No choice for voters
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To the Editor:
In the Friday, Oct. 29 issue of The Tech there appeared an article entitled "the Committee to Protect Jobs and the Use of Convenience Containers." Since the preceding article, written by their opponents, used only facts, I felt that it was highly unfair that the "Committee" was not so hindered.

The article is composed of distorted facts, half-truths, and a few outright lies. As a resident of California, I have personally witnessed the many beneficial effects that a similar bill has brought about.

Among these, in my county, is an 87% reduction in litter over the space of three years (that is how long it took to clean up the pre-bottle-bill era).

Starting with distortions, the article at one point states that the beverage industry provides one item in ten thousand in non-returnable packaging; actually, they provide one item of ten thousand, and they provide two billion of these a year. In fact, later in the article they state that the elimination of cans would place the "continued existence of several operating solid waste

Campaign '76: no shine

Environmental Secretary Evelyn Blasser's "Convenience Committee" was not so hindered.

This election will be well worth watching, especially if it is so close that CBS News, with its computers and "sampling pro-

"Committee" this is thought by the state, but this was at a cost to Vermonters of $5 million. The lie is that, quoting a study conducted by the US Environmental Protection Agency, the actual decrease in litter was 87%, i.e., 2/3. The distortion is that the $5 million came from unclaimed deposits, that is, cans that people had bought but had not returned, cans that were littered with thrown away, or buried in the bullet back yard. At 5¢ per can, this was one hundred million cans that had to be picked up by government litter campaign.

An extremely blatant and obvious lie is "in Oregon, the litter problem did not decrease appreciably after the passage of bottle bill." Quoting from the Thursday, Oct. 21, 1976 issue of The Head Rock News, "Oregon's Stop Litter and Vans
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As a resident of Oregon, I have personally witnessed the many beneficial effects that a similar bill has brought about.

Among these, in my county, is an 87% reduction in litter over the space of three years (that is how long it took to clean up the pre-bottle-bill era).

Starting with distortions, the article at one point states that the beverage industry provides one item in ten thousand in non-returnable packaging; actually, they provide one item of ten thousand, and they provide two billion of these a year. In fact, later in the article they state that the elimination of cans would place the "continued existence of several operating solid waste

political parties are indeed based on the same "liberal" (in the European sense, not the American) beliefs. Even conserva-

tions in America think of themselves as liberals across the ocean.

litter from roadsides.... Last year they gathered 14 dump truck loads of litter from roadsides. . . . Last year they gathered only two dump truck loads of litter." State-wide, over a period of two years, litter decreased 75%. In contrast to the "Committee," this bill has reached many residents of Oregon to be an appreciable amount.

But the worst of all their half-truths, their most effective scare tactic is, to me, the claim that there will be loss of 1400 jobs.

This is very true, but there will be 100 to 100 new ones. Quoting last Thursday's issue of the Boston Globe, Massachusetts Environmental Secretary Evelyn Murphy said that "she has repeatedly asked to see data detailing the claims that jobs will be lost if Question 6 passes. She said as far as she can determine no analysis has been conducted by the opponents of Question 6. Later in the same article, commenting on both jobs and price effects:

"In fact there have been two studies conducted, which calcu-
late that jobs will increase with a returnable bottle and can system. In addition, the studies show there will be significant consumer savings under the bottle bill.... The Federal Reserve Study, released here last March, details the benefits of the bottle bill, including more jobs — not fewer jobs. The Federal Reserve figures also showed that consumer prices declined in Oregon and Vermont after these states eliminated throwaways.

Why then does Labor oppose the bill? Murphy thinks it is in support of protesting steel workers, who oppose the bill nationally. She feels that they are not being given a level playing field and that they are "a bit smug and sanctimony and scorn tactics" while not actually having strong opposi-
tion themselves to Question 6. It is my opinion, however, that un-
ion leaders suffer 1,400 strik-
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Senior Portraits for Technique 1977 will be taken through Friday, November 5th 9 to 12 and 1 to 5

For appointment, call X3-2980 or drop by W20-451

$3.00 sitting fee » free with purchase of yearbook
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opinion cont.

Anti-bottle bill statement distorted

William Lasser responds:

Whenever one talks of "basic philosophy of government" in the American context, one is talking, of course, in terms of degree, as is

correctly pointed out. For throughout our history we have been tied together by the political philosophy of Locke and Jef-

ferson by what Louis Hartz calls the American "liberal tradition." Both political parties are indeed based on the same "liberal" (in the European sense, not the American) beliefs. Even conserva-

tions in America think of themselves as liberals across the ocean.

Nevertheless, it is clear in my opinion that Carrie is left of center, while Ford is at the right of American thought. Your com-

ments are unfortunately typical; perhaps there is now a need to ex-

pand our philosophical horizons to one side or the other. But atti-

dudes such as those in this letter simply were not prevalent in the American past — no socialist or other extreme movement has ever succeeded in the United States. I regret the misunderstanding in the meaning of "basic philo-

sophy." — W.L.

(Note: William Lasser's piece was a column which expressed the author's personal views, rather than an editorial which covers the views of The Tech's Board.)
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