

The original documents are located in Box 25, folder “5/20/75 HR25 Surface Mining Control Reclamation Act (vetoed) (5)” of the White House Records Office: Legislation Case Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Exact duplicates within this folder were not digitized.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am today signing H.R. 25, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975.

On December 30, 1974, I issued a Memorandum of Disapproval which explained the reasons for my veto of S. 425, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974. Briefly stated, I vetoed S. 425 on the grounds that it did not strike an appropriate balance between the need to increase coal production in the United States and reclamation and environmental protection. It would have had an unacceptably adverse effect on domestic coal production, which would have unduly impaired our ability to use the one abundant energy source over which we have total control, restricted our future choices on national energy policy, and increased our reliance on foreign oil. I also pointed out that S. 425 provided for excessive Federal expenditures and would have had an inflationary impact and that the bill contained numerous other deficiencies.

My Memorandum of Disapproval of S. 425 noted that:

"...I am truly disappointed and sympathetic with those in Congress who have labored so hard to come up with a good bill. We must continue to strive diligently to ensure that laws and regulations are in effect which establish environmental protection and reclamation requirements appropriately balanced against the Nation's need for increased coal production. This will continue to be my Administration's goal in the new year."



On February 6, 1975, in accordance with those considerations, I proposed a coal surface mining bill which followed the basic framework of the vetoed legislation changed only (a) to overcome the critical objections which lead to the veto, (b) to reduce further the potential for unnecessary production impact, and

(c) to make the legislation more effective and workable. In transmitting the bill, I reiterated that my energy program contemplates the doubling of our Nation's coal production by 1985. I further noted that this will require the opening of 250 major new coal mines, the majority of which must be surface mines.

Following submission of my bill, the Administration continued to work in every possible way with the Congress in an effort to produce surface coal mining legislation which strikes the necessary balance between environmental protection and increased coal production.

I appreciate the effort that Congress made in its attempt to produce an acceptable bill. Nevertheless, I regret that more of the changes I thought so important have not been made. I continue to have serious reservations about the potential adverse impact H.R. 25 may have on domestic coal production. Notwithstanding these concerns, and recognizing the large uncertainties about the bill's consequences, I am now willing to submit the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act to the acid test of experience. In doing so, I truly hope that the Act can serve as a reasonable basis for accomplishing the necessary increases in coal production as well as realizing the Nation's environmental protection and reclamation objectives.

I must emphasize that my approval of this legislation is based on the assumption that its adverse effects on coal production will not be excessive. The congressional proponents of this legislation have steadfastly maintained that the production losses will be minimal. I hope they are correct. If, however, coal production is unduly restricted by the operation of this Act, I will act immediately to seek corrective legislation from the Congress to remedy the problem.

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H.R. 25, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975.


On December 30, 1974, I issued a Memorandum of Disapproval which explained the reasons for my veto of S. 425, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974. Briefly stated, I vetoed S. 425 on the grounds that it did not strike an appropriate balance between the need to increase coal production in the United States and reclamation and environmental protection. It would have had an unacceptably adverse effect on domestic coal production, which would have unduly impaired our ability to use the one abundant energy source over which we have total control, restricted our future choices on national energy policy, and increased our reliance on foreign oil. I also pointed out that S. 425 provided for excessive Federal expenditures and would have had an inflationary impact and that the bill contained numerous other deficiencies.

My Memorandum of Disapproval of S. 425 noted that:

"The Executive Branch submitted to both the 92nd and 93rd Congresses legislation that would have established reasonable and effective reclamation and environmental protection requirements for mining activities. Throughout this period, the Administration made every effort in working with the Congress to produce a bill that would strike the delicate balance between our desire for reclamation and environmental protection and our need to increase coal production in the United States.

* * * * *

"...I am truly disappointed and sympathetic with those in Congress who have labored so hard to come up with a good bill. We must continue to strive diligently to ensure that laws and regulations are in effect which establish environmental protection and reclamation requirements appropriately balanced against the Nation's need for increased coal production. This will continue to be my Administration's goal in the new year."



On February 6, 1975, in accordance with those considerations, I proposed a coal surface mining bill which followed the basic framework of the vetoed legislation changed only (a) to overcome the critical objections which lead to the veto, (b) to reduce further the potential for unnecessary production impact, and (c) to make the legislation more effective and workable. In transmitting the bill, I reiterated that my energy program contemplates the doubling of our Nation's coal production by 1985. I further noted that this will require the opening of 250 major new coal mines, the majority of which must be surface mines.

Following submission of my bill, the Administration continued to work in every possible way with the Congress in an effort to produce surface coal mining legislation which strikes the necessary balance between environmental protection and increased coal production.

With genuine regret, I must report that our efforts to produce a balanced bill have failed.

H.R. 25, as enrolled, is similar to S. 425 (93rd Congress) in that it would establish Federal standards for the environmental protection and reclamation of surface coal mining operations, including the reclamation of orphaned lands. Under a complex procedural framework, the bill would encourage the States to develop and enforce a program for the regulation of surface coal mining with substitution of a federally administered program if the States do not act.

In its present form, H.R. 25 would have an unacceptable impact on our domestic coal production. By 1977-1978, the first year after the Act would take full effect, the Federal Energy Administration and the Department of the Interior have estimated that coal production losses could range from a minimum of 40 million tons to a maximum of 162 million tons (between 6% and 24% of expected production for that period). In addition, ambiguities in the bill could lead to protracted regulatory disputes and litigation, causing additional production losses.

As I stated in December and continue to believe today, our Nation cannot accept coal losses of that magnitude for a number of reasons:

- Coal is the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control. We must not arbitrarily place a self-imposed embargo on an energy resource that can be the major contributing factor in our program for energy independence.
- The United States must import expensive foreign oil to replace domestic coal that is not produced to meet our needs. Substantial losses of domestic coal production cannot be tolerated without serious economic consequences. This bill could make it necessary to import at least an additional 550 million barrels of oil per year at a cost of more than \$6 billion to our balance of payments.
- Unemployment would increase in both the coal fields and in those industries unable to obtain alternative fuels--total job losses could exceed 35,000.

In addition, H.R. 25 contains a number of other serious deficiencies:

- Over 70 million tons of our national coal reserves could be locked up--this is over half of our total coal reserves potentially mineable by surface methods.
- Higher costs for fuel, for mining production and reclamation and for Federal and State administration could impair economic recovery.
- State control over mining of Federally owned coal on Federal lands could result in severe restrictions, or perhaps even a ban, on production from those lands.

- The Federal role during the interim program could
(a) lead to unwarranted Federal preemption, displacement, or duplication of State regulatory activities, and (b) discourage States from assuming an active, permanent regulatory role in the future.

- H.R. 25 would give surface owners the right to "veto" the mining of federally owned coal or possibly enable them to realize a substantial windfall.

In sum, I think it is clear that H.R. 25 would place our Nation's most abundant energy resource in serious jeopardy--this must not happen. The bill is contrary to the combined interest of consumers, industry, coal miners, and the taxpayer. Accordingly, I am withholding my approval from H.R. 25.

In doing so, I am once again sincerely disappointed that we have been unable to agree upon an acceptable bill. Considerable effort on the part of both the Executive and Legislative branches has been put forth in this effort. In light of our inability to achieve an acceptable bill, I am today directing the Energy Resources Council to initiate an overall study of the coal surface mining reclamation issue. This study will reexamine all aspects of this complex issue, including the adequacy of present State law. The Council's report and recommendations will be submitted to me within six months. I will then recommend an appropriate course of action. Over this period, I hope that the Congress will also reflect further on the many difficult issues presented by this legislation. I hope that in this way we will be able to reach a mutually satisfactory approach that assures that the Nation's environmental protection and reclamation requirements are appropriately balanced against our need for increased coal production.

THE WHITE HOUSE

May , 1975

Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are more vulnerable today than we were during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases.

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving the goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals to date are inadequate to the achievement of the comprehensive energy objectives I have set.

In the face of our deteriorating energy situation and without Congressional action on a strong energy program, I cannot accept new obstacles in the path of our energy objectives. As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of our energy independence. We must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this vital energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce our energy imports and to meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H.R. 25 some of the proposals I made, it rejected others which were important in reducing the adverse impact on coal production and in clarifying various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.

The following are my principal reasons for withholding approval of this bill:

First, H.R. 25 would result in a substantial loss in coal production beyond the level that I find acceptable. The Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons a year would result. This would mean that from 6 to 24 percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. This production loss estimate does not include the potential impact of many ambiguous provisions of H.R. 25 for which loss estimates cannot be developed or the impact of delays that would result from attempts to resolve these ambiguities in the courts.

The bill that I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses -- between 33 and 80 million tons, according to the experts. I went that far, assuming that the Congress would speedily enact my energy program. The Congress has not acted. Therefore, I cannot accept the coal production losses that would result from H.R. 25.

Second, the reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H.R. 25. If a large coal production loss occurs, our dependence on Mid-East oil would triple by 1977.

Third, coal production cutbacks would result in 9,000 to 36,000 job losses and these losses would not be offset by reclamation and other activities financed under this bill. H.R. 25 would also result in increased costs for American consumers.

Another major reason for withholding approval of H.R. 25 is its legislative shortcomings. These include:

- The Federal-State regulatory and enforcement apparatus established by the bill would be cumbersome and unwieldy. It would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most States -- and do it in a manner that may encourage states to abandon their own efforts and leave the entire regulatory and enforcement job to the Federal Government.
- The new tax that would be established by H.R. 25 would be excessive and would unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- The bill provides authority under which State governments could ban surface mining of Federal coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- The Federal Government would pay landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in their hands -- thus providing a windfall profit at the expense of current coal users.

To enable us to move ahead with the development of coal production while protecting the environment, I have today directed the Department of the Interior to proceed with the steps necessary for the promulgation of revised regulations covering surface mining on Federal lands.

Although the Department has had these regulations under preparation for some time, their issuance was held up

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am today returning without my approval, H.R. 25, the proposed Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. I am unable to sign this bill for ~~the following~~ reasons:

because it would mean that;
First, it would exacerbate current economic problems and make

more difficult the achievement of our goal of energy independence.

Although this bill attempts to address valid environmental objectives, it would impose an unacceptable burden on our Nation's economy. *It would:*

- needlessly reducing coal production;
- increasing reliance on foreign oil;
- increasing the outflow of dollars;
- escalating consumer costs, particularly for electric bills;
- adding to unemployment, particularly in Appalachia; and by
- hampering economic recovery.

Second, the bill is ambiguous, vague and complex, as the record of Congressional debate indicates. It would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty -- uncertainty which is not in the best interests of achieving either our environmental or our energy objectives.

This country is headed into a serious energy shortage, and we are not facing up to it.

We can develop our energy sources and, at the same time, protect our environment. *But* this bill does not do that.

I have supported responsible action to control surface mining and to reclaim damaged land. I continue to support actions which strike a proper balance between our energy and economic goals, on the one hand, and important environmental objectives on the other. Unfortunately, H.R. 25 does not strike such a balance.

*WMSH
A*

(A)

~~It would mean that:~~

1. As many as 36,000 people would lose jobs at a time when unemployment already is ^{Too} high.
2. Consumers would pay higher costs -- particularly for electric bills -- at a time when consumer costs are already too high.
3. The Nation would be more dependent on foreign oil at a time when we are already ^{overly} ~~too~~ dependent ~~on~~ ~~foreign supplies~~ and dangerously vulnerable to ~~any~~ interruption of ^{supplies} ~~oil shipments (imports)~~.
4. Coal production would be needlessly cut back at a time when this vital domestic energy resource is needed more than ever.

Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are ^{today threatened} more vulnerable ^{to the disruption} ~~than~~ ^{than} we were during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will

of oil supplies

be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases. *This vulnerability places this country in an untenable situation and could result in new and serious economic problems.*

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving the goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals to date are inadequate to the achievement of the comprehensive energy objectives I have set.

~~In the face of our deteriorating energy situation, and without Congressional action on a strong energy program, I cannot accept new obstacles in the path of our energy~~

~~objectives.~~ ¶ As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of our energy independence. *on the face of our deteriorating energy situation, we* We must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this vital energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce our energy imports and to meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H.R. 25 some of the proposals I made, it rejected others which were important in reducing the adverse impact on coal production and in ~~clarifying various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.~~

STEP



This vulnerability places this country in an untenable situation and could result in new and serious economic problems.

In fact, the Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons would result in 1977. This would mean that six to ~~XXXXXX~~ twenty four percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. Actually, production losses resulting from H.R. 25 ^{are difficult to estimate and} could run considerably higher because of ambiguities in the bill and uncertainties over many of its provisions.

The bill I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses -- between 33 and 80 million tons, according to the experts. Even these losses would have been substantial, but the potential losses of H.R. 25 ~~XXXXX~~ are intolerable.

~~Secret~~ The reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H.R. 25. If a large coal production loss occurs, our dependence on Mid-East oil would triple by 1977.

Additional reasons for withholding approval of H.R. 25 are its legislative shortcomings. These include:

- Its ambiguous, vague and complex provisions -- as the record of Congressional debate indicates. The bill would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty -- uncertainty which is not in the best interests of achieving either our environmental or our energy objectives.
- Its cumbersome and unwieldy Federal-State regulatory and enforcement provisions. It would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most states. Since 1971, 21 states which produce over 90 percent of the nation's surface mined coal have either enacted new environmental legislation governing surface mining or have strengthened laws already on the books.
- Its ^{tax}provisions which would be excessive and would unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- Its provisions which enable State governments to ban surface mining of coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- Its provisions permitting the Federal government to pay private landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in their hands, could provide windfall profits at the expense of current coal users.

To enable us to move ahead with the development of coal production while protecting the environment, I have today directed the Department of the Interior to proceed with the steps necessary for the promulgation of revised regulations covering surface mining on Federal lands.

Although the Department has had these regulations under preparation for some time, their issuance was held up

pending Congressional action to make sure they were compatible with the new surface mining legislation. We must now proceed with these regulations so that we can assure reasonable and effective environmental protection and reclamation requirements on Federal lands.

~~Process is under way~~ Let me re-state these ~~points~~ *my position!*: I favor action to protect the environment, to prevent abuses that have accompanied surface mining of coal in the past, and to reclaim land disturbed by surface mining. I believe that we can achieve those goals without imposing unreasonable restraints on our ability to achieve energy independence, without adding unnecessary costs, without creating unnecessary unemployment and without precluding the use of vital domestic energy resources.

~~H~~


THE WHITE HOUSE,

ok

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am today returning without my approval, H.R. 25, the proposed Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. I am unable to sign this bill for two major reasons. First, it would exacerbate current economic problems and make more difficult the achievement of our goal of energy independence. Although this bill attempts to address valid environmental objectives, it would impose an unacceptable burden on our Nation's economy by:

- needlessly reducing coal production;
- increasing reliance on foreign oil;
- increasing the outflow of dollars;
- escalating consumer costs, particularly for electric bills;
- adding to unemployment, particularly in Appalachia; and by
- hampering economic recovery.



Second, the bill is ambiguous, vague and complex, as the record of Congressional debate indicates. It would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty -- uncertainty which is not in the best interests of achieving either our environmental or our energy objectives.

This country is headed into a serious energy shortage, and we are not facing up to it.

We can develop our energy sources and at the same time protect our environment; but this bill does not do that. I have supported responsible action to control surface mining and to reclaim damaged land. I continue to support actions which strike a proper balance between our energy and economic goals, on the one hand, and important environmental objectives on the other. Unfortunately, H.R. 25 does not strike such a balance.

Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are more vulnerable today than we were during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases.

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving the goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals to date are inadequate to the achievement of the comprehensive energy objectives I have set.

In the face of our deteriorating energy situation and without Congressional action on a strong energy program, I cannot accept new obstacles in the path of our energy objectives. As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of our energy independence. We must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this vital energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce our energy imports and to meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H.R. 25 some of the proposals I made, it rejected others which were important in reducing the adverse impact on coal production and in clarifying various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.



The following are my principal reasons for withholding approval of this bill:

First, H.R. 25 would result in a substantial loss in coal production beyond the level that I find acceptable. The Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons a year would result. This would mean that from 6 to 24 percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. This production loss estimate does not include the potential impact of many ambiguous provisions of H.R. 25 for which loss estimates cannot be developed or the impact of delays that would result from attempts to resolve these ambiguities in the courts.

The bill that I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses -- between 33 and 80 million tons, according to the experts. I went that far, assuming that the Congress would speedily enact my energy program. The Congress has not acted. Therefore, I cannot accept the coal production losses that would result from H.R. 25.

Second, the reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H.R. 25. If a large coal production loss occurs, our dependence on Mid-East oil would triple by 1977.




Third, coal production cutbacks would result in 9,000 to 36,000 job losses and these losses would not be offset by reclamation and other activities financed under this bill. H.R. 25 would also result in increased costs for American consumers.

Another major reason for withholding approval of H.R. 25 is its legislative shortcomings. These include:

- The Federal-State regulatory and enforcement apparatus established by the bill would be cumbersome and unwieldy. It would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most States -- and do it in a manner that may encourage states to abandon their own efforts and leave the entire regulatory and enforcement job to the Federal Government.
- The new tax that would be established by H.R. 25 would be excessive and would unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- The bill provides authority under which State governments could ban surface mining of Federal coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- The Federal Government would pay landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in their hands -- thus providing a windfall profit at the expense of current coal users.

To enable us to move ahead with the development of coal production while protecting the environment, I have today directed the Department of the Interior to proceed with the steps necessary for the promulgation of revised regulations covering surface mining on Federal lands.

Although the Department has had these regulations under preparation for some time, their issuance was held up



pending Congressional action to make sure they were compatible with the new surface mining legislation. We must now proceed with these regulations so that we can assure reasonable and effective environmental protection and reclamation requirements on Federal lands. These regulations, together with State laws applicable to non-Federal lands, will enable us to move ahead with our environmental objectives while we develop new national legislation.

While this process is taking place, let me re-state these points for emphasis: I favor action to protect the environment, to prevent abuses that have accompanied surface mining of coal in the past, and to reclaim land disturbed by surface mining. I believe that we can achieve those goals without imposing unreasonable restraints on our ability to achieve energy independence, without adding unnecessary costs, without creating unnecessary unemployment and without precluding the use of vital domestic energy resources.



THE WHITE HOUSE,

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am today returning without my approval, H.R. 25, the proposed Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. I am unable to sign this bill because it would mean that:

1. As many as 36,000 people would lose jobs at a time when unemployment already is too high.
2. Consumers would pay higher costs -- particularly for electric bills -- at a time when consumer costs are already too high.
3. The Nation would be more dependent on foreign oil at a time when we are already overly dependent and dangerously vulnerable to interruption of supplies.
4. Coal production would be needlessly cut back at a time when this vital domestic energy resource is needed more than ever.

This country is headed into a serious energy shortage, and we are not facing up to it.

We can develop our energy sources and, at the same time, protect our environment. But this bill does not do that. I have supported responsible action to control surface mining and to reclaim damaged land. I continue to support actions which strike a proper balance between our energy and economic goals, on the one hand, and important environmental objectives on the other. Unfortunately, H.R. 25 does not strike such a balance.



Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are today more vulnerable to the disruption of oil supplies than we were during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases. This vulnerability places this country in an untenable situation and could result in new and serious economic problems.

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving the goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals to date are inadequate to the achievement of the comprehensive energy objectives I have set.

As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of our energy independence. In the face of our deteriorating energy situation, we must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this vital energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce our energy imports and to meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H.R. 25 some of the proposals I made, it rejected others which were important in reducing the adverse impact on coal production and in clarifying various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.

In fact, the Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons would result in 1977. This would mean that six to twenty-four percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. Actually, production losses resulting from H.R. 25 are difficult to estimate and could run considerably higher because of ambiguities in the bill and uncertainties over many of its provisions.

The bill I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses -- between 33 and 80 million tons, according to the experts. Even these losses would have been substantial, but the potential losses of H.R. 25 are intolerable.

The reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H.R. 25. If large coal production loss occurs, our dependence on Mid-East oil would triple by 1977.

Additional reasons for withholding approval of H.R. 25 are its legislative shortcomings. These include:

-- Its ambiguous, vague and complex provisions -- as the record of Congressional debate indicated. The bill would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty -- uncertainty which is not in the best interests of achieving either our environmental or our energy objectives.

- Its cumbersome and unwieldy Federal-State regulatory and enforcement provisions. It would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most states. Since 1971, 21 states which produce over 90 percent of the Nation's surface mined coal have either enacted new environmental legislation governing surface mining or have strengthened laws already on the books.
- Its tax provisions which would be excessive and would unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- Its provisions which enable State governments to ban surface mining of coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- Its provisions permitting the Federal government to pay private landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in their hands, could provide windfall profits at the expense of current coal users.

To enable us to move ahead with the development of coal production while protecting the environment, I have today directed the Department of the Interior to proceed with the steps necessary for the promulgation of revised regulations covering surface mining on Federal lands.

Although the Department has had these regulations under preparation for some time, their issuance was held up pending Congressional action to make sure they were compatible with the new surface mining legislation. We must now proceed with these regulations so that we can assure reasonable and effective environmental protection and reclamation requirements on Federal lands.

Let me re-state my position: I favor action to protect the environment, to prevent abuses that have accompanied surface mining of coal in the past, and to reclaim land disturbed by surface mining. I believe that we can achieve those goals without imposing unreasonable restraints on our ability to achieve energy independence, without adding unnecessary costs, without creating unnecessary unemployment and without precluding the use of vital domestic energy resources.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty against the best interests of achieving either our environmental or energy objectives.

- Cumbersome and unwieldy Federal-State regulatory and enforcement provisions. H.R. 25 would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most states. Since 1971, 21 states which produce over 90 percent of the nation's surface mined coal have either enacted new environmental legislation governing surface mining or have strengthened laws already on the books.
- H.R. 25's tax provisions which would be excessive and unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- Its provisions which enable State governments to ban surface mining of coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- Its provisions permitting the Federal government to pay private landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in private hands, could provide windfall profits at the expense of coal consumers.

To enable us to move ahead with the development of coal production while protecting the environment, I have today directed the Department of the Interior to proceed with the steps necessary for the promulgation of revised regulations covering surface mining on Federal lands.

Although the Department has had these regulations under preparation for some time, their issuance was held up pending Congressional action to make sure they were compatible with

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am today returning without my approval, H.R. 25, the proposed Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. I am unable to sign this bill because:

1. As many as 36,000 people would lose jobs when unemployment already is too high.
2. Consumers would pay higher costs -- particularly for electric bills -- when consumer costs are already too high.
3. The Nation would be more dependent on foreign oil -- when we are already overly dependent and dangerously vulnerable.
4. Coal production would be unnecessarily reduced -- when this vital domestic energy resource is needed more than ever.

America is approaching a more serious domestic energy shortage, and we are not facing up to it.

We can develop our energy sources while protecting our environment. But this bill does not do that. I have supported responsible action to control surface mining and to reclaim damaged land. I continue to support actions which strike a proper balance between our energy and economic goals and important environmental objectives.

Unfortunately, H.R. 25 does not strike such a balance.

Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are today more vulnerable to the disruption of oil supplies than we were

during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases. This vulnerability places us in an untenable situation and could result in new and serious economic problems.

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals are inadequate to achieve the energy objectives I have set.

As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of American energy independence. In the face of our deteriorating energy situation, we must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce energy imports and meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H.R. 25 some of my proposals, it rejected others necessary to reduce the adverse impact on coal production and to clarify various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.

The Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration now advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons would result in 1977. This would mean that six to twenty-four percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. Actually, production losses resulting from H.R. 25 could run considerably higher because of ambiguities in the bill and uncertainties over many of its provisions.

The bill I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses estimated between 33 and 80 million tons. Even though these losses would have been substantial, we could have accepted them if Congress had enacted the comprehensive energy program I proposed. But, now the potential losses of H.R. 25 are intolerable.

The reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H.R. 25. This kind of setback in coal production would cause our dependence on Mid-East oil to triple by 1977.

Additional reasons for withholding approval of H.R. 25 are its legislative shortcomings. These include:

- Ambiguous, vague and complex provisions -- as the record of Congressional debate indicates. The bill



would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty against the best interest of achieving either our environmental or energy objectives.

- Cumbersome and unwieldy Federal-State regulatory and enforcement provisions. H.R. 25 would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most states. Since 1971, 21 states which produce over 90 percent of the nation's surface mined coal have either enacted new environmental legislation governing surface mining or have strengthened laws already on the books.
- H.R. 25's tax provisions which would be excessive and unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- Its provisions which enable State governments to ban surface mining of coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- Its provisions permitting the Federal government to pay private landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in private hands, could provide windfall profits at the expense of coal consumers.

~~To enable us to move ahead with the development of coal production while protecting the environment, I have today directed the Department of the Interior to proceed with the steps necessary for the promulgation of revised regulations covering surface mining on Federal lands.~~

~~Although the Department has had these regulations under preparation for some time, their issuance was held up pending Congressional action to make sure they were compatible with~~



the new surface mining legislation. We will now proceed with these regulations to assure reasonable and effective environmental protection and reclamation requirements on Federal lands.

In short, I favor action to protect the environment, to prevent abuses that have accompanied surface mining of coal, and to reclaim land disturbed by surface mining. I believe that we can achieve those goals without imposing unreasonable restraints on our ability to achieve energy independence, without adding unnecessary costs, without creating more unemployment and without precluding the use of vital domestic energy resources.



THE WHITE HOUSE,

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am today returning without my approval, H. R. 25, the proposed Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. I am unable to sign this bill because:

1. As many as 36,000 people would lose jobs when unemployment already is too high.
2. Consumers would pay higher costs -- particularly for electric bills -- when consumer costs are already too high.
3. The Nation would be more dependent on foreign oil -- when we are already overly dependent and dangerously vulnerable.
4. Coal production would be unnecessarily reduced -- when this vital domestic energy resource is needed more than ever.

America is approaching a more serious domestic energy shortage, and we are not facing up to it.

We can develop our energy sources while protecting our environment. But this bill does not do that. I have supported responsible action to control surface mining and to reclaim damaged land. I continue to support actions which strike a proper balance between our energy and economic goals and important environmental objectives.

Unfortunately, H. R. 25 does not strike such a balance.

Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced

surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are today more vulnerable to the disruption of oil supplies than we were during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases. This vulnerability places us in an untenable situation and could result in new and serious economic problems.

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals are inadequate to achieve the energy objectives I have set.

As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of American energy independence. In the face of our deteriorating energy situation, we must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce energy imports and meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H. R. 25 some of my proposals, it rejected others necessary to reduce the adverse impact on coal production and to

clarify various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.

The Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration now advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons would result in 1977. This would mean that six to twenty-four percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. Actually, production losses resulting from H. R. 25 could run considerably higher because of ambiguities in the bill and uncertainties over many of its provisions.

The bill I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses estimated between 33 and 80 million tons. Even though these losses would have been substantial, we could have accepted them if Congress had enacted the comprehensive energy program I proposed. But, now the potential losses of H. R. 25 are intolerable.

The reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H. R. 25. This kind of setback in coal production would cause our dependence on Mid-East oil to triple by 1977.

Additional reasons for withholding approval of H. R. 25 are its legislative shortcomings. These include

- Ambiguous, vague and complex provisions -- as the record of Congressional debate indicates. The bill would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty against the best interests of achieving either our environmental or energy objectives.
- Cumbersome and unwieldy Federal-State regulatory and enforcement provisions. H. R. 25 would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most states. Since 1971, 21 states which produce over 90 percent of the nation's surface mined coal have either enacted new environmental legislation governing surface mining or have strengthened laws already on the books.
- H. R. 25's tax provisions which would be excessive and unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- Its provisions which enable State governments to ban surface mining of coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- Its provisions permitting the Federal government to pay private landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in private hands, could provide windfall profits at the expense of coal consumers.

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am today returning without my approval, H.R. 25, the proposed Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. I am unable to sign this bill because:

1. As many as 36,000 people would lose jobs when unemployment already is too high.
2. Consumers would pay higher costs -- particularly for electric bills -- when consumer costs are already too high.
3. The Nation would be more dependent on foreign oil -- when we are already overly dependent and dangerously vulnerable.
4. Coal production would be unnecessarily reduced -- when this vital domestic energy resource is needed more than ever.

America is approaching a more serious domestic energy shortage, and we are not facing up to it.

We can develop our energy sources while protecting our environment. But this bill does not do that. I have supported responsible action to control surface mining and to reclaim damaged land. I continue to support actions which strike a proper balance between our energy and economic goals and important environmental objectives.

Unfortunately, H.R. 25 does not strike such a balance.

Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are today more vulnerable to the disruption of oil supplies than we were during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases. This vulnerability places us in an untenable situation and could result in new and serious economic problems.

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals are inadequate to achieve the energy objectives I have set.

more

As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of American energy independence. In the face of our deteriorating energy situation, we must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce energy imports and meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H.R. 25 some of my proposals, it rejected others necessary to reduce the adverse impact on coal production and to clarify various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.

The Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration now advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons would result in 1977. This would mean that six to twenty-four percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. Actually, production losses resulting from H.R. 25 could run considerably higher because of ambiguities in the bill and uncertainties over many of its provisions.

The bill I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses estimated between 33 and 80 million tons. Even though these losses would have been substantial, we could have accepted them if Congress had enacted the comprehensive energy program I proposed. But, now the potential losses of H.R. 25 are intolerable.

The reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H.R. 25. This kind of setback in coal production would cause our dependence on Mid-East oil to triple by 1977.

Additional reasons for withholding approval of H.R. 25 are its legislative shortcomings. These include:

- Ambiguous, vague and complex provisions -- as the record of Congressional debate indicates. The bill would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty against the best interests of achieving either our environmental or energy objectives.
- Cumbersome and unwieldy Federal-State regulatory and enforcement provisions. H.R. 25 would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most states. Since 1971, 21 states which produce over 90 percent of the nation's surface mined coal have either enacted new environmental legislation governing surface mining or have strengthened laws already on the books.

more

- H.R. 25's tax provisions which would be excessive and unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- Its provisions which enable State governments to ban surface mining of coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- Its provisions permitting the Federal government to pay private landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in private hands, could provide windfall profits at the expense of coal consumers.

In short, I favor action to protect the environment, to prevent abuses that have accompanied surface mining of coal, and to reclaim land disturbed by surface mining. I believe that we can achieve those goals without imposing unreasonable restraints on our ability to achieve energy independence, without adding unnecessary costs, without creating more unemployment and without precluding the use of vital domestic energy resources.

GERALD R. FORD

THE WHITE HOUSE,

May 20, 1975.

#

May 19, 1975

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am today returning without my approval, H.R. 25, the proposed Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. I am unable to sign this bill because:

1. As many as 36,000 people would lose jobs when unemployment already is too high.
2. Consumers would pay higher costs -- particularly for electric bills -- when consumer costs are already too high.
3. The Nation would be more dependent on foreign oil -- when we are already overly dependent and dangerously vulnerable.
4. Coal production would be unnecessarily reduced -- when this vital domestic energy resource is needed more than ever.

America is approaching a more serious domestic energy shortage, and we are not facing up to it.

We can develop our energy sources while protecting our environment. But this bill does not do that. I have supported responsible action to control surface mining and to reclaim damaged land. I continue to support actions which strike a proper balance between our energy and economic goals and important environmental objectives.

Unfortunately, H.R. 25 does not strike such a balance.

Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are today more vulnerable to the disruption of oil supplies than we were during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases. This vulnerability places us in an untenable situation and could result in new and serious economic problems.

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals are inadequate to achieve the energy objectives we have set.

more

As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of American energy independence. In the face of our deteriorating energy situation, we must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce energy imports and meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H.R. 25 some of my proposals, it rejected others necessary to reduce the adverse impact on coal production and to clarify various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.

The Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration now advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons would result in 1977. This would mean that six to twenty-four percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. Actually, production losses resulting from H.R. 25 could run considerably higher because of ambiguities in the bill and uncertainties over many of its provisions.

The bill I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses estimated between 33 and 80 million tons. Even though these losses would have been substantial, we could have accepted them if Congress had enacted the comprehensive energy program I proposed. But, now the potential losses of H.R. 25 are intolerable.

The reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H.R. 25. This kind of setback in coal production would cause our dependence on Mid-East oil to triple by 1977.

Additional reasons for withholding approval of H.R. 25 are its legislative shortcomings. These include:

- Ambiguous, vague and complex provisions -- as the record of Congressional debate indicates. The bill would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty against the best interests of achieving either our environmental or energy objectives.
- Cumbersome and unwieldy Federal-State regulatory and enforcement provisions. H.R. 25 would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most states. Since 1971, 21 states which produce over 90 percent of the nation's surface mined coal have either enacted new environmental legislation governing surface mining or have strengthened laws already on the books.

more



- H.R. 25's tax provisions which would be excessive and unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- Its provisions which enable State governments to ban surface mining of coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- Its provisions permitting the Federal government to pay private landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in private hands, could provide windfall profits at the expense of coal consumers.

~~To enable us to move ahead with the development of coal production while protecting the environment, I have today directed the Department of the Interior to proceed with the steps necessary for the promulgation of revised regulations covering surface mining on Federal lands.~~

~~Although the Department has had these regulations under preparation for some time, their issuance was held up pending Congressional action to make sure they were compatible with the new surface mining legislation. We will now proceed with these regulations to assure reasonable and effective environmental protection and reclamation requirements on Federal lands.~~

In short, I favor action to protect the environment, to prevent abuses that have accompanied surface mining of coal, and to reclaim land disturbed by surface mining. I believe that we can achieve those goals without imposing unreasonable restraints on our ability to achieve energy independence, without adding unnecessary costs, without creating more unemployment and without precluding the use of vital domestic energy resources.

GERALD R. FORD

THE WHITE HOUSE,

May 19, 1975.

#

MAY 19, 1975

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY

THE WHITE HOUSE
PRESS CONFERENCE
OF
FRANK ZARB
ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

THE BRIEFING ROOM

4:05 P.M. EDT

MR. NESSEN: The President has made his decision on the strip mining legislation. The decision is to veto it.

There will be no filing until this briefing is over.

Now, the official veto message has not gone up and when it does go up, we will obviously give you copies of it, but it has not gone yet.

Q He has not signed it yet?

MR. NESSEN: That is correct.

In the meanwhile, because tomorrow is a travel day and we would either have to do the briefing very early in the morning or after we got back, I thought as a convenience since we have announced the decision that Frank ought to talk to you today about why the decision was made. So, you can go ahead and write your stories saying the President has decided to veto it and will send the message up there shortly.

Q Today?

MR. NESSEN: It is just not clear yet when he is going to send it.

Frank will explain to you why.

MR. ZARB: The message has to go by tomorrow midnight, that is the last day.

Just a few words and then I will answer your questions.

The President reviewed very carefully the impacts of the current legislation on energy economy and as it relates to its environmental benefits. He was impressed by a number of things that I think might be useful to go over here.

MORE

It is clear from everyone's standpoint that this legislation would cause some unemployment. It is our calculation that up to 36,000 people can be put out of work in the first year, or so, of operation, and while there are those who might have different estimates, there is no one -- even the proponents of the bill -- who says that this bill will not cause unemployment. Certainly, at this point in our economic cycle, additional unemployment is not a beneficial result.

We estimate that coal production could be reduced from 40 to 162 million tons, the range which I have given you before --

Q Annually, you mean?

MR. ZARB: Annually. At the high end of the scale, that could mean 25 percent of our total current production. Now, that doesn't include some of the ambiguous, or vague, provisions which we cannot quantify.

It does include estimates on some, but certainly not all, of them.

Q Why is there such a wide range there?

MR. ZARB: Principally because of the ambiguities that we attempted to estimate. I will give you the ones that we did.

The small mines that will be put out of business we were able to come to a fairly decent projection of that. The Alluvial Valley floor, the fact we are able to do that; the restrictions on the saltation hydraulic impact, we estimated that; the steep slope restrictions, particularly with respect to Appalachia, we were able to come to some reasonable estimates there. There were at least three other major areas where vague provisions could not be estimated in terms of impact.

I want to point out a few things for background. I think this is awfully important.

We have calculated first-quarter domestic production of oil to be about 8.5 million barrels a day. That is down from 9 million barrels a day, first-quarter of last year.

We have dropped a half million barrels a day in our domestic production.

You heard yesterday, I think, Senator Mansfield describe the fact that the Congress has a long way to go in finalizing energy legislation. The Senator said that the President has more than met the Congress halfway and he was not too optimistic about having permanent energy legislation in place.

MORE

That has to be considered in the light of any energy-oriented legislation. I think you can see the reason why.

Secondly, the indications that we have discussed earlier about the increase of imported oil in terms of price seems to me has been further substantiated in the last week or two. Not only have the Canadians increased their natural gas prices by 60 percent, or announced that intent by the end of the year, but the Shah yesterday was rather clear in the plans of the cartel on an ongoing basis.

So, we have a situation of continued decline of domestic production. We have the inability to achieve a legislated answer to our energy problem, certainly one that does not appear to be forthcoming over the near term in the face of increasing imports and higher prices for those imports.

Tie that to the unemployment that would be created by this legislation. The coal which would be lost would be replaced by additional imported oil.

Just two other numbers. Since 1971, 21 States which account for over 90 percent of total surface mined coal have either enacted new legislation or strengthened their existing laws. It does not appear that those changes, over the last three years, have been calculated in constructing the latest legislation which was sent to us.

Q How many states was that?

MR. ZARB: Twenty-one States, which account for more than 90 percent of all surface mined coal have either enacted new legislation or strengthened their existing laws.

In the final number, before we get to your questions, we calculated that if we do nothing -- the Congress does not act or we are not successful in achieving any of our administrative measures to conserve oil and bring on additional supplies -- that we would nearly double oil from the Mideast between now and the end of 1977.

If the outer limits of this range of coal reduction was reached during this same period -- now keep in mind that some of the vagaries, if they went against us, could increase that outer limit even further -- but if that 162 million tons was reached that would have the effect of nearly tripling our imports from the Mideast during that same period of time.

MORE



Having looked at all of the issues, including the fact, as I have said, that we do not have a national energy program in place that relates to all of the other elements of both conserving and developing additional resources, the President came to the conclusion that it was in the national interest at this time not to approve the surface mining legislation.

Now, can we have your questions?

MORE



Q What is your chance, Mr. Zarb, of sustaining the veto this time?

MR. ZARB: Our early indications are that there is sufficient strength to sustain a Presidential veto in the House of Representatives.

Q Does the President favor any surface mining legislation at all?

MR. ZARB: The President sent up a bill in February, and for the most part, it had the elements of a bill that would be satisfactory to us. Even that bill had a penalty, but keep in mind two things that were somewhat different.

When that bill went forward, there was some reasonable expectation that at this moment we would be looking at the possibility of a comprehensive piece of legislation in the total energy area having been completed. That certainly is not the case.

Q Is part of the reason then, Mr. Zarb, of what you are saying that because the Congress has not come forward with the total energy plan, that the President felt that it was necessary to veto this bill? Is that part of his reason for vetoing?

MR. ZARB: I think we have to include that as one of the things he has considered. His bill resulted in a loss of a maximum of 80 million tons. However, it was a lot more precise, and in our view would have moved toward the lower end of the range that we calculated at that time.

If a national energy program was in place, and if we were already underway in reducing our consumption levels of oil, and if we were already underway in putting those measures into place to get additional production between now and 1980, then perhaps this bill might have been examined differently.

It was not the sole reason. It clearly was one factor and a number of factors, including the high unemployment and the increase of prices to consumers, particularly utility consumers who buy what we consider to be often times unnecessary and uneasy restrictions.

Q Mr. Zarb, the last time you briefed us here on this bill, you were asked by someone here whether the Administration's position was fair, and you said we got a fair assumption. Is that statement that you have made that 21 States which mine 90 percent, does that suggest now that you don't want a Federal bill?

MORE

MR. ZARB: No, I don't think so. We certainly still believe that a Federal bill is in order, and we will be more than happy to go back to work with the Congress. However, in looking at the status of what has happened since February until today, it seems clear to me at least that much of the history, the three years of history that have gone into the product that we now look at, ignores the fact that the 21 States have in fact moved on their own to provide environmental restrictions and improvements with respect to surface mining.

It is clear that when you look at it in that context and look at a Federal law, which will lay over a new Federal bureaucracy with new Federal costs and new Federal regulations, unless you consider what has occurred during that three-year period, you are legislating public policy that is not in the best interest of what you are trying to do.

Q Mr. Zarb, did you consider those laws in those 21 States generally adequate as to the laws themselves and their enforcement in those States?



MR. ZARB: I would say that -- can I give you a general answer to a general question -- generally yes, the trend has been toward substantially improving the environmental standards and the direction is clearly there.

In some States, they take great pride in what their legislation has produced over the last two years and even in Texas, which I understand doesn't have a reclamation bill, they take some pride in the track record that they have produced.

Q Mr. Zarb, how can you say that is adequate in the West, where about half the land is Federally owned where those State laws don't apply?

MR. ZARB: I think what we should have done in the first place will now be done. The Department of Interior has been in the process of promulgating Federal regulations with respect to surface mining on Federal lands, and they will be instructed to go forward with that and complete that exercise and have those published within the very near term, within a matter of a month or so.

Yes, ma'am.

Q How would it affect the electric companies who have planned to convert from oil to coal? How will it affect them since Cleveland Electric eliminated --

Q Question?

MORE

MR. ZARB: The question is, how will it affect the conversions from oil to coal in those utilities who have planned such conversion.

It is clear to us that over the next three years or so this legislation will make it less easy for those conversions to take place, especially in certain pockets of the country. Thereby, those utilities would have to remain on a higher priced oil and the consumer would pay the price of imported or higher priced oil.

Consumer costs have to be a factor here. They will go up with surface mining legislation. If they go up to the extent that they are buying improvements, that may not be required or are indeed duplicative or unnecessary, then consumers are paying a higher price for improvements they don't need.

Q On the subject of Western coal on Federally owned lands, the Senate Interior Committee has scheduled a mark-up session for Wednesday morning, I believe it is, on a bill sponsored by Senator Metcalf and supported by Senator Jackson, among others, for a freeze on further Federal leasing of coal lands until there is an effective surface mining bill passed.

What is your reaction to this?

MR. ZARB: This is related to Federal plans, particularly?

Q Yes.

MR. ZARB: Well, my reaction is if the Senator's concern is to see that we have promulgated certain standards to protect the environment and to insure reclamation on Federal lands, that we will accomplish that by promulgating the necessary Federal regulations from the Department of Interior and that the long process of legislation would not be required.

I am assuming that the Senators will agree that our regulations achieve the objectives that they agree to.

I don't think we can afford to think in terms of freezes or moratoriums on energy sources while certain things occur that need to occur. It seems to me that the nature of our problem is so severe that we ought to be thinking in terms of producing domestic energy and at the same time insuring that these necessary safeguards are promulgated.

MORE

Q Mr. Zarb, my memory may be faulty, but it seems to me that the last time we had this veto, the Administration said that the previous strip mining measure would have been unfair to certain producers. I have not heard you use that term "unfair" this time. Was that cleared up to your satisfaction in this new bill?

MR. ZARB: No. I am glad you asked the question. The net impact of this bill over the near term will be to put a good number of small, independent miners out of business. Now, just about everyone associated with the bill agrees that that will be the outcome because they cannot nearly afford to live up to the standards and will be inclined to shut their mines and leave the market place. This is particularly true in Appalachia and that is where the highest degree of unemployment occurs.

If you consider that that is unfair, as I do, then use that term. I consider it a lot more severe than unfair. It just feeds a deteriorating situation so that our energy picture can be even further worsened over the next year over what we expect it to be without surface mining legislation.



Q The Secretary has said this will have the net effect of creating jobs. Where do you differ with him?

MR. ZARB: I am not sure except that I have heard the Secretary and we have talked about the reclamation jobs that put people to work, actually, on reclamation assignments.

It is my view, and I think his as well, that many of those reclamation activities are already underway. Perhaps, if you will look into the 1978, 1979, 1980 period, you might be able to structure the work force a little differently showing that some of these miners might indeed be re-employed.

I am not sure what they do in this interim period and my concern -- and I have said this to you before -- relates to the increased vulnerability of this Nation over the next three years.

Q Is the 36,000 figure a net figure?

MR. ZARB: You say a net figure. The number can be debated and has been debated as to whether it is 36,000, 46,000 or 26,000. I would say it is a net figure for the first year of operation.

MORE

Q Mr. Zarb, can you tell us how the agencies lined up? I mean, was it the same this time as last time with Interior in favor of the bill on balance and CEQ and --

MR. ZARB: The last time you asked me that question, I refused to tell you how they lined up.

Q No, I didn't ask it.

Are you going to refuse to tell us now?

MR. ZARB: Just go into a separate category. The President did visit with a number of his advisers and take comments from both sides of the equation, both the pros and the cons.

Q Mr. Zarb, was the vote in the Energy Resources Council seven to six in favor of that veto?

MR. ZARB: That answer to that question is no.

Q Why were you unable to have a veto message on time?

MR. ZARB: The veto message is under preparation and is to be approved by the President. It is a question of the final language being approved.

The reason I am here is because Ron felt it would be a discourtesy to do this in your absence tomorrow.

Q Do you expect to have the veto sustained on the Hill?

MR. ZARB: Do I expect that? I personally expect that, yes.

Q Can you tell me, please, what motive do you think the members have for sending you much the same bill a second time knowing full well your objections to it?

MR. ZARB: You know, the legislation has been in the process of development for over three years. It is clear that there is a great big time investment going way back to 1971 -- that is four years. Many people feel that this time investment should ultimately result in legislation similar to the legislation that we started.

Environmental improvement is a goal that nearly everyone can associate with, including myself. It seems to me, however, that when the members look again at the unemployment created, at the increase in oil vulnerability and how many barrels additional oil we will need to import just to support this legislation, and we calculate that for every 50 million tons of coal, our extra oil imports have to be in the range of 50 million tons, 215 million barrels a year.

When they see that, and when they calculate the extra cost to their consumers, and look at the complexity and the vagaries within the law, and how long we are going to be in court trying to determine what the Congress really meant on this provision or that provision, I think they will see their way clear to sustain the President.

Q Are you saying, then, that the Congress is just stubbornly sending you a bad bill the second time?

MR. ZARB: No.

Q A technical point. Since Congress is supposed to go out on recess at the close of business Thursday for their Memorial Day vacation, is there any time limit involved as far as how long they have to override this veto? In other words, if they are going to do it, do they have to do it before the close of business Thursday?

MR. ZARB: The answer is, this session of Congress so that they can wait as long as it pleases them.

Q Mr. Zarb, about two weeks ago, Senator Jackson sent a letter to the President saying would you please have someone tell me where these magic figures come from 40 to 162 million tons, and I have not seen the answer, which is up in his office, but I think it was signed by you in which you said, "Your letter to the President has been referred to me," and so forth, and you didn't give him the back up.

Is there any back up?

MR. ZARB: There is about three years of back up. Most of the data is being developed by the Bureau of the Mines and they fine-tune their systems as we go along. It is clear that when you look at a bill so complicated with so many general terms, that you have to make some estimates as to how the courts will ultimately rule on this question or that question so you come out with a rather wide range.

I think another point which is at least interesting -- and in going over these numbers again, which I did do, in trying to see if a better determination or a more precise estimate can be made -- I asked whether the proponents of the bill or the supporters of the bill who acknowledge that there will be a coal loss, acknowledge that there will be unemployment and acknowledge that there will have to be an increase in the price of coal, and thereby, a higher price to the consumers, whether those supporters had calculated, themselves, how much coal shortage there would be, how much unemployment there would be, and how high the price of coal would be.

MORE

There are some numbers, I understand, with respect to the increase in price of coal, but I have not been able to find numbers on the other two categories.

Q Mr. Zarb, I have forgotten exactly when the President said he would have to impose the second dollar and the third dollar on the oil imports if Congress didn't act. Can you refresh my memory?

MR. ZARB: The question relates to the second dollar and the third dollar of tariff on oil imports. The President said that he would be looking at the situation within 30 days which gets us into the June 1 period, give or take some days, that he will be making his determination on that question.

Q You had some testimony on the Hill today that seemed to indicate that the President's message on decontrolling old oil was imminent. Is that going to happen this week?

MR. ZARB: It is imminent, but I am not sure it will happen this week.

Q The decision has been made to go ahead and send up your own program, though, and not wait for the Congressional.

MR. ZARB: The President directed us to go ahead. We had our hearings and I took a good deal of the hearing material home with me over the weekend, and came back with a number of questions which I want resolved and we will be working on it this week.

Whether or not it is completed sufficiently to have up there this week remains to be seen, but it will go.

Q Mr. Zarb, there were some people saying around here late last week that there was a new feeling of confidence in the White House following the Cambodian venture, that this would carry over into the legislative process even on the domestic matters up on the Hill.

Is that really esoteric thinking or does that really figure in your decisions or your recommendations and the President's decision, that sort of thing, that it has increased his clout up on the Hill and therefore, you have a better chance of getting this bill?

MR. ZARB: If you ask that question with respect to my personal frame of mind, I will answer it candidly because I cannot speak for the views of others and what goes into their thinking.

MORE

There is little question in my mind but what our energy situation is seriously deteriorating on a day-by-day basis, that we are going to wake up in a middle of a more severe crisis some six or 12 months from now and that will prompt all of the activity that we are asking for right now, if we don't get it now.

When I looked at this bill, and re-looked at it, and asked questions and asked staff analysis and had discussions with my own staff, I honestly looked for a reason to agree that we could accept this bill in the face of our energy problem because, being in favor of environmental legislation is not a bad position for an energy person to be in.

I tried awfully hard, but I had to come to the conclusion that this bill, which so seriously affects our coal production at a time when our total domestic production of oil is declining, at a time when we are not legislating an answer to our total energy issue, and thereby making us more vulnerable.

I come to the conclusion that the people who are paying the price, unfortunately, are the American consumers because, as we increase our imports between now and 1977, and the cartel increases its prices, the people that are going to pay the bill are the American consumers.

So, if you don't share with me the question of national security or the threat of embargo and its international blackmail implications, then share with me, please, the history of the last year where oil import prices have gone up four times, and we have every indication that they are going to go up further in the years to come.

We cannot visit that kind of disservice to the American people even in the light of a noble objective such as this one.

Q A follow up to the Cambodian question. I guess the answer was no.

MR. ZARB: From my standpoint, one had no relationship to the other.

THE PRESS: Thank you, Mr. Zarb.

END

(AT 4:30 P.M. EDT)



May 20, 1975

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am today returning without my approval, H.R. 25, the proposed Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. I am unable to sign this bill because:

1. As many as 36,000 people would lose jobs when unemployment already is too high.
2. Consumers would pay higher costs -- particularly for electric bills -- when consumer costs are already too high.
3. The Nation would be more dependent on foreign oil -- when we are already overly dependent and dangerously vulnerable.
4. Coal production would be unnecessarily reduced -- when this vital domestic energy resource is needed more than ever.

America is approaching a more serious domestic energy shortage, and we are not facing up to it.

We can develop our energy sources while protecting our environment. But this bill does not do that. I have supported responsible action to control surface mining and to reclaim damaged land. I continue to support actions which strike a proper balance between our energy and economic goals and important environmental objectives.

Unfortunately, H.R. 25 does not strike such a balance.

Since I submitted my comprehensive national energy program earlier this year -- a program which included a tough but balanced surface mining bill -- our energy situation has continued to deteriorate. With domestic energy production continuing to drop, we are today more vulnerable to the disruption of oil supplies than we were during the Mid-East oil embargo. We will be even more vulnerable as our economy recovers and energy consumption increases. This vulnerability places us in an untenable situation and could result in new and serious economic problems.

Coupled with this steadily deteriorating situation is the fact that the Congress has yet to act on a comprehensive energy program capable of achieving goals on which we all agree. Several Congressional committees have worked hard to develop solutions. Unfortunately, their proposals are inadequate to achieve the energy objectives I have set.

more



As the one abundant energy source over which the United States has total control, coal is critical to the achievement of American energy independence. In the face of our deteriorating energy situation, we must not arbitrarily place restrictions on the development of this energy resource.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I find it necessary to reject this legislation. My Administration has worked hard with the Congress to try to develop an acceptable surface mining bill and other energy programs which could, when taken together, enable us to reduce energy imports and meet environmental objectives. While the Congress accepted in H.R. 25 some of my proposals, it rejected others necessary to reduce the adverse impact on coal production and to clarify various provisions of the legislation to make it precise and more workable.

The Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Administration now advise me that, if this bill were to become law, a production loss of 40 to 162 million tons would result in 1977. This would mean that six to twenty-four percent of expected 1977 coal production would be lost. Actually, production losses resulting from H.R. 25 could run considerably higher because of ambiguities in the bill and uncertainties over many of its provisions.

The bill I sent to the Congress in February would have also entailed production losses estimated between 33 and 80 million tons. Even though these losses would have been substantial, we could have accepted them if Congress had enacted the comprehensive energy program I proposed. But, now the potential losses of H.R. 25 are intolerable.

The reduction in coal production would mean that the United States will be forced to import more foreign oil. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, it is estimated that we would be forced to import an additional 215 million barrels of oil a year at a cost of \$2.3 billion for every 50 million tons of coal not mined. At a time when our dependence on Mid-East oil is expected to double in just 2-1/2 years, I believe it would be unwise to further increase this dependency by signing into law H.R. 25. This kind of setback in coal production would cause our dependence on Mid-East oil to triple by 1977.

Additional reasons for withholding approval of H.R. 25 are its legislative shortcomings. These include:

- Ambiguous, vague and complex provisions -- as the record of Congressional debate indicates. The bill would lead to years of regulatory delays, litigation and uncertainty against the best interests of achieving either our environmental or energy objectives.
- Cumbersome and unwieldy Federal-State regulatory and enforcement provisions. H.R. 25 would inject the Federal Government immediately into a field which is already regulated by most states. Since 1971, 21 states which produce over 90 percent of the nation's surface mined coal have either enacted new environmental legislation governing surface mining or have strengthened laws already on the books.

more



- H.R. 25's tax provisions which would be excessive and unnecessarily increase the price of coal.
- Its provisions which enable State governments to ban surface mining of coal on Federal lands -- thus preventing a national resource from being used in the national interest.
- Its provisions permitting the Federal government to pay private landowners 80 percent or more of the cost of reclaiming previously-mined land, leaving title to the land in private hands, could provide windfall profits at the expense of coal consumers.

In short, I favor action to protect the environment, to prevent abuses that have accompanied surface mining of coal, and to reclaim land disturbed by surface mining. I believe that we can achieve those goals without imposing unreasonable restraints on our ability to achieve energy independence, without adding unnecessary costs, without creating more unemployment and without precluding the use of vital domestic energy resources.

GERALD R. FORD

THE WHITE HOUSE,

May 20, 1975.

#



May 8, 1975

Dear Mr. Director:

The following bill was received at the White House on May 8th:

H.R. 25

Please let the President have reports and recommendations as to the approval of this bill as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Linder
Chief Executive Clerk



The Honorable James T. Lynn
Director
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D. C.