

wish to give the committee this morning. The Chair does note that there has been a change in the plans of the committee.

The Chair will adjourn the hearing at about 20 minutes of 1 and the committee will be in adjournment until approximately 2 o'clock, at which time it will reconvene.

This has been occasioned by certain happenings that have been brought to the attention of the Chair during the time since the Chair last commented on the plans of the committee.

Mrs. Wolfe, we are pleased to have you. Will you identify yourself fully for the record and the Chair will be happy to receive your statement.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLARD WOLFE, CHAIRMAN, MICHIGAN PESTICIDES COUNCIL AND WEST MICHIGAN ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION COUNCIL; ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE BIOLOGY HONORS SOCIETY, ACQUINAS COLLEGE; GRAND VALLEY JAYCEE WATER POLLUTION COUNCIL OF SEVEN JAYCEE CHAPTERS; GRAND RAPID NEWS MAGAZINE; IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE, DWIGHT LYDELL CHAPTER; KENT COUNTY COUNCIL PTA'S; KENT GARDEN CLUB; KIWANIS CLUB OF GRAND RAPIDS; MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S ALUMNI CLUB IN GRAND RAPIDS; MUSKEGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS COUNCIL; TROUT UNLIMITED, WEST MICHIGAN CHAPTER; YOUTH CONSERVATION COUNCIL; GRAND RAPIDS YWCA; WEST MICHIGAN TOURIST ASSOCIATION; ZONTA OF GRAND RAPIDS; AND THE ANTI-POLLUTION COMMITTEE, UAW LOCAL 107

Mrs. WOLFE. Thank you. Mr. Chairman and Congressman Ruppe, I am Mrs. Willard Wolfe, chairman of the Michigan Pesticides Council and the West Michigan Environmental Action Committee. My remarks today are on behalf of those two councils and the following organizations which have authorized me to speak for them:

Biology Honors Society, Aquinas College.

Grand Valley Jaycee Water Pollution Council of seven Jaycee Chapters.

Grand Rapids News Magazine.

Izaak Walton League, Dwight Lydell Chapter.

Kent County Council PTA's.

Kent Garden Club.

Kiwanis Club of Grand Rapids.

Michigan State University Women's Alumni Club in Grand Rapids.

Muskegon Community College Students Council.

Trout Unlimited, West Michigan Chapter.

Youth Conservation Council.

Grand Rapids YWCA.

West Michigan Tourist Association.

Zonta of Grand Rapids.

Anti-Pollution Committee, UAW Local 107.

This is the reason I could not give you a decent copy because we had to contact so many organizations and discussed this until late last night.

Mr. DINGELL. You have done good work and the Chair will not be distressed on this point at all.

Mrs. WOLFE. Thank you. We first want to compliment you for your outstanding knowledge, interest and efforts in environmental legislation, Representative Dingell. We are grateful that you have introduced House bill 6750 and we are grateful that you and Congressman Ruppe have taken the time and trouble to hold hearings where it is easier for the public to make itself heard. We hope we can convince you that your efforts are of utmost importance to the welfare of us all, and that we will do everything we can to see this kind of legislation passed.

As you are well aware, many people today feel very strongly that we are not adequately protecting our environment, and that perhaps even human survival depends on the decision which we make today. The public shares this feeling with some of our most eminent scientists, and it is for this reason that we must all know where we stand, and what the problem, priorities and solutions may be.

Up to now there has been no national commitment to a quality environment. Our presidents have been able to gloss over the facts or point with alarm, perhaps depending upon political winds. We have not had a real report on just what is happening to our environment issued by the White House since, I believe, 1965.

Furthermore, there is now no cohesive force which is leading our Nation in environmental action. Though the public is well aware that things are going rather badly, they are unsure how badly—or what problems are most serious—or what the solutions are. They are confused by economic arguments, embarrassed by accusations of emotionalism, and more importantly, they are confused by the myriad reports issuing forth on every environmental subject on practically every level of government.

It is impossible for the general public to judge which news or committee report was made by an objective, scientific, or knowledgeable person or membership, and which report is the result of having to audit past recommendations and policies, or is an amalgam of vested interest viewpoints, or is simply politically inspired.

Commissions, councils, and advisory panels are appointed. Legislative commissions make investigations. The results depend entirely on the objectivity and the qualifications of the members but again, the general public, unfamiliar with the background of the reporting individuals and not well grounded in the subject itself, is not in the position to know whether it is good or bad information.

I believe our conservation groups spend half their time fighting to improve inadequate standards and recommendations made by political bodies and panels representing single viewpoints or vested interests.

If instead the public could hear from a council on a Federal level, a small council which would be so eminent its members could be known to everyone very shortly, if the public could have confidence in the qualifications and objectivity of that council, the public could well be more quickly educated and standards could be more properly adopted.

We are, therefore, extremely pleased and optimistic and gratified by House bill 6750.

We would now like to comment specifically on particular aspects of the bill, and we hope we are constructive.

As we indicated, we think the environment needs the strong leadership of an environmental council even more than the economy needs the Council of Economic Advisers.

We are relieved and eager that at last the environment may be taken as seriously as the economy. I say this as an economics graduate from this university. The description of the qualifications which the members should have is excellent. We wonder, however, if those qualifications should be made even more specific.

For instance, should the President choose the council members from a list of nominees drawn up by the Scientists' Institute for Public Information and the Ecological Society of America?

We also believe it may be important to spell out factors which would disqualify a prospective appointee, such as financial or other close association with vested interests.

Since the quality of our environment is certainly at stake and since survival of life may well be at stake—and we better find out—this could well be the most important committee ever appointed by any President and passed by any legislature. There should be no chance that the appointments are made unwisely.

This committee, I feel, would be so powerful because it fills such a great need for direction that every safeguard possible should be built into the bill to insure the quality of the council itself.

I have the feeling, for instance, that should a scientist who would be beautifully qualified in some areas but with limited qualifications in environmental issues be appointed, our scientific community might hesitate to object.

This is probably a question which should be answered by the scientists who have shown the most concern for what is happening to our environment.

Another question our members suggested was whether the number of complex questions involved would require a council membership of five persons instead of three. Again, this is a question for the scientific community to answer.

Finally, we are no judge of what is involved in appropriations, but we are concerned that this not a good bill with no money to put it into operation.

We also wonder if some mention of compensation to the council itself should be mentioned in the bill.

Some of our members were unsure about President Nixon's Committee on Environmental Quality and whether House bill 6750 was necessary. On examining both, we came up with the unqualified decision that 6750 may be our only hope of overcoming inadequate reports coming from a committee—which, typically, is composed of persons who are not eminently qualified to analyze and interpret the environmental information, or even to appoint the advisers who are best qualified to help them.

Certainly the Secretaries of important Cabinet posts cannot spend adequate time and effort on the problems, nor can the President or the Vice President.

This kind of committee obviously will be self-protective and unable

to produce the kind of independent objective ecological analysis that the environmental situation so urgently demands.

Therefore, it is with great gratitude to Chairman Dingell and his fine committee that we promote his bill. We are impressed with its scope and the thought put into it, and we merely plead that every safeguard possible be added so that it will do exactly what it is intended to do—appraise the condition of our environment and let us all know what has to be done to maintain a livable, quality environment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mrs. Wolfe, the committee is grateful to you for your statement. It is very clear to me that you have given a great deal of thought to the problem.

Mr. Ruppe?

Mr. RUPPE. I would like to echo that sentiment. I would certainly say you have done your homework and have raised some very thoughtful questions for the committee to consider further in their own considerations of the bill, and the direction that this legislation should take.

Mrs. WOLFE. Thank you.

Mr. DINGELL. Thank you very much, Mrs. Wolfe.

Our next witness will be Mr. Edward Brigham III, northern Midwest regional representative, National Audubon Society. Mr. Brigham, we are happy to welcome you to the committee for such statement as you choose to give.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD BRIGHAM III, NORTHERN MIDWEST REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY

Mr. BRIGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Edward M. Brigham III, regional representative in the northern Midwest region for the National Audubon Society including the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and northern Illinois.

However, since our executive vice president, and my immediate superior in the society, Mr. Charles Callison, has presented a statement in Washington, to the committee, I think this morning for the sake of the record, I will be speaking more as an individual than as a staff member of the National Audubon Society.

At this point it is difficult to have anything particularly new to say. Our other distinguished speakers in the field of conservation have covered many of the points. However, I think, too often progress in agriculture is judged in terms of quantity per unit of land; or national progress is measured in terms of gross national product, which has been mentioned previously this morning.

When we do these things we are applying single-valued orientations to what are essentially complex phenomena which in reality demand multivalued orientations.

We are in desperate need of a group of people functioning at the highest level who are capable of providing multi—rather than single—valued orientations to contemporary problems as they relate to the environment.

If we had had such a council as is proposed in H.R. 6750 and its similar Senate companion, S. 1075, we probably would not find our Na-