

1  
REMARKS OF PET ON FEBRUARY 25, 1979

Good Evening. My guess this evening from Washington, D. C. is Senator Paul Tsongas. He's a Democrat; he's from Lowell and he is our new member, our junior member from Massachusetts. He's a member of the Senate Energy Committee and the Banking and Currency and I thought of course, tonight, Senator, that since rationing is on everybody's mind, the energy crisis I'd ask you a little bit about energy since you're on that committee. Now, we have special problems in New England and with the Iranian situation what do you think the long term is going to be?

I think that the long term is going to be bleak. You have a situation where because of Iran we are drawing down on our reserves so that basically what will happen is that you have a normal drawdown of oil reserves that takes place in the winter because of the heating season. This is for the whole country. Then you replenish those reserves during the spring and summer, then next winter you do back to a drawdown. We have drawn down so drastically because of Iran that I just don't see any way we can avoid serious shortages that will come next winter and the Administration, for I think, ~~all its good intentions~~ all its, I think, perhaps, good intentions is just not really following through with the seriousness of the issue. If anyone's going to be impacted its going to be us with our incredible dependence on foreign import of crude oil. We

Well, now that they are proposing two gallons a day President Carter has proposed that, what do you think about that? Do you think Congress will pass that and do you think that the American public will accept it?

II

Well, the two gallons a day idea basically is if you have a ten per cent shortfall and if that takes place, then you have to go into the, it will actually be more than ten percent, but that kind of a serious drawdown, we're not at that point. The question, however, is, given what happened in Iran, and I think a reasonable person ~~might~~ could assume that the same thing might happen in Saudi Arabia in time, that we are just hanging on this limb, year after year after year, and eventually, something will come along to saw us off. That's the concern, not the, well we'll perhaps get through this year, and get through next year, may be, next winter, if we put in mandatory allocations, not the rationing scheme but mandatory allocations, but that doesn't change the overall problem the vulnerability we have to imported crude oil and it seems to me that the sooner we get off this, if you will, current life style, and onto the alternatives, onto allocation of resources around the country, the better off we're going to be. The President just seems to be drifting. There's no sense of, he says this was the moral equivalent of war, and that's a - he's right, but he's not following through on that.

Well, it seems to me that for the last several years particularly a few years ago, we had this problem and we never come to a conclusion or solution, but the problem remains. What would you do about it?

(That's right)

A number of things. One, the areas that I think ~~we~~ that we can one is to really maximize on a kind of crash program, the renewables - solar, wind, lowhead hydro which will be important for New England, especially given the river systems that we have, biomass, the conversion of trash and, what they call 'trashwood forests' into electricity, all indigenous New England resources that we could depend upon. One, mandatory



III

conservation, ~~for example~~ in terms of example, not allowing the production of fuel of/inefficient automobiles. Here we are talking about no heating oil this winter and yet someone today is going to buy a car ~~which will~~ burn up the gasoline that could have been used ~~for heating oil~~ down the road, so that kind of, you know, not understanding the interplay between gasoline and home heating oil, not allowing, for example, very small things, outdoor advertising lights to burn all night long, ~~etc~~ Saturdays and Sundays, uh, some discussion about restricting parking places of major employers to have carpooling take place. If this country ~~could~~ just cannot keep on going the way it is. Eventually, someone is just going to smash us in the nose because of our vulnerability and at that point we're going to be talking as we did back in '73 and '74 about military action in the Middle East - to actually send our troops in - and that, I think, is a lot worse than sort of ratcheting down our life style.

But the American consumer doesn't seem to want to. If you ~~have~~ ever drive, just driving to work, where I work, I see car after car coming toward me with one person, one person (Yeah) and they don't seem to understand that you know, it's going to run on and we are going to have to change our life style. Do you see any way that you can make them understand this?

I think this is by far the most (dispairing or disturbing???) issue that I've addressed as a Congressman. There just isn't a public demand for a tough energy policy. But, I think this country - you know, we've been through the embargo of '73, '74; we went through the very cold winter of '77, coal strike, and natural gas problems in '78, and now ~~they're running~~ the Iranian crisis of this year. I mean (and a cold spell) and the cold

THIS STATIONERY PRINTED ON PAPER MADE WITH RECYCLED FIBRE

IV

spell (Had a very cold spell). People are beginning to finally I think, worry about where we are as a country, and I think, for example, on the Energy Committee, there are a number of senators, not only myself, who will want a tough program, who say, Look, the Country's ready. And here's a President, you know, we do have a presidential system around here, who's suggesting things are ~~rather~~ <sup>well, they're</sup> serious but they're not critical, this kind of nuance I think is absurd - I think if the President said, Look, we just cannot continue this vulnerability to OPEC, we're going to sort of get off our addiction, ~~to~~ cheap oil and so forth. (jumble of voices) Well, aren't you at this point. (Yes.) Are you ready to do it? I think the country is. He doesn't perceive that.

Well, I think the country is, too. Let's move on a little bit to some other things. Now President Carter has proposed a \$600,000,000 cuts in Social Security benefits, or cuts, uh, for the fiscal year 1980. How do you perceive this? What do you think will happen? Where is he going to cut?

You know, I'm sure you've met as many people as I have who live on Social Security and if you can tell me how they can withstand that kind of cut, given the inflation rate, then you can be President of the United States. just can't, it's impossible, and it seems to me that, given our willingness to expend monies ~~on~~, for example, military equipment, uh, it seems to me that the question is not how much money we're going to spend, I think we all agree to the \$29,000,000,000 cap in terms of deficits, the question is, how do you allocate it within that. I just don't see the Social Security component being passed by the Congress.



2

I don't  
Well that's good, because, /I'm with you, I don't see how people can live;  
we all know people who live on it and if they had to have a cut, they  
wouldn't be able to.

I'm hopeful that Mrs. Carter, the Mother, (Miss Lillian,) (yes), (she might, too.)

How do you feel about the cutbacks in the Amtrack system?

Well, I said when I was in Springfield for my Town Meeting that I thought it was an ideal way of doing it because you will then have no railroads just as you run out of gasoline for your car, so that we will be totally paralyzed. which seems to be the (Then you'll all walk - you were totally paralyzed here in Washington, just recently.) Mass Transit is going to be part of our lifestyle future, to get back to Amtrack, just when you begin to phase into that transition period, and its Catch-22.

Yeah, yeah, doesn't make sense. Now , you're not on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but you're very interested, and you've come up with some ideas, Angola being one of them. Would you like to talk about that?

Well, I'm not on the Foreign Relations Committee although I thought I had it just before the final gong.

That's something you were interested in and you would like to have been.

That's right  
I'm the only former Peace Corps Volunteer in the entire Senate. There are only three of us in the entire Congress and I know by sheer dint of of having lived there more about how Third World people think than I

VI

think anyone else here, by that experience, and what I'm trying to do is to provide, at least in terms of Africa, some leadership on how you deal with the Third World, and most of our - its like the Amtrack decision - most of our policies are so short-termed that they end up in disaster, then we wonder what happened to us. Angola, initially, Ethiopia, Angola about three years ago. Ethiopia the last two years. Where we've in essence formed a set of circumstances that force the Angolans and Ethiopians into the Soviet embrace. So what I'm arguing for in both cases is that we begin to adopt rational policies that wean these countries away from the Soviets and the Cubans. Now, I had enough experience with the Soviets when I was in Ethiopia with the Peace Corps not to worry about them in terms of their effectiveness. What they're interested in, in the Third World, in Africa, is basically the pursuit of Communist ideology, not the development of those countries. Which is what we're interested in, so unless we make mistakes, there's no way the Soviets can be <sup>?</sup> sort of do is/snatch defeat from the jaws of victory by our policies, so that's an <sup>that's</sup> ~~areaxxxxxxx~~ an area that I'm going to be hopefully involved in.

You're suggesting that we go back with the diplomatic relations with Angola?

That's right.

And you think this would be feasible and workable?

Well, I think they're ready for it. Its like any country: you have basically those who would be pro-Western, those who would be pro-Communist and those who would argue for a non-aligned posture. Now, you're never going to get them to be pro-Western. I think we should give up that ghost. What we



VII

want them to be is non-aligned. By not recognizing them, you give those people no argument, so the hard-liners, the hard-Leftists, in those countries, end up with all the arguments and they continue to be in power. So it seems to me that we can undermine some of that with rational policies. (Right).

The Peace Corps. I'm glad you brought that up because when the Peace Corps first went into existence it was such an exciting concept and I think it stirred the imagination of everybody - certainly the young people; you went into it - but its sort of fallen in disfavor lately. Can you see it coming out of this - can you see anything good in the next few years with the word Peace Corps on it?

Actually, the Peace Corps, during <sup>the</sup> Nixon's <sup>as you know</sup> years, /was put into action.

It was Nixon's way of knocking off Kennedy's program. A very petty approach of his. Typical of the way he did things, but what's happened now is that the Peace Corps has gone from my generation of B.A. generalists with good intentions going over to people who are more technically proficient in agriculture or whatever, engineers and so forth; which I think is helpful, but I think they have lost some of the idealism. Most of the problems that the Peace Corps people have is not knowledge when they get over there but the capacity to live with other people. And to live in a village and get along, and to enjoy it, to be fulfilled by. That's the thing, the major issue. There's now incredible squabbling, internally, in the Peace Corps. between the Director, and who is going to be the new Peace Corps Director and that kind of beaureaucratic, but for the average person going into the Peace Corps, that is almost immaterial. A person is going to end up living or someplace in a village, /you know, and his life or her life will revolve around the people of the village. So the actual Peace Corps volunteer today

VIII

is having an experience not that far different from what we were going through.  
just  
Its just that the Washington climate is/so involved in internal feuding.

Do you think that the people that are going into the Peace Corps are still  
as idealistic as you were when you were in it?

I think a bit less so because when I went in in '62 Kennedy was still  
President and (bill Moyer) Sarge Shriver, Moyers, all those people - that  
was a very exciting era. I think we have lost that as a country so to that  
extent you have a kind of diminution of that ideal. They're less naive  
(Yes) than we were. I'm not sure whether that's good or bad.

Well, I'm not sure whether its good or bad but I agree with you. It's  
there. Senator, we're going to take time out for a message and then  
we'll be right back.....Senator, another item that's very much in the  
news is a balanced budget. Would you like to comment on that?

I think you have to draw a distinction between a balanced budget which  
everyone obviously is supportive of and a convention in which you would  
in essence bring in everyone who wanted to change the constitution into  
one room at one point and who knows what's going to happen. And you have  
a situation where we have a constitution that has survived for two hundred  
and what, three years, now, and very well. Well, actually the Constitution  
was 1787 so I have to change my mathematics, but the point is that you could  
have a balanced budget by Congressional action and the budget has gone from  
a a \$66,000,000,000 deficit under Ford down to the project 29 this year and



TX

hopefully balanced next year, so I don't think anyone argues with the concept. The problem is that it is basically a vehicle being used for two purposes: one, Jerry Brown, in his bid for the Presidency, and secondly, the States legislate towards basically saying, "O.K., Federal Government, balance your budget." Now, let's say you have a \$30,000,000,000 deficit this year, which is a little more than they expect. We give back to the cities and towns, we, the Federal Government, \$85,000,000,000, so all we have to do to balance our budget is to cut out 30 of the 85 billion we send back to the cities and towns. Now...

What would that do to the cities and towns?

That's right. To the same people who voted for the balanced budget resolution you know, would now come screaming to Washington, "Why are you cutting off our funds?" <sup>They</sup> ~~XXX~~ can't have it both ways. Now, there is such a...the other problem with a balanced budget amendment is that, in times of crisis you cannot possibly have a balanced budget. You go back to World War II, I mean, you have Liberty Bonds and the whole thing. No one said, "Look, we have to balance the budget and lose the war", naturally, argue with that.

We haven't had a balanced budget since when, the Depression?

No, the last balanced budget was in Eisenhower's time, but if you look at the deficit as a percentage of your gross national product, the country's been going down since World War II. Yes, the budget figures look like we're growing so rapidly as a country. Its just like saying to an individual "You owe a thousand dollars." The question become, "That is meaningful if I make three thousand <sup>a year</sup>, but if I make \$100,000,000

it has a very different perspective. And the use of a balanced budget one of the conventions, what may come out of that, and we don't know what kind of forces will be unleashed. Secondly, the restrictions that in time of crisis you could not ~~move~~ (Not move, if you had to) that would be catastrophic. And this whole idea that you can solve very complex problems are these simple machete approaches. And what Brown is doing, I think, is ~~unbelievable~~ unforgiveable, because he knows better, and yet he's so ambitious he's going to use this to pursue his political ends.

He's a headline grabber. And this is one of the things that will grab them.  
(That's right).

I used to think he was an attractive candidate. Not that long ago.  
I've changed my mind.

Well, he seems to have quite a bit of support. I don't know how he's faring on this, but across the country he has certainly had some support in the past.

Well, he'll be in Massachusetts in the primary.

Yes, I know. There's going to be a lot of them, as far as I can gather, up there. Now, you've served in both the House and the Senate. What differences have you found in your short term in this office?

On a professional level, this is a much better place to be. You have a better forum. The ideas, for example, that I have on cities, or on energy, Africa, or whatever, I'm just a lot more powerful, because of the position. Not only being a Senator, but being a Senator from Massachusetts, the



respect that's accorded to our State. It's a remarkable difference. And it's just very nice to have. On a personal level it's very disappointing.

On the House side I had a lot of friends who were my age, felt the way I did. It's not true over here. It's very much individual little fiefdoms and there just isn't the...unless you're into the late afternoon sit-in-someone's-office-and-have-a-drink-routine, which is not my style - it's very hard to have the same kind of friendships I had on the House side. Loneliness. So in that sense - lonely ~~loss~~ is not the right word - but there is less a sense of colleague, less a sense of companionship, people that I can turn to, that I had on the House side. You know, when ~~I was~~<sup>we were</sup> elected in '74 there were something like 70 of us of whom maybe 50 were, not clones of each other, but we shared a philosophy of reformist ideology. That's gone; and I tried to organize the Freshmen Senators. It was a waste of time.

Just couldn't make it. Well, you'll get your own club, I guess, if you're bucking the system a little bit and that's not always easy.

The problem is that I was in the caucus ~~room~~<sup>meeting</sup> the other day and I looked around. There were ten people in that room who were running for President, or were going to run for President, two of whom were candidates of Vice Presidents, three of whom were candidates of some other. And that's (That's pretty powerful) Right. The thing is, they begin to think of themselves in those terms and it becomes very denormalizing to go through that.

All right. Now what are your main goals in your first term in the Senate? What do you see before your term is over that you can accomplish; that you'd like to accomplish?