makes the following recommendations....

(1) That the Department of Energy immediately reassess the impact of actions the government can take to combat anticipated natural gas curtailments in the coming winter and that the Administration and Congress begin immediate implementation of these actions. In particular, the subcommittee recommends that... the Congress enact new legislation granting the President authority to allocate natural gas supplies similar to that contained in the Emergency Natural Gas Act of 1977, the major provisions of which expires earlier this year;... the Congress consider giving the President the authority — similar to that in the Petroleum Allocation Act — to order natural gas pipelines not experiencing shortfalls to set aside small amounts of gas for reallocation to pipelines suffering curtailments, for the purpose of protecting jobs, and (that) the Department of Energy put its planned Energy Emergency Center into operation immediately.

(2) That the Special Crisis Intervention Program (SCIP) in the Community Services Administration, under which more than two million low income people have been certified to receive assistance for payment of last winter's fuel bills, be continued into this winter while Congress considers a new Administration proposal to provide such assistance through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

(3) That the Department of Energy take immediate steps to deal with the special problems associated with the maintenance of an adequate fuel oil supply and distribution system in the New England region. In implementing this recommendation the subcommittee urges DOE to pay special attention to the cash flow problems cited in testimony before the subcommittee as well as the adverse impact of governmental regulation on this industry.

(4) That the Department of Energy revise its WEEP plan immediately to place less reliance on the States, many of which lack the necessary authority to deal with energy problems resulting from a severe winter.

Further, the subcommittee recommends that each State begin immediately to examine its situation in terms of energy supply and potential shortfalls and to enact necessary authority to meet the shortfalls this winter....

Senator Long Proposes $100 Billion Energy Development Program

In remarks to the press and to the Senate Finance Committee which he heads, Senator Russell Long (D-La.) proposed the outlines of a $100 billion dollar energy development program Oct. 14, one day after President Carter had attacked U.S. energy producing corporations as "war profiteers." Long claimed his proposal would provide "1.5 million new high-technology jobs in energy-related industries alone, in addition to 3 million jobs created in spinoff industries and would solve the problems of the U.S. steel industry. "I mean $12,000 to $18,000 a year jobs," Long emphasized. "That's the way we do things in the United States. I'm not proposing leaf--raking. ...This is not a CETA proposal or a giveaway," he added, proposing "big investments in oil rigs, mines and developing alternative energy sources."

CONGRESS REPORT

The significance of Long's proposal is manifold. First, it groups him with former Republican Governor John Connally as major U.S. political figures who have spoken out in the last week for action on industrial growth and technological development. More specifically than Connally, Long identified a competent programmatic outline-approach to the problems of energy supply, the steel industry collapse, and unemployment. To the extent that the U.S. labor movement is mobilized behind nuclear fission-fast breeder and nuclear fusion power development as the c

adequate high technology solution to economic collapse is now possible in the United States.

Long's immediate objective is to "judo" the Carter Administration no-growth energy bill into a vehicle for taking the first steps toward his energy development conception. After his Finance Committee stripped the bill of its original series of taxes on energy production, last week the committee added a $32 billion worth of tax credits and incentives to industry to the bill, prompting Energy Secretary James Schlesinger to label it "a Christmas tree" giveaway for industry. In addition Long's Finance Committee has instructed the conference committee which will reconcile the Senate version of the bill with the House version, corresponding to the original Carter-Schlesinger program that if it accepts the well-head tax on oil in the House version of the bill, the tax may not be rebated as the Administration had desired but used to finance an Energy Development Corporation as outlined by Long in his statement.

Long undoubtedly believes he has Schlesinger and the Administration over a barrel; if the White House wants to save the well-head tax, it will have to agree to his proposal. Schlesinger surely prefers a Middle East war, oil embargo and WEEP national emergency plan to enforce his will to White House bargaining with Long. Moreover, many Republicans and some Democrats are saying they will block to prevent any of the Carter Administration taxes in conference, including the wellhead, leading Long himself to estimate that Congressional passage of any energy legislation this year is probably less than 50 percent. As the string of tax-incentive additions to the Senate Energy Bill reflects, the Congressional and national committee leadership of the Republican Party is currently in the grip of a tax--cutting mania, typified by a *Wall Street Journal* editorial and statements by House and Senate Minority Leaders Rhodes and Baker last week proposing a 30 percent tax cut "to get the economy going again just as John Kennedy did in the early 1960s. Such proposals do not at all address the issue of providing credit for real production as opposed to inflationary speculation.

Long's Energy Development Corporation, by contrast, represents the seed-crystal of the needed policy, although low-interest credit financing from general revenues or bonds represents a far more effective approach to financing than the wellhead tax. At present, however, the standard "energy development technologies" of Long's proposal would likely back oil exploration and development, increased mining, oil shale and coal gasification—represent an insufficient response to the magnitude of the crisis. Long and many other congressmen, while letting it be known privately that they are supportive of vastly increased nuclear power production, do not believe they have the political muscle at present in the labor movement to come out publicly for the type of program put forward by the U.S. Labor Party.

Whether Senator Long's EDC conception is transformed into a nuclear energy-based development program therefore depends on how fast the overwhelming support for nuclear energy in the American population can be translated into institutionalized pressure on the Congress. Last week, some 10,000 letters, telegrams and postcards reached the offices of selected Congressmen from trade unionists, scientists, industrialists, and others who demanded a competent program as outlined in the U.S. Labor Party's Nuclear Development Act of 1977, and the party expects the pace of its mobilization to expand and accelerate sharply in the coming week. Institutional collaboration between the USLP and other pro-nuclear forces, particularly the trade unions, is the key to future developments.