

tion. It is liquid fuels. The energy problem on which we should concentrate lies elsewhere.

NAACP Rejects Schlesinger, Calls For Nuclear Development

A personal appearance by Energy Department chief James Rodney Schlesinger was not sufficient to prevent the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) from concluding its National Conference on Energy with a policy statement recommending the development of nuclear power Nov. 19. Originating from the conference's Energy Supply Workshop, the resolution urged "the expanded use of nuclear energy, especially in light of the safety record of the nuclear industry to date."

By supporting the resolution, the NAACP conference's 300 delegates disassociated themselves from support for the slave-labor makework jobs programs such as the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, in favor of high-technology productive employment. Schlesinger's bid for organized black community support of his policy of sabotaging energy development was coolly received. When queried on the Administration's hindrance of nuclear power, Schlesinger lied that the U.S. was looking into more advanced technologies calling the breeder reactor "obsolete."

Following a speech by Fusion Energy Foundation spokesman Susan Kokinda detailing the development of fusion power by the 1990s NAACP National Executive Board Chairman Margaret Bush Wilson, in a veiled reference to Humphrey-Hawkins, asked the delegates to consider, "whether we have to have big government or big oil save us," Wilson then called for a government-industry-black community "partnership for progress."

Below are excerpts of Energy Secretary Schlesinger's remarks to the conference.

We are going to go through a severe transition in the United States. It is the purpose of the President and the energy plan to achieve a smooth and fair transition.

This impact of the National Energy Plan on the economy will be this: we face a future in which cheap and abundant petroleum will ultimately be in relatively short supply. In the longer run, we will have substitutes, be it fusion or solar, we do not know. But we have a problem in the short run — 10, 15 or 20 years.

We are going to have to learn to conserve — by conservation, we do not mean belt-tightening, but greater efficiency. In the longer run, energy prices will rise again, and unless we diminish our dependence on imported oil, we will encounter sudden disruption, with rising unemployment, inflation, balance of payments problems so severe that we could not import oil even if it were available.

And those consequences would fall most harshly on the minorities, elderly, and the poor.

So we are beginning to make adjustments now in our economy — becoming less dependent on oil by switching to coal and other sources, and more fuel efficiency. Then

we could ride out those economic difficulties of the 1980s. Otherwise, this crisis of the 1980s could have political consequences that could shake the nation as it has not been shaken since the 1930s....

...The overall effect of such a redistribution of income through rebates and taxes would be fairness and equity.

Aside from equity, the goal was expansion of production and job opportunities. If we do not have an energy plan that permits for an expansion of the economy, unemployment will rise. So we need a very careful balance between economy and energy policies. We must use monetary and fiscal methods to prevent any part of the energy plan from leading to higher unemployment. We must achieve economic expansion and at the same time diminish our reliance on foreign energy supplies, and be equitable.

We have made reasonably good progress on Capital Hill — 75 to 80 percent of what President Carter proposed will ultimately come out.

We deal with conservation not by bringing down production of energy supplies. Conservation is intended to reduce the rate of growth from 4 percent to 2 percent. But it must not be pushed to the point where it interferes with expansion of the economy and jobs. But we have had a high level of waste, not because people are wasteful, but because capital equipment has been inefficient.

Connally And Allies Continue High Profile Fight For Nuclear Power

Former Texas Governor John Connally and his associates are continuing a political offensive in favor of nuclear energy and technological and economic development. Speaking before the Republican Unity Conference in Florida last weekend, Connally attacked the Carter Administration for rejecting nuclear fusion energy development, renewed space exploration, and the B-1 bomber. "The Democrats have said no to the economic growth of the nation. They have said no to America's future," he charged.

An associate of the former Texas governor, Rep. Olin Teague (D-Tex.), is likewise calling President Carter's veto of the Clinch River nuclear breeder reactor project "rash and irresponsible," according to a column by Felix McKnight in the Nov. 16 *Dallas Times Herald*. "Our grandchildren are likely the ones who shall pay most dearly for this presidential mistake," the House Science and Technology Committee Chairman reportedly said. "The President has called the energy crisis the moral equivalent of war, and that may well be. But this veto action reveals that the President doesn't seem to know which forces are the enemies and which ones are the allies."

In tandem with these strong pronuclear statements from his colleagues, Dallas oil and gas contractor and former Deputy Secretary of Defense under Nixon and Ford, William P. Clements recently declared his candidacy for the 1978 GOP Texas gubernatorial primary. Mr. Clements announced that, if he is elected, he will use his position as governor to influence national energy policy. "There are ways a governor can influence these