

PANEL DISCUSSION

Mr. Overton: Doyle's comments leave me to conclude that the hour is at hand for all of us in government and industry and in private life to begin anew developing a much needed national minerals policy and to consider within the framework of that policy how the total quality of our environment can be safeguarded without jeopardizing the vital minerals industry. Efforts to develop a national minerals policy date back to the Paley Commission in 1952 and to 1954 when President Eisenhower established the Cabinet on Minerals Policy. Legislation seeking to develop a national minerals policy has been introduced in the 91st Congress by Senator Gordon Allott of Colorado. We in the Mining Industry hope for early hearings on Senator Allott's bill. Action in this respect, in our judgement is long overdue. It is in dealing with a national minerals policy that we can best achieve a balanced approach to that environment in which the mining industry can find the scientific, technological and economical incentive to continue to make the impressive contributions it has in the past to our growing economic strength and to the greater well-being of all our people.

Mr. O'Leary: The coal mine inspection force for the Bureau of Mines consists of 200 some people with a median 10th grade education. These people are advising people who in many instances do not have mining engineering backgrounds and can not afford to hire consultants. Our people are advising them not only on the safety aspects of their mining operations. It could be that you could draw a line between safety and the other aspects of an underground operation and the regular courses of production as well. It is obvious that the source of raw material we have to work with in the Bureau now and prospectively, in the future, are out of tune with the demands that are placed on the Bureau. I think that brings up another point if I may add to them. I don't know if this is one you were going to get to. The newspapers, as witness the response to the mining disasters, are interested in the social implications of things. It seems to me that a good deal of the talk here today was with regard to how do we get the message across and we ought to spend a little bit of time on what the message is that you want to get across. I think there are two aspects of this that I can tell you from my own personal experience.

First, in the development of mining and extraction process metallurgical programs for the Bureau of Mines, we have not done the sort of work responsive to the changing public interest and environmental quality. We don't know how to prevent mine fires affectively, we don't know the physical parameters of caving, of subsidence in a tunnel area. We don't know the sort of support that can permanently prevent subsidence or leave a place stable. We don't know how to develop metallurgical processes that are first, economic by cause. As I have said many times, the first responsibility is to pay the freight, and secondly meet requirements of the American people. They want big, fast, high horse-power cars and we are quite willing to pay for them. They also want clean air and thus far we have said no we're not going to give you that,

although I think they are willing to pay for it. We haven't as a bureau, in our work in mining and extractive metallurgy, given the attention in our research programs to directing it to meet this new dimension of interest and demand of the American people. So that is one of the things we are going to have to get around to.

The second thing is that this industry has been so fantastically successful that it has disappeared. The only time that this industry comes to public attention is when people are killed or the landscape blighted. You have simply disappeared, you're not in the same posture as Bell Telephone. You have become, in effect, the industry that isn't there -- except when you cause trouble. Now I mentioned during the break that there are some people in this country who say, and I think the Santa Barbara population are in this category, "Import." "Don't produce it around here. Don't make a mess." And you are simply going to have to convince them with the sort of statements that assistant secretary Doyle and I made this week and others from the Interior Department will make in the future. You are going to have to convince them that if we take that course our whole standard of living is under attack. We have been able to have an affluent society for one reason and one reason only, because less and less of our over-all effort was directed toward raw material supply. A hundred years ago all our effort was devoted to providing enough food for those who produced the food and for the small element of the population who didn't and providing the metallic materials that were ultimately needed by this society. Now we have gotten around to where, as I say, the point of the pyramid has become the base of it. And if we destroy that base, the mineral industry, the whole situation will crumble. That is the social side of this story that has to be gotten across.

You can't do it by saying, "Look how well we've done." We are just now curing the sulfur problem at a little over 100% increase in price, \$18 to \$42. And that means people don't get to use more sulfur, more energy, and more capital, but that more man power goes into the production of sulfur. We're just curing our copper problem at another 4 to 5% increase in price and that means again that our material effort goes into the production of copper and not into the consumption of copper as a nation. We are now getting the first indications that the long-term trend toward declining metallic costs is ending and is starting up. And that is the treat to society that we have here.

QUESTION: I don't think Mr. McDonald has had a chance to talk. I sense a potential conflict in your discussion. I was very much taken, at the beginning of your talk, with the point about the tremendous capacity of the environment to absorb waste and to regenerate itself. How many different variables are there in the environment and how must we use them? Waste disposal is a legitimate use of the environment but to accept this use requires a very complex understanding. Then along toward the end I sensed a reluctance to agree to what seems to me to be the necessary controls and regulations to exact that very policy. If we are going to use the environment that way, I don't see how we can avoid extensive and fairly detailed regulations from the public sector. Nor do I think they can be local. They involve a number of

municipalities, often a number of states, and if we are not to get into a competitive bargaining back and forth it seems to me the logical place is federal.

Mr. McDonald: Well put. My reluctance which you have perceived correctly stems primarily from a recognition that we really know so terribly little about the things we need to know. Many of us haven't had engineering or scientific training and are reluctant to make statements on scientific data. There is a really obvious problem that is hard to express logically. I am sort of familiar with the Hudson River having worked and lived in that area a number of years. The major problem of the Hudson River is the fact that many of the small communities along the river have for many years dumped raw sewage into the Hudson River. And yet the emphasis in the public press and so on is saying that this is all manufacturing's fault. The fact remains that the amount of money that is required to solve the problem of raw sewage is rather monumental. I don't think anyone is prepared to say where that money is going to come from. So I guess you might say we're in a chicken and the egg situation. The more we investigate this thing the more we become impressed with the actions of the public and private sector in contributing to our basic dilemma. Secondly, the point that I tried to emphasize is that somehow we have to find a way of qualifying what it is going to cost us. And the last point that we wanted to make was of course that for heavens sake we have got to have some time. Now, what with the many things we need to do, time is pertinent.

A relative newcomer to the mining industry, I must admit I am appalled at what I regard as a very minimal understanding of public relations. For evidence, I sight the fact that prior to this major copper strike that went on, there was an attempt made to do a public relations job which was, by any reasonable measure, a failure. It was a failure as measured by the fact that the strike went on for 8 1/2 months, but more important than that, we didn't really believe that we made any measurable impact on the attitude of the people in the communities where the strikes were taking place.

So back to my point on more time. As Director O'Leary pointed out, before we start communicating, we need to give some thought to what we have to communicate. It is my observation that it's taking us a long time to do this. First we have to use a 2x4 to whack the public over the head to get his attention. I think we are getting his attention and very slowly people, who after thirty years of work have never spent five minutes seriously considering public relations, are going to have to do a lot of homework. Now that is not a very direct answer to your question but the question you asked was a very hard one to answer.

Editors Note:

At this point in the conference difficulties were encountered with the recording system and a portion of the panel discussion was not recorded.

Panel Discussion concluded:

Dr. Scott: At this time I'd like to introduce Mr. Thomas Ware, Business Consultant, Skokie, Illinois, who will summarize the conference and give his opinion on the position of the Mineral Industry today.