
QUESTION: How much time do you think the country has left to make the adjustment? (suggest you say something like... adjust its energy demands)

Tsongas Not long. I don't know how many of you invested in gold four years ago, but those of you who did will agree that the time is very short. There is no rational reason for gold to be at such record levels. These escalating prices are a result of a lack of confidence in the United States and in our economy. Recently, Iran and Liberia raised their oil prices, a step they have taken before and will no doubt take again.

The United States is like an addict who complains about the price charged by the junkie for his addiction. You can only pump out so much of our economy into OPEC before our economy begins to fall apart. I tell you, it is happening right now. The moves of Paul Volker are nothing more than a response to that reality. We must adjust to that reality now!. It is not something that we can wait 10 years to do. The marketplace is very cruel. If we don't adjust to the reality that's out there, the world is going to make us adjust.

Remember when Kissinger talked about invading Saudia Arabia? His justification was we could take such steps to secure our oil supplies. That rationale is comparable to someone saying that they are going to invade the United States to secure their wheat supplies. It is the wrong attitude. Today's world is different and we have to admit it. The major problem is the energy issue and our inability to get a handle on it. We are going to pour out \$88 billion for synthetic fuels programs. There will be a great to-do about the program and a lot of media attention paid to it. But, no one is going to tell the public that we will not

do we have to change our energy habits? Not much.

Question: To push that a step further, I know you've been critical of the President in terms of his energy package and you've worked on the Joint Energy Committee. Give us some more specifics of what we ought to be working on in the energy area during the next few years.

Tsongas: The average homeowner can cut his or her fuel oil consumption by between 30-75% depending on the type of home and other factors. It is absurd for any new home to be built in this country without passive solar design techniques. Right now, while we're talking, there are people all over this country building new homes-- some of them are all electric like this school we're in today. That awareness of where we need to head in the future when it comes to the type of homes we need to build and the type of energy we should use to run them, just isn't very widespread.

Solar and other renewable resources are the future and there should be ^A massive campaign to change building codes to prohibit the construction of new homes that don't achieve certain standards of conservation and the use of the sun. In the debate we had ^{IN} on the Senate ^{about SYN FuELS} floor, Senator Randolph talked about the Germans using synthetic fuel during World War II. That was the age-old process. My response was yes, they used the sun before Christ was born. ^{Now} We are too 'sophisticated' for that and the only way my solar bank and conservation bank are going to pass is because of the Harvard Business School Study. It apparently took a Harvard report to legitimize what many of us have been saying for years about conservation and renewables.

Think of all the rivers in this country--flowing out to sea with all that energy never tapped. Think of all the trash we generate in this country; we've got to find a place to put it. What is maddening about the energy crisis is that the technology needed to respond to it is known. What is lacking is leadership. When you come right down to it, we are a Presidential system.

Question: Do you anticipate federal legislation for employee rights such as constitutional rights like freedom of speech?

Tsongas: No, I don't think so. It was once said that Houdini used to draw a crowd and charge money to tie himself up in knots and get himself out. Congress is pretty much like that except we don't charge money, directly, that is. Next year is going to be a Presidential year. The only things that will pass Congress are those bills that deal with issues that are essential for keeping the government operating. This kind of long-range issue will not pass out of Congress next year. I think most of the emphasis next year will be on energy and a serious attempt to deal with the problem of productivity and capital formation. In terms of workers' rights, that is not in the legislative cards for next year.

Question: What do you see in the long range in this respect?

Tsongas: It depends on who is President. John Connolly isn't exactly going to lead the fight for workers' rights in this nation. I think you really have to depend on who is President. If you own land in Nantucket or if you fish in Georges Bank, you have one view of the Presidential campaign--others would have a different view. We are a Presidential system and I suspect the next eight years will be determined by what will happen in November.

Question: You talked about part of our problem as a "me first" mentality among the citizens and I think this is led by a "me first" mentality among Congressmen and Senators who don't follow their parties and won't compromise. They are affected by special interest groups and that kind of thing. I wondered what you think of this?

Tsongas: I couldn't agree with you more.

Question: Do you think there's going to be any change?

songas: Will there be any change? Winston Churchill said you get the government you deserve. He was right. Fewer people vote. Fewer people participate. Fewer people contribute. You leave it open to single issue politics. You leave it open to Political Action Committees to finance elections. What do you expect is going to happen? You have an issue, for example, the energy crisis, where you wonder why the oil lobby has such an impact. If they are the only people on the playing field of course they're going to have impact. The old expression about the liberty tree having to be watered by blood of patriots every 20 years--there's a lot to that. Churchill also said that government was like a sausage: you are a lot better off not knowing what goes into it. There's a lot of truth to that as well. But, you have to get in there, participate, and fight, because if you don't, they will. I would rather participate than stand outside and criticize, and I commend people your age who participate in these things. For example, the interns who come to work in my office as opposed to ^{PEOPLE} ~~those~~ who simply curse the system and don't partake. When the tide falls and rises, we all go with it. Let's say we make a mistake on the SALT Treaty and we engage in the worst case scenario and we and the Soviets are armed to the teeth and some crazy individual eventually does the wrong thing. We have to respond and they have to respond. We obliterate ourselves. It's too late

when those ICBMs are on their way over to complain about some politician. You should have replaced him.

QUESTION: You have mentioned overkill with regard to federal control in no particular context. You've also mentioned that it's very difficult for we Americans to impose self-control. I was wondering what the middle ground is that you see.

2
TSONGAS: At the risk of sounding metaphysical, I think that any society has a certain reaction to a perceived sense of drift in that once people understand that ~~that~~ drifting in the current status will lead to chaos, they are willing to make the changes. Part of the German mind set is the chaos they experienced between the two World Wars. It's implanted in that psyche ^{AND} which will be there for a long time. The United States will eventually come to that same conclusion, ~~and I think that~~ the awareness that we have no other choice. When that comes I think is much more important than if it's going to come, because I have no question that it will come, and part of what I have tried to do legislatively is provide the mechanisms so that when that awareness is there we don't have to start looking for how to finance ~~them~~ ^{the changes} or how to put them in place. We will have greased the skids for it. This is a remarkable country. We're very well-educated; we have an incredibly well-trained work force. We have a lot going for us. What is missing is the other ingredient that is not ^{one year old} a physical or resource, it's simply leadership. I'm not talking about the President, I'm talking about leadership in all the various sectors of society. That is the easiest one ^{to turn around} to turn around, but you don't have a Pearl Harbor ~~to all of a sudden snap and it happens.~~ ^{as a} stimulus. It's a slower awareness like any other evolutionary process.

QUESTION:

You'll have to help me with this.

(no record available)

Concerning

TSONGAS: I think it's very much like my answer to the last question. ~~There will come a point in industry,~~ ~~there~~ ^{was} was an article I was told about, Reginald Jones in the New York Times magazine about his ^{business approach} approach to government, the enlightened CEO approach. I think that's where it's going to be. At some point everyone in the business community ~~or most people are~~ going to realize that confrontation is fine in a kind of psychic sense but ~~that it~~ diminishes our capacity to compete internationally. We're all in this boat together. We're all going to sink or swim together. I think it only arises in times of crisis and we are rapidly approaching that. There is no way you can guarantee that people in the political process or private sector or academia are going to be any better. We are all human beings with the

Question: I'm a Canadian and I'd like to know if you think it;s any use to pursue a North American energy policy, and if so, whether you think that the attitudes of the Americans, Canadians, and Mexicans might be insurmountable obstacle.

TSONGAS: Well you have 33 million people and by the year 2000 there will be as many people in Mexico City as there will be in Canada at the current rate of population growth, and ~~we're~~ *the* ~~is~~ in between. Can you have a sense of common purpose? I think you can despite those problems, because ~~we~~ *Canada* and Mexico will ~~be~~ *have* producer status, and ~~we~~ *we* will ~~be~~ *have* consuming status. My hesitation is simply, why is dependence upon Canada any better than dependence upon Venezuela? In the last analysis every country will do what's in its self-interest and to expect anything else is absurd. ~~As~~ so in the last analysis, the Canadian government will do what is best for Canada and the Mexican government will do what is best for Mexico and we have to do what is best for our country. To understand those limitations and work within those limitations is fine. To somehow expect ~~us~~ to repeal those laws of human behavior ~~I think~~ is an error. ~~I think the copy has its limits and~~ I'd rather see this country do everything it can to produce

(6)

its own resources from renewables and conservation. We can get up to 25% of our energy by the year 2000 from those sources. We ought to do it.