Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill, S. 7, Surface Mine Reclamation Act of 1975, now before the Senate, is a good bill, and will supplement some of the surface mine reclamation laws already adopted by several States. I am delighted that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did not consent to some of the weakening amendments suggested by the Department of the Interior, and the coal industry. The State of Montana, I am proud to say, has adopted, perhaps, the most stringent set of laws in the country which pertain to the surface mining of coal, utilization of water, and environmental controls. The legislature is now actively discussing a severance tax as a means of providing funds to assist communities in adjusting to the
impact of significant surface coal mine developments. The Federal Government has a responsibility to support these efforts and to prevent the drift toward a predilection for underground mining and strip mining. It will be a great mistake if we allow the Federal Government to become the landlord of the western coal fields and the owner of the surface areas as well.

The two basic concerns I have with the bill, S. 7, are that it commits our Country to the development of Federal coal deposits, and does not give sufficient protection to the surface owner who does not wish to sell or lease his property. It is for this reason that I am supporting the Mansfield amendment which states that where there are Federal coal deposits and the surface is owned by another party, the land shall be withdrawn from all forms of leasing. This amendment would apply only to coal deposits leased after January 1, 1975.

The energy crisis has focused on alternative sources of energy, and, unfortunately, in my estimation, most of the attention is being given to low-sulfur coal in the Rocky Mountain area. Most of our surface coal deposits in the States of North Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana are easily surface mined with maximum profits. I am convinced that the coal industry is primarily interested in mining the easiest and most profitable manner with little regard for dislocation, environmental, and resource damage, local impact, or the future. I see no reason that the Federal Government should associate itself with the effort to tie up all coal resources in the West to be used at a time convenient to the major coal companies for their financial gain. There are tremendous deposits of coal—Federal, State, and private—that have already been leased and the surface has been acquired. In the West, some 12 million acres of coal have now been leased. Six million of this is Federal coal. Why should we be rushing to tie up the rest of the Federal coal? Admittedly, a moratorium on Federal coal leasing would create inconveniences for some of the larger strip mine operators, but this is inconsequential when compared with the detrimental effects that are associated with such large developments. Modern-day technology has overcome any significant inconvenience to industry.

The West Regional Commission indicates that, in Montana alone, there are 107,737 million tons of coal. Interestingly, over half of this, 65,165 million tons, could be mined by the underground method. Eight of the Western States have a total of 199,042 million tons of coal in place—almost one-half of the Nation's coal reserve.

Too little consideration is being given to alternative sources of energy. Why are we so feverish for accelerated research in wind, sun, and geothermal resources of energy? What about methane? Why are we not making a more concerted effort to improve the underground mining process, and upgrading working conditions for the miners? Let us determine as rapidly as possible just exactly what we can or cannot expect from the sun. In this area, I recognize that it is going to be utilized to a great degree, but why not in a more efficient manner through the MHD process? The administration has, for too long, held back on giving financial and administrative support to the MHD program, which is a more efficient use of coal, with minimal problems, and requires little water, a very precious resource in the West.

Coal is going to be mined in the West, and Montana will do its share to help meet the energy crisis; but not at our own expense. Montana will provide for its own needs and for those of the immediate area. Coal will be, and is, exported by the State and by others elsewhere, but I do not want to see eastern Montana opened up for a network of coal gasification plants, and the social, economic, and environmental impact that comes with projects of this nature. The coal gasification process involves the consumptive use of water, and this would place a very heavy drain on the Yellowstone, and Missouri River Basin Systems.

Mr. President, the one consideration that must be paramount in making these energy decisions for the future is that eastern Montana, and neighboring States are rural in nature and are dependent on an agricultural economy. We must be concerned with protection of agricultural productivity, personal property, and community health and safety. Coal gasification is not yet a very sophisticated process, and creates many problems for the environment, local impact, displacement of local resources, a 20- to 30-year old life, and an uncertain, but frightening, afterlife. I, personally, am not willing to stand by and endorse a program that will mean rural slums for eastern Montana. State licensed utilities have a responsibility to their own, but I am not confident that this extends to the out-of-State company or utility. We already see some examples of shack towns, and sprawling trailer communities with inadequate services.

Coal development anywhere in the Nation needs to be strictly regulated, properly taxed, and utilized. The developers, in addition to a commitment to make certain that no one part of the Nation has to absorb the total consequences of all-out development of coal. We do not want a policy of coal development because it is cheap, and plentiful, and at anyone's expense.

Each Member of the Senate should have on his desk a copy of the autumn issue of Western Wildlands, a natural resource journal published by the University of Montana. This is a comprehensive survey of coal development in Montana, listing the views of those concerned for and against.

Mr. President, the Sunday, March 9, 1975, issue of the New York Times contains a news account of the recent press conference held by the President of the United Auto Workers Union. During the press conference, he discussed coal mining, and its apparent shift from the east to the west. Mr. Woodcock stated:

"The bulk of our coal lies east of the Mississippi River." He said, "We should be developing processes to remove the high sulphur content from that coal and be using it rather than ripping up the West." I ask unanimous consent that this news story be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WOODCOCK SPEAKS NEW ENERGY UNIT: LABOR LEADERS SAY IT SHOULD REGULATE OIL COMPANIES

MAHWAH, N.J., March 8.—Leonard Woodcock, a representative of the United Auto Workers Union, said today that the nation's economic condition and what he called the monopolistic practices of major oil companies were serious enough to warrant the setting up of a national energy development board with broad regulatory powers.

Mr. Woodcock said such a board should have the kind of bipartisan policy: development authority as that of the War Production Board in World War II.

The labor leader's comments came during a news conference before a speech he delivered a month ago to a meeting of students and union members this afternoon at Ramapo State College here.

He stressed that "the major energy sources are not in favor of full nationalization" of the oil industry, Mr. Woodcock said any energy development board would have to have enough power to "take strong action, or to break up monopolies if necessary."

He said that he had been discussing the future of such a board during the last week with Congressional leaders in Washington and that "there has been some encouraging response from them on the project."

***

... on the California Democrat who is chairman of the House Democratic Caucus, John N.udgee, Woodcock added today's conference on "Working People and the Economic Crisis." He said that he was familiar with the discussions on Mr. Woodcock's proposal, but that he "would have to find out more of the particulars before I could discuss its chances."

Mr. Woodcock said the economic and energy crisis is every bit as serious as the war crisis they faced during the nineteen forties, adding that "there's no industry is ever going to revive until the energy crisis itself revives.

"The bulk of our coal lies east of the Mississippi River," he said. "We were developing processes to remove the high sulphur content from that coal and being it rather than ripping up the West."

Mr. Woodcock said that because of company control over oil and other sources of energy, including coal and uranium, "an energy board would require the authority to take over those companies that stand in the way of new policies."

Mr. MANSFIELD: My amendment would limit the Federal Government's role in coal development and it would also give some hope to those ranchers, and surface owners who are not interested in being their lands stripped at any price, and who wish to continue their current livelihood. These people are a part of a way of life which must be preserved and protected.

In the interest of awareness of what is happening in the West, and I am convinced that the people of the Great Plains and Rocky Mountains do not want to become the "utility backyards of the Nation." The adoption of my amendment will, in some degree, slow down but not impede the process, and it will give the little guy a chance.