

56TH NEVADA ASSEMBLY SESSION

PRESENT: Homer, Swackhamer, Olsen, Ronzone, Bryan, Dini and Fry

ABSENT: Getto and Lowman

OTHERS: Paul Gemmill, Nevada Mining Association; Douglas Miller, Miller Geophysical Exploration Company of Carson City; Howard Gray, Reno Attorney representing Nevada Mining Association and Kennecott Copper Corporation; Mr. Taylor, a miner from Reno.

Chairman Homer called the meeting to order at 8:20 A.M. for the purpose of discussing A.B. 418. Mr. Gemmill said that the bill as amended met three suggestions that his organization wanted. 1. Having a fee that would discourage mail order claims. 2. Eliminating the need to do any location work if you pay the fee. And 3. Tying a claim down so the locator cannot move it around because he hasn't got it filed properly. The claim must be placed on a map.

Mr. Swackhamer asked what was the amount of the fee. Mr. Gemmill informed the committee that it was a \$20 fee for location of an unpatented mining claim. Mr. Swackhamer was not completely in agreement with this. He said the small prospector is the one to be concerned with. We want to keep him in the field and won't if we charge this fee. Mr. Miller commented that most all the discoveries have been made. It is drilling and geological placement that we are talking about now. The little man is fast fading because of the enormous cost. The big problem is when he goes to sell his property. He has a claim that has not been properly bounded. The proposed amendments state that everyone that has a claim must have a plot filed and send a copy of it to the surveyor. This way, the plot will be tied down with a description. This plot refers to two corners.

Dr. Homer went on to comment about the \$20 per claim or \$1 per acre fee. The little man says this is too much. Mr. Gemmill felt the little man would be saving money because it would cost more to dig a hole with a dozer and as long as he paid this fee, he would not have to do surface work just to satisfy the present Nevada law. But Mr. Swackhamer asked about the case of a little man who prefers to use his own labor. Mr. Miller replied with the following cost breakdown suggestion:

- 1 - 10 claims ... \$ 2.00 each
- 11 - 20 claims ... 3.00 each
- 21 - 30 claims ... 10.00 each
- 31 - 49 claims ... 20.00 each
- over 50 claims ... 50.00 each

Howard Gray then spoke. He said when the mining law was first enacted back in 1872, the miners themselves really wrote the law that was adopted by the Federal Congress. In those laws, you had to monument your claim, you had to make a discovery and you had to do \$100 worth of work on those claims. Back in 1872, \$100 was a great deal more than it is today. If that amount was applied now, there would be much more work done. He said he was very sympathetic toward the little man but on the other hand, if a man is going to hold land, there must be a purpose for it. The argument of engineers is that there has to be something proving that the claim is being held bonifidely. He said, however, he would be in favor of a bill that would not require location work but rather have a fee. He said the basic thing at the time the mining law was written was that a man had to spend some money (or labor). He also added his feeling that the Federal Mining Law, within the next two years, is going to be entirely rewritten.

Mr. Swackhamer commented that although Utah has no location work requirements, it does have a pretty strict regulation on annual assessment work.

Mr. Gray than suggested doing away with location work altogether and having a map ~~but~~ not requiring a surveyor or engineer. Discussion followed on what effects there could be if location work was not required. Mr. Gemmill added that sometimes it takes ten years from the time of discovery before the claim may have any marketability. In Colorado, the law is that survey work can be done instead of location work.

Mr. Taylor than spoke on this matter. He works a claim and said work has been going on at it for four years and there is not yet any production. He said the claim is not so important as the production. In his case, methods need to be developed. He said they will be in time.

Mr. Dini moved to introduce a committee measure. Mr. Bryan seconded. Motion carried. Mr. Swackhamer said, however, that he would go along with this only if it protects the small miner. Dr. Homer agreed with that.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 A.M.

jb