

BPA plan encouraging

For years now government energy policymakers have joined apologists for the energy industries in mouthing the truism that the cheapest energy is conserved energy. Willingness to formulate effective conservation programs, however, has been lacking. In light of this dismal performance, the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) tentative moves toward federally subsidized insulation for electrically heated houses is highly encouraging.

BPA Administrator Don Hodel advanced the idea of a government-financed insulation program last Thursday before the Congressional Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources. He said that the energy saved by insulating old houses would be cheaper than the energy created by building new nuclear or coal-fueled power plants.

This is exactly the kind of thinking we need from national and regional energy czars. According to BPA cost-benefit analysis, energy conserved through insulation is as much as six times cheaper than energy produced by new power plants. Money spent on conservation pays off immediately, while power plants take 10 to 14 years to complete. Retrofitting houses for energy efficiency is a safe, labor-intensive means of reducing our dependence on risky, capital-intensive power plants that rely on diminishing resources.

Hodel told the Subcommittee that the stiffest resistance to substantial conservation programs could be expected to come from utilities. As revealed by Northwest Natural Gas Company's recent request for a 10 per cent rate hike, attributed in part to falling earnings caused by consumer conservation efforts, profit-oriented enterprises can't stand to operate on a suddenly restricted margin.

So, sad but true, any large scale, government-initiated conservation program will have to somehow accommodate the interests of the utilities. Hodel thinks this can be done by establishing a fund of, say, \$300 million that would in effect be loaned to homeowners for purchase and installation of insulation. The loans would be repaid through charging consumers the same utility rates they paid before they insulated their homes.

Of course, this amounts to a roundabout subsidy of the utilities, with consumers footing the bill. But subsidizing conservation is certainly more appealing than subsidizing new thermal power plants, which is the utilities' vision for the Northwest's energy future. The choice is to pay a lot or to pay a little.

Hodel's idea is basically sound, given the current state of relations between utilities and consumers. Somewhere along the line, the extent to which the energy industry acts in the public interest needs to be examined. But we need positive, large-scale conservation programs now, and if they must serve utilities as well as consumers, so be it.

Hodel's idea is the most constructive conservation plan yet advanced by anyone in a position to make important energy decisions. President Carter and the U.S. Congress should implement Hodel's idea right away and, if possible, expand it to encourage conservation of all forms of energy wherever it is wasted.

Letters

Empty rhetoric

Having heard the empty rhetoric of the Revolutionary Student Brigade for over a year now, I can honestly say that I've yet to hear a workable solution voiced by these so-called revolutionaries. Of course, our economic and social systems have their flaws, flaws that may well be impossible to eradicate, but I fail to see realistic solutions being offered by the RSB.

As it stands now, the RSB reminds me of my former high school principal. He was the type of person, who if a skyscraper had a broken window, would advocate tearing the whole building down to correct the fault. Such is the thinking of the RSB.

While I disagree with the Carter administration's efforts and plans for revitalizing the economy, I applaud the fact that they are trying to solve our problems, while at the same time, working within our present system. All I see Jonathon Draper and his merry band (does Mr. Draper see himself as a modern Robin Hood?) doing is carry-

ing inane signs ("It's right to fight!") and selling their used books. Hardly a start in solving this country's ills (except, perhaps to line RSB pockets). Better Draper and company should talk to those people working in mills and factories who see their hard earned wages being used to support malcontents in liberal universities. I rather doubt that these workers (whom Draper allies himself with) would applaud the RSB's rather futile efforts.

So, I am challenging the RSB to discontinue their silly ideological dreams and deal with reality. If they have the "right" way to run our society, let them express them in concise, simple statements (so that those of us who have been exploited, brainwashed, etc. by the power elite, can understand the truth) instead of hiding behind their signs.

In a society plagued with empty rhetoric, the RSB sounds more-than-vaguely like the very politicians that they profess to be against.

Dave Surdam
Sophomore — Mathematics



"DON'T YOU HAVE ANY DISSIDENTS OF YOUR OWN TO LOOK AFTER?"

Double standard

Either the standards are less solid than they appear, or I'm missing something. It is reported in the Beef Box (Monday, Feb. 28) that the Emerald Calendar of Events doesn't list movies playing at local theaters because they are "professional business ventures." To mention them, we are told, would constitute "free advertising." Why, then, does the calendar frequently mention movies showing at the Mayflower and Cinema 7? And surely someone is making money on the \$4.50 and \$5.50 Mac Court concert tickets even when the Cultural Forum is the sponsor. Local taverns featuring live music enjoy "free advertising" in the Calendar. Are we to understand that these are not "professional business ventures?"

The argument that space in the calendar means forfeiting advertising revenues sounds reasonable. But why is it applied to some businesses and not to others? If the Calendar of Events is meant to be a service for students, why does its coverage stop short of a major form of student entertainment like the movies?

Richard K. Mueller
Senior-History and English

A point well taken. Actually, however, the Emerald does have a solid standard for its calendar listings which was inadvertently omitted in the Beef Box. Our entertainment editor says the Emerald includes in its calendar only listings which are sent to our offices. Any local theater which wishes to send in listings by our calendar deadline (2 p.m. Tuesdays), may do so. Very few do, however. At any rate, the Emerald does not solicit the listings and regrets the Beef Box omission. — ed.

Pay as you go

In her letter (Feb. 22) Ms. Spiller, SEARCH Director, accuses me of conveying "misleading and erroneous information" regarding SEARCH. According to the 1975/76 EMU/ASUO budget, SEARCH spent 32 per cent of its funds on "salaries and wages" (Director \$1,140; Assistant Director - \$486; Administrative Assistant - \$486) and 68 per cent on "administrative expenses." While a total of \$4,215 for "printing and duplication" is listed under administrative expenses it is not at all clear that this was spent "directly on classes" as Ms. Spiller claims. If it was, why was it not listed under a "programs" heading? It's odd that Ms. Spiller considers the reporting of what is in her organization's own budget to be misleading and unethical.

What may have angered Ms.

Spiller most was my comment that SEARCH courses are taken by only "a few" students. I should have said "a very few." During fall term 498 students enrolled in SEARCH courses, only 2.9 per cent of the student body. This term the figures are 796 students, or 4.9 per cent. On a yearly basis, given SEARCH's 1975/76 budget, this works out to a cost of \$4.05 per person taking a SEARCH course. If SEARCH is as beneficial to those taking its courses as Ms. Spiller thinks, they should be willing to pay this small fee rather than taxing all students. Of course, if students had to pay the full costs, they might be less willing to support Ms. Spiller's \$1,140 salary.

While SEARCH is probably one of the best programs funded by ASUO it, like all others, should pay its own way on funds it can get from those it benefits. Such a system makes for more efficient, cheaper organizations that are more responsive to the real needs and wishes of all students.

Terence Hines
Graduate Student —
Psychology

No need to justify

Ron Bamberger's letter of Feb. 28, 1977 is perhaps the culmination of silly — and I must assume racist recommendations on what should be done with a program he obviously knows little about. Typically, of course, we are always concerned about how "they" use "our" tax money. Ron says he likes them when they are "grateful for an opportunity — an opportunity they should never have been robbed of in the first place. The HEP students are not beggars at your precious gates, but men and women better understood as casualties of an indifferent society which forces minorities to beg for access to a system which could not exist without their labor.

Are you grateful, Ron, for the lower cost of fruits, vegetables and nuts because of the slave wages we pay migrant labor?

I truly resented the assumption that you can evaluate "right reasons" for a person to be in the HEP program. And while you may see HEP students in the dorm, they see you there also as students.

Many students come to college for selfish and personal reasons. Many stay for the same reason. Why can't HEP students have selfish and/or personal reasons for staying in HEP?

It tells me a lot about Ron Bamberger if he thinks anybody, even HEP students, would stay any-

where based on the buying power of \$10 a week. Especially to purchase such expensive luxuries as "pot, cigarettes and booze."

Taking advantage of opportunity for personally assessed goals is considered by some as a sign of basic intelligence. Sheer arrogance (racial or intellectual) would want HEP students to "learn how to harmoniously co-exist with college students" as if students are all some wonderfully homogenous band of good fellows. The fact of the matter is that as long as students do not have to justify why they are here or how they spend their money, which includes seven million public financial aid dollars, the HEP students are free from having to justify their life and experiences to Ron.

Lewis Merrick
Coordinator, Special Programs
for Students
Oregon State System
of Higher Education

Varied coverage

I was quite concerned with a recent letter to the Emerald complaining of coverage of "minorities" in lieu of a more expanded coverage of local and national sports events.

First of all I would like to voice my support for the Emerald's recent series of articles, particularly those concerning the black athletes on campus, a gay father, and a blind student at the University.

The articles were well done and indicated some excellent interviewing and writing skills on the part of your staff.

Secondly, I would like to bring to the attention of the critic that of these "minority oriented" articles, most took up the same or less amount of space as your daily coverage of sports. The one exception was the article on black athletes — but I imagine our sports fan is more interested in their performance than in what kind of people they are.

Thirdly, I wonder if the critic is aware of the fact minorities do make up a large share of the student population and that a newspaper should not base its coverage on a "majority rules" basis, but that it should attempt to fit all the needs of its community. We are here — gay men, lesbians, blacks, chicanos and orientals, to name a few. We're willing to let you have your daily sports page (it's true, some of us are not interested in sports!). We expect you to let us have our share too.

Pat Vallerand
First Year Law

Tuesday, March 1, 1977