

Environmentalists tear their hair whenever they so much as think of the pesticide bill. A major criticism, for example, is that citizen intervention of the kind that led to restrictions on DDT and 2,4,5-T would no longer be possible under the bill because only those who suffer direct economic injury would have standing in court. But an official on the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) says this is a misinformed objection. The wording of this section, he says, which substituted in its description of eligible suers "any party at interest" for "any person adversely affected," plainly still leaves the door open for citizens. Congressman John Dow (D-Conn.) pushed through one amendment to strengthen the bill—a provision that would permit states to set tougher-than-federal restrictions. The CEQ man says this is another case of an issue being created where none existed, because the restriction on state laws only applied to "general use" pesticides, which would presumably be above question anyway if they were put in that category.

An Alaska native claims law passed by both Houses and now in conference is another cause of disgruntlement among environmentalists. Congress has been under tremendous pressure to come out with something so that the current land freeze could be lifted and decisions on the trans-Alaska oil pipeline could be made. Senate and House bills call for 40 million acres and \$1 billion to be turned over to the 55,000 natives who live off the land. The Senate bill (S. 35) is generally regarded as superior because it calls for the creation of a joint federal-state planning commission and retention of tight federal control over the ecologically delicate tundra corridor through which the pipeline would run. Those concerned with natives' rights are divided over the land distribution scheme. The Wildlife Federation says that native landowners will be sitting ducks for oil and mineral interests who want to buy or lease their grounds, while Friends of the Earth support the scheme on the grounds of aboriginal rights. A Senate Interior Committee staff member explains that the real problem is not who owns the land, but whether sound and enforceable land-use requirements are built into the legislation. The oil people, in their hurry to see the freeze lifted, are not being too fussy about how it's done, but some people see industry's silence as ominous.

Correction

An article in *Science* (26 November, page 930) incorrectly identifies Atomic Energy Commissioner Wilfrid E. Johnson as a Democrat, rather than as a Democratic appointee. Mr. Johnson is and has been continuously registered as a Republican.

Land use planning is a critical issue, and future policies will have profound effects on social, as well as environmental, developments. The Senate Interior Committee has been holding hearings on bills (submitted by President Nixon and by committee Chairman Jackson) whose provisions would cover the two-thirds of the nation's land not owned by the federal government. Both bills arrange for states to reassume zoning powers which were delegated to localities in the 1920's. The Nixon measure (S. 992), requires states to divide themselves into three categories: environmentally valuable areas, areas with key facilities (such as airports), and areas that are to be used and developed for regional benefit. The Jackson bill places heavy emphasis on comprehensive, statewide planning. An Interior Committee staff member says the Nixon approach is too piecemeal, and leaves room for a state to decide on an unbalanced pattern. According to an Administration spokesman, the Jackson bill (S. 632) means more planning rather than action, while the Nixon bill begins with a "trimmed-down proposal dealing with gut issues." A compromise is being worked upon.

Among other potentially important pieces of legislation undergoing birth throes this year is a bill that would enable citizens to take legal action on those environmental matters that are not yet covered by comprehensive legislation—for example, toxic substances and land use. The legislation, introduced by Senator Philip Hart (D-Mich.) and Congressman Dingell, would, in essence, grant citizen groups standing in court, whether or not they can prove direct injury, in suits against both industry and the government. This bill is opposed by the Administration on the grounds that it would subject courts to a flood of inconsequential actions, but environmentalists believe that con-

tinuing citizen accessibility to decision-making processes is the key to making corporate power and government responsive to popular will.

There are a number of other proposals that would give the federal government radical new powers in areas hitherto left to local or private interests. One is an ocean dumping bill (H.R. 9727), ranking high on Nixon's agenda, which has been passed by both Houses and is now in conference. The most controversial part of this legislation, a proposal to establish marine sanctuaries, was blocked by Congressman Wayne Aspinall (D-Colo.), a man who heads many environmentalists' lists of bad guys. Senator Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) has been trying to restore this provision and to put a 2-year moratorium on oil and gas drilling off the Atlantic Coast, a yet unexploited region in which the Interior Department recently announced areas scheduled for leasing.

Strip mining, related as it is to energy and land use policies, has also been getting stepped-up attention. Some 20 bills have been introduced, ranging from some Aspinall-sponsored suggestions for rehabilitation of mined land to the outright ban desired by Representative Ken Hechler (D-W.Va.). The Senate has taken no action so far; as for the House, foes of strip mining hold little hope that a strong bill will emerge from the Interior subcommittee on mines—heavily manned by Westerners in whom the cowboy mentality persists, despite the fact that the West contains 75 percent of the nation's yet upstripped coal.

No new heroes of the environment have emerged in this year's Congress. In the Senate, the big names are Muskie, Hart (who heads the Commerce Committee's environmental subcommittee), Jackson (although praise is qualified in some quarters because of his far-Western, pro-SST, pro-war orientations), and the two Wisconsin senators, Nelson and Democrat William Proxmire (who won his environmental spurs in the SST fight).

In the House, Reuss and Dingell are probably the most prominent. Representative John A. Blatnik (D-Minn.), one of the earliest toilers for air and water legislation, now has a prominent post as head of the House Public Works Committee, but observers say his effectiveness is hampered by the traditional road- and dam-building orientation of his committee.

Even those people who think the