Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the entire country has had its attention called to the decision made on the use of DDT and I imagine that the majority of Americans look upon this chemical as one conceived by the devil. While I recognize that all DDTs are not comparable, the latest pronouncement of the United States has caused damage. I can also recognize that it has been a great boon to people in all parts of this country.

I have also been concerned that chemicals recommended to replace DDT might not be as good and might even be more dangerous.

Arizona State University has long been interested in these chemicals, because it is located in a region of the United States infested by the type of bug and insect that is harmful to crops, distasteful to citizens and difficult to get rid of.

Dr. J. Gordon Edwards of Arizona State University, has reviewed the decision not to use DDT in a complete and interesting way and has also been critical of the decision. I have read his paper with great interest, and I feel that anyone who lives in a area of the United States infested by this type of insect that is harmful to crops, distasteful to citizens and difficult to get rid of, would appreciate what I have read in this field. Dr. Edwards has also appended a suggestion on the back of his paper. I ask unanimous consent that the entire matter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**The Inamous Buckleshaus DDT Decision**

The recent Buckleshaus decision regarding DDT restrictions is an object lesson to professional environmental extremists and a vivid lesson for science and mankind. Most concerned persons are mindful of the waste of holding seven months of federal hearings on DDT and then ignoring or rejecting all evidence which does not support the preconceived decision of this EPA Administrator. If Mr. Buckleshaus was determined not to be influenced by any factual data, he should not have implemented such a costly, time-consuming legal charade.

A major consequence of his ignoring the scientific record and rendering this false decision on DDT will be the incalculable destruction of the environment which his Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is supposed to protect. It is most highly by Mr. Buckleshaus to replace DDT with the needlessly destroy thousands of honeybee colonies and millions of birds and mammals, and which would not be injured by DDT applications. (Audubon Magazine reported more than 10,000 robins killed this spring by just one of these “substitutes.”)

Another imconsequence of the EPA’s decision on DDT will be the greater use of the herbicide 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T, the two chemicals most highly used by Mr. Buckleshaus to replace DDT. This substitution will seriously destroy thousands of honeybee colonies and millions of birds and mammals, and which would not be injured by DDT applications. (Audubon Magazine reported more than 10,000 robins killed this spring by just one of these “substitutes.”)
other testimony noted the incidence in non-fatal accidents and attributed the reactions to the ingestion of a pesticide called DDT. (Page 27) "It is important to understand that DDT is not the only insecticide that has actually been ingested by man in massive daily doses for seven years, with no ill effects whatsoever. No substitute will be able to make that record.

10. What is the function of the Hearing Examiner? Ruckelshaus statement: (Page 24) "What other weight, then, might be given to the findings based expressly on a credibility judgment of those who are not in the case before me."

Comments: Mr. Ruckelshaus evidently means that if the witnesses fail to tell the truth, the agency is free to make its own findings and that the Examiner's findings and reports only comprise parts of the record which a court will then evaluate. (My emphasis added)

Comments: If the Examiner's findings and reports are approved by the court, why did Mr. Ruckelshaus do it? If Mr. Ruckelshaus was supposed to evaluate the Examiner's findings and report, why does he then state that he is not evaluating them? Certainly if a court evaluated the report by Mr. Burcyniec, (the Hearing Examiner) they would not want to make a decision that was in direct opposition to the court's decision. As my point was made by Mr. Ruckelshaus perhaps that is the only way to obtain justice from DDT.

This capricious act by the Environmental Protection Agency administrator in a matter of great importance to the American public will directly affect our environment, our food supply, our personal health and safety, and the cost of living. It has long been acknowledged by ecologists in the environmental movement and by the uncommitted bureaucrats who, while keeping a close eye on the situation, consider it the most important agency in the Environmental Protection Agency, with copies of all letters also sent to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in Washington D.C., and to others, including the public concern matches that of the agriculture officials, the public health service, the world health authorities, and the legislature. It is most likely that the only way to correct this injustices—J. Gordon Edwards.