Environmental issues and concerns will be in the forefront in the decade of the '90s. Geologists and particularly AIPG must take a stronger advocacy and educational role in this important area of earth science. Who are better trained than geologists to understand and provide balanced solutions to complex environmental problems?

The Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration (SME) is focusing a large portion of their 1991 annual meeting on environmental issues and concerns including federal and state environmental and reclamation regulations, appropriate industry responses to this regulatory framework, and viable technological solutions to environmental reclamation and waste management issues facing the mining industry. The American Association of Petroleum Geologists (AAPG) is highlighting environmental concerns to its membership. The Geological Society of America (GSA) had sessions at their last annual meeting focusing on ground-water contamination and particularly on geological solutions. AIPG, in my opinion, must become much more active in assessing environmental issues and taking advocacy positions with balanced solutions that will protect the environment and yet provide for the extraction of minerals and fuels essential to the nation's welfare.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S ITINERARY
(subject to change)

The Executive Director is visiting various Sections, agencies, campuses, and other organizations. He is both talking and listening, exchanging information and ideas. Members are encouraged to attend these meetings wherever and whenever possible. His itinerary for the next six months, as presently scheduled, is:

January 10 - 11: Indiana geologists and agencies
January 12: Executive Committee, Bloomington, IN
January 29: CESI/NSPE, Alexandria, VA
January 30: Tennessee Section and Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, TN
February 22 - 23: Oklahoma Section, Edmond, OK
February 25 - 28: Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration (convention), Denver, CO
March 2: Nevada Section, Reno, NV
March 4 - 5: Louisiana Section and Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge
March 5 - 6: Mississippi Section and university
March 7 - 8: Alabama Section and universities
March 25 - 26: American Geological Institute, Alexandria, VA
April 7 - 10: American Association of Petroleum Geologists, (convention) Dallas, TX
April 13 - 14: Executive Committee, Arvada, CO
April 25: Pennsylvania Section, Pittsburgh, PA
May 25 - 26: European Federation of Geologists, Stockholm, Sweden
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As many of you know, my expertise is the field of industrial minerals and particularly, clay minerals. Half of my career has been in industry and half in academia. From my industry experience I am intimately aware that many environmental rules and regulations are absolutely necessary, but I also recognize that there are some rules and regulations that are non-essential. All regulations that protect the environment must be reasonable both from a quantitative and an economic standpoint. An example of an unreasonable regulation was the federal Clean Air Act that prescribed dust emissions that were lower than the ambient wind blown dust in the area which happened to be in Casper, Wyoming. Blanket standards cannot be applied without some understanding of local conditions. I believe that our AIPG Sections should become more active in educating the general public and their state and federal legislators concerning some of these environmental earth science issues.

An issue that will seriously affect our mineral and fuel industries in this decade is wetlands. A broad restrictive definition of wetlands will reduce some of our much needed industrial mineral reserves and resources by as much as 50 percent. This will affect our future supplies and raise our costs which in turn will lower our standard of living. All of us in AIPG need to become advocates and educate the public and our legislators about the serious implications of an arbitrary and restrictive definition of wetlands that will prohibit the extraction of some of our critically needed minerals and fuels.

During my term as President of AIPG, I plan to focus on several issues, including:

1. Completion of an acceptable draft model professional registration law for geologists.

2. Establishing an accredited continuing education program.

3. Working closely with AGI to expand its role as an advocate for the earth sciences.

4. Helping our Sections undertake programs to educate the public and their legislators about the importance of reasoned and balanced regulations that will protect the environment and will also permit the production and extraction of needed minerals and fuels.

5. Continuing to foster liaisons with foreign professional geologists organizations, a program that was initiated this past year by Susan Landon and Bill Knight with the European Federation of Geologists and the Institution of Geologists of the United Kingdom.

6. Establishing more control of annual meetings’ organization and administration by AIPG Headquarters.

7. Implementing programs that will bring in more new Members which will strengthen AIPG and allow us to provide additional services for our Members.

I wish to congratulate Susan Landon for her outstanding leadership this past year. AIPG is a much stronger organization as a result of her efforts. Also I commend Bill Knight, our Executive Director, for his successful efforts in visiting and communicating with our Sections. We have a full agenda for 1991 and I look forward to working with the executive committee, the Executive Director, and the Sections to make this a banner year for AIPG.

---

**AASG Publications**

An article in the September issue of *TPG* Wallace W. Hagan, CPG 4866, called attention to publications of the Association of American State Geologists. Current prices are: *List of Publications of the Association of American State Geologists*, $5; *The State Geologists Journal* $10; and *The State Geological Surveys, A History*, $20. All may be ordered from:

Dr. Donald G. Haney  
State Geologist and Director  
Kentucky Geological Survey  
228 Mining & Mineral Res. Bldg.  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, KY 40505-0107

Payment made out to AASG should accompany orders.
Getting Through

The 1872 Mining Law is an antiquated law that permits the unchecked rape and plunder of the public domain. It ought to be repealed!

Anyhow, that is what some folks think. To you, however, it is The Fundamental Law that lays out your rights as a citizen to enter the public domain, to search for minerals, and to claim as your reward for success the exclusive right to mine what you have found. And to you, it is anything but antiquated: having been amended some 50 or 60 times since its inception, it is a very modern law.

Because the matter of the 1872 Mining Law and its proposed repeal has everything to do with your profession and your livelihood, you decide that you must try and get through to your elected representatives. You must sound out their positions and voice your concerns. But where do you begin? The subject is intensely personal to you, yet you have no experience in dealing with politicians.

You begin by attending town meetings. When your Congressman or Senator announces their plan to hold one, you make sure you are present to ask your question and to be heard. After attending a number of such town meetings, however, you become skeptical of that forum for airing issues. They make for interesting theater, but you wonder if anything said at such a meeting could possibly get through. The gentleman on stage is probably more concerned with style than with substance.

You consider the alternative of petitions and form letters. But not for long. Perhaps they have a place, but the matter is too personal for you to dilute your opinion by mixing it with a mass.

You decide on writing original letters. For three years you correspond with your own representatives, and with those from other states. But your thoughtful correspondence seldom meets with thoughtful response. Even the tome you send to Senator Bumpers returns a terse "thank you" with no indication it had any impact whatsoever. Disgusted, you perceive that the political "agenda" the authors of mining law reform wish to push is more important to them than perhaps "truth."

Yet another letter needs to be written - this to Congressman Rahall. In spite of your discouragement, you make this one more effort. If you do not, then you will have not one self-righteous leg to stand on when the rights of discovery go out the window. You compose yet another long letter, taking care to be as explicit as possible. And, you are shocked at the Congressman's response: COME TO WASHINGTON AND SO TESTIFY.

You have "got through!"

Getting There

Now what? Your colleagues have persuaded you that the Congressman's invitation is genuine, and that going to Washington to testify is indeed important. You write the Congressman and accept. But you have not even close to the kind of money it takes to make the trip. The prospect daunts you until a friend advises you of the proper attitude: "It is not that you do not have the money, it is rather that you do not have it yet!"

In your quest to raise funds, you first approach some professional organizations with similar concerns for assistance. They hesitate, however, for your individual testimony is not entirely in line with the position they would take. Surely there must be some like-minded individuals out there who would help.

You know lots of mining claim holders, and many of them are not "mining professionals." They are grocers, merchants, lawyers, manufacturers, and miners. You show them your testimony and ask for a $25 pledge. You promise to carry their names to Washington and to submit them on a list along with your testimony. You further promise to submit their own written statement with yours, should they care to make one. Their response is overwhelming. Many pledge more than $25. In fact, you have to stop asking for assistance because you are getting too much money.

On September 5th, you board the plan for Washington with a prepaid round-trip ticket.

Being There

On September 6, you gather with the others in the Longworth Building next to the Capitol. You are in the Hearing Room of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This is the hearing of the Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources, and the room is crowded. Congressman Rahall and three other committee members sit on the dais. You, along with the other witnesses and spectators, sit in the well.

Up to now you have had no idea who else would be there, but scanning the witness list shows you that this is not a hearing to be taken lightly. You count 43 witnesses, among them: the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, the Associate Chief of the U. S. Forest Service, heads of major mining companies, representatives of major environmental organizations, and folks you recognized from the infamous Prime Time report on television. You are quite surprised to see Ralph Nader on the list, and you wonder what has he to do with this issue. You are pleased to see Fred Beck will be giving a statement on behalf of AIPG. You have not met Mr. Beck, but you are delighted that AIPG is represented at this important hearing.

The marathon hearing runs non-stop from 9:30 in the morning to 6:30 at night. You hear some testimony you rather predicted that you might, and hear some argument for which you were totally unprepared. The testimony of Putnam Livermore, for example, suggested that the abolition of "discovery" as the foundation concept for holding a claim might strengthen "pedis possessio." Livermore favored the...
"pay as you go" system through rentals, and through diligence and user fees, as Congressman Rahall's bill proposes. You acknowledge that his argument has merit, but you doubt that you - who could not afford to come to Washington on your own - could continue to practice prospecting under such a system.

And you are surprised to hear perhaps the most cogent argument against outright repeal coming from a lawyer. He explained that the existing statute and case law was so comprehensive - to the point that virtually every word in the original text had been the subject of judicial interpretation - that to do away with would in fact be creating a welfare state for attorneys!

Overall, you are pleased with the dignified atmosphere of the hearing. You note the general absence of emotionally charged language in the testimony from all sides. You are proud that many within your own "mining community" feel that correcting abuses of the existing law can be accomplished through amending that law, rather than by wholesale repeal. That is a big step beyond the "it ain't broke, so don't fix it" attitude which closes all doors to rational discussion. But perhaps the most important thing you are going to take home with you is a new understanding of the basis of argument for positions contrary to your own.

Coming Home

On the plane leaving Washington, your thoughts turn back to an exchange between Congressman Craig from Idaho and Ralph Nader. Nader had been against Rahall's bill because it was not tough enough on mining. It did not include provision for a federal over-riding royalty - a cash compensation to the general public for mineral production on the public domain. Following Nader's testimony, Congressman Craig asked him why he thought that was so critical for "locatable" minerals on public lands.

Nader responded with a question of his own: "Sir, if you were the owner of a mineral-bearing property, and a mining company came into your lands to extract those minerals, wouldn't you demand a royalty on their mineral production?"

That was a particularly dramatic moment in the hearing, for the only conceivable answer to the challenge was: "Yes." But after an equally dramatic pause, Congressman Craig answered: "No...Not if I had the power to tax them."

Somehow you feel that in this exchange lies the crux of the issue. You look out the window to see you are flying over the Ohio Valley. You see a few large tracts of forested lands covering an otherwise flat and featureless terrain. You marvel at what woodsmen the early inhabitants of those lands must have been to find their way around in those forests. Where were the distant peaks or mountain ranges to guide them, as in your home in Colorado? Then you realize how much the Mining Law debate is an "east" versus "west" issue.

You consider Joe Citizen from the streets of Boston. He is every bit as much a citizen of the United States as you are. And you have been talking about mining on the Public Lands. These are lands belonging to Joe Citizen every bit as much as to you. Perhaps Joe even fought and bled for those lands. How are you going to tell Joe that he does not have a right to some compensation for the use of those Public Lands in which he has a stake? When Ralph Nader says: "Joe you should get a royalty from these mining companies that are carting off gold and copper from your lands," Joe is going to be rather easily persuaded: "Hell yeah! Sounds good to me! Even better since you're taking it out of his pocket and not mine!" Never mind that Joe neither takes the risk, spends the dollars, nor helps you dig the tunnel to win the prize.

It is a formidable argument. It is even more staggering when you realize Joe Citizen generally lives in the east where there are few if any Public Lands open to mineral entry. He is generally ignorant of how mining works. It all takes place in the dark, and to him there is no difference between a "leasable" and a "locatable" mineral. He is easily persuaded of the argument for compensation for use of Public Lands, to wit: a mineral royalty. Joe Citizen also comes from places where are found the largest population centers in the country - the most votes.

You wonder, now: who got through to whom?

Looking Forward

Did you really "get through"? Congressman Rahall promised to revise his bill based on the testimony from that hearing. He intends to work with that revision toward full consideration by the House in the next, 102nd, Congress. You have no way of knowing if you had any impact at all until you read his revision. You do, however, take heart that one of Rahall's aides invited you to make additional testimony to clarify a few points you had raised.

But you worry about the 102nd Congress. Congressman Udall is stepping out of office. He had "felt the heat" before, and vowed no major mining law reform would get through the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee while he chaired it. The recent moratorium on mineral patenting narrowly failed in the Senate by a 50 to 48 margin. The $100 annual fee in lieu of assessment work failed to get out of the Senate committee only by a 9 to 9 vote.

You know this is no time to rest.

Looking Back

After getting over the shock of Rahall's response last May, you later read good advice in The Professional Geologist about "getting through" (Knight, W. V., Writing Your Lawmakers, July 1990). On reflection, you realize your own success followed a somewhat different formula. You summarize what advice you might pass on to some one else struggling to "get through":

1. Know the subject - the law itself. Have you actually read the 1872 Mining Law, as amended? It is not enough to simply holler "it ain't broke, so don't fix it"! Certainly there are some holes in it that could be patched!

2. Study the actual bill - the proposed legislation. Do you know exactly what that legislator is trying to say? Or do you simply perceive the bill as a vague threat?

3. Comment in specific reference to the bill. Consider that the legislator to whom you are writing - despite all appearances - has worked hard to put together a piece of legislation. A vague letter stating your position does not acknowledge you have even read or recognized his effort.

4. Make constructive suggestions. If you are going to point out what you think are the errors of his ways, you would be courteous to offer alternatives.

But more than advice, what you really want to offer that some one else is encouragement to try in the first place. Encouragement, best wishes, and good luck.
A Discussion Of Certain Aspects Of
The New AIPG Code Of Ethics - Part 2

David M. Abbott, Jr., CPG 4570

Introduction

In the first part of this paper, I noted that when the Code of Ethics is applied to real situations the question of what is and what is not acceptable practice may be less clear than many of us would like. This part continues my examples of the application of parts of the Code of Ethics to real situations. Please think about these examples, decide what you believe is and is not ethical, and contribute your thoughts as letters to editor or in calls and letters to me personally. The goals are to create greater awareness of the how the Code of Ethics applies to real situations and to collect a consensus of where the line between the acceptable and unacceptable is.

Members Convicted of Crimes or Enjoined for Fraud: Rule 2.1.1

Rule 2.1.1 states, "A Member shall not knowingly participate in any illegal activities..." Does conviction of a crime warrant expulsion of a Member? Consider the following news item.

Man Sentenced to 8 years for Incest

A former oil-company geologist accused of long-term incest with a stepdaughter, beginning when she was age 6, was sentenced in Jefferson County District [Court] yesterday to eight years in prison.
Rocky Mountain News, 2/6/90, p. 14

If the geologist described in this news item were an AIPG Member, what, if anything, should AIPG do?

Clearly, incest is immoral and illegal. Identification of the perpetrator as a geologist does not enhance the standing of the profession. Furthermore, the incest was long-term and required the "knowing" participation of the perpetrator, the geologist. But what bearing does this crime have on this geologist's ability to competently and ethically practice geology? Should the AIPG's Ethics Code be applied to these activities relating to the practice of geology? If so, would conviction on an embezzlement charge warrant AIPG action? In view of the fact that responsible handling of corporate or client's money is part of many geologists' practice and embezzlement clearly reflects on this ability, I believe that conviction of embezzlement should result in expulsion. Would a murder conviction only be relevant for AIPG purposes if the victim were another geologist?

Another approach to criminal convictions would be to take the position that because the sentence given following conviction represents payment of the criminal's debt to society that completion of the sentence should be sufficient and that AIPG is not obligated to do anything more. Practicing geology from jail is impossible. But adoption of this view has consequences.

Take the case of a geologist convicted of securities fraud for selling shares in a worthless mining venture by promising prompt and substantial returns. Here the conviction is clearly related to geologic practice. If the geologist serves jail time, should he be allowed to resume his practice with full AIPG membership? Hasn't the debt to society been paid? Change the facts to the case where, rather than being criminally convicted, the geologist consents to the entry of a civil injunction against further violations of the securities laws, again for promoting the worthless mining venture. In this case there is no conviction and no jail time or probation. I believe that the geologist in this case should be expelled. AIPG did expel a Member who consented to the entry of a civil injunction in a similar case - it was an oil deal rather than a mining deal - but AAPG, which had a practically identical Ethics Code at the time did not. Who was right in this case, AIPG or AAPG? I will add the personal comment that in evaluating which professional society's Code of Ethics means something, the answer is pretty clear: the AAPG fell flat on its face.

Failure to Do Anything About An Ethical Violation: Standard 5.5

Standard 5.5 states, "Members having knowledge of a violation of these Rules by another Member should bring substantiated evidence of such violation to the attention of the Institute." The following questions arose in connection with an Ethics Committee proceeding on which I worked. How much do you have to know? What is "substantiated evidence"? What should be done about those who fail to bring matters to AIPG's attention? If you are contacted by the Institute for information, what should you do? What should be done about those Members who fail to cooperate with an Institute inquiry?

How much do you have to know? Not everything, perhaps not much. Your incomplete information may be the piece needed to begin an inquiry. The reason for making an inquiry is to find out more about the subject of the inquiry - if everything was known, investigation would be unnecessary. Therefore, I would urge each Member who knows some information to discuss it with someone else who is familiar with the issue and, perhaps equally important, is in a position to do something about it. If it's fraud, call me. Members of the Ethics

continued on page 8
Committee, the Executive Committee, the Executive Director can be contacted if you can't think of anyone else.

My job at the SEC involves identifying suitable matters for fraud investigations, among other things. A phone call or letter from you telling me about a situation that just doesn't seem right may be all I need. Tell me about the sales pitch you got over the phone or received in the mail. You may start an important investigation. The combination of what I know about frauds in general and sources of information most of you don't frequently use plus your information may be all that's required.

What is "substantiated evidence"? Substantiated evidence is the fill-in to the blank in the statement, "J. Doe is an unethically practicing geologist because ______." Like any geologic investigation, ethical investigations require supporting data; opinions and hypotheses are necessary but insufficient. We all have been trained in investigations. Substantiated evidence is the supporting data. Obtaining all the needed substantiated evidence may present real problems, indeed may be beyond your means. But give AIPG what you have, the Ethics Committee and its investigating subcommittee are charged with completing the job.

In the course of working on the AIPG ethics violation that gave rise to the remarks in this section, the investigating subcommittee learned that an AIPG Member had been retained by one of the victims of the fraud that gave rise to the ethics investigation. This Member had visited and reported on the property in question. However, when contacted by the investigating subcommittee, the AIPG Member stated that he didn't know all the facts and didn't want to get involved. Although he did not directly participate in a fraud, his inaction contributed to its continuation. And especially after the investigating subcommittee called him, his refusal to provide such information as he did have to my mind constitutes a violation of Section 5.5.

There are no rules under Standard 5.5; should there be? I believe that failure to abide with Standard 5.5 should result in expulsion from AIPG, particularly where a Member able to assist in an AIPG inquiry declines to do so, "doesn't want to get involved." If you don't want to be involved, don't belong.

Footnotes
1. This paper is based on a talk presented to the Colorado Section, AIPG, April 16, 1990.
2. The Securities and Exchange Commission, as a matter of policy, disclaims responsibility for any private publication or statement by any of its employees. The views expressed herein are Mr. Abbott's and no not necessarily reflect the view of the Commission or of Mr. Abbott's colleagues on the Commission's staff.
3. This conclusion that a fraud was involved is substantiated by the existence of a number of civil actions alleging fraud brought by state securities authorities. These actions constitute part of the substantiating evidence acquired in the case.

Petroleum Geology Is A Profession

Wallace E. Pratt, CPG 734

Editor's Note: These selected paragraphs by the late Wallace E. Pratt warrant occasional repetition. Perhaps any subdiscipline of geology might be substituted for "petroleum geology" as used in the essay. The full paper was originally presented to the Texas Section in 1965 and published in 1966. It appeared in TPG for October-November 1980.

Although they have long devoted themselves zealously to their scientific society, American Association of Petroleum Geologists, many geologists employed by the oil industry have remained indifferent in their attitude toward their profession. Only within recent months, with the arrival of the semi-centennial of the founding of AAPG, have these geologists begun to realize that they also constitute a profession, the welfare of which is of paramount importance to them, and so merits their ardent support.

In some part at least, this unfortunate dereliction has grown out of the reluctance of the geologist to subject himself to the government regulations membership in a legally organized profession must involve. The tendency of the petroleum geologist to avoid, so far as possible, government regulation, has been fortified by his identification with the oil producing industry, where the "rugged individualism" so cherished by the typical oil producer has influenced the geologist's concept of his civic responsibilities. Today, at long length, petroleum geologists begin to recognize their professional status.

I want to document out of my own experience the thesis of this paper, which is that in the past petroleum geologists have not adequately discharged their responsibilities to their profession or to the oil-producing industry. More than forty years ago a geologist whom I have long known intimately found himself in a position for which he was but inadequately prepared; his fellows had elected him president of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. In this new office he immediately confronted a problem he had never anticipated, namely, how should the Association, conceived and established by its founders only three years previously, with its declared object to be "the promotion of the continued on page 9
science of geology among the men engaged primarily in the geology of petroleum and gas," proceed to deal with a charge that two of its members had engaged in unethical - that is to say, unprofessional - practices?

Surely this uncomfortable experience would have impressed indelibly on the mind of this young petroleum geologist that he and his fellows bear serious responsibilities that cannot be adequately discharged by a purely scientific society. That he failed, nevertheless, to grasp this truth is evidenced by his testimony 25 years later when, on an occasion deeply moving to him, he declared his conviction that "geology is a way of life" and in his declaration, revealed again, unchanged, his conception of the petroleum geologist as purely a scientist. Indeed, only within recent months, towards the end of an unusually long and fortunate carer has he come to realize that geology is also a profession - a profession to which he owes the same allegiance and devotion he renders to geology as a science. And for this new, enlightened outlook, it is appropriate here to record, he is principally indebted to the tactful mental prodding of Cam Sproule, Martin Van Couvering, Ben Parker, and Frank Conselman.

No longer do I subscribe so confidently as I did when the oil industry first admitted me into its ranks to the thesis 'He governs best who governs least.' Perhaps the doctrine was valid when the oil finding industry was younger - when we were a nation of pioneers, poised on the frontier of an all-but-empty continent. The frontiersman can - he must -sustain and protect himself. He rubs shoulders with no other man. He does do best with a minimum of government restriction.

But today vastly different conditions prevail. Nearly two hundred million people are now so squeezed together in this once-empty continent that in great metropolitan areas along both our coast-line boundaries congestion has increased until the state of near-chaos we describe as "urban sprawl" stifles both our social and economic life. Today we do rub shoulders with each other, friction results and some government mediation appears to be imperative.

We count ourselves among the most enlightened peoples of the world. Ours is conceded to be the richest, the most powerful nation on earth. Yet our own criticism of our government, both state and federal, fills the editorial pages of our newspapers and covers our television screens throughout the country. Most widely we denounce government because of the social, economic, and fiscal policies it pursues; and among our sharpest and bitterest critics of these policies is so called "big business" - transportation, trade, finance, manufacturing, and industry, including, not least, the oil industry...

But if it be true that ours is not the best of all possible governments, where does the fault lie? Far and away the most powerful element in our social order is this same "big business." In its possession is concentrated the bulk of the nation's wealth and material resources. At its command are the best brains in the country (and in other free nations) - those specialists most competent in the humanities, the law, science, research, and technical know-how. Let us divert into the field of government, about which we are so unhappy, a larger fraction of this accumulation of resources and of talent than we have been wont to do, and so ameliorate the ills of which we complain. After all, it is our government. Let us make it a government worthy to lead and to administer the most advanced, the most enlightened nation on earth...

In summary, I submit that petroleum geologists confront many problems - professional, social, ethical, political, and industrial among others - with which their scientific society is not designed to cope. The solution of these problems is more properly the concern of geologists as a profession rather than as scientists. Professional geologists in fields other than petroleum face these same problems. It would appear to be wise strategy, therefore, for petroleum geologists to join with other professional geologists in a concerted effort to make geology serve the social order more effectively.

So it has come about after many years as a member of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, which always in the past had seemed fully to meet my needs and to define my duties as a petroleum geologist, that I have now been moved to seek membership in the American Institute of Professional Geologists, an organization which includes all professional geologists. At long last I have come to realize that I have a profession to cherish as well as a science and that I share the objectives of this vigorous, young society.

When Chairman Rothrock extended to me the opportunity to speak on this program, I chose to cast my subject in the form of an affirmation: "Petroleum Geology is a Profession." In closing I should like to express my related conviction that not only is petroleum geology a profession, but that it will persist as a profession over a period which current usage has come habitually to designate as the "foreseeable future."
A New Order-
The 102nd Congress

A new year and a new Congress. On January 3, 1991, the 102nd session of the U.S. Congress officially convened. The serious business of actual law-making began later in the month. As a new congressional session, the 102nd Congress will develop a completely fresh legislative agenda. "The past has buried the past." The slate is clean. All legislative actions from the previous session terminated with that session. New legislation must now be introduced, even for "old" or recurring issues. Some of the "oldie but goodie" issues will, of course, reappear in new packaging. Some old issues will fall victim to terminal inertia and disappear from the congressional agenda. Geo-interest legislative initiatives, however, are not among those issues that are likely to fall by the wayside during this congressional session.

The outcome of the November 1990 election served as the die that will cast the form and substance for this 102nd congressional session. Despite all the pre-election foment, most political wizards foresee no major or exceptional alterations to the existing arrangement of basic power and influence.

The capacity of a new Congress to function effectively is determined through the allocation of committee assignments. Obviously, in order to be "movers & shakers," elected officials must have committee slots that provide an opportunity to "move & shake." Congressional committee assignments were underway by both parties in December, once the party leadership positions had been determined.

Fallout from the November elections has caused a number of geo-interest committees to be restructured. In the House of Representatives, on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Democrats have six vacancies; the Republicans have three. On the House Interior Committee, the Democrats have one vacancy and the Republicans have three.

In the Senate, the Republicans have openings on Energy and Natural Resources, Appropriations, Finance, Budget, Environment & Public Works, and Agriculture, as well as several others. Although the next two years will represent a new legislative epoch, the federal sector will function about the same as it has for the past several administrations: a Congress dominated by one political party that must function with an administration of another party. This is a situation that assures there will be "bipartisan government" dictated through "system of checks and balances." The arrangement may not play out just as the shapers of the Constitution envisioned when our form of government was established, but the system does work. We are a government by the people, and for the people. That one order does not change!

Increase in Oil Supplies

The Department of Energy reported in late November that world-wide oil production was on the increase. The loss of production has diminished since August 1990, when oil supplies were reduced about 7 percent through a worldwide embargo of production from Iraq and Kuwait. The Iraqi invasion of neighboring Kuwait triggered the embargo. Other major oil producers, mainly Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Venezuela have increased their production to compensate for the estimated 4.3 million/bpd loss. According to DOE, the anticipated end-of-year shortfall was to be less than 0.5 million/bpd. "While the worst of the production loss is behind us, any unforeseen production problems could cause market reactions since the world is now operating at near capacity production levels," says DOE.

Consultant Disclosure Regulations

Regulations have recently been issued to support a 1988 law that imposes disclosure requirements on federal consultants. The new regs require private consultants who are retained by federal agencies to identify other clients for whom they have performed related services. Consultants must also certify that any government contract sought represents neither an actual nor a potential conflict of interest. Possible conflicts of interest also must be disclosed. Senator David Pryor (D-AR), the author, promoted the legislation because of his concern that private consultants were "working both sides of the street" on the same issue. There are documented examples of consultants performing the same or similar services to both the federal government and to private clients. According to Senator Pryor, out of a group of 156 contract-awardees, the federal government was unaware that almost two-thirds were involved in activities that posed potential conflicts of interest. The regulations, 48 CFR Parts 9, 52, & 53, (Reference-55 FR 42684-TPG October 1990) apply to consultants with direct federal contracts of more than $25,000. Consultants with contracts of $200,000 or more must disclose, also, any marketing arrangements employed to gain a contact.

The regs, just issued, represent a "watered-down" compromise of Senator Pryor's original proposal. The original legislation called for mandatory registration of consultants seeking to do business with the federal government. Senator Pryor says that he is still not completely satisfied that this "wimp" version will protect taxpayers from excesses in federal consultant services.

Info On Iraq-Kuwait Crisis

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) has just completed for the Congress several analytical reports on various facets of the Iraq-Kuwait crisis. Foreign policy, the defense budget, and energy policy are some of the topics covered. A few reports pertain specifically to oil issues. Of particular interest to the geo-concerned, is a report entitled "Petroleum Status of the Western Persian Gulf," by Joseph Riva, CPG 3548. Information on obtaining copies of
these or other CRS reports is available through the CRS Product Line (202) 707-7132.

Importance Of Mining Explained

The American Mining Congress (AMC) has published a non-technical brochure on the importance of the mining industry in the U.S. Included in the pamphlet is a discussion of just how the industry addresses its environmental responsibilities.

The booklet is available for one dollar from the American Mining Congress (att: Joyce Slack), 1920 N. Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036. A discount is available for bulk quantity orders; call (202) 861-7527 for additional information.

Drainage Backlog Still Dogs DOI

The Department of the Interior's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) recently completed a study of the backlog of oil and gas drainage cases in the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Since 1986, according to the OIG report, the number of unresolved cases has tripled, increasing from 8,500 cases to 25,000. The U.S. government could be losing about $74 million dollars in unpaid royalties.

For the past several years, BLM has intensified its efforts to identify potential and possible drainage situations. In 1988, mandatory Bureau procedures were developed to address drainage situations. According to the OIG report, compliance with the procedures is inconsistent among the sixteen BLM field offices that have oil and gas program responsibility. This has caused "inefficient and ineffective utilization of the resources" allocated for management of the drainage program. The OIG study, No. 90-100, "Drainage Protection Program, Bureau of Land Management," also reported that the program is further hampered by insufficient program priority and a failure among the field offices to share necessary technology. The OIG recommended that BLM develop a comprehensive drainage program, with a separate program budget item for drainage activities. The BLM has projected an annual caseload increase of 2,000 to 4,200 cases. At its current level of funding, BLM would be able to work out the existing backlog, only, in 65 years.

Geo-Gullible Rock Around The Clock

A dire prediction that a "killer earthquake" was 'likely' to occur at New Madrid, Missouri on December 3, 1990 generated much public attention. Alas, there was no discernible movement within the New Madrid fault zone on "doomsday."

According to the USGS National Earthquake Information Center seismic activity tracking system, the most significant 'Great Shake' recorded in the U.S. on "doomsday" was a 3.5 temblor near Ely, Nevada. But then it was only a 30-50 prediction.

The prediction, of "The Big One at New Madrid," originated with Iben Browning, a self-identified "business consultant" from New Mexico. After the December 3 non-event, Mr. Browning could not be reached for comment. As reported by the press, his telephone was "out of service." Mr. Browning's scientifically "off-the-wall" forecast was totally unsupported by any insight from the expert scientific community. Nonetheless, a high degree of "Chicken Little" reasoning prevailed throughout the area. Several school districts within the five-state area shut down for a day "just be safe," and cancelled all activities. More than a few residents in New Madrid took sudden holidays out of town. And despite a huge influx of earthquake groupies to town, several local motels and restaurants saw fit to close due to the impending doom.

Many scare stories were circulated about portents and omens of the alleged apocalyptic event. All were wonderful. Once real winner was the oft repeated "eye-witness account" of two "guardian angels" hovering over the county line to warn unwary travelers that "the end was nigh."

"The Really Big One At New Madrid" did not occur on December 3, 1990. One local bar owner, however, did fill the void for the visiting thrill-seekers. Haps Lounge hosted the social event of the season - a marathon "Shake, Rattle, and Roll" party. It was from all reports, an authentic seismic event. In the words of a famous seismologist of the '60s, there really was "a whole lot of shaking going on!"

Heaviest Element Revealed

The heaviest element known to science was recently discovered at a National Laboratory. The element, tentatively named "administratium" (Ad), has no protons or electrons, thus it has atomic number 0. It does, however, have one neutron, 75 associate neutrons, 125 deputy neutrons, and 111 assistant deputy neutrons. This gives it an atomic mass of 312. The 312 particles are held together in the nucleus by a force that involves the continuous exchange of meson-like particles called memo-nos. Since there are no electrons, Ad is inert. It can be detected chemically, however, because it impedes every reaction in which it takes part. For example, when one drop of Ad is introduced to a reaction that normally takes less than one day to complete; the reaction takes over four days to go to completion. Ad has a half-life of about 3 years, at which time it does not actually decay. Rather, Ad undergoes an internal restructuring. The associate neutrons, deputy associate neutrons, and the assistant deputy neutrons are then all realigned, but not changed. Some studies have shown that the atomic mass actually increases after an episode of restructuring.

[Thanks to the Society of Economic Geology Newsletter]

Selected Federal Register Notices - (11/90)

Environmental Protection Agency


Bureau of Land Management


continued on page 12
Mine Safety & Health Administration

Proposed rule 30 CFR Parts 46, 56, 57, & 77 Hazard communications. Contact: Patricia Silvery (703) 225-1910. 55 FR 46400. [Proposal to require operators to inform mine workers of use and type of hazardous chemicals.]

Department of Energy


Environmental Protection Agency


Office of Special Counsel


Environmental Protection Agency


Environmental Protection Agency


Minerals Management Service


Minerals Management Service


Bureau of Land Management

Final rule 43 CFR Part 3160 Onshore oil and gas operations; federal and Indian leases; onshore oil and gas order no. 6, hydrogen sulfide operations. Effective date: January 22, 1991. Contact: Sie Ling Chiang (202) 653-2133. 55 FR 48958.

Environmental Protection Agency


Department of the Interior

Request for information-impact of potential oil spills in the Arctic Ocean on Alaskan nates. Contact: Paul Gates (907) 271-5011. 55 FR 49144.

Environmental Protection Agency

Proposed rule making 40 CFR Part 142 National primary drinking water regulations implementation; primary enforcement responsibility. Contact: Carl Reeves (202) 382-5522. 55 FR 49398.

MEMBERS IN THE NEWS


Philip E. LaMoreaux, CPG 880, is the 1990 recipient of AGI's Ian Campbell Award. Dr. LaMoreaux also recently received the Commander's Award for Public Service from the Department of Army.

Marion L. (Spike) Maderak, CPG 6321, has become Assistant District Chief for the Wyoming District of the USGS Water Resources Division.

Harry W. Smedes, CPG 6480, has been appointed Senior Technical Associate of International Technology Corporation at Irvine, California.

Roderick W. Tillman, CPG 7370, is serving as President of SEPM for 1990-91.

Wyoming Registration Bill

A bill to register geologists is being introduced in the Wyoming legislature under the sponsorship of Senator Diemer True, President of the Senate. The bill, as proposed, incorporates most of the principles contained in the AIPG "Comments and Alternative Language" circulated November 30, 1990, with modifications appropriate to Wyoming. The boards of both the Wyoming Geological Association and the Wyoming Section of AIPG voted unanimously to present the bill to the legislature.

IN MEMORIAM

William T. Ford, CPG 2885, October 21, 1990
Gene B. Wiggins, Jr., CPG 4714, August 1, 1990
Janus

William V. Knight

The Roman deity, Janus, is remembered as the god of gates and doorways, of beginnings and endings. Thus, he was often depicted with two faces, so he could look to both the past and the future.

At this beginning of a new year it seems appropriate to emulate Janus and take a look at both the year just past and the year ahead.

1990 has been very active in both the profession and AIPG. I will touch on only a few of the many things that happened, and say something of anticipated future activities.

Registration: As 1990 began, CoPGO, the Council of Professional Geological Organizations, had begun their work with a meeting in the Dallas office of Pat Gratton, President of AAPG's DPA. The group consisted of one State Geologist and two members, each, from AAPG/DPA, AEG, AIPG, and SPEG. That meeting resulted in the first draft of a suggested registration act for geologists. Their last meeting, in May, resulted in a second draft which was sent for comment to the various represented societies. Several changes subsequently were recommended. In October, AEG published the text of a "Suggested Geologists Practice Act," incorporating changes which they and their attorney had recommended. In mid-November, AIPG circulated for review and comment a copy of the AEG text, together with AIPG's initial comments and suggested alternative language. These went to each of our Sections, each State Geologist, each registration board, and related organizations. A number of comments were received and analyzed. Based on these comments, the AIPG comments and alternative language were revised and published on November 30. These reflect the current policies of AIPG relative to registration of geologists and certification of specialties. Any who are interested should contact either the State Geologists, the registration boards, or the chairman of their AIPG Section Committee on Regulation and Legislation. Copies were sent to each of them.

State Net: About midyear AIPG began subscribing to a service that notifies us of proposed legislation and regulations which may have some bearing on our Members' practices. These are distributed to the Section regulation and legislation chairmen as soon as received. They are also reviewed at Headquarters and selected items are noted in the next TPG. Because of the time lag in publishing, these notices in TPG sometimes are after the fact. Nevertheless, they are proving useful to our Members by telling them of things of which they might not otherwise be aware. We expect this service to be even more valuable during the 1991 legislative session.

Candidates and Students: During 1990, two classes of affiliation were established for younger and aspiring geologists: Candidate for Certification and Student. We have begun to receive applications for each of these. Student Chapters reportedly are being formed on a number of campuses.

Political Activity: A number of items of interest were addressed, and continue to be addressed. In 1989 and 1990, Congress passed or introduced several measures having potentially significant impact on various of our Members. Three deserve special note.

First, Congressman Rahall and Senator Bumpers each introduced legislation to change or replace the 1872 Mining Law, upon which much western mineral exploration and development has been based. After considerable study, a group of AIPG Members from the mining industry submitted a position paper which was approved and presented orally to Congressman Rahall's Committee. As with most controversial matters, some of our Members and their clients do not agree. However, the Executive Committee felt that to do nothing would be even worse. Most of our mining Members from whom we have heard have been very supportive in their comments.

Congress adjourned without action and the legislation is likely to be reintroduced in 1991. AIPG will probably testify again. Those interested in providing input to this testimony should notify Headquarters.

Second, in the "Savings and Loan Bailout," Congress mandated that each state create a certification/registration program for real estate appraisers. As interpreted in most states, this would include appraisals of mineral properties, e.g., oil, gas, coal, gold, gravel, etc. As many of our Members do these types of appraisals, we alerted our Sections. Several have been successful in getting the state legislation modified to allow our Members to continue this type of work. These efforts are continuing. Meanwhile, the National Society of Professional Engineers has expressed a desire to work with AIPG to get a clarification of the intent of Congress that appraisals should be performed by those best qualified. That is, mineral appraisals should be performed by qualified geologists or engineers.

Third, also related to the "Savings and Loan Bailout," Congress has legislation before it which would specify the disciplines which should conduct environmental site assessments. Geologists are omitted from the list. AIPG is working to eliminate this oversight/omission.

AsBOG: The Association of State Boards of Geology (AsBOG) held its first annual meeting in November. As reported in December, AIPG and several other geological organizations were invited to send observers. A membership class of affiliated organizations was created. AIPG expects to participate. The boards are charged with protecting the public. It is up to AIPG to protect the profession by serving as its spokesman before AsBOG, the boards, and in the public arena.

continued on page 14
continued from page 13

Publications: The Issues and Answers series has attracted considerable attention, both in the United States and abroad. A number of new titles are in process. One of the things your Executive Committee will be considering at its January meeting is how to expedite publication of these. They have been before them a concrete proposal, so things are expected to begin to move. The Monograph series on professional practice is also expected to expand in the near future with publication of several new titles. These are designed to help our Members and other geologists as they manage their careers.

Advertising: AIPG has begun to accept advertising for both TPG and the Directory. 1990 has been a learning year. As a result of some of the lessons learned, you likely will see a continuation of the changes in TPG which you noticed in 1990. Other changes are in the offing. The intent is to make the publication more useful to our Members and, coincidentally, to our advertisers.

Continuing Education: Last January, some members of state registration boards expressed frustration over the perceived dilution of the standard Continuing Education Unit (CEU). It seems that self-accreditation of courses by the organizations that present them has resulted in a corruption of the system. Because AIPG is concerned with the maintenance of professional standards and because AIPG has no conflict of interest (because we present no courses), we were asked to develop a program of accreditation to set a standard on which the boards could rely. This program has been developed and was presented to ASBOG at its annual meeting in November. By the time you read this, ASBOG is expected to have endorsed the program. South Carolina will require continuing education for renewal of registration commencing in 1991. Other states have indicated they are considering a similar requirement. AIPG is expected to be the principal accrediting agency setting the standard for all states. Ross Shipman and his committee have their work cut out for them!

Liability (and other) Insurance: During the past 18 months, AIPG has been soliciting and receiving proposals for various kinds of insurance programs. (You may remember the insurance survey conducted through TPG several months ago.) A top priority is the development of some type of coverage for professional liability. Meanwhile, firm proposals have been received for legal defense, life, health and accident, and portable pension plans. The newly formed Insurance Committee, chaired by Gail Waggoner, has begun reviewing these proposals. Significant progress is expected early in 1991.

Section Activities: Although a few of our Sections have been a bit moribund, to say the least, others have been very active. New Members are bringing new life and energy at both the Section and the national level. Although some may think that registration obviates the need for AIPG, it is worth noting that some of our most active Sections include states with registration. They have shifted from the passive to the active mode and are leading the profession into new opportunities instead of merely trying to protect the evaporating status quo.

Our profession is undergoing rapid evolution. Whether it evolves to extinction or to greater strength depends, to a large extent, on AIPG and its Members’ involvement in professional affairs.
Applications Received
(as of December 31, 1990)

Applicants for certification must meet AIPG’s standards as set forth in its Bylaws on education, experience and competence, and personal integrity. If any Member has any factual information as to any applicant's qualifications in regard to these standards, whether that information might be positive or negative, please mail that information to Headquarters within thirty (30) days. This information will be circulated only as far as necessary to process and make decisions on the applications.

Full Membership
BIANG, Randall P., 1280 Seabury Circle, Carol Stream, IL 60188. Sponsors: Nick Beskid, Richard Pearl, Tom Lentzen.


CHERNOW, Robert M., 36 Melrose Drive, Chester, NJ 07930. Sponsors: Steven E. Lane, David Mercer, David Volkert.


COZZI, Andrew M., 161 Camden Street, Roselle Park, NJ 07204. Sponsors: Daniel Nachman, Michael Hocek, Raymond Talkington.

FULTON, David E., 9 Oxford Road, Jackson, NJ 08527. Sponsors: Alex Zabli, Greg Reuter, Rex J. Young.

GREENISH, Anthony T., Box 205 Center Road, Lynde Borough, NJ 08082. Sponsors: Hans Schreiber, Jack Frost, Joe Sphar.


HENDERSON, Charles D., Rt. 1, Box 40, Davie, WV 26260. Sponsors: Larry D. Woodfork, Alan C. Donaldson, Shelly Minns.


JASPER, Alan K., 617 Tophill Drive, Tyler, TX 75703. Sponsors: R. W. Shoemaker, J. D. Koib, A. E. Wright.

JORDAN, David C., 1412 Peterson, Omaha, NE 68130. Sponsors: Lee Nagelot, David M. Swingen, Joseph Barnett.

KLEKAMP, Thomas C., 1321 Livingston Street, Mandeville, LA 70448. Sponsors: Stephanie V. Hrabar, Michael D. Lewan, Gerald Prager.


LOCKEND, David, 768 Cascade Road, Cincinnati, OH 45240. Sponsors: Bill Thompson, Christopher K. Taylor, David Fuchrer.


NICHOLAS, David G., 12 Shallowford Road, Greenville, SC 29607. Sponsors: Norman K. Olson, Dan O. Madison, Steve D. Johannson.

REICHELTHERFER, Jan L., 1317 Ulupi Street, Kailua, HI 96734. Sponsors: Russell J. Jacobson, Derek G. Fullerton, Karen Cohen.


SHELDON, David R., 2888 Kingstown Road, Kingston, RI 02881. Sponsors: Hayden S. Solomon, Margaret D. Bradley, Kenneth McDermott.

SHOPE, Steven B., 1 Oak Hill Lane, Exeter, NH 03833. Sponsors: Donald Bruehl, Francis Hall, Ned Crow.


WIDMAN, Sally A., 91 Chatham Road, Columbus, OH 43214. Sponsors: David E. Johe, Timothy J. Sainey, Kathleen M. Johnson.


Candidate for Certification
GOELLER, Arthur, 1 Remer Avenue, Springfield, NJ 07081. Sponsors: Michael J. Hozik, Myrna Seto.

RICHARDS, Peter M., 24 Monroe Street, #2, Nashua, NH 03060. Sponsors: W. A. Bothner, Michael Burke.


WHITESIDES, Dietrich H., 12095 E. Maple Avenue, #A-2, Aurora, CO 80012. Sponsors: Arden D. Davis, Gary Rynal.

New Members
AGNEW, Paul C., CPG 8039, Canaan, NH
ANDERSON, Kurt, CPG 8040, Redmond, WA
BERG, Richard C., CPG 8041, Urbana, IL
BRINKERHOF, Laura A., CPG 8042, Brick, NJ
DEASON, Kenneth L., CPG 8043, cook station, MO
HAINES, Melissa M., CPG 8044, Denver, CO
KOGER, Curtis, CPG 8045, Monroe, WA
LUKER, James A., Jr., CPG 8046, Plymouth, MA
MARCOTT, Keith M., CPG 8047, Haganan, NY
OWEN, Mark R., CPG 8048, Pembroke, MA
PATEL, Alix, CPG 8049, Arvada, CO
PROCTOR, Thomas A., CPG 8050, Charlotte, NC
ROSENBERG, Lewis, CPG 8051, Santa Cruz, CA
SAVAGE, Craig A., CPG 8052, Farmington Hills, MI
SNYDER, Kevin C., CPG 8053, Mesa, AZ
WINSTANLEY, Daniel J., CPG 8054, Bellevue, WA

New Student Affiliate
SIMMONS, James W., SA0001, Morehead, KY

Ed’s Last Note
In accordance with prior practice and the demands of deadlines this January 1991 issue of TPG has been prepared by the outgoing Editor with the permission of your new Editor, Thomas Z. Jones. I leave with an overwhelming sense of gratitude to the many contributors to TPG and other Institute publications during the past two years. It has been a privilege to serve with Presidents Proctor and Landon and the 1989 and 1990 Executive Committees. Their support and that of Executive Director Knight and the Headquarters staff have been essential to my efforts. Wendy J. Davidson is now AIPG’s Publications Specialist, and she is very special; her talent and diligence are increasingly evident in our publications. My thanks to all of you, and to our 5000 proofreaders! I know that Editor Jones will also have your support and, with you, look forward to the publications that will be prepared under his direction.

Robert R. Jordan, Editor, 1989-90
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Does Your Label Have An Asterisk?
Please take a moment to look at the mailing label attached. If you find an asterisk after your zip code it means that Headquarters had not received your dues as of January 10, 1991. Remember, those whose dues have not been received at Headquarters by February 15 will not be listed in the 1991 Directory. Be sure you don't miss the deadline!