

quired. It must be done with a cost-plus-incentive-fee contract so that efficiency is paramount.

It also must be done by an education clause by which, at the end of the time allotted, the people of the host country are ready to assume the service that had been contracted for.

Finally, we must look for imaginative ways to finance such contracts. International institutions are more than willing to assist in these kinds of projects, according to my information. There will be internal funds provided through resource development and through the commitment of futures in resources by the host country.

And finally, if it is absolutely necessary, where U.S. aid

is required, then we are looking at a system by which that aid goes primarily into U.S. institutions and U.S. business. There is a great opportunity here, Mr. President, to traverse a very great time of peril, to help people who want help and who believe that only we can help. They saw us go to the Moon and they are asking legitimately, if we can do that, why cannot we, of the developing world, participate in the 20th century?

Time and time again, as I have traveled through these countries, as an astronaut, as a representative of this country, I have heard the expression, "Don't send us money; it only goes into the pockets of our leaders. Send us knowledge. That goes into our minds."

House Majority Leader Urges Vigorous Expansion Of Energy Production

The following is excerpted from the text of remarks by Congressman Jim Wright, Democrat from Texas, and the Majority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, to a conference sponsored by the National Environmental Development Association in Washington, D.C. March 16.

The three subjects of your conference — energy, the economy and the environment — collectively account for about 95 percent of our congressional concerns....

Those who focus upon only one of the problems, as though it alone mattered, are foolish....

And those who believe we cannot make simultaneous progress toward all three of the goals — a healthy economy, energy sufficiency and a sound environment — are defeatists.

The nation has, unfortunately, some of both....

...if the philosophy of the "trade-off" becomes a substitute for real action or an excuse for not undertaking essential tasks, leading us to settle for half-way solutions, it is self-defeating and contrary to the spirit that built this nation.

It is not necessary, unless all wisdom has departed us, to conclude that a sound ecology can come only at the expense of a stagnant economy, or that conservation is incompatible with commerce.

Let us put the three problems in the perspective of their relative urgency:

The Economy

The economic problem is both severe and immediate. The nation cannot afford to institutionalize an unemployment rate of seven-and-a-half to eight percent!

We are entering our third year of intolerable unemployment. We have suffered a higher level of joblessness, over a longer period, than at any time since before World War II.

More than 20 percent of our productive capacity lies idle. Nearly 20 percent of our building tradesmen are out of work. Unemployment among young Americans exceeds 20 percent and reaches 36 percent among young black Americans.

There is no such thing as standing still. The problem is soluble only in a *growing* economy. It takes about *two million new and additional jobs* each year to absorb those newly coming onto the job market....

An economic growth rate of about five percent a year is absolutely essential, given the simple facts of life. The goal of zero population growth is one we should, by all means, be pursuing. But a goal of "zero economic growth" as espoused by some, would be utter, irredeemable folly. It could be seriously advanced only by someone deficient in the study of economics or insensitive to human suffering.

I have mentioned the economic problem first because it is the one which can yield most quickly to national action.

There is, after all, much work needing to be done — work from which all of us can benefit — to which the energies of the unemployed can be intelligently applied.

Happily much of that work lies in the fields of energy and environmental improvement. Putting jobless construction tradesmen and unemployed youth to work building wastewater treatment plants....harnessing our unruly rivers....planting winter cover crops in the dust bowl....building parks and playgrounds in urban areas....improving conservation practices in our national forests....working on public transportation projects....perhaps driving mini-buses to provide effective car-pooling for industrial workers....and insulating buildings of all sorts throughout the country....is illustrative of the ways in which all three primary goals can be intelligently pursued by simultaneous action.

Energy

...The simple fact is that we are running out of oil and gas. In one more generation — absent dramatic discoveries which nobody anticipates — the gas tank of our known petroleum reserves will be on “empty.”

The severest test of the statesmanship of this Congress will be our willingness to take some hard steps, and some costly steps, to curb wasteful consumption of these dwindling supplies while bringing on the development of alternate supplies, in actual production of sufficient quantities, *before* we run out of oil and gas.

Perhaps not all things we shall be required to do will be immediately popular.

We need to deregulate well-head prices for natural gas — not suddenly but over a four- or five-year period — as a means to encourage exploration.

And we need an oil pricing policy which will permit recovery of the hard-to-get oil....

But we need also to see that *all* we can do in conservation and in maximized discovery and recovery of oil and gas is only a stop-gap. It simply buys us time.

What I am saying, most basically, is that conservation alone will not be enough....

...Merely to reduce energy *consumption* and to do nothing about increasing *supply* will condemn us ultimately to a declining standard of living. That is an inescapable fact of life.

The Environment

The environment, in the long run, could be the most important of the three. It is what makes life possible on this planet.... We don't know enough about it. We don't know what causes a winter such as the one we just had. We don't know what causes droughts. We don't know what will happen if the ozone layer above us is reduced by one or two or five percent....

There is so much we don't know. And these are serious matters. We cannot ignore them, even if we find they restrict our activities in various ways.

This aspect of the environmental movement of recent years — the growing awareness that man's activities can have unforeseen consequences on man himself — deserves the active support of all of us.

On the other hand, like nearly all popular causes, the environmental movement has taken on some of the aspects of a fad. And a great deal of mischief has been done in the process.

Sometimes environmental clean-up itself has fallen victim to frivolous esoterica spawned by the movement. The clean water program is the most grotesque example....The program has simply choked on its own red tape!

One of the big environmental causes of recent years has been to stop development of nuclear technology. At one site after another opponents — in the name of the environment — have managed to postpone or drag out construction to the point that these projects are years behind schedule.

Perhaps these critics have overlooked one vital facet of the problem. Recent scientific studies indicate that the accumulation of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere,

brought about mainly through the burning of fossil fuels, poses a far more serious environmental risk to the earth that we face in the operation of nuclear power plants.

Scientists tell us that with continued reliance on fossil fuels we are only a few decades away from a warming of global mean temperatures greater than has been experienced in 1000,000 years.

I don't mean to frighten you. There is every reason to believe that adjustments can be made. But one of the earliest possible adjustments would be increasing reliance on nuclear energy. Farther down the road we may be able to rely on other non-polluting energy sources, such as solar power, which also contribute no carbon dioxide to the atmosphere.

Both our nation's economy and our efforts toward energy development have suffered as a result of our failure to make the distinction. We have indulged ourselves in the luxury of protecting species, like the snail darter, having little or no interest or significance to mankind, while ignoring the economic and environmental need for the projects they have stopped.

We have been on a binge of emotion and in a drought of common sense.

The Correlation

By all means, let us continue to study our environment; to protect it and improve it....

And let us remind ourselves that the central purpose of environmental protection is the protection and advancement of the *human* species — so that *it* does not enter the list of endangered species.

The aspirations of the poor, the unemployed and the new workers coming onto the market all are dependent on the continued growth of our economy. So also is our ability to assist the underdeveloped nations of the world. So indeed is our very ability to finance the environmental clean-up.

The people who describe continued economic growth as an undesirable “treadmill” have failed to account for population growth. They have failed to account for automation. They fail to provide any opportunity for the less advantaged strata of society to advance.

Whether they like the label or not, they are elitists.

For the sake of the human race, as well as for achievement of a healthy physical environment, recovery from recession must be our first order of business.

Energy is, of course, a vital part of that equation. The availability of energy and the price we must pay for it have a lot to do with our capacity to solve our environmental problems, to expand our economy and to assist other nations with their problems.

This winter we had our second scare in a little over three years. This time it was natural gas. Three years ago it was oil. Let's hope that this latest fright is not followed by the same kind of apathetic return to “normalcy” that followed the Arab boycott of 1973.

Some believed at that time that our energy crisis was a “one-time, short-term problem”....

Too bad it was *not* that simple! We could have handled that with relative ease.

Cheap energy has been taken for granted in this

country for at least three decades. We have had cheap gasoline, even cheaper natural gas, and cheap electric power.

When we were told that this abundant energy might start to run out sometime, we blithely assumed that scientists and engineers, who put us on the moon in 10 years, were working just as effectively on our energy needs of the future.

It happens that they were not — at least not with the intensity of effort that would save us from hardship or catastrophe.

Next month President Carter is going to address the Congress on the subject of energy. He promises to put forth the outlines of a comprehensive national energy policy, which we have lacked all these years.

I don't know what it will contain, but I think I know some things that ought to be in it.

In addition to those things we've already discussed, the proposal to put utility companies into the business of insulating their customers' homes deserves serious attention.

Anyone looking at the infrared satellite pictures showing heat loss from our cities knows how much energy is being lost in this way.

But there is another form of energy loss that seems to be getting very little attention these days. That is the heat lost from cooling towers and heat disposal systems at thermal and nuclear power plants across the country.

When we permit regulations that require hydroelectric plants to install costly devices to cool water to temperatures below those which run naturally in the stream — and waste precious quantities of water in the evaporative process — we engage in folly.

When we price natural gas far below its equivalent in oil or coal, we are encouraging the profligate use of our cleanest and best fuel when other fuels would suffice...and discourage the exploration necessary to find additional supplies.

When we provide an unwitting disincentive to finding and producing domestic oil and gas through shortsighted tax policies which discriminate against the independent exploration companies, we are putting ourselves more and more at the mercy of foreign producers.

When we impede our off-shore oil exploration with one stumbling block after another, we make it harder to bridge the gap between today's energy system and the mid-term and long-term systems we hope technology will provide us.

In the long run, of course, we must free ourselves from dependence on fossil fuel. The carbon dioxide problem in

the atmosphere should impose a deadline on us, even if our dwindling supplies did not.

Early on in human history, God commanded man to subdue the earth. Implicit was the instruction to protect it — to use it well, but not to use it up.

In Wyoming, there exist great reserves of high quality coal — coal with a low content of sulfur. The people want to market this product. But they do not want to send it by slurry pipeline *unless* a reverse pipeline can replace the precious quantities of their scarce *water* which will be required in its transport. I don't blame them. In the West, water is more valuable than oil or gold or uranium or any resource of the earth.

How ironic that at this moment a movement is afoot to stop the development of necessary water supplies in the West!

A little over a century ago our principal fuel was wood. Then came coal. In the 1920s oil gradually began replacing coal. Natural gas became the dominant fuel for residential heating after World War II. Today coal, our most abundant resource, accounts for less than 20 percent of all our energy consumption.

We can't go back to wood, but we can go back to coal. In the short time we have little choice. Oil and gas reserves both peaked in 1970 and are now dropping dramatically. Coal remains the one resource we have available now to meet our urgent needs until cleaner technology comes along. We must use it.

At the same time, we must put our nation's best brains to work on the development of technology to meet our needs when these resources either expire or have to be abandoned for environmental reasons.

One thinks of the Manhattan Project in World War II and the Space Program. I don't suppose you can force invention any more than you can push a string. But I believe there are ways to speed up the exploration of ideas already awaiting experimentation.

Controlled "fusion," utilizing hydrogen, may exceed our practical grasp at present, but a break through here is clearly conceivable. The Soviets and British are far ahead of us, and we must catch up. Not even the invention of the wheel could compare with success in developing this totally clean and abundant energy source.

Think of the scientists and engineers who went on the unemployment rolls when the Space Program cut back. Think of the new college graduates who can't find jobs. We have the manpower, I believe, to attack and solve our long-range energy and environmental problems. But somehow we haven't had the will to put it to work.

Now is the time to do that. We have no time to lose....