the report was critical of the atomic energy program, including its economic aspects. For instance, let me read you the first statement in the report:

"Contrary to widespread belief, nuclear power is no longer a cheap energy source. In fact, when the still unknown costs of radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management, decommissioning and perpetual care are finally included in the rate base, nuclear power may prove to be much more expensive than conventional energy sources such as coal, and may well not be economically competitive with safe, renewable resource energy alternatives such as solar power.---As the cost of nuclear energy continues to climb, and as a solution to the problems of radioactive waste management continues to elude government and industry, states such as California are rejecting the increased use of nuclear power and favoring the greater use of renewable energy technologies."

Our County Legislators, and all thinking citizens of the County should have access to this report. Probably Mr. McEwen could get it for them. The EMC has two copies.

- Q. But if a powerful and important committee of the House of Representatives arrives at such conclusions, isn't that the beginning of the end for nuclear power?
- A. Ha! A powerful and important committee it may be, but so far those forces committed to the expansion of nuclear power have proved more powerful and more important and wield greater influence in Washington. Money talks.
- Q. Then aren't you saying again that, economically, the country will be better off to continue the atomic program?
- A. Hell, no! One of the hidden costs that we'll all pay for, subtly, is decommissioning. Just to dismantle a nuclear plant may cost over one hundred million dollars. Who do you think will pay for that? And what is happening at West Valley, in our own New York State, where a privately-owned nuclear fuel processing plant has been abandoned? The State or Federal government is left to solve a problem that the U. S. General Accounting Office says "should be paid for by private industry." But it looks as though you and I will pay for it in the end unless we come up with our own "Proposition #13.".
- Q. So if the United States General Accounting Office says that, why doesn't that settle it?

- A. Because there are forces a lot more powerful than the U.S. G.A.O., that's why.
- Q. Isn't labor, in general, pro-nuclear?
- A. I'm not sure. I have heard it both ways. If labor is pro-nuclear I think they are making a big mistake, and are being very short-sighted. The House report I quoted says that solar energy is safer and more labor-intensive; that it would create many more jobs in the



You said,

I like a well-lined face, a detailed story told by crease and crevice.

I thought,

Yes And no. The wrinkles mirror and mask.

Old friends can etch the past And bind us there.

I like you friend

for seeing my wrinkles and looking into my eyes.

--Ellen Rocco