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

SENATOR NELSON: It is a necessary part of the educational effort that must go on to gain an understanding nationwide of the disastrous situation that is occurring in the degradation of the environment, and a very important and critical aspect of getting the understanding that is necessary to precede intelligent action.

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

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

ANNOUNCER: From CBS/Washington, in color, FACE THE NATION, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with the co-chairmen of the April 22nd Environmental Teach-In, Senator Gaylord Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Representative Paul McCloskey,
Republican, of California. Senator Nelson and Representative McCloskey will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent David Culhane, James Ridgeway, Editor of the news weekly Hard Times, and CBS News Correspondent George Herman.

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

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

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I don't think so, because one of the basic ways to get us out of Vietnam is to recognize that we have to change the spending priorities of this country and take $17 billion out of Vietnam and put them into problems such as racial equality and restoring the environment, and I think that
students on every campus that I have seen are undergoing this
exercise, is coming out with that principle, that we must end
the Vietnam war if we are to save the environment.

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

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

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

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

SENATOR NELSON: I think that is because some people who talk
about the environment talk about it as though it involved only
a question of clean air and clean water. The environment involves the whole broad spectrum of man's relationship to all other living creatures, including other human beings. It involves the environment in its broadest and deepest sense. It involves the environment, as I mentioned, of the ghetto which is the worst environment, where the worst pollution, the worst noise, the worst housing, the worst situation in this country -- that has to be a critical part of our concern and consideration in talking and cleaning up the environment.

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

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I think that is an adequate statement. Let me give you an example --

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

REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, think of the problem, for example, in changing after 183 years of this country our attitude toward abortion. Probably, as we look at this whole environmental problem, the problem of overpopulation is the greatest that we have and, yet, if we are going to be able in the Congress to pass, say, a national abortion law or limit the incentives to children to, say, two per family, this takes a massive change in public opinion. Congress generally is unwilling to act until there is a substantial demonstration of public opinion and that only happens when there is a public dialogue such as is taking place this week.
MR. CULHANE: How many children do you have, for instance?

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

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Let me give you an example again:

Out at Stanford University, they had several hundred high school students meet last fall and they heard a discussion of the environment and the population problems. Those girls, that represented some eleven counties around the bay area, almost unanimously resolved that they would have no more than two children. We think this is going to happen on every campus in the country, as they study the cause and effect, if we all continue to have three and four children.

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

SENATOR NELSON: I think that the issue isn't a liberal or a conservative question really, it is a question literally of if not survival at least how we survive. And I think that the purpose of the nation-wide teach-in was to gain understanding not only across the Nation, which is necessary in a representative democracy in order to get support for tough programs, but to educate the Congress, too. And I don't think there has been much understanding in general among leadership politically or in industry or elsewhere in this country of what the seriousness of the problem is. And when there is, then we will be prepared to make commitments to this issue of a dimension that we have made to the exploration of space and the development of weapons systems. We are not talking about appropriations of a billion or two, you are talking about a problem that is going to require us to spend very soon $25 to $30 billion a year at the national level, not counting expenditures --

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

SENATOR NELSON: No administration has shown that sign because I don't think any administration in the past, Democratic or Republican, has really understood the size of the issue. That is the first thing we must accomplish. This is important, much
more important, in fact, than the exploration of space or the expenditures on weapons systems or the money that we are wasting in Vietnam.

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

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

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

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

MR. HERMAN: The question that comes up repeatedly in this thing -- it is a little bit philosophical, a little bit economic -- will the Congress be ready, will the American people be ready to end what we have had, what some economists at least tell us that we have had up to this point, that is a capitalism based on constant growth. Can we settle down to a stable situation which ends the idea of a constantly rising
stock market, constantly returning dividends, a capitalism
based on constant growth which cannot necessarily survive in
the same form if growth stops, if we stabilize?

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

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

SENATOR NELSON: I don't think any voters anywhere in this
country are yet quite prepared to do it, because I don't think
they understand the problem. We have great and distinguished
scientists warning about this for a quarter of a century. Finally, it is getting the kind of visibility that will develop the understanding. You couldn't get 10,000 high schools, as we will have next Wednesday, participating in this dialogue, and 2,500 colleges in over 2,000 communities around the country participating in this dialogue, if they didn't sense that a very serious problem confronts us and that it involves the very quality of our lives. We are at the stage of discussing what that problem is and what we do about it. So as of today, in a referendum in the Congress or a referendum across the country, the $25 billion that we ought to spend, the changing of our -- passing laws that would change our use of the land, change our use of the minerals, require us to recycle solid waste, require a whole series of changes in things we do -- we couldn't get passed today because the understanding of what the problem is must come first.

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

SENATOR NELSON: Well, let me give you one specific choice: In 25 years at the currently increasing pollution of the air envelope around the world, the introduction of all of the particulates and all the other things going into the air, within
25 years most major metropolitan areas in America, if we don't stop it, you will not be able to stay outdoors more than two or three hours without a serious health hazard. You will have to go out -- your kids will go outdoors and play in gasmasks. At that stage do you think the people are going to be prepared to say "you are interfering with our rights" or "we shouldn't spend the money to do something"? I don't think so. And that is one item in the whole environment.

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

MR. HERMAN: We are all going to end up in gray shirts?
REPRESENTATIVE MCCLOSKEY: Well, maybe a littler grayer than sparkling bright.

SENATOR NELSON: You can buy them that color.

MR. HERMAN: That is what I mean. Are we going to end up buying gray shirts to --

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

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

MR. HERMAN: You have got a lot of industrial and big corporation and foundation money in back of the national teach-in, the whole operation. Does this truly indicate, or should we be somewhat skeptical, that big industry, big business is now
genuinely convinced that this is a thing that they are going
to have to change, or are they just trying to sort of paper it
over?

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

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

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

SENATOR NELSON: I think, on that point, there are some very
enlightened leadership, of course. You still have to establish
federal standard on air quality and water quality that makes
everybody comply, because an individual competitor in any
industry is not able to make vast expenditures in this field while all of his competitors fail to do so. You have got to set national standards, and then you must require everybody to comply -- industries, municipalities, and including the federal government.

MR. HERMAN: With federal funds?

SENATOR NELSON: Federal funds.

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

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

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

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

MR. HERMAN: Is that sure enough?

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: Well, I sincerely hope we will be able to do that, because I know of no worse use of government
than to limit the freedom to procreate, and I hope we will
never have to do it. But it is clear that overpopulation is
perhaps is as great a threat to our peace and our solidarity
and national security as is the nuclear weapon. And if we
continue to overpopulation I can see down the line a decade or
two that we would limit people's right to have children.
Hawaii, they have introduced a bill over there in their state
legislature to require a girl to be sterilized at the birth of
her second child. Now, that gives you some idea of how some
people in Hawaii feel about the population explosion on their
islands.

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

SENATOR NELSON: It is 100 percent effective, for all practical
purposes. It has side effects that cause about 40 percent of
the users, according to the Maryland study, to quit using it
within a twelve-month period. The important thing is to develop
a pill that minimizes the side effects, to expand our research
in that field and not limit the concept for the idea that you
would use a pill only for women. We haven't done much research
in the field and it is badly needed. The pill will not solve
-- the current one will not solve the worldwide problem because
it requires a physical examination once every six months in
order to be properly administered, and the medical community
isn't available for that in India, Pakistan, Africa, and in Latin America. And our great neglect is that it has been on the market for ten years without any dose level studies, without much research at all, and that is the move we have to make if we are going to develop an effective pill that can be used worldwide.

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

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE McCLOSKEY: I think one of the most exciting concepts we're dealing with, and this takes some time to work
out, is the concept of the user tax at the source of each product, and the tax would be set by a commission that would look at the competitive products and assign a tax to each product commensurate with the pollution effect and the ultimate probabilities of its cost of disposal. Thus, if an automobile cost $55 to dispose of, we will put a $55 tax every time a new automobile is created, pay it into a central fund and use that money as an incentive to build crunching machines and recycle and reuse the waste. And I think this kind of a product taxed at its source will put an incentive into industry to try to develop the non-pollution type or the non-difficult to dispose of product.

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

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

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

SENATOR NELSON: Well, our proposals -- and I think they should
be adopted -- for national and international monitoring of the source of pollutants, their origin, destiny, their ecological implications, we haven't done that but we must.

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

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

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

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