

cuts, and voice his opposition to Carter's "plutonium ban." The entire Oak Ridge-T.V.A. area has placed heavy pressures on Baker, an aide disclosed.

Looking Toward An Alternative

A significant number of conservative and mainstream Congressional leaders have begun to map out a media campaign to counter President Carter's April 20 energy message. Sen. Baker's office expressed particular interest in a proposal to demand equal time to rebutt Carter under the fairness doctrine now being put forward by the U.S. Labor Party and the FEF.

The GOP plans to release its own energy program on or near April 20. The policy statement, which insiders describe as being somewhat of a "mixed compromise but with a strong pro-nuclear position," will be used as a counter proposal.

A number of Republican and Democratic Southern congressmen are moving toward sponsoring joint press conferences with the Fusion Energy Foundation soon after Carter's April 20 statement.

Eastern and Midwestern Democrats are also begin-

ning to draw the lines on nuclear energy. Rep. Joseph Gaydos (D-Pa) charged in the *Pittsburgh Press* April 11 that outlawing the development of the breeder reactor to curb "nuclear proliferation" is "akin to outlawing crowbars (in the U.S.) in the hopes of stopping all burglaries." From the Chicago Congressional delegation, Rep. Frank Annunzio (D-Ill) and other Democrats tied to the Daley machine have repeatedly stated their commitment to nuclear energy and the breeder reactor.

Congress' unwillingness to dutifully rubberstamp the President's energy policy is so intense that both leaders of the GOP and the Democratic Party are warning the White House that there is no way the energy package will come up for a vote before December 1977 — at the earliest. Without some kind of instigated crisis — like a nuclear terrorist "Pearl Harbor," as James Schlesinger eerily presaged in his remarks to the press this week — a look at the correlation of forces leaves the conclusion that right now the Carter energy program doesn't stand a chance. Then, as one labor leader put it, "Once we get rid of his energy program, Carter's next to go."

Rep. Flowers: Carter Energy Program Guts R&D And Congress' Role

Rep. Don Fuqua (D-Fla) entered a statement by his colleague, Rep. Walter Flowers (D-Ala) into the Congressional Record April 6. Flowers made the statement, which called for an increased emphasis on Research and Development in U.S. energy policy, before the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security of the Committee on Government Operations, at hearings held on the Carter Administration's bill H.R. 4263, which would establish a Department of Energy in the executive branch. The following are excerpts from Flowers' lengthy remarks.

One of the basic concerns I have is that R and D which is very important for our energy policy goals doesn't appear to be given the strong and central role it deserves, either in the bill or the explanation...

The chart that accompanies the bill separates the R and D from the demonstration. This is not the best way to develop technologies for two principal reasons. A successful R and D program includes demonstration, and it should be organized and managed that way. And as important as the R and D itself is the national resource that R and D is and should be...

Next I would like to address the issue of the authorization process itself. The Energy Reorganization Act requires annual authorization in Section 305. Section 626 of H.R. 4263 eliminates entirely the requirements for any further authorizations... This bill in its present form simply guts the jurisdiction of our entire committee for energy R and D and reduces it to an oversight role. I find this unacceptable. Furthermore, I should point out that the annual authorization requirement is the legislative form of zero-based budgeting which has received support in the new Administration...

My next comment relates to another issue raised by this bill which, if enacted, would greatly limit the ability of the Congress to perform its oversight role...

The bill gives very broad powers in several sections... Included in those sections is an additional 600 GS 18 level personnel. This comes to a round figure of \$28.5 million a year. Additionally, the Secretary of the Department is exempted from the provisions of the Administrative Property Act, and Civil Service requirements, is able to use Armed Forces personnel, and indeed, pay his own volunteers... for as many volunteers as he desires. I would urge the Committee to examine each of these sections carefully...