U.S. CONGRESS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 33

NOVEMBER 22, 1971 TO DECEMBER 1, 1971

(PAGES 42575 TO 43950)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1971

practical answer to America's critical natural gas shortage has been proposed by Dr. Norman C. Ford and Dr. Joseph W. Kane of the Department of Physics and Astronomy of the University of Massachusetts. They would develop an enormous solar furnace, which would heat water to 1,500 degrees C. by focusing sunlight on a boiler through a complex of inexpensive plastic lenses. At such a high temperature, some of the water vapor would be dissociated into pure hydrogen and oxygen.

According to them, "if one can selectively pump the hydrogen out as fast as it is produced, the goal will have been accomplished," and the hydrogen could then be used as high-grade fuel to supplant ordinary natural gas. Additionally, "the generation of hydrogen circumvents two of the serious problems associated with most solar power schemes in that the 'energy' is both storable over long periods and transportable over long distances, as electricity, for example, is not."

The most innovative and exhaustively researched idea for the large-scale conversion of solar radiation to electricity on land has been proposed by two astronomers, Dr. Alden Meinel, Director of the Optical Sciences Center of the University of Arizona, and his wife Marjorie. The Meinels propose the construction of 1,000 land-based solar power stations each capable of producing 1,000 megawatts (*i.e.* one million kilowatts).

This so-called National Solar Power Facility would be located in the largely uninhabited desert region of the lower Colorado River basin, between the Mexican border and Las Vegas, Nevada. It could, the Meinels say, supply most of the United States' electrical needs in 2076, as well as those of northern Mexico.

Since the power plants would use conventional steam turbine technology, they would have to be cooled. The Meinels propose to do this by pumping salt water from the Gulf of California through aqueducts built in Mexico's Sonora province. The cooling process would heat the water enough to desalinate it. The steam would be collected and condensed, producing 50 billion gallons of fresh water a day. That is enough fresh water to supply 120 million people in what is now a chronically water-hungry region.

The most encouraging aspect of the Meinels' proposal is the efficiency of the overall power system. Counting all energy losses, the predicted efficiency of sunlight conversion to electricity is just over 30 percent, or about two to three times that expected from a land-based solar power plant converting electricity by silicon cells. The secret of this remarkable efficiency is the design of the solar collectors.

A typical collector would consist of a tubular heat absorber mounted inside a glass envelope; the glass would be coated with a thin multilayer optical coating to transmit sunlight effectively as well as trap infrared radiation and reflect it back to the heat absorber.

Heat energy would be transferred from the system's absorber to liquid metal channeled through the collector to a central thermal storage facility, where the heat (1,000 degrees F.) would be stored in a huge tank of molten salt. The heated salt would then supply the energy necessary to drive steam turbines for ultimate production of electricity.

Ten percent of the desert

The entire facility calls for some 13,000 square miles of desert area, in which the 1,000 individual plants would be placed (see map). There are more than 100,000 square miles of desert in the western United States, and the Meinels want about ten percent of it.

Certain environmental questions stand out. For each gallon of fresh water produced, a gallon of brine would be rejected to the Gulf of California. In time, this additional salt could upset the estuarine ecology of the Gulf, but the Meinels' theoretical studies indicate that if the brine is pumped far enough out into the Gulf, natural turnover of the Gulf's waters will dissipate it sufficiently.

Land use for the facility itself, its supporting aqueducts and its underground transmission lines may also prove to be a problem. But one wonders if it wouldn't be worth trading desert land for a virtually nonpolluting solar-power complex, rather than continuing to destroy the Colorado River basin by hydroelectric projects and filthy coal-electric power stations, such as the notorious Four Corners center which itself involves strip-mining large areas.

Of all proposals for the development of a land-based solar electric project, the Meinels' has the fewest technological and economic worries. The cost of electricity from one of their plants operating 20 years in the future is slated to be approximately five mills per kilowatt hour, which is competitive with today's market. This single fact may get the whole project moving.

But the wheels of change are slow to foster and finance growth of the essential groundwork necessary even to get the first modular solar home into operation. President Nixon referred to solar energy in his June 1971 address on energy problems, but needed money has not yet been invested in the key research projects necessary to realize the solar dream.

A few corporations and power companies have begun to take their first, tentative steps toward the development of solar energy on a large scale. But significant private investment in sun power is a long way off, and most bets for its rapid development still rest with government funding.

At present, federal expenditures for all energy research and development amount to about $500–$600 million. Of this, nuclear power plant development takes about 85 percent. What is left is devoted mainly to attempts to clean up existing fossil-fueled power facilities and mitigate the other environmental problems of dirty, inefficient power production methods.

To develop the needed technology, many years of painstaking research are necessary. At present, the only sources of government funds for research into solar applications have come from NASA, the National Science Foundation and the Air Force. NASA spends several million dollars yearly on solar-cell technology, but only on cells for limited space applications.

The newest and most innovative division of the National Science Foundation, the RANN program (Research Applied to National Needs) has begun to initiate funding in the area. Dr. Meinel's group at the University of Arizona has received a $64,400 grant to conduct an eight-month investigation of their system. But the RANN program, the brightest hope of solar scientists at the moment, has limited resources for supporting much more work in the area.

Today's leaders in the solar field remain surprisingly optimistic, however, and are full of proposals to industry and government for new agencies (such as an "energy NASA") and grand schemes for promoting this unusual product. William Cherry says: "Since solar energy can't be used as a weapon, there's no need for international secrecy. Super-facilities aren't necessary to begin developing this power source. In fact, the American public can participate in this on a do-it-yourself basis. Not many people build nuclear reactors as a hobby. Solar power can be developed at home."

The many forms of solar power may not be the sole answer to the energy crisis, but it is clear that without tremendous support, the promise of its sure, clean energy may forever be lost by a shortsighted civilization. To utilize the full potential of solar power will require years of research, development and hard work.

Solar energy's strongest supporter in the Congress, Senator Mike Gravel (D., Alaska), said in a July Senate debate on AEC appropriations: "It could be argued that the crucial gap (besides safety) between nuclear electricity and solar electricity is the multibillion dollar government subsidy for nuclear electricity. The government has spent *zero* dollars toward the development of large-scale solar electrical generating plants... It makes no sense to lament an alleged conflict between energy and the environment when we have ignored our most obvious source of natural energy."

STRIP MINING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the great unresolved environmental issues is the accelerating destruction of our land by strip mining for coal and other minerals.

In 1965, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) first introduced legislation to halt this abuse, and he has reintroduced similar proposals in every subsequent Congress.

As the Wisconsin Senator recently pointed out, there has been a dramatic change in attitude on the issue since then. With the great increase in public awareness and concern, the question is no longer whether Congress should act against this incredible environmental abuse, but how.

As noted, Senator NELSON has introduced tough legislation in this regard and he recently outlined these measures in his statement as the leadoff witness at the strip mining hearing by the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels, of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator NELSON'S excellent and hard-hitting statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the strip mining bills, including S. 77 and S. 1498 which I have proposed.

In 1965, I first introduced a bill, S. 2688, for strip mining controls, including requirements for Federal licensing of all surface mines and for reclamation. The measure was revised and reintroduced from Congress to Congress along with other proposals, and hearings were held.

In the six years since, there has been a dramatic change in attitude on the strip mining issue. For everyone from environmentalists to the industry itself, the question is no longer whether Congress should act, but how. And with coal stripping increasing at an accelerated pace, the urgency of the situation is universally recognized.

What has happened is that the American public has become educated and concerned about the environmental crisis in general and the incredible destruction of strip mining in particular, and the institutions of this society are finally beginning to respond. The nationwide environmental awakening was represented and stimulated by Earth Day, 1970, with the participation of millions of people, young and old. Because of the vast, peaceful outpouring of public concern, the environmental issue was made a part of the national political dialogue for the first time.

And the environmental and human tragedy of strip mining itself has been brought home to the entire nation by the eloquent speeches and persistent efforts of the Ken Hechlers and Harry Caudills, by the work of many environmental human welfare, and other public interest groups, and by continuous, hard-working newspaper coverage.

Strip mining's permanent destruction of the values of the land has not only been a crime against the environment, but an incredible economic waste. It levies a cost against the future far beyond any short-term profit that has been gained.

Thus, from an environmental point of view, I support a ban on the coal strip mining, by far the largest mining activity with the greatest impact. In addition to reintroducing my legislation to set controls on all surface mining, I introduced this year in the Senate the bill to ban the coal stripping.

If in the committee's judgment, it is concluded that reclamation in certain circumstances is possible, and the outright coal stripping ban is not adopted, at the very least, a strong, effective regulatory measure with tough reclamation requirements, inspections and enforcement is essential.

The Subcommittee Chairman's measure, S. 2452, includes a sound definition of reclamation, and in the Subcommittee's hearings and deliberations, it would seem important to determine whether and with what requirements this standard can be met.

If it is determined that meaningful reclamation is achievable, at the very minimum the following would seem to be essential requirements:

A ban on so-called contour mining for coal;

A prohibition of any surface mining without a permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency or, if a state adopts a Federally-approved implementation plan meeting all the requirements of the Federal law, a state permit instead;

A requirement of reclamation plans for strip mining which assure that the land will be restored to a condition allowing its original uses and potential to be fulfilled;

A national inventory of all potentially strippable areas;

A moratorium on the Federal issuance of coal leases and exploration permits on the U.S. public lands out West until a comprehensive environmental review is done as required under Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act;

Reclamation of abandoned strip mined lands, financed by a Reclamation Fund supported by Federal moneys and by reclamation fees collected from the mining industry based on their environmental impact;

Establishment of underground mining controls similar to those for surface mining;

Special Federal protections and aids to assure the restoration of any jobs that might be displaced by surface mining controls;

Provisions for full public participation at every step of the process of regulations and controls, and for citizens suits at least for non-discretionary provisions of the legislation.

With the great and rising concern about strip mining that has been demonstrated from all across the nation in just this past year, it is clear that the American people are not going to be satisfied with halfway measures on this grave environmental abuse.

And instead of being allowed to continue passing along to the American taxpayer and to future generations the mounting damage bill, the strip mining industry must be required to internalize these costs, and must bear the burden of proof that reclamation of these lands can and will be done.

Thus far, the great strip mining and the greatest concern have centered in Appalachia, a region where a wealth of coal and of natural beauty seem to have been inextricably bound together.

But far more than just the ravaging and pollution of the region's scenic and other natural resources, the strip mining is bringing the disruption and displacement of a people and all that they care about and all that sustains them.

It is a story of the destroying of a part of the earth and all its resources. Appalachia has been bought at bargain basement prices for the few. And for the people of that region and the entire country, no amount of money could pay for what already has been lost.

In short, the pillage and plunder of strip mining in Appalachia are bringing destruction on a scale comparable to that of war itself. It is environmental warfare on our own country.

Now, the same tragedy is posed for the American West. Vast beds of coal underlying thirteen Western states constitute 77 percent of the strippable reserves of this country. With the nation's insatiable energy demands, and with developing technology to convert coal to gas or other fuels, these vast deposits are now becoming feasible to exploit. Already, permits for coal exploration or leases or coal stripping have already been obtained by private interests on 3,500 square miles of U.S. public and acquired and Indian lands, with the vast bulk out West.

It is quickly becoming apparent that vast portions of the region could become a mammoth strip mine. Substantial underground coal mining is probable as well. Without proper environmental protections, the West is in danger of becoming another Appalachia.

The huge scale of the planned Western strip mining for coal becomes dramatically clear when one notes that some of the largest energy companies in the country—Mobil Oil, Peabody Coal Corp., Atlantic Richfield, the Sun Oil Co., and the Carter Oil Co. among others—have already obtained large leases on the public coal deposits.

Reportedly, a confidential survey by a private gas association has already pinpointed 176 prospective sites for huge plants to convert coal to gas, mostly in the coal areas spread throughout the West.

With these gigantic strip mining—coal gasification complexes, the face of the West would be reworked, with thousands of square miles of public and private lands drastically altered, possibly eliminating other uses forever.

Without reclamation, these lands held by the American public would in effect not be leased but sold as consumable, disposable goods. And there is serious question as to whether strip mined lands can actually be reclaimed.

If pollution were to result from the coal stripping and processing, and adequate controls were not established, the consequences could prove devastating in an already water scarce region.

Many of the major river basins in the country could be affected by the massive coal operations: the Colorado River Basin, with coal areas in Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico; the Arkansas River Basin, by coal areas in Oklahoma and Arkansas as well as in Colorado; the Platte River Basin, by coal areas in Wyoming; the Snake River Basin, by coal areas in Wyoming; and the Missouri River Basin, by coal and lignite areas in Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

November 5, I wrote a letter to Russell Train, chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality and to Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton urging a halt to the issuance of Federal permits and leases and Bureau of Reclamation water permits for coal strip mining on the public lands in the West until an environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is made.

While some environmental study steps have been taken, and others considered, and a Section 102 statement under NEPA is being done on the power generating complex using coal from Black Mesa in Arizona, the comprehensive environmental reviews necessary under the National Environmental Policy Act to determine the cumulative impact of coal strip mining out West and whether the lands can be reclaimed simply have not been done.

And while I am aware that the low sulphur coal in the West and coal gasification offer potential environmental and energy supply benefits, my concern is that in our efforts to solve the energy questions, we do not trade one set of environmental and energy problems for another.

I request that a copy of my letter on the Western coal leases and permits be included in the hearing record at the end of these remarks.

Also, Mr. Chairman, last August, Ben Franklin of the New York Times did an excellent piece on this development, and I ask that his article also be printed in the record when this statement is concluded.

Thus in this Congress, we find ourselves at a watershed time in the history of the strip mining concern: backed by a concerned, aware public, we must act to halt the destruction in Appalachia and in other strip mining areas, and prevent similar devastation in the West.

And the strip mining issue poses a crucial test not only of environmental policies and commitment, but of the ability of public agencies to act effectively in the public interest.

Time and again, we have seen Federal agencies who were established to act on behalf of the public become handmaidens to the narrow, profit-seeking goals of private interests.

But with the broadscale intervention of the American public, legislative, administrative and judicial actions have been taken in the environmental area that were more effective and far-reaching than I think any of us would have imagined possible just a few years ago.

In effect, we are now on the way to establishing as national policy the principle that no one has the right to pollute, and are putting the laws on the books necessary to back it up.

Our next big environmental step must be to establish the similar principle that no one has the right to destroy or harm the land, and with continued strong and coordinated public support, I believe this can be done.

The surest way to stop the destruction of the landscape by coal mining—by far the largest mining activity with the greatest overall impact—is to ban the stripping. And from an environmental standpoint, I support a ban on the coal strip mining.

This year, in addition to reintroducing my bill, S. 77, to set controls on all surface mining and to prohibit it where reclamation is not possible, I introduced in the Senate the bill by Congressman Hechler to ban the coal stripping.

Cosponsoring this measure, S. 1498, with me, are Senators McGovern, Kennedy, Humphrey, Case and Harris.

As I noted in my floor statement on the introduction of S. 1498, of all the proposals, the measure to ban stripping for coal most effectively raises a fundamental question of whether reclamation is possible, and thus must be seriously considered.

The nationwide debate that this measure has stimulated has already been highly informative and important in the legislative process, and I think that in its deliberations the Subcommittee can benefit greatly from the delineation of the issues that is taking place.

If an outright coal stripping ban is not adopted, at the very least, a strong, effective

regulatory measure with rigorous and very specific requirements is essential.

Otherwise, in the coal rush that would follow, the hope represented by the current public effort against strip mining abuse would turn to despair and disillusionment, knocking away one more vital underpinning in the foundation of government credibility.

I request that recent editorials in the Christian Science Monitor, the Washington Post, and the New York Times which note the great public interest and the need for action be printed in the hearing record at the end of these remarks, along with a copy of my statement on the introduction of S. 1498.

Short of an outright ban on all coal stripping, the following would seem to me to be minimum provisions for a strip mining bill:

—*Ban so-called contour mining for coal, stipulating the specific degree of slope that will be the cutoff point.* Among others, the Conservation Foundation has suggested the cutoff as a slope of 13 degrees or more, marking the point at which highwalls and benches are created, causing the most severe environmental results. The 13 degree distinction exists in Kentucky and Pennsylvania laws, whose controls are among the strongest in the states.

Especially useful comments on the economic effects of a ban on contour mining were made by CF's Malcolm Baldwin in his statement in House hearings. He estimated that contour mining—on slopes 13 degrees and above—accounts for about 20 percent of our domestic coal production.

This need could be filled by increasing coal production from underground mines or by converting—temporarily if need be—to other fuel sources such as residual fuel oil, by adjusting our import quotas and by encouraging more residual oil production from domestic refineries.

Studies also show that most deep mines work two shifts and that changes to three shifts a day, six days a week, would alone produce an additional 150 million tons of coal a year, more than enough to fill any energy gap created by the banning of contour mining.

Another 50 million tons of coal a year could be made available within six months from expansion of deep mines and so-called punch mining in existing contour mines.

Another possibility would be establishing quotas on our own coal exports.

Finally, a special board could be created to investigate and recommend solutions, including possible variances from phase out deadlines, where a genuine energy supply hardship could be shown by a particular utility or industry.

Prohibit any surface mining without a Federal permit, or, where a state has adopted a Federally-approved plan meeting all the requirements of Federal law, a state permit. Permits would be required for mining on all public and private lands. Similar to the water quality bill just passed by the Senate, permits would be issued only on assurance of compliance with the requirements of the Federal law and all regulations, along with water and air quality standards.

As under the water bill, permits would be issued initially from the Federal level, but the program could be taken over by the state if the state adopts a Federally-approved implementation plan which meets all the requirements of the act.

Though the permit system would apply to all surface mining, requirements would vary according to the resources being mined.

In line with the important concepts stated by the President in submitting his reorganization plans last year that enforcement should be kept separate from development functions, the Environmental Protection Agency should be designated the administering agency for the permit system.

Inasmuch as other committees have retained oversight of portions of EPA with which they have historically been concerned, this would not appear to pose interference with this committee's minerals jurisdiction.

The current status of state strip mining control laws around the country provides dramatic justification for primary authority at the Federal level.

In Appalachian states, where there has been ample time to test the laws, the problem has been lack of adequate appropriations, shortage of inspectors, and consistently weak enforcement, with failure to adequately review and where necessary deny permit applications, or revoke permits or licenses where appropriate.

The state programs have also been characterized by inadequate performance bonds allowing only the most superficial efforts to pass for reclamation, failure to impose bond forfeiture where it is merited, and yielding to industry pressures to be released prematurely from reclamation liability.

In the Western states, where massive coal strip mining is posed, requirements are even more lax. Reportedly, in Wyoming only $20,000 per year has been budgeted for all inspection activities for all strippable minerals in the state.

In Colorado, the performance bond to be imposed is not to exceed $100 an acre, far short of what is necessary.

In North Dakota, the performance bond is set at only $200 per acre, and the reclamation plan apparently does not have to be submitted prior to the date of the issuance of the permit.

In Montana, in addition to funding and personnel shortages, performance bonds are still far short of meaningful requirements.

Reportedly, New Mexico and Utah have no laws as yet to govern coal strip mining.

Require for a strip mining permit a reclamation plan which will assure that the land will be restored to a condition that would allow its original uses and potential to be fulfilled.

Far too frequently, what has passed for reclamation in the past has been a "green lie," revegetation and regrading of the most cosmetic sort, ignoring vital ecological and resource factors that will actually determine the future of that area.

If strip mining controls and reclamation are to be successful at all, strip mining legislation must be specific, assuring deadlines for completion of reclamation as well as minimum performance bonds which are high enough so that a public agency can do the reclamation adequately if the mining company forfeits.

And as other Federal program experience has clearly shown, no strip mining control program will succeed without tough inspection and enforcement.

As an example, a prerequisite to any strip mining approvals should be assurance that the enforcement agency has adequate funds and inspectors, and it would seem to be fair to require the strip miners themselves to contribute toward the inspection program.

Tight inspection procedures should be established: for instance, it would seem reasonable to require that inspections of reclamation progress be made as frequently as every two weeks, that they come at irregular times, unannounced, and that the inspectors be rotated.

A national inventory and classification of all areas with potentially strippable minerals. A primary aim of such a study would be determination of which areas were possible to reclaim in strip mining, based on factors such as acidity, aridity, elevation, and timberland which would have to be clearcut before mining.

Such a study could be conducted within 18 months, and based on its conclusions, issuance of strip mining permits in certain areas might be withheld until such time as technology had advanced to the point where such lands could be reclaimed.

Especially if it were assigned the strip mining permit responsibility, the Environmental Protection Agency should conduct the study.

A moratorium on the issuance of coal leases and exploration permits on the U.S. public lands out West until a comprehensive environmental review is done as required under Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act.

In checking with the Bureau of Land Management recently, our office learned that no environmental impact statements have been filed on the coal leasing on the Western BLM lands, even though the National Environmental Policy Act specifically requires such statements for "major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." A Section 102 report is being prepared in the Black Mesa operation on Indian lands in Arizona.

In response to my letter mentioned earlier, the President's Council on Environmental Quality yesterday confirmed to my office that it is concerned about the matter and is looking into it further with Interior Department agencies.

It should be noted that many of the Western coal leases were granted before passage of the National Environmental Policy Act and what major acreages were leased even before Interior regulations requiring on-site studies were issued in 1969.

In regard to building in environmental requirements for these prior leases before any mining begins, I would point out that Section 103 of the NEPA requires all Federal agencies to review their current policies and regulations and propose such measures as necessary to bring their authority and policies into conformity with NEPA. It would seem to me that Section 103 would thus require a review of the environmental impact and requirements of the past leases.

The same permit and reclamation requirements should be established for mining on the Federal public lands as are proposed here for the state and private lands. In the case of the Federal public lands, it would seem appropriate to require EPA certification of Bureau of Land Management leases and permits.

Reclamation of so-called "orphan" lands that were strip mined and left some time ago, and of lands affected by underground mining. The reclamation would be financed by a Fund supported in part by reclamation fees levied on the mining industry.

Already, the inventory of lands ravaged from strip mining exceeds an area the size of Connecticut, and the destruction is accelerating.

As proposed in both S. 77 and S. 1498, a Reclamation Fund would be established to carry out this program. The Fund would be financed by Federal contributions and by reclamation fees which would be levied on current and future mining operations based on the amount and duration of impact their activities would have on the environment and on other land uses. The reclamation should be administered by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In addition to a serious commitment to enforce the 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, underground mining controls similar to those for the strip mining must also be established. These should include provisions for a permit system and reclamation plans with specific requirements, as well as a provision to prohibit any underground mining operation in wilderness areas established pursuant to or by the 1964 Wilderness Act.

Land undermined by underground mining probably exceeds 7 million acres, with some 2 million acres expected to experience sub-

sidence by the year 2000. Fires and silt and acid mine drainage are also important underground mining effects. These devastating problems reflect a combination of difficult geologic and hydrologic conditions, a recalcitrant industry, and economic disadvantages experienced by deep-mine operators unable to compete with an unregulated stripping industry.

—Special Federal protections and aids must be established to assure the restoration of any jobs that might be displaced by surface mining controls.

In achieving a decent environment in this country, we need not sacrifice the human welfare, and I have long strongly supported measures to reconcile any potential conflict between these aims.

For instance, I proposed an amendment to the water quality bill to establish a program of long-term, low interest Federal loans to small businesses that might be adversely affected in meeting water pollution controls. The proposal was adopted by the Senate 92–0.

Regarding strip mining, Congressman John Seiberling has introduced amendments in the House to aid workers who are laid off due to a mine shutdown. Authority would be given to the Secretary of Labor to provide readjustment payments to an adversely affected worker. A worker would be eligible for this readjustment allowance for up to 52 weeks. In addition, a relocation allowance may be granted to a laid-off worker who can find work outside of a specified commuting distance.

In addition, reclamation could also provide a major employment opportunity for any men who may be out of work from the effects of strip mining controls, and any such workers should have a priority in reclamation jobs. Special training and relocation assistance should be provided for this purpose.

Public participation must be fully provided for at every step of the process of regulations and controls. This must include non-discretionary authority for citizens suits against responsible Federal officials for violations of any provisions in the legislation, a provision similar to that already included in the water quality bill passed by the Senate. In addition, public hearings should be held on request before the issuance of any permits, and there should be public notification and the opportunity for a public hearing prior to the release of a mining company from liability for reclamation.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommitte is to be commended for holding these hearings on this important matter, and once again, I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

THE RECORDING INDUSTRY AND DRUG ABUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have long believed that we must utilize every weapon at our disposal to fight the drug abuse problem. I am pleased that recording companies have now begun to work with recording artists in helping fight drug abuse.

Most recently the Recording Industry Association of America created, in connection with the National Institute of Mental Health, a fine recording entitled, "Some Things You Always Wanted To Know About Drug Abuse." The record has been distributed free of cost to the Government and to every radio station in the country.

As one who represents the State in which so many recordings are produced, I am proud of the recording industry for this meaningful contribution to the war against drug abuse.

I ask unanimous consent that an article discussing the situation and published in the Albany Times Union of October 23, 1971, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Albany Times Union, Oct. 23, 1971]

THE NATIONAL SCENE—A MEANINGFUL CONTRIBUTION

(ISSUE.—With the recording and radio industries cooperating in a government program aimed at curbing drug abuse among young people, do they deserve criticism for using records allegedly glamorizing drug use?)

After weathering a storm of criticism—much of which now appears to have been unjust—the recording and radio industries today are making a significant contribution to a government sponsored program designed to discourage the use of drugs among young people.

Since the first of this month, radio stations throughout the nation have been devoting thousands of hours of public service air time to broadcasting messages which certainly should make a young man or woman think twice before accepting that first sample of an illegal drug.

One of the messages reaching a vast audience of teenagers and, hopefully, influencing them, is a six-sided LP album which covers most aspects of addiction and examines the insidious narcotics which bring on this distressing condition.

This fine educational instrument, entitled "Some Things You Always Wanted to Know about Drug Abuse," was produced, at no cost to the government, by the Recording Industry Association of America. In addition, many individual record companies have released commercial discs with anti-drug abuse themes.

Not so long ago, the record companies and radio statitons were being roundly blasted by many well-meaning critics for producing and playing records whose lyrics, it was charged, made drug use appear acceptable and even glamorous. It eventually was proved, however, that many of these attacks sprang from misunderstanding and were pretty wide of the mark at getting at the real roots of the drug problem.

But if any suspicions have continued to linger as the result of these criticisms, they certainly should be dispelled by the recording and broadcasting companies' forthright, generous and meaningful cooperation in the current government program.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE—RETIREMENT SECURITY AND THE AGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during this week the 1971 White House Conference on the Aging has been meeting in Washington. Three thousand four hundred delegates from all over the country are participating in almost 100 meetings covering a wide range of topics concerning problems of the elderly.

I take this opportunity to welcome New York's delegation and delegates from all over the United States to the White House Conference. The conference is an indispensable means for formulating sound public policy for the aging; and I believe Congress will be sensitive and responsive to the recommendations which are endorsed by the delegates to the conference.

Mr. President, certainly one of the most conspicuous problems identified with the elderly is the absence of an adequate income in the retirement years. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my remarks on this subject that were delivered on Monday, November 29, to a luncheon meeting of the delegates to the White House Conference on the Aging.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETIREMENT SECURITY IN A FREE SOCIETY: THE ROLE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROGRAMS

(Remarks of Senator JAVITS)

There are now approximately 26 million people 65 years of age and over in this country. A quarter of these Americans live below the poverty level; many do not become poor until they reach old age.

Because of this circumstance, the United States is rapidly approaching a critical juncture in its experience with provisions of income assurance to the aged. Some of the accepted principles that heretofore have governed the design of social security and private pension programs are now under serious attack.

The underlying problem—assuring adequate income for the aged—is not new, nor is the United States alone in experiencing increased pressures for adopting more effective strategies to deal with the issue. In recent years, Belgium, Canada, Great Britain, Germany and Switzerland—to name a few—have been compelled to re-examine the adequacy of their retirement systems. Still other countries—notably France—have succeeded in fashioning an elaborate and sophisticated integration of public and private retirement systems so as to insure an adequate old-age income for its workers.

Foreign models and proposals for change vary widely and reflect the specific historical, political, economic and social conditions of the countries involved. It is natural and desirable for experts in this country to examine closely foreign experience in order to develop perspectives from which to evaluate social security and private pension programs in the U.S. In the last analysis, however, the future direction of our "dual retirement system" will come from the unique complex of needs and interests of the American people. Therefore, primary attention must focus on our national concerns.

PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Since its inception, Social Security has been conceived as furnishing a minimum floor of retirement protection for almost the entire work force. Private initiatives, i.e., principally group pension plans, have been cast in the role of providing a "supplement" to the retirement income delivered by Social Security.

However, the scope and level of benefits under Social Security, or what is meant by providing a "minimum floor of protection," has never been firmly decided. This deficiency has grown more acute as persistent inflationary pressures have eroded the purchasing power of the retirement dollars provided by social security.

Most authorities agree that the wage-replacement ratio of social security—between 19 percent to 29 percent—is very low. The median social security benefit paid in 1967 to a retired couple—the latest year for which this data is available—was $129 a month. $241 is the minimum monthly income required to sustain a retired urban couple, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in January 1970.

Despite recent and proposed increases in social security, and despite the likely enactment of measures to guard against loss of social security purchasing power, the continuing inadequacy of Social Security remains a