

Alaska and organized labor, and avoids the wildlife range, staying within established corridors for all but 40 miles. Critics ask whether the gas will go where it is needed and whether the liquefied natural gas (LNG) technology is both safe enough and efficient enough.

A Federal Power Commission administrative law judge, after more than a year of hearings, recently declared the Arctic Gas plan "superior in almost every significant respect" to its competitors. Canada, he said, presented no serious obstacles to the quick approval of Arctic's proposal. But some observers wonder whether the judge was not too quick to buy the Arctic Gas view of the Canadian energy situation.

Canadians are locked in a major national debate over northern resource and energy development. Until recently, it was assumed that large new gas reserves would be discovered in the Mackenzie delta area and transported south through the Arctic Gas pipeline also carrying Alaskan gas. But gas discoveries in the delta have been disappointing. The president of Canadian Arctic Gas, V. L. Horte, has indicated that Mackenzie reserves are now adequate to provide only about half the flow of Canadian gas originally anticipated.

At the same time, though, prospectors for Panarctic oils, a consortium of private companies and the Canadian government, have discovered important gas reserves in the high Arctic islands northwest of Hudson Bay, far to the east and north of the Mackenzie delta. Proved reserves so far are at least 15 trillion cubic feet, almost three times the Mackenzie reserves. A pipeline serving the high Arctic islands gas fields would pass hundreds of miles to the east of the Mackenzie delta region.

While gas exploration in the delta has failed to pan out, opposition has grown among native people—Indians and Eskimos—to early large-scale energy development in the region. A substantial body of Canadian opinion appears to be in sympathy with the natives.

"It used to be 'Bob's your uncle' [an English expression for go right ahead] to Arctic Gas," says a senior energy official. "Now there is at least something of a feeling that we should take another look."

Canadian energy planners are aware that their decision-making schedule must mesh with the one in the United States. Two years ago they feared that if they were "out of synch" they would lose "the Arctic Gas option." Now they fear that the option for an Alcan pipeline—which would intrude far less on the life of

the natives—may be lost to them instead.

During a state visit from 21 to 23 February, Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau demonstrated a complete grasp of the U.S. timetable established by Congress last year. He said the Canadian National Energy Board, similar to the Federal Power Commission, and a Royal Commission studying human and

environmental impacts of a pipeline down the Mackenzie valley would report to him before June.

"We realize that we have to give a final answer before the end of the year," Trudeau said. "We realize that no answer really is an answer." He also noted Canada's interest in helping get "American gas to American consumers." The

Demise of Military Med School Likely

As part of his effort to reduce the military budget, President Jimmy Carter has taken dead aim at the infant Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS). Barely a year old, the school was planning to locate on the Bethesda, Maryland, campus of the National Naval Medical Center once its buildings are completed. The school's purpose is to supply the military with doctors now that the doctor draft has ended. However, Carter and Defense Secretary Harold Brown have a different idea. In one of the few instances of zero-based budgeting in the President's revisions of the Ford budget for fiscal year (FY) 1978, they have zeroed the medical school right out of business. They are not likely to encounter strong opposition from the Congress.

The school, which has been dubbed the B-1 of medical education after the B-1 bomber with its staggering "cost overruns," has been controversial since the day it first was proposed by former Louisiana Congressman F. Edward Hébert, who wielded enormous power as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Hébert was determined that the military have a medical school of its very own—some say he saw it as a monument to himself—despite opposition to the idea on two grounds: one, that there already is an adequate number of medical schools in the country and, two, that the new school would be extremely costly. Just how costly it would be to educate a doctor at USUHS is, however, a matter of some controversy with estimates ranging from a high of \$190,000 per student for 4 years to a low of \$21,000. Naturally, higher figures are given out by the school's opponents and, frankly, it is difficult to ascertain who is correct. In any case, it is fact that virtually every civilian and military organization that testified on the issue of establishing the school, including the Department of Defense, was cool to the idea. Today, its greatest supporters are the faculty members who were recruited from medical schools nationwide to get the USUHS off to a good start. Naturally, this unanticipated move to scrap the school altogether does not exactly please them.

The fact that the first batch of students is in place and the building more than half completed obviously did not persuade Secretary Brown that the school should stay. "Physician needs of the military services can be satisfied more economically over the long run by direct recruitment," he said in a budget statement. Nor does he buy the view that it would be a waste of money to stop now that the school is so far along. Said Brown, "I look on this not as wasting the money that has already been spent . . . but saving the money that would otherwise be spent to carry out complete construction."

The school's supporters, on the other hand, quite naturally think that Brown's decision is all wrong. Former Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard, chairman of the school's board of regents, terms the proposed shutdown a "disaster" and is appealing to the armed services committees of the House and Senate to come to its rescue. Technically, the way that Carter and Brown went about scrapping the school was simply to delete from the FY 1978 budget any request for money to support it. According to this game plan, the school is dead unless the Congress decides to put the money back in its own budget proposal which must be ready by 15 April. At this writing, no one has emerged as a committed champion of the school. The armed services committees, with more important fights with the President in store, apparently do not want to take a hard line here.—B.J.C.