
Ray Dudley

Bres Hoffman

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Recycling

ANNUAL MEETING OF NATIONAL PETROLEUM
REFINERS ASSOCIATION

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

APRIL 2, 1973

My 1926 - Model T
1928 - Model A

1930 . . .

Note: This speech has been retyped for
Record House. So there is an MIST connected tapes.
4/24

President Hoffman -

L I WAS SURPRISED TO HEAR YOUR PRESIDENT REFER TO
THE FAIR TRADE HEARINGS BACK IN THE FIFTIES. I THOUGHT
EVERYONE HAD FORGOTTEN ABOUT THEM.

L YOU PROBABLY KNOW THAT AS A FORMER DRUGGIST I
HAVE ALWAYS HAD A PARTICULAR INTEREST IN THE ~~SMALL~~
INDEPENDENT BUSINESSMAN.

L THOSE PRICE WARS OF THE FIFTIES, IN GASOLINE MARKET-
ING WERE RUINING MANY OF THE DEALERS. (I ALWAYS
FELT THAT ENDING THOSE PRICE WARS BENEFITED ~~THE~~ THE
DEALERS AND THE REFINERS--AND THE CONSUMER AS WELL,
~~BECAUSE~~ PRICE WARS THAT DESTROY THE INDEPENDENT DEALER

DO NOT PROMOTE REAL COMPETITION FOR A LONG PERIOD, and
when competition is eliminated
the consumer is the one who
pays.

-2-

L WELL, CONDITIONS HAVE CHANGED. AT THAT TIME,
THE DEALERS AND THE REFINERS WERE FACED WITH TROUBLE
BECAUSE OF SURPLUSES. L EVERYONE WAS TRYING TO DISPOSE
OF HIS SURPLUS BY 'DUMPING' IT SOMEWHERE ELSE. TODAY,
YOU SHOULD ONLY HAVE SUCH PROBLEMS.

} agree
tho!
funnier
too,

L INDEPENDENT MARKETERS ARE IN TROUBLE BECAUSE
THERE IS A SHORTAGE OF PRODUCT.

L THOUGH THE PROBLEM IS DIFFERENT, THE PRINCIPLE
IS THE SAME--WE MUST KEEP INDEPENDENT MARKETERS AND
REFINERS IN BUSINESS.

-3-

ONE OF THE GREAT STRENGTHS OF THE OIL INDUSTRY
IS THAT IT IS TRULY DIVERSIFIED WITH REAL COMPETITION
IN BOTH MANUFACTURING AND MARKETING *and it*
IS JUST AS IMPORTANT ~~TO YOU~~ TO MAINTAIN THE INDEPENDENT
SECTOR IN TIMES OF SHORTAGE AS IT WAS IN THE TIMES OF
SURPLUS.

#
HOW DID WE ALL GET INTO THIS FIX--THIS SHORTAGE
WHICH IS GOING TO GET WORSE BEFORE IT GETS BETTER--THIS
ENERGY CRISIS?

LAST WINTER, WE GOT OUR FIRST REAL TASTE OF IT:

-4-

--SCHOOLS, FACTORIES CLOSED IN THE MIDWEST DUE TO
LACK OF HEATING OIL;

--GRAIN SHIPMENTS STRANDED ON BARGES ON THE OHIO
RIVER;

--JET FUEL SO SCARCE THAT PLANES COULDN'T MAKE
NONSTOP FLIGHTS TO THE WEST COAST.

L NOW THIS SUMMER WE'RE ABOUT TO FACE A GASOLINE
SHORTAGE.

L WHY IS THIS? YOU KNOW THE BASIC REASON, AS
DAVID FREEMAN OF THE FORD FOUNDATION SAYS, "THE JOY
RIDE IS OVER."

-5-

L THE HAPPY ERA OF LOW COSTS, LOW RISKS, AND HIGH
BENEFITS IS OVER.

IN TERMS OF PROVEN RECOVERABLE RESERVES,
--WE HAVE 10 YEARS ~~WORTH~~ OF OIL LEFT AND 11 YEARS
OF NATURAL GAS, ~~WORTH~~.

ON THE OTHER HAND,
--WE HAVE ANYWHERE FROM 35 TO 120 YEARS OF SHALE
OIL RESERVES.

--AND 500 YEARS ~~WORTH~~ OF COAL.

L THE PROBLEM, OF COURSE, IS THAT THIS NATION HAS
NOT BOTHERED TO DEVELOP THE TECHNOLOGY AND KNOW-HOW TO
USE THOSE RESOURCES WITH THE GREATEST POTENTIAL.

L WE ARE IN THE POSITION OF A MAN WHO IS ABOUT TO
FACE STARVATION--WHO HAS A MILLION DOLLARS--BUT IS IN
SOME FOREIGN COUNTRY THAT IS UNWILLING TO EXCHANGE HIS
MONEY FOR LOCAL CURRENCY. L BY THE TIME HE GETS TO
ANOTHER COUNTRY THAT WILL COOPERATE, IT MAY BE TOO LATE.

L HOW DID HE GET IN THAT SITUATION?

HE GOT THERE BECAUSE HE WAS OFF ON A JOYRIDE, NOT
PAYING ATTENTION TO WHERE HE WAS GOING.

L THERE ARE TWO REASONS WHY THERE HAS BEEN INADEQUATE
PLANNING IN THIS AREA:

L THE FIRST IS THAT ENERGY POLICY IS A MORE COMPLI-
CATED BUSINESS THAN ALMOST ANY OTHER AREA OF ~~GOVERNMENT~~

or government?

It is an incredible mix of technology, economics, trade,

policy, foreign relations and consumer economics.

The second reason is that

have not seem to believe in long-range planning in the

domestic area, the ideology of the free-market-place

is so pervasive that the idea of trying to plan for a

balance of supply v. demand in energy resources cannot

really get off the ground.

of Resources.

We direly need a national energy policy, but I

am frankly skeptical that this administration will give

us one.

-8-

WHAT SHOULD BE THE ELEMENTS OF SUCH A POLICY? FIRST, *lets take*
A HARD LOOK AT THE FACTORS WHICH HAVE CONSPIRED TO
CHANGE OUR NATION'S ENERGY PICTURE.

WE ARE USING UP A FINITE RESOURCE AT A GEOMETRIC
RATE.

--BETWEEN 1940 AND 1965 THE CONSUMPTION OF ENERGY
IN THE U. S. DOUBLED.

-- IF THE PRESENT TRENDS CONTINUE, CONSUMPTION COULD
DOUBLE AGAIN BY 1980. THE RATE OF ENERGY CONSUMPTION
INCREASED TWICE AS FAST IN 1972 AS IT DID IN 1971.

THE RESULT OF ALL THIS IS:

└--IN 1962 WE HAD 3 MILLION OIL BARRELS A DAY - *Hudson*

SPARE PRODUCING CAPACITY. IN 1972 WE HAD NONE.

└--IN 1972 WE IMPORTED SOME 30 PERCENT OF OUR OIL.

BY 1980 IT WILL BE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF 60 PERCENT.

└--WE HAVE BEEN USING TWICE AS MUCH NATURAL GAS AS

WE CAN FIND. AT THAT RATE, WE COULD BE SHORT TEN TRILLION

CUBIC FEET OF GAS IN 1980.

└IN THE FACE OF SUCH GALLOPING CONSUMPTION, WE ARE,

INCREDIBLY, FAILING TO DEVELOP NEW RESOURCES.

--FOR THE FIRST TIME IN MANY YEARS, THERE IS NOT
ONE SINGLE NEW REFINERY UNDER CONSTRUCTION IN THE
UNITED STATES. *L* YET THEY ARE SPROUTING LIKE MUSHROOMS
IN CANADA AND THE CARIBBEAN.

L --THE NUMBER OF NATURAL GAS WELLS DRILLED PER YEAR HAS
DECLINED FROM ALMOST 5500 TO LESS THAN 3300.

L --LESS THAN TWO PERCENT OF THE NEAR-SHORE PART OF
THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF HAS BEEN LEASED FOR
DEVELOPMENT.

L ALL THIS ADDS UP TO ^{*agrowing*} A GAP BETWEEN SUPPLY AND DEMAND--
A GAP THAT IS BEING MET BY IMPORTS.

CURRENT PROJECTIONS INDICATE THAT BY 1980 OIL
IMPORTS WILL ACCOUNT FOR AS MUCH AS ONE-HALF OF U. S.
CONSUMPTION OF OIL, AND ONE-FOURTH OF TOTAL ENERGY
SUPPLIES.

✓ NO MATTER HOW MANY NEW ENERGY RESOURCES WE DEVELOP
IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS, AND NO MATTER HOW MUCH WE
CONSERVE ENERGY, WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO IMPORT
INCREASING AMOUNTS OF OIL AND GAS.

*Balancing Payments
Dollar Crisis*

✓ IF THERE WERE EVER A SET OF STATISTICS THAT WAS
CALCULATED TO SCARE US INTO ACTION, THIS IS IT. ✓ I AM

FIRMLY CONVINCED THAT WE MUST DO SOME OF THE HARDEST
THINKING WE HAVE DONE SINCE THE MANHATTAN PROJECT, ABOUT
OUR ENERGY SITUATION.

*which made possible
Atomic
Energy*

-12-

SUCH THINKING SHOULD BE PREDICATED ON THE FOLLOWING

CONCLUSIONS OF A SENATE STUDY ON ENERGY POLICY ~~BY THE~~

INTERIOR COMMITTEE.

└ FIRST, A HEAVY AND GROWING DEPENDENCY ON IMPORTED
FUELS IS INEVITABLE UNTIL AT LEAST 1985 OR 1990.

└ THE GROWTH OF THESE IMPORTS PRESENTS
REAL SECURITY ISSUES └ IT IS NO LONGER TO BE REGARDED
AS A SCARE TACTIC INVENTED BY THE OIL INDUSTRY AND
THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

└ WHERE WAS THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION IN LOOKING
AHEAD TO THIS DANGER? I'LL QUOTE YOU FROM THE CABINET
TASK FORCE OF 1969: "THE RISKS TO SECURITY FROM INTER-
RUPTIONS OF OIL SUPPLY DO NOT, IN THE MAIN CONCERN

ANY DANGER TO THE FUNCTIONING OF THE NATION'S ARMED
FORCES."

L YET, TODAY, THE U. S. HAS NO RESERVE SUPPLY OF
PRODUCING CAPACITY AS IT DID DURING EARLIER MID-EAST
of the 1950's
CRISES, NOR SIGNIFICANT OIL STORAGE CAPACITY.

ISN'T THAT RELEVANT TO THE FUNCTIONING OF OUR ARMED FORCES?

L THE RECENT EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CARTEL OF PETROLEUM
EXPORTING COUNTRIES, AND EXPLICIT THREATS BY MANY OF
THEM, HAVE RAISED THE DISTINCT POSSIBILITY OF A GENERAL
OR SELECTIVE EMBARGO BY THE ORGANIZATION OF PETROLEUM
EXPORTING COUNTRIES (OPEC) — *and a sharp*
rise in crude oil prices!

-14-

CONCLUSION OF THIS STUDY IS THAT
A SECOND A THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS BURDEN OF ENERGY

IMPORTS WILL BE ~~BEAR~~ *Staggering.* RESPECTED ECONOMISTS PROJECT

THE NET FOREIGN EXCHANGE BURDEN TO THE U. S. OF ENERGY

IMPORTS AS HIGH AS \$10 BILLION PER YEAR IN 1980

L THE IMPACT WOULD BE EVEN GREATER IF WE WERE FORCED
TO IMPORT

TO IMPORT MORE COSTLY ENERGY THAN CRUDE OIL--SUCH

AS REFINED PRODUCTS AND LIQUIFIED NATURAL GAS (LNG).

L THE TENDENCY TO IMPORT REFINED *Products - as* ~~PRODUCTS--AS~~

OPPOSED TO CRUDE OIL--FROM FOREIGN REFINERIES--IS

THEREFORE TO BE DEPLORED, NOT ONLY, FOR THE HIGHER COST,

BUT ALSO BECAUSE OF THE GREATER NATIONAL VULNERABILITY

IT CREATES.

THE BILLIONS IN ^{Dollar} CASH ASSETS THAT WOULD ACCRUE TO
THE SHEIKS OF ~~Saudi~~ ARABIA AND OTHER NATIONS ARE MORE
LIKELY TO BE USED FOR INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL LEVERAGE
THAN FOR MEETING THEIR NATION'S URGENT DOMESTIC NEEDS.

THE FACT IS THAT THE RELATIVELY LOW COST AND VAST
SUPPLY OF OIL IMPORTS MAKES THEM INCREASINGLY APPEAL-
THOUGH THE PRICE OF FOREIGN CRUDE HAS RISEN SHARPLY,
IT IS STILL CHEAPER THAN PRODUCING NEW DOMESTIC CRUDE
-- EXCEPTING THE ALASKA PIPELINE, WHICH WOULD BE CHEAPER.
ING. IF OUR ONLY CONCERNS WERE CONSUMER PRICE AND

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, THE COMPLETE DECONTROL OF OIL
IMPORTS MIGHT BE DICTATED.

HOWEVER, THE PRICE OF CRUDE IS NOT OUR ONLY CONCERN.

WE ARE ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT THE PRICE OF OUR
NATIONAL SECURITY.

-16-

L NOW THE THREAT OF AN EMBARGO IS A RELATIVELY REMOTE
ONE. L THE ECONOMIES OF MIDEAST COUNTRIES ARE TREMEN-
DOUSLY DEPENDENT ON THE WESTERN COUNTRIES, ^{+ Japan} MORE
THAN HALF THE GNP OF SAUDI ARABIA AND OTHER COUNTRIES
DEPEND ON SELLING OIL TO US.

L NEVERTHELESS, WE MUST INTEGRATE OUR ENERGY NEEDS
L ~~GIVEN THE SHARPLY INCREASING PRICE OF FOREIGN OIL~~
INTO OUR FOREIGN POLICY CONSIDERATIONS. ^ SOME WOULD

ADVOCATE JOINING WITH OTHER CONSUMING NATIONS, TO PRESENT

A CONSUMER BLOC THAT CAN STAND UP TO OPEC.

*Lets face it,
when it comes to oil, its a sellers
Market - we pay - or we go without!*

Clearly there are real complications in developing any such strategy to counter the power of the exporting

Nations' Cartel Oil companies are limited in what they can do. The benefits to an individual company

from resisting OPEC demands are limited and uncertain,

whereas the risks are large.

Therefore
But we must examine alternatives and forge new strategies. *a National Strategy!*

One thing is sure--the absence of clear legislative
authority for the oil import program, the general

practice of deciding import matters on an ad hoc basis,

and the drift in administration of the existing

program, all add up to uncertainties that deter in-

vestment in the energy economy. *Particularly in Refineries*

L A CONSISTENT AND EQUITABLE IMPORT POLICY FOR ALL
SECTORS OF THE ENERGY INDUSTRY AND THE CONSUMER IS BADLY
NEEDED.

L THE INCREASING DIFFICULTY WITH THE IMPORT SYSTEM IS
enforced
NOT ONLY DUE TO ~~THE~~ ADMINISTRATION.

L IT IS DUE TO A LACK OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING FOR
DEVELOPMENT OF NEW ENERGY RESOURCES.

L IT IS THIS LACK OF ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES WHICH
IS MAKING THE IMPORT-QUOTA SYSTEM CRACK UNDER THE
PRESSURE OF DEMAND.

L IF WE HAD LOOKED AHEAD 10 YEARS AGO, WE WOULD
HAVE SEEN THIS COMING.

L WE STILL HAVEN'T LEARNED OUR LESSON.

Energy Policy now under wing of
Sen. Schultz, Kissinger, & John Erlichman

-19-

001458

I SEE NO EVIDENCE FROM THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED
1974 BUDGET OF AN ADEQUATE EXPENDITURE *for research and development*
~~PLAN ON CREATION~~

OF NEW ENERGY SOURCES.

*[We are relied on AEC -
con. edison predicted 20% of
to this energy -*

[The I THINK THIS EMPHASIS ON PINNING MOST OF OUR HOPES
ON A FAST-BREEDER REACTOR ^{*nuclear*} IS DANGEROUS. I HOPE IT WILL

- Time
TURN OUT SUCCESSFULLY. BUT PENNY-PINCHING ON OTHER

ALTERNATIVES IS DISASTROUS.

h WE NEED MORE EXPLORATION AND DISCOVERY OF NATURAL
GAS.

h THERE IS A REAL SHORTAGE OF NATURAL GAS ON THE MARKET
DESPITE RAPIDLY INCREASING GAS PRICES. WHY? IN PART

BECAUSE OF THE REGULATION OF THE PRICE OF GAS AT THE
WELLHEAD.

7. *Power Commission estimates that under present policies, the supply shortfall would increase from 1971's 4% of demand to a whopping 34% in 1985.*
001459
001459

L BUT ALSO BECAUSE OF THE UNCERTAINTY OF OUR POLICIES.

WILL THE FPC DEREGULATE OR WON'T IT?

L THE ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN MAKING US BREATHLESS
WITH ANTICIPATION, WAITING FOR AN ENERGY MESSAGE WHICH
WOULD LAY OUT SOME CONSISTENT, EQUITABLE POLICIES. L ITS
CONTINUAL DELAY HAS ONLY ADDED TO THE PROBLEM.

L WHAT ABOUT OIL SHALE? FEDERAL LANDS CONTAIN ABOUT
600 BILLION BARRELS OF RECOVERABLE OIL IN THIS FORM.

L YET WE HAVE SPENT ALMOST NOTHING TO DEVELOP THE
TECHNOLOGY NEEDED TO MAKE THIS OIL ECONOMICALLY AVAIL-
ABLE AND ENVIRONMENTALLY ACCEPTABLE. L AS A MATTER OF

FACT, LAST YEAR THE ADMINISTRATION SPEND ONLY \$2.5 MILLION
ON OIL SHALE RESEARCH.

coal accounts for less than 20% U.S. Energy
 consumption - but enough known reserves
 to supply nations energy needs for 300 yrs
 yet serious problems - ⁻²¹⁻ environmental strip mining -
gasification etc

WE ARE FORTUNATE IN HAVING ENORMOUS COAL RESOURCES.

BUT WE SPEND A TINY FRACTION OF THE FEDERAL BUDGET

DEVELOPING COAL GASIFICATION TECHNIQUES.

AND, ONLY \$2.5 MILLION WAS SPENT LAST YEAR FOR

GEOTHERMAL DEVELOPMENT. COMPARE THIS FIGURE TO THE \$25

BILLION THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS SPENT TO DEVELOP

NUCLEAR REACTORS SINCE WORLD WAR II, WHICH HAS PRODUCED

LESS THAN 2 DOZEN WORKING POWERPLANTS.

SOLAR ENERGY IS ANOTHER GREAT POTENTIAL ENERGY

SOURCE THAT HAS BEEN IGNORED IN THE FEDERAL R&D BUDGET.

-22-

EVEN THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL STATED, "HAD IT NOT

BEEN FOR AN ABUNDANCE OF FOSSIL FUELS--COAL, OIL AND

NATURAL GAS--WE MIGHT TODAY HAVE A 'SOLAR ENERGY

ECONOMY' JUST AS EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT AS OUR 'FOSSIL

FUEL ECONOMY.'" YET, ONLY \$4 MILLION WAS DEVOTED TO

SOLAR ENERGY IN LAST YEAR'S BUDGET.

THIS ~~ADMINISTRATION~~ *Government* HAS DONE LITTLE TO DEVELOP
A WIDE RANGE OF NEW ENERGY SOURCES.

(Sector - Industry Partnership.)

IT HAS DONE EVEN LESS TO PROMOTE ENERGY CONSERVATION.

THIS NATION MUST START THINKING ABOUT A COMPRE-
HENSIVE ENERGY-CONSERVATION PROGRAM. ABOUT--

-23-

--MASS TRANSIT--BUSES AS WELL AS RAIL. AN

AVERAGE OF FOUR OUT OF FIVE SEATS ON BUSES ARE EMPTY.

└--CREATING INCENTIVES TO INDUSTRY AND INDIVIDUALS

TO CONSERVE AND SHARE ENERGY--SUCH AS HIGHER TOLLS FOR

SINGLE-PASSENGER CARS, SPECIAL LANES FOR BUSES AND

CAR POOLS, COMPUTERIZED CAR-POOL INFORMATION EXCHANGES. } IF WE

COULD PUT TWO PEOPLE INSTEAD OF ONE IN EACH CAR, WE COULD

CUT GASOLINE CONSUMPTION, TRAVEL TIME AND POLLUTION

IN HALF.

└--TAXING GIANT GAS-GUZZLING CARS -- *or better yet,*

cutting back on horsepower

└--^{*cost*}MARGINAL PRICING BY UTILITIES, SO THAT LARGER

USERS PAY ~~THE, NOT LESS~~ TO REFLECT REAL COST; AND

SO THAT PEAK-HOUR DEMAND IS PRICED HIGHER.

-24-

└--LABELING OF APPLIANCES TO SHOW THEIR ENERGY

EFFICIENCY AND CONSUMPTION.

└THE URGENCY OF FORMULATING A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY,

AND THE MANY DIMENSIONS OF SUCH A POLICY--CUTTING ACROSS

ECONOMIC, INTERNATIONAL AND SOCIAL SPHERES--CALLS FOR

THE CREATION OF A NEW ENTITY TO FORMULATE POLICY IN

THIS AREA *and to assure action -*

└ENERGY POLICY IS PRESENTLY IN A NO MAN'S LAND AS

FAR AS THE PRESENT BUREAUCRACY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERN-

MENT GOES.

*we must immediately establish a
National Energy Resources Agency -
empowered to plan, to authorize releases, to direct
all energy development & consumption policies*

I WILL, IN THE NEAR FUTURE, BE PROPOSING A BALANCED

NATIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT, WHICH WOULD CREATE

AN OFFICE OF BALANCED NATIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

IN THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

-25-

IT WOULD CREATE A SIMILAR MECHANISM IN THE
CONGRESS. SUCH AN OFFICE WOULD RESTRUCTURE THE
DOMESTIC POLICY ACTIVITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGIS-
LATIVE BRANCHES AROUND THE KEY ISSUES OF NATIONAL
GROWTH.

AT PRESENT, THERE IS NO MORE PRESSING ISSUE THAN
THAT OF BALANCING OUR GROWTH IN ENERGY CONSUMPTION WITH
A QUEST FOR NEW ENERGY RESOURCES.

YET, THE VARIOUS PROPOSALS I HEAR, FOR MODIFICA-
TIONS OF PRESENT REGULATIONS AND LAWS ARE, FRANKLY,
INADEQUATE TO THE MONUMENTAL CHALLENGE WE FACE.

I BELIEVE THAT ONLY ~~SUCH~~ AN OVER-ALL

FOCAL-POINT FOR NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY CAN BE

IN THE WHITE HOUSE AND THE CONGRESS

COMPREHENSIVE ENOUGH TO FORMULATE ^{*long term*} POLICIES IN THIS AREA.

A BALANCED GROWTH POLICY FOR THE NATION WOULD DO

MORE THAN BALANCE OFF ENERGY CONSUMPTION AGAINST DEMAND,

ALTHOUGH IT WOULD HAVE THAT AS A MAJOR GOAL.

SUCH A POLICY WOULD ALSO DEVELOP ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL

BALANCE IN OTHER ASPECTS OF OUR LIVES. IT WOULD

help us define goals, set priorities, direct our resources to

--DEVELOP RURAL AREAS, ^{*today*} SO THAT 70 PERCENT OF THE

PEOPLE ^{*are*} ~~WERE NO LONGER~~ CRAMMED ONTO 2 PERCENT OF THE LAND; *these*

cannot & must not continue

--REBUILD OUR CITIES, ^{*make them comfortable,*} ~~SO THAT SUBURBAN TRAFFIC~~

is safe, livable. Urban sprawl is ugly, wasteful &

~~JAMS AND UNPLANNED COMMUNITIES NEEDN'T BE THE LOT OF EVERYONE.~~

costly, and Urban decay is at the very center of our social problems of crime, blight, disease, welfare, & congestion.

-27-

I'M SPECULATING HERE, BUT I DO BELIEVE THAT SUCH BALANCED ECONOMIC GROWTH WOULD ALSO HAVE THE SIDE-EFFECT OF HELPING BALANCE SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF ENERGY.

I SAY THAT BECAUSE A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF TIME AND ENERGY--HUMAN AND FOSSIL-FUEL--IS SPENT IN TRANSIT

^{AUTO}
BETWEEN SUBURB AND DOWNTOWN, AND BETWEEN THE COUNTRYSIDE (FOR A REFRESHING OUTING) AND METROPOLITAN AREAS.

THE INCREASE IN AUTO TRAVEL HAS BEEN A MAJOR FACTOR BEHIND THE ENERGY CRISIS.

WE SPEND INCREASING PARTS OF OUR LIVES LURCHING BACK AND FORTH--FROM DOWNTOWN OFFICE TO SUBURBAN HOME DURING THE DAY.

~~FROM SUBURBAN HOME TO THE NEAREST STATE PARK 30
MILES AWAY ON A WEEKEND.~~

~~--FROM HOME TO THE SHOPPING MALL TWO MILES AWAY.~~

~~WE SPEND SO MUCH TIME TRAVELING, AND OFTEN GET
SO TIRED DOING IT, AS WE SIT STALLED IN TRAFFIC, THAT
WE BARELY ENJOY IT WHEN WE GET THERE.~~

IF WE HAD A BALANCED GROWTH POLICY, WHICH AIMED
AT CREATING LIVABLE COMMUNITIES WHERE WORKING AND SHOPPING
AND LIVING AND RECREATION WERE ALL REASONABLY NEARBY--WE
WOULD CONSERVE A LOT OF ENERGY, ~~AND NOT HAVE TO TAKE~~
~~ALL THESE TRIPS.~~ *and* WE MIGHT ALL LEAD LESS FRAZZLED,
FRAGMENTED LIVES.

Planning is no longer a dirty
word - or an academic subject.

-29-

It is survival. It is essential

I SAY THERE ARE MORE USEFUL THINGS WE CAN DO WITH
for an urbanized, industrialized,
mechanized society - We can
OUR OWN ENERGY AND OUR FOSSIL FUELS THAN SIT IN TRAFFIC
no longer ignore the facts of
international economy
We do face ^{or} immediate and long
Term Crisis in Energy, in
Transportation, in Environmental
protection - in Resource conservation
and development.

we can't wish it away. It will get
worse unless we do now.
And no one industry, company,
bank, or conglomerate can save
us. It will demand the best
of Government & the private
sector - working in Partnership

WELL, I'VE BEEN THINKING BIG HERE TODAY - BUT
WHAT BETTER PLACE TO DO IT IN THAN SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS?
###



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org