

The original documents are located in Box 27, folder “State of the Union - 1975: General (2)” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

file

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

U.S. CAPITOL

Wednesday-January 15, 1975

12:40 P.M. Departure

From: Terry O'Donnell ~~DO~~

SEQUENCE:

12:40 p.m.

You, Mrs. Ford, and Susan board motorcade and depart South Grounds en route U.S. Capitol.

12:50 p.m.

Arrive South Door of the Capitol (House Wing).

You will be met by Mr. Ken R. Harding, House Sergeant-at-Arms, and Mr. George White, Architect of the Capitol.

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH

You, Mrs. Ford, and Susan proceed inside the South Door entrance. Mrs. Ford and Susan will be escorted directly to their seats in the Executive Gallery by Gil Udell of the Doorkeeper's Office.

Escorted by Mr. Harding, you proceed to the holding room (H-210).

State of the Union Address

2. Wednesday - January 15, 1975

12:55 p. m.

Arrive holding room (H-210).

NOTE: The Cabinet will be departing H-210 for the Chamber floor as you arrive.

12:56 p. m.

Mrs. Ford and Susan arrive at their seats in the Executive Gallery.

12:57 p. m.

The Escort Committee consisting of the following Members arrives outside the holding room:

Senator James O. Eastland (D-Miss)
Senator Mike Mansfield (D-Mont)
Senator Hugh Scott (R-Pa)
Senator Robert Byrd (D-W. Va)
Congressman Thomas O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass)
Congressman John Rhodes (R-Ariz)
Congressman John McFall (D-Ca)
Congressman Bob Michel (R-Ill)

12:58 p. m.

Depart holding room en route House Chamber, escorted by Mr. Ken Harding and Mr. Bill Wannell (Senate Sergeant-at-Arms), and the Escort Committee.

12:59 p. m.

You arrive center door of the House Chamber.

1:00 p. m.

Announcement by Mr. Jim Molloy, the new Doorkeeper.

1:01 p. m.

Escorted by Mr. Molloy and the Escort Committee, proceed down the center aisle then to your left to step up onto the middle level where you will proceed to the Clerk's Desk to present copies of the State of the Union Address to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, then remain standing.

LIVE NATIONWIDE TELEVISION

State of the Union Address
3. Wednesday - January 15, 1975

The Speaker calls the Joint Session to order and formally presents the President.

1:03 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS.

LIVE NATIONWIDE TELEVISION

1:30 p.m.

State of the Union Address concludes.

Depart House Chamber via the entrance route, escorted by the two Sergeants-at-Arms and the Escort Committee, and proceed to motorcade for boarding.

1:31 p.m.

Mrs. Ford and Susan depart their gallery seats en route motorcade.

1:34 p.m.

You are joined by Mrs. Ford and Susan in the hallway and together, proceed outside South Entrance to board motorcade.

1:35 p.m.

Motorcade departs Capitol en route South Lawn.

1:45 p.m.

Arrive South Grounds of the White House.

#####

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 15, 1975

NOTE FOR THE PRESS OFFICE STAFF

The following materials are being made available today in conjunction with the President's State of the Union:

1. The President's message to Congress (NOTE that it is not a speech text, but rather the document he will hand the Speaker and the President of the Senate--ie. the formal State of the Union message. His speech, we can say, will be drawn and excerpted from the longer printed message.)
2. Fact sheet.
3. Q&A on energy
4. Energy charts and graphs.
(later)
5. As-delivered text of the speech itself.

The EOB briefing scheduled for 8:30 a.m. is likely to slip to 9 a.m. to give people an opportunity to read the message and other materials.

If we run out of materials occasionally during the morning, you can say that it's because of the massive amount of information we're providing that tying up all our presses and collaters.

Non-press requests for SOTU information before 1 p.m. can not--repeat CAN NOT--be accomodated since all the material is embargoed until 1 p.m. Thereafter, as material becomes available we will send it to press releases.

WE DO NOT EXPECT AN ADVANCE TEXT OF THE SPEECH ITSELF, BUT WILL TRY. The President, you can say, wanted to review what he will be saying again this morning so we don't know if we will have a final text in time to do an advance-- but we will get an as-delivered out as rapidly as possible.

Of the materials we're making available, only the message, fact sheet and as delivered speech will be permanently available here. When we run out of the others we'll have to refer people to FEA.

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE
UNTIL 1:00 P.M., EST

JANUARY 15, 1975

EMBARGOED FOR WIRE TRANSMISSION
UNTIL 10:00 A.M., EST

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

Twenty-six years ago, a freshman Congressman, a young fellow, with lots of idealism who was out to change the world, stood before Speaker Sam Rayburn in the well of this House and solemnly swore to the same oath you took yesterday. That is an unforgettable experience, and I congratulate you all.

Two days later, that same freshman sat in the back row as President Truman, all charged up by his single-handed election victory, reported as the Constitution requires on the State of the Union.

When the bipartisan applause stopped, President Truman said:

"I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the State of the Union is good. Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness. It is foremost among the nations of the world in the search for peace."

Today, that freshman Member from Michigan stands where Mr. Truman stood and I must say to you that the State of the Union is not good.

Millions of Americans are out of work. Recession and inflation are eroding the money of millions more. Prices are too high and sales are too slow.

more

(OVER)

This year's Federal deficit will be about \$30 billion; next year's probably \$45 billion. The national debt will rise to over \$600 billion.

Our plant capacity and productivity are not increasing fast enough. We depend on others for essential energy.

Some people question their government's ability to make the hard decisions and stick with them. They expect Washington politics as usual.

Yet, what President Truman said on January 5, 1949, is even more true in 1975.

We are better able to meet the peoples' needs.

All Americans do have a fairer chance to pursue happiness. Not only are we still the foremost nation in pursuit of peace, but today's prospects of attaining it are infinitely brighter.

There were 59,000,000 Americans employed at the start of 1949. Now there are more than 85,000,000 Americans who have jobs. In comparable dollars, the average income of the American family has doubled during the past 26 years.

Now, I want to speak very bluntly. I've got bad news, and I don't expect any applause. The American people want action and it will take both the Congress and the President to give them what they want. Progress and solutions can be achieved. And they will be achieved.

My message today is not intended to address all the complex needs of America. I will send separate messages making specific recommendations for domestic legislation, such as General Revenue Sharing and the extension of the Voting Rights Act.

The moment has come to move in a new direction. We can do this by fashioning a new partnership between the Congress, the White House and the people we both represent.

Let us mobilize the most powerful and creative industrial nation that ever existed on this earth to put all our people to work. The emphasis of our economic efforts must now shift from inflation to jobs.

To bolster business and industry and to create new jobs, I propose a one-year tax reduction of \$16 billion. Three-quarters would go to individuals and one-quarter to promote business investment.

more

This cash rebate to individuals amounts to 12 percent of 1974 tax payments -- a total cut of \$12 billion, with a maximum of \$1,000 per return.

I call today on the Congress to act by April 1. If you do, the Treasury can send the first check for half the rebate in May and the second by September.

The other one-fourth of the cut, about \$4 billion, will go to businesses, including farms, to promote expansion and create more jobs. The one-year reduction for businesses would be in the form of a liberalized investment tax credit increasing the rate to 12 percent for all businesses.

This tax cut does not include the more fundamental reforms needed in our tax system. But it points us in the right direction -- allowing us as taxpayers rather than the Government to spend our pay.

Cutting taxes, now, is essential if we are to turn the economy around. A tax cut offers the best hope of creating more jobs. Unfortunately, it will increase the size of the budget deficit. Therefore, it is more important than ever that we take steps to control the growth of Federal expenditures.

Part of our trouble is that we have been self-indulgent. For decades, we have been voting ever-increasing levels of Government benefits -- and now the bill has come due. We have been adding so many new programs that the size and growth of the Federal budget has taken on a life of its own.

One characteristic of these programs is that their cost increases automatically every year because the number of people eligible for most of these benefits increases every year. When these programs are enacted, there is no dollar amount set. No one knows what they will cost. All we know is that whatever they cost last year, they will cost more next year.

It is a question of simple arithmetic. Unless we check the excessive growth of Federal expenditures or impose on ourselves matching increases in taxes, we will continue to run huge inflationary deficits in the Federal budget.

If we project the current built-in momentum of Federal spending through the next 15 years, Federal, State, and local government expenditures could easily comprise half of our gross national product. This compares with less than a third in 1975.

more

(OVER)

I am now in the process of preparing the budget submissions for fiscal year 1976. In that budget, I will propose legislation to restrain the growth of a number of existing programs. I have also concluded that no new spending programs can be initiated this year, except those for energy. Further, I will not hesitate to veto any new spending programs adopted by the Congress.

As an additional step toward putting the Federal government's house in order, I recommend a five percent limit on Federal pay increases in 1975. In all Government programs tied to the consumer price index -- including social security, civil service and military retirement pay, and food stamps -- I also propose a one-year maximum increase of 5 percent.

None of these recommended ceiling limitations, over which the Congress has final authority, are easy to propose, because in most cases they involve anticipated payments to many deserving people. Nonetheless, it must be done. I must emphasize that I am not asking you to eliminate, reduce or freeze these payments. I am merely recommending that we slow down the rate at which these payments increase and these programs grow.

Only a reduction in the growth in spending can keep Federal borrowing down and reduce the damage to the private sector from high interest rates. Only a reduction in spending can make it possible for the Federal Reserve System to avoid an inflationary growth in the money supply and thus restore balance to our economy. A major reduction in the growth of Federal spending can help to dispel the uncertainty that so many feel about our economy, and put us on the way to curing our economic ills.

If we do not act to slow down the rate of increase in Federal spending, the United States Treasury will be legally obligated to spend more than \$360 billion in Fiscal Year 1976 -- even if no new programs are enacted. These are not matters of conjecture or prediction, but again of simple arithmetic. The size of these numbers and their implications for our everyday life and the health of our economic system are shocking.

I submitted to the last Congress a list of budget deferrals and recisions. There will be more cuts recommended in the budget I will submit. Even so, the level of outlays for fiscal year 1976 is still much too high. Not only is it too high for this year but the decisions we make now inevitably have a major and growing impact on expenditure levels in future years. This is a fundamental issue we must jointly solve.

more

The economic disruption we and others are experiencing stems in part from the fact that the world price of petroleum has quadrupled in the last year. But we cannot put all of the blame on the oil-exporting nations. We in the United States are not blameless. Our growing dependence upon foreign sources has been adding to our vulnerability for years and we did nothing to prepare ourselves for an event such as the embargo of 1973.

During the 1960s, this country had a surplus capacity of crude oil, which we were able to make available to our trading partners whenever there was a disruption of supply. This surplus capacity enabled us to influence both supplies and prices of crude oil throughout the world. Our excess capacity neutralized any effort at establishing an effective cartel, and thus the rest of the world was assured of adequate supplies of oil at reasonable prices.

In the 1960s, our surplus capacity vanished and, as a consequence, the latent power of the oil cartel could emerge in full force. Europe and Japan, both heavily dependent on imported oil, now struggle to keep their economies in balance. Even the United States, which is far more self-sufficient than most other industrial countries, has been put under serious pressure.

I am proposing a program which will begin to restore our country's surplus capacity in total energy. In this way, we will be able to assure ourselves reliable and adequate energy and help foster a new world energy stability for other major consuming nations.

But this Nation and, in fact, the world must face the prospect of energy difficulties between now and 1985. This program will impose burdens on all of us with the aim of reducing our consumption of energy and increasing production. Great attention has been paid to considerations of fairness and I can assure you that the burdens will not fall more harshly on those less able to bear them.

I am recommending a plan to make us invulnerable to cut-offs of foreign oil. It will require sacrifices. But it will work.

I have set the following national energy goals to assure that our future is as secure and productive as our past:

- First, we must reduce oil imports by 1 million barrels per day by the end of this year and by 2 million barrels per day by the end of 1977.

more

(OVER)

- Second, we must end vulnerability to economic disruption by foreign suppliers by 1985.
- Third, we must develop our energy technology and resources so that the United States has the ability to supply a significant share of the energy needs of the Free World by the end of this century.

To attain these objectives, we need immediate action to cut imports. Unfortunately, in the short-term there are only a limited number of actions which can increase domestic supply. I will press for all of them.

I urge quick action on legislation to allow commercial production at the Elk Hills, California, Naval Petroleum Reserve. In order that we make greater use of domestic coal resources, I am submitting amendments to the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act which will greatly increase the number of power plants that can be promptly converted to coal.

Voluntary conservation continues to be essential, but tougher programs are also needed -- and needed now. Therefore, I am using Presidential powers to raise the fee on all imported crude oil and petroleum products. Crude oil fee levels will be increased \$1 per barrel on February 1, by \$2 per barrel on March 1 and by \$3 per barrel on April 1. I will take action to reduce undue hardship on any geographical region. The foregoing are interim administrative actions. They will be rescinded when the necessary legislation is enacted.

To that end, I am requesting the Congress to act within 90 days on a more comprehensive energy tax program. It includes:

- Excise taxes and import fees totalling \$2 per barrel on product imports and on all crude oil.
- Deregulation of new natural gas and enactment of a natural gas excise tax.
- Enactment of a windfall profits tax by April 1 to ensure that oil producers do not profit unduly. At the same time I plan to take Presidential initiative to decontrol the price of domestic crude oil on April 1.

more

The sooner Congress acts, the more effective the oil conservation program will be and the quicker the Federal revenues can be returned to our people.

I am prepared to use Presidential authority to limit imports, as necessary, to assure the success of this program.

I want you to know that before deciding on my energy conservation program, I considered rationing and higher gasoline taxes as alternatives. Neither would achieve the desired results and both would produce unacceptable inequities.

A massive program must be initiated to increase energy supply, cut demand and provide new standby emergency programs to achieve the independence we want by 1985. The largest part of increased oil production must come from new frontier areas on the Outer Continental Shelf and from the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska. It is the intention of this Administration to move ahead with exploration, leasing and production on those frontier areas of the Outer Continental Shelf where the environmental risks are acceptable.

Use of our most abundant domestic resource -- coal -- is severely limited. We must strike a reasonable compromise on environmental concerns with coal. I am submitting Clean Air Act amendments which will allow greater coal use without sacrificing our clean air goals.

I vetoed the strip mining legislation passed by the last Congress. With appropriate changes, I will sign a revised version into law.

I am proposing a number of actions to energize our nuclear power program. I will submit legislation to expedite nuclear licensing and the rapid selection of sites.

In recent months, utilities have cancelled or postponed over 60 percent of planned nuclear expansion and 30 percent of planned additions to non-nuclear capacity. Financing problems for that industry are growing worse. I am therefore recommending that the one year investment tax credit of 12 percent be extended an additional two years to specifically speed the construction of power plants that do not use natural gas or oil. I am also submitting proposals for selective changes in State utility commission regulations.

more

(OVER)

To provide the critical stability for our domestic energy production in the face of world price uncertainty, I will request legislation to authorize and require tariffs, import quotas or price floors to protect our energy prices at levels which will achieve energy independence.

Increasing energy supplies is not enough. We must also take additional steps to cut long-term consumption. I therefore propose:

- Legislation to make thermal efficiency standards mandatory for all new buildings in the United States. These standards would be set after appropriate consultation with architects, builders and labor.
- A new tax credit of up to \$150 for those home owners who install insulation equipment.
- The establishment of an energy conservation program to help low income families purchase insulation supplies.
- Legislation to modify and defer automotive pollution standards for 5 years to enable us to improve new automobile gas mileage 40 percent by 1980.

These proposals and actions, cumulatively, can reduce our dependence on foreign energy supplies to 3-5 million barrels per day by 1985. To make the United States invulnerable to foreign disruption, I propose standby emergency legislation and a strategic storage program of 1 billion barrels of oil for domestic needs and 300 million barrels for defense purposes.

I will ask for the funds needed for energy research and development activities. I have established a goal of 1 million barrels of synthetic fuels and shale oil production per day by 1985 together with an incentive program to achieve it.

I believe in America's capabilities. Within the next ten years, my program envisions:

- 200 major nuclear power plants,
- 250 major new coal mines,
- 150 major coal-fired power plants,
- 30 major new oil refineries,

more

- 20 major new synthetic fuel plants,
- the drilling of many thousands of new oil wells,
- the insulation of 18 million homes,
- and construction of millions of new automobiles, trucks and buses that use much less fuel.

We can do it. In another crisis -- the one in 1942 -- President Franklin D. Roosevelt said this country would build 60,000 aircraft. By 1943, production had reached 125,000 airplanes annually.

If the Congress and the American people will work with me to attain these targets, they will be achieved and surpassed.

From adversity, let us seize opportunity. Revenues of some \$30 billion from higher energy taxes designed to encourage conservation must be refunded to the American people in a manner which corrects distortions in our tax system wrought by inflation.

People have been pushed into higher tax brackets by inflation with a consequent reduction in their actual spending power. Business taxes are similarly distorted because inflation exaggerates reported profits resulting in excessive taxes.

Accordingly, I propose that future individual income taxes be reduced by \$16.5 billion. This will be done by raising the low income allowance and reducing tax rates. This continuing tax cut will primarily benefit lower and middle income taxpayers.

For example, a typical family of four with a gross income of \$5,600 now pays \$185 in Federal income taxes. Under this tax cut plan, they would pay nothing. A family of four with a gross income of \$12,500 now pays \$1,260 in Federal taxes. My plan reduces that by \$300. Families grossing \$20,000 would receive a reduction of \$210.

Those with the very lowest incomes, who can least afford higher costs, must also be compensated. I propose a payment of \$80 to every person 18 years of age and older in that category.

State and local governments will receive \$2 billion in additional revenue sharing to offset their increased energy costs.

more

To offset inflationary distortions and to generate more economic activity, the corporate tax rate will be reduced from 48 percent to 42 percent.

Now, let me turn to the international dimension of the present crisis. At no time in our peacetime history has the state of the Nation depended more heavily on the state of the world. And seldom if ever has the state of the world depended more heavily on the state of our Nation.

The economic distress is global. We will not solve it at home unless we help to remedy the profound economic dislocation abroad. World trade and monetary structure provides markets, energy, food and vital raw materials -- for all nations. This international system is now in jeopardy.

This Nation can be proud of significant achievements in recent years in solving problems and crises. The Berlin Agreement, the SALT agreements, our new relationship with China, the unprecedented efforts in the Middle East -- are immensely encouraging. But the world is not free from crisis. In a world of 150 nations, where nuclear technology is proliferating and regional conflicts continue, international security cannot be taken for granted.

So let there be no mistake about it: international cooperation is a vital fact of our lives today. This is not a moment for the American people to turn inward. More than ever before, our own well-being depends on America's determination and leadership in the world.

We are a great Nation -- spiritually, politically, militarily, diplomatically and economically. America's commitment to international security has sustained the safety of allies and friends in many areas -- in the Middle East, in Europe, in Asia. Our turning away would unleash new instabilities and dangers around the globe which would, in turn, threaten our own security.

At the end of World War II, we turned a similar challenge into an historic achievement. An old order was in disarray; political and economic institutions were shattered. In that period, this Nation and its partners built new institutions, new mechanisms of mutual support and cooperation. Today, as then, we face an historic opportunity. If we act, imaginatively and boldly, as we acted then, this period will in retrospect be seen as one of the great creative moments of our history.

The whole world is watching to see how we respond.

more

A resurgent American economy would do more to restore the confidence of the world in its own future than anything else we can do. The program that this Congress will pass can demonstrate to the world that we have started to put our own house in order. It can show that this Nation is able and willing to help other nations meet the common challenge. It can demonstrate that the United States will fulfill its responsibility as a leader among nations.

At stake is the future of the industrialized democracies, which have perceived their destiny in common and sustained it in common for 30 years.

The developing nations are also at a turning point. The poorest nations see their hopes of feeding their hungry and developing their societies shattered by the economic crisis. The long-term economic future for the producers of raw materials also depends on cooperative solutions.

Our relations with the Communist countries are a basic factor of the world environment. We must seek to build a long-term basis for coexistence. We will stand by our principles and our interests; we will act firmly when challenged. The kind of world we want depends on a broad policy of creating mutual incentives for restraint and for cooperation.

As we move forward to meet our global challenges and opportunities, we must have the tools to do the job.

Our military forces are strong and ready. This military strength deters aggression against our allies, stabilizes our relations with former adversaries and protects our homeland. Fully adequate conventional and strategic forces cost many billions, but these dollars are sound insurance for our safety and a more peaceful world.

Military strength alone is not sufficient. Effective diplomacy is also essential in preventing conflict and building world understanding. The Vladivostok negotiations with the Soviet Union represent a major step in moderating strategic arms competition. My recent discussions with leaders of the Atlantic Community, Japan and South Korea have contributed to our meeting the common challenge.

But we have serious problems before us that require cooperation between the President and the Congress. By the Constitution and tradition, the execution of foreign policy is the responsibility of the President.

more

(OVER)

In recent years, under the stress of the Vietnam War, legislative restrictions on the President's capability to execute foreign and military decisions have proliferated. As a member of the Congress, I opposed some and approved others. As President, I welcome the advice and cooperation of the House and Senate.

But, if our foreign policy is to be successful we cannot rigidly restrict in legislation the ability of the President to act. The conduct of negotiations is ill suited to such limitations. For my part, I pledge this Administration will act in the closest consultations with the Congress as we face delicate situations and troubled times throughout the globe.

When I became President only five months ago, I promised the last Congress a policy of communication, conciliation, compromise and cooperation. I renew that pledge to the new members of this Congress.

To sum up:

America needs a new direction which I have sought to chart here today -- a change of course which will:

- put the unemployed back to work;
- increase real income and production;
- restrain the growth of government spending;
- achieve energy independence; and
- advance the cause of world understanding.

We have the ability. We have the know-how. In partnership with the American people, we will achieve these objectives.

As our 200th anniversary approaches, we owe it to ourselves, and to posterity, to rebuild our political and economic strength. Let us make America, once again, and for centuries more to come, what it has so long been -- a stronghold and beacon-light of liberty for the world.

GERALD R. FORD

THE WHITE HOUSE,

January 15, 1975.

OUTLINE OF ENERGY
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

BACKGROUND

- Data History and Forecasts

NEAR-TERM ACTIONS

- Import Fee, Tax and Decontrol
- Naval Petroleum Reserve

MID-TERM PROGRAM

- Outer Continental Shelf Production
- Domestic Price Uncertainty
- Clean Air Act Amendments
- Strip Mining Legislation
- Coal Leasing and Prices
- Electric Utilities
- Energy Facility Siting
- Energy Conservation

EMERGENCY PLANNING MEASURES

- Emergency Storage
- Standby Authority

LONG-TERM ACTIONS

- Research and Development

ECONOMIC IMPACT

INTERNATIONAL

GENERAL

DATA HISTORY AND FORECASTS

Q. Has demand for petroleum products increased since the embargo?

A. Domestic consumption of energy is now beginning to increase again and is estimated to keep growing, although at a slower rate than prior to the embargo. The latest figures show total domestic demand to be at 18.2 million barrels per day (MMB/D) as compared to 17.7 MMB/D at the close of 1973. Gasoline consumption dropped 3.4 percent during the first 9 months of 1974 (as compared to 1973), but has increased since September by about 300,000 barrels per day.

Q. What about production and import levels?

A. Domestic oil production continues to decline as older fields have reached their peak. During the first eleven months of 1974, domestic production averaged 8.8 MMB/D as compared to 9.2 MMB/D in 1973. As a result, imports continue to rise even with present high prices. We are now importing 7.3 MMB/D (average of 6.8 MMB/D in last quarter of 1974), as compared to 6.5 MMB/D in October, 1973, the month prior to the embargo.

Q. What about coal production?

A. Coal (approximately 20 percent of domestic energy production) was the only major energy source that showed increased output during the first three quarters of 1974. Coal production in October was 5 percent above its level for the same period in 1973. However, the strike in November interrupted coal output and the industry has not yet regained former production levels.

Q. Do you foresee any shortages in the next 6 months?

A. We do not expect shortages of petroleum products but we do project large shortages for natural gas, as high as 14%. The greatest impact will be felt by electric utilities and industries that receive natural gas on an interruptible contract basis. These curtailments of natural gas have already had a serious impact on employment.

BACKGROUND



- Q. How high are current inventories?
- A. FEA figures indicate that December, 1974 crude oil stocks were about 20 million barrels higher (this is an adjusted figure to account for disparities between the American Petroleum Institute and FEA reporting methods) than the same period of 1973. Similarly, stocks for refined petroleum products were higher in December 1974 than the corresponding month in 1973 due to reduced demand and increased imports. Coal stocks, however, are down as a result of the recent UMW strike.

NEAR-TERM ACTIONS

The fee program will help to reduce our imports of foreign oil by reducing our overall demand. As a result, we will have less demand for products from some OPEC nations. To this extent, it may affect some prices being charged by certain OPEC nations. But overall, the fee will have a minimal effect on lowering world crude prices in the immediate future.



- Q. Will the fee on imports create additional profits for the oil companies?
- A. No, the import fee, by itself, will not increase industry profits. However, the fee will place an upward pressure on the price for crude. Since the price for uncontrolled domestic crude will rise to meet the world price, industry profits will also rise. This is why we are calling for a windfall profits tax as part of the energy proposals. It will be retroactive to collect any profits caused by Administrative actions.
- Q. Won't certain areas of the country which are heavily dependent on crude oil or product imports suffer a disproportionate burden as a result of the tariff?
- A. No. The FEA is currently administering a program which substantially equalizes the cost of crude oil to all domestic refiners. This crude equalization program aids refiners with high crude costs at the expense of other refiners which have access to price-controlled domestic crude. Further, the product fees will be less than crude fees; there will be a \$3 fee on crude and a \$1.20 fee on refined products in April.
- Q. How does a tax or fee achieve our national energy goals?
- A. As a result of these measures, petroleum products will become more expensive relative to other goods and services, thereby encouraging conservation and discouraging consumption. Also, making imports more expensive than domestic supplies of petroleum encourages the production of domestic crude oil.
- Q. Will the fee help to lower world crude prices and protect us from another embargo?
- A. The fee program will help to reduce our imports of foreign oil by reducing our overall demand. As a result, we will have less demand for products from some OPEC nations. To this extent, it may affect some prices being charged by certain OPEC nations. But overall, the fee will have a minimal effect on lowering world crude prices in the immediate future.

- Q. Why didn't you tighten the mandatory allocation program which you already have authority to administer rather than raising prices? Why not rationing?
- A. The mandatory allocation program was designed in response to an emergency situation, and does not address the more basic economic issues. A tighter mandatory allocation program could necessitate a significant increase in the Federal bureaucracy and could mean a return to the long gasoline lines we experienced last winter. Additionally, rationing and price control programs are inevitably discriminatory against those who would enter the market and provide competition.

While the Administration's program, which relies on the market forces, is more effective, the President announced his intention to guarantee reaching the goals by using his authority to limit imports if necessary.

- Q. How much more expensive will gasoline and other products be?
- A. On the average, if costs of a crude import \$3 fee are spread evenly among all products, prices of gasoline and other petroleum products refined from the higher priced imported crude could rise as much as 5 cents per gallon (controlled domestic oil will stay at the same price).

The total tax package and decontrol would ultimately add about \$4 a barrel (10 cents per gallon) to the average costs of all products.



- Q. What are the limits to the President's power to institute a fee?
- A. The President may impose a fee in response to a national security finding and should be established at that amount sufficient to offset the threat to national security.
- Q. What additional actions are you asking from Congress?
- A. In conjunction with the establishment of the fee, we are asking Congress for an excise tax on domestic crude oil (and will maintain a fee on all imports), the decontrol of old crude oil, deregulation of new natural gas, windfall profits tax, and a natural gas excise tax.
- Q. What are the differences between a tax, a fee and a tariff?
- A. All three are charges which can be used to produce revenue and all three have the effect of reducing demand. The differences lie in the source of authority to levy the charge. A tax must be levied by Congress for the purpose of raising domestic revenue. A tariff is a charge against imports and must also be authorized by the Congress. A fee is also levied on imported material but may be set for non-revenue purposes and need not be legislated.
- Q. How much oil will the combined tax/fee program save?
- A. The overall tax-package will save an estimated 1.6 MMB/D in 1977 and about 1.0 MMB/D in 1975.
- Q. Will there be rationing?
- A. No, not unless another emergency embargo situation necessitates it.
- Q. Why not?
- A. Rationing will not solve our long-term problems and will create severe energy disruptions in lifestyles and would require a large bureaucracy to administer.

- Q. Wouldn't it be better to reduce demand by imposing import quotas instead of raising prices through a fee?
- A. No, it would not. Import quotas can cause disparities in the marketplace by mandating specific, allowable levels of products into the country. By raising prices via a fee, the individual consumer can determine in what areas to conserve. While we are not considering the use of import quotas at this time, we will submit legislation requesting the authority to use tariffs, import quotas or other measures to achieve energy price levels necessary to reach our goals. The Message stated that Presidential power to limit oil imports would be used if necessary.
- Q. What is the effect of decontrolling domestic old oil?
- A. Prices on the domestic market will rise to meet world oil prices, and oil industry profits will also rise. This is why we must have immediate enactment of a windfall profits tax - to preclude this from happening.
- Q. Why are you requesting the deregulation of natural gas prices?
- A. I want to let the free market work to the maximum extent possible. The deregulation of natural gas prices will greatly encourage higher production levels in the long run. As you know, we are currently faced with a natural gas shortage of 14 percent for this winter. In the short run, higher prices will serve to lessen demand and will therefore mitigate the severity of this projected shortage.
- Q. Isn't the ultimate effect of this action going to be increased prices to the consumer?
- A. Yes, this will be the effect. We estimate that the typical monthly natural gas bill to the consumer would increase by about \$8 by 1985. The alternative to deregulation is less natural gas and higher costs for other fuels, such as petroleum and electricity.

- Q. How much will natural gas prices rise in the next few years?
- A. We estimate that, as a result of deregulation, the average natural gas prices will rise from 31¢/mcf in the interstate market in 1974, to 35¢/mcf in 1975; 38¢/mcf in 1976; and 41¢/mcf in 1977. The average national natural gas price will be higher, because intrastate gas is not controlled.
- The estimated market clearing price for natural gas is 99¢/mcf, and would be reached by 1985.
- Q. Why are you placing an excise tax on domestic natural gas?
- A. The excise tax on natural gas will approximate the excise tax and import fees on oil on a Btu equivalency basis. It will also inhibit preference for natural gas over oil. This tax will reduce the curtailment problem and lessen negative employment effects.
- Q. How much will the production of old oil be stimulated by price decontrol?
- A. We estimate that price decontrol could result in an additional 1-2 MMB/D of crude oil production in the next 3-4 years.
- Q. What are the advantages of an import fee over a gasoline tax?
- A. An import fee covers all crude and product imports and spreads the effects of demand reduction more evenly than a gas tax. The gasoline tax would have to be very large to save an equivalent amount of oil -- at least 30¢ per gallon -- and it would severely affect the already depressed automobile industry and numerous related industries.
- Q. Why doesn't the Administration provide priority treatment in domestic production of crude oil relative to the levying of tariffs and excise taxes? For example, the fee on imported crude could be \$2.00 per barrel, whereas, the domestic excise tax would be at \$1.50. Won't such action encourage domestic exploration as a result of an additional financial incentive?
- A. The immediate import fees will raise the prices of imports relative to domestic production. In the long-run, and at the margin, decontrolled domestic crude would rise to the same selling price as foreign crude, and any differential in taxes would probably only result in additional profits. Further, decontrol of old oil and higher prices should provide sufficient incentives to produce.

- Q. What is your specific proposal with regard to the Naval Petroleum Reserves?
- A. There are two proposals involved. We have asked Congress to permit production of the Elk Hills, California, Naval Petroleum Reserve (NPR-1) under Navy control and are submitting legislation to the Congress to authorize the exploration, development and production of NPR-4 in Alaska. The oil produced from NPR-1 would be used to top off all Defense Department storage tanks with the remainder to be sold at auction or exchanged for refined petroleum products used by the Department of Defense. The production from NPR-4 would provide petroleum for the domestic economy as well as for defense needs.
- Q. Who will have Government authority for developing NPR #1?
- A. I have asked the Congress to permit production of the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve under Navy control.
- Q. How quickly can NPR-1 and NPR-4 be brought onstream?
- A. NPR-1 can produce 160,000 barrels per day within a few months and 300,000 barrels per day by 1977. NPR-4 will take longer to produce as exploration and development must first take place.
- Q. Can we use the Trans-Alaska Pipeline to move NPR-4 oil?
- A. No. North Slope oil production will fill the capacity of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and thus new transportation facilities will be needed for NPR-4.
- Q. What is the time frame and cost involved in retrieving oil and gas from NPR-4 in Alaska?
- A. The development of NPR-4 will require several years and production is not expected before 1982 at the earliest. The cost would be more than \$400 million if exploration is done by the Government. If any part of NPR-4 is leased commercially, revenues could more than offset costs. It is estimated that about two million barrels per day can be produced in NPR-4.

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF PRODUCTION

- Q. How do you know there are sufficient quantities of oil and gas in the Outer Continental Shelf to make its development worthwhile?
- A. We don't know for sure that there are sufficient quantities for development although geological formations indicate that there may be. We are reaffirming our intention to continue an aggressive exploration and development policy.

Q. What will be done to insure that the environmental impacts of oil and gas development in the OCS and other frontier areas will be kept to safe levels?

A. We already have an extensive body of law designed to protect these areas from unacceptable levels of environmental damage and a whole new level of technology (environmental monitoring protection) has been developed in response to these new laws. In the field of oil and gas development, technical procedures and equipment are now in use designed to prevent oil spills and to minimize and control them once they occur. In addition the development of environmental baselines and the requirement to monitor the sites under development insures that any adverse effects will be detected early to allow proper and effective counteraction.

The Council on Environmental Quality conducted an extensive study of oil and gas exploration in the offshore areas of the U.S. and concluded that with proper safeguards, these areas can be safely developed. The Department of the Interior has now adopted literally all of the recommendations of the CEQ report.

In addition, new funds are being requested for coastal zone management to investigate and develop further the additional safeguards needed to protect our environment. Of course, before any leasing of frontier areas is done, there will be extensive public hearings and environmental impact statements to advise the public of the safeguards being taken.

MID-TERM PROGRAM



DOMESTIC PRICE UNCERTAINTY

Q. How would you determine when our vulnerability to pressure from oil exporting countries is high enough to make a price floor or other measure desirable?

A. Our vulnerability becomes unacceptable when our expected level of imports could not be completely replaced by emergency storage and standby actions. If the price of imported oil declines considerably, demand for oil would increase and import levels would get much higher.

Q. What is the difference between a quota and a price floor on imports?

A. A quota is designed to restrict the actual amount of imports into the country while a price floor sets a minimum price for imports so that domestic fuels will remain economically competitive with foreign sources.

Q. Wouldn't price floors maintain oil prices you have claimed are exorbitant?

A. We would have no intention of setting a floor price at current world oil price levels (\$11-12 per barrel). Rather, price floors could conceivably be set at a significantly lower level and still keep traditional domestic sources economic.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS

Q. Will the Clean Fuels Deficit be eliminated by your proposed energy actions?

A. Yes. The Clean Fuels Deficit is a term used to describe the potential shortage of low sulfur coal needed to meet emission limitations in 1975 and beyond. This shortage of low sulfur coal was at one point estimated to be as high as 200 million tons by mid-1975. The alternatives to these actions would be to curtail coal burning, thereby curtailing electric energy generation, or to import low sulfur oil to fill the low sulfur coal gaps, thereby increasing our oil imports. The actions I propose include voluntary revision of State emission limitations, implementation of supplementary control systems and extensions of compliance deadlines to eliminate this problem.

Q. By relaxing auto emission requirements, aren't you letting the auto industry off the hook and at the same time lowering the quality of our air?

A. No. We are actually moving to a tougher standard than now in force. I would like to emphasize that compliance with the legislative standards will still be required and cleaner air will thus be achieved. The interim standards set carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions at the current California levels (9.0 grams and .9 grams per mile respectively) and NO_x emissions at 3.1 grams per mile for all States except California, where 2.0 grams per mile will still be required. Thus, the quality of our air will not be significantly impaired nor will we be retreating to the uncontrolled emission levels allowed before the passage of the Clean Air Act.

The proposal to extend the time required to comply with the original 1977 auto emission standards is based on the need to balance fuel conservation with the Clean Air Act requirements; simply proceeding with the present schedule for emission controls would have involved the additional consumption of 1 1/2 to 5 1/2 billion gallons of gasoline per year by 1980. By extending the time required to comply with the final emission limitations we achieve fuel conservation in the form of a 40 percent fuel efficiency improvement.



Q. What are your plans for stack gas scrubbers?

A. Certainly some types of scrubbers have not reached the level of effectiveness that other designs have reached. However, scrubbers will play an important role in our future expanded use of coal. By 1985, we expect that all plants which need scrubbers will have them.

Q. Won't the Clean Air Act (CAA) and the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act (ESECA) Amendments which you are proposing mean a retreat from our present efforts to clean the nation's air?

A. No, it will not. There will be a delay in achieving certain standards but the commitment remains firm.

The purpose of these proposed amendments is to facilitate the use of coal thereby reducing our dependence on imported oil and to resolve the clean fuels shortage created by the unavailability of low sulfur coal and stack gas scrubbers. In no way are they intended to trade off our environmental needs for some quick energy solutions.

Q. How will your plan to convert electric utilities from oil to coal affect air quality?

A. There may be an absolute increase in air pollution as a result of converting from oil to coal but the burning of coal itself will not adversely affect air quality since all coal conversion candidates will have to develop plans for complying with primary air quality standards. These plans must be approved by the Environmental Protection Agency before conversion orders may be placed in effect. In certain instances, an oil burning facility required to convert to coal may have difficulty obtaining the necessary low sulfur coal or pollution control equipment. Such facilities will not be converted unless they can comply with ambient air quality standards which protect health.

Q. It has been reported that the delays you propose in auto emission requirements represent a deal with Detroit to gain your 40% fuel efficiency goal -- is this true?

A. No, there is no deal involved. But this action is a recognition of the technical limitations that now exist in trying to meet both the auto emission requirements as they presently exist and the 40% increased fuel efficiency goal. By allowing for the delay we are providing for a more gradual and less disruptive development of emission control equipment while at the same time achieving a 40% increase in fuel efficiency.



STRIP MINING LEGISLATION

- Q. How will your proposed strip mining bill differ from the proposed bill which Congress developed and you vetoed?
- A. On December 30, 1974, I gave my objections to the strip mining bill proposed by Congress. The Congressional bill would have resulted in a reduction in coal production, and also contained too many vague and unclear requirements that could have led to an extensive litigation between the Federal Government and various private interest groups. The bill I will propose will be similar in many respects to the bill developed by Congress but amended to minimize these objections.

COAL LEASING AND PRICES

- Q. Why do we need increased coal leasing in the United States?
- A. In order for the nation to meet the goals I have announced, we must act quickly to remove constraints and provide new incentives for domestic production. We must focus our production capability on coal as it is our most abundant domestic resource. The Federal Government owns over 200 billion tons of coal reserves, but only 6 billion tons are currently scheduled to support production by 1980. Thus, we should move ahead to design a new program of coal leasing and should speed up production from these leases, providing the environmental impact of these actions is acceptable.
- Q. What was the effect of the United Mine Workers strike on coal prices?
- A. Coal prices rose substantially on the spot market in anticipation of and during the UMW strike. The cost of the new UMW contract will add approximately \$2-3 to the price of a ton of coal in 3 years. Other factors continue to exert upward pressure on coal prices, the most notable of which is the return to the use of less expensive coal in place of higher priced oil by electric utilities.
- Q. Even though the reserves are there, can the coal industry produce as much coal as we need in the short term?
- A. If we eliminate the uncertainties surrounding coal production, we can substantially close the gap between coal supply and demand. The program I have outlined addresses all these uncertainties (stripmining legislation, coal leasing, Clean Air Act implementation, oil import policy, natural gas pricing policy and electricity demand) and should serve to assure an increased production of coal. We may not, however, be able to assure that coal production meets our demands in the very near future due to the current high oil prices and the shortage of natural gas which heightens coal use. Increased coal production is also constrained by manpower and equipment shortages in the short term.



ELECTRIC UTILITIES

Q. What legislative changes are you proposing for electric utility rate structures?

A. The legislation we are proposing will require state regulatory authorities to permit the utilities under their jurisdiction to generate sufficient revenues to cover costs during a period of rapid inflation and heavy capital expansion requirements.

Three of the provisions, including the cost of construction work in progress in the rate base mandating fuel adjustment pass-throughs, and setting a 5 month maximum processing time for regulatory hearings, would require all authorities to adopt procedures that are now being used in many jurisdictions.

The off-peak pricing proposal would prevent authorities from limiting electric utilities in their efforts to increase revenues by selling more power during slack demand periods.

Q. You said you would take further actions to aid electric utilities if necessary. What actions do you anticipate?

A. At this time, more than 60 percent of all planned nuclear plants have been delayed or cancelled. The Energy Resources Council will be working with the utilities and, if warranted, we will propose additional measures to get these plants going again.

Q. Many of these proposals will lead to increases in utility rates. How large will these increases be?

A. The inclusion of Construction Work in Progress in the rate base would add about 11 percent a year to prices and the limitation on rate decision delay would add about 5 percent next year, and probably less thereafter. The other proposals would add 1 to 2 percent to rates. In all, for the first full year in which the charges would take effect, the additional increase would be almost 20 percent.

Q. Why are you proposing rate increases in a time of double-digit inflation?

A. The increases in cost of electricity must be paid either directly by consumers, or indirectly through Government subsidy. Direct increases will cut back demand and reduce the overall increase required. A Government subsidy, on the other hand, means that everybody pays, whether they use more or less. Therefore, price increases for electricity will assure that those who use more, pay more.

Q. I'm using less electricity but paying more. Why?

A. Under last year's unusual circumstances (unprecedented oil price increases) the average per unit cost of electricity to industry rose 55 percent and 20 percent to residential consumers. This increase was so large that it offset most efforts to cut consumption. Rates should not increase as fast this year.

Q. Isn't the electric utility industry already making record profits?

A. Profits did increase through 1973. However, in 1974, they began to decline. For the first three quarters of 1974, aggregate profits for the utility industry declined by about 7 percent from those of the equivalent period of 1973. The critical issue, however, is that investor-owned electric utilities are now earning less than three times their total interest charges. A number of utilities are only barely meeting statutory requirements for interest coverage.

Q. How do you intend to monitor what electric utilities pay for fuel to make sure they are trying to be as cost-conscious as possible?

A. Our proposal calls for the appropriate local regulatory authority to allow a justified fuel pass-through. It will continue to be the function of that authority to oversee these regulations.



Q. If investor-owned utilities are unable to remain solvent without Federal intervention, why aren't you proposing public ownership at the State/municipal level or nationalization?

A. Public ownership as a solution implies that such ownership can solve the problem more cheaply. However, there is no consensus that publicly owned power is cheaper than privately owned power in the United States, except to the extent that it receives subsidization through cheaper capital and lower taxes. Such subsidy would tend to stimulate consumption relative to private ownership, and would be more expensive in the long run.

Q. Aren't you suggesting an infringement of states' rights? Isn't this unconstitutional?

A. While regulation of utility rates has traditionally been under State jurisdiction, the interest of the country as a whole is at stake. Specifically, the Interstate Commerce Clause gives the Federal Government the authority to regulate activities that affect interstate commerce - and it has been determined that consumption of electricity does affect interstate commerce. Most of these proposals are not new and already exist in many states. What we propose will establish uniformity across the nation resulting in more equitable treatment of all public utilities.

Q. What will the role of the States be in energy facility siting?

A. Under the proposed facilities siting legislation, States will be required to develop and submit comprehensive management plans to the FEA for the siting and construction of needed energy facilities within their boundaries. Each management plan will have to be approved by the FEA before State implementation may begin.

Q. What if FEA does not approve a plan?

A. If a State fails to formulate an acceptable plan, the FEA Administrator may promulgate an energy facility management program for the State to administer.

Q. Can a State veto an FEA promulgated plan?

A. No.

Q. Will the bill authorize FEA to overturn a State decision on a particular site application?

A. No. If a State fails to comply with the plans requirements in a particular case, the applicant may seek relief in the courts.



ENERGY CONSERVATION

Q. Are the specific conservation measures you've proposed tough enough to provide the petroleum demand reduction necessary to achieve the import goal in 1977?

A. Yes, they are. We are setting a goal to reduce imports by 2 MMB/D by the end of 1977. The savings from increased taxes and import fees amounts to 1.6 MMB/D while coal conversion will bring an 0.3 MMB/D oil saving. The development of Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve will allow us to cut another 0.3 MMB/D from our import needs and additional conservation programs (public information, auto efficiency standards, thermal standards, voluntary appliance standards) will save even more.

Q. Why do we need long term conservation measures if, according to the Project Independence Report, accelerated development of our supplies alone will lead us to energy independence in 1985 if oil prices stay at \$11 per barrel?

A. We need long term conservation goals specifically because we do not expect that the future price of world oil will be \$11 and we do not want prices that high. Since the world price may drop considerably below \$11 per barrel, we must make sure that the resulting increased demand will not increase our imports. We also need to stop using energy wastefully and to preserve our limited oil resources as much as possible.

Q. Will the conservation program you proposed result in attainment of the goal of one million barrels per day savings in imports for 1975 that you established in your energy message to Congress in October, 1974?

A. Yes. If it is all carried out -- higher prices resulting from the tariff and excise taxes, combined with the comparatively smaller immediate effects of specific conservation measures, such as the expanded conservation education program, the development of the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve, and coal conversion should provide us with at least one million barrels per day savings in projected imports by the fourth quarter of 1975.

However, attainment of this very near term goal is not enough. Our attention must turn to the far tougher goals of reducing our vulnerability to foreign supply curtailments through 1977, and eliminating it by 1985.

Q. If energy efficiency improvements in the home effectively reduce fuel costs, why is a tax credit needed for thermal improvements?

A. More and more Americans are highly mobile and do not remain in the same house for long periods of time. Because of this factor, and because it may take a few years to make thermal insulation pay off economically, a tax credit will encourage homeowners to insulate now regardless of how long they reside in the same house.

Secondly, because the economics of insulation do not pay off quickly, homeowners will have to pay higher first costs. In this period of recession many will find it difficult to pay higher first costs and a tax credit will help.

Q. Has the 55 m.p.h. speed limit been effective?

A. Yes. Lower speed limits are directly attributable to lower death rates on our highways and is a factor in reduced gasoline consumption. As you know, the President just signed into law a bill making the 55 m.p.h. speed limit a national mandatory limit for interstate highways and urges all State Governors to vigorously enforce this limit.

Q. What steps are you taking to assure that conservation goals are met by industry?

A. Members of the Administration have been meeting with industrial leaders on a regular basis to work out programs of industrial conservation. We are receiving commitments from these industries to conserve more energy and I am confident that industry is prepared to conserve as much as possible. If savings are not achieved by voluntary means, however, mandatory measures will be considered.



- Q. Will the mandatory thermal standards delay recovery for the construction industry anticipated during the second half of 1975?
- A. Since the mandatory thermal standards proposed will take six months to formulate, and subsequently will be implemented in a phased program over three years, this conservation action should have no impact on the recovery of construction expected during 1975.
- Q. Why did you decide against mandatory appliance standards?
- A. As in the case of automobile efficiency standards, before the Government should intervene in the marketplace, industry should be provided an opportunity to demonstrate that it can act responsibly and responsively to the higher value on energy. For this reason, we have allowed a short period for industry to voluntarily institute measures to increase energy efficiency in appliances and have asked the Energy Resources Council to work with industry to establish the voluntary standards.
- Q. Why haven't you initiated any new public transportation programs?
- A. We are already doing a number of things to stimulate use of mass transit, including a rapid increase in funds for its development. Additional actions have not been taken because they would only result in small additional savings of energy.
- Q. Do you think your total energy program places as much emphasis on conservation as it does on resource development?
- A. Yes. The program being proposed is a tough mandatory energy conservation program and relies heavily on conservation to reduce imports in the short-term.

EMERGENCY PLANNING MEASURES

What products will be stored - crude as well as refined products?

A. We currently anticipate that we will store predominantly crude oil, although there will probably be some storage of petroleum products, mainly for the needs of the Northeastern part of our country. The specific amounts of each type of storage will be determined in the planning stages.

Q. How will the program be financed and will the owner be public or private?

A. We have not fully established how the program will be financed, or who will own the storage facilities. These questions will be fully explored later in the planning and engineering stages.

Q. How will the program be financed and will the owner be public or private?

A. We have not fully established how the program will be financed, or who will own the storage facilities. These questions will be fully explored later in the planning and engineering stages.

Q. How will the program be financed and will the owner be public or private?

A. We have not fully established how the program will be financed, or who will own the storage facilities. These questions will be fully explored later in the planning and engineering stages.



EMERGENCY STORAGE

- Q. What kind of specific authority are you requesting with regard to emergency storage?
- A. We are requesting authority to create and maintain a strategic reserve capacity of more than 1 billion barrels of petroleum and petroleum products and the authority to determine under what circumstances and to what extent those reserves should be used during emergency situations. This is sufficient to provide 3 million barrels of oil per day for a full year.
- Q. What is the benefit of a storage program to safeguard against an embargo if it won't be operational until 1980?
- A. While it is true that a storage program won't be fully operational before 1980, it will provide some protection between now and then as stocks are gradually accumulated. Further, we will need the protection provided by a storage program after 1980, as the nation will continue to be dependent upon foreign imports to meet some portion of its energy needs. During this interim period, we will continue our efforts toward stringent conservation by all consuming nations.
- Q. How will the program be financed and will the ownership be public or private?
- A. We have not firmly established yet how the program will be financed or who will own the storage facilities. These questions will be fully explored later in the planning and engineering stage.
- Q. What products will be stored - crude as well as refined products?
- A. We currently anticipate that we will store predominantly crude oil, although there will probably be some storage of petroleum products, mainly for the needs of the Northeastern part of our country. The specific amounts of each type of storage will be determined in the planning stages.

- Q. Why would oil be stored in salt domes located in the Gulf Coast, when other regions are heavily import dependent?
- A. Suitable salt domes provide inexpensive storage facilities and are located near crude oil distribution centers, refineries, and transportation facilities. Thus, during an embargo, oil stored in salt domes will be readily available to all sections of the country at equitable cost.
- Q. How will the military be provided for in the event of another embargo?
- A. Of the 1.3 billion barrels of petroleum emergency storage capacity, 300 million barrels will be reserved for national defense needs in case of an emergency.
- Q. Won't petroleum for storage have to be purchased from high priced foreign oil?
- A. No. We will not purchase significant quantities of oil for at least a couple of years, at which time prices may have broken. In addition, our strategic reserves will be partially filled from domestic sources.
- Q. Will we store all the oil in salt domes, or will some be stored in conventional tanks?
- A. The type of storage facility, location and the mix of crude oil and product to be stored will be determined in a report to Congress one year after enactment of the Strategic Reserve Bill. However, preliminary studies indicate that crude oil will comprise the majority of the reserve and will be stored in salt domes, although there will probably be selected product storage in steel tanks.



STANDBY AUTHORITY

Q. What kind of standby authority are you asking for?

A. The main features of the proposed legislation to deal with emergency situations are:

- to allocate and control the price of domestic oil;
- to ration end use of energy directly if necessary;
- to implement energy conservation programs;
- to increase domestic oil production and allocate supplies of critical materials.
- to regulate and control petroleum inventories.

This legislation will also contain authority for the U.S. to comply with the International Energy Program requiring international sharing of oil in times of emergency.

Q. Why are you asking Congress for standby energy emergency authorities?

A. In an emergency situation, such as an embargo, the President should have the authority to act quickly and effectively to minimize the impact on this country. Furthermore, standby conservation authority is one of the requirements of the International Energy Plan. I must emphasize, however, that this is "standby" authority to be activated only in a time of crisis.

LONG-TERM ACTIONS

Q. Will your Synthetic Fuels Commercialization Program encourage oil shale development at the expense of the environment?

A. No. The program could lessen environmental impacts if we can learn to commercialize cleaner types of production, such as in-situ processing of oil shale. In addition, one of the important purposes of this program will be to investigate and determine the environmental problems associated with synthetic fuels development and to identify the solutions.

Only when we have developed commercially feasible technologies which are environmentally acceptable will we proceed to the final step of full commercial implementation.



RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Q. What are you doing about solar energy development?

A. Federal funding for solar energy R&D has climbed from approximately \$3 million in FY 1972 to approximately \$50 million in FY 1975. The recently enacted Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1974 provides an additional \$60 million over five years for developing and demonstrating solar heating and cooling technology. Planning is well underway to implement this program. The Solar Research and Development Act which was also just recently enacted authorizes another \$75 million in FY 1976 for solar energy R&D. The Administration is continuing to review the requirements of the program to determine the appropriate level of funding that can be usefully spent over the next five years to develop solar energy technology.

Q. What are your specific proposals with regard to increasing nuclear R&D?

A. Nuclear energy holds great promise in satisfying our energy demand. Unfortunately, it now accounts for only 1% of our energy needs due to technical problems, construction delays, and other bottlenecks which have slowed its progress. We are markedly increasing the budget appropriation for nuclear waste disposal and for continued improvements in safeguards.

Q. Will your Synthetic Fuels Commercialization Program encourage oil shale development at the expense of the environment?

A. No. The program could lessen environmental impacts if we can learn to commercialize cleaner types of production, such as in-situ processing of oil shale. In addition, one of the important purposes of this program will be to investigate and determine the environmental problems associated with synthetic fuels development and to identify the solutions.

Only when we have developed commercially useable technologies which are environmentally acceptable will we proceed to the final step of full commercial implementation.

Q. Many environmentalists are concerned about the development and use of the nuclear breeder reactor -- what is the Administration's position on this issue?

A. We have continued support of an expanded R&D program for breeder reactors and will spend over \$500 million in FY 76 to answer some of these questions.

All projections indicate that nuclear power will become an increasingly important source of electric power generation. However, for such growth to occur, nuclear fuel will need to be readily available, for our supply of economically available domestic nuclear fuel is limited. Thus, we must supplement this domestic supply by developing other supply sources.

The breeder reactor is one such supply source. Other sources of nuclear fuel and other methods for nuclear power generation are also being investigated.

Q. What role will ERDA play in achieving these goals?

A. ERDA's mission is to develop ways of using solar energy, geothermal energy, nuclear power, coal gasification and other new or undeveloped energy sources and will play a major role in achieving our long-term goals.



ECONOMIC IMPACT

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Q. What impact will be made on the Federal budget by those programs proposed within the energy message?

A. There will be very small budget impacts in FY 75. In FY 76 these programs could increase Federal obligations by 100-200 million dollars, mostly for conservation and facility siting programs, but of course those are more than offset by the revenues raised by the conservation tax measures.

The emergency storage program will be financed from a special fund which will utilize revenues from Naval Petroleum Reserve production.

Q. The Administration expects prices of energy and energy-intensive goods to rise, and plans to offset the impact by reducing income taxes. Won't this affect individuals and income groups differently? Will low-income households tend to be affected more? How does the Administration plan to assist low-income households?

A. Individuals and income groups will be affected differently by these proposals. What we can do and are doing is to provide a level of tax relief that will stimulate the entire economy for the benefit of all citizens. These tax cuts proposed by the Administration will provide relief to low-income households. In addition a rebate of \$80 per adult will be provided to individuals whose incomes are so low that they do not pay taxes.

Q. What are the long run and short run effects of the President's program on the regional costs of energy?

A. While there will be some significant fuel price increases in the Northeast, the uneven regional effects will be dealt with through the existing cost equalization program and lower product import fees. In the longer term, regional effects will be handled by decontrolling the price of crude oil and thus eliminating any petroleum price differentials.



Q. What will the effects of the program be on the economy in terms of inflation and recession?

A. This program contains the balancing elements essential to meet the problems inherent in the existing economic environment. It will reduce our balance of payments, increase domestic resource development, and encourage recognition of the need for energy conservation and the fact that energy is no longer abundant. This program will produce higher prices in the short run which will result in a one-time increase in inflation, but will prepare us for dealing with future energy disruptions which could be devastating to our economy.

Q. How much will all your programs increase the average family's bills in a year?

A. This program is estimated to increase the average middle-income family's energy budget by about \$250 in 1975.

Q. What will be the effect of this program on the dollar outflow for oil?

A. The United States spent \$2.7 billion on petroleum imports in 1970. This dollar outflow rose to \$23.6 billion in 1974. If no new actions are initiated, we estimate the petroleum revenue outflow to reach \$32.1 billion in 1977 and \$32.4 billion in 1985. With this program, we estimate outflows to be \$21.3 billion in 1977 and \$12.0 billion in 1985.


INTERNATIONAL



GENERAL


- Q. Do you believe that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is a hindrance to the development of domestic energy production?
- A. No, I do not. NEPA was promulgated to insure that environmental concerns were considered in Government decision making. Because of this new, major consideration, decision making will in many instances take more time and require more detailed review than was required in the past. However, this process should ensure that the energy projects selected will maintain the quality of the environment.
- Q. What would be the projected profit picture for the oil industry this year if a windfall profits tax were enacted? If one were not enacted?
- A. Either way, we estimate that profits will be relatively constant this year. If we maintain price controls but do not enact a windfall profits tax, we can expect industry profits to remain stable. If we decontrol old oil and enact a tax, we can expect a small decrease in profits from last year's levels.
- Q. What are you going to do about getting New England to build refineries?
- A. The Administration intends to encourage refinery construction in all areas of the country and particularly in those in which there is a significant refining deficit. In New England, for example, it would be beneficial to have refining capability now and particularly if Atlantic OCS production begins. Refineries in that area could offset New England's extensive reliance on product imports and could create jobs.
- Q. Why do we say that independence and self-sufficiency can now be attained in 1985 rather than 1980 as was earlier announced by President Nixon?
- A. After a thorough review of potential domestic supply and demand for all fuels, on a regional basis, we have concluded that independence by 1980 cannot be attained. The lead-times for exploring and producing oil from new sources and for constructing new facilities is too great to expand domestic supply sufficiently.
- Q. How can you propose great increases in resource development when it is a fact that there are acute shortages of materials and equipment throughout the economy?
- A. At present, many categories of steel products, plate and tubular goods are in short supply. There is little that can be done to accelerate supply in the next 2-3 years and that is why this program concentrates on reducing demand. Within the 1975-1985 time period, however, new capacity will come on-stream and the problem will be eased.
- Q. In compiling your energy message, whose statistical data did you rely on -- industry or government?
- A. Ours. One of the real achievements in the last year was growth in the capability of the Federal government to provide its own energy data. The analyses in this program were developed by the government using its own reporting systems and analytical tools.
- Q. What can the public do to contribute to the success of your program?
- A. I am hoping that all Americans will support this program in every way possible. The most significant contribution the average consumer can make is in the area of energy conservation -- by installing thermally efficient insulation in their homes, by lowering thermostats, by driving 55 MPH and by driving less. The greatest contributions will come when we all learn how to conserve which is why I have requested an increase of \$4 million in the government's public information program. We will try to explain the rationale and effects of this program to all Americans in the next several weeks.
- Q. What is the effect of the Trans Alaska Pipeline on domestic supply plans and will it help the situation? Are there any plans to speed up construction? What about a second pipeline?
- A. The Trans Alaska Pipeline will supply more than 2 MMB/D of domestic crude production, almost 20 percent above current production levels. To assure rapid completion of the pipeline, the Administration has already given priority to its requirements of equipment and materials. A second pipeline could be constructed later if necessary.

PETROLEUM TRENDS



U/15/757


THE PRESIDENT'S SHORT-TERM PROGRAM




IMPACTS OF SHORT-TERM PROGRAM

	<u>1975</u> [MMB/D]	<u>1977</u> [MMB/D]
CONSUMPTION IF NO NEW ACTIONS	18.0	18.3
IMPORTS IF NO NEW ACTIONS	6.5	8.0
IMPORT SAVINGS		
LESS SAVINGS BY SHORT-TERM ACTIONS:	<u>1975</u> [MMB/D]	<u>1977</u> [MMB/D]
PRODUCTION FROM ELK HILLS	0.2	0.3
COAL CONVERSION	0.1	0.3
TAX PACKAGE	<u>0.9</u>	<u>1.6</u>
TOTAL IMPORT SAVINGS	1.2	2.2
REMAINING IMPORTS	5.3	5.8


PRICE EFFECTS OF PROGRAM



ACTIONS TO BECOME INDEPENDENT



IMPACT OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAMS ON PETROLEUM IMPORTS




EFFECTS OF MID-TERM PROGRAM (1985)

DEMAND WITH NO NEW ACTIONS	23.9 MMB/D
IMPORTS WITH NO NEW ACTIONS	12.7 MMB/D
LESS SAVINGS ACHIEVED BY FOLLOWING ACTIONS:	1985 IMPACT ON IMPORTS [MMB/D]
OCS LEASING	1.5
NPR-4 DEVELOPMENT	2.0
COAL CONVERSION	0.4
SYNTHETIC FUEL COMMERCIALIZATION	0.3
AUTO EFFICIENCY STANDARDS	1.0
CONTINUATION OF TAXES	2.1
APPLIANCE EFFICIENCY GOALS	0.1
INSULATION TAX CREDIT	0.3
THERMAL STANDARDS	0.3
TOTAL IMPORT SAVINGS BY ACTIONS	8.0
REMAINING IMPORTS	4.7
LESS:	
EMERGENCY STORAGE	3.0
STANDBY AUTHORITIES	1.7
NET IMPORT VULNERABILITY	0

[1/15/75]


1973 CRUDE PETROLEUM PRODUCTION AND PETROLEUM PRODUCT CONSUMPTION FOR MAJOR PRODUCING AND CONSUMING AREAS (MMB/D)



1/15/85



U. S. EXPENDITURES FOR FOREIGN OIL



OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS
OF
PRESIDENT GERALD FORD
TO A JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

THE HOUSE CHAMBER

1:06 P.M. EST

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of the 94th Congress, and distinguished guests:

Twenty-six years ago, a freshman Congressman, a young fellow, with lots of idealism who was out to change the world, stood before Sam Rayburn in the well of the House and solemnly swore to the same oath that all of you took yesterday, an unforgettable experience, and I congratulate you all.

Two days later, that same freshman stood at the back of this great Chamber, over there someplace, as President Truman, all charged up by his single-handed election victory, reported as the Constitution requires on the State of the Union.

When the bipartisan applause stopped, President Truman said, "I am happy to report to the 81st Congress that the State of the Union is good. Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness. It is foremost among the nations of the world in the search for peace."

Today, that freshman Member from Michigan stands where Mr. Truman stood, and I must say to you that the State of the Union is not good. Millions of Americans are out of work. Recession and inflation are eroding the money of millions more. Prices are too high and sales are too slow.

This year's Federal deficit will be about \$30 billion; next year's probably \$45 billion. The national debt will rise to over \$500 billion. Our plant capacity and productivity are not increasing fast enough. We depend on others for essential energy.

Some people question their Government's ability to make hard decisions and stick with them. They expect Washington politics as usual.

MORE

Yet, what President Truman said on January 5, 1949 is even more true in 1975. We are better able to meet our peoples' needs. All Americans do have a fairer chance to pursue happiness. Not only are we still the foremost Nation in the pursuit of peace, but today's prospects of attaining it are infinitely better.

There were 59 million Americans employed at the start of 1949. Now there are more than 85 million Americans who have jobs. In comparable dollars, the average income of the American family has doubled during the past 26 years.

MORE

Now, I want to speak very bluntly. I have got bad news, and I don't expect much, if any, applause.

The American people want action and it will take both the Congress and the President to give them what they want.

Progress and solutions can be achieved and they will be achieved. My message today is not intended to address all of the complex needs of America. I will send separate messages making specific recommendations for domestic legislation, such as the extension of General Revenue Sharing and the Voting Rights Act.

The moment has come to move in a new direction. We can do this by fashioning a new partnership between the Congress on the one hand, the White House on the other, and the people we both represent.

Let us mobilize the most powerful and most creative industrial Nation that ever existed on this earth to put all our people to work.

The emphasis on our economic efforts must now shift from inflation to jobs. To bolster business and industry and to create new jobs I propose a one-year tax reduction of \$16 billion. Three-quarters would go to individuals and one-quarter to promote business investment.

This cash rebate to individuals amounts to 12 percent of 1974 tax payments -- a total cut of \$12 billion, with a maximum of \$1,000 per return.

I call on the Congress to act by April 1. If you do -- and I hope you will -- the Treasury can send the first check for half of the rebate in May and the second by September.

The other one-fourth of the cut, about \$4 billion, will go to business, including farms, to promote expansion and to create more jobs.

The one-year reduction for businesses would be in the form of a liberalized investment tax credit increasing the rate to 12 percent for all business.

This tax cut does not include the more fundamental reforms needed in our tax system but it points us in the right direction -- allowing taxpayers rather than the Government to spend their pay.

Cutting taxes now is essential if we are to turn the economy around. A tax cut offers the best hope of creating more jobs. Unfortunately, it will increase the size of the budget deficit. Therefore, it is more important than ever that we take steps to control the growth of Federal expenditures.

MORE

Part of our trouble is that we have been self-indulgent. For decades, we have been voting ever-increasing levels of Government benefits and now the bill has come due.

We have been adding so many new programs that the size and growth of the Federal budget has taken on a life of its own.

One characteristic of these programs is that their cost increases automatically every year because the number of people eligible for most of the benefits increases every year.

MORE

When these programs were enacted, there is no dollar amount set. No one knows what they will cost. All we know is that whatever they cost last year, they will cost more next year.

It is a question of simple arithmetic. Unless we check the excessive growth of Federal expenditures, or impose on ourselves matching increases in taxes, we will continue to run huge inflationary deficits in the Federal budget.

If we project the current built-in momentum of Federal spending through the next 15 years, State, Federal and local government expenditures could easily comprise half of our Gross National Product. This compares with less than a third in 1975.

I just concluded the process of preparing the budget submissions for fiscal year 1976. In that budget, I will propose legislation to restrain the growth of a number of existing programs. I have also concluded that no new spending programs can be initiated this year, except for energy.

Further, I will not hesitate to veto any new spending programs adopted by the Congress.

As an additional step towards putting the Federal Government's house in order, I recommend a 5 percent limit on Federal pay increases in 1975. In all Government programs tied to the Consumer Price Index, including Social Security, civil service and military retirement pay and food stamps, I also propose a one year maximum increase of 5 percent. None of these recommended ceiling limitations, over which Congress has final authority, are easy to propose because in most cases they involve anticipated payments to many, many deserving people. Nonetheless, it must be done.

I must emphasize that I am not asking to eliminate, to reduce, to freeze these payments. I am merely recommending that we slow down the rate at which these payments increase and these programs grow. Only a reduction in the growth of spending can keep Federal borrowing down and reduce the damage to the private sector from high interest rates.

Only a reduction in spending can make it possible for the Federal Reserve System to avoid an inflationary growth in the money supply and thus restore balance to our economy. A major reduction in the growth of Federal spending can help dispel the uncertainty that so many feel about our economy and put us on the way to curing our economic ills.

MORE

If we don't act to slow down the rate of increase in Federal spending, the United States Treasury will be legally obligated to spend more than \$360 billion in fiscal year 1976, even if no new programs are enacted.

These are not matters of conjecture or prediction, but, again, a matter of simple arithmetic. The size of these numbers and their implications for our everyday life in the health of our economic system are shocking.

I submitted to the last Congress a list of budget deferrals and recissions. There will be more cuts recommended in the budget I will submit. Even so, the level of outlays for fiscal year 1976 is still much, much too high. Not only is it too high for this year, but the decisions we make now will inevitably have a major and growing impact on expenditure levels in future years.

MORE

I think this is a very fundamental issue that we, the Congress and I, must jointly solve. Economic disruptions we and others are experiencing stems in part from the fact that the world price of petroleum has quadrupled in the last year.

But in all honesty, we cannot put all of the blame on the oil exporting nations. We, the United States, are not blameless. Our growing dependence upon foreign sources has been adding to our vulnerability for years and years, and we did nothing to prepare ourselves for such an event as the embargo of 1973.

During the 1960s, this country had a surplus capacity of crude oil which we were able to make available to our trading partners whenever there was a disruption of supply. This surplus capacity enabled us to influence both supplies and prices of crude oil throughout the world.

Our excess capacity neutralized any effort at establishing an effective cartel, and thus the rest of the world was assured of adequate supplies of oil at reasonable prices.

By 1970 our surplus capacity had vanished and, as a consequence, the latent power of the oil cartel could emerge in full force. Europe and Japan, both heavily dependent on imported oil, now struggle to keep their economies in balance.

Even the United States, our country, which is far more self-sufficient than most other industrial countries, has been put under serious pressure.

I am proposing a program which will begin to restore our country's surplus capacity in total energy. In this way we will be able to assure ourselves reliable and adequate energy and help foster a new world energy stability for other major consuming nations.

But this Nation, and in fact the world, must face the prospect of energy difficulties between now and 1985. This program will impose burdens on all of us, with the aim of reducing our consumption of energy and increasing our production.

Great attention has been paid to the considerations of fairness, and I can assure you that the burdens will not fall more harshly on those less able to bear them.

MORE

I am recommending a plan to make us invulnerable to cutoffs of foreign oil. It will require sacrifices, but it -- and this is most important -- it will work.

I have set the following national energy goals to assure that our future is as secure and as productive as our past.

First, we must reduce oil import by one million barrels per day by the end of this year and by two million barrels per day by the end of 1977.

Second, we must end vulnerability to economic disruption by foreign suppliers by 1985.

Third, we must develop our energy technology and resources so that the United States has the ability to supply a significant share of the energy needs of the free world by the end of this century.

To attain these objectives, we need immediate action to cut imports. Unfortunately, in the short-term there are only a limited number of actions which can increase domestic supply. I will press for all of them.

I urge quick action on the necessary legislation to allow commercial production at the Elk Hills, California Naval Petroleum Reserve.

In order that we make greater use of domestic coal resources, I am submitting amendments to the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act, which will greatly increase the number of power plants that can be promptly converted to coal.

Obviously, voluntary conservation continues to be essential, but tougher programs are needed and needed now. Therefore, I am using Presidential powers to raise the fee on all imported crude oil and petroleum products.

The crude oil fee level will be increased \$1 per barrel on February 1, by \$2 per barrel on March 1 and by \$3 per barrel on April 1.

MORE

I will take action to reduce undue hardships on any geographical region. The foregoing are interim administrative actions. They will be rescinded when the broader but necessary legislation is enacted.

To that end, I am requesting the Congress to act within 90 days on a more comprehensive energy tax program. It includes: excise taxes and import fees totalling \$2.00 per barrel on product imports and on all crude oil; de-regulation of new natural gas; and enactment of a natural gas excise tax.

I plan to take Presidential initiative to de-control the price of domestic crude oil on April 1. I urge the Congress to enact a windfall profits tax by that date to insure that oil producers do not profit unduly.

The sooner Congress acts the more effective the oil conservation program will be and the quicker the Federal revenues can be returned to our people.

I am prepared to use Presidential authority to limit imports, as necessary, to guarantee success.

I want you to know that before deciding on my energy conservation program, I considered rationing and higher gasoline taxes as alternatives. In my judgment, neither would achieve the desired results and both would produce unacceptable inequities.

A massive program must be initiated to increase energy supply, to cut demand and provide new standby emergency programs to achieve the independence we want by 1985. The largest part of increased oil production must come from new frontier areas on the Outer Continental Shelf and from the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska. It is the intent of this Administration to move ahead with exploration, leasing and production on those frontier areas of the Outer Continental Shelf where the environmental risks are acceptable.

Use of our most abundant domestic resource -- coal -- is severely limited. We must strike a reasonable compromise on environmental concern with coal. I am submitting Clean Air Amendments which will allow greater coal use without sacrificing clean air goals.

I vetoed the strip mining legislation passed by the last Congress. With appropriate changes, I will sign a revised version when it comes to the White House.

I am proposing a number of actions to energize our nuclear power program. I will submit legislation to expedite nuclear leasing and the rapid selection of sites.

MORE

In recent months, utilities have cancelled or postponed over 60 percent of planned nuclear expansion and 30 percent of planned additions to non-nuclear capacity. Financing problems for that industry are worsening. I am therefore recommending that the one year investment tax credit of 12 percent be extended an additional two years to specifically speed the construction of power plants that do not use natural gas or oil.

I am also submitting proposals for selective reform of State utility commission regulations.

To provide the critical stability for our domestic energy production in the face of world price uncertainty, I will request legislation to authorize and require tariffs, import quotas or price floors to protect our energy prices at levels which will achieve energy independence.

Increasing energy supplies is not enough. We must take additional steps to cut long-term consumption. I therefore propose to the Congress legislation to make thermal efficiency standards mandatory for all new buildings in the United States; a new tax credit of up to \$150 for those home owners who install insulation equipment; the establishment of an energy conservation program to help low income families purchase insulation supplies; and legislation to modify and defer automotive pollution standards for five years which will enable us to improve automobile gas mileage by 40 percent by 1980.

MORE

These proposals and actions, cumulatively, can reduce our dependence on foreign energy supplies from three to five billion barrels per day by 1985.

To make the United States invulnerable to foreign disruption, I propose standby emergency legislation and a strategic storage program of one billion barrels of oil for domestic needs, and 300 million barrels for national defense purposes.

I will ask for the funds needed for energy research and development activity. I have established a goal of one million barrels of synthetic fuels in shale oil production per day by 1985 together with an incentive program to achieve it.

I have a very deep belief in America's capabilities. Within the next ten years, my program envisions 200 major nuclear power plants, 250 major new coal mines, 150 major coal-fired power plants, 30 major new refineries, 20 major new synthetic fuel plants, the drilling of many thousands of new oil wells, the insulation of 18 million homes, and the manufacturing and the sale of millions of new automobiles, trucks and buses that use much less fuel.

I happen to believe that we can do it. In another crisis, the one in 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said this country would build 60,000 military aircraft. By 1943, production in that program had reached 125,000 annually. They did it then. We can do it now.

If the Congress and the American people will work with me to attain these targets, they will be achieved and will be surpassed. From adversity, let us seize opportunity. Revenues of some \$30 billion from higher energy taxes designed to encourage conservation must be returned to the American people in a manner which corrects distortions in our tax system wrought by inflation.

People have been pushed into higher tax brackets by inflation with consequent reduction in their actual spending power. Business taxes are similarly distorted because inflation exaggerates reported profits resulting in excessive taxes.

Accordingly, I propose that future individual income taxes be reduced by \$16.5 billion. This will be done by raising the low income allowance and reducing tax rates. This continuing tax cut will primarily benefit lower and middle income taxpayers.

MORE

For example, a typical family of four with a gross income of \$5,600 now pays \$185 in Federal income taxes. Under this tax cut plan, they would pay nothing. A family of four with a gross income of \$12,500 now pays \$1,260 in Federal taxes. My proposal reduces that total by \$300. Families grossing \$20,000 would receive a reduction of \$210.

Those with the very lowest incomes, who can least afford higher costs, must also be compensated. I propose a payment of \$80 to every person 18 years of age and older in that very limited category.

State and local governments will receive \$2 billion in additional revenue sharing to offset their increased energy costs. To offset inflationary distortions and to generate more economic activity, the corporate tax rate will be reduced from 48 percent to 42 percent.

Now let me turn, if I might, to the international dimensions of the present crisis. At no time in our peacetime history has the state of the Nation depended more heavily on the state of the world and seldom, if ever, has the state of the world depended more heavily on the state of our Nation.

The economic distress is global. We will not solve it at home unless we help to remedy the profound economic dislocation abroad. World trade and monetary structure provides markets, energy, food and vital raw material for all nations.

This international system is now in jeopardy. This Nation can be proud of significant achievements in recent years in solving problems and crises.

The Berlin agreement, the SALT agreements, our new relationship with China, the unprecedented efforts in the Middle East are immensely encouraging, but the world is not free from crisis.

In a world of 150 nations where nuclear technology is proliferating and regional conflicts continue, international security cannot be taken for granted.

MORE

So, let there be no mistake about it, international cooperation is a vital factor of our lives today. This is not a moment for the American people to turn inward. More than ever before, our own well-being depends on America's determination and America's leadership in the whole wide world.

We are a great Nation -- spiritually, politically, militarily, diplomatically and economically. America's commitment to international security has sustained the safety of allies and friends in many areas -- in the Middle East, in Europe and Asia. Our turning away would unleash new instabilities and dangers around the globe, which, in turn, would threaten our own security.

At the end of World War II, we turned a similar challenge into a historic opportunity, and I might add, historic achievement. An old order was in disarray; political and economic institutions were shattered. In that period, this Nation and its partners build new institutions, new mechanisms of mutual support and cooperation. Today, as then, we face an historic opportunity.

If we act imaginatively and boldly as we acted then, this period will in retrospect be seen as one of the great creative moments of our Nation's history. The whole world is watching us to see how we respond.

A resurgent American economy would do more to restore the confidence of the world in its own future than anything else we can do. The program that this Congress passes can demonstrate to the world that we have started to put our own house in order. If we can show that this Nation is able and willing to help other nations meet the common challenge, it can demonstrate that the United States will fulfill its responsibilities as a leader among nations. Quite frankly, at stake is the future of industrialized democracies, which have perceived their destiny in common and sustained it in common for 30 years.

The developing nations are also at a turning point. The poorest nations see their hopes of feeding their hungry and developing their societies shattered by the economic crisis. The long-term economic future for the producers of raw materials also depends on cooperative solutions.

Our relations with the Communist countries are a basic factor of the world environment. We must seek to build a long-term basis for coexistence. We will stand by our principles. We will stand by our interests. We will act firmly when challenged. The kind of a world we want depends on a broad policy of creating mutual incentives for restraint and for cooperation.

MORE

As we move forward to meet our global challenges and opportunities, we must have the tools to do the job.

Our military forces are strong and ready. This military strength deters aggression against our allies, stabilizes our relations with former adversaries and protects our homeland. Fully adequate conventional and strategic forces cost many, many billions, but these dollars are sound insurance for our safety and for a more peaceful world.

Military strength alone is not sufficient. Effective diplomacy is also essential in preventing conflict and in building world understanding. The Vladivostok negotiations with the Soviet Union represent a major step in moderating strategic arms competition. My recent discussions with the leaders of the Atlantic Community, Japan and South Korea have contributed to our meeting the common challenge.

MORE

But we have serious problems before us that require cooperation between the President and the Congress. By the Constitution and the tradition, the discussion of foreign policy is the responsibility of the President. In recent years, under the stress of the Vietnam war, legislative restrictions on the President's ability to execute foreign policy and military decisions have proliferated.

As a Member of the Congress I opposed some and I approved others. As President I welcome the advice and cooperation of the House and the Senate.

But if our foreign policy is to be successful, we cannot rigidly restrict in legislation the ability of the President to act. The conduct of negotiation is ill-suited to such limitation. Legislative restrictions, intended for the best motives and purposes, can have the opposite result, as we have seen most recently in our trade relations with the Soviet Union.

For my part, I pledge this Administration will act in the closest consultation with the Congress as we face delicate situations and troubled times throughout the globe.

When I became President only five months ago, I promised the last Congress a policy of communication, conciliation, compromise and cooperation. I renew that pledge to the new Members of this Congress.

Let me sum it up. America needs a new direction, which I have sought to chart here today, a change of course which will put the unemployed back to work, increase real income and production, restrain the growth of Federal Government spending, achieve energy independence and advance the cause of world understanding.

We have the ability. We have the know-how. In partnership with the American people, we will achieve these objectives. As our 200th anniversary approaches, we owe it to ourselves, to posterity, to rebuild our political and economic strength.

Let us make America once again and for centuries more to come what it has so long been, a stronghold and a beacon light of liberty for the whole world.

Thank you.

END (AT 1:50 P.M. EST)