

to the surroundings. It also is probable that situations will be found where it is needless to require that any reclamation be undertaken.

Undoubtedly, some will say that enactment of this bill will inhibit the development of the mining industry and cause severe economic losses. We all heard this in connection with our national water and air quality standards legislation. But industry has responded to those standards. I read an article in "Business Week" this week that shows the tremendous increase in investment by American industry in water pollution control facilities.

Some said they wouldn't do it unless there were tax incentive. Well, they are doing it and I think they deserve credit for doing it and the figures that come in I regard as highly encouraging.

As I said the other day in connection with the water quality hearings in the House, if industry continues to move at the tempo it has recently, I think you are going to see some very significant improvement in our environment. Most members of industry know that the national sentiment strongly favors effective measures for the protection of our natural resources.

I think this is truly encouraging. Industry is not complaining the way it did recently. I think the enlightened people in industry realize if you put all of industry on the same footing, if all are put to the same cost of carrying out reclamation measures, that then this adds to the cost of doing business, it adds to the cost of the product, and the cost is borne by the Nation as a whole. This is a sound and economical way of doing our business.

S. 3132 proposes to step up this action by creating a State-Federal relationship through which States would develop programs promoting an appropriate balance between the extraction of minerals and the need to preserve and protect the environment. The goals sought are not punitive nor are they visionary.

On the contrary, we are offering a moderate, orderly, and practical approach, tailored to meet local needs and providing for detailed consideration of regional conditions. I would not suggest, for example, that the Bingham Canyon pit in Utah, or the Hull-Rust pit in Minnesota, be filled with earth and rocks when operations cease at those great metal mines.

May I say to the chairman that this also is not necessary or possible in the copper mines in Arizona or Montana, because of their size and because of the places where they occur.

We believe that Federal encouragement is needed to assure that all 50 States—not merely some as at present—regulate surface mining and that all forms of surface mining are covered. We further believe that some minimum basic requirements for such State action are required to serve the national interest and to assure some equity between States, and equity within industry.

Remember that surface mining is not confined to the States where some controls already exist. The thing that was fascinating to me about one of those charts just pictured was that every State in the Nation had some surface mining activity, and it was interesting to me how this was roughly balanced over the Nation as a whole.

You could see the coal mining States, particularly Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky. There has been more surface mining in them than in other parts of the Nation, but there is activity in all 50 States.