

Moving Toward Mass Terrorism

"The potential for harm to the services and institutions that supply society with its basic needs is greater today than ever before; society can be victimized with relatively little expenditure of effort and ingenuity by individuals or by small groups.

The modern terrorist wields power far in excess of anything his predecessors could have imagined. Today, all

must pause before the awesome consequences of possible terrorist action. In former times, terrorist victims might have been counted in hundreds at most; now their numbers could reach to hundreds of thousands. New technologies have placed within easy reach of the modern terrorist, who has the weapons of mass destruction, the ability to create terrifying, uncontrollable, and irreversible situations."

Carter Blackmail Falters: Senate Votes Overwhelmingly To Restore Water Project Cuts

The Senate handed Jimmy Carter a stinging defeat yesterday by voting 65 to 24 to bar the President from cutting off federal funds for 19 water development projects.

"We've had government by the executive for too long around here and we have to remind the good President what the law of the land is," said Senator J. Bennett Johnston, Jr. (D-La), chief sponsor of the measure which was passed in the form of an amendment to a \$4 billion public works bill.

The *Baltimore Sun* called the Senate vote "the first setback that the heavily Democratic Congress has given the President."

The Johnston amendment, backed by 35 Democrats and 30 Republicans, passed only hours after Carter rebuffed a large Senate delegation at a White House meeting held to discuss the proposed water project cuts. Carter — with Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus and Office of Management and Budget Director Bert Lance also attending — refused to restore the projects which include the huge Central Arizona Project on the Colorado River, the Dickey-Lincoln Project in Maine and 17 others, mainly in the West.

"Surprise Amendment"

When the group returned to the Hill, Johnston drafted a "surprise amendment" to the jobs bill. Johnston's amendment not only bars the President from holding up any of the funds budgeted for the water projects in the current (1977) fiscal year, but also declares that if Congress votes funds for the projects in 1978 and Carter tries to rescind or defer the money, Congress will vote against that, too.

"Congress meant what it said when it appropriated money for these projects," Johnston stated when he first proposed the amendment. Senator Edmund Muskie (D-Me) followed suit with the charge that Carter made his decision to eliminate the water projects on "the flimsiest kind of evidence."

Sen. Russell Long (D-La) declared that the water projects create far more jobs than many of the projects to be funded in the public works section of the bill and are better for the economy than the President's proposed \$50 tax rebate, which he said many people would use for harmful items like "whisky, cigarettes and maybe even marijuana."

A Deal

"Carter's planned cutback was unconstitutional," an aide to Johnston stated. Muskie also warned Carter against "sitting on the funds." It is your constitutional obligation, he told Carter, to openly challenge any disagreements between Congress and the Executive.

If the President foolishly decides to counter Congressional policy, he should impound the funds, Muskie stated, adding that this would insure an open debate. "However, Carter has no case for impoundment and would lose the fight."

The leaders of this emerging coalition against Carter purposefully picked the public works bill to ram home their message to the White House. The public works measure — a popular boondoggle which allocates funds to states and communities for hospitals, schools, sewers, bridges and other public works — allowed the anti-Carter conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats to "strike up a deal" with largely pro-public works urban-based Democrats. This deal gave the anti-Carter coalition the clout to soundly defeat Carter's water cuts with all but Carter's most loyal backers, like Senators Kennedy and Humphrey voting for full restoration.

Nuclear Energy

Carter's defeat on the water project cuts is expected to give a strong push to the anti-Carter coalition's fight for nuclear energy, according to high-ranking sources on Capitol Hill. "After seeing what the Senate did on the water cuts, I will back the (pro-nuclear energy) Chairman of the House Science and Technology subcommittee" a previously wavering congressman on Rep. Walter Flowers' (D-Ala) subcommittee on Fossil Fuels and Nuclear Research stated.

A number of Congressional spokesmen interviewed today realized that the preservation of the water projects, while politically important, will be meaningless unless accompanied by at least a full restoration of the nearly 20 percent cuts in the fast breeder reactor and fusion research and development. "Without vastly increasing the energy supply, we will lack energy needed for dam construction and other development projects," one Congressional aide stated. "A bi-partisan consensus on nuclear energy development is emerging," remarked an aide to the House Science and Technology subcommittee's ranking minority member, Rep. Gary

Myers (R-Pa). He reported that several subcommittee members will be voting for full restoration of the nuclear cuts. "A number of Democrats — including Rep. Mike McCormack — will go for full restoration of the cuts while Republicans — like Rep. Myers — will initially support only partial restorations," he said. "But when the Dems move openly to restore the cuts, the Republicans will back them."

Such wheeling and dealing — while in the right direction — leaves the anti-Carter coalition vulnerable to a Carter counterattack, an observer remarked. Earlier in the week, Congressional sources say, a number of members on the House Science and Technology subcommittee were subjected to heavy pressure tactics.

According to informed sources within the subcommittee, Carter has been wining and dining members

of the subcommittee and pressuring them to stop opposing his cuts in nuclear energy. One enraged source said that Carter offered a number of Congressmen "restoration of water projects in their districts if they supported him on the fusion cuts" — a weapon which the Senate has subsequently removed from Carter.

Concurrently, Carter succeeded in inducing the committee to postpone the markup on the ERDA budget, originally scheduled for yesterday until Tuesday. At that point, a number of previously outspoken proponents of nuclear energy began issuing leaks that the subcommittee would only partially restore the cutbacks. When asked why the Congressmen would not go for full restoration, a top-ranking aide said "to go that far would be like waving a red flag to that man in the White House."

'Nuclear Swords Into Nuclear Plowshares'

Statement by Senator Strom Thurmond (R-SC) on the Senate floor

Reference the need for emphasizing research and development of nuclear energy. March 3, 1977.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Over the last few weeks, our Nation has suffered the most serious energy shortage within memory. Unfortunately, many representatives of the media and even some members of the Administration have either misunderstood or misrepresented the underlying problem. By raising the spectre of greedy businessmen hoarding energy reserves to boost prices, they have encouraged the gullible to believe that the shortage is artificial.

Let us stop this charade once and for all. The problem is real and serious. Despite the world's most advanced energy technology, this Nation cannot keep its factories busy or its homes warm without expensive assistance from abroad. Even with this assistance, we have seen severe weather cause widespread national suffering. Unless we act now to develop alternative energy sources, we shall soon be utterly at the mercy of foreign governments and the elements. It would be hard to say which is more unreliable.

A small group of single-minded environmentalists has succeeded in blocking such development through litigation and scare tactics. I do not mean to belittle the environmentalist cause. There is good reason to be concerned about the conservation of natural resources and the preservation of wild life.

It is only common sense, however, to balance environmental goals against energy needs. The Hindus of India, as Congressman Poage has pointed out, let people starve rather than kill the rats that eat their grain. Some environmentalists seem to want us to let people freeze rather than exploit the energy resources that could provide heat.

Two of the many accomplishments of such shortsighted activists are a three-to-five year delay in construction of the Alaska pipeline, and a nearly total

blockage of off-shore oil and gas exploration. For instance, a couple of weeks ago, a Federal judge in New York nullified a contract of \$1.1 billion for the lease of oil and gas rights off the coast of New Jersey. He justified his action on the ground that there has been insufficient study of the environmental background. The paperwork on the subject runs to 4,043 pages.

Another trophy claimed by such environmentalists is the obstruction of a \$116 million TVA hydroelectric project on the Little Tennessee River. They protested that the project threatened a fish called the Tennessee snail darter.

Nuclear power is the energy source which has come under the most constant—and the most illogical—attack. Countless legal, emotional, and environmental arguments are made against nuclear development. Most of these, especially the frequent forecasts of doom, are the product of unthinking opposition to progress. Perhaps the most ridiculous charge is that energy-producing reactors could explode like nuclear bombs.

The true facts about nuclear energy should allay any such hysterical fears. Here they are:

1. Nuclear power is *safe*. No one has died in an accident involving nuclear generation at any plant in America. In fact, one university study indicates that an all-nuclear U.S. electrical power system, at worst, would be three times safer than a similar all-coal system.
2. Nuclear wastes can be stored safely in sub-surface salt deposits which are stable and virtually impenetrable. The entire process can be accomplished with little danger to man or the environment.
3. Nuclear plants produce only small amounts of waste. A large power plant in one year produces about two cubic yards of high-level waste. The current stock of nuclear waste in America would barely fill one small room and this quantity is not growing rapidly.
4. Nuclear fuel can be reprocessed for continuing use in nuclear energy generation. Facilities for such reprocessing have been completed in Barnwell, South Carolina, but environmental complaints have held up operation.