

TRANSCRIPT

All copyright and right of copyright in this transcript and in the broadcast are owned by CBS. This transcript may not be copied or reproduced or used in any way (other than for purposes of reference, discussion and review) without the written permission of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

CBS NEWS
2020 M Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

FACE THE NATION

as broadcast over the

CBS Television Network

and the

CBS Radio Network

Sunday, April 19, 1970 - 12:30-1:00 PM EST

Origination: Washington, D. C.

GUESTS: SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON
Democrat of Wisconsin

REPRESENTATIVE PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.
Republican of California

REPORTERS:

George Herman, CBS News

James Ridgeway, Hard Times

David Culhane, CBS News

PRODUCERS: Prentiss Childs and Sylvia Westerman

NOTE TO EDITORS: Please credit CBS News' "Face the Nation."

TIMB

Phone (Area 202) 628-4266

1 MR. HERMAN: Senator Nelson, Congressman McCloskey, next
 2 Wednesday is Earth Day, featuring environmental teach-ins all
 3 across the country. I notice some of the young radicals are
 4 already calling it nothing but a con game set up by the
 5 establishment to conceal even further abuses of the environ-
 6 ment. Will this kind of excitement and hullabaloo really
 7 accomplish anything? Senator Nelson?

8 SENATOR NELSON: It is a necessary part of the educational
 9 effort that must go on to gain an understanding nationwide of
 10 the disastrous situation that is occurring in the degradation
 11 of the environment, and a very important and critical aspect of
 12 getting the understanding that is necessary to precede intelli-
 13 gent action.

14 MR. HERMAN: Will it work, Mr. McCloskey?

15 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I think it will work. I think that
 16 on every campus across the country probably five percent of
 17 the students will attack the environmental teach-in as a
 18 cop out, but most of the students will be making an affirmative
 19 contribution, doing their homework, and I hope giving us and
 20 the Congress some of the answers we need to really meet these
 21 new priorities.

22 ANNOUNCER: From CBS/Washington, in color, FACE THE NATION, a
 23 spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with the co-chairmen
 24 of the April 22nd Environmental Teach-In, Senator Gaylord Nelson,
 25 Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Representative Paul McCloskey,

WARD & PAUL

25 K Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002

1 Republican, of California. Senator Nelson and Representative
2 McCloskey will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent David
3 Culhane, James Ridgeway, Editor of the news weekly Hard Times,
4 and CBS News Correspondent George Herman.

5 MR. HERMAN: Mr. McCloskey, you think that there will be some
6 attacks on the teach-in as a cop out. Do you mean that just
7 verbally or do you expect that there may be some actual dis-
8 ruptions, some trouble some place on some of the campuses as
9 some of these excited young people of the left disagree?

10 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, I wouldn't want to predict
11 actual violence, but I think it is a possibility. Both Senator
12 Nelson and I have been called, by the SDS, "fascist pigs," for
13 example, "captives of the establishment," for initiating this
14 teach-in.

15 SENATOR NELSON: I have spoken at half a dozen, almost ten
16 already that preceded and they have all been very constructive
17 and very valuable exercises in understanding of this issue.

18 MR. RIDGEWAY: But, Mr. McCloskey, isn't this just really a
19 mask to cover up the major problems of Vietnam and civil rights
20 in this country?

21 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I don't think so, because one of the
22 basic ways to get us out of Vietnam is to recognize that we
23 have to change the spending priorities of this country and take
24 \$17 billion out of Vietnam and put them into problems such as
25 racial equality and restoring the environment, and I think that

1 students on every campus that I have seen are undergoing this
2 exercise, is coming out with that principle, that we must end
3 the Vietnam war if we are to save the environment.

4 MR. CULHANE: Well, won't this, in fact, deflect people from
5 Vietnam as a cause and from civil rights as a cause?

6 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, I can't talk on civil rights
7 so much on this issue but I can say that Senator Nelson here
8 has taken a lead, asking the President if we are going to have
9 an environmental action in this country, that we ought to stop
10 using defolients in Vietnam, and the President last week
11 respected that and ended the use of this 2, 4, 5 Orange. And
12 I think that the two issues are related.

13 SENATOR NELSON: I think, on the contrary, the discussion of the
14 priorities that we should be emphasizing will force us to con-
15 clude that the enterprise in Vietnam is not worth the invest-
16 ment and that the money we are spending there ought to be spent
17 here to clean up the environment of America, including the
18 ghetto where the worst environment in America exists.

19 MR. CULHANE: Well, one thing I have noticed, in looking at
20 these organizations across the country, for instance, there are
21 practically no black people involved, and they seem to feel
22 that this is, in fact, deflecting people from what they cer-
23 tainly think is a much more serious problem.

24 SENATOR NELSON: I think that is because some people who talk
25 about the environment talk about it as though it involved only

1 a question of clean air and clean water. The environment in-
2 volves the whole broad spectrum of man's relationship to all
3 other living creates, including other human beings. It in-
4 volves the environment in its broadest and deepest sense. It
5 involves the environment, as I mentioned, of the ghetto which
6 is the worst environment, where the worst pollution, the worst
7 noise, the worst housing, the worst situation in this country
8 -- that has to be a critical part of our concern and consider-
9 ation in talking and cleaning up the environment.

10 MR. RIDGEWAY: Gentlemen, there have been a series of very bad
11 oil spills on the Outer Continental Shelf, and if Congress and
12 the administration are really so serious about this pollution
13 business, why isn't the drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf
14 stopped?

15 SENATOR NELSON: I have introduced legislation to do that. I
16 think that our problem here is that neither political party nor
17 the country as a whole has looked at the dimensions, the size,
18 the nature, or the character of this problem, and the disaster
19 that we are heading toward unless we do something about it.
20 And we need to develop a whole series of national policies, and
21 one of them would be a minerals policy that would say that we
22 will not drill for oil in the seabed any place any more until
23 we need the oil and until we have the technology to extract it
24 without a threat of an environmental disaster such as has
25 occurred in Santa Barbara and in the Gulf and elsewhere around

1 the world.

2 MR. HERMAN: Both of you gentlemen are members of Congress and
3 Congress is where it is at on this. Congress has the power.
4 If anything is going to be done, it seems to me, it is going
5 to have to come from the federal government and, since some of
6 the things that may have to be done involve serious changes of
7 legal philosophy, it is going to have to come from the law-
8 makers. Now, why an environmental teach-in? Is it really sort
9 of -- are you really sort of telling us that you can't get
10 these bills passed in Congress until you change the thinking
11 of the constituencies back home?

12 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I think that is an adequate state-
13 ment. Let me give you an example --

14 MR. HERMAN: Well, I mean it as a question.

15 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, think of the problem, for
16 example, in changing after 183 years of this country our
17 attitude toward abortion. Probably, as we look at this whole
18 environmental problem, the problem of overpopulation is the
19 greatest that we have and, yet, if we are going to be able in
20 the Congress to pass, say, a national abortion law or limit the
21 incentives to children to, say, two per family, this takes a
22 massive change in public opinion. Congress generally is un-
23 willing to act until there is a substantial demonstration of
24 public opinion and that only happens when there is a public
25 dialogue such as is taking place this week.

1 MR. CULHANE: How many children do you have, for instance?

2 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I am public enemy number one. I
3 think I am pretty typical. I have four children.

4 MR. HERMAN: Well, that puts you way behind Senator Hart.

5 MR. CULHANE: My serious question really is do you really think
6 that people are going to be prepared to limit the number of
7 children they have?

8 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Let me give you an example again:
9 Out at Stanford University, they had several hundred high
10 school students meet last fall and they heard a discussion of
11 the environment and the population problems. Those girls, that
12 represented some eleven counties around the bay area, almost
13 unanimously resolved that they would have no more than two
14 children. We think this is going to happen on every campus in
15 the country, as they study the cause and effect, if we all
16 continue to have three and four children.

17 MR. HERMAN: Let me take you back to the politics of it. In
18 the past, when you want to get some major legislation of this
19 kind passed, you have to have some ground, some main source of
20 strength, liberals, conservatives, southerners, no matter what
21 it might be. Now here you are going to have a problem on
22 either side. Are you going to get the liberals to pass what is
23 really basically anti-liberal legislation? Are you going to
24 get the liberals to pass tax laws which will tax people for
25 having children, which will stop some of the freedom that we

1 have been accustomed to having in the past? Are you going to
2 get liberal support for this?

3 SENATOR NELSON: I think that the issue isn't a liberal or a
4 conservative question really, it is a question literally of
5 if not survival at least how we survive. And I think that
6 the purpose of the nation-wide teach-in was to gain under-
7 standing not only across the Nation, which is necessary in a
8 representative democracy in order to get support for tough
9 programs, but to educate the Congress, too. And I don't think
10 there has been much understanding in general among leadership
11 politically or in industry or elsewhere in this country of what
12 the seriousness of the problem is. And when there is, then we
13 will be prepared to make commitments to this issue of a dimen-
14 sion that we have made to the exploration of space and the de-
15 velopment of weapons systems. We are not talking about
16 appropriations of a billion or two, you are talking about a
17 problem that is going to require us to spend very soon \$25 to
18 \$30 billion a year at the national level, not counting ex-
19 penditures --

20 MR. CULHANE: Well, this administration doesn't seem to show any
21 sign of beginning to go in that direction.

22 SENATOR NELSON: No administration has shown that sign because
23 I don't think any administration in the past, Democratic or
24 Republican, has really understood the size of the issue. That
25 is the first thing we must accomplish. This is important, much

1 more important, in fact, than the exploration of space or the
2 expenditures on weapons systems or the money that we are
3 wasting in Vietnam.

4 MR. HERMAN: Well, I just want to finish off this congressional
5 question, since you are both legislators, from the Senate and
6 the House. Is there a hard core or are you the entire corps?
7 Do you have a small solid corps of strength from which to work,
8 and what kind of an envelope can you put them all in? Are
9 they intellectuals? Are they from rich communities? What is
10 your strength?

11 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, let me give you my view on
12 that in the House of Representatives. I have only been in the
13 Congress two years and conservation was kind of a bad word when
14 I came here two years ago. This year, in the first three
15 months of the Congress, if you look at the major issues --
16 crime, Vietnam, and the environment -- look in the Congressional
17 Record. There are 635 pages on crime and Vietnam in the first
18 three months; there are 685 pages on the environment. This is
19 a bipartisan issue, if there ever was one, and there are more
20 Congressmen trying to get aboard this band wagon today than on
21 any other issue. And I think that you are going to see
22 congressional leadership. This last year we voted four times
23 the Presidential budget for water pollution, and you notice
24 the President didn't talk about vetoing that legislation as
25 anti-inflationary. This represents public opinion, and I think

1 you are going to see a very healthy contest and competition
2 between the Executive Branch and the Congress as to who leads
3 the way.

4 MR. RIDGEWAY: Yes, but according to the General Accounting
5 Office, on a study that was done on water pollution, between
6 1957 and 1969 the government spent \$1.2 billion for water
7 pollution projects. The GAO says they were all wasted; they
8 weren't any good. Now, what is the point of putting more money
9 down the drain in this kind of stuff?

10 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: You raise a very good question, Mr.
11 Ridgeway, because I am not at all satisfied that the way we
12 are spending our money now is correct in building better
13 primary and secondary sewage treatment plants. It may be that
14 we ought to stop and do a great deal of research right now on
15 whether or not we take and put together regional water pollu-
16 tion plants and big interceptor mains that run from every
17 county in a given watershed into one place, and I think we have
18 to do that research.

19 MR. HERMAN: The question that comes up repeatedly in this
20 thing -- it is a little bit philosophical, a little bit
21 economic -- will the Congress be ready, will the American
22 people be ready to end what we have had, what some economists
23 at least tell us that we have had up to this point, that is a
24 capitalism based on constant growth. Can we settle down to a
25 stable situation which ends the idea of a constantly rising

1 stock market, constantly returning dividends, a capitalism
2 based on constant growth which cannot necessarily survive in
3 the same form if growth stops, if we stabilize?

4 SENATOR NELSON: The country can't survive with constant growth.
5 We have demonstrated our lack of will or capacity or both to
6 stem the tide of deterioration of the environment with 200
7 million people. When we get to 300 million people, it will be
8 a disaster. You can't have constant consumer growth of the
9 kind that we have seen. The fact of the matter is, in a hundred
10 years we will run out of all the major -- practically all of
11 the major resources upon which a highly sophisticated techno-
12 logical society now depends. So I think we have to revise our
13 attitudes and our philosophy and modify the works of our in-
14 stitutions in order to preserve the environment that is live-
15 able. It involves a huge investment in resources and a vast
16 change in attitude. You cannot, we cannot continue to intrude
17 upon the works of nature, destroying living creatues all over
18 the world without us being in the line some place, because
19 there are all kinds of creatues with much more survivability
20 than we do.

21 MR. HERMAN: Are your voters in Wisconsin ready to do that
22 right now?

23 SENATOR NELSON: I don't think any voters anywhere in this
24 country are yet quite prepared to do it, because I don't think
25 they understand the problem. We have great and distinguished

1 scientists warning about this for a quarter of a century.
2 Finally, it is getting the kind of visibility that will develop
3 the understanding. You couldn't get 10,000 high schools, as
4 we will have next Wednesday, participating in this dialogue,
5 and 2,500 colleges in over 2,000 communities around the country
6 participating in this dialogue, if they didn't sense that a
7 very serious problem confronts us and that it involves the very
8 quality of our lives. We are at the stage of discussing what
9 that problem is and what we do about it. So as of today, in a
10 referendum in the Congress or a referendum across the country,
11 the \$25 billion that we ought to spend, the changing of our --
12 passing laws that would change our use of the land, change our
13 use of the minerals, require us to recycle solid waste, require
14 a whole series of changes in things we do -- we couldn't get
15 passed today because the understanding of what the problem is
16 must come first.

17 MR. CULHANE: What are people going to do when they find out
18 that the cleaning up of the environment might involve less use
19 of automobiles by them, that might involve cutting back on
20 things like air-conditioning? How do you think people are
21 going to respond when they see that that is what the cost is?

22 SENATOR NELSON: Well, let me give you one specific choice:
23 In 25 years at the currently increasing pollution of the air
24 envelope around the world, the introduction of all of the par-
25 ticulates and all the other things going into the air, within

1 25 years most major metropolitan areas in America, if we don't
2 stop it, you will not be able to stay outdoors more than two
3 or three hours without a serious health hazard. You will have
4 to go out -- your kids will go outdoors and play in gasmasks.
5 At that stage do you think the people are going to be prepared
6 to say "you are interfering with our rights" or "we shouldn't
7 spend the money to do something"? I don't think so. And that
8 is one item in the whole environment.

9 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: This has already happened in southern
10 California, where the doctors have said to the schools, "Do not
11 let people engage in strenuous competitive athletics when the
12 air pollutants reach a certain level." Clearly the people
13 of southern California are prepared to vote more money for
14 rapid transit in this day and age in order to move the auto-
15 mobile, even though that means less convenience. To take the
16 examples of phosphates in detergents: I think you are going
17 to find the League of Women Voters and the PTA ladies saying
18 "we are not going to buy detergents, even though our clothes
19 are dirtier as a result, if the phosphates in those detergents
20 are going to kill our lakes." We have to focus specific
21 questions, specific costs, specific inconvenience and come up
22 with a legislative solution. This is, again, the great beauty
23 of the teach-in. We are getting better answers from kids on
24 our campuses.

25 MR. HERMAN: We are all going to end up in gray shirts?

1 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, maybe a littler grayer than
2 sparkling bright.

3 SENATOR NELSON: You can buy them that color.

4 MR. HERMAN: That is what I mean. Are we going to end up buy-
5 ing gray shirts to --

6 MR. CULHANE: Is there any concern in your mind that this might
7 just be a fad? I have seen other issues that people got aroused
8 about briefly, for a year or so, and then --

9 SENATOR NELSON: Well, constantly people bring it up with me,
10 that this may be a fad. How can it be a fad? You live with
11 the environment every day. That is the reason that you see
12 this great expression of interest around the country. The air
13 is going to be here every day, the water is going to be here,
14 the deteriorating scenic beauty of the country, the destruction
15 of living creatures -- of the peregrine falcon, the bald eagle
16 and the Bermuda petrel and all kinds of other creatues -- they
17 are here. We see it every day. It is a fad? It is not a fad
18 that can go away. It will be with us and we will do something
19 about it intelligently and in a rational fashion, spending as
20 much money on that as we have spent on defense, or else we will
21 suffer the ultimate disaster. It is as simple as that.

22 MR. HERMAN: You have got a lot of industrial and big corpora-
23 tion and foundation money in back of the national teach-in,
24 the whole operation. Does this truly indicate, or should we
25 be somewhat skeptical, that big industry, big business is now

1 genuinely convinced that this is a thing that they are going
2 to have to change, or are they just trying to sort of paper it
3 over?

4 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I don't think so. You know, big
5 industry is run by big men, and those are the men that fish in
6 trout streams and go out and use the out-of-doors and get a
7 little upset when their air is fouled up. I think individually
8 the leaders of business want an environment in which they can
9 work to cure pollution as well, but the only way that we in
10 government can create that environment is to put some incentives
11 or some tax or some regulation into the system so that they are
12 rewarded by coming up with a smog-control device or reducing
13 phosphates. We haven't done that yet.

14 MR. HERMAN: But the businessmen have the know-how and the money
15 to operate this. Are they going to help lead the way or are
16 they going to hang back?

17 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: They are leading the way now, partly
18 under the pressure of young people. If no one will buy gasoline
19 with lead in it, I think you are going to find gasoline compan-
20 ies devising gasoline without lead, as many of them have started
21 to do.

22 SENATOR NELSON: I think, on that point, there are some very
23 enlightened leadership, of course. You still have to establish
24 federal standard on air quality and water quality that makes
25 everybody comply, because an individual competitor in any

1 industry is not able to make vast expenditures in this field
2 while all of his competitors fail to do so. You have got to
3 set national standards, and then you must require everybody to
4 comply -- industries, municipalities, and including the federal
5 government.

6 MR. HERMAN: With federal funds?

7 SENATOR NELSON: Federal funds.

8 MR. HERMAN: As well as standards? Matching funds? I don't
9 think --

10 SENATOR NELSON: It depends on what you are talking about. If
11 you are talking about municipalities, the problem there has
12 been that we don't give them the kind of support we gave to the
13 states to build the Interstate Highway System. We ought to be
14 90-10 money. As far as industry is concerned, the consumer is
15 going to pay the cost of the -- the increased cost of the
16 sophisticated equipment that we require industry to adopt, as
17 research develops it. It really doesn't matter whether you
18 provide some fast tax, writeoffs or however you approach it.
19 The cost goes into the product and the objective is a clean
20 environment.

21 MR. RIDGEWAY: But at a time when there is this great push for
22 population control, women really are reacting against it. I
23 mean they are reacting against the pill because they say it
24 abuses their bodies. They are against their role, their role
25 in a male society, in the family. How will you deal in effect

1 with the women's liberation movements?

2 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I think if you characterize the
3 women's liberation movement, you would have about the same
4 minority that are the radicals as there are on the campuses and
5 the whole environmental issue. I rather respect the women's
6 right to say "we women should know whether we have the right to
7 an abortion or not," and not have it be determined solely by
8 male legislators. I think the women are leading the way and
9 certainly our attitudes, if we are going to reduce family size,
10 require that the girls decide voluntarily, that they are not
11 going to have four children. This was -- the national poll
12 showed in '64 that every girls thought it was socially neces-
13 sary to have four children. Today these girls are saying two
14 children, and that kind of leadership from the girls is going
15 to really give us the means to handle the environmental
16 question.

17 MR. HERMAN: Is that sure enough?

18 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, it may not be so sure. There
19 has been a little talk of vasectomy in our family as a means
20 that is a better way than the abortion or the pill or --

21 MR. HERMAN: No, I meant leaving it to the voluntary whim of
22 each generation of child-bearing people as they grow up to do
23 what they want.

24 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, I sincerely hope we will be
25 able to do that, because I know of no worse use of government

1 than to limit the freedom to procreate, and I hope we will
2 never have to do it. But it is clear that overpopulation is
3 perhaps is as great a threat to our peace and our solidarity
4 and national security as is the nuclear weapon. And if we
5 continue to overpopulation I can see down the line a decade or
6 two that we would limit people's right to have children.
7 Hawaii, they have introduced a bill over there in their state
8 legislature to require a girl to be sterilized at the birth of
9 her second child. Now, that gives you some idea of how some
10 people in Hawaii feel about the population explosion on their
11 islands.

12 MR. RIDGEWAY: Considering all the dangers of the bill, Senator
13 Nelson, that you have shown, do you think it should still be
14 sold and used as a birth control instrument?

15 SENATOR NELSON: It is 100 percent effective, for all practical
16 purposes. It has side effects that cause about 40 percent of
17 the users, according to the Maryland study, to quit using it
18 within a twelve-month period. The important thing is to develop
19 a pill that minimizes the side effects, to expand our research
20 in that field and not limit the concept for the idea that you
21 would use a pill only for women. We haven't done much research
22 in the field and it is badly needed. The pill will not solve
23 -- the current one will not solve the worldwide problem because
24 it requires a physical examination once every six months in
25 order to be properly administered, and the medical community

1 isn't available for that in India, Pakistan, Africa, and in
2 Latin America. And our great neglect is that it has been on
3 the market for ten years without any dose level studies, with-
4 out much research at all, and that is the move we have to make
5 if we are going to develop an effective pill that can be used
6 worldwide.

7 MR. CULHANE: But right now would you advise women to use the
8 pill?

9 SENATOR NELSON: I am not technically qualified to advise yes
10 or no. There are critics of the pill. Most of the people --
11 everybody who appeared before the hearings that I conducted
12 was in favor of the pill, with qualifications, say, of one,
13 and that is some of them would use it for two years without
14 interruption but not longer, and so forth. There are some
15 things about metabolic effects on the body that we do not know.
16 They raise a serious question and we don't know the answer. But
17 I am not qualified to advise anybody on it.

18 MR. HERMAN: We have been talking about the population explo-
19 sion. How about the product explosion? If we are going to
20 control what numbers of people will put into the ecology, what
21 about businesses? Shall they be allowed to produce anything
22 they want to, no matter how difficult it is to dispose of it
23 afterwards?

24 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I think one of the most exciting
25 concepts we're dealing with, and this takes some time to work

1 out, is the concept of the user tax at the source of each
2 product, and the tax would be set by a commission that would
3 look at the competitive products and assign a tax to each
4 product commensurate with the pollution effect and the ultimate
5 probabilities of its cost of disposal. Thus, if an automobile
6 cost \$55 to dispose of, we will put a \$55 tax every time a new
7 automobile is created, pay it into a central fund and use that
8 money as an incentive to build crunching machines and recycle
9 and reuse the waste. And I think this kind of a product taxed
10 at its source will put an incentive into industry to try to
11 develop the non-pollution type or the non-difficult to dispose
12 of product.

13 MR. CULHANE: The taxpayer is going to have to pay that.

14 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Sure, but this is true of everything
15 we do in the environment. John Erlichman was absolutely right:
16 we are going to have to give up a convenience or pay more
17 for every single thing we do to save the environment.

18 MR. HERMAN: Have you given any thought to developing anything
19 like an index, like the gross national product or the price
20 index, which can be constantly cited to show the state of
21 pollution in a community or in the Nation -- you know, fifty
22 years to arm again or some kind of an index which can be
23 constantly cited and will constantly show us how well or badly
24 we are doing?

25 SENATOR NELSON: Well, our proposals -- and I think they should

1 be adopted -- for national and international monitoring of the
2 source of pollutants, their quality, their
3 ecological implications, we haven't done that but we must.

4 REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Let me give you one example that
5 just frightened the dickens out of me: The Smithsonian
6 Institution reports that since 1907 the particulant matter in
7 the air or something in our environment has reduced the flow
8 of sunlight into the earth's atmosphere by 40 percent in 63
9 years. Now, that reduction in the flow of sunlight hits the
10 life process because all life depends on the photosynthesis
11 and the flow of that sunlight. That kind of an index I think
12 we ought to start keeping. That may mean we have to start or
13 stop putting all kinds of pollutants into the air.

14 MR. HERMAN: Well, I would like you to check that because my
15 impression was that that was done in research above the atmos-
16 phere and it was just a recalculation of the solar constant,
17 but I won't quarrel with you at this point. Do you think
18 the people are now ready -- in the 10 seconds that we have left
19 -- to pay all of this extra tax or will be after this Earth Day?

20 SENATOR NELSON: They are going to pay it, whether they want to
21 or not. It is costing \$10 billion a year for air pollution.
22 They are going to pay it and it is going to cost a whole lot
23 more.

24 MR. HERMAN: Okay, we are out of time. Thank you very much,
25 gentlemen, for being with us here today on FACE THE NATION.

Phone (Area 202) 628-4266

WARD & PAUL

25 K Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- - -

ANNOUNCER: Today, on FACE THE NATION, the co-chairmen of the April 22nd Environmental Teach-In, Senator Gaylord Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Representative Paul McCloskey, Republican, of California, were interviewed by CBS News Correspondent David Culhane, James Ridgeway, Editor of the news weekly Hard Times, and CBS News Correspondent George Herman. Next week, another prominent figure in the news will FACE THE NATION. FACE THE NATION originated, in color, from CBS/ Washington.

- - -