causing problems for Reagan. The fuss suggests that Reagan's energy principles would quickly run afoul of some nasty complications. Even his own party is in knots on synfuels.

Stockman, a true believer in the importance of maintaining a free marketplace, sought to curb his colleagues' enthusiasm for subsidies. The synfuels corporation, after all, is the creature of a Democratic Congress and a classic big government solution to an economic problem. Stockman thinks that removing federal price controls and letting profits soar should be incentive enough to get fuel industries producing. The government should not hand out subsidies as well. Although this may be sound economics, it is not good politics.

Many businesses are happy to accept federal aid and guidance. Some eagerly await the support promised for synfuels, and they have been in touch with friends in the Capitol to see that their hopes are not dashed. Last month three Republican Senators, Pete Domenici of New Mexico, Henry Bellmon of Oklahoma, and James McClure of Idaho, wrote to Reagan urging him not to oppose the synfuels program during the campaign. They praised the subsidy scheme, pressing the candidate to make a large exception to the free-market economics that supposedly would be the bedrock of a Reagan Administration. Reagan has not answered the letter. Neither has he settled on a final policy for the synfuels corporation.

The free-market politicians are having trouble winning support from their Republican colleagues. It will be more difficult still, if Reagan wins the election, to win support in Congress for a radical reduction in federal energy authority. The character of Congress (mostly Democratic and fond of subsidies) is unlikely to change. Its interest in federal energy programs, especially those that award grants and subsidies, is not likely to fade. And, having struggled mightily for 4 years with three versions of a Carter energy policy, Congress probably would not be eager to set out on a fresh crusade under Reagan's leadership.

No doubt a Reagan Administration would attempt to reduce federal involvement in the pricing and distribution of energy. It would try to lower taxes for industry and trim back the scope of laws that protect the quality of the air, water, and wilderness. But it would have to deal with a possible hostile Congress with a will of its own on energy matters. For this reason, Reagan might be able to accomplish a shift of emphasis, but not a radical overhaul of the system.

Senator Bennett Johnston (D-La.), who knows the oil business, says that it does not matter which candidate wins the election; federal energy policy will not be affected much. He speaks as one with the power to make the prophecy come true.

Johnston, who comes from an important oil-producing state and frequently speaks for the interests of the energy

Anderson Pushes Conservation

On the matter of energy, John Anderson is without question the most conservation-minded of the three presidential candidates. Ever fond of studies, Anderson has taken in particular to the Harvard Business School study, *Energy Future*, authored by Daniel Yergin and Robert Stobaugh, in which it is estimated that Americans could reduce energy use by 30 to 40 percent without making significant sacrifices.

The centerpiece of the Anderson energy plank is his call for a 50 cent per gallon gasoline tax. Anderson claims the tax would result in long-term savings of 1 million barrels of oil a day. The estimated $50 billion annual proceeds would be used to offset increases in the Social Security tax. He has also called for extending the fuel economy timetable to achieve a 40 mile per gallon standard by 1990.

Anderson puts considerable emphasis on the need for effecting a permanent change in transportation patterns, which would mean encouraging carpooling, community transportation, and bus and light rail systems. To ensure a stable source of support, he wants to establish a $4 billion federal trust fund for mass transit.

Anderson also places high priority on various economic incentives and technical assistance programs to encourage energy efficiency in new building construction and retrofitting of existing structures.

In most other respects Anderson's energy strategy does not deviate much from that being pursued by the Carter Administration. He wants to reduce reliance on foreign oil by enhanced oil recovery and completion of the strategic petroleum reserve. He supports ongoing decontrol of oil and gas prices. He also recommends a new mechanism within the International Energy Agency to encourage development of energy supplies in non-OPEC Third World countries.

In the near term, Anderson goes along with stimulating coal production, hastening conversion of oil-fired power plants to coal, and improving rail and port facilities for coal transport.

No particular enthusiasm is manifested for the Administration's synthetic fuels program. Anderson wants to find out if economic and environmental costs warrant a major push before going beyond present commitments.

Formerly a big nuclear power enthusiast, Anderson has now retrenched considerably since the accident at Three Mile Island. He now wants a moratorium on new plant construction pending better answers to the problems of reactor safety and nuclear waste disposal. He has also pulled back from his early support of the demonstration breeder reactor.

Anderson shares Carter's goal of meeting 20 percent of the country's energy needs with renewable sources by 2000. To this end, he wants the Department of Energy more involved in photovoltaic research and in demonstration of small-scale, decentralized energy systems.

So far, Anderson has indicated that he believes energy development can proceed without compromising any of the nation's environmental regulations. His program is basically one of economic incentives, relying on decontrol of prices, changes in utility rate structures, low-cost loans, and tax manipulation to lower consumption and direct capital into energy-efficient enterprises.

Among those whose ideas have helped shape Anderson's energy strategy are Roger Sant of Carnegie-Mellon University, the Department of Energy's conservation chief under Gerald Ford, and Carroll Wilson, a world coal expert at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

—Constance Holden