. 37 S., R. 5 W.
- T. 38 S., R. 5 W.
- T. 39 S., R. 5 W.
- T. 39 S., R. 6 W.
- T. 36 S., R. 5 W.
- T. 36 S., R. 6 W.
- T. 36 S., R. 7 W.
- T. 37 S., R. 6 W.
- T. 37 S., R. 7 W.
- T. 38 S., R. 6 W.
- T. 38 S., R. 7 W.
- T. 38 S., R. 8 W.
- T. 40 S., R. 8 W.

### Areas Examined and Advertised

#### Jackson County

**May 14, 1958**

- T. 31 S., R. 4 W.
- T. 32 S., R. 3 W.
- T. 32 S., R. 4 W.
- T. 33 S., R. 1 W.
- T. 33 S., R. 3 W.
- T. 33 S., R. 4 W.
- T. 36 S., R. 3 W.
- T. 38 S., R. 2 W.
- T. 39 S., R. 1 W.
- T. 39 S., R. 2 W.
- T. 39 S., R. 3 W.
- T. 39 S., R. 5 W.

#### Josephine County

**June 11, 1958**

- T. 33 S., R. 5 W.
- T. 33 S., R. 6 W.
- T. 33 S., R. 7 W.
- T. 33 S., R. 8 W.
- T. 33 S., R. 9 W.
- T. 40 S., R. 7 W.
- T. 41 S., R. 8 W.
- T. 41 S., R. 9 W.

### Areas Examined and Not Advertised

#### Curry County

- T. 31 S., R. 14 W.
- T. 38 S., R. 2 W.

#### Douglas County

- T. 29 S., R. 2 W.
- T. 31 S., R. 4 W.
- T. 32 S., R. 4 W.
- T. 32 S., R. 5 W.
- T. 32 S., R. 7 W.

#### Jackson County

- T. 33 S., R. 2 W.

*In most instances only part of township has been examined. Exact areas examined can be obtained from U.S. Bureau of Land Management.*
LAND DETERMINATION AREAS CURRENTLY BEING EXAMINED BY
U.S. FOREST SERVICE AND U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

EXPLANATION
- Determination completed
- Examined and advertised
- Examined only
- To be examined
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Information about Public Law 167 and its management is given in the following Ore.-B inf articles, which, may be obtained free-of-charge by writing to the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, 1069 State Office Building, Portland 1, Oregon:

1. "Basic Mining Law Amended" (explains Public Law 167) - August 1955.

2. "Mining Claim Holders Take Note" (gives procedures under which the U. S. Forest Service is conducting land determinations and discusses rights of claim holders) - April 1956.

3. "The Multiple-Use Mining Law - Success or Failure" (shows purpose of PL 167 and includes maps of land determination areas) - October 1956.

4. "Multiple Use of Public Land" (gives progress report and maps of land determination areas) - December 1957.

In addition, the Department, upon request, will send free forms for notice that land determinations have been made and for filing a "Verified Statement" of the claims' validity.

***************************
ROGUE RIVER WITHDRAWALS FINAL

On September 10, 1958, the Secretary of Interior published in the Federal Register legal descriptions of the areas bordering the Rogue River that are to be reserved and set aside for protection and preservation as scenic and recreation sites (see index map). The Secretary's determination came almost two years after the public hearing held at Grants Pass.

At the hearing, local sportsmen, businessmen, miners, and mining organizations protested against the withdrawals while State and National wildlife, recreation, and sportsmen groups along with local individuals and others urged the withdrawals. More testimony was presented, both for and against, than had ever been given before to the Bureau of Land Management hearings officer on a proposed withdrawal of land in the State of Oregon. Nevertheless, only 2,323 acres (see map of Tps. 33 and 34 S., Rs. 7 and 8 W.) out of 23,096 acres of the withdrawn area were left open for mineral location. This was done in spite of the fact that the government had the right to manage the surface of any mining claim made in the proposed withdrawal area (Public Law 167) and that, in addition, the Secretary of Interior could control all placer locations (Public Law 359, see article on page 101). By contrast, leasing of land for summer homes and lodges under the Small Tract Act will now be permitted on 16,200 acres, and leases or sales under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act will be permitted on 13,879 acres. Lease or sale of resources under the Materials Act will be allowed on all 23,096 acres.

Although the original publicity stated that the withdrawals were to be within one mile on either side of the Rogue River, it develops that other land was included. Four parcels of land were withdrawn on the upper Applegate River. These are: (1) near Ruch, (2) on the Little Applegate River approximately 1 mile east of Buncom, (3) between the Little Applegate River and the Sterling mine ditch on Bear Gulch south of Tunnel Ridge, and (4) at the confluence of First Water Gulch and the Little Applegate River. As the names imply, this is mining country. It was near these areas that gold was first discovered in Oregon in 1852. It would be interesting to know what the old-timers who settled southwestern Oregon in their search for gold would say if they knew the land of their struggles was now being set aside just for recreation purposes.

***************************

H.M.D.
BLM EXPLAINS MINING CLAIM PROCEDURE

Of vital importance to mining men who have claims on O&C or Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands is the press release issued by the Bureau of Land Management of November 19, 1958, which is reproduced below.

Virgil Heath, Bureau of Land Management Supervisor for Oregon, reports there is some misunderstanding about the necessity of recording mining claims on Oregon and California revested lands and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands. Heath said that many mining claim locators are forfeiting their unpatented claims because they are not complying with the O&C Mining Act of April 8, 1948. This act opened the O&C and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to mining claim locations, but it required that a copy of the notice of location must be filed in the U.S. District Land Office within 60 days after the location is made. Heath points out that if this requirement is not observed, the mining claims are voided.

Heath also said that since completion of an exchange of national forest lands for O&C lands on June 22, 1956, approximately 242,000 acres of former national forest lands become O&C lands. These lands are now subject to the laws pertaining to the O&C lands, including the O&C Mining Act of April 8, 1948, which requires that a copy of the notice of location must be filed in the U.S. District Land Office within 60 days after the location is made. Any locator of a mining claim believed to be on O&C or Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands should learn the exact legal description of the land on which the claim is located, then inquire at the nearest BLM district office, or the Land Office at Portland, as to whether the claim is located on O&C or Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands. If so, the O&C Mining Law must be complied with or the claim will be voided, Heath said.

Claim holders in western Oregon who have claims located on or near O&C or Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands are advised to make periodic checks with the Bureau of Land Management to determine the status of their claims. New regulations, transfers of land between federal agencies, and the changing status of certain parcels of land may impair or imperil a claimholder's rights and may even render them null and void.

The Bureau of Land Management suggests, and the Department concurs, that claim holders having claims located on or near O&C lands make duplicate filings with the Bureau. Copies of location notices are acceptable but certified copies of "Proofs of Labor" are specified. Inquiries concerning claims on O&C lands should be directed to the Bureau of Land Management, 809 N.E. 6th Avenue, Portland 12, or to the Bureau's field office in the Medford City Hall.

NORTHWEST MINING ASSOCIATION TO HOLD ANNUAL CONVENTION

The 64th annual convention of the Northwest Mining Association will be held December 5th and 6th in Spokane at the Davenport Hotel. Principal speakers will be Dr. John Convey, Director of the Mines Branch, Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Ottawa, Canada, whose topic is "Recent Canadian Developments in Mining and Metallurgy," and Hon. Royce Hardy, Assistant Secretary for Minerals, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., who will speak on "Mineral Resource Development in America."

The two-day program will be divided into sections including Canadian Industrial Developments, Geology, Management, and Mining. Papers on uranium, iron ore, roof bolting, industrial development, production cost control, potential and outlook of Northwest Canada emphasize the scope of the conference which draws mining men from the Northwest, Western Canada, and Alaska.

Social functions during the convention include two luncheons, the Miner's Soiree, a Moose Milk Breakfast, an evening of dancing, and the annual banquet. Women attending the convention will be entertained at several coffee hours and a luncheon.

W. D. Nesbeitt is general chairman, with E. C. Stephens in charge of the program. Registration is being handled by Hamilton Owen. Reservations for hotel accommodations and registration for the convention may be obtained by writing to the Northwest Mining Association, West 522 First Avenue, Spokane, Washington.
The Oregon Academy of Science and Northwest Scientific Association are combining their annual meetings this year at Corvallis on December 29 and 30. This is the first time since the 1952 meeting at Reed College that the two organizations have joined forces. The sessions of the Geology-Geography section are scheduled to start at 9:00 a.m. Monday, December 29, and continue both days. Chairmen are George S. Koch, Jr., Department of Geology, Oregon State College, for the Oregon Academy of Science, and R. C. Newcomb, U.S. Geological Survey, for the Northwest Scientific Association. Meetings will be held in room 208 Memorial Union Building on the Oregon State College campus. Tentative program for the Geology-Geography section is as follows:

Monday, December 29 - 9:00 a.m.
George S. Koch, Jr., and R. C. Newcomb, presiding
1. The Oregon "Klima" - R. D. Rudd, Natural Resources Department, Oregon State College.

Monday, December 29 - 2:00 p.m.
Ira S. Allison and Charles D. Campbell, presiding

Tuesday, December 30 - 9:00 a.m.
Marshall Hunting and Lloyd Staples, presiding
2. Permafrost problems in mining - Ernest Wolff, University of Oregon.
3. Frasch sulfur in Mexico - J. Granville Jensen, Natural Resources Department, Oregon State College.
4. Geology of part of the Santa Cruz Mountains, California - Jon Cummings, Oregon State College.

Tuesday, December 30 - 1:30 p.m.
Joseph W. Mills and John E. Allen, presiding
RUSSIAN CHROME ORE TO UNITED STATES

The E&MJ Metal and Mineral Markets, issue of October 30, 1958, states:

Russian chrome ore, 80,000 tons of it, is being acquired by a major U.S. producer of ferroalloys. The same firm bought perhaps a third as much last year. On both occasions a Canadian broker arranged the business.

The transaction is probably better described as a barter arrangement. An amount of steel equal in value to the chrome ore is being taken by the Canadian broker for shipment to the USSR. A major U.S. steel manufacturer may have had more interest in arranging the transaction than the ore consumer. The steel company has probably assured the ferrochrome manufacturer it will take any of the ferro the latter cannot sell.

Though the ore is scheduled to go to Canada, shipping arrangements for some of it may provide for alternative U.S. destinations. The ore is standard Russian ore - good grade but with considerable amount of fines.

Doubtless chrome ore suppliers and their governments will express displeasure at acceptance by U.S. firms of Russian ore. Some Americans take the position that since the U.S. has no significant amount of chrome ore - it is clearly a have-not country in this respect, and chrome ore is an important product to the steel industry here, it is to the advantage of the U.S. to take all it can get from the USSR. It might appear that it conserves the limited Western supply. Turkish chrome ore representatives have been saying Turkish good grade ore is becoming scarcer and that what was a few years ago considered only passable ore is now considered high grade; they suggest this will continue. They have claimed prices must rise because of this growing scarcity of good ore. In the past year Turkish asking prices have dropped very little in spite of the drastic drop in sales.

The claim probably will be made the Russian sales are really calculated to destroy the Western chrome ore industry. Some chrome ore suppliers point out that the USSR was once a major supplier of chrome and manganese ore to the U.S. and some years ago stopped selling here - a part of the USSR's economic warfare. No one doubts the USSR will engage in economic or any other form of warfare that suits its purpose. But there is no doubt it also has the more usual motive - to export in order to import.

Since the USSR is taking an equal value of steel, and since the steel maker here appears to be as interested in the steel market as the ferro maker is in getting the ore, any claim of economic warfare may be hard to prove. Doubtless when negotiations were going on the sale of perhaps $3.5-million of steel looked to be most beneficial to the U.S. economy and steel industry. Certainly U.S. firms can be expected to compete with the rest of the Western world in getting foreign business including with Russia. They have been put to considerable disadvantage by the slowness with which the U.S. Government has implemented the COCOM agreements, announced August 15, to drop the Western embargo on the export of hundreds of products to the USSR.

It is most impractical to export products to the Iron Curtain areas without importing from them; if U.S. firms are going to get a significant amount of that business they will have to import from them also.

Shades of Harry Dexter White! How familiar these arguments sound to the West's mining industry. Following World War II we were characterized as a "have not" nation in various materials including tungsten, petroleum, cobalt, columbium-tantalum, uranium, and quicksilver - to name a few. Now we have many of these commodities "running out of our ears." That "have not" is a matter of price has been demonstrated time and again.

Another slant on the subject is furnished by the Wall Street Journal in its Commodity letter of November 18, 1958. Here pitfalls of trading with Russia are touched upon. Sales of aluminum and platinum have been carefully timed by Russia to disrupt the markets, according to U.S. producers. Russia trades arms for cotton and then dumps the cotton on world markets. Now it is rumored that Russia plans to dump Chinese tea.

Perhaps the barter of American steel for Russian chrome, as described above, benefits the steel producer in this instance, but such a deal puts another nail in the coffin of the domestic chrome industry and therefore is difficult to reconcile with the common good.

H.M.D.
OREGON URANIUM PLANT TO START PROCESSING

Lakeview Mining Company announces that it expects to begin processing uranium ore at its new 3-million-dollar plant at Lakeview on November 29. The plant will process ores from the Company's White King mine and also independently produced ores that are economically and metallurgically amenable to the plant's processing methods. The Atomic Energy Commission will purchase the entire output of uranium oxide on a five-year contract. The plant has a capacity of 210 tons of ore per day. The mine and mill will employ about 140 men on a three-shift basis.

***************************

NATIONAL METALLURGICAL ENLARGING SPRINGFIELD PLANT

National Metallurgical Corporation, Springfield, Oregon, is adding a new stationary hearth electric furnace to their plant which produces elemental silicon. The new furnace will go "on stream" next July and approximately 15 men will be employed in addition to the 30 now on the payroll. The furnace and other related installations will cost in the neighborhood of $500,000. Raw materials for the plant include silica, obtained from near Reno, Nevada, and Rogue River, Oregon; coke from the San Francisco Bay area; and wood chips obtained locally. National has recently obtained a contract for firm power from the Springfield Municipal Power Company for both its present furnace and the new unit which is rated at 4000 Kva.

***************************

IAN CAMPBELL TO HEAD CALIFORNIA DIVISION OF MINES

Prof. Ian Campbell of the California Institute of Technology was named Chief of the California Division of Mines on October 30 by DeWitt Nelson, Director of the California Department of Natural Resources. Dr. Campbell placed first in a competitive examination for the post and was recommended by the State Mining Board. He succeeds Dr. Olaf P. Jenkins who retired in March of this year. Dr. Campbell received his bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Oregon and his doctor's degree from Harvard. In 1931 he joined the teaching staff at California Institute of Technology, and in 1952 was made Executive Officer of the Division of Geological Sciences at that school. He takes over his new position as Chief of the California Division of Mines on January 1, 1959.

***************************

SALIENT STATISTICS OF CHROMITE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Domestic production (shipments)</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>New Supply</th>
<th>Consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>163,365</td>
<td>1,471,037</td>
<td>1,634,402</td>
<td>913,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>153,253</td>
<td>1,833,999</td>
<td>1,987,252</td>
<td>1,583,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1/207,662</td>
<td>2,175,056</td>
<td>1/2,382,718</td>
<td>1,846,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>166,157</td>
<td>2,281,591</td>
<td>2,447,748</td>
<td>1,760,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958: First 3 Months</td>
<td>42,617</td>
<td>322,945</td>
<td>365,562</td>
<td>279,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>13,582</td>
<td>104,671</td>
<td>118,253</td>
<td>85,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>16,872</td>
<td>175,675</td>
<td>192,547</td>
<td>87,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4/ 8,877</td>
<td>133,670</td>
<td>142,547</td>
<td>3/ 72,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>2/ 9,785</td>
<td>76,397</td>
<td>86,182</td>
<td>3/ 71,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>2/ 9,559</td>
<td>154,775</td>
<td>164,334</td>
<td>3/ 90,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 8 Months</td>
<td>101,292</td>
<td>968,133</td>
<td>1,069,425</td>
<td>3/ 687,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Includes 45,710 short tons of concentrate produced in 1955 and 1956 from low-grade ore and concentrate stockpiled near Coquille, Oregon, during World War II.
2/ Dry weight.                      3/ Preliminary.  4/ End of GSA stockpile purchasing.