state, there will be no session of the Senate on this Saturday.

SPECIAL ORDERS FOR MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, after the leaders are recognized under the standing orders, Messrs. DANFORTH, BAKER, STEVENS, TOWER, and ROBERT C. BYRD be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for 1 minute to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with Calendar No. 271 and going through Calendar No. 276, with the exception of Calendar No. 274.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—these items are cleared on our Executive Calendar. We have no objection to proceeding to their consideration and their confirmation.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

The nominations which were considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Charles J. Chamberlain, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Daniel Edward Leach, of Virginia, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Stuart M. Statler, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

Brenton H. Rupple, of Wisconsin, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Leroy D. Clark, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move en bloc to reconsider the votes by which the nominations were confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BAKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, are there any orders for the recognition of Senators on tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are none.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Then I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the HUD appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order has been entered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. No; the previous order, I believe, was following the orders for the recognition of any Senators, but there are none entered, so I thought I had better modify the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are none, then that request is in order. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will come in at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the HUD appropriations bill under a time agreement. There will be rollcall votes, and hopefully tomorrow it will be possible to complete action on that bill, and also on the D.C. appropriation bill.

As for the D.C. appropriation bill, that has not yet been cleared for action on tomorrow and a time agreement has not been entered into; but it is hoped that overnight there might be some progress in those directions.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 7:12 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Friday, July 27, 1979, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 26, 1979:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Charles J. Chamberlain, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years from August 29, 1979.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Daniel Edward Leach, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the term expiring July 1, 1984.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Stuart M. Statler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for the remainder of the term expiring October 26, 1979.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

Brenton H. Rupple, of Wisconsin, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1981.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Leroy D. Clark, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of 4 years.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 26, 1979*

The House met at 10 a.m.

Dr. Carroll Hubbard, Sr., the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how majestic is Thy name in all the Earth.

Thou hast been our help in generations past: Thou art our hope for the future. We implore for ourselves and our Nation Thy grace and guidance.

Grant us a new awareness that government is by divine appointment and that those elected to high office are servants of God. May these representatives of the people be able to perceive issues clearly, to make decisions judiciously, and to act courageously for the common good. Bestow upon them spiritual strength and a wisdom far above their own.

Let us all experience a fresh dedication to the ideas and institutions which have made America great.

Create in us today the purpose of mind "to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with our God" (Micah 6: 8).

We pray in the name of the Lord Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4392. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4392) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. SASSER, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. GARN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DR. CARROLL HUBBARD, SR.

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, naturally, it is a real joy to have with me in the House Chamber today my father, Dr. Carroll Hubbard, Sr., of Louisville, Ky., who led the prayer for us today and serves as guest chaplain for today.

One limitation regarding being a Member of Congress is that service at the Nation's Capital requires almost all of us to move from our home area and be in the Washington area most of the time. This causes, for example, my wife Joyce and our daughters Kelly and Krista and me to spend most of our time in the Washington area, with a home in McLean, Va., and away from my parents, Dr. and Mrs. Carroll Hubbard, Sr., and my wife's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Hall, of Metropolis, Ill.

One of the joys of summertime is that my wife's parents and my parents visit us and together we can enjoy the beauty and thrills of our Nation's Capital and Washington, D.C. That special occasion of togetherness is ours this week here.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4392, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1980

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4392) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SLACK, SMITH of Iowa, ALEXANDER, EARLY, HIGHTOWER, WHITTEN, O'BRIEN, ANDREWS of North Dakota, and CONTE.

JEANNETTE RANKIN, 1880–1973

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the day after Pearl Harbor, the U.S. House of Representatives voted 388 to 1 to declare war on Japan. The dissenting vote was that of Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin from Montana. This was the second time she had voted against U.S. entry into a world war. In her first term in Congress she voted against U.S. entry into World War I. She stated:

The first time the first woman has a chance to say no to war she should say it.

In 1916, Jeannette Rankin was the first woman elected to the House of Representatives. Defeated in a bid for the Senate in 1919 she continued to work for peace. She attributed her setbacks to flaws in the machinery of the democratic process, never to democracy itself.

In 1968, at age 87, Jeannette Rankin came to Washington one more time. She led 5,000 women, the Jeannette Rankin Brigade, in protest against the war in Vietnam. Jeannette Rankin was an ardent pacifist who boldly declared the futility of war:

You can no more win a war than you can win an earthquake.

TRIBUTE TO AMA FRANCES HICKS

(Mr. AKAKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn about the recent death of Mrs. Ama Frances Hicks on July 12. Luke Hicks, staff assistant in the Office of the Doorkeeper and a close personal friend, told me of his mother's death in Mill Valley, Calif., which had been her home for 25 years.

Mrs. Hicks was a native of Tennessee, and moved out West with her husband to California in 1957. In Mill Valley, she was active in several community organizations: She was president of the sewing club, and active in the Methodist church. In 1965, she became grand noble of the Blysthesdale Lodge of the Rebekahs. Mrs. Hicks was respected and loved in her community—her vigor and enthusiasm was unsurpassed. I feel that Mrs. Ama Hicks embodied the true spirit of American womanhood in all of her endeavors.

Mrs. Hicks led a rich, full life. On October 12, she would have celebrated her 85th birthday. In her lifetime, she witnessed the passing of the last century into this one, and saw the many changes and events that took place in this country over the decades.

I know that she was proud of Luke, her only son. Luke said that, "when my mother died, I lost my best friend." Mrs. Hicks was survived by a sister, Mrs. Arizona Leutke. I would like to pay my respects to the passing of Ama Frances Hicks, and extend my condolences and warm aloha to her family.

MAGNETIC FUSION ENERGY PROGRAM

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I wrote to Acting Under Secretary of Energy, John Deutch, requesting that the Department of Energy consider an aggressive acceleration of the magnetic fusion energy program. The goal of this accelerated effort would be to have a magnetic fusion electric demonstration plant on the line before the end of the century. I consider nuclear fusion to have the greatest future potential of any advanced energy technology; and I believe that we must move forward aggressively to realize the promise of this infinite and cheap supply of usable energy.

REPRESENTATIVE BROYHILL SUPPORTS GILMAN CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AMENDMENT

(Mr. BROYHILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed last night to hear the President's response during his press conference to a question about the Gilman amendment which we added to the Emergency Energy Conservation Act, S. 1030. I must take strong issue with the President's interpretation of Representative GILMAN's amendment.

The President seemed to be confused and misinformed as to what this amendment would do. He implied that the amendment ties his hands in the event of a national emergency, that it would interfere with his power to implement a gasoline rationing plan in the event of a national emergency. The inference is that the House has acted irresponsibly in adopting the Gilman amendment.

This simply is not the case.

Under the committee bill, the President is able to devise the gasoline rationing approach he prefers, put this plan on the shelf and store it for future implementation. Then, if he finds that fuel shortages hit 20 percent below average supplies, he can pull this plan he has devised off the shelf and put it into use. Congress would then have 15 days to review the President's decision to implement the plan.

The catch is this: In its review Congress would be focusing, not on the details of the plan, but on whether the severity of the energy emergency warranted the implemention. In other words, the substance of the plan itself would not be considered.

The Gilman amendment lets Congress have a reasonable, logical look at the plan before it is stored away for possible future use. Under the terms of Mr. GILMAN's amendment, Congress has 30 days in which to review the President's plan subsequent to its submission. This period

would be used to review the actual content of the plan itself to make certain the plan is a responsible and equitable approach to a very serious problem. If Congress does not act on the proposal within 30 days, under the Gilman approach the plan is set on the shelf and is subject to the same 15-day veto provision as in the committee bill.

Under the terms of the Gilman amendment, we are only asking that Congress have the right to review the details of the plan the President devises. Obviously, such a plan would be put into reserve until an energy emergency occurs.

Frankly speaking, we must all concede that the provision of S. 1030 we are questioning here is not the result of a well thought-out energy policy. Rather, this is a mere reaction to the fact that a gasoline rationing plan has already been submitted to this body and has been rejected. Now we are asked to endorse sight unseen, blindfolded if you will, a future plan as yet to be devised by the President. Further, we will not be able to question the specifics of that proposal unless a critical shortfall of fuel forces our hand and the President invokes a rationing plan.

It only stands to reason, Mr. Speaker, that Congress should consider a rationing plan in the cool and calm atmosphere afforded by the Gilman amendment rather than wait until necessity compels Congress to debate this issue in the heat of an emergency.

Let me underscore one important point. A vote for the Gilman amendment is not a vote against the idea of preparing a contingency plan to be held for use in the unfortunate eventuality that gasoline rationing must be considered.

But there are so many variables here. We have heard a multitude of criticisms about possible components of the plan. Some Members have expressed concerns that different regions of the country would not be treated fairly under a plan, that urban areas would receive too much gas, that rural areas would not receive enough.

Some Members have expressed concern about a possible "white market" in rationing coupons which would drive costs up and make gasoline affordable principally for the well-to-do.

Yet others have expressed the belief that the costs associated with such a program would run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Or that such a plan could not be implemented quickly enough during a time of emergency. The list goes on and on.

In all fairness to everyone, and in light of the controversy which has already been proven to surround rationing, why is there objection to a review of the content of the plan prior to its promulgation?

I have listened to the debate, and one thing I notice is that the term "special interests" has been tossed about continuously.

Is a person about to lose his or her job because of rationing a special interest?

Is a person who sees his small business fail because of the effects of rationing a special interest?

Is a traveling salesman who relies on gasoline to perform his job a special interest?

Is the person who lives in a rural area with no access to public transportation and inadequate supplies of gas for ranching or farming a special interest?

These are the questions I put to my colleagues.

In all our fervor over sections and paragraphs and titles of subsections, are we forgetting those we represent? Gasoline use touches upon the everyday life of almost all American citizens. These citizens sent us here to look out for their best interests. Let us use some commonsense here. Let us do the job we were sent here to do and make certain a rational approach is adopted. Only the elected officials, responsible to the public, should make the kinds of decisions needed here, rather than turn dictatorial powers over to an imperial Presidency while a blindfolded, bound, and gagged Congress stands helplessly by.

A COURAGEOUS CONGRESS

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night, the deliberations of the House were the subject of some "instant analysis" by the President, who characterized as "timidity" the adoption of my amendment providing for a one-house veto of the provisions of any gas rationing plan.

I would respond to the President that the timidity, if any, is on the part of the administration, which apparently is unwilling to subject its rationing plans to congressional scrutiny.

The House action providing for a congressional veto demonstrated that there are those of us in the Congress who wish to act responsibly and are courageous enough to consider the merits of any rationing plan prior to placing it in a stand-by status.

I was heartened, Mr. Speaker, to hear the President indicate that his major concern was the quick implementation of rationing under emergency conditions.

I re-emphasize that my congressional veto amendment contains no roadblocks to implementation. Since a congressional approved plan will be in place "on the shelf" when any emergency occurs, any debate will focus only on the most immediate problem—whether or not the emergency warrants rationing, rather than on the substance of the plan.

□ 1010

THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the media-interest in tonight's congressional baseball game is at a fever pitch.

And, is there any wonder that the media is interested in the 18th Annual Roll Call Congressional Baseball Game? It has all the ingredients of the major news stories of the summer: It is as filled with tension and anticipation as the Skylab landing. It has produced tempers as hot as a mile-long gas line. It has all of the drama of a week's seclusion at Camp David. And, I can promise you that tonight my fine-tuned Republican team will demonstrate such razzle-dazzle on the bases that last week's Cabinet shuffle will pale in comparison.

I would like to remind my colleagues that the game will be played tonight at Four-Mile Run Stadium—home of the Alexandria Mariners—at 7:15 p.m. I also would like my Republican colleagues to recall the old saying "He also serves who only comes and cheers." I ask them all to come to witness our 15th drubbing of the Democrats.

UNRESPONSIVENESS OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, more than a month ago, I wrote to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to register some serious concerns and complaints from my constituents over failure of the Central Arizona Health Systems Agency to act according to public needs.

To date, I have received no response from the Secretary.

It is almost too coincidental that the response to these documented irregularities made known to the Secretary was delayed so that it would not arrive until after the House had considered legislation extending and expanding the authority for federally chartered health planning agencies such as CAHSA.

Such dilatory tactics by Federal officials should not be tolerated.

I believe that Congress should consider a statutory time limit on executive branch responses to congressional inquiries.

Substantial penalties should be imposed when Federal officials fail to take appropriate action when requested to do so in behalf of the public by elected representatives.

CONGRESS WOULD LIKE A SHARE IN APPROVAL OF STANDBY RATIONING AUTHORITY

(Mr. MYERS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we join our colleague the gentleman from Kentucky, CARROLL HUBBARD, in welcoming his father, Dr. Hubbard, who once again as guest chaplain delivered the very beautiful prayer.

Mr. Speaker, 11 days ago our President told the Nation the critical situation our Nation is in, particularly concerning energy. Again last night, for the first few minutes of his press conference, he once again identified energy as the Nation's No. 1 problem.

Yet, last night when this body was considering what the President and the Democrat leadership of this Congress identify as an important part of the President's program, standby authority to ration, the bill was abruptly removed from the program and at this point, has not been replaced on the calendar. Why? Because this body about 4 weeks ago rejected one of the President's standby authority rationing programs. Angrily, he said, "Let Congress write it."

That is all we asked last night was to have a share in the approval of a standby authority before we ever have to consider putting it in place.

CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT SHOULD STEP ASIDE AND LET AMERICA PRODUCE ITS OWN ENERGY

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the President had a clear choice to make on energy: Get the Government out of the business or get it further in. Unfortunately for everyone, he chose more Government.

Government does not produce energy. Geologists, engineers, drillers, investors—these are the people who produce energy. And the President has chosen to attack those people, labeling them the "oil lobby" and charging that they wish to rob the American people.

Constantly pitting one part of America against another part is not the way to win the energy war—or any war. It is sometimes the way to win an election, but it is no way to run the country.

How can the President expect us to pull together when he constantly pulls us apart? Attacking Congress is no way to get a coherent energy policy—and attacking the oil companies is no way to produce more oil.

I believe in the ability of America to produce its own energy, and I believe that Congress and the President ought to get out of the way so we can do just that.

BICENTENARY-ERA COMMISSION

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor legislation to establish the Citizens' Commission for the Commemoration of the Federal Government Bicentenary Era.

The purpose of this bill is to focus public awareness on our heritage—on the trials, tribulations, sacrifices, and courage that went into forging the Government of this Republic between 1776 and 1800.

It has become apparent that millions of Americans take our liberties for granted, and are oblivious to the obligations of citizenship such as voting and participation in the political process. Today, with TV and print media, the story of the founding of representative government can be presented for mass circulation, in fascinating ways.

The legislation that my colleague from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, and I are sponsoring, would launch an official Federal effort to stimulate and coordinate observances of the anniversaries of significant dates in our Nation's struggle to become a functioning republic.

This approach resulted in a gala celebration of our bicentennial year. Certainly, there is a demonstrated need for more awareness by more Americans of the unique Government we have, and the fierce challenges our forefathers and mothers overcame to pass on to us this priceless legacy of freedom and opportunity.

I urge my colleagues in the House to rally around this bill, to help us launch an appropriate tribute to the founding of the United States of America.

CAN YOU BELIEVE THAT THE PRESIDENT CHARGES CONGRESS WITH TIMIDITY?

(Mr. BAUMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the Speaker and of the majority leader, and of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), my good friend and of all my colleagues here in the House who were being kicked around by the President of the United States during his press conference last night.

How dare the President charge us with timidity? How dare he say this about his own leaders with a 2-to-1 majority in this House?

I think it is unfortunate that the President of the United States, who should bring people together, should try and divide his own ranks by these constant attacks on the Congress of the United States, which is controlled by you, Mr. Speaker, obviously—that was shown last night—and by the Democratic Party's majority.

I looked up the word "timidity," and found the definition—"lacking in courage, or self-confidence; easily frightened or overawed."

At least the President does know the English language, and he ought to know the meaning of the word "timidity" very well.

THE PLIGHT OF IOSIF MENDELEVICH

(Mr. LEVITAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Mr. HOWARD, and others in participating in the "Shatter the Silence Vigil, 1979," in an effort to improve emigration for Soviet Jews.

Today, I would like to discuss the case of Iosif Mendelevich. His case presently has two significant aspects. With the release this past April of seven of the Prisoners of Conscience convicted in the infamous Leningrad Trial of 1970, there remains in prison three from that trial, two non-Jews and Mendelevich. It is unjust for some who received harsher sentences than Mendelevich's to have been freed, and to keep him and the others incarcerated.

Second, and perhaps this is one of the reasons why the Soviets chose not to release Mendelevich along with the others, he is an observant Jew. He eats only kosher food, thus limiting an already paltry diet upon which he must subsist while working at hard labor. He insists on wearing the traditional skullcap, and works extra hours 6 days a week so that he does not have to work on the Jewish Sabbath. This, apparently, does not sit well with the Soviets.

Born into a family close to Jewish traditions, the 31-year-old Mendelevich and his family were refused permission to emigrate to Israel three times between 1967 and 1970. On June 15, 1970, he was arrested at the Leningrad airport for the alleged attempt to steal a plane to Israel. Simultaneously, Soviet Jewish activists were apprehended in cities throughout the Soviet Union. After worldwide expressions of outrage Mendelevich's original sentence of 15 years was reduced to 12. He is scheduled to be released from prison in 1982. We must continue to cry out for justice, and, once again, I say it is unjust for this man to have to continue to work at hard labor for several more years while some of his fellow prisoners, a number of whom received harsher sentences than his, are now enjoying freedom from prison.

Certainly, it would be in the spirit of the Helsinki Conference for the Soviets to review this case and others mentioned above. I urge my colleagues to be continually aware of human rights violations, not only in the Soviet union, but elsewhere—wherever they exist.

THE BRAVERY OF VIKTORAS PETKUS

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to review and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House are trying to, over the next month, hopefully not years, mention each morning one of the prisoners of conscience who are held in the Soviet Gulag concentration camps.

This morning I would like to speak of Viktoras Petkus, the 50-year-old Lithuanian Catholic and present cellmate of Anatoly Shcharansky, has now completed over one year of his current sentence—10 years hard labor in Chistopol prison and 5 years of enforced exile from Lithuania.

Petkus is no newcomer to the struggle for human rights. Eighteen years after his birth in 1929, in Raseiniai, Lithuania, he was arrested for his activities in a Roman Catholic youth organization which opposed Lithuania's annexation by the U.S.S.R.

When not in prison, Petkus courageously fought for basic human rights. He distributed reading materials to interest fellow Lithuanians in native history, religion and literature. He assisted the mother of Simas-Kudirka in working for Kudirka's release from a Soviet prison, and also attempted to attend the trial of Sergei Kovalev in Vilnius, but was detained by the KBG.

The efforts of Petkus, as well as Shcharansky, in founding the Moscow Lithuanian Helsinki Monitoring Group, are well-known to all of us. Petkus went on to prepare twelve of the Helsinki Group documents, as well as to attempt organizing a "Supreme Committee on the National Movements of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania."

My colleagues, though you are well aware of the details of the work of Petkus as a leader in the Lithuanian Catholic movement, I cannot impress upon you enough the severity of his situation now. Having no known relatives to plead his case, he fights solely for the only family he has—the Lithuanian people. However, it is not his own people who can free him from the deplorable conditions under which he is forced to live and work. It is only the Western world that can secure his release and freedom.

It is of utmost importance that we not let our familiarity with the Petkas case dissipate. His fate is in our hands. The more we learn of such Soviet dissidents the more we must impress Soviet authorities with our dedication to the release of these heroic people.

Mr. Petkus was designated a "Prisoner of Conscience." Let us also become "prisoners" of our consciences. Let us never forget the plight of Petkus or the other imprisoned Helsinki Monitors. The actions that we take to help free Petkus will set the stage for future releases. And it is only through our unrelenting concern that we can free our own consciences.

□ 1020

THE LATE W. E. "ED" WILLIAMSON

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House the sad news that the longtime counsel to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Ed Williamson, has passed away. His funeral is going to be today. He was a good friend to many of us and a tremendous help and guide to the committee. I am sure we will all miss him and extend our sympathies to his family.

AFTER GOOD SUMMIT MEETING DEMOCRATIC BASEBALL TEAM REORGANIZED

(Mr. CHAPPELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak briefly on the ball game coming up tonight. The gentleman from the other side of the aisle, Mr. CONTE, has been doing a lot of big talk about how the Republicans are going to take on the Democrats tonight. I am here to tell him if he wants to stay out of the loss column, the only chance he has is to pray for rain so the game will be postponed.

Mr. Speaker, we have reorganized the Democratic team. We know we have not had the best of luck in the past 2 or 3 years. But we want the Members to know we have been up to the summit. We have held a good summit meeting, and closed the confidence gap. Our players turned in their contracts and we have renegotiated them. We needed more weight so we have brought MENDEL DAVIS back for heavy work. We needed stronger leadership so we drafted our majority leader, JIM WRIGHT, as our chief of staff. The Members would be surprised how that has improved the attendance of our baseball team at the practices. He is going to be out there in full uniform, and he is going to be directing the team. I guess we are just going to call him "Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

We have had some problem on the bases in the past. Some players were so fast they overran the other runners on the bases. So this year we have decided to put earphones on our players to receive the signals from the bench. We first planned to use two signals "whoa" and "Go." But surmising the independence of our players we determined that one signal is preferable. So the signal will be "Go" all the way—and "Whup" the Repubs good.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPPELL. Not at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am sorry, but the gentleman under the rules of the House cannot have it.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CONTE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves the right to object. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. CONTE. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. The last week when I made my speech about the coach of the Democratic team——

Mr. KAZEN. Nobody questioned the gentleman, sir, nobody interrupted him.

Mr. CONTE. Last week, I fear I may have made a mistake when I said that my Democratic opponents would rely solely on fossil fuel. From the remarks of the gentleman from Florida, it is clear that they will also have plenty of windpower and hot air.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen can argue in the bus on the way to the game.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3000, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1980 AND 1981—CIVILIAN APPLICATIONS

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 379 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 379

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3000) to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian programs for fiscal year 1980 and fiscal year 1981, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one and one-half hours, thirty minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, thirty minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and thirty minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Science and Technology, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider, immediately after the enacting clause of the bill is read, the text of the bill H.R. 4839 as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill, said substitute shall be considered for amendment by titles instead of by sections and each title shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI, and clause 5, rule XXI, are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text by this resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 379 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3000, Department of Energy civilian programs authorization for fiscal year 1980.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed further I have an unanimous consent request with regard to this resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be amended by striking out the words "for amendment" on page 2, lines 22 and 23, and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule." Mr. Speaker, this phrase was inadvertently left out of the rule as reported. This will simply allow for a more orderly procedure when the bill is being considered for amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 379 provides for an open rule with 1½ hours of general debate to be divided as follows: 30 minutes to the Committee on Science and Technology, 30 minutes to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and 30 minutes to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In each instance the time is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the respective committees.

The rule provides for a waiver of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act since one of the committees did not meet the May 15 reporting date requirement. However, the Budget Committee supports the granting of the waiver in this instance since that committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, decided not to report the bill because of its limited jurisdiction over certain titles of the bill. The other committees did satisfy the May 15 reporting requirement. Thus, the Budget Committee has no objection to the waiver.

In addition, House Resolution 379 makes in order H.R. 4839 as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the original bill to be read by titles instead of by sections. Each title shall be considered as read. H.R. 4839 is the compromise bill agreed to by the three committees to resolve many of their jurisdictional problems. Since the resolution has been amended, this substitute will be considered as an original bill for purposes of amendment under the 5-minute rule. Points of order are waived against the substitute for failure to comply with clause 7, rule XVI—the germaneness rule—as well as with clause 5, rule XXI, which prohibits appropriations in an authorization measure. House Resolution 379 also provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3000 authorizes appropriations of $6.9 billion for several department of energy civilian programs in fiscal year 1980. The bill provides for programs in research and development in nuclear, solar, fossil and other energy sources and includes funding for the Clinch River breeder reactor. In addition, the bill authorizes funds for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Economic Regulatory Administration, the Energy Information Administration and the strategic petroleum reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend these committees for working so well together in resolving many of their jurisdictional differences on this very complex but necessary piece of legislation. I know of no opposition to the rule, although some Members are concerned with various provisions in the bill. I urge the adoption of House Resolution 379 in order that we may discuss and debate this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN).

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) has explained the provisions of the rule very thoroughly and very accurately.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, it is time for action by this House to solve the energy problem without so much comment or criticism emanating from the White House. So, today, as we face this measure on the floor, it is time for action. It is time for more nuclear energy; for more solar energy, both research and technology; it is time for more geothermal energy. It is time for more coal gasification; it is time for basic research; it is time for action.

Without any lengthy speech I am going to commit myself to its time for action by reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 6, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

YEAS—404

Abdnor
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Ambro
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Atkinson
AuCoin
Badham
Bafalis
Bailey
Baldus
Barnard
Barnes
Beard, R.I.
Beard, Tenn.
Bedell
Bellenson
Benjamin
Bennett
Bereuter
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Bouquard
Bowen
Brademas
Breaux
Brinkley
Brodhead
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Buchanan
Burgener
Burlison
Butler
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carr
Carter
Cavanaugh
Chappell
Cheney
Clausen
Clay
Cleveland
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conte
Corcoran
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Courter
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Dannemeyer
Daschle
Davis, Mich.
de la Garza
Deckard
Dellums
Derrick
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dicks
Diggs
Dingell
Dixon
Dodd
Donnelly
Dornan
Dougherty
Downey
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Early
Eckhardt
Edgar
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, Okla.
English
Erdahl
Erlenborn
Ertel
Evans, Del.
Evans, Ga.
Evans, Ind.
Fary
Fascell
Fazio
Fenwick
Ferraro
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Fithian
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford, Mich.
Ford, Tenn.
Fountain
Fowler
Frenzel
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gephardt
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Grassley
Gray
Green
Grisham
Guarini
Gudger
Guyer
Hagedorn
Hall, Tex.
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hance
Hanley
Hansen
Harkin
Harris
Harsha
Hawkins
Heckler
Hefner
Heftel
Hightower
Hillis
Hinson
Hollenbeck
Holt
Holtzman
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Ichord
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jeffries
Jenkins
Jenrette
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kelly
Kemp
Kildee
Kindness
Kogovsek
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach, Iowa
Leach, La.
Leath, Tex.
Lederer
Lehman
Leland
Lent
Levitas
Lewis
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
Lowry
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
McClory
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKay
McKinney
Madigan
Maguire
Markey
Marks
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin
Mathis
Matsui
Mattox
Mavroules
Mazzoli
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Mottl
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murphy, Pa.
Murtha
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Natcher
Neal
Nedzi
Nelson
Nichols
Nolan
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Panetta
Pashayan
Patten
Patterson
Pease
Perkins
Petri
Peyser
Pickle
Preyer
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quayle
Quillen
Rahall
Railsback
Rangel
Ratchford
Regula
Reuss
Rhodes
Richmond
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rousselot
Roybal
Royer
Rudd
Runnels
Russo
Sabo
Satterfield
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schulze
Sebelius
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Simon
Skelton
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Nebr.
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spellman
Spence
St Germain
Stack
Staggers
Stangeland
Stanton
Stark
Steed
Stenholm
Stewart
Stockman
Stokes

Stratton	Vander Jagt	Wilson, Tex.
Studds	Vanik	Winn
Stump	Vento	Wirth
Swift	Volkmer	Wolff
Symms	Wampler	Wolpe
Synar	Watkins	Wright
Tauke	Weaver	Wyatt
Taylor	White	Wydler
Thomas	Whitehurst	Wylie
Thompson	Whitley	Yates
Traxler	Whittaker	Yatron
Trible	Whitten	Young, Fla.
Udall	Williams, Mont.	Young, Mo.
Ullman	Wilson, Bob	Zablocki
Van Deerlin	Wilson, C. H.	Zeferetti

NAYS—6

Bauman	Crane, Daniel	Paul
Burton, Phillip	Crane, Philip	Weiss

NOT VOTING—24

Boiling	Forsythe	Rosenthal
Burton, John	Hall, Ohio	Santini
Chisholm	Holland	Treen
Conyers	Lee	Walgren
Davis, S.C.	McDonald	Walker
Drinan	Mitchell, Md.	Waxman
Emery	Moffett	Williams, Ohio
Flood	Pepper	Young, Alaska

□ 1040

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. John L. Burton with Mr. Emery.
Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Forsythe.
Mr. Santini with Mr. Walker.
Mr. Walgren with Mr. Williams of Ohio.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Lee.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Hall of Ohio.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. McDonald.
Mr. Moffett with Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Waxman.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Drinan.

Mr. PAUL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1050

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 3000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1980 AND 1981—CIVILIAN APPLICATION

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3000) to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian programs for fiscal year 1980 and fiscal year 1981, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3000, with Mr. BOLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) will be recognized for 15 minutes; and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of all Members today for what I think is the most significant energy bill to come before this Chamber this year. I say this because the programs and projects authorized in this bill are designed to develop our domestic resources and improve our technologies for the short, medium, and long term. It has required a great deal of work within our Committee on Science and Technology to bring before the House a bill which will spend the money wisely and accelerate areas such as photovoltaics, coal liquid demonstration plants, fusion technology, and conservation.

The work has been broader than our committee because the Department of Energy has other functions to perform which are handled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Mr. DINGELL and Mr. UDALL and their staffs have been most cooperative in working with us and the fruits of our labors are reflected in the fact that there are no disagreements between the committees in the bill before us today.

Mr. Chairman, now is the time to act. We need assured sources of energy supply and we must develop the technologies to take advantage of our abundant coal reserves, oil shale reserves, and agricultural land skills that are underutilized. The Congress has an excellent record in accelerating these technologies. Our committee first authorized demonstration plants for high-Btu and low-Btu gas in fiscal year 1976. Those plants have not yet been built. In that year, we also authorized two coal liquefaction pilot plants and I am pleased to report both of them are completing construction at this time and should be operating in the near future. The technologies contained in this bill are geared to the production of energy domestic resources. This is the key to achieving our energy independence.

Our Nation is blessed with vast resources in many regions of our country. We have the technology and scientific skills that cover a broad range of potential applications. This bill keeps our scientists working on these applications while at the same time, providing for the construction and operation of plants which are on the forefront of technology and from which decisions about commercial plants can be made.

Mr. Chairman, I hope these brief remarks serve to indicate that Congress has been toiling in the vineyards these past several years. This bill seizes that initiative and presents an aggressive Federal program. I am personally proud of our record and can only say that we would be far better off today if the several plants that have been authorized in the past were built, or at least under construction.

The cooperation we have had with others in understanding the situations we face has been outstanding, and I urge your cooperation in supporting this bill which is absolutely vital to achieve the goals of energy production we jointly seek.

On the 1st of May, the Committee on Science and Technology reported favorably on H.R. 3000, the initial bill introduced to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1980, for consideration by the House. The Committee on Science and Technology shares jurisdiction over this legislation with the Commerce and Interior Committees. In order to simplify consideration of the bill on the House floor, the committees have worked together to resolve differences and overlaps which came about as a result of each committee's separate actions. The committees, at the suggestion of the Parliamentarian, have introduced a bill, H.R. 4839, which represents a resolution of those differences.

H.R. 3000 contains an authorization for Department of Energy research, development, and demonstration programs of approximately $6.1 billion, an increase of $241 million above the administration's authorization request of January 1979. The work on our part of this bill has been carried out by our distinguished subcommittee chairmen: MIKE MCCORMACK, who handled the nuclear, geothermal, low-head hydro, electric and storage systems and basic research programs; RICHARD OTTINGER, who has worked on the fossil, solar, and conservation programs; JEROME AMBRO, who worked on the environmental research and development programs; and TOM HARKIN, who handled transportation and energy conservation programs.

The committee made significant changes in the bill as it was submitted by the administration. In the nuclear fission programs, the committee funded the Clinch River breeder reactor project at $183.8 million; it increased the DOE request for civilian nuclear waste treatment technology by $6.75 million, and added $5 million to begin demonstration of high level waste solidification at the nuclear fuel services facility at West Valley, N.Y. It added $27.4 million to the converter reactor program to bolster the effort in reprocessing of converter reactor spent fuel and to develop high-temperature gas reactor technology.

In the fusion energy program, the committee recommended modest changes that would accelerate development of the most promising magnetic fusion alterna-

tives in an effort to proceed more quickly to the successful demonstration of a fusion power reactor. Thus, the committee increased the development and technology subprogram by $4.3 million and decreased the applied plasma physics program by $5.5 million. It also added $10.4 million to the inertial confinement—or laser—fusion program, for civilian power applications.

In geothermal energy, the committee added $4 million for a second hydrothermal demonstration powerplant, an important project which was previously authorized by Congress, but has yet to be initiated by the administration. The committee decreased the geopressured resource activity by $4 million, which will have the effect of reducing the number of new geopressured wells to be drilled from five to four.

In electric energy and storage systems the committee restored funding to critical programs to develop efficient and safe high-voltage transmission lines, to control the transfer of bulk electrical power to different regions on the Nation's utility grid system, and to continue development of advanced energy storage systems.

In fossil energy programs, the committee added a total of $45 million for the solvent refined coal demonstration plants—$20 million for SRC–I and $25 million for SRC–II. These propects are aimed at converting coal to clean solid and liquid fuels for boiler use.

Looking to the long-range technologies which will use coal and other fossil fuels more efficiently, we added $4.5 million for thermionics and $9 million for fuel cells.

Although we are interested in developing synthetic fuels from coal, we recognize that in the next 25 to 30 years the primary use of coal will be direct combustion, for generation of electricity and for industrial process heat. Since the Department of Energy focus has been on energy production technology rather than on end uses, we added $2 million for a program plan and a technical implementation plan for coal-fired electric power generation technologies.

In conservation, we added $29 million for urban-waste-to-energy grants and loan guarantees. This will have a twofold effect—in disposing of our urban waste and in using it as a resource to generate energy. This is a specific mandate to the DOE to take action in this direction.

The committee also added $26.75 million for industrial energy conservation, specifically for industrial process efficiency and industrial cogeneration of heat and electricity.

In solar applications, we added $25 million for photovoltaics and another $15 million for solar heating and cooling demonstration systems development. Our recommendation for the Federal photovoltaic utilization program of $10 million, which was not requested by the Department of Energy, is an indication of our desire that photovoltaic technology be demonstrated as soon as possible.

Turning to the environmental area, I am pleased to report that the administration's proposed budget reflected recommendations made by the committee in previous authorizations. The major change made by the committee was the addition of $2.5 million in authorization for research into appropriate cleanup procedures following a nuclear accident. The committee believes that the restoration of contaminated areas to productive use has not been adequately examined and that research into this area is essential.

Finally, we have approved the administration's request for a healthy basic energy research budget, so essential to our long-term goals. These programs include materials science, chemistry, geological science, and energy-related aspects of the biological sciences. We have also approved the request for a strong general science program in the areas of high-energy and nuclear physics, assuring that our Nation will continue to be a world leader in the search for new knowledge about the fundamental nature of matter and energy.

Mr. Chairman, the energy research, development, and demonstration authorization bill reported by the Committee on Science and Technology represents a strong effort to get this Nation's energy program on track and moving toward a solution of our many energy problems. I urge my colleagues to adopt this important piece of legislation.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are going to consider here today is an important bill for our Nation because it deals with the question of supply of energy. This is one vote that members of the committee and of the House can cast knowing that they are coming to grips with the supply issue, and I hope every Member will consider that most seriously as we consider the bill and some of the amendments that are going to be offered to the bill this afternoon.

There is an urgent need to pass the second energy supply bill of this Congress in the form of H.R. 3000. As I said before, we must demonstrate the seriousness with which the Congress approaches the question of energy supply by ratifying this bill. We must then exert the utmost pressure on the other body to do the same with their version, S. 688.

Just as in the Moorhead synthetic fuels bill, which the Congress overwhelmingly approved a few weeks ago, we here are answering the need for energy supply by setting forth congressional policy in the absence of a firm commitment on this front by the administration. The administration's recent push for synthetic fuels is a blatant attempt to catch up with the Congress after the Moorhead initiative. In this bill we are putting more distance between ourselves and the administration on the question of nuclear policy.

The major focus of controversy in this bill, as it has been for the last 3 years, is the Clinch River breeder reactor project. We have strong reasons for proceeding with this project and the objections to it by the administration have been literally shot full of holes in every aspect. The General Accounting Office has strongly confirmed the position of our committee and the whole House that this country must retain a commitment to build a breeder and demonstrate that this important energy supply technology is available when we need it.

□ 1100

I have discussed this matter with the Japanese, the Germans, the British and the International Atomic Energy Agency. The United States remains a minority of one on this issue, standing against the development of a breeder reactor.

On the Committee on Science and Technology we have also taken an initiative to hammer out a viable program in nuclear fuels reprocessing research and development.

Unfortunately, the administration has chosen not to request any funds for the Barnwell nuclear fuels plant, despite all indications that it should be the developing countries first international reprocessing plant with programs conducted under advanced nuclear safeguards.

Neither have we neglected the long term nuclear option in magnetic fusion. There have been recent breakthroughs in this most promising technology. It will present a savings in time and money if we can move now and move boldly to augment the fusion budget and push the promising Tokamak concept toward technology demonstration. The administration, unfortunately, seems to continue to lag behind in this area also. So, we must lamentably conclude that the administration feels no urgency to push ahead on the advanced technology fronts in either fission or fusion.

In the area of civilian waste management, there is overwhelming evidence that the technology for safely isolating nuclear waste for long periods of time is at hand. Our Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production documented this view conclusively in hearings this May. We must get on with demonstrating to the citizenry that the technology is indeed here and that the corresponding geological work at specific alternative sites must now be done.

I will be supporting the Goldwater-Dannemeyer amendment to this bill to assure that this end is achieved on a reasonable timetable.

The additional requirements for nuclear safety R. & D. have emerged clearly from our committee hearings on this topic held in late May. We heard from representatives of the nuclear industry, nuclear critics, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, State representatives and Adm. Hyman Rickover, head of the naval nuclear propulsion program. We also received testimony from Dr. George Low, the former deputy administrator at NASA, who gave us an aerospace perspective.

I was particularly interested in what Admiral Rickover and Dr. Low had to say so we might set a new benchmark for nuclear safety systems. We identified several specific areas where DOE is now prepared to move out with an enhanced program. I shall offer an amendment to this bill to provide $5 million for the following technical program elements:

First. Improved methods of risk assessment.

Second. Improved safety systems including component and plant layout approaches.

Third. Refined methods of safety data analysis and studies of hydrogen explosions and related reactor systems problems.

I believe that this add-on complements the $5 million authorization in title VII of this bill which the committee provided for DOE to develop a program to train nuclear operators. That program should incorporate the latest advances in our knowledge of the man-machine interaction.

In my opinion, these new thrusts should follow through on our commitment to make the Three Mile Island accident the "Apollo 204 Fire" for the nuclear industry. I believe this will be a basis for constructive utilization of all the data derived from this accident.

As the members of this committee may remember, we did in the middle of the Apollo program have a very serious accident occur, an accident in which three of our astronauts were killed in training. There were some in those days that said we should end that program and not take any more risks, but instead of doing that we pulled our program together, improved the safety of the program and went on from that accident to make the program a better program and a successful program. That is what we should be doing with what we have learned from the Three Mile Island accident as well.

Mr. Chairman, there are many important provisions in this bill that will help to increase the energy supply for our Nation in the years to come. I hope the members of this committee will give this bill the support it needs to indicate to the President and the administration that we mean business in increasing energy supply. The funding of general science and research in this bill is quite healthy and basic energy sciences have been increased from fiscal year 1979 by over 20 percent.

Our committee intends to pursue closely the important relationship between these programs and the early phases of technology development programs in nuclear, fossil, geothermal, and the other energy sources. The major amendments to this bill adopted by the Science and Technology Committee and, in some cases modified in joint jurisdictional negotiations with the other two committees, are significant. I should mention that the West Valley solidification demonstration project on nuclear waste is to be an important milestone in that area.

Mr. Chairman, the thrust of this bill can be summarized in three words: supply, supply, supply.

Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the legislation and to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) on the gentleman's work as ranking minority member of the full committee and on the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production and most particularly for the gentleman's pragmatic and farsighted approach to the energy dilemma.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Science and Technology Committee I would like to speak today in support of H.R. 3000, the Department of Energy authorization bill.

This Nation is facing a serious and complex energy dilemma, and disagreements abound on possible solutions to the problem. No panacea has been discovered, no single answer is most appealing. But there are several energy sources which have a great deal of potential, and this bill is notable for the fact that it emphasizes the most promising of these, although admittedly we must proceed cautiously in some areas.

The committee has once again acted in support of the development of the breeder reactor. The margin this year was wider than last, reflecting this body's awareness of the increasing necessity for new energy-producing methods and the debate reflected the body's recognition of environmental factors. Arguments for the breeder have already been advanced which have pointed to its technological benefits and the energy needs in this Nation that the breeder could fill, recognizing the finite nature of other energy sources and the time needed to develop others. But energy issues touch on all sectors of American life, so I would like to mention a subsidiary result of safe breeder development which supports its use. Simply put, reactor construction means jobs. Organizations with a tradition of concern about unemployment, such as the AFL–CIO, have publicly advocated the advancement of safe breeder technology. It would be foolish for us to ignore an industry which would have a doubly beneficial impact on our Nation's economy.

The widespread use of the breeder reactor and other alternate sources would not only reduce our dependence on foreign oil and our trade imbalance which fuels inflation, but also could help diminish the unemployment rate in certain regions of the Nation and ameliorate social ills, such as crime, which are aggravated by a high jobless percentage.

Magnetic fusion is another important energy field which is advanced by our committee in this bill. The work at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory has been especially exciting. They have achieved higher temperatures and have come closer to energy breakeven than most people expected. Construction of a new fusion machine, the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor, was begun at Princeton before these achievements. I strongly support the committee's initiatives to fund an upgrading of this new facility which will allow these achievements to be taken into consideration in the new facility's design. If we do this, I hope to be able to announce in the near future that more breakthroughs have occurred at Princeton and that they have demonstrated the temperature and confinement period necessary to extract more energy from a fusion reaction than we initially supplied in heating the gas.

In coal gasification and liquefaction, the committee authorized adequate funds for further research and development, but I would like to see signs of a stronger commitment to certain features of these technologies. In gasification, we should not ignore schemes for making low Btu gas for utility use and conversion to electricity. And as far as liquefaction is concerned, the gasoline crunch in the Northeast has convinced many residents of that region of the pressing need to develop alternate fuel sources. I would like to see this urgency reflected in the pace of the adaption of this technology to the fossil energy program.

I am in support of the committee in its recommendation of $2 million more for direct combustion than was directed by DOE. This year, as in last year's authorization bill, particular emphasis had been placed on the application of fluidized bed combustion to clean coal burning. It is imperative that atmospheric and pressurized fluidized bed approaches be pushed to commercialization. Advanced environmental control technology must be considered in the course of this research and development so that sensible clean air provisions are applied to new concepts.

I will conclude with a few cautionary remarks about our spending on energy development. The temptation on some funding programs for energy, with long range potential but relatively minimal results in the short term, is to subject them to less rigorous cost benefit inspection and this, too, frequently results in a waste of public money. We cannot allow this to happen with solar energy and geothermal energy, for example, although properly funded and supervised by a Congress mindful of its oversight role, solar and photovoltaic programs can make a valuable, marketable contribution in coming decades.

Mr. Chairman, I must restate my support of H.R. 3000, and urge all Members concerned about the formulation of a coherent and practical energy policy to join me in voting for this legislation.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is divided into many parts. We present it according to subcommittee jurisdiction. The Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production deals with nuclear energy, geothermal energy, low head hydroelectricity, basic energy sciences, high energy psysics, nuclear physics, electric energy systems and electric energy storage.

I congratulate Chairman FUQUA and the ranking minority member on our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) for the tremendous efforts they have put forth in coordinating and pulling this bill together, along with the chairmen of the other committees who will be sharing responsibility for the bill.

I think this is one of the most im-

portant energy bills this Congress will handle this year. I completely agree with what the gentleman from New York has just said about energy supply. The thrust of this legislation is that we must produce energy from domestic sources. This is what we are talking about, and it is the only way that we are ever going to relieve our dependence upon imported oil. In spite of any conservation program, no matter how successful, we must produce energy from domestic sources, and there are only two significant energy sources for this Nation for the balance of this century and early next century. They are nuclear fission and clean fuels made from coal. We must rely heavily upon these. That is why this legislation, moving forward aggressively with our nuclear programs is so important to the Nation.

As the gentleman from New York has mentioned, in our nuclear program we fully funded the Clinch River breeder reactor project. This is a continuing project which was, in its budget request, totally ignored by the administration. No funding was requested, either to discontinue it or to continue the CRBR.

The Committee also funded the Barnwell reprocessing plant in South Carolina, continuing the research and development programs related to nuclear fuel reprocessing, not only for a breeder program, but also for conventional nuclear powerplants.

□ 1110

In addition the committee set aside a million dollars for a special study of an internationally managed nuclear fuel reprocessing center at Barnwell. In addition to that, we took an important policy position which I believe the Members of this House will overwhelmingly endorse, and that is that we established that spent nuclear fuel elements would not be thrown away as if they were waste.

Ninety-eight percent of the contents of a spent fuel element is fuel, and a spent fuel element about 6 inches across and about 10 feet high, as it comes from a nuclear powerplant still contains the energy equivalent of 8 million to 10 million barrels of oil, if used in a breeder program. I repeat, 8 to 10 million barrels of oil equivalent from each spent fuel bundle.

So the committee has taken a strong policy position that spent fuel shall not be considered as waste which may be stored temporarily, but not thrown away, as assumed in the words "permanent storage."

On the other hand, we have moved forward aggressively with a waste disposal program, accepting an amendment from the gentleman from New York, STAN LUNDINE, who proposes to glassify the liquid wastes in storage at West Valley, New York. The committee is sponsoring this program as a demonstration to show that indeed this Nation does have the technology to totally remove all high level nuclear wastes from the biosphere forever.

The committee added funds for a safety research program for nuclear powerplants and for the training of nuclear powerplant operators. It became very evident to the committee in its investigation that one of the great weaknesses in the Three Mile Island accident was the inability of the operators to handle nuclear accident situations because of inadequate training and inadequate discipline. So we have increased funding for a training program—for nuclear plant operators.

We have also funded programs to increase the mid-term efficiency of our nuclear powerplants and make them more efficient. Making our nuclear powerplants 10 percent more efficient by the year 1985 will have the effect of adding almost a half a million barrels of oil a day to our energy supply. That is the result of just having our nuclear powerplants 10 percent more efficient.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3000.

The events of this summer have brought home with a vengeance how much we need a coherent energy policy; and how much we need an effective energy research, development, demonstration, and production program. We simply cannot afford to continue to drift from year to year while oil gets more expensive, OPEC gets more powerful, and the economy staggers from the hammer blows of repeated energy famines. There are major R. & D. policy decisions that need to be made now. They should be made through a fully supported authorization bill that forcefully communicates the will of the Congress to pursue a course that will lead us out of the energy bind in which we find ourselves.

The Committee on Science and Technology has looked long and hard at the energy program submitted to the Congress by the administration. In a number of areas we have found it grossly deficient, and these deficiencies have been corrected by committee actions. The bill that stands before us represents a major step in the direction of a comprehensive and coherent energy program.

Mr. Chairman, before I move into a discussion of the specific provisions of this bill, I would like to express my thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA), for his dedicated efforts in guiding this piece of legislation from its initial unimaginative beginnings to its present form. His leadership as chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, his fairness, and his determination to consider all aspects of the problem have been essential to the formation of an innovative and responsible energy bill.

I would also like to note the very substantial contributions of our ranking minority member, Congressman JOHN WYDLER, whose constructive actions have served to strengthen this bill in many ways.

The programs I will discuss today are those that are under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production of the Committee on Science and Technology, which I have the honor to chair. Those sections cover DOE's programs in nuclear fission, including civilian waste management and uranium enrichment and resource assessment; fusion energy; geothermal and low-head hydroelectric energy; electric energy systems, and storage systems; basic research, and general science and research.

NUCLEAR FISSION AND URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

For the nuclear fission and uranium enrichment programs, the Committee on Science and Technology voted to authorize appropriations of $2,263,773,000, an increase of $202,850,000 over the amount requested by the administration. A large fraction of this increase goes to support the Clinch River breeder reactor project (CRBRP), which the administration chose to ignore completely in submitting its budget request to the Congress.

Within the nuclear fission program, the committee voted to increase authorization for conventional nuclear plant systems research by $27.7 million; for civilian waste management by $13.25 million; for breeder reactor systems by $91.9 million; and for uranium enrichment and resource assessment activities by $70 million. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to briefly describe these changes.

CONVENTIONAL NUCLEAR PLANT RESEARCH

In the nuclear plant program, the committee increased authorization for reactor technology by $32.4 million, and decreased authorization for advanced reactor systems by $4.7 million. The reactor technology increases included the following actions:

Safety programs were increased from $3.5 to $8.5 million, to enable DOE to establish an operations training program for civilian nuclear powerplant operating personnel. This program would draw on DOE's experience with the naval reactor operator training program, but would be compatible with existing civilian operator training programs. Its purpose would be to provide intensive training for nuclear plant, operators, with particular emphasis on dealing with a wide range of operational anomolies.

Light water nuclear fuel cycle R. & D., which was dropped from the fiscal 1980 budget request, was restored by the committee at a level of $10 million. This funding allows for continued work in coprocessing and refabrication begun in fiscal 1979, and complements the fuel cycle effort in the breeder reactor program. The committee directed that $1.0 million of this increase be used to study options available for using the Barnwell nuclear fuel plant as an international facility at the conclusion of the international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation.

The high temperature gas-cooled reactor (HTGR) programs was increased by $13 million, for a total authorization of $25 million. The administration proposed to close out the program to develop gas-cooled reactor steam cycle work in fiscal 1980, and to limit work on the HTGR to direct-cycle gas turbine plants and process heat applications. Both of these advanced technologies are being developed also in the Federal Republic of Germany. The committee increase will make it clear that the United States will be a strong partner with that nation in the development of high temperature gas-cooled reactors.

The committee also provided $4.4 million for HTGR thorium cycle research

and development, which restores this program, dropped by the administration, to half the level of funding for fiscal 1979. In its action on this program, as well as on LWR fuel cycle R. & D., the committee is affirming its belief that the administration's decision to halt the reprocessing of converter reactor spent fuel is premature and contrary to the most informed views offered to the committee in its hearings on the present bill.

Funding for a new program called advanced reactor systems was cut by $4.7 million, to a level of $5.3 million. Much of this program is aimed at developing low-enriched fuel for research and test reactors, as a means of reducing the risk of proliferation of nuclear weapons. The committee noted that these reactors, most of them 1 megawatt or smaller, are not considered to be major proliferation threats. The committee action is made with the understanding that only one reduced enrichment demonstration core should be fabricated, installed and tested.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

In the area of civilian nuclear waste management, Mr. Chairman, the committee has made relatively few changes. Nevertheless, the changes that have been recommended reflect the committee's deep dissatisfaction with the slow and uncertain pace at which the administration is moving in this critical area. Despite a budget of almost $200 million per year for the past several years, the waste management program still consists of study after study, panel after panel, and deferral after deferral of the demonstration of a technology that is in hand now and has been in hand for years.

In an effort to get this program moving, the committee voted to increase its authorization by $13.25 million. Specifically, two areas have been increased:

The civilian waste treatment technology program was increased by $8.25 million, including $6.75 million for operating expenses and $1.5 million for the environmental and energy technology facility at Richland, Wash. The operating expense increase restores funding cut from the civilian high-level waste technology program in the fiscal 1980 budget request. DOE justified the cut on the basis that part of the waste vitrification effort had been transferred to the defense waste management program. However, there are substantial differences between civilian and defense high-level waste, and separate development programs are necessary for each.

A nuclear waste solidification demonstration program at the West Valley Nuclear Center was funded by the committee at a level of $5 million. The high-level liquid nuclear wastes stored there resulting from the operation of the nuclear fuel services reprocessing facility at West Valley present an unusual opportunity to demonstrate solidification of liquid wastes on a large scale. A recently completed DOE study acknowledges Federal responsibility for this high-level waste, and indicates that a vitrification demonstration project will be a 10-year effort costing about $130 million to complete. It is essential that this project be started immediately.

In addition to these budget changes, the committee adopted an amendment discouraging the wasteful practice of burying spent fuel elements before all the useful energy value is extracted from them. Underground tests simulating the irretrievable storage of spent fuel assemblies from nuclear reactors are to be prohibited. The once-through fuel cycle extracts only about 2 percent of the potential energy value contained in the uranium in spent fuel assemblies. Throwing them away is completely contrary to the national commitment to conservation of needed energy.

The committee's amendment is not intended to prohibit the demonstration of permanent disposal of nuclear isotopes which are truly wastes. The committee is strongly in favor of placing canisters of glassified wastes in deep geologic repositories or test facilities at the earliest possible date.

NUCLEAR BREEDER REACTORS

When we speak of breeder reactors, we are dealing with the heart of the nuclear development program. Here, as in the case of the waste management program, the committee is concerned with the slow pace pursued by the administration, and particularly with its efforts to abandon the centerpiece of the program, the already authorized Clinch River demonstration facility, and to substitute a vague and unsatisfactory alternate design, with no commitment to build a plant. Once again, as in the last 2 years, the committee has voted full funding for the Clinch River project, and this action increases the plants project's subprogram of the liquid metal fast breeder reactor program by $183.8 million.

At the same time, the committee reduced the administration request for the conceptual design study for an advanced breeder plant from $55 million to $15 million. This activity involved personnel who are also working on the CRBR, so the CDS cannot proceed at the $55 million level with CRBR proceeding as the committee believes it should.

The committee made changes in the authorization of a number of construction projects in the breeder program. It increased the fiscal 1980 authorization of project 78–6–e, Energy Technology Engineering Center—ETEC—Facility modification at Santa Susana, Calif., from $5.5 to $9.5 million to provide for continuity of the project, which had been delayed for 8 months. The additional $4 million will result in a total authorized amount through fiscal 1980 of $16.9 million. This increase also represents a $1.8 million increase in the total estimated cost.

At the request of the Department of Energy, project 78–6–f, Fuels and Materials Examination Facility, and project 77–4–c, High Performance Fuel Laboratory, at Richland, Wash., have been combined into a single project to effect a cost savings. These two projects have therefore been deauthorized and a new project, 80–ES–16, Fuels and Materials Examination Laboratory, has been created. The new project was authorized through fiscal 1980 for $53 million. This represents an increase of $17 million over DOE's budget request. The total estimated cost of the new project—FMEL—$139.8 million.

Project 78–6–c, safety research experimental facilities, at Argonne Laboratories in Idaho, has been authorized at $3.6 million for fiscal 1980, bringing the total authorized amount through fiscal 1980 to $27.7 million. This amount represents full authorization for that part of the safety research experimental facilities which is known as "Phase I—Treat Upgrade." DOE requested transfer of previous appropriations from Project 78–6–d, EBR II safety research modifications, to project 78–6–c. The committee has no objection to the transfer of $5 million of appropriations to 78–6–c, but did not completely deauthorize 78–6–d. It thus left $1.5 million in the EBR II safety research modifications project.

The operating expense authorization for the water cooled breeder program was increased by $3 million to $60.9 million. This increase resulted from moving the proof-of-breeding activity from fuel cycle research and development to the water cooled breeder program, since this activity supports the Shippingport atomic power project.

The gas-cooled fast reactor program was left unchanged at a total authorization of $26 million. Also, fuel cycle R. & D. operating expenses were increased by $10.5 million, to permit continued testing and studies at the Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant in South Carolina. Of this amount, $10 million is directed toward continuing the ongoing research program at Barnwell with an emphasis toward utilization of the facility in a coprocessing mode. The other $500,000 is authorized to be spent at Barnwell to undertake preliminary conceptual engineering studies on waste vitrification, plutonium conversion and mixed oxide fuel fabrication facilities. These preliminary conceptual studies will help prepare Barnwell to be used as an international fuel cycle center should the decision be made to use the facility in that way. Finally, the $3 million proof-of-breeding activity moved to water cooled reactor programs resulted in a net increase in fuel cycle R. & D. of $7.5 million.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT

Enrichment of uranium is a DOE activity in which revenues received go far to offset the costs of operating existing facilities and constructing new facilities as needed. In some years, including fiscal year 1980, the projected enrichment revenues exceed the budgeted cost of enrichment activities.

At one time, the revenues received for enrichment for private nuclear facilities, both domestic and foreign, were retained by the Department's predecessor agencies and made available to fund agency programs. This practice permitted very wide discretion on the part of the agency as to the application of these funds. In the last Congress, the enactment of Public Law 95–238 directed that the revenues received from the sale of enrichment services be used to offset the cost of providing the service.

In its fiscal 1980 budget request, however, the Department would use enrich-

ment revenues, not only to offset enrichment activities, but also to support the national uranium resources evaluation (NURE) program. The budget request for the NURE program is exactly $84,303,000—the amount by which enrichment revenues are projected to exceed the requested funding of enrichment activities.

The Department thus appears to be justifying its expenditures for both enrichment and the NURE program on the basis of revenues received, rather than on the basis of need and cost. The committee has reservations about this "justification by revenue" argument; it considers it important that these activities be reviewed and funded like any other budget activity. To do otherwise obscures the true cost of the program. The committee therefore intends to review the present practice during the coming months to determine if the treatment of enrichment revenues should be further amended.

In other action on the enrichment budget, the committee increased the construction authorization for project 78-8-g, the add-on centrifuge enrichment facility at Portsmouth, Ohio, by $70 million. In submitting its budget request for this project, DOE assumed that the fiscal 1979 authorization was valid. Since the fiscal 1979 authorization bill did not become law, the budget request was understated by $70 million.

FUSION ENERGY

The second major DOE activity I would like to describe today is the fusion energy program. This great prospective source of essentially unlimited energy is being pursued in two forms: magnetic confinement fusion, in which fusion energy is released by confining highly energetic ionized gas within strong magnetic fields; and, inertial confinement fusion, which uses powerful laser or particle beams to initiate the fusion reactions in fuel pellets.

MAGNETIC FUSION

For the magnetic fusion program in fiscal 1970, the committee voted to authorize $343,058,000, a decrease of $15.55 million from the administration's request. However, this decrease is a result of the committee's approval of only partial authorization for several construction projects, rather than the full authorization requested by DOE. In terms of budget authority for fiscal 1980, the committee recommended an increase of $12.3 million, for a total of $376,358,000.

The magnetic fusion program is divided into four subprograms: Confinement systems; development and technology; applied plasma physics; and reactor projects.

For the confinement systems subprogram, DOE requested $103.55 million in authorization and $136.75 million in the authorization figure unchanged, but recommended decreasing budget authority by $5 million. This cut will slow the pace of the mirror fusion test facility construction, while the important tandem mirror experiment and Beta II field reversal experiments go ahead on schedule.

The committee voted to increase the authorization for development and technology by $4.8 million, for a total of $62.35 million, and to redirect an additional $4 million. These actions support the engineering test facility and the conceptual design of the chief alternate concept, the Elmo Bumpy Torus (EBT). These are the two most critical activities in the mainline Tokamak program, and yet there is no explicit delineation of funding for them in the fiscal 1980 budget.

The committee reduced the authorization for applied plasma physics subprogram by $5.5 million, to $70.15 million. The reduction would cut back certain experimental activities and delete the stellerator and certain generic theory efforts. The rest of the reduction would be spread across the board within the applied plasma physics subprogram.

In the reactor projects subprogram, the committee recommended increased budget authority of $15 million for the fusion materials irradiation test facility, but provided only partial authorization for the project by reducing authorization by $17.85 million. As the fusion program develops—and significant and encouraging progress has been made in the past several years—the engineering of facilities that can convert fusion energy into useful forms becomes more and more urgent. Testing and verification of appropriate materials for fusion reactors is an important part of this process, to be carried out at the FMIT facility, and the committee action will accelerate its construction by 1 year. The committee also added $3 million to the operating expenses authorization for reactor projects for the development and testing of the prototype accelerator for the FMIT facility, to keep it in phase with accelerated construction of the facility.

INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION

The bulk of the development effort in inertial confinement, or laser, fusion is carried out by DOE's defense program. For fiscal 1980, however, the Committee on Science and Technology has added $10.4 million to provide support for civilian power applications at two operating facilities. The laser users facility at the University of Rochester was funded with an additional $5.6 million to assure that scientific experiments that support civilian applications can be performed at high power levels. Funding of $4.8 million was also provided for civilian power applications at the KMS laboratories.

GEOTHERMAL AND LOW-HEAD HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY

Geothermal energy offers a large but underutilized potential of energy, both for electric power generation and for direct heat applications. The geothermal energy development program is beginning to show substantial results, with commercial geothermal projects moving beyond the conventional dry steam facilities, such as the Geysers facility in northern California, to begin using the water-dominated heat sources that are much more common. This commitment to geothermal resources has been made more practical by incentives and demonstration projects under the DOE program, and by the economic incentives such as investment tax credits, depletion allowances, and intangible drilling cost deductions provided by the 1978 National Energy Act.

There are three principal types of geothermal energy resources. In increasing order of estimated size, they are hydrothermal, geopressured, and hot dry rock. The budget request for fiscal 1980 for hydrothermal resources program is $59.1 million, down sharply from the $70.9 million of the previous year. DOE justified this reduction by arguing that the hydrothermal technology is ready for commercialization, so that the need for developmental efforts on the part of the Federal Government are not as great. However, the committee restored $4 million of the cut and reauthorized a second 50-megawatt hydrothermal demonstration plant, previously authorized in Public Law 95-238. Despite the appropriation of funds for this project in fiscal 1979, DOE has not proceeded with the project.

The committee believes that two demonstration plants are needed, using different technologies and located in different geologic formations. There is little evidence that private industry will commit to this plant without Government involvement.

The fiscal 1980 budget request for geopressured resources was $36 million, an increase of $8.3 million over the previous year. The committee voted to decrease this request by $4 million, cutting back the number of new geopressured wells to be drilled from five to four. The committee believes that with rapid expansion of the program proposed by DOE, drilling would likely outpace the collection, analysis and assimilation of the information gained in earlier drilling, as well as that from new wells. Moving too rapidly also seems unwise in view of the difficulty in drilling DOE's first geopressured wells. The committee endorses the expanded activities in the geopressured resource program, but believe that success in determining the economic potential of the resource is more likely if the program is paced to take optimum advantage of all new information.

The third subprogram in this activity is geothermal technology development, for which the fiscal 1980 budget request was $43.9 million, a $13.7 million reduction from the previous year. Much of the technology development subprogram is concerned with hydrothermal resource development, and the cut in the budget request parallels the reduction in that program. However, the technology subprogram also includes the work on hot dry rock, and the committee voted to increase the authorization by $500,000 for that activity. The increase will meet the rapid escalation of drilling costs for the geothermal exploratory well at Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. This well is proposed for use as a hot dry rock resource to heat laboratory buildings at the site.

LOW-HEAD HYDROELECTRIC POWER

The small-scale hydropower development program seeks to revitalize an energy resource that was essentially abandoned over the past several decades. At

one time, small dams provided water power for the generation of a modest amount of electricity for small communities and individual manufacturing operations. Many of these facilities were abandoned because of the availability of low-cost electricity resulting from increasingly efficient central-station powerplants and low-cost fuels. With the increased cost of imported oil, the economics of power production have changed, and it is believed that many dams could be redeveloped to install generating facilities capable of providing competitive electric power.

The fiscal 1980 budget request for the low-head hydropower program was $8.486 million, a decrease of about $10 million from the previous year. The cut was justified on the basis that the technology for low-head hydro is well advanced, and the program already has underway eight demonstration projects. The committee left the DOE request unchanged.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS

The electric energy systems program is concerned with the integration of new technologies such as solar power into the electric energy network, and with expanding the capability of the Nation's electric energy transmission networks. It is broken down into two subprograms; power supply integration and power delivery.

The committee increased the power supply integration subprogram by $3 million to $19.9 million. This increase restores funding for the systems development and control function, for which no funds were included in the fiscal 1980 budget request. The funds would support electric service reliability studies requested by the Economic Regulatory Administration, as well as studies for interregional power transfer and electric grid system stability. Both these activities were mandated by the Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act of 1978.

The power delivery program is concerned with three areas: The effects of electric fields resulting from high-power transmission lines; the development of underground cables and compact stations, and high-voltage direct current technology. The administration's 1980 budget request has cut this program to the bone, from $24.5 million in fiscal 1979 to $9 million. It proposes to eliminate all work on high-voltage direct current technology and reduce support of underground cables and compact stations by more than 60 percent.

The committee does not agree with this policy. It voted to increase this program by $10 million, including $6.7 million for underground transmission and compact stations, and $3.3 million for the high-voltage direct current subprogram. The work on underground transmission and compact stations is important because of a serious shortage in available overhead transmission corridors in some areas, and because of environmental concerns about high-voltage overhead cables. Regarding high-voltage DC lines, the results of the National Grid Study suggests that these systems would be advantageous for inter-regional grid connections. The funds would support work on component technology and would also support work on underground DC cable systems.

ENERGY STORAGE

The energy storage program has two major components: Battery storage technology and thermal and mechanical energy storage. Battery storage activities include development of near-term batteries, advanced batteries, solar applications, and electrochemical systems research. The committee made no change in the administration's proposed $32 million for these activities.

Among the activities in the thermal and mechanical storage subprogram are thermal storage, chemical and hydrogen storage, mechanical storage, magnetic storage, and utility applications.

The budget request for the thermal and mechanical storage subprogram for fiscal 1980 is $30.84 million. The committee voted to increase this amount by $4.7 million. The increase would provide $4 million for the chemical/hydrogen activity, which was reduced in the fiscal 1980 budget request by two-thirds compared to fiscal 1979. The fiscal 1980 budget request would support only hydrogen production work, and would postpone hydrogen storage, transmission, and distribution work. In order to provide continuity in the development of hydrogen technology, the committee recommends maintaining the pace of hydrogen storage, transmission, and distribution activities in the overall DOE hydrogen program.

In addition, the increase provides $700,000 for the magnetic storage activity. This activity was also reduced in the fiscal 1980 budget request by two-thirds, which would result in a slowdown in the construction schedule for the 10 kWh superconducting magnetic energy storage unit (SMES) for electric transmission line stabilization. The unit, to be installed on the Bonneville Power Administration transmission line between Washington State and California, would be the first utility application of a superconducting magnetic storage device. The committee recommends maintaining a modest level of effort in the SMES activity.

BASIC RESEARCH

The basic research program has four major components: Basic energy sciences, technical assessment projects, university research support and technical program and policy analysis. The basic energy sciences activities are subdivided into materials sciences, nuclear sciences, chemical sciences, engineering, mathematical and geosciences, advanced energy projects, and biological energy research. The fiscal 1980 budget request for these activities is $250 million, and the committee recommends that this amount be authorized.

The technical assessment projects subprogram provides a vigorous assessment of a broad range of energy technologies, including both existing and proposed initiatives, by means of studies, workshops, panels and other mechanisms. Also included in this subprogram is the solar-power satellite (SPS) activity, which was formerly included under the solar R. & D. budget. The SPS effort was transferred to the basic research program because it is currently an evaluation activity only. The fiscal 1980 budget request for the technical assessment projects subprogram was approximately $11.5 million, which the committee left unchanged.

University research support consists of a number of activities that had previously been budgeted and managed separately under various other programs. It includes university institutional agreements, university reactor fuel assistance, and university coal research laboratories.

The university institutional agreements activity provides support at universities and colleges for energy-related research focused on longer term research problems, many of which cut across individual energy technologies. In addition to research awards to a small number of major universities with significant energy programs, this activity includes a minority institutions research program to develop new energy research capability at smaller, traditionally minority universities and colleges.

The university reactor fuel assistance program supports specialized nuclear energy research facilities which are not duplicated elsewhere in National Laboratories or in private industry.

The fiscal 1980 budget request for university research support is $4.171 million in authorization, and an additional $5 million in budget authority for the coal research laboratories activity. This last activity was previously authorized by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, and amended by the Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, and requires no further authorization for fiscal 1980.

The committee left unchanged the budget request for this program. With regard to the coal research laboratories activity, however, the committee expressed its strong interest that the establishment of these laboratories be made in such a way as to increase the number of universities that are capable of making significant contributions in basic coal research.

The technical program and policy analysis subprogram, the fourth component of the basic research program, provides the personnel resources to see that research and development activities are properly balanced and coordinated. The fiscal 1980 request for this activity is $2.417 million, which the committee left unchanged.

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

Included in the general science and research program are high energy physics and nuclear physics.

The high energy physics program conducts research on the fundamental nature of matter and energy. It has as its goal the exploration and understanding of the properties of matter and energy in their most basic forms. It also develops new technologies needed for particle acceleration and detection, which frequently find application in other DOE programs. The program also plays a role

in developing and maintaining talented scientific manpower for the Nation's future needs in this important field of science.

The DOE program now includes four large accelerator centers—at Argonne and Brookhaven National Laboratories, at the Fermilab accelerator in Illinois, and at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) in California. The Zero Gradient Synchrotron (ZGS) at Argonne will be shut down in fiscal 1979. A broad base of experimental user groups located at 6 DOE laboratories and 42 universities, theoretical groups at 6 DOE laboratories and 36 university campuses, and a program of advanced technology R. & D. focused largely at the four accelerator centers and the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, make up the rest of the program. Three major new facilities are under construction or due for completion: A 15 GeV by 15 GeV positron-electron colliding beam facility at SLAC; the "energy saver" project at Fermilab, which will provide 500–1,000 GeV protons interacting on fixed targets; and the 400 GeV by 400 GeV Isabelle proton-proton colliding beam facility at Brookhaven.

The program has three components: physics research, which supports theoretical work and the planning and design of experiments; facilities operations, which supports the operation of the accelerator centers; and high energy physics technology, which supports advanced accelerator R. & D. and associated projects.

The administration's authorization request for fiscal 1980 for the high-energy Physics research, which supports theorequest includes $241.5 million for the Isabelle accelerator at Brookhaven, which would fully authorize the project. The committee voted to authorize the project only partially, and reduced the authorization by $151.5 million. This decrease will have no effect on the project's total cost and completion date. It will not affect the obligations and outlays for fiscal 1980 and is not intended to affect the obligations and outlays in future years. Isabelle is a $275 million project, and is scheduled to be completed in fiscal 1986. By partially authorizing the project, the committee and the Congress will be assured a continuing role in reviewing it while the facility is under construction.

The nuclear physics program has three major components: medium energy nuclear physics; heavy ion nuclear physics; and nuclear theory.

Medium energy nuclear physics is concerned with experimental research aimed at improving our understanding of the atomic nucleus and of the interaction of nuclear and subnuclear particles with atomic nuclei. The principal facilities used for these experiments are the Clinton P. Anderson Meson Physics Facility (LAMPF) at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the William H. Bates Linear Accelerator at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. All accelerator operations costs for these facilities are supported by the medium energy nuclear physics activity. For fiscal 1980, two projects to improve the two accelerators are included in the authorization request: a project to increase the Bates accelerator power from 400 MeV to 700 MeV, and an expansion of critically needed offline space for operations prior to the final positioning of equipment at LAMPF.

Heavy ion nuclear physics studies the atomic nucleus through the use of probes of heavy ions, which are projectiles of nuclei heavier than the helium nucleus. The use of these massive—on the nuclear scale—and complex projectiles creates new conditions for the study of nuclear phenomena. Beams of heavy ions are produced by accelerator facilities, the major ones being the superHILAC and Bevalac at Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and the Holifield Heavy Ion Facility at Oak Ridge. The National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory at Michigan State University will provide a major expansion of heavy ion research capabilities at the existing laboratory. This new facility will be built by the Department of Energy and then turned over to the National Science Foundation for operation.

The nuclear theory activity has as its goal the development of physical theories that can describe a system in a comprehensive way and predict results which are in accord with experimental measurements. The characterization of properties of objects such as mass, charge, and angular momentum and the identification of the forces of nature such as gravitational, electromagnetic, and nuclear, allow the theorists to describe physical systems with the use of mathematical formulas.

The fiscal 1980 authorization request for the nuclear physics program is $104.-768 million. The committee recommends that the full amount requested be authorized.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes the summary of the programs under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production. Together with the programs presented by the other subcommittees of the Committee on Science and Technology, they represent what I believe is a forceful and efficient means of grappling with the ever-increasing dilemma of our modern civilization: The need for energy in a period of rapid transition. I urge the Congress to adopt this bill without any major amendments.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Department of Energy fiscal year 1980 authorization bill. This bill provides funding for programs that create the technology to enable us to break the economic stranglehold being placed on this Nation by the cartel of oil producing nations. The very future of our great Nation depends on how successful we are in that endeavor.

I strongly endorse the proposals called for in this legislation for a strong commitment to the development of synthetic fuels. I have introduced legislalation in this House calling for the construction of synthetic fuel plants in the near future.

Solar technologies involving direct energy production and photovoltaic cells are emerging as are other developmental technologies. Although it is difficult to see how they may be developed into large scale systems in the near future, it is important to insure that there is adequate funding for their continued development.

But we must also insist that there is a balanced approach to our energy future and that "mix" must include a significant increase in the use of nuclear energy.

The most practical method of insuring guaranteed long-term nuclear energy supplies is the development and construction of breeder reactors. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor program is one of vital importance and we must insure in this legislation that its construction goes ahead without any further delay.

Some of my colleagues though do not agree with that assessment. They would have us go back to the drawing board and spend millions more for "breeder studies," even though more than a billion dollars has already been invested in the Clinch River program.

My good friends would suggest that the breeder reactor program be stopped and that we go into a long, drawn out term of looking, reviewing and asking what do we do next? They are literally saying to the Nation that we will not go with the breeder reactor at all, but that we are going to do a little more research on the subject.

Meanwhile, we are encouraging other nations like France and Japan to go into advanced breeder study. We have provided the Japanese with plutonium and told them to move ahead with breeder technology and that we do not want to handle that in this country. You can bet the Soviet Union is not taking that same approach.

Let me say that it is tragic, if not totally damnable that 40 percent of the inflation that is economically strangling our country is due to energy disruption.

Every dollar increase in the cost of energy increases the cost of production in this country. Virtually everything that we touch, or that touches us, everything that is manufactured by mankind—the clothes we wear, the cars we drive, the food we eat—involve the input of energy. We cannot increase energy input in excess of 400 percent over a period of several years and not expect, if not invite, catastrophic economic dislocation in virtually every segment of our society as well as in every American home.

Not only Clinch River, but the breeder reactor program in general, represent a tremendous source of energy and a highly significant technological advance for our country. Breeders can extend our uranium resources sixtyfold. The energy value of uranium already mined and above ground—the byproduct of our enrichment operations that can only be used in breeders—is roughly equal to our total unmined coal resources or at least three times the total OPEC oil resources.

To ignore or simply walk away from the continued demonstration of this vital energy source would be criminal. To kill Clinch River would assuredly be a clear sign to energy consumers worldwide that we are not concerned about pursuing alternate energy resource recovery programs, achieving increased

energy production or eliminating our critical dependence on foreign energy sources. As Members of Congress we cannot, we must not, take the responsibility of throwing $1.5 billion in taxpayer dollars and 20 years of invaluable research out the window.

This committee and the Congress have demonstrated tremendous courage and great vision in the past in developing advance designs and technologies throughout this Nation which ultimately have touched the lives of each and every man, woman, and child. On behalf of the American people and the Nation as a whole, we have exercised our prerogative and responsibility as legislators and made that investment.

Let us not forget that in 1776, Thirteen Colonies took a stand against tyranny and oppression and made a commitment to seeking independence. Their road to independence was not an easy one.

Over 200 years later, we are being asked by the President and by the American people to make a similar and equally critical commitment to energy independence from the economic oppression and tyranny of foreign energy sources such as the OPEC cartel. Few would disagree today that our road to energy and economic independence will be an easy or short one. However, it is encumbent on every Member of Congress who shares this goal to protect the technological investment and advances we have made to date. As a nation we can afford to do no less.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Environment, I would like to take this opportunity to commend our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. AMBRO), for the excellent work that he and other members of the subcommittee did during the course of our hearings and consideration of the activities of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and the programs under the jurisdiction of our subcommittee. I would also like to commend my chairman and the other members of the subcommittee for the strong sense of fiscal responsibility they have shown in the consideration of this bill.

Within the scope of our subcommittee jurisdiction we labored long and hard to make sure the meritorious programs were funded and that all available resources were put toward their highest and best use, I think it is fair to report to the House that our efforts this year have been largely successful.

There is one particular issue that I would like to discuss briefly before the House today. As many Members of the House recall, last March 28 the United States suffered the worst nuclear accident in American history at the reactor located just south of Harrisburg, Pa., on Three Mile Island. During the course of that accident we were all aware of the potential threat not just to people in the immedate area of the reactor itself, but people far down wind.

As a result of the Three Mile Island reactor accident and of my deep and abiding concern for the health and the safety of the American people, I offered an amendment to the bill today before the House to provide $2,500,000 for studies to be conducted by the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment to determine precisely what contingency planning is necessary to help us mitigate the consequences of similar accidents in the future should they ever occur, and also to help us make contingency plans for recovery efforts. Both the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Environment and the full Committee on Science and Technology overwhelmingly supported this amendment. In fact, there were indications at the time that such efforts were desperately needed on the Federal level.

Since that time, our Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Environment journeyed to the Three Mile Island nuclear plant on June 1, 1979, and toured that facility and had an opportunity to discuss informally the accident itself and the contingency plans which were in place at the time of the accident and modifications since then. The next day, Saturday June 2, 1979, our subcommittee spent all day on a hearing held nearly in the shadow of the cooling towers of Three Mile Island, to address the environmental and health impacts of that accident.

One of the witnesses to appear before our subcommittee that day was the Honorable Ruth C. Clausen, the Assistant Secretary for Environment of the U.S. Department of Energy. At that time, I asked Mrs. Clausen whether or not she and her staff had determined if that $2.5 million was necessary, and if so, how it would be spent. Her testimony to the subcommittee was that yes such a study was indeed necessary, and that she saw the product of this study as a comprehensive report that would be fully coordinated with the appropriate agencies and organizations of the Federal Government, and that it would include such things as a review and analysis of existing Federal and State capabilities for responding to major nuclear accidents, an analysis of the required radiation monitoring equipment, and the methodology currently in use to provide common data to be able to estimate levels of radiation exposure to the public and to determine environmental contamination. She went on to say that she would review the various radiation protection guides and protective action guidelines which currently exist for recontamination of restoration of property. Mrs. Clausen indicated that there is a need for a review and analysis of decontamination and restoration methodology including the kind of equipment which would be used, plans and resource requirements needed for recovery from an accident situation, and restoration of land use. She also said that she wished to identify further research and analytical efforts associated with the development of emergency planning.

Mr. Chairman, for many years the attitude of the Government has been that Federal responsibility for disasters in nuclear plants regulated by the Federal Government ends at the fence line. The one clear lesson of Three Mile Island, is that the protection of the American public in this area is clearly a responsibility of the Federal Government. I do not believe that it is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government, but only at the Federal level can we make the type of emergency contingency plans which will cover accidents uniformly throughout the United States. The $2.5 million included in this bill is a small step in the right direction.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER).

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, my Subcommittee on Energy Development and Applications has what I consider the most exciting part of the budget for new energy in the research and development area. We have fossil fuels and the new technologies for using those in a clean manner. We have both the solar applications and the solar technology programs to bring along these most promising areas for the future.

This bill is not merely a supply bill in the sense of producing new energy resources, but it is also a supply bill in a very major way by means of developing new conservation technologies by which we can save and use more efficiently the energy we already have. We have made major increases in that area.

We also have the very interesting and promising area of biomass.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to acknowledge the tremendous help we had on this from all the subcommittee members and particularly from the ranking minority member, my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH). He has been very helpful. He has gone over all the programs with us in detail, and he has made many worthwhile initiatives. He gets credit particularly for moving ahead very fast in the promising technology of waste energy where his efforts brought many of the possibilities of this technology to the attention of the committee.

We have also had marvelous support from the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER), and from a staff that I think is incomparable anywhere in the House of Representatives. They have, under tremendous time constraints, done a most tremendous job, and I must thank them very personally for their help.

Finally, I want to commend the Chairmen of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Mr. STAGGERS, their Energy and Power Subcommittee, Mr. DINGELL, and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. UDALL, for their superb cooperation in getting these three important committees together to present this critical authorization bill before the House. We may have had our differences in the past but we are here today together in mutual support of this important legislation to see that our country has the proper resources to do the job ahead. This work has had bipartisan

support by all committees and deserves the serious consideration by all Members.

I think that we have done a responsible and a very useful job for the country in this bill. In the area of fossil fuel energy, perhaps the most important action that we have taken is to fully fund the SRC technologies, both SRC-1 and SRC-2. This gives us the promise of clean solids in the case of SRC-1 and clean liquids, particularly for utility applications, with SRC-2.

We have also made very substantial increases in the fuel cell area, which is exciting for our cities because it promises a clean resource for producing electricity without pollution in the major cities of the United States.

With respect to the solar part of the budget, of course, as the Members of the House know, this is a particular area of concern and interest on my part. We have increased the total budget from $763 million in the DOE request to $873 million, and that is an increase of over $110 million in the solar area.

□ 1129

We have pushed that just as hard as we felt that it could be pushed. We held more hearings on photovoltaics than perhaps any other subject because the Department of Energy failed to come in with a program to proceed with the Photovoltaic Act which was authored by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. McCORMACK), and the gentleman from California. (Mr. GOLDWATER). That was an excellent piece of legislation, and we have insisted that that be proceeded with.

As we consider this bill, I would like to share with you my thoughts about the role of R. & D. with respect to the energy problem as well as a description of the committee's actions on the fossil, solar, and conservation programs, and why these actions will be an important contribution to the Nation's energy problem in the short as well as the long run.

We have known for a long time, at least since 1973, that we have an energy problem. It is clear that the energy problem has become an energy crisis which certainly needs both long- and short-term solutions. Those near-term efforts must include aggressive conservation requirements and incentives for the residential and commercial sector, more stringent requirements for automotive fuel efficiency, and firm examination of the oil industry to insure that the Nation's refinery capacity is used optimally.

We often hear that conservation will produce unendurable changes in lifestyle: for many of us gaslines and higher prices are changing our lifestyles now. Uncertainties in winter heating oil supplies may mean disastrous changes for some this winter. What is vividly clear this summer is that whatever happens, our lives and lifestyles will be changed. This new air-conditioning limit is the first example of this change that comes to mind.

Sensible but aggressive conservation policies are vital in the short term to lessen our dependence on imported oil and the economic havoc that results. However, we will still be faced with future supply problems, as domestic oil supplies decrease, no matter how quickly we integrate conservation measures in our lives. Thus, whatever Congress and the administration acts on now, we must bear in mind that our energy policy must be seen within a timespan of decades, not just months. Within such a context, research, development, and demonstration have both a natural and a necessary place.

Of course, we must also realize that research is only one tool and the problems of society are too complex to be solved with one approach. Nonetheless, it is a powerful tool and one of the most important for examining and solving our energy situation. The Government has a tremendous obligation to support the long-range research and development on technologies to address energy production and conservation. The Government also has the obligation to evaluate the research and development that has already been pursued; it must also set priorities and make program choices for those technologies which are ready to be demonstrated. There are a number of such technologies available to us now in renewable energy resources, the fossil energy area, as well as in conservation where decisions to demonstrate are appropriate and the administration has been slow to make commitments.

The question then arises as to what should be the balance between R.D. & D. programs for energy conserving technologies and the programs for energy production technologies. Without doubt, this country has used its energy in ways that in the context of today's energy prices are unacceptably wasteful. In the past, our industries used the cheap energy available without regard for its nonrenewable nature and society accepted this practice. Clearly this cannot continue.

Great strides have been made in the past 5 years to increase the efficiency of industrial energy use; yet, much can still be done, although it will require substantial improvements in technology and large capital investments. In addition, we need to address the areas of residential and commercial space heating and cooling as well as transportation, if we are to have any significant impact on our nonindustrial energy use. Further improvements will require technological ingenuity to develop housing, automobiles, and new industrial processes which will use whatever fuels are available to us in the most efficient way possible and seek alternatives to oil. At this time the possible advances in this sector are very exciting.

We cannot separate our solutions to the energy problem from environmental issues. We may not be able to live in a world if the production of that energy means ruined landscapes and deadly air and water. Whatever energy production technologies are devised, whether renewable or nonrenewable, they must be clean. I reserve my strongest support for the renewable energy production technologies—active solar, hydroelectric, passive solar, wind and biomass—because they are the most environmentally acceptable, as well as the most affordable and job intensive. At some future time, I would hope that solar energy and advanced conservation technologies might provide all of our energy needs, and I support an aggressive policy to achieve that goal.

However, in the next 20 to 30 years, it appears that we will need to expand our domestic sources of energy in addition to solar and conservation, particularly in view of the great difficulty of persuading the administration, Congress, and the public of the opportunities and needs for a sufficiently aggressive program for conservation and renewables. The most promising candidate seems to me to be our fossil energy sources and in particular, natural gas and coal. Fortunately, the ingenuity of our scientists and engineers are exploring ways to utilize coal in a more environmentally acceptable manner, although most in place technology for coal use demonstrates that it is not by nature a clean fuel.

At this point I would like to take some time to describe to you in more detail the committee's actions in the areas of research, development, and demonstration for the Department of Energy's conservation, fossil, and solar programs.

Conservation is a blanket term that covers energy use efficiencies in many economic sectors, such as transportation, industry, and buildings, and many different kinds of decisionmaking. It is difficult therefore for public policy to grasp, but the potential effect of utilizing existing energy supplies more efficiently is equivalent to 7.5 million barrels of oil per day. This is the finding of the National Academy of Science and the American Physical Society has arrived at an even higher figure. These results fly in the face of conventional wisdom; yet the lifestyle changes and economic impacts will be considerably less daunting than massive coal, nuclear, or synthetic fuels.

For these reasons and many others the Science Committee added $91,950,000 to the President's request. The additions are to the following programs: Waste-to-energy, cogenerating fuel cells, district heating, industrial process efficiency, industrial cogeneration, appropriate technology, alternate fuels, and vehicle propulsion research.

The DOE waste-to-energy research and demonstration program has become critical because of the Ocean Dumping Act of 1972 and because cellulose, a major component of urban waste, can be used as a feedstock for synthetic fuels. The Ocean Dumping Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-532) forbade ocean disposal of urban solid and sewage waste after 1981. This deadline makes alternate waste disposal methods essential, particularly for the large coastal urban areas which have practiced ocean dumping for years. DOE waste-to-energy programs offer promise in providing an answer to this problem but also of mitigating our energy supply problem as well.

In the fiscal year 1978 DOE authorization (Public Law 95-238) the Science Committee instituted a loan guarantee

program for alternative fuels which directly applied to waste-to-energy technologies demonstrations. In the same bill, the committee also legislated a direct grant program for municipalities so that they could utilize these technologies to solve their own waste and energy problems. The committee thus has added $29 million to the conservation budget; $19 million would implement the direct grant program for municipalities, $10 million is added to underwrite the loan guarantee program, which would permit $100 million of loans to be guaranteed by the Federal Government.

Neither of these programs were budgeted by DOE for fiscal year 1980. The committee is aware of overlapping jurisdictions in this area between the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency, but the committee feels strongly that the efforts of both agencies are needed—an EPA program to enable municipalities to utilize existing technology and the DOE program to demonstrate new technologies.

Another technology to increase our efficient utilization of both natural gas, coal based synthetic gas and the naphtha byproduct of petroleum are phosphoric acid fuel cells. At a relatively small size, these fuel cells can be utilized in a cogenerating mode for residential, commercial and small industrial users for the production of both electricity and heat. Though there is still opportunity for the development of these fuel cells, it was clear to the committee that the current generation is ready for field testing and demonstration now. To accomplish this, the committee added $10.5 million to the conservation program for field testing a number of these fuel cell systems.

The area of industrial conservation also offers an opportunity for Federal investment that would provide a most cost-effective return to the American people for energy savings. Major energy savings are available, if new industrial processes are developed and cogeneration technologies are utilized.

The industrial sector has by far led the other energy consuming sectors of our economy in the efforts to conserve energy; further conservation in this sector requires changes in production and processing technologies. The development of new processes will entail both technical risks and capital investment of such a magnitude that the committee thinks the industrial sector will be unlikely to undertake these improvements for some time without Federal support. However, it is also the opinion of the committee that the energy savings from such development is by far the most promising opportunity for the mid-term. Thus, the committee added $12,750,000 for a number of projects to improve industrial process efficiency.

The committee acted to expand the advanced development and demonstration work in industrial cogeneration by $11,500,000. The advantages of cogeneration are substantial—about half as much fuel is used to produce electricity and steam as would be needed to produce the two separately. Unfortunately many firms perceive the technology risk as too high compared to the projected return on investment. Additionally, the Nation as a whole suffers because the equivalent cost of saving fuel through cogeneration is far below the cost of new fuel supplies or new synthetic fuel production. The committee's improved funding hopefully will reduce the technical risks and improve the reliability of cost estimates so that industry can move with greater confidence into cogeneration.

Another area which the committee looked at carefully was appropriate technology. The appropriate technology program is an effort which reaches out to communities to develop energy saving and production technologies that meet the real life needs of people. It is the poor that are hardest hit by energy price increases, and the appropriate technology program is directed toward low-cost approaches to energy conservation, solar utilization and the like.

During 1978, a pilot program was executed in region IX, primarily in California and has since been expanded nationwide. In response to a request for proposal, for example, the DOE received some 3,300 proposals in the Northeast alone; within the current DOE request for funding in fiscal year 1980, only 130 of these could be funded. The committee has added $15 million to permit a more adequate expansion of the appropriate technology program to all regions of the country and to enhance its ability to fund a larger portion of successful proposals. This is the only Federal program which has been available directly to individuals, local nonprofit organizations, State and local agencies, Indian tribes, and small businesses. The committee feels emphatically that this program should be expanded.

I have said before that in the long term I hope that solar technologies and renewable resources will satisfy the bulk of our energy needs. However, solar technology is not simply a long term option. In the very near term, solar space and hot water heating can serve to displace imported oil currently used for those purposes. Since reliable storage systems are not yet available, current solar technologies are intermittent energy suppliers and must be backed up with conventional energy production.

This fuel saving function of solar technologies links them naturally to conservation efforts. The part of the Department of Energy programs which address the problems of current solar technologies is called solar applications. The committee has taken special care and attention with these programs.

Within the solar applications efforts, the systems development program received special attention. There are four main subprograms in this area: Passive heating and cooling, solar industrial process heat, active heating, and active cooling.

The committee examined each of these subprograms through oversight activity during the past year and during the authorization hearings and acted to add a total of $15,500,000. In the committee's view passive heating and cooling and industrial process heat deserve the top priority. The delay in recognizing the potential of these applications has left a considerable investment and development momentum in danger. The committee recognizes that active cooling systems for buildings are in the component and prototype development stage despite the many prototype systems that have been incorporated into demonstration buildings. All too often such demonstrations have indicated the present high cost of systems presently commercially available and the clear need for further systems development activities to develop lower cost approaches to active solar hot water and space heating.

The committee added $7.0 million to allow R. & D. to continue but at a reduced pace compared with prior years. This increase will permit final assembly and field testing work on eight systems which would not otherwise have proceeded in fiscal year 1980. The systems mentioned during full markup are as follows: Two 3-ton residential cooling systems, three 75-ton industrial cooling systems and three 25-ton commercial building systems. This action will preserve the technology already developed with $20.0 million of prior year expenditure.

The committee added $3.5 million to accelerate hybrid passive-active systems according to the national plan for passive solar systems.

The committee also added $2 million to advance the field testing of solar-assisted heat pumps with emphasis on the solar components. Improved performance which is the goal of design revision, and field testing will speed commercial market introduction. Thirteen systems designs are ready for field testing; the committee's addition will allow all to move into field testing.

The committee also added $3 million to meet the urgent need for component cost reductions and performance improvements and to identify the technical and cost problems associated with solar system components.

The committee also reviewed the outcome of the solar buildings demonstrations program which were pursued under the mandate of the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1974. To date, the results of the demonstration have been mixed. Both highly successful systems performance and disappointing engineering and institutional practices have been demonstrated.

The committee desires that the lessons learned during equipment design, manufacture and installation for these projects are not lost through abrupt program termination. The committee added $4.5 million to the authorization request for fiscal year 1980 is to provide manufacturers and building contractors the opportunity to modify systems components which have been installed in demonstration buildings. Such actions should yield improved solar systems and enhance the performance of many demonstration buildings.

Further, the committee extended the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1974 for 1 year. This will enable the Department of Energy to continue work on combined heating and cooling systems to bring the Department's efforts on competitive combined systems closer to realization.

A rational energy future for this country will also depend upon innovative developments in solar thermal collectors, solar electric technologies, including advances in photovoltaics and storage systems, as well as the use of the resources available in the wind and ocean. Further, we must pay careful attention to the use of the nation's biological resources of energy as well. In examining the Department of Energy's solar technology programs, the committee paid careful attention to certain areas. In the case of solar thermal systems, which utilize lenses or mirrors to focus sunlight onto receivers, which produce high temperature heat for conversion to electricity or mechanical power, the Committtee acted modestly. It incerased the authorization by $900,000 for completion of phase I and initiation of phase II of the Crosbyton Solar Power Project, which consists of a 65-foot diameter fixed spherical bowl solar concentrator. This project not only explores a novel solar concept but also could provide 5 megawatts of electric power to a municipal system as well as powering irrigation systems at its location.

Last year the Congress overwhelmingly passed into law the Solar Photovoltaic Energy Research Development and Demonstration Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-590). This law which was authored by Congressmen MIKE MCCORMACK of Washington and BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR., of California, established an aggressive $1.5 billion 10-year program to develop low cost photovoltaic systems and to utilize these systems in a gradually increasing scale to develop a strong competitive photovoltaic industry. The photovoltaic program that was presented to the committee by DOE in the fiscal year 1980 budget was not consistent with the congressional intent as called for by the legislation. The photovoltaic budget presented to us contained an aggressive research and development effort for advanced photovoltaic materials which have the potential of major cost reductions in the long term. However, there was no clear commitment by the administration to develop and utilize the photovoltaic technologies presently being pursued by the photovoltaic industry. There are a wide variety of applications where photovoltaic systems are presently cost effective, and with the cost reductions that are likely with refinements and mass production of the present technology a strong industry can be established. This integrated program approach of aggressive advanced material R. & D. coupled with the full development and utilization of the present photovoltaic technology will most optimally hasten the day when photovoltaics will significantly contribute to this Nation's energy needs.

It was in this light that the committee reviewed the DOE photovoltaic program budget request. The actions taken by the Committee on this program are in the area of near term photovoltaic technology development and utilization.

The Committee's action on the solar photovoltaics program was to increase the administration's request by $25 million; $20 million of this increase in funding is for the test and applications element of the program to fund the completion of additional first-cycle photovoltaic flat plate and concentrator experiments. This increase restores the funding that was originally planned for this activity, but had been diverted by DOE to fund several unsolicited proposals and international photovoltaic projects. The additional experiments that will be completed through construction will provide valuable data on: First the systems integration of photovoltaics in the private sector; second, the actual balance of systems requirements and costs; third, the reliability of photovoltaic systems; and fourth, their public acceptance in these high-visibility experiments. This level of procurement in the test and applications area will also assist in creating a marketplace for introduction of photovoltaics recommended in recent studies by Westinghouse, General Electric, Texas Instruments, MIT, and industry.

The remaining $5 million of the increase is earmarked for the low-cost silicon array (LSA) project, managed by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. The LSA project is developing the production technology necessary for all the steps in the production process for photovoltaic arrays. This increase will permit the scaling up of promising production technologies which have been proven technically feasible in laboratory-scale processing units and will keep the project on schedule for attaining its cost reduction goal of 50 cents per peak watt (Wp) in 1986.

The committee has taken special care with the wind program, because it represents the renewable resource, which could make the largest energy impact in the least amount of time. The committee added a total of $8,400,000 to the program, the total figure consists of both increases and decreases; the increases total $15.4 million and the decreases amount to $7 million. In the near to midterm, wind technology is limited by the lack of reliable storage systems. However, like these other technologies, wind turbines offer a significant opportunity for saving oil reducing our dependence on oil imports. One of the most attractive markets for the use of wind turbines will be for dispersed utility applications.

To encourage this application the committee added $4 million for a fourth MOD-2 wind turbine, which would be integrated with three other machines at a single site. This would provide a 10 megawatt station to yield data on problems associated with both a multi-wind turbine unit as well as the interface with a utility grid. In addition, such a configuration would provide the program with a unit that is more consistent with utility needs and would more easily compare to other solar electric technologies, which are aimed at the same utility market.

In addition to this demonstration effort the committee added $10 million to support a parallel design and development effort leading to the testing of two prototypes for the MOD-3 megawatt scale wind turbines. This would allow two contract teams to be involved in the development work, which would offer a reduction in the cost of power that would significantly broaden the utility and direct-site markets for wind energy systems.

Finally, the committee added $1,400,000 to accelerate the wind resources assessment efforts, which could provide additional detailed assessments of regions of the country where there is believed to be high wind energy potential.

The reductions of $7 million were taken from three wind program activities. The committee reduced the authorization for the field testing of small wind machines by $4 million, having observed that the Department of Energy appears to have evolved an overly lavish and costly program to field test small wind machines. The testing program should be targeted on several promising high wind resource utility areas, instead of the Department's present approach of testing two machines per State and U.S. territories. This would allow the examination of the effects of significant concentrations of wind energy being added to a local utility grid, rather than the DOE plan which would result in limited useful information on small wind machine interface with utilities. The committee also reduced the technology development programs and innovative concepts programs.

The fossil energy research and development program in the Department of Energy is one of its largest. This is appropriate given the important role that our fossil resources must play in the coming years. The lion's share of this $786,642,000 authorized by the committee goes to the coal research and development program. A smaller share goes to the oil and gas programs.

In large part, this arises because there is significant industrial participation and willing investment in the areas of enhanced oil and gas recovery. The appropriate government role in these areas is being carefully assessed by the Department as well as the committee. The committee's major action in this area was to add $5.5 million for enhanced gas recovery program to support improved resource characterization of what may be abundant gas reserves in the Western Tight Sands and the Eastern Devonian Shales.

The committee placed great stress on the coal program, the committee added a total of $33,500,000 to the coal program. This addition represents a combination of specific increases and decreases. The major decreases represent construction projects, such as the high Btu pipeline demonstration plant. The requested authorization for this project would have been in excess of the required appropriations. The committee decreased the requested authorization for this project by $27 million, which will not affect the requested appropriation.

Another example of a decrease was $10 million for the low-medium Btu fuel/gas small industrial demonstration project, which the Department of Energy has decided will not continue, since the budget request was submitted. Other programs were cut because it was the committee's judgment that they were

not sufficiently promising, or that they were accelerated in excess of the Department's ability to manage them or that the Federal role in the programs has not been sufficiently demonstrated.

For example, in the area of chemical coal cleaning the committee decreased the program by $2 million, since there is not yet any clear indication that chemical coal cleaning will be economically competitive with other methods of coal preparation. In the area of advanced environmental control technology, the committee decreased the budget for lime/limestone reliability by $5 million, since the program addresses currently available technology whose improvement should be addressed directly by the utilities.

The committee's positive actions on the coal program reflect its views on the two major strategic goals of coal utilization. The coal program should be directed toward two goals: First, the use of coal for the clean and efficient production of electric power and second, the conversion of coal to synthetic liquids and gases as substitutes for those markets which currently use imported oil.

In its authorization hearings, the committee received testimony from the Department of Energy stating that the major thrust of the fossil program for fiscal year 1980 was to be the direct combustion coal. This strategic emphasis was reflected in new programs and increased efforts in the combustion systems area and the advanced environmental control technology programs. The committee agrees with the importance attached to these areas, but the committee feels strongly that the emphasis should not simply be on combustion but rather on the use of the coal for electric power production and to some extent for industrial process heating.

The major use of coal for the next 25 years will be the environmentally acceptable production of electric power. This can be carried out either in a centralized or decentralized fashion with or without cogenerating capabilities for process heat. The Department has a number of technologies in addition to combustion technologies and post-combustion and cleanup technologies, which belong in such an overall strategy. These include gasifier combined cycle systems with present-day turbines and later with advanced high-temperature turbines; fuel cells also offer the option of decentralized use and/or cogeneration. The MHD technology is also an option for the production of electric power generation.

The committee added $2 million for the Department to develop an integrated program management plan and technical implementation plan to establish departmental priorities and criteria for the various technologies for the production of electric power. In addition to this overall strategic plan, which must be developed the committee added $3 million for the MHD program, which will permit the integrated operation of a prototype MHD combustor with the currently available MHD channel. This will permit experience to be gained before the installation of the 50 megawatt combustor and channel at the Component Development and Integration Facility at Butte, Mont.

The committee also added $9 million for the development of fuel cells for utility applications as well as advanced development for the on-site cogenerating fuel cell. The committee also increased the thermionics program by $4,500,000 to continue the work on this advanced coal-fired electric power generating technology. Within the gasification program, the committee redirected $7 million for entrained bed gasification technology; the intent of this increase was to provide a gasifier that could be used in combination with a gas turbine/steam turbine combined cycle generating system for electric power production.

The committee is also dramatically aware of the need to use the Nation's coal resources to provide synthetic substitute liquids and gases. This need is twofold: First, alternative fuels may replace substantial amounts of imported oil which have put our national economy in jeopardy and second, defense requirements will need assurance of sufficient domestically controllable resources to fuel our defense mobility forces which may otherwise be in a perilous situation.

Major initiatives which the committee took in the coal area added a total of $54 million for both the SRC–I and SRC–II demonstration projects. The demonstration of these coal conversion technologies will help to establish the infrastructure necessary to utilize coal for synthetic fuels. Ultimately they will lead to the development and utilization of technologies that will not only provide clean fuels for our electrical and gas utilities, but will also provide a model for those technologies producing fuels that will directly impact our transportation sector, the major consumer of our petroleum supplies.

Another area in the synthetic fuels production technologies, which the committee chose to emphasize was peat gasification. The Nation has approximately 1,400 quads of energy stored in its peat resources. However, peat is located often in areas where there is not a lot of energy utilization; for example, in Alaska there are 700 quads of peat alone. To utilize this resource on a national basis requires the conversion of peat into an easily transportable fuel. Thus, gasification of the highly reactive peat to methane would allow it to be shipped in our conventional gas pipelines. Thus, the committee added $6,700,000 to continue the development of peat gasification technology.

I have tried here to hit the highlights of the committee's actions in the conservation, solar, and fossil areas. I have tried to give you a sense of the approach which the committee took and which I believe in with respect to these technologies. I would like to note in closing our close cooperation with the Interior and Energy and Water Development Subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. I wish to thank my colleagues, TOM BEVILL and SID YATES, whose time and attention are very much appreciated. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the many hours of thought and work which my fellow members of the Science and Technology Committee and our excellent staff put into the formulation of this legislation. I hope that our colleagues here today will carefully consider this bill and vote for it overwhelmingly.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN).

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 3000, authorizing appropriations for the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1980 as reported from the Science and Technology Committee, and urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I must admit that the bill before us is not perfect, but it is imperative that Congress pass a DOE authorization bill this year because we were unable to pass one last year. It is necessary that the Department be guided by congressional intent on its overall program.

We are all aware that the Speaker has called for the 96th Congress to emphasize the oversight functions of the legislative branch. In keeping with the role of the "oversight Congress," we should avoid becoming too picky in considering the Department's program as laid out in this authorization bill, and should remember that all of the energy subcommittees in the House have committed themselves to close scrutiny of the operations of the departments under the DOE budget for fiscal 1980. It would therefore seem advisable to pass this authorization bill as promptly as possible and to fine-tune the DOE program through the fiscal year 1981 authorization after a year of intensive oversight of the Department by all relevant subcommittees.

This oversight should by no means be unfocused or undirected. One of the primary areas for consideration should be the management problems at DOE, about which I am greatly concerned. In the R. & D. area, Congress should emphasize the balancing of research efforts so that most of the appropriated funds are dedicated to programs dealing with energy sources from which we will be obtaining most of our energy in the medium range and long-term future. We should look specifically at our projected needs for electricity, residential and commercial heating and cooling, and transportation fuels, and plan our legislative program accordingly. This means that Congress should avoid the temptation of devoting our money and effort to popular technological fads and other marginal energy sources.

I regret to say that this standard was not rigidly adhered to in this year's DOE budget, and that disproportionate amounts of money were appropriated for certain programs which involve important technologies that are politically attractive but not our most promising energy technologies of the future. For instance, I note that research in the field of ground-based solar energy accounted for $864 million. I am in favor of meaningful development of solar energy to take care of its fair share of our energy problems, but I do not feel it is a panacea, and the usefulness of ground-based solar energy as an electricity source is particularly overrated.

On the other hand, there are energy technologies which have not, unfortunately, been emphasized in the past but which are now gaining well-deserved attention, particularly from the Science and Technology Committee. For example, I am quite pleased that our committee voted to increase the authorization for development of biomass energy from $42 to $57 million. I was also glad to see the formation of the National Alcohol Fuels Commission, which will explore the energy potential of gasohol. Although the contribution of alcohol fuels in the mid-1980's is not likely to be substantial, DOE reports that "they represent an important energy component and building block for the longer term." In addition, this impact in particular regions may be quite significant—much greater, in fact, than national figures would suggest.

In summary, I would ask at this time that Congress leave the more picayune details of the Department of Energy to subcommittee oversight and move with a sense of urgency to get the fiscal year 1980 DOE authorization signed into law.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ROTH).

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman of our Committee on Science and Technology, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA), and also the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. MCCORMACK), who has done an outstanding job; and our minority leader, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER), for their vision and their dedication.

I know of no Members in the House who work harder than they do, and I think the House can recognize their contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on H.R. 3000 is far greater than the question of simply appropriating funds for the Department of Energy. It is far greater than a debate of whether or not the benefits of the bill outweigh the unjustified increases in spending for more regulatory functions within the Deartment.

Today, we decide whether we as a Congress assembled, and we as a nation are willing to look at the 21st century. Today, we decide whether or not we believe enough in the quality of life to invest in some efforts to maintain it for our future generations.

We who live in the great Badger State often live by what we proudly call "the Wisconsin tradition." Simply defined, the "Wisconsin tradition" is a belief in the future that justifies an investment today.

Wisconsin is a State almost totally energy dependent. Yet, we are also a people who strive to build and maintain a quality of life. We believe in education. We believe in technology. And we are willing to combine the two with government and private dollars to accomplish our goal.

One such example is energy. Today Wisconsin receives over 33 percent of its energy from nuclear power. We have found that this new technology in energy production can blend with our farmlands and industrial parks for the good of all. We have found that most citizens have come to recognize the joint partnership required for a better life.

In H.R. 3000, we invest over $6 billion in energy research and production. We do so because we believe Americans want energy, and they want a quality of life. Today, we invest the majority of those funds, almost $3 billion in nuclear research and development. Today, we show the country and the world that we believe nuclear power can and will be a viable source of our energy. Today, we bring the Wisconsin tradition to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH).

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 3000, authorizing appropriations for the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1980, but in opposition to the decision of the Committee on Science and Technology to provide funds for the Clinch River breeder reactor for yet another year. My feeling is that if we should decide to spend the amount of money authorized for this project, it would be far more beneficial to our Nation to invest this money in the development of other alternative energy resources.

BACKGROUND

We are facing perhaps one of the most serious crises ever to confront our Nation. Our Nation's inability and unwillingness to face the energy issues squarely and to take drastic action in the last 5 years have now come to haunt us. This energy crisis has drained the financial strength of our country and now seriously threatens our national security. I fear that our current trends which have new led us to import almost half of our daily consumption of petroleum could soon have serious repercussions on our military posture. Guaranteed access to an insured supply of energy is essential to insure our national defense.

Our Nation has only recently awakened to our pressing energy problems. The long lines at the gasoline stations and the dramatic increases in the price of gasoline have made us painfully aware of their seriousness. Developments in Iran, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere, as well as the crude oil price increases recently passed by the OPEC cartel, have served notice that our Nation can no longer afford to be as dependent on foreign supplies of oil. As we have seen, OPEC prices will continue to increase, and we will spend more than $60 billion this year for foreign crude oil and crude oil supplies, a staggering blow to our balance of trade position.

These events have made it imperative that we press forward with the development of our domestic energy resources, particularly solar and fossil. We must now take advantage of the potential billions of barrels of oil shale, tar sands and heavy oil deposits, and the vast abundance of coal reserves which lie in our country. The question has become not whether we will need to develop our alternative energy resources, but instead, when will they be needed. If they are not developed in a timely fashion, I am afraid that our Nation may suffer a severe economic and political crisis by the late 1980's or early 1990's.

Those of us who have frequently urged a commitment to solar, are pleased to see the President establish a national goal of deriving 20 percent of the Nation's energy needs from the Sun by the year 2000. To attain this goal or better will require funding levels which parallel the historical attention which has been heaped on the nuclear industry. Solar energy offers us a virtually inexhaustible energy source that can be developed in a manner consistent with our environmental goals. In fact, it might just be the deciding factor in whether we can truly ever become energy independent.

In the near term, we have now recognized that conservation offers us the most promising potential to reduce our vulnerability to uncertain foreign oil supplies, and to help us meet our future energy demands. The myth that energy conservation may lead to a reduced standard of living and unemployment must be laid to rest.

In recent reports, the Council on Environmental Quality and the Harvard Business School Study clearly point out the numerous benefits that could be obtained from existing and additional conservation measures. I am hopeful that the bill before us now will help us accelerate the development of more energy-efficient technologies that will allow us to take advantage of these benefits.

It is against this background that we must consider H.R. 3000, the legislation which authorizes funding for the Department of Energy, and in particular, for its research, development and demonstration programs. This legislation contains many essential elements that must be passed if we are to ever become energy independent. After much effort and careful review of the administration's request, the Committee on Science and Technology has structured a piece of legislation which will give our energy programs the momentum they need to help us accelerate the development of our inexhaustible energy resources.

I am pleased to see that our committee is reporting a bill which, for the second year in a row, authorizes more dollars on nonnuclear research and development than it does on nuclear fission research and development. I wholeheartedly support this trend. Our past governmental policies have made it much more difficult for solar and renewable resource technologies to compete. I am hopeful that this new trend of enhanced funding of solar energy and other alternative technologies will help these technologies become competitive with nuclear fission technologies, and allow us to reap the enormous benefits which they have to offer. In this regard, I have recently introduced a resolution to encourage the President to develop an accelerated conservation and alternative energy program.

Before discussing the specifics of the bill, I would like to compliment the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA), the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER), and the chair-

man of our subcommittee (Mr. OTTINGER) for their fine leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. They have worked many long and hard hours on this bill, and they should be commended for their efforts. As a result of their hard work, I am confident that we have structured a well-balanced, aggressive program that will allow us to effectively accelerate the development of our energy resources.

SOLAR, BIOMASS, FOSSIL, AND CONSERVATION, PROGRAMS

As to the specific features of the bill, the committee has added over $24 million for the solar technology and applications programs, with significant increases in solar systems development and the solar photovoltaics program. These changes will help the Department of Energy have a more balanced and effective solar program, both for dispersed and central applications.

In biomass, our committee has authorized over $57 million for the fuels from biomass program. Of this amount, close to $25 million is devoted specifically to alcohol fuels activities. These fuels show much promise for providing a portion of our energy needs in the transportation sector. With these funds, I hope that the Department of Energy will place the emphasis on the biomass program that it deserves.

In the fossil program, the committee authorized over $805 million for fossil energy research, development, and demonstration, and resource applications, an increase of $41 million over the administration's budget request. I was particularly pleased that the committee has added over $45 million for the two solvent refined coal (SRC) demonstration projects. The SRC program shows much promise for allowing us to utilize our enormous coal resources in an efficient and environmentally acceptable manner. These two projects can provide us with the needed information for determining investment costs for commercial-sized plants using the SRC process.

In the conservation area, the committee has authorized a total of $437 million, a dramatic increase of approximately $102 million over the administration's budget request. As I stated earlier, our Nation has much to gain from accelerated conservation measures and these increases will help us to sooner reap these benefits. Of particular importance is the municipal waste-to-energy program, which offers the potential for making fuel out of waste materials that would otherwise be discarded, and at the same time helping us solve our disposal problems. The committee has authorized an additional $19 million for the financial support effort, with $5 million specifically earmarked for construction activities, and an additional $10 million for loan guarantees to construct municipal waste-to-energy demonstration facilities. Without this funding, I am afraid that municipalities will not press forward at the present time with the construction of these facilities.

OTHER ENERGY PROGRAMS

The committee has authorized many other energy programs which I believe are of particular significance. For fiscal year 1980, the committee has authorized $8 million for small-scale hydroelectric power research, development, and demonstration activities. In addition, $10 million is provided for loans for studies to determine the feasibility of undertaking small hydroelectric power projects at existing dams. The committee has added $9.7 million to expedite development and bring down costs of underground transmission cables and high voltage d.c. cables for the transmission of electricity from powerplants. An additional $8 million will also be spent for expanded work on the possible environmental effects of the electric fields associated with high voltage overhead transmission lines in New York and other States.

CLINCH RIVER

Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as opposing the funding provided by the committee for the Clinch River breeder reactor project. I believe that it would be unwise at this time to authorize $183.8 million for Clinch River in light of the President's intent to terminate the project.

We have visited the Clinch River breeder reactor issue many times before. The pros and cons are well known. The proliferation risks, enormous costs, environmental concerns, and safety problems with this project have been outlined in detail, and I do not think it is necessary to discuss these problems in detail again.

I believe that the Committee on Science and Technology has made a tactical error in not terminating this project. The need to get an authorization bill enacted into law is even more pressing than ever. On numerous occasions, the President has stated his intent to veto an authorization bill that contained funding for Clinch River, and has instead offered a compromise to strengthen the breeder base research and development program. This compromise will provide for a stronger breeder program, which will, in fact, enhance the program by allowing for a more rational design. The fact that an authorization was not passed into law last year is clear evidence of what will happen again this year if we continue to insist on authorizing Clinch River.

Mr. Chairman, Clinch River was originally authorized as a crash project in response to our diminishing supply of uranium. Utilities, however, have encountered numerous licensing difficulties for new nuclear plants, causing the cancellation of many of these plants, resulting in a corresponding reduced use of uranium. Preliminary reports from the NURE program have indicated that our domestic uranium resources are larger than we originally thought. Thus, the original breeder demonstration schedule no longer makes economic or technical sense. The Clinch River project is now an anachronism and should be treated as such.

After 9 years, ground has not been broken on the project, and we have no right to expect ground to be broken while Jimmy Carter remains our President, be it 2 or 6 years, and restarting the licensing will take even more time. Key employees working on the project have been leaving, which is to be expected. We cannot expect highly skilled and motivated individuals at the peak of their careers to stick to a project that is indefinitely stuck in the mud. We clearly continue to be in a no-win situation. We cannot afford to wait any longer to cut our losses.

Mr. Chairman, let us face the energy future, stop living in the past, and push ahead with an aggressive energy research package that the President can live with.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BAILEY).

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCCORMACK) especially as they pertain to support for the Clinch River project.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER), a member of the committee.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the American people have an opportunity here, through the judicious actions of their Representatives on the Committee on Science and Technology, to move ahead and solve some of our energy problems. The considerations of the Committee are well deliberate and oriented toward practical solutions.

I urge the support of my colleagues for H.R. 3000 and its substitute H.R. 4839 to provide the United States with an energy future that is real, not blue sky.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DOE authorization bill for fiscal year 1980. It is doubtful whether the energy situation in the United States has ever been more critical than it has been so far this summer, and shortages could very possibly get even worse. Gasoline lines are the most striking signs of the makeshift, improvised and impractical energy policy which the United States has had in recent years, and which the Carter administration has done nothing to improve. It is ridiculous for a world power such as the United States to allow itself to remain enslaved by OPEC. This bill is an admirable attempt to deal with our problem in a rational and progressive fashion and judiciously utilize our resources on a short and long-term basis. I have comments to make about several sections of the bill.

I would first like to discuss the need for this country to develop its geothermal energy resources. They are found in at least 37 States, and in especially large quantities in California. I support the combined efforts of Federal, State, and local governments to turn the promise of geothermal energy into reality. I also agree with the action by the Science and Technology Committee to add to the DOE request $4 million for design studies and procurement of long-lead materials for a second 50 megawatt demonstration plant, which I think is necessary to assure the effectiveness of a binary cycle energy conversion system. I feel that we should insist that this plant be funded,

even if it means a confrontation with the administration.

The issue on which my views are furthest from the administration position, however, is the Clinch River breeder reactor. Frankly, I am amazed that we cannot arrive at a middle ground on the breeder question. As the administration continues its ill-considered policy, other nations are leaving us far behind in developing this valuable technology and our energy situation is becoming more and more crucial. Our committee has voted to continue this project and study prospects for future breeders, and I heartily endorse this action.

I am also pleased to note that the committee authorized $10.5 million to be spent in fiscal year 1980 at the Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant in South Carolina, with $10 million going to the ongoing research program and the other half million to conceptual engineering studies. DOE did not request any funds this year for this project, for which about $16 million was appropriated in fiscal year 1979. I feel that the committee is following the proper course in keeping the reprocessing option open.

All of this is not to say that nuclear energy is the only remedy available to us. Other technologies have great potential and our committee has made appropriate recommendations as to the funding of these projects. One of these involves the innovative method of coal gasification, converting abundant coal supplies to replace dwindling natural gas supplies. Of particular interest to me is the development of the molten salt gasification process. The Science and Technology Committee wisely added $4 million to explore the production of medium Btu gas with this process. For example, the use of this method allows the gasification of a wide variety of coals with a high purity product gas, and it makes possible other uses besides gasification. For example, the transformation of nuclear waste into a more compact and easily disposable waste form. This is high-leverage research and development funding.

Coal liquefaction and biomass are other technologies which are intended to use abundant materials such as coal and alcohol to replace or supplement scarce resources such as gasoline. Anyone who has waited in 90 degree heat in a gasoline line knows the necessity of researching and developing alternative fuels, and our committee has agreed. It has recommended an expenditure of $51 million more than DOE requested for coal liquefaction, and has concurred with DOE on an expenditure of almost $58 million for biomass development. The economics of these energy sources are presently uncertain, but their potential is unquestioned, and further research must be done.

The technology which I would like to discuss in concluding my remarks is one about which I have always been optimistic: solar energy. I am interested in seeing further research and development of both central station and distributive applications of solar power, and both fields are adequately funded in this bill. Central station systems are exemplified by the pilot central receiver plant under construction near Barstow, Calif., which is to be tied in with a fossil field electric plant already existing nearby. This complex will utilize the approach known as solar retrofit repowering, in which a fossil-field plant is provided with a supplementary solar fixed energy source. Photovoltaic solar cells, on the other hand, are examples of distributive solar applications, and I am pleased that the committee has authorized $25 million more for this project than DOE requested. Photovoltaic solar cells directly convert sunlight into electricity, and comprise a technology worthy of much long-range consideration and deserving of the money which the committee recommended.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and our committee has done a fine job in preparing it for consideration. I recommend its passage.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BOUQUARD) a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Chairman, although there are some points of disagreement on specific projects contained in this legislation, I want to take this opportunity to commend my chairman for the effort that he has put forth to bring to the House floor a bill which is truly responsive to the energy needs of this Nation. Chairman FUQUA has worked diligently to solve a number of jurisdictional disputes associated with this measure.

I cannot recall a single instance during the consideration of the bill where he did not make every effort to be fair and evenhanded in his treatment of the issues involved. I want to express my appreciation to him. Mr. WYDLER, the ranking minority member of the committee, has also distinguished himself in the contribution that he has made to this legislation. I also want to express my appreciation to the committee staff for the assistance they have given to the members in the preparation of the bill and the committee report. My friend and esteemed subcommittee chairman from Washington, Mr. MCCORMACK, has devoted an enormous amount of time and effort and expertise to bringing the best possible piece of legislation to the House floor. This body should be grateful to these individuals for the job they have done.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year President Carter called for an emergency program which stressed both long and short term needs. This bill amply meets the requirements set down by the administration. The President defined our long term energy program to include solar-photovoltaic, fusion, and advanced fission breeder reactors. This bill carefully addresses each of these areas. This bill merits the strong and active support of this House. This bill is an excellent one and I hope it can enjoy overwhelming support. We have made a conscious effort to accelerate the development of those programs which are capable of meeting energy needs in the near future, and we have supported reasonable and prudent funding levels for those programs which will yield energy only in the more distant future.

This bill strongly supports the rapid development of solar power. We have, in anticipation of the President's emphasis on synthetic fuels pushed for further development of coal, and improved conservation technology. And we have continued to support the orderly development of nuclear power.

There are a number of areas in this bill which are deserving of special comment, I was especially pleased with the attention given by the committee to the development of fusion power, and the emphasis on improvement of our uranium enrichment policy. But I am equally proud of the budget conscious attitude displayed by the committee.

There are many projects which I would personally like to see funded at higher levels, but the committee has worked diligently to bring forth a bill which remains within the budget guidelines and still meets the funding needs for a responsible, productive energy program.

The bill is an excellent one, and I would hope that it can enjoy overwhelming support in the House.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN).

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3000 the 1980 DOE authorization.

I would call the attention of my colleagues to a relatively small, but very important part of the bill. On page 3, line 13, of the substitute text (H.R. 4839) the Science Committee has authorized $113 million for transportation conservation.

Included in this figure are two very important programs:

First. The electric vehicle program; and

Second. Research on alternate liquid-fuel automotive engines, such as the gas turbine and the Stirling.

Both of these efforts are aimed at reducing our dependence on foreign oil, without forcing us to give up the freedom of personal mobility that we now enjoy. I believe that it is essential to move aggressively in this area. Americans want and, in fact, our whole economy depends on personal transportation.

Yet, the gas lines that we have seen this summer, clearly show that something is going to change. Either we improve the automobile or we will be forced to accept a drastically altered lifestyle.

Let me point out further that money invested in conservation research, such as this, is extremely cost effective. If we can improve the average mileage of our cars by only 10 miles per gallon, we can save 4 million barrels of oil a day.

These programs cannot only do this but will enable us to move to alternate energy sources for transportation as well. So, they fit perfectly with the call that President Carter recently made for energy security. I urge my colleagues to approve this bill.

Mr. Chairman, transportation uses more petroleum-derived fuel than all other energy-consuming sectors in the United States combined and accounts for about 26 percent of all energy consumed in this country. Energy consumption in

transportation is increasing more rapidly than in any other sector—9 percent between 1975 and 1977.

The Department of Energy has a small but cost-effective program aimed at developing more energy-efficient technology for this important sector. The goals of the program are to improve the energy efficiency of transportation by: First, achieving a 10-percent reduction in the level of gasoline consumption projected for 1985; and second, reducing total energy use in the sector by 25 percent from the 29 quads now projected for the year 2000. Ultimately, the goal is to reduce the transportation sector's almost total dependence on petroleum. Specific reduction goals are 500 barrels per day by 2000 and 4,600 barrels per day by 2000.

For fiscal year 1980, the Department requested $95,861,000. To this amount was added $20,900,000 for a total of $116,761,000 in the Science Committee's portion of the bill.

Most of these funds will be directed at improving the fuel efficiency of light-duty vehicles because they currently consume 35 percent of all petroleum used in the United States, at a rate of 5,750,000 barrels a day. Program objectives include:

First. Demonstrate by 1983, as required by the Automotive Propulsion R. & D. Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-238, Title III), new automotive engine options (gas turbine and Stirling) for industry commercialization decisions that are 30 percent more fuel efficient than projected conventional 1983 engines with comparable performance, have a multifuel capability, and meet the most stringent proposed emission standards.

Second. Accelerate commercialization of electric/hybrid vehicles by at least 10 years through research, development, demonstrations, incentives, removal of barriers, and other related activities in accordance with the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle R.D. & D. Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-413, as amended).

Third. Develop and test batteries, components, and vehicle systems which will improve the performance, increase the reliability and reduce the cost of electric and hybrid vehicles. Near-term efforts (through 1985) are focused on special-purpose, electric vehicles; long-range efforts (through 1990) are on hybrids and general-purpose electrics.

Fourth. Develop and demonstrate energy saving propulsion system options for large trucks and buses for industry commercialization by 1983.

Fifth. Complete solutions to operational and reliability problems with the use of alcohols (straight and blends) in conventional spark-ignition engines for highway vehicles by 1983.

Sixth. Establish by 1985 appropriate fuel/engine combinations to optimize the resource/process/fuel engine system for oil shale and coal derived fuels; develop by 1985 one or more practical hybrid fuels consisting of a combination of petroleum and unconventional materials from nonpetroleum resources.

The Science and Technology Committee took action to increase funding in three areas:

First. Vehicle propulsion R. & D. (heat engine program)—mandated by Public Law 95-238, title III, this program is focused on development of two alternative automotive engines, the gas turbine and the Stirling engine.

In the gas turbine program, work has concentrated on concept formulation. Three contractor teams have been involved: GM-Detroit Diesel Allison/Pontiac Division; Ford/Air Research Corp.; and Chrysler/Williams Research. Fiscal 1980 will be the year the program moves into hardware development. Two different concepts are being proposed. One is the well-established two-shaft, two-turbine machine with a conventional transmission. The other has a single turbine with a continuously variable transmission.

Originally, plans called for selection of two contractors in June 1979 to proceed with hardware development. OMB directed that a single-contractor approach be used. An additional $7 million in fiscal year 1980 would support a second contractor, utilizing the same work scope and schedule as the first.

The situation in the Stirling program is somewhat different. Two contractors had been involved in concept formulation with fiscal year 1980 planned as the year for start of hardware development. Unfortunately Ford pulled out in late 1978 citing other business pressures, not technology shortcomings. This left the MTI/United Stirling AMC combine as the only variable Stirling contractor in the world. Nevertheless, DOE feels it would be possible to educate a second contractor to the point where further development of the Ford hardware could proceed.

Such a contractor would have to operate to a lesser work scope and a stretched out timetable. But the committee felt that the advantages to be gained from competition and the reduced risk to eventual commercialization justify the special treatment. An additional $5 million is needed in fiscal year 1980 to conduct such a program.

Second. Electric vehicle program. Established by Public Law 94-413, the EV program called for cost shared purchase and demonstration of 1,700 vehicles in fiscal year 1980. The law allows DOE to reduce this number if adequate justification exists.

DOE proposed a buy of 700 vehicles, citing insufficient U.S. industrial capacity to meet the larger number. The committee disagreed, in part, with this conclusion and increased the budget request by $8 million to support a buy of 1,100.

Third. Alternate fuels utilization. The DOE program as proposed emphasized testing of alcohol fuels only. The committee added $900,000 to include testing of oil-shale and coal-based fuels.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Department of Energy authorization bill for fiscal year 1980. This bill is a balanced piece of legislation reflecting many days of hard work on the part of three committees. The bill as reported does a good job of balancing priorities and making sure that none of the important developing technologies, that we need so badly, is neglected. I want to especially commend the efforts of Chairman DON FUQUA and ranking minority member JOHN WYDLER on their untiring efforts in bringing forward this complex legislation in a timely, fair manner.

I think by this point everyone realizes that this country is in a tremendous energy bind. Our problem is much greater than gas lines and temporary inconvenience in not being able to spend leisure hours exactly as we wish. We are heavily dependent on foreign nations for much of the energy which is the lifeblood of our industry, our jobs, our transportation, and our comfort. This is a critical situation, as serious as we have faced in peacetime, and one which we must overcome if we are to revive our economy and retain our position of leadership in the world.

This legislation is a step in the direction of relieving our dependence on foreign oil and building a new energy future for this country. It contains vigorous programs for the development of all the emerging energy technologies which are now seen as being viable within the next 40 years. There are healthy programs in developing improved solar energy systems with a major effort in photovoltaics, and responsible programs in wind, solar heating and cooling, biomass, and several other solar technologies. One of the biggest areas of increase is in energy conservation research, finding more efficient processes in all energy consuming sectors of our economy. The long-range options like fusion and the breeder reactor also receive reasonable allocations of funds under this legislation. I feel this approach is crucial; we cannot permit any of these technologies to slip until we know for sure where, from domestic sources, we can meet all our energy needs.

I am a fiscal conservative and it may seem strange to some to see me speaking strongly in favor of a major spending proposal. Here, however, we have a prudent expenditure for the future of our Nation. When compared with our needs and the relationship of secure energy supplies to the well-being of our Nation, the amount requested here is certainly reasonable. Furthermore, the programs are not designed for long-term Federal control. There is a conscious effort to work in partnership with industry, with heavy Government involvement in the early stages when the risks are great but with greatly increasing private sector influence and cost sharing as we approach the development stages where we are preparing for complete industry takeover of the technologies. We are not going to get out of this situation unless we have industry and Government working hand-in-hand on responsible programs.

Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LUNDINE).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. LUNDINE) is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman and the ranking minority member of the full committee and the Subcommittee on Energy for the work they have done in fashioning I think a very constructive bill. I am very interested in the waste demonstration solidification project at West Valley in New York State, which I believe will be a major contribution to America's effort to develop a nuclear waste management program.

Mr. Chairman, title I of the substitute version of H.R. 3000, which has been endorsed by the Science and Technology, Interior, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees for consideration on the floor, contains authorization for the Department of Energy to carry out a nuclear waste management demonstration project on the high level liquid nuclear wastes at the Western New York Nuclear Service Center in West Valley, N.Y.

The Western New York Nuclear Service Center is the site of the only commercial nuclear reprocessing operation ever undertaken in this country. This undertaking was encouraged by the Atomic Energy Commission as a first step toward commercialization of the back end of the nuclear fuel cycle. In fact, over 60 percent of the spent fuel reprocessed at West Valley was provided by the Federal Government from operation of the N reactor at the Hanford, Wash., Federal installation. The operation has been closed down since 1972 and will never be reopened as a nuclear reprocessing facility. Located on the site are approximately 600,000 gallons of high level liquid nuclear waste resulting from reprocessing operations, two solid nuclear waste burial grounds, a reprocessing facility, and a spent fuel receiving pool.

An amendment I authored to authorize the Department of Energy to carry out a nuclear waste demonstration project on the high level liquid waste at the site was adopted by the House Science and Technology Committee during their consideration of H.R. 3000. To accommodate several concerns raised by members of the Interior and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees changes have been made in the original amendment which I sponsored and which was adopted by the Science and Technology Committee.

The major change which has been made in my original amendment is the addition of a requirement for a cost-sharing arrangement to finance the project. Under the joint committee substitute version, a non-Federal share of the cost of the project not to exceed 10 percent is required. The Department of Energy estimate to complete this project, including the respository fee, is $130 million.

Although the Federal Government's key role in encouraging this venture and promoting its development establishes the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for the safe and permanent disposal of these high level liquid nuclear waste at the site, the colicensees of the site, New York State and Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc. have some responsibility in this regard as well. Many interests, including the Federal Government, State of New York, commercial operator, and the public will benefit from successful completion of this project. For this reason I do not regard the cost-sharing arrangement being suggested here today as an unacceptable concession.

Beyond acknowledgement of some non-Federal cost-sharing responsibility, the practical effect of this substitute amendment should be the same as the original amendment adopted by the Science and Technology Committee. There is clear intent to acknowledge Department of Energy management and financial responsibility to implement a program to safely dispose of these high level liquid wastes. The project shall move forward in the upcoming fiscal year with appropriations which have already been approved by this legislative body a few weeks ago, through initiation of environmental, safety, and engineering work as well as conclusion of contracts to insure a cost-sharing arrangement, transfer of title to the high level liquid nuclear waste to the Federal Government, and utilization by the Department of Energy of property and facilities at the center. The project should be completed in a timely and uninterrupted manner.

Beyond this, there is one distressing aspect of the legislation under consideration here today about which I am deeply concerned. That is, the economic, social, and safety impact of this project on the West Valley community which I represent in Congress. This tiny community of less than 2,000 in population has already borne the brunt of what has turned out to be a major national experiment in nuclear reprocessing and now must provide the support services and community cooperation for this—another first step in nuclear technological development.

A provision considered by the Science and Technology Committee during debate on this matter, to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct a fiscal impact study of the effect on the local community from this project, was narrowly defeated. At this time, I want to reiterate my strong belief that in carrying out this project, the Department of Energy, State of New York, and commercial operator, should give consideration to the needs of this tiny community in upstate New York. Beyond this, as a matter of national policy, it is important that the Federal Government begin to focus on the related impacts on communities across the country with similar experiences. As this project goes forward, I intend to continue to be an advocate for the best interests of the West Valley community above all else.

As I noted, in addition to the high level liquid nuclear waste and reprocessing facility at the site, there is also two low level nuclear waste burial grounds and a spent fuel holding pool. The future disposition of these aspects of the site remains unresolved and will be determined independent of this project after careful consideration has been given to available alternatives. This determination will remain that primarily of the people of New York State, the owner of the site. I am encouraged that the future disposition of these other aspects of the site can be resolved in time on their own merits.

The unresolved problem of nuclear waste handling and disposal is a serious national concern which must be addressed without delay. The West Valley demonstration project authorized in the legislation before you today is an important link in the overall evolution of an acceptable national nuclear waste management policy. The Federal Government will benefit substantially from the successful demonstration of waste-handling techniques for the high level liquid nuclear waste at the site and will gain invaluable first-hand experience that can be applied to other nuclear waste management problems resulting both from our national defense program and commercial applications. Utilization by the Federal Government of the facilities at the West Valley site offers a unique opportunity to gain this knowledge and experience in a practical and cost-effective manner.

I urge your support for the joint committee substitute language under consideration today.

The CHAIRMAN. All time of the Committee on Science and Technology has been utilized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 3000, which provides authorizations to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1980. Through the cooperative efforts of Chairman STAGGERS, UDALL, and FUQUA, and ranking minority members, Messrs. CLAUSEN and WYDLER, as well as the chairman and ranking minority members of the affected subcommittee, we have been able to present to the House a revision of the original bill, which has been introduced as H.R. 4839, and which reflects the views of the various committees while avoiding jurisdictorial problems and duplication.

As to matters within the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, title II of the bill before you today would authorize appropriations to the regulatory programs within the Department of Energy which would include the Energy Regulatory Administration, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Energy Information Administration. In addition, the bill would provide $3 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals and $8.3 million for the strategic petroleum reserve, which is the amount requested by the administration for this program. However, the bill does not authorize any additional funds for the operation and implementation of this program and specifically provides that of the funds which were appropriated in fiscal year 1979 for petroleum purchases, not more than $110 million may be used for fill and leach operations, standby operational storage, planning and facility or equipment site design, construction and acquisition.

Mr. Chairman, some months ago, the administration sought to reprogram more than $700 million of the funds ap-

propriated to this program. This reprograming would have covered funds for both fiscal years 1979 and 1980. Our committee was greatly concerned about the reprograming and indicated to the administration that we support a certain level of funding for 1979 and a certain level for 1980. But, more importantly, we did not want the Department to use the funds specifically authorized and appropriated for the purchase of oil for other purposes. We believe very strongly that if the administration wants to increase the funding for other programs, it should specifically request funds for those purposes and through the normal authorization process and not try to raid petroleum purchase funds. The SPR program is important; it must be completed. We must take steps now to complete it. We must fill the reserve. The appropriations that we have provided are designed to fill the reserve. They should not be used for other purposes.

We want to also stress that we are not satisfied with the way the Department has handled this program. Improvements have been made in this program since our hearings of last December and earlier this year, but much more needs to be done, and the agency must move more rapidly to complete the program.

Title III of the bill includes funds for solar commercialization and for certain conservation programs, as well as funds for State and local conservation functions under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act and the Energy Conservation and Production Act. I would point out to the Members that the Department has recommended that the State funds be made a part of other legislation which the administration has submitted to Congress. This committee will consider that other legislation, but we could not do so prior to the enactment of this legislation.

Title V of the bill has been referred jointly to our committee and to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Our committees are fully in accord with the amounts authorized for the uranium resource assessment program, spent fuel disposition, and decontamination and decommissioning activities. In addition, this title includes a section 502 in which we have provided a procedure for dealing with away-from-reactor storage of spent fuel. This provision directs the Department to conduct specific studies and provide a mechanism for the selection and designation of away-from-reactor storage sites with the full participation of the Governors of the affected States and the public and for the issuance of a final report concerning the designation of sites. That report will also include recommendations concerning the modification and expansion of existing sites at reactors. An additional report will be provided concerning the cost of both on-site and away-from-reactor storage, and the fees to be charged to the utilities for this purpose. I emphasize that the bill makes it very clear that no funds can be used for the acquisition of a site, or for the construction of any facility on any site, before all of these activities are taken and a subsequent act of Congress is enacted which specifically authorizes funds for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important provision and has been carefully crafted so the Department can continue its efforts to identify and resolve the problem without prematurely committing the Congress or the administration to a specific course of action until we know the parameters of the problem, and whether the proposed sites can be readily available for use. It also provides the State and the public with a significant role in the decisionmaking process.

Section 503 is an amendment which was offered by my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Mr. GORE, to have the Secretary of Energy conduct a study to determine whether Federal assistance similar to that provided under the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 should be provided to the Tennessee Valley Authority to conduct remedial action at the uranium mill tailing site at Edgemont, S. Dak., which TVA purchased after the previous owners ceased mill operations at the site.

Section 504 provides for the Secretary of Energy to study and devise a plan for the emergency removal from foreign countries of spent fuel of U.S. origin where necessary. The steps should include, where appropriate, the initiation of specific detailed feasibility studies for receiving such fuel, and in accordance with applicable provisions of law, the acquisition of such spent fuel of the physical capability for implementing a retrival operation. I stress the point that all of these activities must be carried out in accordance with applicable provisions of law, including various statutes relating to the use of foreign vessels.

Title VI, which was referred to our committee and the Committee on Science and Technology, includes authorizations for funding for buildings and community systems for the extension service, for appropriate technology, for urban waste energy conservation, fossil energy activities, solar application, and industrial conservation.

Title VII generally provides funds for various departmental activities, particularly administrative-type activities, including funds for the program and management and for the Office of Inspector General, the Secretary, and other offices within the Department. It also provides funds for the uranium enrichment program and for in-house energy management. Section 702 of this title directs the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study to develop a program to be conducted by the Department of Energy which would provide for retraining and training of civilian nuclear reactors operators. The training program must be in accordance with applicable requirements of law and regulations, and the responsibility for establishing regulatory requirements would remain with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Secretary of Energy would provide a report of this study to the Congress, and it could be implemented, unless the Congress disapproves of the idea.

Section 703 provides for a commercial waste management report and section 704 relates to international energy assistance.

Title VIII of the bill provides general limitations on activities of the Department such as road reprograming, use of unexpended balances, and limitation of use of revenue. The committees felt that these were all important to carry out the programs of the Department.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this very important energy bill which provides an opportunity for this country to move forward in energy development.

□ 1130

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to just at this point commend my mentor and chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) for a job very well done.

Later in the day we will have under the amendments a proposed amendment to continue decontrols on oil and this debate on decontrolled prices raises a number of very, very important issues which the House will be addressing at that point.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on oil decontrol raises a number of important issues that all Members of the House need to address—and which deeply affect our country and our future. As a supporter of phased decontrol of oil prices, I want to share with my colleagues the conclusions which I have reached during 4 years of membership in the Subcommittee on Energy and Power.

In the opening of the recent Democratic caucus debate, the question was raised: Who controls oil prices? The implication of the question is that if oil prices are decontrolled, we are only further playing into the hands of the OPEC cartel. The reality of the situation is that, like it or not, the cartel already effectively controls the price of oil. And, like it or not, existing price controls only reinforce the power of the oil cartels. And that price—or cartel—is not going to be broken until we face the energy issue squarely. No amount of rhetoric or political maneuvering in the Congress will dent the cartel.

The point was also raised that the proposed windfall profits tax is simply a politicians protection device. Let me again suggest the reality: The real politicians protection device is the orchestrated assertion that increased oil prices are the problem. The clear implication of the arguments of those who support continued controls is that we have an energy policy that works, and that any change is a sellout to the oil companies. The policy suggested by the resolution debated in the Democratic caucus (to continue controls on oil) is the real political protection device. Rent price controls have not created more apartments in New York, and oil price controls will not create more oil. Instead of facing the reality of a declining energy supply, the proponents of continued controls view price increases as the problem. I do not impugn their motives: I just think they are wrong.

The problem is not price increases; the problem is economic and geological. Price increases are a response to a diminished supply, a failure to conserve, and a continued dependence on one energy source of which OPEC controls the marginal supply. Artificially regulating these prices subsidizes additional consumption, inhibits exploration, creates distortions in our energy distribution system, and reflects the impact of economics on alternative energy sources.

How to analyze the conflicting arguments? Let us first try to escape the emotionalism of the past energy holy wars which have swept the Congress, and let us try to avoid the certainty which flows from holy positions. Above all, let us not be misled by those who argue that there are simple answers or obvious villains here. I have found it to be useful to balance the cost of decontrol against the benefits of decontrol—let me share my analysis with you:

The Cost of Decontrol: Decontrol will cause higher prices, but this should be put in context. First, higher prices would occur—as they have in past years—even with continuation of price controls. Second, the debate over decontrol concerns somewhat less than 40 percent of all the crude oil we use—the rest is already at or near world prices.

Forty-three percent of our oil is imported (world price).

Seven and one-half percent is from Alaska, or the Naval Petroleum reserve (including transportation, Alaskan oil is effectively at world price).

Seven and one-half percent is stripper oil (which has been, for sometime, effectively at world price).

About 6 percent is deep stripper and marginal wells, which will now go to the world price, along with newly discovered oil under proposed DOE regulatory changes distinct from legal decontrol.

Thus, more than 60 percent of our total crude oil supply is already at or near world price. This leaves less than two-fifths of our crude oil supply under price controls. Further, it should be noted that all products from refineries except for gasoline are presently decontrolled. Despite some controls on crude, therefore, consumers are paying decontrolled product prices for middle distillates and residual fuel oil. These make up about 50 percent of the barrel. The other half is gasoline. With full decontrol we can expect these decontrolled prices to rise somewhat as the cost of crude to refineries increases, but it will not be a dollar-for-dollar increase. Combined with other slippage in the regulatory structure, by the time oil gets to the consumer, we are now left with 15 to 20 percent of our oil effectively under price regulation.

Thus, I believe that the present debate over decontrol is often couched in somewhat specious terms. This is not an all or nothing arrangement, or a debate of control or decontrol. The reality of the situation is that relatively little of our oil—15 to 25 percent—is under price controls. Thus, the debate should focus on the costs of decontrolling this remaining oil, compared to the benefits that will result from this decontrol. I think the evidence clearly indicates that the benefits far outweigh the costs, and that we should immediately confirm the administration's policy on decontrol.

The projected inflationary impact of decontrol is relatively small and therefore is not a convincing argument for maintaining controls. Under the President's proposal, decontrol is phased in over nearly 3 years, so that the inflation impact is .03 percent in 1979; 0.2 percent in 1980; 0.2 percent to 0.3 percent in 1981 or a cumulative 0.5 percent to 0.7 percent over the 3 years. Major future price increases by OPEC would increase this impact.

There is no question that in these troubled economic times, with sharp inflation, these are real costs and they cannot be ignored. A rational analysis has to measure what we get for this increased cost. Let me present what I believe to be the five areas of return to the economy and to the American people:

One, Supply: There is a temptation to misinterpret the projected supply response, just as there is a temptation to overemphasize the new oil supplies that will result from decontrol. We have estimates ranging from 400,000 to 2 million barrels extra per day by 1985, because of the economic stimulus of decontrol. No matter what numbers you choose, there are several factors that must be kept in mind:

First, we have to find new reserves of oil and decrease the decline of production which has been dropping dangerously since it peaked in 1970 at 11.3 million barrels per day (including natural gas liquids). Production dropped to 9.8 million barrels per day in 1977 but increased to 10.3 million barrels per day in 1978 as a result of increasing Alaskan production. Alaskan production has now leveled off as limited by the transAlaskan pipeline and total U.S. production will again show a decline.

Are additional incentives necessary? I believe so. New exploration is expensive; tertiary recovery techniques are expensive. Most of the easy finds in this country have been made, and new oil is going to cost more. There is also another valid answer to this question. At present, oil and gas production companies' returns on equity are slightly below the national industrial average. Certainly rates of return for this sector of the economy—which should be a national priority—should not be below the national average for industry as a whole.

Second, we cannot ignore the value of the additional production projected from decontrol. The administration's projections of 300,000 barrels per day by 1982, and 700,000 barrels per day by 1985, is oil that we would otherwise import. And the amount relative to our needs is not insubstantial, particularly when we recognize that the over 500,000 barrel shortfall resulting from Iran shutdown caused severe shortages that are felt.

Third, the argument that an increased price produces relatively little new production is a narrow argument; it neglects the return from conservation, economic efficiencies in supply allocation, impact on alternative energy supplies, and the strength of the dollar in foreign markets, which are the other benefits of decontrol.

Finally, an answer should be given to the question most often asked by the opponents of decontrol: "Don't the oil companies already have enough incentive?" I believe that this is the wrong question. The question most fundamental is: "What is the marginal cost of each extra barrel of oil to the U.S. economy, and to whom will this be paid?" The marginal cost is the world price. Each additional barrel that we do not produce domestically is imported at the world price. With decontrol the user of the marginal barrel of oil will pay its true price, and that cost will be reflected in energy and investment decisions throughout the economy concerning conservation and alternative energy sources.

At present, no one in the United States pays the marginal cost of oil. Through the convoluted entitlements system, those who import that extra barrel of oil are subsidized by those who do not, and—theoretically—every refinery has an average cost of oil. This is bad economics, and bad public policy.

Second. Conservation—We can divide oil use into three different economic sectors: Industrial, 35 percent; commercial and residential, 15 percent; and transportation, 50 percent. Each of these sectors should be examined separately to understand the potential conservation effects of decontrol.

Industrial. A major energy conservation effort is successfully underway in American industry. Total industrial energy use—not just oil—has decreased by 6 percent since 1973, while the economy has grown 12 percent in real terms. Industrial energy use in the United States has decreased more than in any other major industrial economy since 1973; our energy use overall has increased by only 1 percent a year since 1973, compared to an average of 3½ percent per year over the previous 20 years. Our overall energy use is over 10 percent lower than it would have been had we followed the 1953–73 trend line. Clearly, the economy is responding to increased prices. Industrial capacity does not turn over quickly, but we can expect significant future savings as architects, engineers, and managers factor in the cost of energy, something they generally have not done until recently.

Commercial and residential. Here the record is not as good, but the incentives are not as clear, either. An industry can invest scarce capital in energy conservation, and realize a predictable rate of return on that investment. The homeowner too often does not have the available capital; or the cost of borrowed capital is far higher in the short term than the dollars saved from decreased energy use. There is significant long-term conservation potential here, however, as builders and architects adjust, spurred by various regulatory and tax incentives. How soon and how strong will we send the conservation signal to this community? If we delay the difficult decision on price, the response will also be delayed.

Transportation. The argument for higher prices as an incentive for conservation is also less clear in the trans-

portation sector. Fifty percent of our oil goes to transportation use, compared to about 25 percent in Germany and 15 percent in Japan.

Unfortunately, gasoline consumption continues to increase despite the need for conservation and perceived higher prices. Part of the explanation is that the real price of gasoline has not increased since 1974; in constant 1972 dollars, a gallon of regular cost 44.8 cents in 1974, and 41 cents in April 1979. The only time the real price of gasoline rose—from 36 cents in 1973 to 44 cents in 1974—consumption declined. But the evidence is conflicting and claims about the conservation effect of higher gasoline prices are mixed.

More promising developments are the fact that new autos are now 50 percent more efficient than they were in the early 1970's. According to most estimates, this efficiency will result in a net 5-percent reduction in gasoline consumption below current levels by 1985, despite the increase in the numbers of automobiles on the road. Again, this is a long-term issue—smaller, more efficient cars, more mass transportation, changes in our love affair with the automobile.

The summary of the conservation issue is best found in these statistics: The American economy is 35 percent more energy intensive than Germany's and 67 percent more than Japan's. The biggest differences are in the transportation and commercial/residential sectors, and these will require significant changes over the long run.

Third. Regulation. A significant positive result from decontrol will be the flushing of the present regulatory structure. Current oil regulations are inefficient, shot through with exceptions and cause major distortions in the petroleum sector of our economy.

For example:

The present entitlements program subsidizes imports in the neighborhood of $5 billion per year;

The small refiner bias has created a good deal of inefficient refinery capacity. Since the present law was passed, many new, small refineries have been built, many of which cannot efficiently refine the supplies of increasingly heavy and high sulfur crude oils, nor make unleaded gasoline. Yet these small, inefficient refineries are subsidized by the large ones;

Utilities, which should have the incentive to move to coal-fired electricity have no incentive to do so as long as the price of residual fuel oil is kept unrealistically low, at the average rather than the marginal price;

Under current entitlement program regulations, all domestic oil is assumed to be of the same quality although it is not. Until recently California refineries, which depend on heavy California crude stock, were paying the same entitlements subsidy as other refineries using higher quality crude, a windfall for the latter group;

At a time when we need new processing units in refineries, to produce lead free gasoline and to process heavy and high sulfur crudes, Government regulations allow the refiner to recapture only the cost of borrowed principal and interest, not a return on equity, and therefore leaves little incentive for needed new construction;

Because production qualifies for the higher price of the stripper category if it is less than 10 barrels per day from a well, there is a great incentive for the producer to reduce production from 14 or 15 barrels to 10. One proposed solution is to expand the definition of stripper to 20 barrels per day. What will then happen to those wells which are now producing 25 barrels? The production disincentive will be moved but maintained; and

A warning: When the crude decontrol issue is behind us, the next major energy issue facing the Congress and the administration will concern refineries. As outlined above, the present regulatory structure has badly skewed the investment in new refinery capacity and efficient use of our existing capacity. In the future, the unmet demand for unleaded gasoline, and for gasoline altogether, is going to create a net set of refinery-related problems that will demand our early attention.

The examples go on and on in this encrusted, outmoded, and inefficient regulatory structure. They exist for refineries, producers, pipelines, marketers, and ultimately for all consumers. We keep patching up the leaky system, granting a price increase for Long Beach's municipally owned lower tier oil, because the profits will accrue to a city, not a company; making small refiner millionaires, and developing bizarre stripper definitions. If we continue this archaic and inefficient regulatory policy, we will simply see more and more exceptions to try to make the regulations work, or in response to them. For example, Louisiana and Texas have considered State excise taxes on exported oil, which will move oil right back into the interstate versus intrastate complexities that plagued natural gas for years.

Regulation breeds economic inefficiency and inequality, and it is time to flush the system. Decontrol will accomplish this end; the maintenance of controls will only serve to magnify the existing problems.

Fourth. Alternative energy supplies. How long are we going to put off the day of energy and economic reality? Energy is a long-term problem—when are we going to start? Decontrol will provide more price certainty, against which alternative energy investment decisions can be made. Until the price of oil is high enough, investment and changes in our energy infrastructure will not be made. A good example of the validity of price incentives are found in natural gas. Until recently the price controls on conventional gas discouraged independent drilling for gas, as opposed to associated gas—produced along with oil.

As oil prices are decontrolled, we begin to approach the window where alternative energy sources become viable. Arabian crude is now selling for close to $20 a barrel. The following are some ball park estimates in current dollars of the thresholds for alternative energy sources; capable of producing the energy equivalent of a barrel of oil:

Coal liquefaction (nonmethanol), $30–$35.

Shale oil, $22–$26.

Very heavy crude, $20.

Solar collector, $30.

Methanol, $25–$35.

Unconventional gas, $20–$30.

We are nearing the economic threshold for the development of alternative energy sources. Decontrol will help to stimulate investments that should have been made long ago.

And, because it will take a decade or more before alternative energy sources can have a major impact on the Nation's energy supply, each day we delay in stimulating investments in these alternative energy resources means 1 day longer before these sources becomes available. We can postpone this thrust, or we can accept the reality that tomorrow's issue will be supply, not simply price.

Fifth. Value of the dollar. The best economic testimony indicates that last year 1 percent of our total inflation rate was caused by the decreased value of the dollar. While the specific economic trail, from decontrol to increased production and conservation, to lessened imports and a slowed dollar flow overseas is complex, it is very real. We paid about $45 billion for oil imports in 1978. Without that huge transfer abroad we would have had a positive balance of trade. The United States this year will pay about $50 billion for oil imports, by 1985 the cost of imports will probably double to $100 billion. This enormous drain will keep continuing pressure on the dollar in overseas markets and could cause disastrous weakening of the currency. The country cannot afford to permit this situation to continue indefinitely. It is probably fair to estimate that the cost of decontrol in inflation from higher costs—discussed earlier—will in part or in whole be offset by a strengthened dollar.

In addition, we cannot quantify the value of signalling to the world the intent of the United States to become serious about energy. Our failure to raise domestic oil prices to world levels to date has meant that neither our European allies nor the OPEC nations take our oil conservation protestations seriously. And we know that OPEC will continue to take advantage of our increasing dependency.

SUMMARY

The question of decontrol is an economic and a political question. In the foregoing I have attempted to outline what I believe are the compelling economic arguments for decontrol. Hopefully they speak for themselves.

The political argument is harder to quantify. But it is easy to outline what the political argument is not—or should not be.

This is not an argument for or against big oil and small oil, for or against Marcor or J. C. Penney's. While there has unquestionably been some very poor management by the industry, we should not reply in kind.

This is not an argument for or against the Department of Energy or bureaucrats. It is an argument about public policy which, once resolved, must then be executed by the executive branch with

aggressive and effective oversight by the Congress.

Finally, this is not an argument about price increases, nor should we view price increases as the sole problem. It is an argument about supply, about economic and about geological problems.

The political issue is whether we have the foresight to focus on our future problem, on the need to pay more and use less. If we refuse to do so, if we refuse to take the difficult and unpopular position, then we will not be exercising our responsibilities, nor will we be leading the country. I would hope that responsibility and leadership would characterize the ultimate decision of the House of Representatives on the issue of energy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4839, an amendment offered in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 3000. Many of the titles of H.R. 3000 were concurrently referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Science and Technology, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The many differences in the provisions which were reported out by the various committees have been negotiated among the committee staffs, and a workable compromise bill, H.R. 4839, has been forged.

While I personally feel that more and more should be done to reduce the massive spending which is authorized under this legislation, I do accept, in the spirit of compromise, the authorization levels reached in H.R. 4839. It must be remembered that the DOE has never had an authorization bill since its not-so-immacuate inception. I do believe that the time is right to have a DOE authorization bill made into law. I urge my colleagues to support the compromise bill, H.R. 4839.

There are two additional matters which I would like to address before yielding to my colleagues. The first deals with the authorization for the uranium enrichment add-on facility at Portsmouth, Ohio. This plant, using the energy saving gas centrifuge method of enriching uranium, has been plagued by slippages in its completion schedule. The first module of this add-on, originally slated for mid-1986, is now due in mid-1988. Completion of the facility is now set for 1993. I have been assured that the money authorized in this bill is sufficient to meet this goal. I have also been assured that no further schedule slippages will occur, and that if the schedule can be accelerated, it will be. I am in favor of that, and I am glad that sufficient money has been authorized to complete rapidly this efficient new technology at Portsmouth.

Second, I believe that we need to understand the limited nature of section 702 of the bill, which deals with the establishment of a training program for nuclear reactor operators. Under this program, the Department of Energy is to develop a program to train nuclear reactor operators. The program is to be nonmandatory and must train the operators in accordance with the licensing requirements established by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The program also is to be submitted to the Congress and will begin operating unless it has been disapproved by either House of Congress.

Several points need to be made. First, I do not believe anyone in this Congress is against improving the training of nuclear reactor operators. I certainly favor improving that training because I believe it will result in safer operation of our nuclear powerplants. Second, I am not at all convinced that the DOE is competent enough to do the job right. However, I believe that DOE should be given the opportunity to develop a training program. If it is good enough, it will be patronized by the industry. If it is not, then perhaps the research and development could be used by the private sector. It is critical, therefore, that it is understood that this program is not mandatory—a reactor operator may still be licensed by the NRC if he receives his training elsewhere and meets the NRC licensing requirements.

Finally, although I would not have involved the DOE in training operators at all, I agreed to include this provision in the compromise bill with the understanding that the DOE's role is to be strictly limited to developing and running a training program. DOE is not to insinuate itself into the NRC rulemaking procedures. DOE is not to review the work of the NRC. DOE is not to establish operator licensing requirements. DOE is to use whatever expertise it has at its disposal, however limited, to develop an operator training program in accordance with the applicable requirements of law and regulations which govern the granting of operating licenses to nuclear reactors. That is the assurance I have been given in agreeing to include this provision in this bill, presented as a compromise among the three committees having jurisdiction over DOE authorizations.

□ 1140

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) 5 minutes.

Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that we should have learned from the gasoline shortages throughout the United States this year, I think it is that we have to anticipate the requirements and the needs in the field of energy that we have as a country and plan ahead in order to provide adequate solutions for those needs. It seems to me that movement from crisis to crisis by this Congress or by the executive branch on any issue of importance such as energy, the environment, the economy, foreign affairs, or any other public policy issue that confronts the United States, we should always anticipate what the problem will be and move appropriately in time to provide adequate solutions. Nowhere is this more true, it seems to me, than with respect to nuclear waste management.

One of the reasons in my second term in Congress I sought and was selected to join the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was to serve on the Energy and Power Subcommittee because of its responsibilities for nuclear waste management, something that in 30 years of commercial use of nuclear power our country has not addressed adequately.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to briefly review our current status as it relates to proceeding with the implementation of the President's spent fuel program. What we have pending before us is a slightly revised version of section 403 of H.R. 11392, the fiscal year 1979 DOE authorization reported by the Commerce Committee in the last Congress. The current bill contains language relating to the commercial spent fuel storage program in section 502. Principal elements include:

First. A requirement to complete and publish a need study on interim spent fuel storage within 30 days of enactment;

Second. Initiation of hearings in each State selected as a candidate for any regional facilities;

Third. An expression of the need to complete these hearings by March 1, 1980, in order to report to Congress by approximately April 15, 1980; and

Fourth. Transmittal to Congress by February 1, 1980, of a report discussing costs of acquisition or construction and criteria for determining the one-time fee for interim storage and final disposal.

As I will review for the RECORD later in more detail, the Department of Energy has fulfilled essentially every requirement called for and is in a position to proceed with State hearings tomorrow. There have been extensive NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) related activities beginning in late 1977, which have led to the release of several environmental impact statements from the Department of Energy and related agencies. These public documents cover domestic spent fuel storage, foreign spent fuel storage, charges for storage and disposal, and the overall commercial waste management programs.

An important aspect of what we will vote on is a direct and early involvement of the States that may be candidate sites for spent fuel storage. The Governors of these States will play a formal role in developing the local plans for acquisition and operation. This aspect of the program has already been undertaken by Department officials on a limited basis and certainly should continue aggressively. I would hope the Department will not read the pending legislation as any constraint in this regard, but rather as an encouragement to continue what they have been doing in this respect.

My colleagues should also be aware that the Senate has addressed the spent fuel storage issue in their version of the fiscal year 1980 DOE authorization bill, S. 688. The Senate has opted to use the statutory vehicle of the construction line item, project 79-1-P, which was first approved in 1979 to assure continuity as well as important progress toward the goal of providing initial off-site storage capacity by the early eighties. The Senate Energy Committee has proposed that $25 million of the $300 million requested for the facilities by the President be made available in fiscal year 1980 for specific site activities short of actual acquisition. Of the approved funding, $5

million is set aside for the study of cost and potential sites.

I personally feel that many elements of the House and Senate provisions are compatible. Both bodies are committed to the sense of urgency in taking the initial steps required to advance the program. I trust that my colleagues will support this vitally needed program both now and in any supplementary legislation treating the mechanics of transfer of title and refund for recovered fuel value.

Before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a couple of questions to the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

If the gentleman will respond, Mr. Chairman, am I correct in stating for the record that the Subcommittee on Energy and Power will proceed expeditiously to conclude the hearing record on H.R. 2586, the Spent Nuclear Fuel Act of 1979?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORCORAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has provided valuable leadership in this and we are going to move just as soon as possible on the legislation referred to.

Mr. CORCORAN. I thank the chairman.

One other question I have is whether or not the Commerce Committee intends that the Department of Energy pursue all aspects of this program, including review of candidate sites to assure a timely submittal of their initial report which is called for in section 502 of this legislation?

Mr. DINGELL. The answer to that question is yes.

Mr. CORCORAN. I thank the chairman for his assurances.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would just hope that my colleagues would recognize the urgency that we in the United States have with respect to nuclear waste management and also accept the recommendation of the committee that section 502 does address the problem. In my judgment it is the minimum course that we should take at this time in order to get on top once and for all of the very serious problem of storing on both an interim and a permanent basis the nuclear wastes which have been accumulating in this country for many, many years.

□ 1150

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I yield 1 extra minute first to express to my colleagues how effective the gentleman's work has been on the Energy and Power Subcommittee, the minority side, of the Commerce Committee, and also to express my appreciation for the cooperation we received from the majority side, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), in fashioning this legislation. I also want to say a kind word about the members of the Science and Technology Committee, both the majority and minority, who have been so cooperative. I also want to express my real appreciation for the help we received from the minority side of the Interior Committee, for their help in our consideration of this bill.

It is a complex proposition that we are into, where a piece of legislation is referred to three different committees, and jurisdiction must be shared. There were some tensions in past years on the resolution of these problems between the committees, but I think this year a good job has been done by all three committees in trying to work out these problems. I, for one, am deeply appreciative, because it makes a difficult job, the job we are trying to do here, much easier.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that, while the gentleman from Illinois was in the well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN).

Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not ask for additional time because of the comments made commending the gentleman from Illinois, but I certainly would agree and underscore the comments of the gentleman from Ohio about our colleagues who have been involved in this difficult process.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORCORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) for specializing in this area and providing us with his leadership. I would like to point out to my colleagues on the floor and for the record the difference between spent fuel and nuclear waste. As I understand it, this legislation deals with the commodity of spent fuels and it is important that spent fuels should not be classified as waste. Indeed, if the policy of the present administration is changed, or a subsequent administration changes that policy, those spent fuels can serve as the energy equivalent of billions of barrels of oil through the technique of reprocessing.

So, the storage of those spent fuels is putting aside in a safe and effective way, energy for the future. They are not wastes.

Mr. CORCORAN. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MAGUIRE).

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, today we will have an amendment to reimpose EPCA crude oil controls until October 1, 1981. I hope the House will support the amendment. Inflation is currently running at an annualized rate of over 14 percent, and energy is the principal driving force. In May, energy prices added 4.31 percentage points to the annual rate of inflation, a large impact than during any month following the October 1973 embargo.

Since February, total consumer energy prices and wholesale figures have both increased at an average annual rate in excess of 50 percent, and that rate was in excess of 100 percent during the month of June. The costs of decontrol will be added on to these runaway consumer costs. Moreover, with the most recent OPEC price increases the President's decontrol program will cost much more than anticipated when he proposed it.

Based on current world prices, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that decontrol will cost $27.8 billion through 1981, and $135 billion through 1985. With the OPEC price increases, those numbers become $40.7 billion through 1981 and $209 billion through 1985. That last figure calculates out to about $2.5 billion a month in increased costs to consumers and inflationary pressures in the economy.

Across-the-board decontrol allows already discovered oil to receive cartel-set prices even though the investments have already been made and little additional oil would be produced. Old oil would go from about $6 a barrel to $20, a 230-percent increase. Paying that additional money for old oil which would have been produced in any event will not significantaly reduce imports.

Decontrol eliminates any connection between cost of production and price even for new oil. The Harvard Business School Energy Future Report shows that since 1973 the regulated price of newly-found oil has already more than tripled while drilling costs have only doubled. So decontrol does not help produce much new oil either. The incentives are already there, as study after study has showed.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, decontrol would increase domestic production by only 2.9 percent of projected 1985 demand. And it would cost us $135 billion to bring in that additional 2.9 percent. According to Administration estimates, we could make nearly as much oil available if we adopted residential and commercial conservation programs at a cost of only $2 billion through 1990 as opposed to the $135 billion figure through 1985 for marginal increases in production.

Now, people will say that if we do not decontrol we are going to lose the revenues from the windfall profits tax. Let us look at that. Assuming the House passed version, the windfall profits tax between now and 1981 would collect only $11 billion. After 1981, between 1982 and 1985, it would collect $30 billion. The key point to understand is that that $30 billion will be collected regardless of the action we take today on decontrol between now and 1981. If we keep controls, when the synfuels program that the President has proposed comes on line in the 1980's we will still be collecting a substantial windfall profits tax on domestically produced oil that is sold at

world prices. That money will in fact be there even if we prevent decontrol from going through today.

I have received 17,000 letters against decontrol from citizens in my State of New Jersey and across the country which I presented to the Speaker earlier today. Americans do not want more unnecessary inflation when they do not get any substantial benefits in either production or conservation in return.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the subcommittee allowing me to take some time to discuss what I found out about the Department of Energy in my position as subcommittee chairman on the Civil Service Committee.

Mr. Chairman, on March 29, 1979, the Subcommittee on Civil Service, which I chair, held hearings on personnel management at the Department of Energy. What we found was a disorganized, poorly run Department. After 18 months of operation, the Department of Energy seemed to lack the goals necessary to structure the agency. Agency management appeared incapable of putting to constructive use the talents and energies of its 19,000 employees.

Within the next month, the staff of the subcommittee will go back to DOE to find out whether improvements have been made. Our return visit was going to be sooner. Every time when a reexamination seemed timely, however, another cloud burst over the top of the Forrestal Building. Crisis after crisis prevents the Department of Energy from ever getting on an even keel.

At our March 29 hearings, we found the following personnel management problems at DOE:

Below the Assistant Secretary level, the organizational structure was not clearly articulated. The Department conceded that the conservation and solar and defense programs lacked fully approved organizational structures. Our staff investigation revealed that, in other areas as well, the organizational structure was not clear to the employees. Complaints were received from branch chiefs and similarly situated officials that no organizational structure was evident to them in any part of the Department.

A very high proportion of branch chief, division director, and office director positions was filled on an acting basis. As of April 1, 164 of the 424 filled branch chief positions were filled by people in acting capacity. One hundred and seventeen of the 354 division-director and 52 of the 211 office-director jobs were filled in the same way. Employees filling positions on an "acting basis" have no job security or tenure. They can be removed from their position without an adverse action or any cause. An employee in such a vulnerable position, especially if he or she is interested in gaining a permanent appointment, is likely to be excessively compliant with the wishes of management.

As of the time of the hearing, a full one-third of the positions in DOE lacked position descriptions and approved classifications. While the number has creeped up since then, large numbers of positions are still not under approved position descriptions. Without a position description, there is no way to know whether the job is classified at the proper grade level. Furthermore, employees are unable to tell whether they are fully performing all the functions of their position. They do not know what the critical elements of performance are. They do not know whether they have been subjected to reductions in grade. Such a situation results in a scared work force, extremely responsive to the whims of management.

The old Civil Service Commission performed a personnel management evaluation on DOE a year ago. In the course of this study, CSC found that nearly 30 percent of a representative sample of DOE jobs were misgraded, with most being overgraded. This costs the taxpayer a large amount of money. CSC found that DOE lacked a serious classification maintenance system. In our hearings, it was revealed that the Department is contracting out for the services of classifiers. Subsequently, DOE has attempted to cure the actual cases of misclassification which the Civil Service Commission found. I was upset to find out that the misclassifications were corrected not by downgrading the position but rather by abolishing the position, creating a new employee into that job. This is just about the most blatant example of grade creep I have seen.

Minority representation in DOE is abysmal. While the Department claims to have the best affirmative action program in the Government, equal employment complaints linger on far longer than the 180-day statutory deadline. Women are only 35 percent of the whole workforce at DOE, compared with 43 percent of the Government as a whole, and over 50 percent of the population. Blacks are virtually unrepresented in higher level positions in DOE, comprising only 1.4 percent of the supergrades.

Employees complain about extended details, frequent transfers, and details to positions with no work. If these allegations are true, it indicated that the Department of Energy does not know what to do with its employees.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, with the chaos at the Department of Energy. My subcommittee will continue to look into this problem. The Office of Personnel Management plans a nationwide personnel audit of DOE next year. In the meanwhile, I urge the authorizing committees to keep a keen eye on the Department of Energy. If the mismanagement, confusion, and misuse of employees continues for another year, some of us might start rethinking the utility of having a separate Department.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Energy fiscal year 1980 authorization bill and fiscal year 1979 supplemental authorization bill will be considered by the House today and tomorrow. It is likely that an amendment that would take away the President's power to gradually remove crude oil price controls will be offered. Such an amendment would seriously impair our efforts to meet our international obligations to the other Western industrialized nations and would deal our country a serious blow as it attempts to formulate a rational and effective energy policy. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose vigorously any such amendment.

Crude oil prices have been legislatively controlled since 1973 under the authority vested in the President by the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act. In 1975, the EPAA was amended by the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. At the time that the crude oil pricing system was established, its proponents stated that it was designed with two goals in mind; providing producers with adequate incentives to search for and produce additional oil supplies while at the same time protecting the consumer from price increases. This pricing policy has failed miserably in both respects. The impact of these prices controls on our domestic crude oil production particularly has been devastating.

In 1973, the year controls were imposed under the EPAA, lower-48-State production averaged 9.2 million barrels per day. By the end of 1978, lower-48 production had declined by over 20 percent—to only 7.2 million barrels a day. At the same time price controls were discouraging domestic production, they also had the effect of artifically subsidizing imports through the complicated entitlements program which transfers money from domestic oil users to imported oil users. As a consequence, while our domestic production was declining, use of more expensive and less dependable imported oil increased by 23 percent between 1973 and January 1979.

Today, despite 1.2 million barrels of production per day from Alaska, we meet only about 50 percent of our crude oil needs from our own production as compared with 1970 when the United States produced enough oil to meet some 76 percent of its crude oil needs.

It is without question that our crude oil pricing policy has failed to provide us with the crude oil we need to keep our economy running smoothly. This pricing policy has been an even larger failure, however, in its impact on consumer prices.

Since 1972 the amount of dollars the United States has spent on imported petroleum has increased from slightly over $3 billion to an estimated 1979 import bill of a staggering $60 billion. In this same time frame, average retail gasoline prices in the United States have increased from 36 cents a gallon to over 85 cents—and this is under price controls.

By discouraging investment in domestic production and alternative technologies, by encouraging consumption, and by subsidizing foreign imports, we have tightened the supply-demand balance in the world oil markets, thus allowing OPEC to charge more for its oil than it would have been able to in the absence of price controls. This has detrimentally affected our balance of payments and has contributed to the rate of inflation.

Thus, far from protecting the consumer, price controls have had the effect of driving up the prices for goods and services throughout the economy. Perhaps the Washington Post said it best when it concluded that the protection afforded by price controls "is, in fact, spurious. Because controls have held domestic prices low, Americans have used much more than otherwise they would have done, and that in turn has made it much easier for the oil-exporting countries to keep raising the world prices that are now feeding back into the American economy. It is quite possible that Americans are paying higher oil prices today, after 8 years of controls, than they would be paying if there had been no controls at all."

On April 5, the President announced his program for phasing out crude oil price controls. This phaseout can begin without legislative action under the terms of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act which was passed in 1975. Under EPCA, crude oil price controls became discretionary with the President as of June 1, 1979. After that time, the President has the options of allowing controls to lapse altogether or continuing them in whatever form he chooses. All legislative authority for crude oil price controls expires on September 30, 1979, unless, of course, this authority is legislatively extended.

The President's program is the best approach for ending the damaging effects of regulation. First, the President's program calls for a gradual increase in the price of the third of our total crude oil consumption that is under price control. During the period June 1, 1979, through September 30, 1979, the controlled price will rise to world market levels. This decision to gradually permit prices to return to world market levels will add a total of only about 0.6 percent to the Consumer Price Index by the end of 1981, as compared with over 1.7 percent if prices were immediately decontrolled. In addition, this steady escalation in prices over 28 months gives consumers time for additional conservation efforts. Conservation by price does work, as evidenced by the experience of Germany and Japan, neither of which have petroleum price controls. Since 1973, the economies of these countries have grown without an overall increase in crude oil consumption. Data Resources, Inc., estimates that decontrol will reduce U.S. consumer demand by 300,000 barrels a day by 1981.

Second, the President's decontrol program will provide additional capital and price incentives to U.S. firms to increase exploration and production efforts. Oil and gas are getting hard to find and much more expensive to produce—deeper wells, expensive techniques to produce, and expensive platforms for offshore production. As a general matter, higher prices will allow producers to assemble the capital needed to increase U.S. supplies. Moreover, the President's program provides several specific incentive programs to encourage increased production.

The administration estimates that between 740,000 and 840,000 barrels a day more crude oil will be produced during 1985 under its decontrol program as compared with continued controls. Chase Econometrics, Inc., estimates the U.S. supply response at 2,400,000 barrels per day in additional crude oil by 1985. Every one of these barrels would replace foreign oil imports—which might not be available to the United States in 1985.

In June, at the economic summit in Japan, the President promised the leaders of the other Western industrialized nations that the United States would take strong steps to reduce our oil imports between now and 1985. Only if we allow the President to gradually remove crude oil price controls can this commitment be met.

It is clear that decontrol is necessary for the long-term health of the U.S. economy. Extension of controls will have a disastrous impact on U.S. production and consumption. In addition, it would demonstate to the rest of the world that the United States does not take its international obligations seriously.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against any attempts to trade away the future economic welfare of this country and vigorously oppose extension of price controls on crude oil.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just 1 minute to say a word with reference to our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER).

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER) as many of my colleagues know, is unusual in that he is one of the very small handful of Congressmen with technical backgrounds. As such, he offers a different and valuable insight to the legislative process, especially on issues such as energy and technology, about which his background gives him a special familiarity.

For my colleagues' information, I might note that Mr. RITTER received his doctor of science degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has served as a professor on the faculty at a university which is distinguished nationally for the excellence of its scientific and technical programs, namely, Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pa. More recently, Mr. RITTER managed the development of new research programs for nearly 10 years at Lehigh across a broad cross-section of fields, in science and technology as well as the social sciences and humanities, before his election to Congress last year. Previously, he had also served as an engineering consultant to various firms in the materials field.

I would suggest that the Congress has too few of such technically trained Members—we can count them on the fingers of one hand. We could use more people of his quality and ability in the Congress.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for the leadership he has given to the House with respect to the decontrol question. I think it is not only paramount that the amendment to stop decontrol is defeated, but actually what we should be doing here is to take out this entire section of the bill where we have given the Department of Energy the ability to go in and allocate and disrupt the retail distribution and wholesale distribution of petroleum products in the country. That part of the bill is the part I find very obnoxious, and it is unfortunate that it is in the bill. If anything, we ought to be getting rid of the entire segment immediately, now, and get those people out in the private sector doing something worthwhile.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Chirdon, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 25, 1979:

H.R. 4289. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for other purposes.

On July 26, 1979:

H.R. 4537. An act to approve and implement the trade agreements negotiated under the Trade Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1980 AND 1981—CIVILIAN APPLICATIONS

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4839 as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for H.R. 3000, the Department of Energy authorization for fiscal year 1980. This is a clean bill representing the substantive agreements of the chairmen of three committees of jurisdiction and I think it is a good and comprehensive recommendation.

I want to briefly discuss some provisions of the bill of particular interest to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Perhaps our most concerted effort went toward development of an amendment requiring the Secretary to provide us with a justification and cost report on Federal and private provision of away-from-reactor interim spent fuel storage. I worked with my colleague Mr. SHARP and with the Commerce Committee to send a clear message to the Department. This committee is interested in helping to solve a problem which the nuclear industry has at least in part as a result of Federal policies or lack of

action. The committee is willing to support Federal provision of away-from-reactor storage space for nuclear spent fuel if it is necessary. But the committee believes the Department in its spent fuel storage proposals has not given adequate consideration to the extent to which the nuclear industry is undertaking to solve its own problem, or of the additional measures realistically available to the utilities. We did not have enough information on storage capacity requirements, possible storage sites, or storage costs to proceed this year with a program. We hope that the Department will complete the study and have the results back to us in time to allow us to make a decision on this issue for next year's authorization.

With regard to foreign spent fuel, H.R. 4839 includes a $5 million authorization for the Secretary to begin immediately preparing to receive any nuclear fuel which might have to be removed from foreign reactors for nonproliferation reasons. Although the Secretary is authorized to undertake certain kinds of construction activities, which might include physical modifications of existing federally owned facilities, the provision is not in any way intended to authorize the Secretary to acquire or construct new storage capacity for spent fuel.

No changes were made in the administration budget for requested civilian waste management programs, although the Secretary is required to report to the Congress with regard to its progress in selection of sites for commercial high level waste repositories, and with regard to its activities resulting from the recommendations of the Interagency Review Group on Nuclear Waste Management.

H.R. 4839 does include a new program to begin cleaning up high level wastes resulting from a commercial reprocessing operation at the West Valley, New York Nuclear Fuel Services Center. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a hearing on the amendment proposed by the Science Committee and received testimony from the Department and from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, among others, explaining the remedial and the research and development aspects of the project. The Committee feels that Federal assistance to the State of New York represented by the amendment serves three purposes: First. Appropriately involves the Federal Government in helping to pay for certain clean-up activities at the site, including waste solidification and transportation and facility decommissioning; Second. Helps to remedy what is over the long term a serious health and safety problem, and Third. Provides an opportunity to conduct research and development activities relating to liquid high level waste solidification which will be useful to our national waste management program. The Committee will continue to oversee the regulatory, remedial and health and safety aspects of this program.

The budget for another remedial program, the uranium mill tailings cleanup, was increased by $5 million, to bring the total for decontamination and decommissioning activities in title V of the bill to $28,000,000. The committee believes that carrying out the mandates of the Uranium Mill Tailings Control Act should be a top priority of the Department since it clearly affects the health and safety of populations now exposed to tailing piles.

The Committee agreed to an amendment recommended by the Commerce Committee requiring the Secretary to study a uranium mill tailings pile at Edgemont, S. Dak. for possible eligibility for remedial action under the Uranium Mill Tailings Control Act. The Committee notes that the site could only be included if inclusion were consistent with the provisions of the act. The act prohibits inclusion of tailings piles under license by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and contains other constraints on eligibility.

Funding for the uranium enrichment program is recommended to be increased for fiscal year 1980 by $70 million, applicable to the Portsmouth gas centrifuge project. This increase corrects an error in the administration budget request and does not change the total project authorization.

Section 702 of the bill would require the Secretary to develop a program to improve the training of commercial nuclear reactor operators. The Interior Committee is continuing its oversight of the recent nuclear accident at the Three Mile Island plant in Pennsylvania, where inadequate operator training contributed significantly to the severity of damage. The Committee hopes that in developing a training program, the Department will pay special attention to the lessons of Three Mile Island as determined by the congressional inquiries, the President's Commission and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Five million dollars is recommended to be authorized to carry out this program.

The Department's budget for international activities is recommended to be increased by $10 million to provide energy planning assistance primarily for less developed countries.

For programs in titles IV, V, and VII of H.R. 4839, the Interior Committee and the other committees of jurisdiction are recommending budget increases totaling $103,281,390. Of that, as noted above, $70 million for uranium enrichment programs does not represent an increase over the President's budget but rather corrects an arithmetical error by the Department.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SHARP) and wish to thank him for the outstanding work he has done on our committee on this legislation.

Mr. SHARP. I thank the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and just wish to add my voice in support for H.R. 4839, the amendment in the nature of a substitute for H.R. 3000, the Department of Energy authorizations for fiscal year 1980.

I would just briefly like to call the attention of our colleagues to title V regarding spent fuel. We have worked out an arrangement between the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to address for the orderly and expeditious consideration of the serious question of what to do about spent fuel, how to provide for interim storage in this country. We have set up a procedure to help us identify more clearly the need for away-from-reactor storage, to see to it that the Department of Energy is able to identify potential sites for such storage, and to place the Congress in the position next year, when we consider the authorization bill for 1981, of being able to make a decision as to whether or not to purchase one or more of these sites and in what manner we should proceed with the serious question of away-from-reactor storage.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 3000 and more particularly the substitute amendment, H.R. 4839, which represents a consensus between the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Science and Technology.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that although the committees have reached a consensus on substantive issues and funding levels for the various DOE programs in fiscal year 1980, the House should look closely into the jurisdictional issues that seem to delay the authorization process and consider ways to more rationally delineate committee jurisdictions to the extent that overlaps and joint referral situations are minimized. We are criticized because we cannot report authorizing legislation in a timely fashion, and the result is that the appropriating committees are acting in the absence of guidance from the authorizing committees. This situation appears to be the rule rather than the exception. I would urge the Speaker to take steps to remedy this problem before the 1981 fiscal year authorization is before us.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments regarding the authorization measure before us. I will comment on two sections of the bill in which I have a particular interest. One of these sections that I believe is important is section 502 of H.R. 4839. In this section we authorize $5 million for a study to look into the need for interim storage of spent fuel from nuclear reactors in the near term. While I am not one who supports studies by the bureaucracy in general, I do believe that we must look into this very real and serious problem. Estimates from the nuclear industry indicate that if we do not have the capability to store on an interim basis spent fuel from commercial reactors by 1984, at least three nuclear facilities will have to shut down.

□ 1210

I do not have to tell my colleagues the seriousness of having such situation arise. I believe that the study called for in section 502 will provide information upon which we can act to develop such storage capacity and, thereby, avoid shortfalls of electrical generating capacity by 1984.

Another important section of this bill upon which the Committee on Interior

and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Science and Technology have worked closely is section 105. Of particular importance is the provision dealing with the West Valley, N.Y., service center and the nuclear waste issue associated with that facility. I believe that this provision marks one of the first real attempts to come to grips with the nuclear waste issue.

As my colleagues know, this section authorizes the Secretary of Energy to carry out a high-level nuclear waste management demonstration project whose purpose is to vitrify the liquid waste at the center and, thereby, provide a safer means for transporting and disposing of it in the future. Of course, none of this would have been necessary if the current administration in their antienergy policies would not have abandoned our capability to reprocess nuclear waste and to further utilize the same waste in breeder reactors which we appear to have abandoned also.

I would urge my colleagues to support this provision.

The foregoing are two provisions of the measure before us which I specifically wanted to comment on, although I do support several of the other research and development projects.

I think in general this bill is a Catch-22 situation, as the gentlewoman from Colorado mentioned. The gentlewoman mentioned some of the mismanagement of the Department of Energy. I think we all know the nightmare DOE has caused in their allocation and price regulation in the retail and wholesale distribution of petroleum products. Certainly that part of the Department of Energy should be abolished. It should not be out into the future, it should have happened yesterday. I think it does put those of us in the Congress in a Catch-22 situation since this is all one big package.

I believe personally we were in a much better position as a country to come to grips with those things where we wanted Government involvement in basic research and development with the old ERDA Administration, rather than trying to put all of this business into one big department and have it managed under a multibillion-dollar package which makes it much more confusing and much more difficult and allows for much more bureaucratic slowdown.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN).

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 3000, the DOE authorization bill, which I feel sets a reasonable agenda for the department on the coming fiscal year. However, I must qualify my endorsement of this legislation by expressing concern with the fact that it does not go far enough in some areas. My remarks today will concentrate on the breeder reactor, reprocessing, high temperature gas cooled reactors, and geothermal energy.

BREEDER REACTOR TECHNOLOGY

I wish to express my opposition to the counterproductive breeder reactor policy of the Carter administration. If the United States follows such a policy it will permanently surrender world leadership in the use of a very valuable energy source. The breeder's proliferation risks are definitely manageable under modern safeguards and these concerns do not justify scrapping research and development of this nearly limitless source of energy.

REPROCESSING

We have a recommendation that $10.5 million be spent on research and conceptual engineering studies at the Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant in South Carolina. This plant uses a process whereby fast reactor fuels, which are generically similar to light water reactor fuels, are reprocessed by using the same base technology. Although new equipment concepts and additional process steps must be developed, long-range additional process steps must be developed, long-range considerations make this project an integral part of a viable nuclear program sustained by the Congress.

On the other hand, I was dismayed to see the committee allow a considerable reduction in the development of the high temperature gas-cooled reactor fuel recycle program. Although there are some points in favor of reorienting this program to the direct-cycle concept, on balance I think that this technology is more efficient and marketable than its detractors contend and that funds earmarked to it will barely sustain a "critical mass" of talent.

In section 124 of this bill, the committee has taken a strong position on the question of spent fuel versus high level waste. We have included a prohibition on deep geological burial of spent fuel under any of the authorized research, development, and demonstration activities in civilian waste management. This Nation cannot afford to even consider wasting the precious energy in the uranium and plutonium of spent fuel assemblies.

Also, although there is no provision on this bill for funding the Rigatron concept, I am consoled by the fact that DOE has promised to review this concept carefully because of its great potential.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

Another source which this Nation has in ample supply is geothermal energy. In modifying the administration's budget for various programs, the committee recommended an increase of $500,000 over the DOE request for geothermal. I was particularly pleased by the increase in the authorization for technology to extract energy from hot dry rock where my amendment was adopted at full committee. The purpose of this add-on is to cover the rapid escalation of drilling costs for the geothermal exploratory well at Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, where significant progress in this technology has been made.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that although certain funding does not go as far as I would like, it is a very good bill and should be given the strong support of my colleagues in the House.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BLANCHARD).

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3000. One area I would like to focus on is the area of wind energy. Our Nation has traditionally depended upon fossil fuel resources to meet its energy needs. Now we are caught in a situation where the availability of those fossil fuel sources is declining and their cost is soaring to unbelievable heights. We must find viable alternatives and we must do so now. Perhaps we will find that there is no one answer to the energy problem. But it is incumbent upon us to explore all possible alternative energy sources to assess the contribution each might make toward meeting our energy needs.

The winds which blow over the United States provide a virtually inexhaustible source of energy, with a total power capacity estimated at 100,000 gigawatts of electricity.

Experts believe that if this resource could be tapped successfully it alone could provide at least 2 percent of our national energy needs by the year 2000—or as much as the Alaskan North Slope oil fields.

The DOE wind energy program is seeking ways to efficiently and cost-effectively harness this energy. A measure of the importance the Science and Technology Committee attaches to these efforts can be seen in the committee's approval of wind energy authorizations for fiscal year 1980 which, at $75.4 million, are more than double the authorization for fiscal 1978.

As an indication of the level of development which wind energy has reached, I would like to cite the final report of the Research, Development and Demonstration Panel of the President's Domestic Policy Review of Solar Energy.

The panel found that, and I quote, "there are no technological breakthroughs necessary" for development of wind energy. It said further that DOE anticipates that "advanced systems currently in the conceptual state will be capable of producing electricity at a cost of from 1½ to 3 cents per kilowatt hour." If the low end of that range is reached, wind energy will be competitive with our least expensive sources of conventional power.

The DOE program is well underway. By this fall, DOE will have three 200-kilowatt wind machines installed and producing electricity, as well as its first megawatt-scale machine, a 2-megawatt system located in Boone, N.C.

In considering the DOE budget request of $67 million, the committee judged that the interests of the wind program would be best served by selected increases, decreases, and rearrangements of support for different program elements.

I strongly support the accelerated efforts called for by the increase in funding for the MOD-2 wind farm which will be comprised of four 2½-megawatt machines—an increase of $4 million—advanced work on the MOD-3 advanced megawatt wind generator—$10 million—and the additional funding of $1.4 million for wind characteristics studies. These increases, I believe, will serve to fund those efforts which will give us the greatest return on our dollar investment in wind energy.

I might also add that I have been sufficiently impressed by the potential of wind energy to join with Mr. MINETA and Mr. JEFFORDS in introducing H.R. 3558, the Wind Energy Systems Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1979, which would establish a $1 billion 7-year research and development program aimed at making wind energy cost-competitive and bringing it into widespread use. To date, we have been joined in that effort by 81 other Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the increase in wind energy funding called for in H.R. 3000 is essential to a balanced wind energy program. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and its provisions funding this promising technology.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say that during the 5-minute rule I am going to offer an amendment cosponsored on behalf of myself and my California colleagues (Messrs. LEWIS, THOMAS, LUNGREN, COELHO, MINETA, CLAUSEN, and ROUSSELOT) that will earmark some funds in the bill for development of refinery techniques for heavy oil.

As the Chairman and my colleagues know, the President in his energy message of July 15 proposed special treatment for heavy oil—immediate decontrol and exclusion from the windfall profits tax. Inasmuch as estimates are that there are some 100 billion barrels of heavy crude oil in place in the United States, and inasmuch as there are some 1 trillion barrels of such oil in Canada, we can see that this is a very important potential energy resource. However, Mr. Chairman, unless this oil can be refined the resource is going to go largely untapped, unused, and will not add to the energy base.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment will go a long way in at least helping to demonstrate Government concern. I had originally intended to offer an amendment providing some $30 million. In discussions with the committee we have agreed to lessen that amount to $2 million, but at least that will start the process and perhaps in the Senate additional time will be available to work out something that will be of more immediate help.

□ 1220

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK).

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding. I do not know to whom to address these questions, but I have questions.

I notice here that we are taking immediate steps to prepare for removal of U.S. spent fuel from foreign countries.

How can it be that we are intending to give asylum or to act as a place for refuge for the waste nuclear products of other countries?

I understand that the reason given is because we turn off their supplies of uranium if they do not send the spent fuel back; but we still have not solved to the satisfaction of everybody in this country the disposal of our own waste.

How can it be that we are still intending to give asylum and to store the wastes of foreign countries who happen to buy our uranium? That is question No. 1.

The other program I would ask about is the $2.7 million for nuclear energy programs and only $1.3 million, less than half, for renewable sources and for conservation.

Now, that seems to me not a very fortunate division of resources. I ask for the reasons for that.

I would like to know how much is going into the fusion program, which I suppose is under the nuclear energy umbrella of $2.7 million. These are some of the questions and I would be grateful for answers.

Could we have them?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FENWICK. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the program to store spent fuel from foreign countries is an administration program which is designed to attempt to dissuade certain foreign countries from reprocessing their own fuels. It makes sense from whichever way you approach the question. The administration is trying to reduce the potential for weapons proliferation. I applaud the attempt. I think it is rather meaningless, because I do not expect anybody is going to try to make weapons from nuclear fuel. It is too expensive and the weapons quality is too poor.

On the other hand, some foreign nations may only have 1, 2, 5, or even 10 nuclear powerplants and that does not justify a reprocessing plant.

Mrs. FENWICK. But what are we going to do with it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, ultimately it will be reprocessed in this country and the 98 percent of the fuel that is still there will be reclaimed.

It is important to understand that each spent fuel bundle has the energy equivalent of between 8 and 10 million barrels of oil. It is an extremely valuable energy process.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK) has expired.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my 1 remaining minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK).

Mrs. FENWICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for the other half of the gentlewoman's question?

Mrs. FENWICK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman mentioned the ratio of the cost of nuclear energy research and development demonstration as compared to renewable resources. The nuclear energy program includes all the fission program and all the fusion research and all the uranium enrichment for our nuclear powerplants. It is all included in that one big block of money.

It is not nearly so lopsided as one would expect if one breaks it down.

Mrs. FENWICK. How much is for fusion?

Mr. McCORMACK. About $343 million for magnetic fusion and then about $156 million for inertial confinement fusion, part of it in this bill and most of it, $146 million, in another bill.

Mrs. FENWICK. Something over $500 million, then?

Mr. McCORMACK. Approximately, yes, all told.

I should point out that nuclear energy is much further advanced than solar or geothermal energy and this means.

Mrs. FENWICK. I know.

Mr. McCORMACK. For this reason, because nuclear energy is more advanced, we are now at the point in time where the facilities needed to support the nuclear program are much larger and inherently more expensive.

For this reason the larger nuclear expenditures are justified. While these larger projects cost more, the payback is more energy per dollar later on; so you cannot really compare nuclear technology with a younger technology. It is an apples and oranges comparison.

You can do solar energy research in your garage, but it takes $50 million to even start a nuclear research laboratory.

● Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill contains funding for our civilian energy programs.

Of particular importance is the emphasis the bill places on general energy conservation and the use of renewable energy technology. These programs are an essential part of our drive toward energy independence.

The bill authorizes the funds needed by our various power marketing administrations to undertake programs to promote energy efficiency and to allow them to purchase and construct facilities which use sources of energy such as wind, geothermal, solar, and wood waste.

The use of these renewable, clean energy sources is consistent with our environmental objectives as well as our goal of our energy independence.

The bill also addresses a very important nuclear issue, the future of our nuclear waste management program. The problem of permanent, safe disposal of nuclear waste is one of several key issues which needs to be resolved before we consider moving ahead with further development of nuclear power.

Our bill directs the Department of Energy to provide a report on its implementation of the recommendations of the President's Interagency Review (IRG) Group on Nuclear Waste Management.

Foremost among these policy questions is whether or not we should move ahead quickly to choose a permanent storage repository. Our report provisions will allow us to closely monitor the Department's activities in this field.

An interim issue is the question of the away-from-reactor storage of spent fuel. I concur with the position taken by our distinguished chairman of the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (Mr. UDALL) that we must have access to adequate storage facilities to meet our domestic and nonproliferation goals.

If there is any possibility or threat of

the misuse of fuel of U.S. origin from foreign reactors, we must be prepared to move swiftly to withdraw the fuel, return it to the United States, and safely store it in existing Government facilities. Five million dollars is authorized in our bill to permit the preparation of these emergency contingency plans.

Our portion of the authorization adequately addresses our vital civilian energy programs under the jurisdiction of DOE, and I urge my colleagues to join our committee in supporting this important legislation.●

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues are aware, the subject of the various applications of atomic power is most timely. Related to this fact is the complexity of this issue. In particular, H.R. 3000 had to be addressed by four standing committees of this body. At the outset, I want to express my appreciation to the four committee chairmen for their efforts to bring this measure before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my strongest support for a vigorous continuation of the Clinch River breeder reactor project. The information which this project will provide us is essential to the development of an effective national energy policy. If we are ever to achieve our goal of energy independence, we must act now to insure that we will have the option of deploying the commercial breeder reactor in the next decade. I am as concerned as any about the horrors of plutonium proliferation, and I am anxious to see strict international safeguards agreed upon, but I cannot let the doors be closed on two decades of breeder research when the energy needs of this Nation are so pressing.

I strongly believe that the future of this Nation is linked to the discovery of a commercially feasible, virtually inexhaustible energy source. That source appears to be the breeder reactor. We know that the breeder is an inexhaustible source of energy. The crucial Clinch River project will tell us if it is commercially feasible. This is not an outright commitment to commercialization. The Clinch River project is designed only to demonstrate and determine the feasibility of producing electricity with a commercial-scale breeder reactor.

This Nation is in the midst of a worsening energy crisis. As elected representatives, we have a responsibility to vigorously pursue alternative energy source research. We can no longer depend on exhaustible fuel sources—be they fossil fuels or uranium—to satiate our growing energy needs. It would be folly to become dependent on another exhaustible resource when we have the alternative of a virtually inexhaustible form of energy.

At present, the breeder reactor is the only nondepleting energy system in the later stages of development. While conventional reactors use only 1 to 2 percent of the potential energy in uranium, breeder reactors will use as much as 60 percent of this precious energy source. In addition to their very obvious advantages in fuel economy and conservation, breeder reactors also have environmental advantages. Breeders discharge less heat than current nuclear reactors and, unlike conventional reactors, they do not pollute the air with combustion products. Breeders will also eliminate the need for large-scale mining operations which scar the land. Indeed, much of the uranium for breeder reactors has already been mined and is available in residue and tailing reserves.

To abandon Clinch River now would be to throw away 25 years of research. We must realize that if we terminate or defer the project now, it will be more difficult to reassemble the scientists and technicians at a later date.

Construction costs, and other related expenses, will only rise the longer this essential project is delayed. Presently, the total cost of the Clinch River project will only be a fraction of our annual expenditures for OPEC oil. This comparison is even more poignant when we realize that the breeder would tap an energy source immeasurably greater than all known OPEC reserves.

The dangers of a plutonium economy are not significantly greater than those of a conventional uranium economy. Though uranium does not offer an instant weapons capability, weapons can be made from enriched uranium or the plutonium currently being produced as a byproduct of fission in conventional reactors. In fact, the nuclear weapon fabricated by India was made with plutonium from a conventional Canadian light water reactor.

It is unreasonable to assume that Western European nations and Japan will abandon, or even defer for any lengthy period of time, their breeder research programs when 80 to 90 percent of their energy is dependent on imported oil. In fact, since the President announced his decision to curtail our breeder program, Western European nations have signed a pact to continue their own breeder research programs regardless of the American position.

The fact that other nations are pursuing policies which might lead to proliferation of weapons-grade plutonium does not make it right for us to pursue a similar policy. But we cannot hope to stop proliferation by unilaterally withdrawing from the breeder community. And we cannot expect a strong voice in international nonproliferation negotiations if we are not on the breeder team.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see an America strong enough to stand free of the tight reins of OPEC oil, strong enough to take a lead in offering developing nations needed energy security, and most importantly, strong enough to make a commitment to energy independence. To take these leads, we must vote for full funding of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor project.

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. GOLDWATER to H.R. 3000 which would require the Department of Energy to construct a nuclear waste facility by 1985.

I am particularly disturbed by the provision mandating that DOE examine the Nevada test site and Hanford, Wash., locations. The purpose of this amendment is not clear. DOE is already spending considerable time and energy studying the feasibility of locating a long-term storage site in Nevada as well as other locations. The following is a response by the Department of Energy to several questions I asked in June 1979. It indicated why no decision can be made on the specific location of a waste site prior to 1984.

WASTE MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS ON NEVADA FROM CONGRESSMAN JAMES SANTINI

Q1. What is the expected date of selection for the sites?

A1. The primary mission of the Nevada Test Site (NTS) is to provide a location for testing of nuclear weapons. It has been agreed between the Waste Management Program and the Weapons Test Program that areas available for consideration for a radioactive waste repository would be limited to the southwest corner of NTS. A major Waste Management Program Milestone for NTS is the determination at the end of FY 1979 whether any major hydrologic or geologic impediment existed at the NTS that would preclude its selection as a location for a repository. At this time several specific sites on NTS have been considered, evaluated and rejected on a technical basis as potential locations. They include Syncline Ridge, Calico Hills, Topopah Wash and Wahmonie Stock (see Tab A). If no major impediments are identified, evaluation of the remaining areas could result in a positive determination on site selection by 1984. The current area of consideration is limited to Yucca Mountain.

Q2. Is any preliminary data available on whether Nevada meets hydrological and geothermal criteria?

A2. Preliminary data is available that indicates that Nevada has many attractive areas from a hydrologic and geotechnical viewpoint. However, since the bulk of the work has been limited to the NTS, it is not possible to indicate whether Nevada meets hydrological or geothermal criteria. On the NTS several areas, as noted in the answer to Question 1, have been shown to be unacceptable from a geological viewpoint. For the remaining area on NTS all the data will not be available to make a positive decision to the acceptability until 1984. However, it could be possible before 1984 to make a determination that there is some impediment that would disqualify it.

Q3. Has a decision been made to use granite formations rather than salt formations for storage?

A3. A decision to use granite formations rather than salt formations for storages has not been made. While questions have been raised about the use of salt formations no decision has been made concerning its use. Research work is still underway to provide answers to the questions that have been raised. Granite formations have been suggested as potential geologic media that would be suitable for disposal of radioactive waste. Research work, including that at NTS, is underway to determine if granite can provide the isolation of radioactive waste. The Climax Stock granite, site of the spent fuel test, is an area which has been reserved for nuclear weapons testing and is not available to the waste program on a long-term basis for consideration as a potential repository location.

Q4. Would the site of a storage facility in or near the Nevada Test Site preclude the use of the site for continued weapons testing?

A4. Technical studies indicate that, with proper siting and design of a repository, long-term isolation of radioactive waste and continued use of the NTS for weapons testing could be compatible. In addition, administrative action has also been implemented that reserve the northern quadrants of the site for future weapons shots.

Q5. I understand that spent fuel from

Turkey Point, Florida will be transported to Nevada this summer for use in an experiment. Are similar experiments being conducted in other locations? If not, is this an indication that Nevada is high on the list of sites to be selected? What precautions are being taken to prevent accidents?

A5. Thirteen (13) commercial spent fuel assemblies will be transported to Nevada from Turkey Point, Florida this summer and fall. These assemblies will be canistered in stainless steel containers at the Engine-Maintenance and Disassembly (E-MAD) Facility and, at any one time, eleven (11) will be emplaced at the Spent Fuel Test Facility which is located in the Climax Stock granite formation at NTS. The purpose of this experiment is to obtain generic, not site-specific, data on the physical response of a large granitic rock mass to thermal and radiation effects from emplacement of radioactive waste (see Tab B). Similar experiments have been performed in a bedded salt formation at Lyons, Kansas and are being planned in a basalt formation at the Hanford Site in Richland, Washington. NTS has been chosen because the facilities are available to conduct the test, not because of repository siting considerations.

Our shipments of spent fuel assemblies will be made in a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved and certified shipping container (casks). Such shipments will comply with the requirements of the certificate of compliance governing the use of the cask and will be made in accordance with all Federal, state and local regulations applicable to the transport of hazardous materials. The transport carrier responsible to accomplish the transport of the cask containing the spent fuel assemblies has trained drivers who are knowledgeable of the rules and regulations applicable to shipments of hazardous materials. As the shipments move from origin to destination, as in the past, the Nevada Operations Office will require the carrier's central dispatch office to furnish in-transit passing reports so that the general location of each shipment will be known each time the report is provided.

Precautions are also being taken to prevent accidents associated with spent fuel transportation, operations, and testing performed on the NTS. A comprehensive Safety Assessment Document is being prepared and is scheduled to be published in January 1980 which will address all of the safety-related issues of the Spent Fuel Test—Climax (SFT-C). This document is presently in preparation and is scheduled to be published in January 1980. A Table of Contents for this document is enclosed for your information (see Tab C).

The receipt and canistering of the spent fuel for the SFT-C to be performed later this year will be carried out in accordance with procedures established and approved for the Spent Fuel Handling and Packaging Program Demonstrations. NVO-198, "Safety Assessment Document for the Spent Fuel Handling and Packaging Program Demonstration at the Nevada Test Site," December, 1978 provides the published assessment of the safety-related issue of the operations conducted at the E-MAD Facility including canistering the spent fuel and placement in lag storage. The Safety Assessment Document for the SFT-C will address the safety-related issues pertinent to the operation commencing with loading the canistered spent fuel at E-MAD for transport to the SFT-C storage location. No spent fuel assemblies will be moved to the Climax Stock without completion and approval of the Safety Assessment Document and procedures applicable to the SFT-C.

Q6. Will the governor of each state have the right to approve or disapprove site selection?

A6. The DOE supports the Interagency Review Group (IRG) position on this question, which is that the technical and social-political and social-political success of the waste management program will largely depend on effective state participation in the process and is committed to provide the states a substantive, participatory role in the program. The IRG has recommended that the President establish by executive order an Executive Planning Council to consist of selected governors, selected Indian nation representatives, officials of national organizations of state and local governments and representatives of DOE and other Federal agencies. This Executive Council will (1) identify joint Federal-state planning activities in nuclear waste management and (2) identify and agree on the appropriate existing or new mechanisms and time tables for carrying out such joint activities.

By use of the expression "state veto" the IRG means the possibility that a state could at one specific moment approve or disapprove Federal site investigation activities or a proposal to site a repository or other facility. This veto concept as used did not include an ongoing dialogue and cooperative relationship between Federal and state authorities. By contrast the suggested program of "consultation and concurrence" implies an ongoing dialogue, and the development of a cooperative relationship between state and all relevant Federal agencies during program planning and the site identification and characterization programs on a regional basis. Under this approach the state effectively has a continuing ability to participate in activities at all points throughout the course of the activity and if it deems appropriate, to prevent the continuance of Federal activities. The IRG believes that such an approach will lead to better protection of the states' interests than would a system of state veto.

The Nevada Operations Office of DOE has for many years maintained good communications with officials in the State of Nevada government. This spring Governor List received a complete briefing on the commercial nuclear waste storage investigations in Nevada. Members of the Governor's staff including officials of the Nevada Department of Energy and the State Planning Coordinator's Office have been invited to all of the formal technical review sessions on the nuclear waste program conducted by the Nevada DOE office before technical experts from the scientific community who are not part of the nuclear waste program. In addition, one half of the technical reviewers themselves are made up of experts from the Nevada scientific community including the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the Desert Research Institute of the University of Nevada, Reno and the Mackay School of Mines. The involvement of these Nevada personnel from the early days of this program and the inclusion of their comments on the program's work from the beginning will help assure that if a repository site is found on NTS, it will be acceptable to the State of Nevada.●

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, this morning I received a letter from the President, which I assume each of my colleagues also received, in which the House is urged to reject the Moffett amendment. That amendment would restore price controls on domestic oil production.

In order that the record can be clear on the President's position, I ask consent to make his letter part of the RECORD. Further, to make clear my own feeling about the energy program in general and the question of controls in particular, I ask consent to enter my reply to the President in the RECORD.

It is important to understand that oil prices have always been administered, and not subject to market forces, since the emergence of the industry in its modern form. Originally, the industry was monopolized by Standard Oil. After Texas became the dominant producer of oil in this country, production levels were determined through monthly action of the Texas Railroad Commission, which worked closely with the oil industry. This control of production levels maintained prices at the levels desired by the industry. In today's world the floor price of oil is set by OPEC. In short, decontrol of domestic prices does not mean a return to the market as the term is normally used; it merely means letting American prices enjoy the floor set by OPEC. The question is really one of whether our oil production will be priced through a public mechanism or through one controlled by the world oil cartel.

Beyond that, of course, there is the bald fact that decontrol is intended as much to discourage consumption as anything else. The misnamed and misdirected windfall profits tax assures that any production incentives afforded by higher prices will be minimized. Meanwhile, the tax will reward foreign production.

The control of oil prices holds no charm for me, since I oppose price controls in the general sense. But we are not dealing here with a commodity whose price has ever, in modern times, been set by the forces of a free market.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1979.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,

TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Soon the House of Representatives will consider an amendment to the Department of Energy Authorization Act designed to repeal the program of phased decontrol of crude oil which I announced last April 6 and which began June 1.

I urge you in the strongest terms to join me in opposition to this amendment. Phased decontrol involves sacrifice. But it is and must be a critical component of our national effort to achieve energy security. As such, phased decontrol is essential to our national security.

By itself the decontrol program I am implementing will increase production by 1 million barrels per day by 1990. It will also encourage conservation and use of alternate forms of energy, such as solar power.

In combination with a fair windfall profits tax such as I have proposed and the House has enacted, phased decontrol permits the major national investment required to cut our oil import needs in half over the next decade, and to help our neediest citizens meet the burdens of rising energy prices. The $140 billion of investments I have proposed over the next ten years—in alternate energy sources, in conservation, in mass transit and auto efficiency, and in aid for those in need—are critically dependent on oil decontrol and an adequate windfall profits tax.

The war against energy dependence will involve all of the citizens of our country—in their homes, in their workplaces, in their communities. But it must begin with you. With your help, I am convinced that the House of Representatives will act with courage in the national interest.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1979.

Hon. JAMES E. CARTER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just been handed your letter asking that the House defeat amendments to the Department of

Energy authorization bill, which are intended to keep oil price controls in effect.

You recognize, I know, that your legislative program has been one that I have consistently supported. I voted for the standby gasoline rationing program; and for many other proposals that required me to face considerable opposition. I point this out so that you will understand that my position on decontrol has nothing to do with what you have called "timidity" on the part of the Congress in dealing with energy issues.

I understand clearly that higher energy prices will tend to discourage consumption, simply by pricing fuel out of reach of those least able to afford it. And I, likewise, understand that higher prices should encourage greater efforts toward production. But there are so many inconsistencies in the energy program that I feel compelled to vote for the amendment on maintenance of price control.

For many months, I have patiently tried to explain to your advisers that the coal conversion policy is in direct conflict with transportation policy, and that coal conversion is, in fact, being hampered, if not defeated outright, by high transportation costs allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, costs which are supported by the Department of Transportation and opposed (correctly) by the Department of Energy. Most recently, I wrote to ask that you take a personal interest in this policy conflict, and that you settle firmly on the side of coal users. I hope that you will do this.

With respect to oil pricing, it is clear that higher prices will discourage consumption by those who are least able to afford higher prices. Yet, you have also proposed that certain consumers be given subsidies. I submit that it makes little sense to subsidize consumers in one part of the country while throwing the full burden on others who are equally in need of help. People in my part of the country have seen their home heating bills triple, and quadruple, without a glimmer of concern from official Washington, a record that stretches through three administrations. Now it is proposed to subsidize still further users of imported heating oil. This is blatantly unfair. Meanwhile, the ordinary working people of my area, and the poor, not only are to have no utility help, but are to have no help with rising transportation costs. These consumers have suffered in patience, only to see an energy program that clearly ignores their needs, even as it provides help to others, in other parts of the Nation. I cannot explain in any satisfactory way how this can be fair. Clearly, it is not fair.

The windfall profits tax passed by the House is not, I feel, a constructive one. It is, in fact, not a tax on excess profits, but a severance tax. The tax strikes at the producer level, which is where the greatest incentives need to be, instead of at the integrated oil company level, which is where the excess profits lie. Indeed, by failing to address excess profits, the tax exempts foreign production and thereby creates a double disincentive for oil independence. It discourages independent domestic exploration and production even as it rewards foreign production.

Please be assured that I have no doubt of your sincerity. You know that I have supported you on many difficult issues, without regard to my own political interests. My position is, I emphasize, one of disagreement, not political timidity.

Like you, I believe that this country has no choice but to do those things which will weaken the power of oil exporting countries over us. Like you, I believe that the task is urgent. Like you, I believe that the struggle will be long and hard, and that it must involve each one of us. It is a matter of the most profound regret that I must say that I cannot support you on this particular issue. Though my feelings are not in conformance with yours, I trust that you will accord my position the same consideration and respect that I have given yours. Most of the time, you and I have agreed. It is most likely that I will be among your most consistent supporters in the future. For that reason, I am confident that you will accept my candor as a mark of my respect for you, something that you would expect from one who honestly and earnestly wishes you well.

Respectfully,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.●

● Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support continued funding of the Clinch River Nuclear Breeder Reactor. It seems to me that the issue we decide here today is whether or not we are going to continue to pursue the continued development of an essential energy source of the future.

The issue is one of foresight. Back in the 1950's with the Paley Commission report we were warned of a serious shortage of oil as an energy source by the 1970's. Had the Congress then realized the critical domestic and strategic crisis we now face, no doubt they would have proceeded to develop synthetic fuels. We are now rushing this synfuels alternative a decade late.

We must move ahead now with development of this breeder reactor so that by the 1990's, we can make intelligent decisions concerning commercialization of the breeder program and on to fusion.

Upon my recent trip to Europe with my friend the majority leader, JIM WRIGHT, I observed firsthand the priority placed by England on developing nuclear power as the answer to energy needs of the future. I visited the breeder reactor at Dounreay, Scotland, and observed the advances they have made with their technology.

America cannot afford to bypass any safe alternative to OPEC oil including the development of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. For these reasons I urge my colleagues to support the funding recommendations of the Science and Technology Committee.●

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, all time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, in lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Science and Technology, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider by titles the text of the bill, H.R. 4839, as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate the enacting clause.

The enacting clause reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Energy Civilian Programs 1980 Authorization Act".

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title I.

Title I reads as follows:

TITLE I—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following fossil energy coal programs:

(A) Mining research and development, $48,000,000.

(B) Coal preparation research and development, $12,150,000.

(C) Coal liquefaction, $96,006,000.

(D) Surface coal gasification, $88,150,000.

(E) In situ coal gasification, $9,900,000.

(F) Advanced research and technology development, $38,500,000.

(G) Advanced environmental control technology, $37,450,000.

(H) Heat engines and heat recovery, $52,300,000.

(I) Combustion systems, $36,603,000 including $2,750,000 for alternative fuel utilization.

(J) Fuel cells, $28,500,000.

(K) Magnetohydrodynamics, $75,000,000.

(L) Personnel resources, $11,057,000.

SEC. 102. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following fossil energy oil and gas programs:

(A) Enhanced oil recovery, $20,900,000.

(B) Oil shale, $27,000,000.

(C) Drilling and offshore technology, $3,000,000.

(D) Advanced process technology, $3,500,000.

(E) Enhanced gas recovery, $32,410,000.

(F) Personnel resources, $1,069,000.

SEC. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following conservation R.D. & D. programs:

(A) Building and community systems, $99,300,000.

(B) Industrial energy conservation, $51,150,000.

(C) Transportation, $113,245,000.

(D) Conservation multisector:

(1) Inventors program, $3,200,000.

(E) Personnel resources, $7,662,000.

SEC. 104. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following solar technology programs:

(A) Solar thermal, $73,805,000.

(B) Photovoltaics, $147,700,000.

(C) Wind, $43,260,000, including $500,000 for innovative technology for vertical axis systems.

(D) Ocean systems, $23,600,000.

(E) Personnel resources, $3,144,000.

SEC. 105. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following solar applications programs:

(A) Systems development, $61,500,000.

(B) Demonstrations, $52,000,000.

(C) Personnel resources, $2,860,000.

SEC. 106. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following biomass research and development programs:

(A) Biomass research and development, $54,500,000.

(B) Personnel resources, $838,000.

SEC. 107. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following nuclear fission energy programs:

(A) Converter reactor systems:

(1) Thermal reactor technology, $63,900,000, including the following amounts for—

(a) LWR fuel cycle R. & D., $10,000,000;

(b) HTGR thorium recycle, $4,400,000.

(2) Advanced reactor systems, $5,000,000.

(3) Advanced isotope separation technology, $46,200,000.

(B) Civilian waste management—operating expenses, $182,450,000, including the following amounts for—

(1) Terminal isolation research and development, $156,500,000.

(2) Waste treatment technology and other activities, $20,950,000.

(3) West Valley Project—

(a)(1) The Secretary of Energy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall carry out, in accordance with the provisions of section 107(B)(3) of this Act, a high-level liquid nuclear waste management demonstration project at the Western New York Service Center in West Valley, New York (hereinafter referred to as "the project"). The Secretary shall carry out the project by vitrifying the high-level liquid nuclear wastes located at such Center or by employing the most effective technology for solidification available. The Secretary shall, as part of the project, also (A) as soon as feasible transport such solidified wastes, in accordance with applicable provisions of law, to an appropriate Federal repository for long term burial, and (B) decontaminate and decommission facilities, materials, and hardware used in connection with the project.

(2) During the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, the Secretary shall:

(A) prepare a plan for safe removal of such wastes from tank numbered 8D-2 and any other storage tank at the Center containing such wastes, including safely breaching the tanks, operating waste removal equipment, and sluicing techniques, and

(B) determine the feasibility of immobilization and waste handling techniques required by the unique situation of such wastes at the Center, including initiation of detailed engineering and cost estimates as well as safety analyses and environmental impact analyses.

(3) Title to the high level liquid wastes at the Center shall be transferred to the United States upon payment by the State of New York and other appropriate persons of an appropriate fee, as determined by the Secretary, for the perpetual care and maintenance of such wastes.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not more than $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980 for the project. Funds authorized and appropriated in subsequent fiscal years for the project shall not be used by the Secretary for such purpose until the Secretary, the State of New York, and other appropriate persons enter into such contracts and agreements as may be required—

(1) to provide for the transfer of title of such wastes and the payment therefor,

(2) to enable the Secretary to utilize property and facilities at the Center for the project.

(3) to share the costs of the project, except that the non-Federal share of such costs shall be limited to no more than 10 per centum thereof and in determining such share the Secretary shall consider the utilization of such Center by the Secretary for the project, the amount of money in the existing perpetual care fund originally designated to provide for ultimate disposition of the high level liquid nuclear waste at the Center, and such other factors as the Secretary deems appropriate, and

(4) to otherwise provide for the conduct of the project in a timely manner.

(c) In carrying out the project, the Secretary shall consult with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Transportation, the Director of the Geological Survey, the State of New York, and the commercial operator of the Center.

(d) Not later than February 1, 1980, and on February 1 of each calendar year thereafter during the term of the project, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science and Technology, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an up-to-date report containing a detailed description of the activities of the Secretary in carrying out the project, including the costs incurred, and the activities to be taken in the next fiscal year and the costs thereof. Any contract or agreement executed under subsection (b) of this section, together with summaries thereof, shall be promptly transmitted to such committees for their information and review.

(e) Other than the costs and responsibilities established by section 107(B)(3) for the project, nothing in such section shall be construed as affecting any rights, obligations, or liabilities of the commercial operator of the Center, the State of New York, or any person, as is appropriate, arising under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 or under any other law, contract, or agreement for the operation, maintenance, or decontamination of any facilities or property at the Center or for any wastes at the Center. Nothing in such section shall be construed as affecting any applicable licensing requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 or the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974. The provisions of section 107(B)(3) shall not apply or be extended to any facility or property at the Center which is not used in conducting the project.

(C) Spent fuel storage R. & D.—operating expenses, $4,700,000.

(D) Advanced nuclear systems:

(1) Advanced systems evaluation, $2,600,000.

(2) Space and terrestrial applications, $34,300,000.

(E) Breeder reactor systems:

(1) Liquid metal fast breeder reactor plant projects:

(a) Fast flux test facility, $76,200,000;

(b) Clinch River breeder reactor, $183,800,000; and

(c) Breeder reactor studies, $15,000,000.

(2) Liquid metal fast breeder reactor technology, $142,400,000.

(3) Liquid metal fast breeder reactor test facilities, $75,300,000.

(4) Water cooled breeder reactor:

(a) Shippingport atomic power, $12,600,000.

(b) Light water breeder reactor, $30,900,000.

(c) Advanced water breeder applications, $14,400,000.

(d) Proof of breeding, $3,000,000.

(5) Gas cooled fast reactor, $19,988,000.

(6) Fuel cycle reasearch and development:

(a) Reprocessing, $18,100,000.

(b) Barnwell nuclear fuel plant, $10,500,000.

(F) National uranium resource assessment research and development, $7,000,000.

(G) Personnel resources, $17,344,000.

SEC. 108. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following nuclear fusion programs:

(A) Magnetic fusion:

(1) Confinement systems, $83,500,000.

(2) Development and technology, $52,300,000.

(3) Applied plasma physics, $56,600,000.

(4) Reactor projects, $42,100,000.

(B) Inertial confinement fusion (civilian applications), $10,400,000.

(C) Personnel resources, $3,158,000.

SEC. 109. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following geothermal energy research and development programs:

(A) Hydrothermal energy, $37,850,000.

(B) Geopressured resources, $31,700,000.

(C) Geothermal technology development, $42,300,000.

(D) Personnel resources, $2,215,000.

SEC. 110. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following low head hydroelectric development programs:

(A) Low head hydroelectric development, $8,000,000.

(B) Personnel resources, $468,000.

SEC. 111. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following electric energy systems programs:

(A) Power supply integration, $19,900,000.

(B) Power delivery, $18,300,000.

(C) Personnel resources, $1,466,000.

SEC. 112. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following energy storage systems programs:

(A) Battery storage, $32,000,000.

(B) Thermal and mechanical storage, $35,540,000.

(C) Personnel resources, $1,425,000.

SEC. 113. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following basic energy sciences programs:

(A) Nuclear sciences, $30,700,000.

(B) Materials sciences, $81,300,000.

(C) Chemical sciences, $58,800,000.

(D) Engineering, mathematical and geosciences, $23,900,000.

(E) Advanced energy projects, $16,600,000.

(F) Biological energy research, $6,900,000.

(G) Personnel resources, $2,570,000.

SEC. 114. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following supply research and development programs:

(A) Technical assessments projects, $10,500,000.

(B) University research support, $4,000,000.

(C) Technical program and policy analysis, $2,417,000.

(D) Personnel resources, $637,000.

SEC. 115. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following high energy physics programs:

(A) Physics research, $71,850,000.

(B) Facilities operations, $105,100,000.

(C) High energy technology, $37,050,000.

(D) Personnel resources, $1,133,000.

SEC. 116. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following nuclear physics programs:

(A) Medium energy nuclear physics, $41,700,000.

(B) Heavy ion nuclear physics, $33,600,000.

(C) Nuclear theory, $6,100,000.

(D) Personnel resources, $368,000.

SEC. 117. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the uranium enrichment process development program, as follows:

(1) Uranium Enrichment Process Development operating expenses, $77,400,000.

SEC. 118. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following environmental research and development programs:

(A) Overview and assessment, $60,900,000.

(B) Environmental research, $154,170,000.

(C) Life sciences research, $40,500,000.

(D) Decontamination and decommissioning research and development, $9,000,000.

(E) Personnel resources, $12,825,000.

SEC. 119. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for capital equipment expenses not related to construction for the following energy research and development programs:

(A) Fossil:

(1) Coal, $3,000,000.

(2) Oil and gas, $2,600,000.

(B) Conservation:

(1) Building and community systems, $1,000,000.

(2) Industrial energy conservation, $500,000.

(3) Transportation, $1,100,000.

(4) Solar applications, $3,000,000.

(C) Solar, $12,700,000.

(D) Biomass, $500,000.

(E) Nuclear fission:

(1) Converter reactor systems, $8,800,000.

(2) Civilian waste management, $11,800,000.

(3) Spent fuel, $2,000,000.

(4) Advanced nuclear systems, $2,100,000.

(5) Breeder reactor systems:

(a) Liquid metal fast breeder reactor, $22,000,000.

(b) Water cooled breeder reactor, $2,100,000.

(c) Gas cooled breeder reactor, $1,500,000.

(d) Fuel cycle research and development, $2,500,000.

(F) Nuclear fusion:

(1) Magnetic fusion:

(a) Confinement systems, $10,950,000.

(b) Development and technology, $8,050,000.

(c) Applied plasma physics, $4,450,000.

(d) Reactor projects, $6,850,000.

(G) Geothermal, $3,200,000.

(H) Electric energy systems, $800,000.

(I) Energy storage systems, $2,160,000.

(J) Basic energy sciences programs, $14,050,000.

(K) Technical assessment projects, $500,000.

(L) High energy physics, $36,000,000.

(M) Nuclear physics, $8,200,000.

(N) Uranium enrichment process development, $5,030,000.

(O) Environmental programs, $16,000,000.

SEC. 120. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for supply research and development plant and capital equipment, including planning, construction, acquisition, or modification of facilities, including land acquisition, as follows:

(A) Fossil:

(1) Project 80-FE-1, Technology transfer building, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, $3,000,000.

(2) Project 80-FE-2, Renovation and upgrading of Building B-1, Morgantown, West Virginia, $1,750,000.

(3) Project 80-FE-3, Program support facility, Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, Bruceton, Pennsylvania, $1,700,000.

(4) Project 80-FE-4, Gasification test facility, site undetermined, $15,000,000.

(5) Project 80-FE-5, Pressurized fluidized bed utility engineering development system, $10,000,000.

(6) Project 80-FE-6, Catalytic gasification pilot plant, site undetermined, $4,700,000.

(7) Project 80-FE-8, H-Coal Liquefaction pilot plant, Catlettsburg, Kentucky, $27,000,000, for a total project authorization of $131,200,000.

(8) Project 80-FE-9, Exxon donor solvent pilot plant, Baytown, Texas, $5,000,000, for a total project authorization of $61,300,000.

(9) Project 80-FE-10, Atmospheric fluidized bed component test and integration unit, Morgantown, West Virginia, $9,297,000, for a total project authorization of $39,860,000.

(10) Project 80-FE-11, Pressurized fluidized bed combined cycle pilot plant, Woodridge, New Jersey, $3,500,000, for a total project authorization of $29,800,000.

(11) Project 80-GPP-1, General plant projects for energy technology centers, six locations, $5,600,000.

(12) Project 76-1-b, High Btu synthetic pipeline gas demonstration plant, site undetermined, an additional sum of $28,000,000 for a total project authorization of $122,000,000.

(13) Project 78-2-d, SRC-I (Solids) Demonstration Plant, $20,000,000, for a total project authorization of $60,000,000.

(14) Project 79-1-r, SRC-II (Liquids) Demonstration Plant, $25,000,000, for a total project authorization of $75,000,000.

(B) Conservation:

(1) Project 80-C-1, Black-liquor hydro pyrolysis recovery system, $1,000,000.

(2) Project 80-C-2, Cogeneration demonstration, $4,500,000.

(3) Planning and Design Project 80-C-3, Acid or Enzymatic Hydrolysis, Process Development Facility, for the conversion of urban waste and biomass-derived cellulose via a continuous process to alcohol. The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, no later than six months following the date of the enactment of this Act, an independent evaluation study of the need for two facilities of this type.

(4) Project 80-C-4, Waste-to-Energy Demonstrations, various locations, $5,000,000.

(C) Solar:

(1) Project 80-ES-1, Wind energy systems test center building, Rocky Flats, Colorado, $2,140,000.

(2) Project 80-ES-2, Shenandoah large scale experiment, Shenandoah, Georgia, $4,800,000, for a total project authorization of $9,060,000.

(3) Project 80-ES-19, Small communities systems applications experiment No. 1, location to be determined, $3,795,000, for a total project authorization of $4,610,000.

(4) Project 80-ES-20, Multi-unit Mod 2, wind farm site undetermined, 10 MWe, $18,300,000, for a total project authorization of $30,900,000.

(5) Project 80-ES-21, Mod 3, Advanced megawatt scale, two wind turbines, $10,000,000.

(6) Project 79-1-m, OTEC-1, Ocean test facility, Keahole Point, Hawaii, $10,700,000, for a total project authorization of $33,000,000.

(7) Project 79-1-q, Solar Energy Research Institute facility, Golden, Colorado, and additional sum of $15,000,000 for a total project authorization of $18,000,000.

(8) Project 76-2-b, Ten megawatt central receiver solar thermal power plant, Barstow, California, an additional sum of $36,500,000 for a total project authorization of $108,000,000.

(D) Biomass:

(1) Project 80-B-1, Biomass thermochemical experimental facility, site to be determined $2,000,000.

(E) Nuclear Fission:

(1) Project 80-ES-3, Physical security and safeguards project, test reactor area, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $1,200,000.

(2) Project 80-ES-4, Laundry decontamination facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $2,200,000.

(3) Project 80-ES-5, Modifications to reactors, various locations, $2,800,000.

(4) Project 80-ES-6, Boilers, heating and ventilating, and fuel tank and roof replacement, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $1,900,000.

(5) Project 80-ES-7, Plant operation maintenance facility, Richland, Washington, $2,000,000.

(6) Project 80-ES-11, Idaho Laboratory facility, phases I and II, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $22,000,000.

(7) Project 80-ES-12, Near surface test facility, phase II (spent fuel), Richland, Washington, $3,600,000, for a total project authorization of $8,015,000.

(8) Project 80-ES-13, Near surface test facility, phase I (electric heaters), Richland, Washington, $2,900,000, for a total project authorization of $12,430,000.

(9) Project 80-ES-14, Core flow test loop, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $3,212,000, for a total project authorization of $9,089,000.

(10) Project 80-ES-15, Gas reactor in-pile safety test loop, INEL, Idaho, $1,300,000, for a total project authorization of $3,583,000.

(11) Project 800-GPP-1, General plant projects, breeder program, $12,300,000.

(12) Project 80-GPP-1, General plant projects, Richland, Washington, $3,300,000.

(13) Project 80-GPP-1, General plant projects, advanced nuclear systems, $800,000.

(14) Project 78-6-e, Energy technology center facility modifications, Energy Technology Engineering Center, Santa Susana, California, an additional sum of $9,500,000 for a total project authorization of $16,900,000.

(15) Deauthorize Project 78-6-f, Fuels and materials examination facility, Richland, Washington, in the sum of $104,600,000, for an outstanding project authorization through fiscal year 1980 of $30,200,000.

(16) Deauthorize Project 77-4-c, High performance fuels laboratory, Richland, Washington, in the sum of $5,000,000, for an outstanding project authorization through fiscal year 1980 of $6,500,000.

(17) Project 80-ES-16, Fuels and materials examination laboratory, Richland, Washington, $53,000,000, for a total project authorization of $53,000,000.

(18) Project 80-ES-24, Environmental and engineering technology facility, Richland, Washington, $1,500,000, for a total project authorization of $2,500,000.

(19) Project 78-5-b, Fuel cycle R&D integrated equipment test facility (IET), Oak Ridge National Lab, $6,400,000, for a total project authorization of $15,400,000.

(20) Project 79-1-c, Safeguards and security improvements, Richland, Washington, $7,500,000, for a total project authorization of $12,000,000.

(21) Project 79-1-h, Maintenance and storage facility, Richland, Washington, $13,700,000, for a total project authorization of $16,700,000.

(22) Project 78-6-c, Safety research experimental facilities (TREAT upgrade), Argonne National Laboratory West, Idaho, $3,600,000, for a total project authorization of $27,700,000.

(23) Project 78-6-d, Experimental breeder reactor (EBR-II), Argonne National Laboratory West, Idaho, for fiscal year 1980, deauthorize the sum of $5,000,000, for a total authorized amount through fiscal year 1980 of $1,500,000 for A-E only.

(F) Nuclear Fusion:

(1) Project 80-GPP-1, General plant projects, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Plainsboro, New Jersey, $1,400,000.

(2) Project 80-GPP-1, General plant projects, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $3,500,000.

(3) Project 80-MF-1, PDX Neutral Beam, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, New Jersey, $6,600,000.

(4) Project 80-MF-2, Double-III neutral beams, San Diego, California, $2,500,000.

(5) Project 80-MF-3, EBT-proof of principal experiment, location to be determined, $9,100,000.

(6) Project 80-MF-4, Large Coil Test facility, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $2,000,000, for a total project authorization of $5,300,000.

(7) Project 78-3-b, Fusion materials irradiation test facility, Richland, Washington, an additional sum of $50,000,000 for a total project authorization of $71,300,000.

(G) Geothermal:

(1) Project 80-G-1, 50 MWe geothermal demonstration, Valles Caldera, New Mexico, $20,450,000, for a total project authorization of $39,851,000.

(2) Project 80-G-2, second 50 MWe demonstration power plant, $4,000,000, for a total project authorization of $8,000,000.

(H) Basic energy sciences:

(1) Project 80-ES-9, Intense Pulsed Neutron Sourse-I (IPNS-I), expanded experimental capabilities, Argonne National Laboratories, Argonne, Illinois, $2,400,000.

(2) Project 80-ES-10, Chemical and materials sciences laboratory, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, California, $12,600,000.

(3) Project 80-GGP-1, General plant projects, various locations, $250,000.

(I) High energy physics:

(1) Project 80-GS-1, Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations, $6,000,000.

(2) Project 80-GPP-1, General plant projects, various locations, $5,000,000.

(3) Project 78-10-b, Intersecting storage accelerator (ISABELLE) 400x400 GeV, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York, an additional sum of $90,000,000 for a total project authorization sum of $123,500,000.

(4) Project 79-9-b, Energy saver, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois, an additional sum of $26,900,000 for a total project authorization of $38,900,000.

(J) Nuclear physics:

(1) Project 80-GS-2, Bates Linear Accelerator Beam Recirculator Project Middleton, Massachusetts, $1,800,000.

(2) Project 80-GS-3, Experimental support addition, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $2,400,000.

(3) Project 80-GS-4, Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations, $1,600,000.

(4) Project 80-GS-5, National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan (A-E and long-lead procurement only), $6,000,000.

(5) Project 80-GPP-1, General plant projects, various locations, $3,000,000.

(K) Uranium Enrichment:

(1) Project 79-2-d, Technology test facilities, various locations, and additional sum of $13,000,000 for a total project authorization of $20,000,000.

(L) Environmental:

(1) Project 80-ES-8, Modification to life sciences and environmental research facilities, various locations, $3,500,000.

(2) Project 80-CPP-1, General plant projects, related to life sciences and environmental research, $2,500,000.

SEC 121. (a) With respect to Department of Energy civilian research and development programs, the Federal share of each plant and capital equipment construction project, other than a construction project for which funds are authorized under section 107(E)(1)(b) of this Act, shall be funded exclusively from an account separate from operating expenses; and, for purposes of the President's annual budget submission and of related reports submitted by the Secretary to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, each plant and capital equipment construction project shall be assigned or reassigned to one of the following categories:

(1) MAJOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—All construction projects having a total estimated Federal cost of $5,000,000 or more. Each such project shall be set forth by name, location, total estimated cost, total estimated Federal cost, description, justification, cost details, and outlays for pertinent fiscal years. Appropriate documentation shall also be provided.

(2) MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—All construction projects having a total estimated Federal cost between $1,000,000 and $5,000,000. These projects within each program area may be submitted in combined form. Accompanying documentation shall include the name, location, description, total estimated cost, and total estimated Federal cost of each project. By December 1 of each year, the Secretary shall issue a report to each such Committee describing all changes in the list of these projects and in the funding among them.

(3) GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.—All general plant construction projects having a total estimated Federal cost of up to $1,000,000. These projects within each program area may be consolidated into one item.

(4) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—The architect and engineering phase for construction projects (title I design and title II design) within each program area may be combined into one item. Site work or other construction activities may not be included. Accompanying documentation shall include a description by subprogram of the effect, purpose, and estimated cost of such planning and design.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, operating expenses may be used for (A) any construction project having a total estimated Federal cost of $500,000 or less, (B) the conceptual design of any project, (C) the procurement and installation of individual components fabricated for research and development or testing when such components are not an integral part of a basic facility or construction project, (D) experimental test equipment to conduct specific investigations but not for long-term research and development use, and (E) solar heating and cooling demonstrations.

For major construction projects where it is in the national interest to initiate construction in advance of the next annual budget cycle, the Secretary or Under Secretary shall notify the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate sixty days in advance of commencing construction under this section, shall provide those committees with a detailed justification for commencing construction in advance of such cycle, shall (subject to the applicable limitations in title VIII) reprogram necessary funding from other major construction projects, and shall inform those committees of the sources of the funding and of the effect on the particular projects from which the funding was taken.

(c) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "total estimated Federal cost" with respect to a construction project means the most current estimate of the cost which will be borne by the United States Government of all activities ultimately constituting a part of the project;

(2) the term "total estimated cost" with respect to a construction project means the most current estimate of the cost of all activities ultimately constituting a part of the project;

(3) the term "construction project" means the design, construction, or modification of a Department of Energy civilian research and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and plants, processing and reprocessing plants, utilities, and improvements; and for this purpose (A) only facilities uniquely related to a larger construction project may be combined with that project, and (B) when minor construction projects or general plant projects are submitted in combined form, completed projects including all dedicated equipment must always be used in these submissions;

(4) the term "conceptual design" means the formative stage in the design of a facility leading to preliminary estimates of size, capabilities, and design criteria and an inital understanding of the interrelationships among the facility's significant features;

(5) the term "title I design" means the refinement of the design concept by means of preliminary engineering drawings, outline specifications, cost estimates, and schedules, the identification of long-lead procurement, site improvements, and applicable code standards, and the consideration of structural, hydraulic, chemical, mechanical, and electric constraints and capabilities; and

(6) the term "title II design" means the development of the details of each aspect of title I design to the point where a contractor can order the components and proceed with construction, including complete engineering calculations considering all applicable codes, standards, and contract provisions, detailed specifications, dimensioned drawings, and procurement data, a precise cost estimate, and a firm-construction schedule.

(d) As used in this section, the term "program" includes any of the categories listed in subsection (a) of this section, and any construction project included in the category of major construction projects as described in paragraph (1) of such subsection. *Provided*, That if the current total estimated Federal cost of any major construction project exceeds the original estimated Federal cost by more than 10 percent, such funds may be acquired from other major construction projects upon written notice to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Energy and Natural Resources Committee of the Senate.

(e) Whenever the provisions of this section conflict or are inconsistent with any other provision of this Act or the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, Public Law 93-438, as amended, the provisions of this section shall govern.

SEC. 122. (a) No funds appropriated pursuant to any authorization contained in this title may be obligated for expenditure or expended for long-lead procurement, land acquisition, or construction for any plant and capital equipment project listed in subsection (b), where the estimated total Federal cost of the project is greater than $50,000,000 unless—

(1) the Secretary has submitted to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report showing the nature, purpose, and amount of the proposed obligation or expenditure and its relationship to the overall project plans; and

(2)(A) a period of sixty calendar days (not including any day on which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) has elapsed after the submission of such report, or

(B) each such committee (before the expiration of such period) has transmitted to the Secretary written notice to the effect that it has no objection to the proposed obligation or expenditure.

(b) The projects to which subsection (a) applies are as follows:

Project 76-1-b, High Btu Pipeline Gas Demonstration Plant.

Project 78-2-d, SRC-I (Solids) Demonstration Plant.

Project 79-1-r, SRC-II (Liquids) Demonstration Plant.

Project 79-1-9, Solar Energy Research Institute, Golden, Colorado.

Project 80-FE-4, Gasification Test Facility; Site Undetermined.

Project 80-FE-5, Pressurized Fluidized Bed Utility Engineering Development System.

Project 80-FE-6, Catalytic Gasification Pilot plant; Site Undetermined.

Project 80-G-2, Second 50 MWe Geothermal Demonstration Plant, New Mexico.

(c) In order to facilitate the early activation of solar experiments, long lead procurements of a computer, commitment of title I and title II design, and site construction consisting of roads and utilities on Project 79-1-9, Solar Energy Research Institute, Golden, Colorado, may proceed prior to the submissions required by subsection (a)(1) of this section.

SEC. 123. In any case where—

(1) funds appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1979 or any prior fiscal year under the heading "Operating expenses" were specifically assigned to a particular project,

(2) a portion of the funds so assigned for such project remained unexpended on March 1, 1979, and

(3) funds are appropriated to the Department for such project (for fiscal year 1980), pursuant to the authorization contained in paragraphs (A) (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), or (10), (B) (1) or (2), (C) (2), (3), or (4), (D)(1), (E) (7), (8), (9), or (10), (F) (3), (4), (5), or (6), or (G)(1) of section 120 of this Act, under the heading "Plant and Capital Equipment" instead of for "Operating expenses",

the unexpended amount described in paragraph (2) (or so much thereof as remains available for such project and unexpended on September 30, 1979) when so specified in an appropriation Act shall be transferred to the new appropriation account established for such project pursuant to the Act making the appropriations described in paragraph (3), and the amount so transferred shall be merged with any funds in such new account and thereafter accounts for as one fund.

SEC. 124. No funds appropriated pursuant to any authorization in this title may be obligated for expenditure or expended by the Secretary to place, bury, or store in any subsurface geologic repository for research, development, and demonstration purposes any irradiated nuclear fuel assembly, or part thereof, from any nuclear reactor unless the geologic repository is designed so that all fuel assemblies, or parts thereof, to be placed, buried, or stored can be easily and economically retrieved. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the placement, burial, or storage of reprocessing wastes which have been glassified, vitrified, or otherwise appropriately treated to provide long-term isolation from the biosphere.

SEC. 125. Section 19(c) of Public Law 93-409 is amended by striking out "and 1979, $50,000,000 in the aggregate" and inserting in lieu thereof "1979, and 1980, such sums as may hereafter be authorized in annual authorization Acts".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: Page 37, after line 15, add the following new section:

SEC. 126. (a) As soon as practicable and not later than February 1, 1980, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Congress a plan for the termination of the performance of work of the Department of Energy at the Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory under contract numbered W-7405-ENG-48 between the United States and the Regents of the University of California (a corporation of the State of California). Such plan shall include provisions to assure that such a termination of work would be conducted in accordance with the terms of such contract.

(b) The Secretary of Energy shall study the types of contracts that would best provide for the continued performance of the work performed under the contract referred to in subsection (a). The Secretary shall include in any contract proposed to replace such contract terms to assure that—

(1) the paramount objectives and missions of such laboratory continue to be in the field of basic scientific research:

(2) the transition from management of such laboratory by the University of California to management by any new contractor will be orderly, invlove a minimum of uncertainty, and provide employee rights and benefits with respect to pensions and retirement) reasonably comparable to those currently provided employees of the laboratory by the Regents of the University of California; and

(3) any new contractor may retain as many of the current management officials and employees of the laboratory as may be consistent with maintaining and fostering excellence in carrying out the functions assigned to the laboratory.

(c) The Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory at Berkeley, California, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory". Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory shall after such date be considered to be reference to the Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous censent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does this amendment relate to the Lawrence Laboratory?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this relates to the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, which is in the State of California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And the one managed by the University of California?

Mr. FUQUA. Yes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is going to explain it, but just for now, so that we make sure the House has read the fine type, what does it basically do?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I intend to explain the amendment. This requires a study only by the Department of Energy to review the possibilities in case that contract were ever terminated by the State of California, as has been proposed by the Governor.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I see. Well, as the gentleman knows, the board of regents voted last week to continue the Lawrence Laboratory. Is there anything in here that would be an encouragement to the Federal Government to terminate it?

Mr. FUQUA. There is not in any way anything intended either way; but I think there should be a contingency plan.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. This amendment is basically neutral as it relates to the continuation at the University of California as a manager of these facilities.

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) that the amendment be considered as read?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has partially been explained to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

There has been some concern expressed by the Governor to the board of regents in California about the operating conditions of these laboratories, that I might add are great national resources and assets, about the work that they may be doing in the area of weapons research and that this should be separated. These research programs are very integral parts of the programs that are being carried on at all three of the laboratories, the Livermore, the Berkeley, as well as the Los Alamos laboratories.

This contract with the Department of Energy has been working very well. It has been going on for some time and it expires in September of 1982.

Since this concern has been expressed, and particularly since it is of such vital importance to this country and to the Committee on Science and Technology, I proposed the amendment so that the Department of Energy could review some contingency plans that they may have in the event that this contract was terminated and also what type of transition might take place and if there were other interested parties entering into such a contract in this area.

I have talked to several of my colleagues from the State of California, to reassure them that this is not an attempt to summarily sever that contract that has been going on for a long time; but I think the Department of Energy needs to have a contingency plan in case events should occur that that contract was terminated.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FUQUA. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to read through this amendment and trying to comprehend exactly what we are intending to do here today. The little information that I have about this problem is gained from reading newspapers.

□ 1230

The story that went around regarding the situation was that the Governor of California, Governor Brown, as a member of the board of regents of California, within the last few weeks made a request to the board of regents that they terminate all activities of this laboratory and in effect terminate the contract. Then, as a result of that request the board of regents rejected his motion or suggestion and voted to continue the activities of the laboratories of the University of California.

But I also understand—and I am sure it is a fact—that the Governor has the

power to continuously appoint new members of the board of regents, and so the danger to the laboratories continues, and there might come a situation where he will get a majority vote of the board of regents and in effect terminate the contracts of the laboratories.

Is that what the situation actually is? As I understand it, that is where we are today.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, that is my understanding. By a vote of 15 to 7 and 1 abstention, the board of regents just recently, last week, voted to continue the contractual obligation to the Department of Energy. Now, that may change, but I think in a situation such as this we need a contingency plan. This is true of all our laboratories, not necessarily just these laboratories. Should there be a potential problem with the contractor, the Department of Energy or the laboratory—and this is true whether it be Brookhaven or Argonne or Oak Ridge or one of the other laboratories which are operated on a contract basis with some type of university affiliation; and I concur with this wholeheartedly because I am not proposing the Government take over these laboratories—there should be some type of contingency plan for somebody to operate these laboratories without an interruption in the very valuable work that is going on there.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I tend to agree with the gentleman, but the question I would ask is: Why should the Government not at this point start to consider seriously changing its relationship with the existing laboratories if the Governor is going to insist they be taken out of the university system? If that is the threat, why do we not just accommodate him and protect our own interests in that way? That would seem to be the sensible way for the Federal Government to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER), that several of us from California have talked to the board of regents. As a matter of fact, some of them called us, and they were rather concerned that the signal would go out that the Governor represents the mainstream of thought in California on this issue.

He does not, and I think the vote of the board of regents, regardless of the fact, reflects that attitude, even though several of those appointments were the Governor's. So I think that the fact that the board of regents has flatly rejected this idea and the fact that they gave it very careful consideration should be some proof that just because the Governor is on the board of regents does not mean that he is the whole and only factor in determining what the University of California in all of its activities does.

So I really do not believe that the Congress today should believe that the Governor is representing the main thought in California. I think just the opposite is true, and I think the board of regents reflected that in its vote. As a matter of fact, I know that it is true. They gave this issue very thorough and complete thought. They considered this for better than 2 weeks. The first time they did not vote on it; they just passed it over for another time.

I think it would be wrong to interpret that our Governor on this issue represents what the board of regents or the majority thought is in California on this subject. I do not think he does.

On the other hand, I think that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) is right, that maybe the Government should protect itself in having some kind of contingency in case—and we pray that it does not happen—Governor Brown does in fact get a majority of people on the board of regents who think as he does or as Jane Fonda does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can say to the Governor of California—and I am glad his view is not the view of the members of the board of regents and, I hope, not the view of the people of the State of California—is that this laboratory is a very valuable asset to our country and it is also a very valuable asset to the State of California. If they do not appreciate it and do not want it, I am personally convinced there are many States in the Union that would be just delighted to be hospitable to the Federal Government in establishing laboratories in their States.

If the Governor wants to bring that about as a result, then I think he is heading in the right direction. I think there are plenty of places that would be delighted at that outcome. There are plenty of States that would be delighted and overjoyed to have this great national asset and this great State asset established in their States.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's yielding.

I understand what my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) is saying. I want to say that I think the majority of the people in California understand that this is a valuable asset for both the country and the State. Before the gentleman gets a gleam in his eye to take it away and put it in New York, I think I am safe in saying that we would be delighted to keep it in California for now.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman why the study indicates only this particular contract with this particular laboratory. We have other laboratories that are under contract with the University of California that face the same problem. For example, we have the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory and the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.

Why is it particularly limited to this, or is that perhaps the contract that governs the overall situation?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I might respond to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) and say that that would be in the Department of Energy National Security authorization bill. That is the Department which has the primary jurisdiction over those laboratories where the weapons work is conducted. So a similar amendment might be offered to that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. ROUSSELOT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee chairman for yielding.

I just want to indicate my support for this amendment. I think this kind of contingency plan is consistent with a number of other initiatives being taken by the Department of Energy, specifically the reanalysis counts that are going on relating to the Rocky Flats Plant in Colorado. I think this is consistent with that, and I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to make it clear that the amendment does not in fact terminate the contract. It only provides for a standby mechanism for the University of California to do so.

Mr. FUQUA. That is correct.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur in what my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) said, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Under the current structure of the management of these laboratories, I do not think it is quite clear as to the process of the termination of contracts. In fact, in California our Governor raised this question, and probably appropriately so.

With this particular study, we can create an orderly process if in fact a termination is decided upon. So I think this is good, because these laboratories

are an integral and an important part of not only our national defense but of our energy concerns, and to have a premature disruption in the operation of those facilities would, I think, be disastrous.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment offered by the chairman of our committee is a good one. It will bring consistency and orderliness to the process of managing these laboratories.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out again in the remainder of my time that this does not sever that relationship. It only provides for a contingency plan for some laboratories that have contributed very greatly to the enhancement of the well-being of this country in a great many research and development projects. They have been very well operated, and this is to ensure that there will not be any interruption in this service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY LAGOMARSINO

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGOMARSINO: Page 3, line 3, strike out $3,500,000 and insert in lieu thereof "$5,500,000."

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I am today offering an amendment to H.R. 3000 (H.R. 4839) as a substitute authorizing funds for the purpose of heavy oil conversion technology. I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Congressman LEWIS, THOMAS, LUNGREN, COELHO, MINETA, CLAUSEN and ROUSSELOT.

Estimates indicate that there are 100 billion barrels of heavy crude oil in place in the United States and 1 trillion barrels of heavy crude oil reserves in Canada. Although this resource is vast, most of it is presently unrecoverable because current refining methods are inadequate, costly, and environmentally hazardous. Presently, refining techniques produce unacceptable levels of difficult to dispose of waste, including threatening sulfur emissions. New and innovative refining techniques could permit us to utilize this wealth of crude oil at our disposal, to meet present and future energy demands.

As you know, the President, in his energy message July 15, proposed to immediately decontrol heavy oil, exempting it from the windfall profits tax. This action will, of course, result in long-term incentives for heavy crude refining investment, as well as production. However, it has come to my attention that there is already a cost-effective technology to facilitate the development of heavy crude oil refining methods. One such project, proposed by a small refiner in my district in California, provides an encouraging approach to manufacturing gasoline feedstock and other high value products from the thick high sulfur crude oils, abundant in our Nation, without producing hard to dispose of wastes and significant environmentally threatening emissions. This demonstration refinery plant in California has the capacity to convert 5,100 barrels of heavy crude oils and residual oils a day into valuable natural gas and gasoline, while removing sulfur. All residual oil is eliminated and, as already mentioned, the process is nonpolluting.

Unfortunately, the project was presented late in the DOE budget process. Although DOE has expressed strong interest in this concept it simply does not now have the funding with which to proceed. My amendment would allow DOE to assist in developing this technology. At a time when we cannot afford to overlook any technologies which might assist in enhancing vital domestic energy supplies, it is crucial that we expedite those projects which are economically and environmentally appropriate. This process, in fact, would be possible on a quicker time scale and at a lower cost than massive coal conversion programs.

Mr. Chairman, unless the fiscal year 1980 DOE authorization bill is amended to enable DOE to fund such projects, at least one crucial year will be wasted in developing technology paramount to tapping our vast domestic heavy crude oil reserves. However, this vitally important project came to our attention only within the last several days. Although I had originally intended to offer an amendment authorizing $30,000,000 for the purpose of developing heavy oil conversion technology, I realize that the Subcommittee on Energy Development and Applications and the full Science and Technology Committee (responsible for this portion of the bill) has not had an ample opportunity to explore and review this project.

However, I do understand that the committee would be willing to accept an additional $2,000,000 to get this project off the ground. While I believe that the project would need substantial additional funds. I nevertheless accept the committee's recommendation. But, of course, I would hope that the other body might be able to work out additional funding so that this important technology might get started.

Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge that my colleagues support this amendment to the DOE authorization legislation.

□ 1240

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee and the full committee have had a chance to look at the amendment. We think it makes a very useful contribution to the DOE research program, particularly setting up the design on which we can go further in the near future for conversion of heavy oils to more usable fuels, which is a very worthwhile thing, and we are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the minority also accepts this amendment. I recognize this as a very peculiar problem in heavy oils. In California there is a great resource there, but it needs the research and development to be extracted safely and in environmentally sound ways. It does have the potential to add greatly to our energy in the future.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment, but I really do not fully understand what we mean when we talk about heavy oil. Will the gentleman explain what makes oil heavy oil? What makes it become heavy oil?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. The term "heavy oil" refers to its specific gravity. I guess the best way to describe it is that light oil is something like gasoline; heavy oil would be more like tar. As a matter of fact, some of the heavy oil we are talking about, if you look at it, cannot be distinguished from tar. It is very heavy, very hard to refine, almost useless unless you can find a way to refine it.

Mr. WYDLER. How do you mine it? How do you get it to the surface?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. It can be produced by tertiary methods of production, steam, primarily, heat, fire sometimes, flooding in other cases. It depends on how heavy it is. It is a very heavy oil. It probably requires some application of heat to melt it, and also dilutants are used, which, of course, are very expensive.

Mr. WYDLER. Am I correct in thinking that this is one of the items that the President mentioned in his speech as something he is going to give tax incentives, to promote its production?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Yes. As a matter of fact, the President proposed immediate decontrol of heavy oil and also that they not be subject to the windfall profits tax. He has not so far specifically defined heavy oil for that purpose, but it would be in the range we have been talking about.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman offering the amendment because, as we both know, there are new ways being developed to extract this very heavy oil about which the gentleman from New York has inquired as to how we know what it is we are talking about. I compliment the gentleman for bringing it up, because I think it is an important area. There are vast reserves, as the gentleman has already mentioned, not just

in California, but in other places, and I think it is a resource of which we should make use, and so I do support the amendment.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support research and development for all potential domestic energy sources, and I am especially pleased that the DOE authorization bill has been amended to include an initial, though extremely small, effort to promote development of technology to better utilize our heavy oil resources.

As the world has exploited petroleum deposits, the most economical approach has been to develop the most easily refined deposits first. Most of the Nation's, and the world's, refinery capacity has been designed for and works best on "light" (easily flowing) and "sweet" (low-sulfur) crude oils.

As domestic U.S. oil production decreases and we become more dependent upon imported oil, we face the choice of either developing our ability to tap our deposits of relatively heavy, or thick and viscous, oil, or seeing our imports increase at a more rapid rate than they otherwise would, while also becoming more vulnerable to price hikes than we would be with greater internal supply capacity.

California has an estimated 20 billion barrels of recoverable heavy crude oil and the United States has a total of over 40 billion barrels of known recoverable oil. It is estimated that there are over 100 billion barrels in place in the United States. Canada has an estimated 1 trillion barrels of heavy oil reserves.

These heavier crudes will become much more readily available if they can be processed without leaving a large residue of low-value, sludgy "residual" oil. Further, the very thick hydrocarbon materials found in "tar sands," such as those in Utah and Canada, are of the sort requiring refining techniques other than those developed for light and "sweet" crude oils.

Thus, we are forced to find ways to develop the capacity to refine the more viscous crude oils, with their heavier burdens of carbon, sulphur, and metals, without causing environmental problems.

Because the western United States has the largest deposits of heavy oils, the need for "retrofits" of refinery capacity to handle such oils is greatest there. California is in an anomalous position It has more crude oil underground than is needed to supply its petroleum product needs. Much more crude oil is north of it in Alaska. But California imports crude oil from overseas and in addition imports gasoline from other portions of the United States. Further, we are under pressure to export our Alaskan crude oil to Japan, instead of using it to supply the Western United States, including the Pacific Northwest and the Mountain States. This pattern of lack of proper domestic refining capacity for the west coast crude oils strains our balance of payments and, in a shortage situation such as today, drains gasoline supplies from other States.

Boosting our capacity to use heavy crudes for automobile and household heating purposes, without creating surplus "residual" oil, will give us more elbow room as we work through our transition to greater reliance upon coal, solar energy, and other alternative sources.

One project being undertaken by a small California refinery has demonstrated an ability to convert heavy oil into naptha (the basic constituent of gasoline), distillates (of the sort used for home heating), and gases of the sort used in the manufacture of fertilizer and commercial heating. Pure sulfur was separated out, in a form suitable for commercial use, rather than being left in the petroleum products or vented to the atmosphere. There was no coke residue, no heavy residual materials.

This unique reactor design can be combined with complementary hardware standard in refinery operations—which supplies the oxygen and steam needed, separates out sulfur, and channels the major products into separate streams for storage and use.

While the design is advanced, it works from well recognized principles. An outstanding advantage of this process is that there are no significant emissions into the atmosphere.

Increasing our ability to use "heavy" domestic crude oil with technology such as this would make the United States less vulnerable to instability overseas and the profit-maximizing price and supply moves of the OPEC countries. We cannot expect to avoid substantial dependence upon offshore supplies of oil for the foreseeable future. But every bit of elasticity helps. Every bit of inelasticity hurts: In the pocketbook.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: Amend H.R. 4839 by:

(a) Deleting, at page 10, lines 22 through 25, inclusive; and

(b) Adding, immediately after line 15, page 37, a new section 126, to read as follows:

SEC. 126. (a) Notwithstanding section 106 of Public Law 91-273, as amended, or any other law, the Secretary of Energy (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") is authorized and directed to complete only—

(1) systems design for the Clinch River breeder reactor project; and

(2) procurement and testing of such components as he determines to be useful in conducting research and development on advanced fission technology or otherwise in the public interest, including, but not limited to, the prototypic sodium pump and pump drive, the prototypic steam generator, the in-vessel transfer machine, and the prototypic secondary control rod systems.

(b) The Secretary of Energy is directed to take such action with respect to contractual instruments previously entered into in connection with the Clinch River breeder reactor project pursuant to section 106 of Public Law 91-273, as amended, as in his judgment are necessary or appropriate to carryout this section: *Provided however*, That nothing in this section is intended in any way to affect, modify, or prejudice any existing rights of any party, under any such contractual instrument.

(c) The Secretary shall assure that any generic environmental or technical issues related to carrying out the elements of the Clinch River breeder reactor project described in subsection (a) of this section are fully documented and discussed with the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Secretary may initiate any necessary and appropriate modifications in any existing liquid metal fast breeder reactor facilities to test, and shall provide for the testing and evaluation of components which are completed pursuant to subsection (a)(2) of this section:

(d) The Secretary is directed to initiate a conceptual design study of a new breeder reactor test plant. The conceptual design effort will focus on a liquid metal fast breeder reactor plant. This design effort shall include the conceptual planning, conceptual studies, systems studies, and systems designs. The conceptual design effort shall also include preliminary costs analyses, engineering drawings, utility interconnect studies, and consultations with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff on generic environmental and safety issues. In preparing the conceptual design the Secretary shall take into consideration criteria including, but not limited to, ability to test alternative fuels of the reactor for proliferation-resistance and other factors, economic factors, safety, and the technical viability of the technology.

(e) The Secretary shall undertake to identify and evaluate a reasonable number of alternative sites potentially appropriate for a new breeder reactor test plant and shall include his assessment in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (f).

(f) The Secretary is directed to submit to the President and to the Congress, no later than March 31, 1981, a final report containing the conceptual design, together with his recommendations and additional documentation necessary to support his recommendations. In reaching his recommendations, the Secretary shall consider other breeder and advanced reactor concepts to more efficiently utilize uranium, in addition to the liquid metal fast breeder reactor.

(g) The Secretary shall utilize existing contract design personnel to the maximum extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of subsections (a)(1), and (d) of this section.

(h) In addition to the reappropriation of unexpended funds previously appropriated for the Clinch River breeder reactor project, which is hereby authorized to carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated an additional sum of $107,000,000 to carry out this section.

(i) This section shall take effect upon the date of enactment.

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), joins with me in offering this amendment this afternoon. This is the third time in recent years that I recall that we have been involved in a debate on whether or not to continue with the Clinch River breeder reactor project. We have been up and down this hill. We voted for it and against it.

I might point out that I have supported the Clinch River in the past, but I

have realized since that time that that was the wrong position. Changing my mind did not come easy. It was not something that I took lightly; it was something that was done after a great deal of study and careful thought.

Let me say that I am speaking of a project, not the breeder reactor. I support the concept of the development of a breeder reactor and a breeder reactor program. I think it is essential for this country to meet our long-range energy goals that we must have a very strong, highly technical development program for the breeder. But do not confuse Clinch River with killing the breeder.

Clinch River is a project that happens to be named and proposed for location in Tennessee on the Clinch River. But I might further point out that the licenses have not even been approved for this project. There is no construction going on, no ground construction going on. The site has not been approved by the NRC yet. And if, for some reason, they should decide that it should not be there at this particular site in the district of our distinguished colleague and very valuable member of our committee, a member who I am very happy to know, my friend, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BOUQUARD), it is estimated it will cost between $700 and $900 million to change the location to some other site.

Since the time back in the 1960's, when the cost of energy in this country was very cheap, when people were promoting the utilities, when they were promoting the Gold Medallion Homes, all electric, when we thought that an energy crunch was totally out of the question and that was the last thing on the mind of the American people, we had a tremendous growth in this country, both economically as well as population during that period of time.

But what has happened since that time? We have had an energy crunch. Since 1973 people have become more concerned about the cost, as the OPEC prices increased, the domestic prices increased. People began to decide, "Well, maybe natural gas is not such a bad thing to heat my home with or my hot water with." We have had the beginning of a rapid increase in solar hot water heaters throughout the country. We have decided that it is important to put insulation in our homes. And since that time in the middle 1960's, when our projections were then estimated to be some fantastic figure, the projections today are less than half of what they were at that time.

The question comes up: Well, listen, who are you trying to kid? The French and the Japanese are going ahead full force, the U.K. is going ahead full force with a breeder reactor.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues to look at the resources in these countries. Both Japan and France have no uranium, they have no coal, they have no alternative but to try to preserve the uranium sources that they have today and to go to a breeder reactor. If I were in that country, I would be an avid supporter of moving ahead today, if not yesterday, in the development of a demonstration project or breeder. But we do not have that problem in this country today. We have a problem, but we have vast resources of coal. This House has already passed a synthetic fuels bill that will move forward with the development of synthetic fuels for coal. We have vast sources of uranium. As a matter of fact, we have a considerable amount of uranium in this country. I am sure that reference will be made to a GAO report. I have supported and opposed GAO reports, too, depending upon what my philosophy was on how I supported that project. But the GAO even admitted in their report that the uranium rich countries, such as Canada and Australia, could continue using uranium intensive converter reactors for many, many years. But the United States, quoting the GAO report, is not in either class, the class being that of France and Japan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I quote from the GAO report:

> It has significant quantities of uranium and other resources, such as coal. As a result, the decision to commercialize the breeder is not so clear cut, resting on a complicated set of assessments of the U.S. energy situation.

□ 1250

Now, we have proposed a very strong program. We are spending more money in this country in this bill that we have before us today for breeder technology than all of Western Europe put together.

Someone suggested, well, we need to go ahead with it, even if it is old technology.

My friends, for those of us who may be old aviation buffs, it is about like using an old Ford trimotor compared to a new Boeing 767 that is on the drawing boards.

What we are proposing is that we utilize the component parts of the current Clinch River project, that we have a study to see just exactly what we do need, what are our future requirements? What size should we have?

We realize now that our scientists have said that we can build a much larger project than the 385-megawatt project that the Clinch River project is, that we can go with a much larger project. We do not have to go back with that. We can come up with the concepts and how to better utilize uranium, and what type of project do we need in the future.

When I first came to Congress in 1963, one of the biggest issues in my State at that time and also in New England was whether or not we would lift the import quotas and tariffs on imported oil coming into this country. It was very cheap a barrel then, but today in that short period of time, from 1963 to 1979, look what has happened to this country.

If you have a crystal ball, I hope yours is better than mine, because I get little cataracts on it before it gets fuzzy when you look down the road as to what exactly our energy needs are going to be, what the projections are that the people have had in this country, the requirement for a Clinch River type for a breeder today is not here.

We can build at a future date a much more advanced project than we have to date. This amendment does not kill. This amendment does not impede. It strengthens the breeder technology program that we need in this country so much.

The President has said repeatedly that he does not think it is necessary. This is one occasion I happen to agree with him. I think he is absolutely right.

We had a distinguished group of Nobel laureates before our committee recently. One of the things they said—and these are some very eminent men. I think this was Dr. Bethe who made the comment that Clinch River was an outdated project, that we ought to go forward with a more advanced program than the Clinch River project. I agreed with him. I think this is what we need to do.

My friends, the Clinch River project is dead. It is dead. We are wasting our time if we think we can keep resurrecting this project every year. The President is not going to sign the bill with this in there. We are going to be in a stalemate as we have been before and marching up and down this Hill before.

What we should do is have a decent funeral today and go on with a much more advanced program. I think it is in the national interest, and I think it is in the interest of this Congress to move on and quit fooling with this project and advance our thinking to much and better in the years to come rather than working with outdated programs.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 11 days ago, President Carter came down from the mountain and announced again that this Nation must resolve to find alternatives to oil and gas and do everything possible to develop our domestic energy resources.

Here we are again debating the future of an energy source which should be one of this Nation's key hopes for solving the energy problem. Without nuclear energy, the United States last year might have had to burn an additional 470 million barrels of oil to make electricity.

This amount of oil could be converted to at least 12 billion gallons of gasoline, a year's supply for 17-some million automobiles.

Nuclear power's contribution will nearly triple by 1985 as plants now under construction come into operation. I shudder to think about the real crisis we would be in if all that oil had to be used to generate electricity instead of fueling our cars and heating our homes.

Here again we come to the question of one of several energy alternatives, nuclear energy, and specifically whether or not we should continue a significant level of research and development and demonstration of breeder technology.

It has been pointed out many, many times on this floor and during our hearings that this particular project of breeder technology development—and the demonstration of CRBR has been going on for some 25 to 30 years, it is not a recent phenomenon, it is not a recent

start—we have already spent over $700 million on breeder technology.

At some point in time, whether it is solar energy or geothermal energy or biomass conversion, we have got to stop studying and demonstrate the state of the art as it exists at that time to see if it answers a lot of the questions, social, economic, licensing, or whether that technology is compatible with our needs.

That is precisely the function of the Clinch River breeder reactor, to demonstrate after 30 years of development a technology and find out whether in fact it works or does not work.

Now, the Clinch River project is some 75 percent completed. The only reason it has not been licensed is because the administration has decided not to license it. That is not to say that it could not be. It certainly could be. It has been carefully designed. It has been carefully thought out. Component parts are practically all built and stored in a variety of places around this country.

As we sit discussing this year after year after year, we are continually losing our leadership in nuclear technology.

Looking back on the history of nuclear energy and the atom, back in the fifties under Eisenhower, we exported nuclear technology. We brought scientists and engineers here. We taught them about the atom and its peaceful uses. Today in other countries, in Japan, Russia, the U.K., France, and Germany, they are proceeding full bore ahead on developing this breeder technology.

As we sit here discussing whether we should or should not, we are losing our leadership, and in that loss I think goes also the high standards of safety and technology superiority. I think it is premature. I think it is an act of folly to put our heads in the sand and deny this opportunity of demonstrating this particular technology.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should continue with this funding irrespective of whether the President is not enlightened to it or not, but certainly we should proceed as a body of separate authority and responsibility in pushing ahead this technology, which we could, yes, study and study and study; but at some point in time, we have got to see whether it works or not.

I think it is a wise course of action to take. I would suggest we vote down this amendment by my very able chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) who has in the past, over years and years and years rose in support of the Clinch River breeder reactor, and for some reason today he decided to change his mind.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Florida. I think in his enthusiasm, in his presentation to the committee, though he might have just given some people a false impression that somehow by voting against the Clinch River breeder reactor we were going to help the breeder program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WYDLER and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOLDWATER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let us get it absolutely clear that what the administration is proposing, and that is his amendment, is to terminate the one real demonstration program that we have in our country, to demonstrate the practicality of taking a breeder reactor and producting electricity from it, something useful for mankind and for our country.

□ 1300

That is the purpose of this amendment. If we pass this amendment we are left with nothing but a program of pieces and parts and a vague hope that we are going to do something in the future and whatever that is nobody knows. That is really the choice that the members of this committee and this House are going to have to make today, whether we want a real program of demonstration or a vague promise, meaning really nothing. Does not the gentleman agree that is what we are voting on when we vote on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA)?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We all know we have been trying to reach a compromise with the White House for many, many years. We have said to them, OK, we can go along with your study, but how about a commitment? That is the failure of this amendment. All it does is further study this issue without a commitment certain to proceed with demonstration.

If we had a commitment I would suggest to the gentleman that perhaps we could get a consensus on the committee for making a change in the direction in this demonstration. But all we are asked to do is approve another study without any commitment to demonstrate, and actually build some kind of facility to demonstrate a technology that has been ongoing for over 30 years.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK and by unanimous consent Mr. GOLDWATER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The point the gentleman made about working toward a compromise is very well taken. Perhaps it would be well for all of the Members to know that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER), the ranking minority member of the committee, and I wrote a formal letter to the President suggesting a compromise in which we agreed that we would support the President in designing his own liquid metal fast breeder reactor for construction sometime in the 1980's, and that under those conditions we would agree with him to terminate the Clinch River breeder reactor. He refused any sort of an accommodation on this; refused to even talk about it at all. Accordingly, administration amendment being presented by the chairman of the committee, with all due respect, represents a position that says we must kill the Clinch River breeder reactor and kill the forward movement of our breeder program, all in exchange for nothing but a promise of a study.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I know the gentleman has been down to the White House on many, many occasions trying to work out a compromise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. FUQUA and by unanimous consent Mr. GOLDWATER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FUQUA. I asked unanimous consent that the amendment not be read because it was rather long, but I would like to point out to the gentleman that in subparagraph (f) of the amendment is the statement, and I will read it to the gentleman, that after the report is reported back in March of 1981 "a final report containing the conceptual design, together with his recommendations," speaking of the Secretary, "his recommendations and additional documentation necessary to support his recommendations."

Now, the Secretary can recommend we go to site selection, and in reaching his recommendations the Secretary shall consider "other breeder and advanced reactor concepts to more efficiently utilize the uranium, in addition to the liquid metal fast breeder reactor."

So we are making some progress, and I would prefer maybe that we went ahead on a demonstration project at this time, but I think it destroys the study if we are going to make a conclusion before the end of the study. I think the Secretary is mandated in this to come back with those recommendations and supporting documentation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. GOLDWATER was allowed to proceed for 30 seconds additional.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. I appreciate what the Chairman is talking about, but again, some of our great concerns here, really all the gentleman is asking for is to study a larger concept in a breeder demonstration program, and we do not have too much problem with that. But again, there is not an established policy that we are going to proceed. The study is just to see what kind, and what fuels, and what shape and form, and maybe perhaps where it should be located. We want an affirmative commitment that we are going to do it, and I think until we get that we have to hang onto what we have. I think that has been the big problem.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: Page 10, lines 22 and 23, strike out "Clinch River breeder reactor, $183,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "Activities related to the termination of the Clinch River breeder reactor project, $52,000,000".

Page 10, line 24, insert after the comma "including the study described in subsection (f) of this section,".

Page 11, line 2, strike out "$142,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$107,000,000".

Page 11, line 4, strike out "$75,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,300,000".

Page 11, line 15, strike out "$18,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,000,000".

Page 11, strike out lines 16 through 17.

Page 11, insert after line 20 the following new subsection:

(f) The Secretary of Energy shall conduct a comprehensive study on advanced fission energy strategies and shall submit a report of the results of the study to the Congress not later than March 31, 1981. In conducting the study, the Secretary of Energy shall review the potential role of nuclear energy for supplying electricity in the United States for periods of fifty and one hundred years into the future. The study shall include an examination of alternative advanced fission energy strategies, including strategies designed around breeder reactors, particularly the liquid metal fast breeder reactor, and those based on reliance on advanced converter reactors which provide for more efficient use of uranium (including advanced light water reactors, high temperature gas-cooled reactors, and heavy water reactors). With respect to each strategy reviewed under the study, the Secretary of Energy shall examine matters relating to research and development, budgetary considerations, safety, proliferation of nuclear materials, and licensing. The report submitted to the Congress shall contain recommendations of the Secretary of Energy regarding the possibility of reprograming funds authorized to be appropriated under this section for the purpose of conducting studies respecting the safety of light water reactor technology. The Secretary shall consult with the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies in carrying out the study.

Page 16, line 22, strike out "$22,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$17,400,000".

Page 17, line 4, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,200,000".

Page 22, line 10, strike out "$2,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000,000".

Page 23, line 12, strike out "$12,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000,000".

Page 23, strike out lines 17 through 21.

Page 23, line 22, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14)".

Page 24, line 3, strike out "(16)" and insert in lieu thereof "(15)".

Page 24, line 8, strike out "(17)" and insert in lieu thereof "(16)".

Page 24, lines 11 and 12, strike out "$53,000,000" each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof "$21,000,000".

Page 24, line 12, strike out "(18)" and insert in lieu thereof "(17)".

Page 24, line 16, strike out "(19)" and insert in lieu thereof "(18)".

Page 24, line 18, strike out "$6,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000,000".

Page 24, line 19, strike out "$15,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,000,000".

Page 24, line 20, strike out "(20)" and insert in lieu thereof "(19)".

Page 25, strike out lines 1 through 3.

Page 25, line 4, strike out "(22)" and insert in lieu thereof "(20)".

Page 25, line 8, strike out "(24)" and insert in lieu thereof "(22)".

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thought the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) gave a very compelling and moving address in support of his amendment. But I agree with him that the Clinch River breeder reactor is dead, the practicalities are that the Persident is not going to sign legislation that contains further funding for the Clinch River. I think we would all be wise if we would give this project a decent burial and comfort the widows and maybe let the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCCORMACK) be one of the pallbearers, and get on with the business of the country.

The time has come to make hard energy decisions and to readjust our expectations and our energy programs to face tough new realities. The amendment offered by myself and Mr. BINGHAM is an attempt to do that. It offers Congress a chance to look at our breeder development program as part of our national nuclear energy program and as part of an international effort to focus on energy sources that are economic; that are reliable, and that fit the difficult situations we are in.

The Udall/Bingham proposal would have the effect of putting on "hold" to the obsessive preoccupation with development of the commercial liquid metal fast breeder reactor technology, which is only one—only one of many possible means to expanding the use of uranium resources. I would liken it to the decision by the United States to forego the race with Europe to develop the SST and to work instead to improve our more economical and environmentally benign jumbo jet. Our amendment puts the liquid metal fast breeder reactor technology where it belongs: As a potentially promising technology in competition with other promising advanced reactor technologies, which may be ready and necessary at some point after about 2020 but which have not yet shown a clear winner among them.

STAKES ARE HIGH AND DIFFICULT TO STOP

In taking this stand Mr. BINGHAM and I are up against billions of dollars invested in this one technology to date.

One point should be perfectly clear: Breeder reactor development does not have now and will probably never have any effect on our national energy independence or on our liquid fuels problem; that is, gasoline lines. Today the total amount of our crude oil used for electric power generation is only 10 percent. By the time a breeder reactor is likely to be on line for commercial purposes, our national fuel conversion policy will have brought that amount down substantially. Therefore, even if replacing our entire electrical generating capacity with breeder reactors would have an insignificant effect on our oil import, or oil consumption rates.

The breeder program included in the science and technology proposal is grossly inflationary: It includes massive sums of money to continue building and testing components for a liquid metal fast breeder reactor when the national program may be headed in a different direction. The time to make a real commercialization decision will be several years down the road.

The Fuqua/Brown proposal is presented as resulting in a savings of billions of dollars as a result of termination of the Clinch River project. The fact is that Fuqua/Brown sets us up for a commitment to a larger and more expensive breeder program than Clinch River; if we really want to save money we have to either cut both projects, which Udall/Bingham would do, or go ahead and build Clinch River and hope we can get away without ever having to fund the new project.

Our amendment leaves us the a breeder development budget larger than that of any European country. The Udall/Bingham amendment provides DOE with nearly $350 million to study not only plutonium-based breeder technologies but all promising advanced fission ideas so that if and when we do need to extend our uranium supply, and when doing so is economically feasible, we will have chosen the technology best adapted to our society's goals of safety and security as well as energy sufficiency.

I urge support of the substitute amendment and the defeat of both the Fuqua and the Science and Technology Committee proposal.

□ 1310

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a particularly difficult position on these two amendments. I was reminded of the TV series of William Bendix in "The Life of Riley." When things got a little bit difficult, the program would always end with, "What a revolting development."

I find myself in that position, having to oppose the amendments offered by not only the chairman of the one committee, but the chairmen of both committees on which I serve. But, Mr. Chairman, this has been a most confusing chain of events on the whole breeder program.

On the one hand we are told by the administration and by the amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA that, "If only you will not persist in this business of the breeder, we will give you a bigger and better one."

It does not really make a lot of sense. If we are going to talk about proliferation, which was the original argument as to why we should not go ahead with breeder technology, is not the fuel in the "Carter Bigger and Better Breeder"

just as subject to proliferation problems as the fuel in the Clinch River breeder reactor? So, I cannot understand why this new track has come about.

On the other hand, if we completely ignore the question of going into breeder technology, how is that going to help the problem? Other countries are moving right ahead with it, and the only thing that we will find is that we will lag behind the rest of the world in this technology. I cannot see where that is to the benefit of this country.

It is not a thing that we are just asked to abandon a thought that we had of going into breeder technology. This thing has been going on for a long time, and we have some responsibilities to the people who have joined us in this effort. The utilities that were asked to join us as partners in this endeavor have put up over $100 million already in cash, and one of the things that we are going to have to do is give them back that money if we do not follow through, or even if we change concepts and try to go on to the "Carter Bigger and Better Breeder."

Parts have been ordered already for Clinch River. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding—I have not seen it—but there is a tremendous warehouse that costs over a million dollars, just the warehouse alone, to keep some of the materials that will be used in this project. And so, to abandon all of that and start all over, to start reviewing a new concept, I think is just not in the best interests of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the defeat of both amendments that my two chairmen have offered to this bill.

Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL). He forthrightly tells us that his amendment intends to terminate the Clinch River breeder project, but in order to clarify his position for Members of this body, I wonder if I might address one or two questions to my good friend from Arizona, who chairs the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. From his position on this distinguished panel, he does exercise great influence and great authority over the use of public lands in this Nation.

I wonder if the gentleman is aware of the fact that, according to the Department of Energy, about 40 percent of the uranium ore in this Nation lies beneath the surface of our national parks, our wilderness areas, our wildlife refuges, and our national forests? I wonder if the good chairman of the Interior Committee would be supportive of efforts to open up these facilities in our national parks, our wilderness areas, our wildlife refuges, and our national forests for uranium mining in order to meet the demands for nuclear fuel which will result from our failure to develop a breeder reactor.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOUQUARD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I do not know whether we are going to have to have more breeders down the road or the exact role nuclear power is going to play in our future, but I suspect that it has a role. The uranium is where the Almighty put it, and, as the gentlewoman indicated, a lot of it is on public lands. In our committee in recent years, we tried to get on these parks, wilderness areas, so that we could make out what we needed to get on the public lands in an orderly way in order to develop our resources.

Mrs. BOUQUARD. I appreciate my friend's response. I would like to remind my colleague that I joined with him a few weeks ago in supporting the "conservation vote of the century," the Udall substitute to the Alaska lands bill. So, I wonder if the gentleman has any estimates of the lands with uranium ore in those lands.

Mr. UDALL. In the Alaskan lands legislation we were very careful to draw boundaries so that two-thirds of all the mineral sources were outside the boundaries. We cannot do much about the Great Smokies, the Grand Canyon, the national parks in the country. I do not think the country is ready to turn them loose.

Mrs. BOUQUARD. So the gentleman does not support opening these areas for mining. The reason I asked this question is, in my congressional district we have rock formations known as the Chattanooga shale deposit. That deposit contains very minute quantities of uranium ore. They are so minute that for every 200 tons of this rock, they can only produce 1 pound of uranium ore. Yet, the Department of Energy includes these deposits in their resource estimates. Really and truly, I do not want to see one-third of the State of Tennessee strip mined to provide this fuel. But this will be the inevitable impact of termination of the breeder reactor project. Without the Clinch River project, there will be no effective nuclear program.

Now, it is possible that the gentleman from Arizona feels that we would be better off simply ignoring the contribution that nuclear power can play for our energy independence, because I know that he is very concerned about the requirements of the Clean Air Act. But, if we do not use nuclear fuel and nuclear plants, then we will either burn more coal or we are going to have to do without electrical energy. Two million barrels of oil every day go to produce electricity, and that same electricity can be produced by either coal or by nuclear power. Now, if we are forced to burn more coal, then we are going to have to relax the clean air standards. This is due to the fact that the areas that are most dependent on oil-generated electricity are generally the areas that have the most significant air pollution problems.

For example, today California generates about 55 percent of their electricity from oil; New York, 35; and several New England States have 60 percent of their electrical power generated from oil. These are the areas, my colleagues, where we are going to have to put the coal plants.

So, I wonder if my colleagues would be supportive of efforts to relax the clean air standards and environmental reviews and appeals processes to bring these plants on-line in the shortest time possible?

□ 1320

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. BOUQUARD was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mrs. BOUQUARD. I was wondering if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) would be inclined to relax environmental standards so we could put more coal plants on line.

Mr. UDALL. If the gentlewoman would yield, there are very serious trade-offs. We have got to do something to work it out. If we do not go nuclear, we have to go coal. People are going to be killed in coal mines and suffer from bad air. We have to work it out, and I think we can do it. But I am not in favor of relaxing the Clean Air Act. From what I have seen up to today, it is not necessary.

Mrs. BOUQUARD. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, if he does wish to protect the wilderness lands in this country from mining for uranium and coal, and if he wants to maintain the existing standards for clean air, and if he wants to end the Nation's dependence on the foreign supply of oil, the only mechanism we have to reach these goals lies in the continued development of nuclear energy generating capacity. This is a position which requires a prompt, orderly introduction of the breeder reactor or, to put it quite simply, our Nation is going to have to do without. I do hope that this puts into proper perspective the meaning of the proponents of this amendment.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. BOUQUARD was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOUQUARD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to emphasize one point that the gentlewoman from Tennessee has made, and I want to confirm her in this debate. We are talking about the availability of nuclear fuel. The administration projects up to 395 nuclear powerplants on the line in this country by the year 2000. The known and probable reserves of uranium are about 2,400,000 tons A nuclear plant operating for 50 years requires about 10,000 tons. So we have only enough nuclear fuel for 240, or perhaps 300 plants. The fact is that, given the presumed life of nuclear plants, and our known and probable reserves—and we now have already explored all of our most promising known

areas for uranium—we have enough fuel for no more than about 300 plants without a breeder program. This is what we are talking about, and it demonstrates why we should support continuation of the Clinch River breeder project.

Mrs. BOUQUARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman—and those who are watching the proceedings on closed circuit television sets, which I am told I am not supposed to mention but I do not think it is any secret that that is what many of the Members do and must do—I just want to set the stage so everybody is very clear first on what we are voting on probably within the next hour.

The amendment was offered by the gentleman from Florida, which is the administration amendment or the Carter amendment. That amendment in effect would stop the Clinch River project. It terminates the project in clear words. It terminates the Clinch River project and brings into immediate effect all the results that will flow from that termination in the way of legal obligations owed by the U.S. Government which, in my judgment, and I am going to demonstrate this before this debate is over, will probably cost our Government about $1.5 billion for nothing. We will get nothing for it, but that will be the result of terminating the Clinch River project. The hope that his amendment offers to us is that the same President apparently who has decided to kill the Clinch River project, no matter what, will allow his administration to propose a bigger and better breeder reactor for our country. I do not know how many people really believe that. It is a nice hope. It is a nice thing to put out as a possibility, but it is not realistic, and I think any Member here who thinks about it knows that if we are not going to build the rather modest Clinch River breeder reactor project, we are not going to build any breeder reactor project, at least not as long as the present occupant of the White House is there. We have been offered a substitute for that amendment, and that is the substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and that is the vote that will come first. That amendment, I would say, is more honest than the other amendment in that it sets the matter clearly before this body. He not only wants to terminate the Clinch River project and kill it and finish with it, but in effect he wants to totally and utterly gut our breeder program as a nation so that we would be out of the breeder business almost in a total fashion. But it is a more honest amendment, because the first amendment will really have the same effect although it is done in a more subtle fashion.

I urge the House, those Members who are concerned about the supply of energy for our Nation, not to take this step backward. I say to those who are supporting fusion, those who are supporting fusion energy, do not take this step backward because I ask you this: If our need for energy is down and our need for electricity is down, as these people tell us, and that we will not need so much in the years ahead, why are we going to spend a half billion dollars to try to develop fusion energy, whose main purpose is to produce electricity, is basically the same time frame as the breeder reactor? Why would we go ahead and spend a half billion dollars for this very chancy, untried new source of power to produce electricity if we buy the arguments that they are making here to us today that the need for electric power is going down and, therefore, we do not need the breeder? If we do not need the breeder, we do not need the fusion program either. Let us face that fact and look it right in the face.

What we are being asked to do here today is turn our backs on the new and real technology of the future—that is what this vote is all about—and that is what this President has done in many areas of our national endeavors. He has asked us to turn our backs on the technology of the future. If we as a body do that today, we are going to make our country a second-rate one in the years ahead. We will certainly not be able to compete with the breeder-oriented countries of the world, which will include the major countries of the world. They are going ahead with their breeder programs. The only country—the minority of one country—in the world saying no to the breeder today is our country. France is saying "Yes" to the breeder; England is saying "Yes" to the breeder; Japan is saying "Yes" to the breeder. West Germany is saying "Yes" to the breeder.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WYDLER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYDLER. The Soviet Union is making an all out effort to not only develop the breeder but put it into use and practice in their country. In the face of this we are being asked to go ahead and have a coal economy—or last week it was changed to a synthetic fuels economy. The President, who blinks at trying to demonstrate on a small scale the practicality of using a breeder reactor is asking this Nation to commit itself to an $88 billion commercialization synthetic fuels program. He wants to go all out in total commercialization of synthetic fuels, spend $88 billion for that, and blinks because maybe in this case we will have to spend a billion or two dollars to build a small demonstration project to prove the viability of the breeder reactor for commercial purposes. It is an insane type of policy that he is calling on for this House and this Committee to pass.

The committee this year, I would say, did a great job on the breeder reactor. The committee chairman, as we saw, was opposed to the continuation of the mittee vote was stronger for the breeder project in the committee, but the comreactor program this year than it was last, and I think it is because they realize the realties of the situation that we face.

The General Accounting Office—and I do not ask the Members to take my word for this—has analyzed the administration arguments and found them totally wanting and has strongly suggested to the Congress that if we want a breeder program, we continue the Clinch River breeder reactor project. I hope that type of advice, coming from the source that it is, will be listened to very seriously by this House today.

□ 1330

This is the argument that gets me the best of all, this project is dead because the President said so, and we should lie down and let it die. We should be parties to the murder. I say, let us not be a timid Congress. Let us say to the President we have the courage of our convictions, to say to him in this country: We are going to try to increase the supply of energy from our own sources in every way we can. We are going to test and try to demonstrate it and wherever we can help to make our country now and in the future independent of foreign sources of energy.

If you say that to yourself—and so many Members do say that to themselves—then I ask you how can you turn your back on one of the most realistic, proven potential sources of energy for the future of our Nation?

I just want to speak for a few minutes to the newer Members of this body who were not here in the last few years to give them a few minutes of the history of where we are today. This is not a fight brought about by the Congress, this is a fight insisted upon by the President of the United States.

Let us think how this project came into existence. Many years ago the President of the United States, a different President of the United States, asked American industry to join together with the Government in a project to develop a new source of energy, the breeder reactor. Industry said yes and joined with him. Today we have a President of the United States who suggests that industry join together with Government to develop another new source of energy, synthetic fuels. A very great parallel.

The breeder reactor project started, American industry involved itself and has invested $100 million in this project to date. The President supported the program, the Congress supported the program, the program moved forward.

So it did under Presidents Nixon and Ford. Then when President Carter came to office he submitted his first budget to our committee which reduced the spending for the Clinch River breeder reactor. It did not cut it out, it just reduced the spending a small amount to slow the project down. A few months later the President submited a new budget to our committee and asked us to, in effect, terminate this project. The reason he gave to the Congress and to the American people at that time was the danger of proliferation of the plutonium in the world's economy. That was the reason he

gave when he first asked that the Clinch River breeder reactor be stopped.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WYDLER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYDLER. That is a very inconsistent argument, of course, today because he is now proposing, if we can believe the gentleman from Florida, to build us a bigger and better breeder reactor.

Be that as it may, at that time he said the reason he wanted it stopped was to stop the danger of proliferation in the world. That argument fell flat on its face, mainly because all of the other countries of the world said they did not understand the argument, they were going to go ahead and develop their own breeder reactors.

Last year the President did not use that argument at all to the Congress of the United States. Instead he came in and he said to us, "The reason I don't want Clinch River, it is an uneconomical project to build." They tried to prove to us with dollars and cents it did not pay to build the project. The problem with that argument is the Clinch River breeder reactor project is not a commercial project, it is a demonstration plant. It is not supposed to come out on the bottom line. So that argument has been abandoned as well and we are down to the argument the gentleman from Florida made and I was with the President when he made that argument. His argument was, "If I were the President of France I would build the breeder reactor but I am the President of the United States and I don't think we need it. Our problems in energy are not as severe as the energy problems of France."

How many of us believe that? I think our energy problems are just as severe as the energy problems of France and we need to utilize every form of possible energy we can utilize in our Nation, and I certainly do not want to be second in this world to the French Government and I surely would not want to be second in this world to the Soviet Union in the development of new sources of energy.

All the arguments have been specious. The President wants to kill this project. The Congress can roll over and play dead if it wants to. It will be doing a serious disservice to the American people if it does so.

I ask the members of this committee and this House to stand up and be heard in favor of increased supplies of energy for the future of our country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to be a cosponsor of the Udall amendment. I believe that the issue before us at this time is not nuclear energy versus no nuclear energy, and it is not breeder versus no breeders. The issue is essentially whether we are going to move ahead now or very soon in the next year or two with a decision for the commercialization, the development on a commercial scale of breeder reactor technology. It is our position that that decision not only need not be made now, because we have time to make it. The time when breeder technology may become economically sensible, the experts have generally agreed, will be sometime after the turn of the century. It would be undesirable and wasteful to make that decision now, on the basis of the technology which is probably already obsolete if not obsolescent. Why go ahead with the development of a large-scale, expensive reactor with serious safety problems? Why go ahead with that now rather than pursue the more fundamental research and development activities which our amendment contemplates and which are included in the bill if you adopt the Udall-Bingham amendment?

We would still have the largest breeder R. & D. program in the world, assuming the adoption of the Udall-Bingham amendment. It would amount to some $350 million and because it stays at the R. & D. stage and does not move to the commercialization stage, that program is in a position to take advantage of such technological developments and improvements as are made throughout the world from time to time.

Let us just have a look at safety. Many people in this country are concerned about light-water reactors today, and with good reason after Three Mile Island. Do you know what the Clinch River type of breeder uses for a coolant? It uses sodium for a coolant. Do you recall from your elementary chemistry days what it was like to handle sodium? Sodium was something you could not permit to have any contact with air or with water, or you were in serious trouble.

There are other aspects of the Clinch River-type of design that are dangerous. It is capable of producing an explosion that could rupture the containment. That is not true of your light-water reactor, but a breeder reactor of that type is so capable. That is another reason to defer the decision on the type of breeder reactor with which we are going ahead.

I would like to take just a little time to quote from a letter which you all have, which you probably have not had a chance to read, from the National Taxpayers' Union. This is an organization I must say I have not always agreed with but in this case I think they are on target. They urge you as representatives to vote for the Udall-Bingham amendment. The Udall-Bingham amendment, it points out, would leave us with the largest breeder R. & D. program in the world, and at the same time avoid wasteful spending—up to $200 million—on premature, Clinch River—related oriented breeder fuels and components. This would be in addition to saving $184 million by putting an end to the Clinch River project itself.

The letter says:

> One of Congress' present highest priorities is the development of an adequate energy program for the future. However, in attempting pursue this goal one should not throw all common sense and fiscal rationality to the wind. Because of cost and technical reasons the Clinch River Breeder Reactor is simply no longer needed. We cannot afford to allow panic over energy to force us into a needless and wasteful expenditure on this outmoded and technically obsolete demonstration projects.

And going on with what the National Taxpayers' Union has to say:

> Taxpayers' dollars can also be saved by cutting the overall LMFBR R&D program by $200 million. This cut in the breeder program would not jeopardize the solution to long term energy programs nor would it delay the commercialization of the breeder. In fact, according to estimates the decision on the commercialization of the breeder can be deferred until the first quarter of the 21st century.

□ 1340

That is the National Taxpayers Union talking.

Now, what that would do is open up for use toward other much more necessary energy programs, such as those we have been talking about in this Congress, somewhere in the neighborhood of $300-plus million that we can save.

This, Members of the Committee, is a good economy vote.

I urge support for the Udall-Bingham amendment.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks will start off as one of our colleagues had already stated, that we have visited the Clinch River breeder reactor issue many times before. The pros and cons are well known. The proliferation risks, enormous costs, environmental concerns, and safety problems with this project have been outlined in detail, and I do not think it is necessary to discuss these problems in detail again.

I believe that the Committee on Science and Technology has made a tactical error in not terminating this project. The need to get an authorization bill enacted into law is even more pressing than ever. On numerous occasions, the President has stated his intent to veto an authorization bill that contained funding for Clinch River, and has instead offered a compromise to strengthen the breeder base research and development program. This compromise will provide for a stronger breeder program, which will, in fact, enhance the program by allowing for a more rational design. The fact that an authorization was not passed into law last year is clear evidence of what will happen again this year if we continue to insist on authorizing Clinch River.

Mr. Chairman, Clinch River was originally authorized in 1971 as a crash project in response to our diminishing supply of uranium. Utilities, however, have encountered numerous licensing difficulties for new nuclear plants, causing the cancellation of many of these plants, resulting in a corresponding reduction in the use of uranium. Preliminary reports

from the NURE program have indicated that our domestic uranium resources are larger than we originally thought. It is generally agreed that estimates of uranium reserves have almost doubled in the last 9 years. We have learned today that we have a 50-year supply of uranium for 240 nuclear plants. Thus, the original breeder demonstration schedule no longer makes economic or technical sense. The Clinch River project is now an anachronism and should be treated as such.

We have heard and will hear repeatedly during this debate that the United States needs a breeder program; that other countries are far ahead of us; and that we are headed for a second-rate position in breeder technology.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that funding Clinch River does not address any of these valid concerns. Dependence on foreign breeders is not the issue before us. Breeders themselves are but one option among the so-called inexhaustibles.

Clinch River's 10-year-old design is already obsolete. The U.S. position in this technology will be better served through a sensible R & D. program, rather than funding a program that is already out of date.

Let me repeat—construction of Clinch River will not move us to the forefront of breeder technology. Rather, it will merely demonstrate our capacity to build a Model T breeder.

We have the alternatives before us to maintain a strong breeder program. The Fuqua-Brown amendment contemplates a larger breeder plant design study. It will focus on more promising breeder technologies than that technology to be employed at Clinch River.

We have nothing to fear from foreign competition. We are outspending all European nations together on breeder R. & D. Certainly, this is true if we enlist our technological genius in a new design study to consider different breeder technologies and alternate fuel cycles.

After 9 years, ground has not been broken on Clinch River, and we have no right to expect ground to be broken while Jimmy Carter remains our President, be it 2 years or 6 years, and restarting the licensing will take even more time. We clearly continue to be in a no-win situation. We cannot afford to wait any longer to cut our losses. Those who believe a balanced energy program should include the breeder, will serve their conviction and their view of the national interest by joining in the new direction promised in the Fuqua-Brown amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us face the energy future, stop living in the past, and push ahead with an aggressive energy research package that the President can live with.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment, of course, the distinguished chairman of my Committee on Science and Technology and certainly my good friend and distinguished chairman of our Committee on the Interior, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) and, of course, the ranking minority member (Mr. WYDLER) of the Committee on Science and Technology.

We have listened for 6 months, and I usually get to the floor and I am filled with fire and brimstone because I do not like to speak about things that I do not know something about and I do not like to speak about things that I do not really believe in one way or the other; but I also have a sense of humor that I would like to share with the House.

We started out this momentous debate on the point of view that we were serving a funeral mass. I think if we are going to have a funeral mass, then what we ought to be doing is putting on our black coats and ties and we ought to be joining here together and we ought to invite our brethren who are watching us today from the heights of their castles in the air and looking at the television and they follow the debate, and I say that with the greatest of respect, because we are really having a funeral mass. Both of our distinguished chairmen and my dearest friends came up and said, "It's dead, it's dead. Let's bury it."

Well, I do not think it is dead. I do not think it is dead any more than any other piece of the programing for energy development of this Nation.

Now, we sat here for 6 months. I have fought on the side, arm in arm, with the chairman of the Committee on the Interior and arm in arm with the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology; but think with me a minute. Review with me a minute what we have done. "What hath thou wrought?"

Every single energy issue that has come before this House from January to now, whether it had to do with oil shale, tar sands, hydroelectric power generation, nuclear generation, there have been vast coalitions that have been opposed.

What new energy have we put into place in the last 6 months or the last 4 years or anything in production to provide 1 new ounce, 1 kilowatt of energy for the Nation?

□ 1350

I say to the Members, "You answer that." What have we put into place? Nothing; and the Nation comes and looks at this debate, and the people say, "What will we do?"

Now we hear the taxpayers' groups that come out, and we are asked, "Why should we panic over energy?" I say, "Great Scott, don't panic over energy?"

All right, except for the point of view that in my State and in other States people are not only burning up internally themselves with anger and distrust and perhaps misjudgment, but they are waiting in those gas lines and they cannot even get their much needed fuel supply.

Why should we panic over energy? Why do we not just turn the temperature up to 90 degrees in here and maybe we can smoke out some energy decision in all our buildings?

The people are panicked over energy. The Nation is panicked over energy and rightfully so.

Do we concur in this point of view that if our Saudi Arabian friends or the people in Iran or any of the OPEC nations cut off our oil supply, we are in trouble? Nigeria announced this morning maybe they will cut back on production. What would it mean to the United States? What would it mean to those gas lines and the energy needs of our people?

We can forget the gas lines. What would it mean to the productivity of goods and services in the United States? So many people think of gasoline as being the problem of energy. That is not the only issue.

The fundamental, basic issue in the Nation with inflation and the fundamental basic issue in the Nation with the energy situation is that we cannot increase the cost of energy by 500, 600, or 700 percent in a matter of 5 years and not have an enormous impact upon the cost of production of goods because energy is production. And those people who are concerned about the United States becoming second rate because we do not control our energy supply for production are most real in what they are speaking of.

Mr. Chairman, we come back and we talk further in some of this debate and we are saying, "You know, this is what the experts say." Let me tell the Members what an expert is. I will ask the Members how many experts testify before their committees and before my committee?

The opposition goes and gets one set of experts, and they become the experts in their field and they are the soothsayers with the tablets coming down from the mountain top. Then those of us who disagree hire the economists and the experts on the other side, and they wrangle before the committee.

But what have the experts done to us? Those very same experts who have testified time and time again are the know-it-alls who never have had the responsibility of running for office or of having people come out and support what they believe in or of staying on one side of an issue. Many of these experts are for sale. It depends on how much money they are paid to appear and testify before respective committees. They are not lobbyists; they are experts.

Oh, yes, we are told the experts have said we do not need nuclear energy, we do not need the breeder reactor, that we can wait until the year 2000.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROE) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROE. So, Mr. Chairman, the experts come aboard. They have now testified again, and we debate this issue today, and the experts say to us, "You know, what Mrs. BOUQUARD said, you are

all wrong." The others say, "You know what Mr. UDALL said. You don't know the facts." The experts disagree.

Mr. Chairman, I know Members want me to yield, but let me finish my dissertation, and then perhaps I will give up some of my time.

Mr. Chairman, one of my good friends, my delightful friend, said that we really do not have to cross that bridge until the year 2000. But there is also a bridge we have to cross known as the "Rubicon." It is an "economic Rubicon," and any time we falter and fall apart in developing the technical expertise and endanger the freedom of this nation and the knowledge of this nation technologically, we are continuing to depend on the rest of the world. Must we look to them for breeder knowledge, or must we develop it here?

We are not talking about commercializing the breeder reactor. That is nonsense. It is not obsolete. Nothing is obsolete that has not yet been born.

People will tell us there will be plenty of time. We have already waited too long in America. They say that there will be plenty of time to develop new technology. I say that we will go to hell in a handbasket, and the people will throw this Congress out unless that decision is made now.

That is what the issue is about. We cannot turn out our ideas, our dimensions, and our technologies. We do not have the vehicles to do it.

We spent a billion dollars on this program. Do we have the right to throw it down the drain and say that we will develop something else in the next 10 or 15 years? This is not an issue of Democrats versus Republicans or the President versus the Congress. We have in place in our hands the technology of the breeder reactors which is crucial to the energy supply of this Nation.

What will our answer be to our constituents when we come back if they come to us and say, "Well, they cut off our oil supply."

Who is going to answer for that in the fall on the heating oil supply that we may not have? One oil supply disruption can happen in the world, and where are we then?

We are going to study and debate and study and debate some more, but, God, let us get on with it. This is one thing we have in our hands. It is the high technology of the breeder reactor, not the vehicle but the technology itself to place into focus the program and move ahead with it.

Mr. Chairman, this does not mean that the fierceness of my response is one of lack of respect and decency and honesty to every Member in this room, but I must point out that there is always a great challenge in life. We hear it said that "the operation was a success, but the patient died." Or we hear, "if I had only made the decision when the decision had to be made."

Or how about the fact of this statement: "More mistakes are made from the lack of facts than from poor judgment."

Here we sit with technological information ready to go ahead, ready to start. We fought this issue for 5 or 6 years. This is not a debate on technology; it is a debate on the future economic policy and sovereignty of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, to let this get away from us now would be one of the greatest travesties of justice I can imagine.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my fellow colleagues what brings me to the well is to clarify some points that were brought up by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BOUQUARD) and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs concerning the lands which are not available for the production of the very important uranium that exists within the State of Alaska.

My good chairman and I have discussed this many times before—and I refer to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL)—concerning the whereabouts of the known mineral resources within my State. In fact, contrary to his statement, one of the largest, if not the largest, single uranium finds in the United States is within one of the monuments designated by the President of the United States. I think that should be made clear. It is a valid existing right. It is there, but it will not be able to be mined because of its classification by the President of the United States.

I would also like to remind the Members—and I say this respectfully because on the floor of the House I have a great deal of respect for other people's beliefs—that the people who are promoting this amendment, this amendment that would kill a project that this Nation does need, are the same people who also spoke so reverently about locking my great State up.

I could not agree more with the gentleman who spoke just previously from the well. This Congress must act on the production of all facets of energy, including the breeder reactor, including the dams that must be built, including the wells that must be drilled, including the coal that must be mined, and yes, including geothermal and solar and all the other sources of energy. But, as the gentleman just said previously, this Congress in 8 years' time and certainly during the time I have served here has not passed but one piece of legislation that has produced 1 Btu. We did that because of an environmental lawsuit against the Alaska pipeline. We had to have a special act of Congress to override the special interest groups that have brought this great Nation of ours to a grinding halt under the guise of clean air and clear water and all of those good things that we hold dear to our hearts. But in the meantime not one new refinery has been built, not one new dam has been built, no oil of any significant value has been found, and the coal mines are below the level they were before World War II.

That, I say to my good friends, is what is wrong with this Nation today. Yet I hear someone tell me that we do not need all these different facets of energy, that we can wait. We can wait, but still we are sending $75 billion abroad to buy oil from the foreign countries.

I listened to the President who attacked the oil companies last night and placed the blame on their shoulders. Let me tell the Members where the blame lies. It lies upon our shoulders because we have responded to a special interest group, a group that is really the zero growthers, the nonexpansionists, this diverse group that says we cannot allow a man to reach his zenith.

And let me say to the Members that if we listen to them and do as they say, I hope the people will throw us all out because we do not deserve to represent this great Nation, we do not deserve to be here to put our people coming in future generations at the total mercy of those countries in the world that have really made us dope addicts. We depend upon energy.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members that to take away whatever facet we have to produce that energy is wrong. I urge the Members to consider carefully not only this amendment and defeat it, but, when we get to this floor in future months, as we must, to quit responding to that group that says, "no, no, no," and to this administration and the people who have surrounded the President and have given him ill advice. Let us get on with our act of producing energy.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The point the gentleman makes is, I think, extremely significant, and every Member of the Committee should understand this.

□ 1400

The administration's argument this year is that we have a plentiful supply of uranium to continue to build and supply light water reactors for many years to come and, therefore, the conclusion is that we do not have to go ahead with the breeder. But they are assuming that every ounce of uranium can be used. And that means, at the gentleman is pointing out, we have to go into the monument areas of Alaska and mine the uranium, we have to go into the other national parks of our country and mine the uranium, we have to go into every community where it exists and mine it all, so that we could continue to run our light water reactor plants. I do not think that is a choice that the American people would like to make when, instead of that, we could take the used fuel, which today we do not know what to do with, and turn it into fuel to run a breeder re-

actor. We could take our spent fuel—it is not waste, but many people think it is waste—and turn it into a natural resource.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that we are hearing these arguments with regard to energy. Every Member in this room—every Member in this room—has gone home time and time again and told the people at home, "I am doing my level best to produce the energy that this Nation so sorely needs." And yet here we are, saying that there is a quality to the energy that the United States needs. One is good quality, if it is produced a certain way, apparently if it comes from the oil out of OPEC nations, but if it could come from another source, we ought to consider that source, because that alone somehow makes a difference in the needs of this Nation with regard to its energy needs. And, frankly, I cannot believe that we are engaged in this kind of a discussion.

I have in the past had my doubts about this reactor, as some of the Members here know, and I am in no way the expert that some of the Members in this room really are, and I have never pretended to be; but I will tell the Members one thing—I did agree with the President when he spoke just a few short days ago, when he said that we must solve the energy problem.

Here is a potential of another solution. Let us assume—which I do not believe—but let us assume that it will not work. I do not think that is the case. Even if it would not work, it is still worth the money to go forward, it is worth the effort to go forward, to try to achieve a solution to the problems of energy in the United States today.

Also all those Members who are experts in this room today pro or con know that this process will indeed work. When you walk right over there to that door and flick the switch, when electrical energy comes through those lines and the lights go on, I doubt seriously that there is a man or woman in this Chamber who can tell you the origination of that power. Or, for that matter of fact, care a great deal.

Do the Members know what we spent so far? A little over $700 million.

Now let us talk about what it will cost to shut it down. It will cost, roughly, a quarter of a billion dollars, $250 million. This is nonsensical at a time when we are faced with problems in our economic world, it is nonsensical at a time when energy is of the utmost importance to this country, because Clinch River breeder reactor represents a solution. The abundance of energy represents a solution to many of our economic problems.

I cannot believe the insanity that we go forward with around here at times.

I am not asking for something that is unreasonable. I am asking for energy. And the American public is asking for energy. At this point I really beg of you, I truly beg of you, would you just reconsider what it is you are really doing here. Are you producing the energy that this Nation needs, or are you somehow involved in some emotional process? Maybe your egos are on the line. I honestly do not know what it is. All I know is, I told the people who elected me that I would do my best, my level best, to find the energy that is so important for this country to go forward—and by God, I am going to do it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is still in the Chamber.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am here.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I wonder if the gentleman can enlighten us as to where is this great uranium find he was referring to.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. If the gentleman will yield, it is north of Fairbanks. In fact, if the gentleman wants the specific location, it is north of Fairbanks, in the middle of the Yukon monument location. And when you pass the bill you cannot mine in a monument that is a refuge.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thought that was what the gentleman was referring to. It is in the White Mountains area.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It is beyond the White Mountains, farther north than the White Mountains.

Mr. SEIBERLING. The boundaries of the monument and the boundaries of the national wildlife refuge monument in the bill that passed the House are both drawn so as to exclude the great, vast bulk of the uranium finds in the White Mountains area. I just finished rechecking that point with the staff of the subcommittee. There is absolutely no question to it. I think it is important to set the record straight. We have taken great pains in the drawing of the national monuments in Alaska to exclude areas of high mineralization, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. We have discussed this before, and I do not want to use up the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN). The boundaries may be outside of it, but you cannot cross the monuments. There is no way you can mine that mine. As I said before, you can have land on the Moon with uranium, but if you cannot get to it you cannot use it. I do not want to use up the time of the gentleman from California, but I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, that we have discussed this back and forth and back and forth. All I know is this: If the gentleman is truly sincere in this, when this bill finally comes back to the floor there will not be any question in anybody's mind, including mine, that this mine can be mined for the needs of this Nation.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I am glad to hear such assurances from the gentleman, but let me say that the matter is already accomplished, as the House knows, having debated it at great length. There is full access guaranteed to all mineral claims within or without the national monuments in Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for just one other point which I think is important, there is more than enough uranium outside any national parks, outside any wilderness areas, to take care of the needs of this country far beyond the end of this century.

The gentleman from Arizona is absolutely right. We do not need to cross that bridge for a long, long time to come.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the contribution that both Members have made on my time.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of difficulty in getting emotional about this subject, having been through this argument so many times in the past. In fact, I have some difficulty in even developing the motivation to impose upon the time of the House to discuss it further. But I think it is important that we try to have a balanced discussion between the proponents and opponents of the Clinch River breeder reactor.

I began my relationship with the Clinch River breeder as a supporter. I served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during a brief period of time when the Clinch River project was within that jurisdiction, and since then, on the Science and Technology Committee. I have been persuaded by the facts, what I consider to be the facts, that it is not timely to go forward with the Clinch River project, but that it is important that we maintain a strong breeder research and development program and include in that program the preliminary design work on the next generation of breeders and on alternative methods of breeder design and operation.

This position has led me to join with my distinguished colleague who spoke so eloquently on this matter, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA), chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, in offering the amendment which he has presented. I cannot at this time go so far as to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona and by the gentleman from New York, the Udall-Bingham amendment, although I recognize that this amendment does reflect a growing sentiment within the Nation, a growing sentiment that is antagonistic to further development of any nuclear programs, at least until we can demonstrate that we have solved the problems of the light water reactor technology which we have in place in his country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

□ 1410

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the majority of the House is ready to support the Udall-Bingham amendment, but I hope that a majority will recognize the wisdom of supporting what I feel is the sensible and moderate position represented by the Fuqua-Brown amendment.

I think we have to have a nuclear program. I think we have to have a breeder program. The two are inseparable. You cannot have a permanent nuclear program without breeders.

All of those who have studied the situation even to a slight degree, agree on this. But I do not think that it is necessary to deploy for commercial demonstration purposes a breeder reactor at the present time. We have 30 years' experience with breeders. We have built breeders since the early fifties. We have built experimental breeders.

At one point, as I think most of you know, the utility industry thought they were ready to proceed with breeders without further Government help. They built the Fermi plant in Detroit.

That plant proved to be a failure. It had a partial core melt down during the process of testing after it was completed, and it was never put into service.

In fact, that is the reason for the Government in effect mounting a rescue operation for the utility industry by going into the Clinch River reactor program.

We would take over where the private utility industry failed, and we would build, primarily at the taxpayers expense, the next generation of breeders. Well, at that time we thought it was necessary. The evidence today is that it is not necessary.

What we are doing today in this House, as the debate amply demonstrates is that which the House does so well. We are going to gallop full speed ahead to solve an energy problem which does not exist. We are going to "fix" something that needs no fixing.

We all want to solve the energy problem, but the energy problem is not a shortage of electricity now or in the foreseeable future. Our energy problem is a shortage of liquid fuel, largely for transportation purposes. Only a small percentage of oil is used to generate electricity, and by the time and breeder technology can be deployed, it will be far less than it is today.

This shortage of oil is where our present energy crisis is. It will not be solved by generating breeder electricity. All available studies now indicate that we have ample resources of uranium and coal to meet our electrical generating needs until well into the next century.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my distinguished subcommittee chairman and to my colleagues in the House that the electricity generated in this country is composed of, some 17 percent, of about 600 million barrels of oil a year and that any electricity that is not generated by one of these other technologies or the coal that is not coming out of the ground must be made up for. Unless the lights are going to go out, that electricity or brand new forms of storage are developed, it must be generated by imported Middle Eastern oil, which is exactly what we are doing today.

Many regions all over the country are definitely dependent on Middle Eastern oil or OPEC oil that is coming in this country at vast and strangulation prices.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. His facts on the current situation are correct. We still today generate a small portion of our electricity from oil. We will not, by the time this Clinch River plant is on line or any future breeder technology, be doing that, which is the basis for my statement that the Clinch River breeder will not replace any oil, and it is oil that we are short of. It is oil that we have to have today.

If we go back to our constituents and tell them we have solved the energy problem by voting for Clinch River, if they know anything, they are going to laugh in our face.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Why do we set the temperature in this room at 78 degrees, and we are advised all over the country that public buildings set them at that, and set them back to 65 in the winter if there is no oil shortage? Why are we concerned about electrical energy then?

Mr. BROWN of California. I expect that it may be that it is good for your soul to suffer, more than anything else.

Let me make one or two other points as long as I have taken the liberty of usurping the time of the House in this fashion.

There are several other points that need to be made about this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. The GAO report has been referred to, and the GAO does support a continuation of the Clinch River project, but the report is worth reading, because it makes a number of points which should be made.

It says, for example, because of the uncertainties inherent in forecasting electrical demand rates, it is difficult to predict when commercial liquid metal fast breeder reactors will be needed.

This is true. We thought they would be needed in the eighties when this program was originally planned. Today, it is inconceivable that they will be needed before the year 2000, probably closer to 2020. The GAO report recognizes this.

It also says, for those of you who are wondering about the cost, that it will cost the Federal Government between $1.3 billion and $1.5 billion more to build the Clinch River breeder plant, than to scrap it. If you can save up to $1.5 billion by terminating a project which has no economic justification you are going to have a difficult time explaining to your constituents why you went ahead and wasted that extra $1½ billion.

The point has been made that the other nations are going ahead with these programs. Yes, some of them are. But not nearly as fast as you might think.

For example, the statement in the GAO report says that Britain is going ahead with the construction of a program. The fact is Britain is not going ahead. They are in a holding pattern right now. They have not selected a site. They do not have an approved site for their next generation of breeders. They will not even begin construction until they select such a site, and go through a lengthy public hearing process. It is indefinite at the present time as to when they are going to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman is talking about with respect to Great Britain is the British decision to proceed with a 1,000- to 1,200-megawatt commercial breeder plant. The fact is the British have had their equivalent to Clinch River, their breeder of the same size, in operation since 1973.

If we get ours on the line by 1987, which is the nearest estimate if we start now, we would only be 14 years behind the British.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. The status of the United Kingdom program is that no decision on future commercial breeder plants will be made until a public inquiry on that subject is concluded, and that public inquiry has not even begun. The gentleman is right. They have a plant of the size the gentleman indicated. I might say that the gentleman has in his own district a fairly good-sized breeder plant. We call it a fast-flux test facility, but it is a moderate-sized breeder reactor incomplete only to the extent it is not intended to supply power in a power network, but it is a breeder reactor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry to again rise to correct a point. The fast-flux test facility has no breeding blanket. It is a test bed only. It is one-third the size of the Clinch River plant, and of course, about one-tenth the size of a commercial plant.

Mr. BROWN of California. The point that I would like to make in conclusion is the point that I have already emphasized. We want to solve an energy problem. We want to do it in a timely, cost-effective way. Clinch River is not the way to do it.

The continuation of a sound, properly directed, research and development program as contemplated by the administration and as contained in the Fuqua-Brown amendment is the proper course to follow at the present time.

To do otherwise would be to seek to solve the wrong problem in the wrong way and at the wrong time and at a cost which cannot be justified.

I ask my colleagues to vote yes on the Fuqua-Brown amendment.

□ 1420

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in support of the Udall substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, several distinguished speakers have discussed the economics of energy and of the nuclear system, and I would like to address that subject.

We seem to be perplexed in this Nation as to why we have such things as inflation and recession at the same time. We do not seem to know what is wrong with our economy.

Actually, the answer is a rather simple one. The gentleman from New Jersey mentioned it. The fact is that energy costs in this Nation, and I am talking about almost all new forms of energy, from imported oil to nuclear energy, have increased as if they were on skyrockets. They have not increased over old forms of energy 10 and 20 percent, they have increased fourfold, sixfold, eightfold, all in the last few years. This has sent enormous shock waves throughout our economy, adding to the price of almost everything we use and everything we buy. Therefore, the Consumer Price Index has gone up at rates of 10, 12, and 14 percent a year.

Inflation, however, is the increased amount of money in the economy. What has happened is as the sharply increased costs of energy have occurred, the Government, we, have, through deficit spending and other devices, put the money out into the marketplace into the hands of people in order to cover the costs of this increased energy. Otherwise we say we would go into recession so, therefore, we have deficits and we increase the money supply causing inflation. The money has been increased to cover the cost of this increased energy.

Today we have a weak dollar and are slipping into recession at a time of staggeringly high inflation. Our Government's response is not to deal with the real problem, which is the high cost of energy. Instead, they deal with the symptoms. They have just raised interest rates once again to protect the dollar, and they are buying dollars on the foreign currency markets in order to keep the dollar from falling further. These are both highly detrimental to our economy. They will mean that the recession we are going into will be deeper, and longer and more dangerous.

There is an answer. The answer is obvious. The answer is clear. Our people today are continuing to live as if oil were $2 a barrel, not $20. Our people are continuing to live as if electricity were still 5 or 10 mills a kilowatt hour instead of 60, 80, and 100 mills a kilowatt hour. That is the reason we have turned down the lights and that is the reason that we must not squander energy in this Nation any more as we have done in the past when oil was $2 a barrel and electricity was 5 mills a kilowatt hour. We can no longer afford that.

The single most inflationary way to meet the energy problem today would be, of course, new production, because new production is extraordinarily more expensive than what we have today. Synfuels will cost probably twice as much as foreign oil. The fast breeder reactor will be so expensive, as we have already heard testimony, that people could not even afford to buy the electricity produced by the fast breeder reactor today, even with today's high energy costs.

There is one simple answer and that is addressed by the Udall-Bingham substitute amendment today, and that is do not go into these extremely inflationary new energy forms today, but to conserve what we do use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WEAVER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WEAVER. The breeder we all know is 25 or more years away. Nuclear plants take 10 years to build. But conservation can be implemented today, tomorrow, within 6 months, and it can cure our economic problems, the problem of inflation and recession at the same time. It is conservation which is the cheapest, safest and most immediate form of energy. We do not need to change our lifestyle. Both Dr. Schlesinger and the new book "Future Power" says we can cut down 30 percent of our use of energy in this country today, and they outline the details of how to do it without changing our lifestyle in any way. As a matter of fact, we would live better lives, cleaner lives, more disciplined lives and we would be a stronger Nation, and less dependent, of course, on foreign oil.

Just to conclude, I simply would say that that is the answer, the Udall-Bingham substitute amendment is the answer to really solve the real problems of this Nation. And if we do not, if we do not we are going into a depression. I am serious, we are going into a depression that will make the 1930's look like a pink tea party.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I think that the points made by the gentleman from Oregon are the most telling in this debate.

What we are about to do now is pour extra hundreds of millions of dollars into a technology which the recent Harvard Business School Energy Report indicates, contrary to widespread impression, "Even the world's most technically advanced breeder reactor development program (in France) is decades away from making any significant addition to that country's nuclear power supply." Today we have the opportunity of taking those extra hundreds of millions of dollars and not pouring them down a rathole into this technology. The breeder program is a bridge to our energy future that we do not have to cross until at least the year 2000. Let us cut through the haze and realize that we are speaking of long-term energy solutions, and that anything we discuss today will mean nothing for the short-term energy crisis of gasoline lines and shortages of oil. We need a coherent, intelligent productive, and safe energy system in the next century and today as well. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from New York would do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. MARKEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. WEAVER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. MARKEY. Will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARKEY. All we are saying is that when we must make that decision we do not want this bridge to be littered with white elephants like Clinch River or other near-term commercial breeder technologies that make it impossible for us. We would be far wiser today if instead we were voting to increase programs for energy efficiency and energy productivity, which do not receive the incentives and subsidies that the fast breeder reactor has traditionally received. So I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is an old debate, and unfortunately it gets less, rather than more, enlightening as time goes on.

But I would like to ask that today, just for a moment, we step down off this plane of vague rhetoric and sweeping ideological assertions about energy, and that we desist for a moment at least in the implication that support for the Clinch River breeder project is a test of our energy manhood.

I support the Fuqua amendment for one simple reason. It is simply too early

to commercialize breeder reactors and the breeder technology. I would suggest to my colleagues that they can support that position, the Fuqua amendment, without fear of being antiproduction or antienergy.

I happen to think that my proproduction credentials are about as good as anybody else's. If I had my way, I would decontrol oil now, I would decontrol natural gas now, and I would start digging for coal anywhere around this country Mr. UDALL would allow me to dig.

We do not have to worry if we support this amendment about being accused of being antinuclear. I happen to support careful development of nuclear power. And I have two plants in my district.

I took some satisfaction a couple of weeks ago when in committee we had a moratorium amendment, and I was able to help defeat that amendment.

□ 1430

I think what we have to recognize is, despite the severity of the energy problem we have in this country, we are not going to solve it by throwing globs of money at any project or any idea that comes down the pike.

I think we have to recognize that the problem is not entirely to maximize production, but it is equally important to minimize the cost of additional energy supplies we get in the future. I would like to suggest to the House today that we are not dealing with energy in the abstract; we are not dealing with energy independence; we are not dealing with gasoline lines or liquid fuel operations. We are talking about one simple question; that is, in the next two decades do we have the resources and technology online presently to produce the electrical power we are likely to need without commercializing the breeder in the nineties. I would suggest that we clearly have it in the form of coal and other technology, and we ought to get moving.

I think we need to recognize that this annual debate we have on Clinch River is simply a rear guard effort to keep a project alive that was conceived before 1973, and we have to recognize finally, after 6 years, that the energy world has changed entirely and completely; indeed, has been revolutionized, since 1973 when this whole project and this whole commercialization time schedule was designed. In fact, the insistence on building the Clinch River project or retaining that old commercialization time schedule reminds me of the flat Earth folks' insistence that Columbus was wrong.

There are three major things that have changed radically since the 1969–73 period when this time schedule and this project was designed. First, the rate of growth in electricity demand, and therefore all forecasts or projections for the year 2000, have collapsed, utterly collapsed. This project was based on the scenario of 7-percent growth annually in electrical demand. The fact is, it is growing at less than half that today, and the growth rate is likely to decline even further.

So therefore, instead of talking about the year 2000 in terms of 2,000 gigawatts of electrical demand, in terms of 1,000 gigwatts of nuclear capacity, today as we look ahead to the year 2000 we are talking about 800 to 1,000 gigawatts, half the electrical power. If we are talking about half of that from nuclear—and I do not see that given the regulatory crisis and the climate we have today—the fact is that we have more than enough uranium resources today in this country and around the world to support 2,000 gigawatts of nuclear capacity. If we do not start changing the regulatory process, we are not going to reach that at this rate. And new orders, in the last 36 months have been practically zero.

The second thing is a static thing. In 1970, the projected total rose 1.4 million tons. Today it has increased threefold, to 4.3 million tons. The fact is that when we hear this 2.4 million figure, that is the proven inventory. It is like saying that when you run a candy store, when you run out of candy on the shelves there will never be anymore candy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. STOCKMAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. STOCKMAN. The second thing we have to remember about the uranium supply is that the technological possibilities have improved, the efficiency of the enrichment process, and therefore our yield of nuclear fuels is increasing and will improve as we move toward the year 2000.

The third fact is that they are discovering large amounts of new uranium around the world, as was indicated by the Canadian discovery last year and renewed activity in Australia. As a matter of fact, it would be well worthwhile for Members of the House to pick up a copy of today's Wall Street Journal, where they will find that the market is predicting a collapse of the $40 uranium price because demand is continuing to erode and supply prospects improve.

The third thing that has changed is, simply and unfortunately, that the nuclear climate in this country has soured. That means that if we are to move from the current generation of technology we have proven, and hopefully we can license, into a totally new generation technology, by the time we get a licensable commercial breeder the costs are going to have escalated so violently that they will be well beyond the range anybody imagined in 1973 or in 1970.

That brings us to the bottom line. We are switching the technology of the relatively low-priced uranium, due to the fact that the demand was lower than was projected and the supply is likely to be better, and we are going to face, on the other hand, excessively high and uncertain costs for the advanced new technology embodied in this generation of breeders.

I suggest, therefore, that it is simply premature to move toward commercialization at this time. Let me conclude by saying that if one is a member of the pro-production group do not be intimidated by all this fierce rhetoric we have heard here today. Do not vote to waste $1.5 billion on a commercialization program.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks relating to the Clinch River breeder reactor. It seems to me he very effectively exposed three of the myths which surround the construction of the Clinch River reactor.

First, he talked about the energy manhood argument; if the Europeans are doing it, if the British are doing it, if the French are doing it, therefore we should do it. That is like saying that if they continue to use sail for vessels, that we should continue to use sail. That is myth No. 1.

The second relates to demand for electricity. The gentleman's figures, which Members should look at carefully, he is absolutely correct in saying that the situation has changed remarkably. We do not have that demand for electricity unless by building the breeder we are going to back out of oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. WIRTH and by unanimous consent, Mr. STOCKMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WIRTH. The first myth is the energy manhood myth. The second myth is the demand for electricity myth. The third is the uranium myth. As the gentleman correctly points out, we now have very significant supplies of uranium. As the price has gone up in the Rocky Mountain area, we are in the process of mining the tailings, and doing so at a profit.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I think that is a good argument. One of the reasons this is happening is that we do not have price controls on uranium. If we want to really get the breeder built, put price controls on uranium and we will have a supply shortage.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one point. The gentleman is entitled to his point of view. However, the gentleman talked about the Clinch River breeder reactor as being a commercialization project. I think the gentleman's assumption, if I can suggest it to him, is all wrong. The Clinch River breeder reactor is not a commercialization project. It is a demonstration project which is trying to help us to find out whether we should in fact try to commercialize a breeder reactor.

We are trying to learn whether this very important step is bad or whether we should go to commercialization. In fact, the gentleman may be right; it may be that when we build it and test it and find out what the problems are, what the commercial aspects are, we will find out that it is not a sensible policy. So, it is not a commercialization project. We had this argument 2 years ago. I thought that was done with by then. We were thinking of tomorrow's problems.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I would say that I understand the gentleman's argument perfectly. If I misspoke, then I apologize for that. But, clearly we are building a demonstration plant of this magnitude as the first step in a commercialization track that would begin in the nineties. I would like to make the point to the gentleman that there are literally hundreds of technologies we could possibly commercialize.

□ 1440

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STOCKMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. STOCKMAN. The point remains that we cannot spend a billion dollars to build a demonstration plant for every one of these technologies to find out whether it ought to be commercialized or not. We have to make some hard judgments ahead of time like the kind we have been discussing here this afternoon.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) just made a case about the fourth myth of this debate, and that myth is that somehow we are killing the breeder reactor. That is not the case at all. We are just going from a first generation to the next generation. Whether or not this is commercial is not the point. The point is, let us go with the most far-out, modern technology and not a technology of the 1960's. We are continuing the breeder technology; we are not killing it. And every Member who says we are killing it is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to associate myself with the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. WIRTH). I think this has been a most informed and informative discussion.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, we are talking about two amendments that do just about the same thing. The Brown-Fuqua amendment would kill Clinch River, very seriously weaken our energy program and make the United States look absolutely foolish all over the world. The Udall-Bingham amendment does that, but it does something more. After all they would kill the Clinch River, they would want to jump up and down on the corpse for awhile. But both amendments are killing it. I think it is important to understand that both of the amendments are equally damaging, equally destructive, and equally unacceptable. When we come to vote on them, I hope no one will say, well, I voted against that terrible Udall-Bingham amendment, but I am going to vote for that nice, soft, Fuqua-Brown amendment. Remember, the nice, soft, Fuqua-Brown amendment still leaves the corpse on the floor; and all of us embarrassed as can be, because the Clinch River project will have been killed, and we will be standing here with blood on our hands for it.

To speak just a minute to the Udall amendment, it not only kills Clinch River, it dramatically cuts the base program, cuts out funding for the Barnwell nuclear fuels plant, and then proposes to spend more money expanding the research and development programs that have been rejected, after thousands of scientific man-years of research and development have been conducted all across the world. Talk about Model T's. We went through two whole decades of figuring out which was the best breeder technology, and now as an excuse to kill Clinch River just because he assumes—maybe he does not know—he assumes we do not know, but all of this research has been done already, it is an excuse to do it all over again so we do not have to move for a breeder program, and we can spend another 20 years in research.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The fact of the matter is that the Udall-Bingham amendment does not propose any expenditures already in the committee bill. It is simply cutting them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe the gentleman will find that his amendment expands into other technologies, other breeder technologies, whether it is in the money or the words.

Let me talk just a minute about the costs involved in this thing. We act as though just cutting this program is going to allow us to walk away from it. There are various estimates as to how much it will cost to kill the Clinch River project. They vary from a billion and a quarter dollars to $1.5 billion. That is what we have got in it, and what it would cost to pay for our debts, probably to have some moderate lawsuits, pay interest on money that is invested, to do some testing on component parts that would have to be done, and so on. We would then have to start all over again to start another breeder project, which would be another LMFBR with exactly the same technology which we now have. I think it is important to understand that.

The next point is that they have been trying to scare us with the safety argument. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) talked about the safety of nuclear powerplants and the terrible uncertainty of this thing. The fact is that liquid metal nuclear plants are probably even safer than the extremely safe light-water plants we have today. The fact is that liquid metal does not boil away. You cannot lose it. When you put it down in the pot, it is simply there, and acts as a tremendous heat sink. It is a tremendously forgiving material. A liquid metal-cooled plant is a very safe machine. This is why all of the industrialized nations of the world—England, France, Germany, Japan, and Russia, and the low countries of Western Europe and Italy—all have agreed to go with the LMFBR.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is trying to scare us with the terrible word "sodium." Remember your high school days when you put sodium on the stove and watched it boil. Gasoline is a terrible scare word. Put it on your skin, and it will burn. The point is, we are not going to put sodium in the water. We put it inside the LMFBR, and we seal it up in there. Let us keep our thoughts in context here.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would the gentleman recommend using gasoline as the coolant for reactors?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. Sodium is much better. Gasoline is a fine coolant. Sodium is much better.

The point has been made that liquid fuel is our problem; electricity is not our problem. I would like to point out to the Members that this building is now running at an uncomfortably high temperature, and all public buildings are in this country, because we presumably do not have enough fuel for our electricity. I have a map here put out by the New York Times earlier this week that shows how much oil is being used on the west coast to generate electricity: 60 percent in New England; 35 percent in the Middle Atlantic States; 22 percent in the South Atlantic States; 77 percent in California. This is oil, most of it OPEC oil, being imported into this country and being used to generate expensive electricity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact is, as someone has said, they threw a red herring across the trail and said CRBR is not going to replace any oil. Do not go home and tell your folks it is. Of course it is not. It is an experimental test bed, a research reactor, to demonstrate how we would generate electricity with this particular size machine, this particular type technology. What it does is it gives the foundation for a decision to commercialize at some future date with intelligent information.

Over and over again we have had this

red herring about we should not be commercializing the breeder. Of course we should not be commercializing the breeder. We do not know enough about it. That is why we want to build this plant, so we can test it out and have the experience of building it and operating it, and have the engineering knowledge and the operational knowledge that would come from this operation, so that when we have to make the decision, when the fuel crunch is so tight, that we are going to know we are either going to have to stop building nuclear plants and start building breeder plants, and we are going to have adequate experience and knowledge to make an intelligent decision.

In spite of statements made on this floor earlier in this debate, the General Accounting Office report makes it quite clear, and over and over and over again in our hearings the testimony has made it quite clear, that that decision will very likely come in the early 1990's. By that time all of the uranium that is available, the known and probable reserves, will have been committed by the nuclear plants in operation or under construction at that time. By that time they will have been committed, and they will still be far short of requirements for energy, even with the most successful of conservation programs.

The point has been made that our electric growth rate has collapsed. The fact is that it is still 3.5 percent per year. It has been 7 percent, and it is now way down—all the way down to 3.5 percent per year. Do the Members recognize that a 3.5-percent-per-year growth rate still means that it doubles in 20 years?

"Oh, McCormack, that is just your opinion," somebody says. Just remember that is straight, pure mathematics, just as simple and basic as 2 and 2 are 4. A 3.5-percent-per-year growth rate means doubling within 20 years. By the end of this century, at the rate we are now going and with this colossal growth rate, we still must double our energy production capacity. These are facts we are facing.

The General Accounting Office report points out that we will not have enough uranium. It makes it quite clear. The question is, Why should they not kill Clinch River? Why should they not just take the easy way out? The fact is that we do not have an ongoing breeder program. Sure, we still have a basic program under the Fuqua amendment. But it would not be moving forward. We would not have the engineering experience and the operating experience we need to make intelligent decisions. And if we do not have that, we will not have the fuel when we need it and we would be putting ourselves in exactly the same position with respect to uranium in 1990 as we are today with oil, because we did not take intelligent steps 10 years ago. That is what this issue is all about.

There is another reason we should not kill this project: because of its impact on the free world. I have photographs here of all the other breeders across the world that I will share with anybody who wants to see them.

□ 1450

Breeders have been operating for as long as 7 years in England, France, and Russia. Russia is now building and finishing its second, and scoping a bigger breeder than anyone else in the world. And France, where they are building a 1,200 megawatt commercial breeder which will be on the line 4 years before we can have the Clinch River breeder on the line.

What about the impact on OPEC, and our friends who are depending on us? Killing Clinch River will be saying to them, we are really not serious about solving the energy problem. We really do not care. We ignore the fact that nuclear is one of the only two important energy resources we have to solve our problems in the present century and the early part of the next century. We ignore the fuel supply.

The question has been made there will be no benefits now from CRBR, so we should not waste the money. Yet we are spending $500 million for fusion research. All of which I applaud, which I supported, which I put in my bill. We are spending $1.5 billion over the next 10 years for photovoltaics research, under a bill that I sponsored, a bill I believe in. We have to do this with new technologies. They are expensive.

It is fundamental to understand that the GAO, writing for us, our GAO, the GAO of the Congress, has said that the administration's arguments on this issue are phony, they are unreliable, that we will need the breeder, we will need to make intelligent decisions on the breeder by the early 1990's and we cannot intelligently get there without CRBR. I suggest we kill both amendments. Vote no on both the Brown amendment and the Udall amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, we have had a long debate and there are other titles to get to. I would ask, for myself and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Fuqua), unanimous consent that all debate on the Udall substitute and all amendments thereto close at 3:05.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall)?

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there have been many of us, unfortunately, who, for one reason or another, were not members of the committee and I think a little more time would be in order.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I would revise my request that all debate on the Udall substitute and all amendments thereto close at 3:20.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Members standing at the time the unanimous-consent request was made will be recognized for just a little over 1 minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Wolpe).

(By unanimous consent, Messrs. Udall, Bingham, and Weaver yielded their time to Mr. Wolpe.)

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Udall-Bingham substitute, but want to spend just a moment talking about the important points of agreement between the two amendments that are before us today.

First, Mr. Chairman, both amendments that are being offered, both the Fuqua-Brown amendment and the Udall-Bingham amendment, agree and would mandate that the Clinch River breeder be killed. It should be killed because it is an obsolete technology.

If there is any question about that, the Committee on Science and Technology received direct testimony just a few weeks ago from Dr. Hans Bethe, one of the world's leading nuclear scientists who is certainly an advocate for the development of nuclear power and an advocate, moreover, for the development of the breeder concept and design.

Let me quote from Dr. Bethe's testimony before our committee:

> In my opinion, we shall need something like the breeder sooner or later. Perhaps a little later now than we thought a while ago, because the demand for power has increased less fast than we anticipated. But sometime in the not-too-distant future, we shall need a breeder or a similar device.
>
> Now, that breeder does not need to be the Clinch River breeder. In fact, the Clinch River breeder is rather obsolete. Such a long time has elapsed between the design of that reactor and the building, so that we would probably be better off to start from the beginning and to have a new design for the breeder.

The fact of the matter is we are being asked today to commit ourselves to an additional $1.5 billion expenditure for an obsolete technology that is incredibly wasteful and cannot be justified to the taxpayers of this country.

A second important point of agreement between the two amendments before us is that breeder research should, in fact, continue. Neither of the amendments that are before us today would even touch the $330 million authorization for the continuation of breeder research. That breeder research program would still represent the largest breeder research program in the entire world. So those who would argue that a vote for one of these amendments is a vote to kill a breeder research program are simply misleading this body.

There are two points of difference, however, between the two amendments. The first is that the Brown-Fuqua amendment mandates that we commit ourselves today to the development of a demonstration commercial breeder reactor. By 1981, under the terms of the Fuqua-Brown amendment, the Government would have to come forward with a specific concept, with a specific design, even recommendations for a specific site. The Udall-Bingham substitute amendment would postpone that decision to move toward commercialization of the breeder technology.

The second major point of difference between the two amendments concerns money. The Udall-Bingham amendment is $200 million less costly than the Fuqua-Brown amendment. That is $200 million that can be either returned as a saving to the taxpayer or set aside for the development of energy research

and development that would far more effectively address this country's most immediately pressing energy problems.

Much has been said about the relationship between oil and the proposal to commercialize the breeder reactor. The fact of the matter is today, only 9 percent of all of our petroleum resources are going to the generation of electricity. Fifty-four percent of our petroleum resources are going to transportation. Does this not suggest that our greatest research and development priority ought to be the development of alternative transportation fuels to reduce our petroleum dependency?

The end product of the breeder reactor is electricity. That is the least demanding end use toward which our available petroleum supplies are directed. I submit that to pretend that somehow we are impacting upon our petroleum dependency by commercializing the breeder reactor technology is simply, again, misleading. It is, rather, diverting scarce dollars that should be used to impact on the immediate energy requirements of this country.

This body is going to be tested many times in the weeks ahead. We are going to be told that the effort to use discretion, the effort to attempt to establish our energy priorities is somehow irresponsible. Every time there is a program that is going to be offered up in the name of energy, we are going to be told that our failure to support such a program is unpatriotic.

□ 1500

I submit that we simply cannot allow ourselves to be intimidated by that kind of demagogic appeal. We do no one any favor—not ourselves, not our constituents, not our country—when we abrogate our responsibility to establish our energy priorities and to insure that taxpayers dollars are used wisely and effectively. Just as other problems our country is facing will not be solved by throwing money at them indiscriminately, so the energy problem will not be solved by wasteful and irresponsible expenditures.

The test we need to apply in determining our energy research and development priorities is whether or not a proposed expenditure on one technology offers greater or lesser potential for reducing our dependence on petroleum than alternative expenditures. Our criterion, I submit, should be what research and development initiatives offer the greatest potential for displacing petroleum. What technologies and approaches will accomplish this goal most quickly, most cheaply, and with least public health and environmental damage?

In my judgment, the Clinch River breeder reactor and related proposals for "bigger and better" breeders badly fail this test.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOUGHERTY).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DOUGHERTY yielded his time to Mr. BADHAM).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BADHAM).

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing the future of America and what type of America we will have. We have been talking about what size and shape of America we are going to have in the future: Whether we are going to have a smaller America that is going to settle for hotter houses and buildings in summers and colder houses and buildings in winters and less food and less transportation and less production; or, whether we are going to have a greater and stronger America that can meet the challenges that we face now, have faced in the past, and will face in the future.

The Clinch River breeder reactor is just one symbol of this. Will we or will we not use technology and technological advances that we have at hand. The anti's say, "No, we should not." It is like saying there is no sense in having an army until we have a war or no sense in building a B-1 until the Russians are on the way to attack. Foolish.

Now, what we are talking about is a technology that Japan, the Soviet Union, France, Great Britain, and Germany, are all using and they are laughing at the United States of America because we will not use what we developed. Why not? Because we say that would be proliferation.

Well, what does that mean, proliferation, if the technology is already fact, existant, and used by friend and foe alike?

THE ENERGY VALUE OF BREEDER REACTORS

Breeder reactors represent a tremendous source of energy. They can extend our uranium resources by a factor of about 60 times. The energy value of uranium already mined and above ground—the byproduct of our enrichment operations that can only be used in breeders—is roughly equal to our total unmined coal resources or at least 3 times the total OPEC oil resources.

To walk away from demonstration of this vital energy source would be a clear signal to energy consumers and other nations that we are not serious about pursuing increased energy production to reduce worldwide shortages and perilous and costly dependence on foreign energy sources, such as the OPEC nations.

Almost every other industrialized nation is actively engaged in a strong breeder research and development program centered on an intermediate scale demonstration plant. These nations fully recognize the dramatic resource utilization potential of breeders compared to light water reactors (sixtyfold increase). France, Britain, and Russia are currently operating CRBR scale plants.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE VIEW

On May 7, 1979, the General Accounting Office issued a detailed report entitled "The Clinch River Breeder Reactor—Should the Congress Continue to Fund It?" Some of its highlights are:

> The Clinch River Project is not technically obsolete, and its intermediate size is a logical and prudent step in developing liquid metal fast breeder reactor technology.
>
> Terminating the Clinch River Project accomplishes very little in the area of nonproliferation.
>
> If the Clinch River Project is terminated, much of the $674 million already spent on it may be wasted.
>
> . . . it will be difficult at best and perhaps impossible to maintain a strong liquid metal fast breeder reactor program without building the Clinch River Project.

On May 11, 1979, the administration released a white paper detailing its criticism of the CRBR plant. GAO was asked to do an analysis of this document and issued its report entitled "Comments on the Administration's White Paper—The Clinch River Breeder Reactor—An End to the Impasse" concluding:

> GAO found that the Administration's presentation of several key issues and facts could have been more balanced and informative.

In reference to the White House paper, the GAO report is replete with words such as "misrepresentation," "omission of facts," "invalid assumption," and "highly questionable."

In another GAO report dated May 23, 1979, entitled "Nuclear Reactor Options To Reduce the Risk of Proliferation and To Succeed Current Light Water Reactor Technology," the liquid metal fast breeder reactor, or more specifically Clinch River, was clearly placed on an equal or preferred footing when compared on a number of bases with nine other advanced reactor concepts.

Specifically, the report calls for consideration of the next generation of nuclear power to be assessed against a broad range of social, political, economic, environmental, and technical factors—a path endorsed strongly by an international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation working group in a recent report. The report states that,

> No fuel cycle should be avoided solely on proliferation grounds if there are good and prudent economic and energy strategic arguments in favor of introducing it on an industrial scale.

THE CHALLENGES TO CLINCH RIVER

A number of the allegations which have been made by opponents of the CRBR demonstration plant should be kept in perspective:

Clinch River is the right plant: After 3 years of rigorous licensing review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the CRBR design has been updated to reflect safety standards consistent with conventional nuclear plants. CRBR represents a prudent 2½ times scale-up beyond the fast flux test facility and is a necessary low-technological risk, high-confidence step in the development of breeder technology. Many new technological advances are being incorporated into the CRBR design such as the new heterogeneous core announced only several months ago. Additionally, the abundant flexibility in the reactor provides the opportunity for U.S. leadership in demonstrating the practicability of fuel cycles which might come from the international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation (INFCE).

Clinch River will be operating at the right time: Experience in licensing, building, and operating an intermediate scale breeder demonstration plan will be

needed in the mid-1980's if prudent decisions are to be made by utilities about the long-term need for inexhaustible energy from breeders. Even if one were to accept the argument that commercialized breeders would not be needed before 2020, as maintained by the administration, we are already late with progress on CRBR.

Clinch River can be built at the right cost: It has been estimated that cancellation of CRBR would cost the American taxpayer more than $1.4 billion. This compares to a cost of going ahead with the project of $2.5 billion in year of expenditure dollars. More than 70 percent of the value of CRBR components has been ordered and fabrication of the order is half completed. Scrapping Clinch River and starting over on a new plant will undoubtedly cost a great deal more. The utility contribution to Clinch River is the largest commitment ever made by the industry-at-large—753 utilities participating—cancellation of the project would jeopardize the possibility of any future joint ventures involving private funds.

Clinch River is the right place: As a result of extensive review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Clinch River site was given approval as suitable from both a public health and safety and an environmental impact standpoint. The hearings, suspended by the administration, will provide the opportunity for full weighing of any remaining public concerns regarding the plant and its operation.

The Clinch River breeder reactor demonstration project is a vital element of the U.S. energy future—it deserves strong continued congressional support.

The Clinch River breeder reactor puts us on the road to the technology of the future which we must have. We cannot retrench. We do not want a smaller America. Americans might want somebody else to sacrifice, but Americans do not want to sacrifice themselves.

I do not want less. I want more. I think Americans want more, more production, more energy and the way to do it is not just with Clinch River, not just with nuclear power, not oil, not coal, not shale, not synfuels; we have to have them all.

Depleted uranium, not usable for light-water reactors in use today, is stored in canisters in Portsmouth, Ohio, Paducah, Ky., and Oak Ridge, Tenn. This uranium in energy equivalent is worth $20,000,000,000,000—that's right, $20 trillion. It is owned by the U.S. taxpayer and is already mined. The breeder reactor unlocks this energy source.

Three Mile Island, the most serious nuclear accident which ever occurred, resulted in no loss of life or injury to the public, and the investigation of this accident doubtless will further improve nuclear safety.

What are we telling private industry? We have encouraged them, "Come on out on the end of the gangplank with hundreds of millions of dollars to go in partnership with the Federal Government for a Clinch River breeder reactor."

What we are going to do? We will get you out there and cut off the gangplank.

Do you think any other private company in this United States is going to advocate going into partnership with the Federal Government that does that, constantly, time after time? The answer is "No." Clinch River is another symbol because of that.

We have a technology. For heavens' sakes, America, let us use it.

I do not want the lights to go out. America does not, either.

If you want to sit here and preside over a dark and cold America, be my guest, but I will not be with you. And America has more sense than to accept that archaic, head-in-the-sand-type leadership, or I should say nonleadership.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GORE yielded his time to Mrs. BOUQUARD.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FISH yielded his time to Mr. COUGHLIN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN).

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, today the House once again must debate and vote on the Clinch River breeder reactor demonstration project. This issue occurs at a particularly appropriate time when the United States must rally to meet the challenge of tighter world oil supplies and rising energy costs. We must decide today whether we continue with the full funding of our commercial liquid metal fast breeder program or reallocate our energy research and development dollars to other energy alternatives.

I rise in support of the Udall-Bingham amendment which would terminate the Clinch River breeder reactor project and throttle down the headlong rush for early commercialization of the LMFBR.

As my colleagues are well aware, the LMFBR program has claimed a disproportionate share of the U.S. energy R. & D. funds since 1969 and represents the single largest expenditure of nuclear fission research dollars.

It is the subject of huge cost overruns. Clinch River from $400 million in 1971 to $2.5 billion today. Engineering corps to design and build it cost-benefits "out of control."

The Udall-Bingham amendment would establish a technological design study which would require a careful and thorough study of all advanced fission technologies and not commit us directly to a plutonium reactor. In addition, the amendment includes $330 million for a broad, intensive research and development program on breeders, while deleting $200 million for the premature development of commercial LMFBR components and fuels. It also urges the Secretary of Energy to increase efforts on the light water reactors in order to address the safety problems highlighted by the Three Mile Island incident and which threatens the future operation of LWR's.

I have been in the forefront on efforts to terminate the CRBR project since 1974. I can imagine that my colleagues are well aware of the economic, technological, safety, and security arguments which I have repeatedly brought before you, so I will not address these points yet again.

However, I urge my colleagues to give very careful consideration to all three options which are open to the U.S. nuclear breeder program. Today this Nation faces an energy crisis. This shortage is in liquid fuels. Plutonium breeders will not displace the use of liquid fuels or be commercially feasible until after 2020. This Nation must find answers to the energy shortage over the next 10 to 20 years.

The committee bill will spend $670 million this year for the breeder development program with this amount increasing annually. The Clinch River breeder reactor project would consume almost half of this amount. I do not believe that this is the wisest use of our limited energy R. & D. funds. With an annual inflation rate of over 10 percent, the need to control unnecessary Federal spending becomes more critical. We must avoid overcommitment to a program which will preclude alternative energy development programs which could more immediately answer our energy needs.

I urge your support of the Udall-Bingham amendment. It provides a reasonable insurance policy for the United States in funding the world's largest breeder R. & D. budget, but avoids a commitment to an expensive and dubious demonstration project. This allows the United States to probe more economical, secure and safer breeder designs, and redirect energy R. & D. funds to encourage additional nuclear technologies and strengthen nuclear safety programs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the action of the Committee on Science and Technology in providing full funding for the Clinch River breeder reactor.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinch River breeder reactor demonstration plant represents only one of several energy options this country is looking at to replace its dependence upon fossil fuels, especially oil and gas. It is an important option, because as we move forward in the next decade or so, it is going to be more important than ever that we begin right now to find substitutes for the diminishing supply of the world's oil and gas.

Nuclear energy is one of our most significant options. As we look back a number of years to the 1950's, we see that the United States was truly the originator and developer of nuclear energy. We were unquestionably the leader in this field. In the atoms for peace program of that decade, we felt it was important to share our technology and our knowledge with the rest of the world, and we began a concerted effort of exporting nuclear technology. We invited to this country literally thousands of foreigners to be trained in our expertise of nuclear energy.

We have gone along during these years with a very aggressive program, and in

fact today, because of our leadership, the world enjoys a movement toward the use of nuclear energy, a safe use of the atom that will make up for the diminishing supplies of oil and gas.

Now we come to this administration, which all of a sudden has decided to change the policy of this country, to change the policy of nuclear energy use, and to precipitously close our doors to the advancement of atomic energy. It is strange that the United States is pursuing a unilateral energy disarmament policy and abrogating its leadership in breeder technology. It is understood that most other countries do not share our abundance of knowledge and our large resources of oil and gas, and so, therefore, these other countries are not following our leadership but are pursuing their own course in developing, demonstrating, and in fact building breeder reactors.

It is also very strange that this administration takes an entirely different approach than it does for the breeder regarding conventional nuclear powerplants, which I might remind the Members also can produce weapons-grade material.

The President has changed this country's position on breeder technology primarily based on his legitimate concern over the possibility of proliferation. And then, when that concern was proved to be basically false, he changed his reasoning to one of economics, an argument which is certainly debatable.

But how can you debate the worth of an energy alternative until we know by actual demonstration, by actual online effort, whether it is going to be economically feasible for this country to depend on it?

In my opinion, the answer to proliferation is one of action instead of default. We need a parallel technology effort in as well as diplomacy in order to dampen down the threat of proliferation of weapons-grade material.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues that I support the continuation of Clinch River for many reasons. Let me cite just a few.

We have so far spent over $700 million on this demonstration project, and it represents the culmination of some 25 or 30 years of research and development on breeder technology. So far, 75 percent of the equipment for the Clinch River breeder reactor has been ordered. The design is almost complete. All of the materials for the 11 steam generators to be required have been ordered, most of them have been received, and they are just now being fabricated and put together. If you kill this project, you will kill and destroy the many millions of dollars that have been so far spent on this plant. We will not receive commensurate value in return.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, there are over 753 utilities which have committed themselves to this project and have recently reaffirmed their support, and have already committed some $254 million to this project.

In addition to that, it is interesting to note the bipartisan support that has developed for the breeder. In addition, the NAACP, many labor organizations, business, the American people, and certainly the National Governors' Council support continuation of this demonstration program.

I say to my colleagues that one of the main reasons I think we need to demonstrate this technology is because the breeder reactor does represent an increased utilization of the available uranium supplies in this country and in the world. And let me point out that there is debate, there is uncertainty as to the amount of uranium left in the world. Some people will put the assured and probable reserves at a low figure of 1.8 million tons, as does the National Academy of Sciences. On the other hand the administration is very liberal and generous, and they peg it at 3.1 million tons, thereby saying we have sufficient uranium to delay the need for the breeder. But I think that uncertainty makes it even more compelling to vote down this amendment.

In my opinion, in order to assure the safe utilization of nuclear energy worldwide, the United States must continue its leadership. By voting this amendment in and canceling Clinch River, we would abrogate our leadership, our knowledge, our technical expertise, and certainly our ability to guide the rest of the world in the safe use of nuclear energy and the high standards that we have supported to date.

In addition to that, by canceling the Clinch River breeder reactor we would disrupt an industrial base which has been put together over the years. Termination of the Clinch River Breeder reactor would result in a significant loss in the program, more than 10 years' delay, and certainly an added significant cost. I think it is time, after all these years, to go ahead with this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. JENRETTE).

Mr. JENRETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal today in the debate about where we should be, where we are and where we should be going.

I think that we must look at it very closely as it relates to the complete cutoff of all of our programs.

I would say particularly, "Woe unto Moe," as far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned.

We must look at where we are going in the future. I think a meat ax approach of cutting it off completely would be irrational and would be wrong and I would ask particularly the Udall-Bingham amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to both the amendments that are pending.

I became a member of the Appropriations Committee that funds Clinch River 8 years ago. Up until the past 2 years every year since that time we have had requests for modifications and changes in the plan, modernizing, updating the plans for Clinch River.

Now we are being asked again today to wait to vote for an amendment that would provide for a study to come in 1981. When was the last time you remember a study being brought to us timely, on time?

The issue today is do you want an alternative? If you do, you had better vote down both of these amendments, because a vote for these is only a further delay in coming forth with a badly needed alternative to our energy problems today.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BAILEY yielded his time to Mr. MCCORMACK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, an aspect of this problem that I think has been overlooked, and I rise in support of the Udall amendment and that failing, in support of the Fuqua amendment; an aspect of that that has been overlooked has been the role of the United States attempting to carry on in regard to proliferation of nuclear weapons internationally. If Clinch River continues we will be in a much weaker position to exert an influence against the spread of nuclear weapons.

There is no hurry about the development of the breeder reactor, the commercialization of that approach. There is ample time. There is no real shortage that impels us to move in this direction. What we need is to wait for a technology that will give timely warning of diversion of the byproduct of the breeder reactor for weapons grade plutonium. That time will come. It is not yet at hand, but we ought to wait until it does arrive.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BOUQUARD).

Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Chairman, we truly are a great country and we are a free count. But one of the major reasons is because we are blessed with an abundant supply of energy. Our continued greatness is tied to the use we make of this energy abundance. Certainly the world looks to us as the technological leader, as the provider of technology to aid in the development of their Nation. We cannot abdicate our responsibility to our own country, or to our neighbors throughout the world. We have an obligation to develop and deploy technologies that meet the common needs of mankind. Clearly, one of the foremost of those needs is the availability of reliable, cost-efficient, abundant energy.

□ 1510

We know that we only have enough uranium, in assured reserves, to fuel about 250 light water reactors. Now if we limit our annual growth in energy demand to 4 percent per year, which is going to be a great accomplishment indeed; and, at the same time if we save through conservation one-third of our present energy consumption; if we look to solar for 5 percent of supply, if we

look to hydroelectric for 2 percent, and if we look to coal for one-third of our projected needs and we cut our imports of oil by one-half.

If we continue our domestic production at two-thirds at the rate we produce at the present time; if we can do every one of these things; we are still going to require some 400 light waterplants on line by the year 2000, if we are serious about meeting energy consumption need, and we simply do not have an assured supply of uranium, sufficient for even this highly optimistic projection.

Reference has been made to the issue of proliferation. I agree that this is a matter of concern but I truly believe if we can assure the world of an adequate supply of relatively inexpensive, abundant energy, this is going to be a far greater source of strength and stability that we can share with the rest of the world, than any nation can provide to its people from the acquisition of atomic weapons.

This certainly is the area in which we must work to see that not only do we have the vital energy supplies that we need, but at the same time we can say to the neighbors, "We will share our knowledge with you," we will also continue to have the energy we need not only for our technological advances but for our economic and military strength as well.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HILLIS yielded his time to Mr. WYDLER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Udall-Bingham amendment.

Some 10 years ago, when Clinch River was born, I was the manager of a rural electric cooperative. Our members invested their money in that project at that time, and I say at this time the rural electric cooperatives of America still believe that it is in the best interests of America to go on with the project.

Twenty-five years ago we were warned by responsible people that if we do not change our attitude toward energy, the day would come when we would be dependent on foreign sources. We are here.

I ask all the Members here, with the punitive attitude we have toward the oil and gas industry, if we eliminate the breeder reactor from our future energy sources, what will the price of coal be in 1990? What will the price of electricity be in 1990?

Competition is the best friend of the consumer.

Mr. Chairman, compared to a $60 billion foreign oil bill and compared to an $88 billion investment in synthetic fuels, a $1.5 billion additional investment in Clinch River for this country, with a $183 million downpayment, could be the best fiscally prudent decision that we can make for energy in America this year.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WYDLER yielded 1 minute of his time to Mr. RITTER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER).

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The GAO was set up to provide the Members of this body with information, with as objective and critical an eye toward the value of our expenditures as they possibly could provide. The GAO report makes mincemeat out of the Carter administration attack on the breeder program. The GAO report, in effect, says "Go ahead."

I notice that a lot of Members here who are constantly referring to GAO reports in other areas are ignoring this particular GAO report.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of energy we have in the year 2000 depends so much on what we do today, tomorrow, next week, and next month. Technology is not just a few hundred million dollars here and a few hundred million dollars there. Technology is people. It is time, what we have assembled, what this Congress has assembled in Clinch River, Tennessee, is more than just $700 million worth of hardware, $300 million in obligations, or $400 million worth of closing costs added on. What is there is teams of individuals who have dedicated a whole segment of their lives to making a reality out of a plan.

The breeder technology involves a human effort, a community effort, a commitment. To rip and rend asunder that kind of basic human team effort and community effort goes well beyond its dollar cost, and I advise the Members to watch with great caution that their vote on this amendment does not have the effect of performing deadly surgery on the Federal Government's ability and reputation to live up to its obligations.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROE yielded his time to Mr. MCCORMACK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, CRBR is not obsolete. It is not an obsolete technology, it is not an obsolete design. The GAO report makes that abundantly clear. Even the core has been redesigned during the last year.

While we have been moving along on this project, we have been updating it all the time. The technology is no different from that being studied for nuclear plants in France, in Russia, in Great Britain, and so on.

My next point deals with the suggestion that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) made about the threat of producing weapons-grade plutonium in CRBR. That argument had not been brought out before, and I am sorry it comes so late. I will try to respond to it with this one simple fact:

The conventional nuclear powerplants that will be on line in this country before Clinch River could be built will routinely produce 500 times as much plutonium as CRBR will produce. That is the same kind of plutonium in the same physical form. Those nuclear plants will produce 500 times more than CRBR.

To pretend that the Clinch River project by itself uniquely contributes to weapons proliferation is nonsense, and we should treat it as such.

We need to worry about weapons proliferation throughout the nuclear program, whether associated with breeders or conventional plants, but the fact is that the key to preventing diversion is not at the nuclear plant. It is at the fuel reprocessing center. This should be an international center, supervised by the IAEA, and with appropriate institutional and technological safeguards. This we can do without great difficulty. It is important that we not be frightened by the fact that the CRBR will produce plutonium.

This is not weapon-grade plutonium, even though it is plutonium. It is heavily contaminated with plutonium 240, and nobody has ever made a weapon with such material.

The next point is this: The administration's argument, which is the position of the Fuqua-Brown amendment, is that we should delay the decision to move forward with the breeder program. This, in turn, is based on the administration's forecast of what our electric energy requirements would be in the year 2020. That is 41 years in the future. So they are saying we should not start before 1985 because they know what our demands will be in the second decade of the 21st century.

How would you like to go back 41 years to 1938 and project our energy requirements and energy problems of today, and make policy on such predictions?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER).

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Udall amendment.

Mr. Chairman I rise in opposition to the Udall and Fuqua amendments to delete funds for the Clinch River breeder reactor project.

We are in the midst of the most severe energy crisis our Nation has ever experienced. Instead of hiding our heads in the sand about possible alternatives to expensive petroleum-based energy sources, we need to be continuing our efforts to develop alternative sources that will help to decrease our dependence in foreign supplies. The passage of this amendment would not help us to accomplish this goal.

The President has been very careful to try to agree with the energy proposals of the major energy-consuming nations of Great Britain, France, West Germany, and Japan. Yet he has not wanted to go along with their approach to breeder plants. These nations have been willing to take upon themselves some of the

obvious risks associated with the development of nuclear breeder reactors because of the significant contribution they can make to supplying electrical energy for their citizens.

If the United States is to free itself from its petroleum operated electrical generating plants and dependence on a nonrenewable source of energy, we must proceed with the development of a safe and efficient breeder reactor. How do we know the full potential of this type of energy source unless we are willing to take advantage of the opportunity to continue to construct and refine the ability of this unique form of energy production to continue to contribute to the energy needs of our Nation?

I can certainly understand the fear and emotionalism of many opponents to nuclear energy. But we cannot allow these feelings to cause the scientific possibilities to be ignored and result in this project being dismantled. We have invested too much time, money, and effort in this development to scrap Clinch River. If there are substantial dangers associated with the breeder reactor that warrant substantial concern, we certainly cannot solve them by shutting down the project.

We can only find these answers to these problems by working on them at the same time that the breeder reactor program is continuing. We cannot afford to close our eyes to this type of positive program. What we need is to take the concern of nuclear opponents and work on rational and realistic solutions to these concerns. No one ever solved this type of complex problem by running away and ignoring it.

The energy future of our Nation must not be allowed to be held hostage to any unfounded suggestions that we are playing with potential national disaster with breeder reactors. I do not deny that there are problems that do not exist, but I do deny that nuclear power cannot play an important role in America's future energy dependence. Just as we cannot afford to go into further nuclear development with a closed mind to past nuclear problems, we cannot go into our energy future with a closed mind about the contributions that the breeder can make.

Nuclear fission is the cheapest, safest, and cleanest source of energy available to help gain our energy dependence. We cannot suppress the technology that will be necessary to insure that this is also one of the safest sources of energy once the best and most appropriate safeguards are instituted. This can be assured only through continued work and development.

□ 1520

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members should be well aware of what they are incurring in the way of costs by terminating the Clinch River project. I would say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), who said it is an economy vote, that the gentleman should listen very carefully as to

The contract termination costs—and what it will cost the American taxpayers. I am being very, very conservative in this estimate—would be $135 million. You would have to modify the fast flux test facility so that you could test the components that we have built already and have for the project. That would cost about $300 million. The cost to cover the utility payback—and, of course, they have to be paid back, they have put in the money—and litigation over other uncompleted contracts will be about $375 million. The total termination costs would be $810 million. The funds we have spent on this project to date is $700 million. It would cost the taxpayers $1,500,000,000 for nothing.

I hope the Members will vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) to close the debate.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, we have been debating two amendments simultaneously. The Udall-Bingham amendment I think goes too far, and I urge a "no" vote on that amendment. The Fuqua-Brown amendment is the middle position. It provides us an opportunity to leap forward.

The Clinch River, if it went today, would not go into effect and operation until approximately 1987. It would take another 7 years after that before we have a commercial project. So if someone is trying to lead you to believe that the lights are going to dim because you voted for the Fuqua amendment, that is absolutely wrong. We have to rely on other near-term sources of energy before we get into the exotic technology that we are working on in the breeder.

So I urge a "no" vote on the Udall amendment and an "aye" vote on the Fuqua amendment, and let us get on with the business of this country's energy needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the strong decision of the committee, those who were here during the debate on the Udall-Bingham amendment, I strongly support now the Fuqua proposal. It is far superior to what the Science and Technology Committee brought in.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and urge a vote for the Fuqua-Brown amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 237, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—182

Albosta	Fowler	Nedzi
Ambro	Frost	Nelson
Applegate	Fuqua	Nolan
Ashley	Garcia	Nowak
Aspin	Gephardt	Oakar
AuCoin	Gilman	Oberstar
Baldus	Glickman	Obey
Barnard	Gonzalez	Ottinger
Barnes	Goodling	Panetta
Beard, R.I.	Gray	Patterson
Bedell	Guarini	Paul
Bellenson	Hall, Ohio	Pease
Biaggi	Hamilton	Pepper
Bingham	Harkin	Petri
Blanchard	Hawkins	Peyser
Boland	Heckler	Pritchard
Bonior	Hefner	Quayle
Bonker	Heftel	Rahall
Brademas	Holtzman	Rangel
Brinkley	Howard	Ratchford
Brodhead	Huckaby	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Hughes	Richmond
Burton, John	Ireland	Rodino
Burton, Phillip	Jacobs	Rose
Carr	Jeffords	Rosenthal
Cavanaugh	Jenkins	Roybal
Clay	Kastenmeier	Sabo
Conte	Kemp	Scheuer
Corman	Kildee	Schroeder
Cotter	Kogovsek	Seiberling
Coughlin	Kostmayer	Sensenbrenner
D'Amours	LaFalce	Shannon
Danielson	Leach, Iowa	Sharp
Daschle	Lehman	Simon
Davis, S.C.	Leland	Skelton
Deckard	Levitas	Solarz
Dellums	Long, La.	St Germain
Diggs	Long, Md.	Stack
Dingell	Lundine	Stark
Dixon	McDade	Stockman
Dodd	McHugh	Stokes
Donnelly	McKinney	Studds
Downey	Madigan	Swift
Drinan	Maguire	Synar
Early	Markey	Tauke
Eckhardt	Marlenee	Thompson
Edgar	Matsui	Traxler
Edwards, Calif.	Mattox	Udall
Emery	Mavroules	Van Deerlin
English	Mica	Vanik
Ertel	Mikulski	Vento
Fascell	Mikva	Waxman
Fazio	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Fenwick	Minish	Weiss
Ferraro	Mitchell, Md.	Williams, Ohio
Findley	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wirth
Fish	Moakley	Wolff
Fisher	Moffett	Wolpe
Fithian	Mottl	Wylie
Florio	Natcher	Yates
Ford, Tenn.	Neal	

NOES—237

Abdnor	Broyhill	Duncan, Oreg.
Addabbo	Buchanan	Duncan, Tenn.
Akaka	Burgener	Edwards, Ala.
Alexander	Burlison	Edwards, Okla.
Anderson, Calif.	Butler	Erdahl
	Byron	Erlenborn
Anderson, Ill.	Campbell	Evans, Del.
Andrews, N.C.	Carney	Evans, Ga.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Carter	Evans, Ind.
	Chappell	Fary
Annunzio	Cheney	Flippo
Anthony	Clausen	Foley
Archer	Cleveland	Ford, Mich.
Ashbrook	Clinger	Fountain
Atkinson	Coelho	Frenzel
Badham	Coleman	Gaydos
Bafalis	Collins, Ill.	Giaimo
Bailey	Collins, Tex.	Gibbons
Bauman	Conable	Gingrich
Beard, Tenn.	Corcoran	Ginn
Benjamin	Courter	Goldwater
Bennett	Daniel, Dan	Gore
Bereuter	Daniel, R. W.	Gradison
Bethune	Dannemeyer	Gramm
Bevill	Davis, Mich.	Grassley
Boggs	de la Garza	Green
Boner	Derrick	Grisham
Bouquard	Derwinski	Gudger
Bowen	Devine	Guyer
Breaux	Dickinson	Hagedorn
Brooks	Dicks	Hall, Tex.
Broomfield	Dornan	Hammer-schmidt
Brown, Ohio	Dougherty	

Hance	Marriott	Shuster
Hanley	Martin	Slack
Hansen	Mathis	Smith, Iowa
Harris	Michel	Smith, Nebr.
Harsha	Miller, Ohio	Snowe
Hightower	Mineta	Snyder
Hillis	Mollohan	Solomon
Hinson	Montgomery	Spellman
Hollenbeck	Moore	Spence
Holt	Moorhead, Calif.	Staggers
Hopkins	Moorhead, Pa.	Stangeland
Horton	Murphy, Ill.	Stanton
Hubbard	Murphy, N.Y.	Steed
Hutto	Murphy, Pa.	Stenholm
Hyde	Murtha	Stratton
Ichord	Myers, Ind.	Stump
Jeffries	Myers, Pa.	Symms
Johnson, Calif.	Nichols	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	O'Brien	Thomas
Jones, N.C.	Pashayan	Treen
Jones, Okla.	Patten	Trible
Jones, Tenn.	Perkins	Ullman
Kazen	Pickle	Vander Jagt
Kelly	Preyer	Volkmer
Kindness	Price	Walker
Kramer	Quillen	Wampler
Lagomarsino	Railsback	Watkins
Latta	Regula	White
Leach, La.	Rhodes	Whitehurst
Leath, Tex.	Rinaldo	Whitley
Lederer	Ritter	Whittaker
Lee	Roberts	Whitten
Lent	Robinson	Williams, Mont.
Lewis	Roe	Wilson, Bob
Livingston	Rostenkowski	Wilson, C. H.
Lloyd	Roth	Wilson, Tex.
Loeffler	Rousselot	Winn
Lott	Royer	Wright
Lowry	Rudd	Wyatt
Lujan	Runnels	Wydler
Luken	Russo	Yatron
Lungren	Satterfield	Young, Alaska
McClory	Sawyer	Young, Fla.
McCloskey	Schulze	Young, Mo.
McCormack	Sebelius	Zablocki
McDonald	Shelby	Zeferetti
McEwen	Shumway	
McKay		

NOT VOTING—15

Bolling	Flood	Mazzoli
Chisholm	Forsythe	Pursell
Conyers	Holland	Santini
Crane, Daniel	Jenrette	Stewart
Crane, Philip	Marks	Walgren

□ 1530

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walgren for, with Mr. Santini against.

Mrs. Chisholm for, with Mr. Philip M. Crane against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Marks for, with Mr. Daniel B. Crane against.

Mr. LIVINGSTON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1540

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAVROULES

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAVROULES: Page 2, line 17, strike out the period and insert "and $27,400,000 for atmospheric fluidized bed system."

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, before I get into my statement I wish to commend the chairman of our Committee on Science and Technology, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) and also the subcommittee chairman and the members for a commendable job in their performance in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to set aside $1.5 million to cover the cost for an additional project for small scale atmospheric fluidized bed combustion technology, by redirecting already existing funds within the combustion systems programs.

The advancement of such a technology is in the interests of this Nation as it strives for energy independence.

Industrial steam generation consumes one-sixth of this Nation's energy. I am talking about over 4 million barrels of imported oil a day.

As a step in remedying this situation, the fuel use act and the Department of Energy's industrial applications program are directed at converting utilities and large industrial boilers from oil or natural gas to an alternative fuel like coal.

But no consideration has been given to the possibility of converting the small industrial and commercial boiler market.

Such boilers, as well, consume a large percentage of foreign oil imports each day, and unlike the larger boilers that use residual oil, these smaller ones use precious distillate fuels.

Our course of action should be clear: We must advance the small scale technology proposed in this amendment.

For if coal could be burned in small industrial and commercial boilers, the large volume of distillate presently consumed in these systems could be directly converted to heating oil, gasoline, or diesel fuel—areas where it is most needed.

In the past, the reasons why the small boiler market was not targeted for conversion to coal was largely economical. But the technological advances in second generation fluidized bed combustors have changed all of that.

Today is our opportunity to promote this technology and call for demonstration projects for small, clean, coal-burning systems.

One final point, Mr. Chairman.

Some of the criticism leveled at the Department of Energy has been its failure to bring more small business participation into its research development, and demonstration programs.

And yet these smaller concerns play an important role in our economic development as a whole and can play an even greater role in dealing with the energy problems shared by every man, woman, and child in America.

They should be encouraged.

The funds I ask for would speed up significantly the availability of this technology, which is a positive step toward our energy independence.

Almost as important, these funds bring the resources of the small business concerns to bear on a problem of national dimension.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVROULES. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. FUQUA. I also hope the gentleman will yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER). We have had a chance to examine the gentleman's amendment. I think he makes a good point and the fluidized bed for small boilers is a technology that we need to put some additional emphasis on as far as I am concerned, and I am willing to accept the amendment. I think the gentleman from New York feels likewise.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVROULES. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. OTTINGER. I agree with the gentleman and the chairman and I congratulate the gentleman on his amendment. This amendment would provide for a redirection of $1½ million from a pressurized fluidized bed project which is to be canceled and thus it will add no additional funds. The funds would be utilized for an innovative, small atmospheric fluidized bed combustor, producing less than 20,000 pounds per hour of steam and utilizing a 2-stage combustion approach. The project has many advantages. It would be of a size of interest to small users, smaller than those currently marketed. It develops a concept that permits efficient operation at low-load factors, which has been a problem for most fluidized bed units.

It is sufficiently developed in small sizes to have application within the next 5 to 7 years. I think it is a worthwhile project and I am happy to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVROULES. I am pleased to yield to the ranking minority member.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say on behalf of the minority that we have no objection to the redirection of funds. I compliment the gentleman on his amendment.

Mr. MAVROULES. I thank the gentleman very much. With those statements, Mr. Chairman I would yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MAVROULES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOLDWATER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOLDWATER: Page 10, after line 10, insert the following:

(4) Intermediate Scale Technology Demonstration Project (site unspecified)—

(a) The Secretary shall promptly initiate and carry out a project, as provided in this section 107(B)(4), to construct a technology demonstration repository capable of receiving up to one thousand (1000) tons of solidified nuclear wastes. The Secretary shall take the steps necessary to insure that such repository shall be capable of operating by September 30, 1985.

(b)(1) As soon as practicable, but no later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make a preliminary determination on (A) the location of one or more sites suitable to serve as a technology demonstration repository, and (B) suitable techniques and methods for the design, construction, and operation of a technology demonstration repository. In making such determination, the Secretary shall specifically consider candidate sites located on Federal Government lands in basalt media at Hanford, Washington, and in tuff or granite media within or immediately contiguous to the Nevada Test Site.

(2) The Secretary shall report his preliminary determination to both Houses of Congress by written communication within fifteen days after the date such determination is made.

(c)(1) Within six months after the preliminary determination required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall select a specific site for a Federal technology demonstration repository and suitable techniques and methods for the design, construction, and operation of such repository. Upon selecting such site, techniques, and methods, the Secretary shall (A) submit a report to both Houses of Congress specifying the reasons for making such selection and an estimate of the total costs of such repository, and (B) authorizes the initiation of detailed design activity and completion of site—specific geology directed toward the ultimate construction and operation of such repository.

(2) Any actions taken under this subsection shall take into account, as fully as possible, the preliminary determination made by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(d) The Secretary shall authorize construction of the technology demonstration repository if he finds that there is reasonable assurance that the detailed design for the construction of the repository, including necessary structures related thereto, can be implemented in a manner compatible with the use of such site for such repository.

(e) The Secretary shall submit to both Houses of Congress a report, by not later than September 30, 1980, specifying the construction schedule for the technology demonstration repository; Provided, That such schedule shall insure that the repository is in operation by September 30, 1985. Such schedule shall, to the maximum extent possible, include specific dates for the commencement and completion of construction on such repository.

(f) As soon as he deems necessary, the Secretary is authorized to acquire (by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise), construct, operate, and maintain such facilities, major items of equipment, and real property (including, where appropriate, any interest therein) as may be necessary to meet the objectives of this section. Fee title to all such facilities, items of equipment, and real property shall be vested in the United States.

(g)(1) The Secretary shall provide funds, by contract (to the extent provided in appropriation Acts), to initiate, continue, supplement, and maintain research, development, and demonstration activities which are necessary to carry out his duties under this section. The Secretary may enter into such contracts with any person.

(2) Each contract under this section shall be entered into in accordance with such rules as the Secretary may prescribe under the provisions of this section. The Secretary may enter into contracts under this section without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5).

(h) In carrying out the project, the Secretary shall consult with the heads of appropriate Federal agencies and other persons as he deems fit.

(i) For the purposes of this section 107(B)(4)—

(1) the term "nuclear wastes" means the high-level radioactive wastes, and transuranium contaminated wastes, resulting from civilian nuclear fuel reprocessing operations;

(2) the term "technology demonstration repository" means a federally owned and operated test facility in the form of a physical structure or earthwork capable of permanently disposing of nuclear wastes, and shall include underground and supporting facilities necessary to receive, prepare, conduct tests with, and permanently store such materials; and

(3) the term "operation" means testing carried out in the technology demonstration facility to insure that nuclear waste management technology is demonstrated in an integrated fashion.

(j) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, to carry out the project. Any amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall remain available until expended, and any amount authorized for any fiscal year prior to the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, but not appropriated, may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year through the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983.

Mr. GOLDWATER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will help us press forward with our energy program. I offer this amendment jointly with my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER). Our amendment would direct the Secretary of Energy to build and operate a demonstration test repository for the long-term disposal of nuclear wastes by no later than September 30, 1985.

The issue of nuclear wastes is of considerable importance to the Nation, and is a problem which has already been neglected for too long a period of time. Our Nation must face this problem now or we may have to face the prospect of closing our nuclear plants in the near future. We have already been forced to limit construction of new nuclear plants in some areas of the country due to the public's perception of the nuclear waste problem, and we must act now to assure that this situation gets better, not worse.

During our hearings on the DOE authorization bill, I was disappointed to see that the Department of Energy has still failed to establish a comprehensive nuclear waste management program. We have heard the administration talk for quite a long time now about their intention to develop such a program and build a permanent repository, but as far as I can tell, no actions have yet been taken to get the job done.

We in Congress must take the necessary actions now to help our Nation solve its energy problems. Our amendment allows us to proceed with the construction of a critical energy project. It sets the timeframe for building the nuclear waste test repository that this Nation badly needs. Under this amendment, the Secretary is also directed to consult with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, EPA and other appropriate parties in carrying out the nuclear waste project.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that we need to take these actions now. The Nation needs a firm policy to manage our nuclear wastes. Our amendment would help us to establish that policy. For this reason, we urge our colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have had this amendment under consideration for a number of days. In our subcommittee we had hearings on legislation similar to this, but for a somewhat more aggressive program and a larger facility. Because of the fact that the administration has been so slow, and because of the fact that the technology does exist, I am going to accept the gentleman's amendment.

I think everyone will agree that it is, if anything, an optimistic amendment in its goals, but I think the time has come for this country to set out to develop a waste repository and to demonstrate that we have the technology for totally removing all of the nuclear wastes from the biosphere whatever, and this amendment will accomplish that goal. I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOLDWATER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment comes at a very appropriate time. As the gentleman pointed out, various States are taking the position that until the waste disposal problem is solved, whatever that might mean, they do not want to go ahead with nuclear development.

I think it is incumbent on the Federal Government to start moving forward with a demonstration project. I think the amendment the gentleman has offered gives us that opportunity. I am pleased to accept it on behalf of the minority.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is tailored to address the real need for a solution to the nuclear waste dilemma without getting bogged down in more studies. The Congress has been presented with overwhelming evidence that technology can assure safe isolation of nuclear waste in a "permanent" repository; that is, for periods of hundreds to several thousand years, is well in hand.

The technical experts agree that the time is ripe for action on the front. However, the administration's Interagency Review Group (IRG) on Waste Management has neither set a firm goal for demonstration of such waste isolation nor stressed in a positive manner the tremendous depth of experience of the Federal Government in nuclear waste technology. This amendment presumes that such a reasonable goal should be set and on that basis mandates a timetable for construction of and testing in an intermediate scale technology demonstration repository. It is fitting that this be described as a technology demonstration facility because it is indeed a first-

of-a-kind facility. It will be built at a scale large enough to demonstrate that we have the technological answers in hand.

The selection of sites for this important facility is based on the fact that these two areas have been heavily subjected to either extensive nuclear weapons tests (Nevada) or to experiments involving handling of nuclear materials (Hanford) to such a degree as to be considered contaminated. The GAO pointed out this preference in their report on waste management. This concept of a technology demonstration repository is perfectly consistent with the strong congressional sentiment which has emerged for "fast-track" or "priority" energy projects.

There is no reasonable basis, I believe, for objecting to the inclusion of nuclear projects, particularly one as critically needed as this, in the category of "fast-track" activities.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that all the pieces are ready to be fit together. The technology for packaging the waste has been demonstrated, the site-specific geology on the location of the demonstration repository is straightforward and remains to be done. It is time that we proceeded to integrate these answers on technology and geology.

I hope my colleagues will support this in the spirit of enhancing the nuclear energy supply option.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in congratulating the gentleman from California for offering his amendment, and particularly for getting it accepted. I have joined with the gentleman from California in introducing legislation which does substantially what his amendment would do.

I think we ought to recognize that in this period when we are facing an energy crisis, that we cannot afford to put any kind of energy to one side, particularly nuclear energy. Until the Three Mile Island incident came along, which gave the antinuclear people a new shot in the arm, the major objection to nuclear power was the fact that we had no way to dispose of the waste products. That was a misunderstanding. There is no problem with disposing of the waste products. The experts tell us that these can be encased in glass, for example, and buried in the desert and be perfectly safe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. STRATTON and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOLDWATER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. STRATTON. If I can conclude my remarks, there is no problem about getting the waste situation solved. The problem has been, as the gentleman from Washington has said, in the leadership. There has been no effort to mobilize the resources of the country to deal with this problem of collecting the wastes and burying them somewhere. This is exactly what the gentleman's amendment would do. I think it is a major step forward.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment offered by my friend and esteemed colleague from California. I would like to commend him on his remarks that speak so clearly to the heart of this issue. I would like to take a few moments of the time of the House to further discuss this issue which is so crucial to the long-term energy security of the Nation.

At the outset, it should be clearly understood that this amendment is a recognition of a political impasse insofar as development of adequate nuclear waste storage facilities is concerned. There is no technological impasse that can reasonably be construed as standing in the way of this measure. The interagency review group, set up by the President to study this issue, would like to create the feeling that there is a fog of technological uncertainty surrounding the question of nuclear waste storage. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The House has heard ample testimony from a wide variety of sources, that we presently possess the know-how to safely and economically deal with nuclear wastes. The reprocessing and long-term storage of nuclear wastes is going on at this very moment in Japan and France and the irony of it is that they are employing technology that has its roots, if you will, right here in the United States. Yet here we sit without so much as a pilot project to facilitate further study and implementation of nuclear waste disposal. It is an unfortunate state of affairs when a small group can paralyze the Nation's progress on establishment of needed nuclear waste storage.

Allow me, if you will, to illustrate the degree to which this problem at the Federal level has spread to the States. As a member of the Resources, Land Use and Energy Committee of the California State Legislature, I was close to the energy issue and the questions surrounding nuclear power generation in particular. In 1978, the California State Assembly considered a bill which would have exempted the Sun Desert nuclear reactor near Blythe, from a 1976 State law, precluding the further licensing of nuclear power plants in California until the Federal Government has demonstrated the technology for long-term storage of nuclear waste. The State senate overwhelmingly passed the legislation to exempt this particular project from the State law, but the bill became bogged down in the assembly energy committee. The rationale used to kill this bill was that there was no Federal effort directed at solving the nuclear waste issue.

This situation in California illustrates two problems created by this Federal inaction. First, the absence of a demonstration program has placed many States in the position of uncertainty regarding long-term nuclear waste disposal. Second, the lack of progress on this issue has created an aura of doubt surrounding the disposal of nuclear wastes, doubt that has raised concern over the use of nuclear energy per se. This baseless fear has acted to delay the development of a sorely needed alternative energy supply.

There is the additional danger that this inaction, spawned by ignorance of the facts surrounding nuclear waste disposal, could result in a real crisis by the middle of the next decade. Testimony by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has indicated that storage capacity for spent fuel rods will be exhausted at many reactors by the mid-1980's and that these reactors will have to be shut down if an alternative means of storage of nuclear wastes is not established. This bill is designed to alleviate this problem by mandating that a demonstration nuclear waste facility be completed by September 30, 1985.

This amendment proposes the most basic of nuclear waste storage facilities that can be used to demonstrate the feasibility of dealing with such waste. The amendment calls for the Secretary of the Department of Energy to select either Hanford, Wash., or the Nevada Test Site as a site for the demonstration repository. The facility must be operational by September 30, 1985. The amendment calls for the Secretary of DOE to report to Congress upon determination of a site and when a construction schedule is determined. These last provisions insure close congressional oversight of the project and will enable us to monitor the progress of DOE in complying with the mandate of the amendment.

In his recent address to the Nation, the President stressed the need for "fast tracking" vital energy related projects. I feel that this emphasis on his part is a recognition of the present and future problems that this Nation faces. This amendment is, in a sense, a "fast track" solution of a future dilemma that deserves the support of the House. I strongly urge your support of this amendment.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Just very briefly, I am advised and informed and persuaded that if we are able to reprocess the so-called spent fuels that we are generating from nuclear power plants that are on line today, that will be a very valuable source of energy for the future. I hope that the gentleman in his amendment would make sure, through langauge or through report language or further amendment, that the spent fuels and the long-term storage will take advantage of this tremendous pool of energy, and that the energy so stored therein would be retrievable so that it would not be stored in such a way that it would not become retrievable, as it

would be if it were stored willy-nilly and be irretrievable.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The gentleman makes a good point. It is a point that once we decide on a policy of reprocessing, we should be able to retrieve those fuels from the repositories.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding. I rise in support of his much needed amendment.

Let me ask my colleague, because I was not present at the committee hearings, why no later than September 30, 1985? Why not 1982 or something to speed up the process?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I feel the same kind of urgency.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Especially in California.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is just a matter of the facts. The 6-year period was chosen because it is the current best estimate of the time required for site selection, architects, engineering, and construction. The administration is talking about a longer period, but I personally think we have studied this to the point where we are able now to proceed in a minimum amount of time, which would be 6 years.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So the gentleman is setting 6 years, which is in fact the quickest time?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think that is a reasonable time frame.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. DANIELSON and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOLDWATER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I support the amendment. We have not done enough in the disposal area. We must take the lead. This demonstration project is a good first step. I hope it will lead to many more important steps in this area. I think the gentleman is on the right track.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly join in the gentleman's amendment and compliment him.

I was just wondering if he has decided in whose district the disposal site would be. Maybe the gentleman would like to have it in his district.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That decision is left up to the Department of Energy in consultation with the gentleman from California, as well as myself.

Mr. DANIELSON. There will be a lot of consultation.

□ 1600

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his amendment and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I read in the gentleman's amendment as follows:

(f) As soon as he deems necessary, the Secretary is authorized to acquire (by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise), construct, operate, and maintain such facilities, major items of equipment, and real property (including, where appropriate, any interest therein) as may be necessary to meet the objectives of this section. Fee title to all such facilities, items of equipment, and real property shall be vested in the United States.

First of all, can the gentleman tell me, the amount authorized in the amendment is $5 million; is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. For 1980, yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Can the gentleman tell me what is the total cost of the land acquisition, the construction, and the other things that would go with the plant?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is anticipated, although not specifically stated in the amendment, that it would be on Federal land. There are suggestions in the amendment that sites be examined in Nevada as well as the State of Washington. The estimated total cost is approximately $350 million, based on architectural-engineering estimations on salt depositories.

Mr. DINGELL. What is the date of those previous estimates? When were those estimates made?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Those estimates, according to my facts, were made within the last 3 or 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(At the request of Mr. DINGELL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOLDWATER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DINGELL. What is the date of those estimates?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The estimates are based on the last 1 or 2 years. I do not know the exact timing, but they are recent studies.

Mr. DINGELL. Recent studies? Is it years? A couple of years ago?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not have the dates.

Mr. DINGELL. There is a tremendous importance in the costs, in the dates of the studies.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Obviously, the costs are very important. The best estimates I have are approximately $350 million. Obviously, when we get into the engineering program, we are going to be able to pin costs down more closely.

Mr. DINGELL. But it is not a new estimate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is not an estimate based on today. It was based on, several years ago.

Mr. DINGELL. If this is going to be placed on Federal land, why is condemnation authority needed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The amendment does not proscribe precisely the location.

Mr. DINGELL. I thought the gentleman had advised me that this was to be on Federal land.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is not specified in the amendment. However, even though it is anticipated that it would be on Federal land, it is possible that the site would not be. This authority is made available in the latter case.

Mr. DINGELL. What the gentleman is really telling me is he is not sure where it is really going to be put, whether it is on Federal land or not.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, I am not.

Mr. DINGELL. Can the gentleman tell me whether any studies have been made or any criteria laid down with regard to what would be the area or the kind of area, or the kind of structures in which the repository of this nuclear waste would be placed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. To my knowledge, it could be in a number of locations or geological formations that have been studied, such as the salt formations located at the Hanford facility or the salt formations in New Mexico.

Mr. DINGELL. Have these studies been completed with regard to the different formations and where they would be?

Mr. GOLDWATER. These studies have been completed, and there have been ongoing studies, and they will continue to be studied.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think I can help clarify this. The fact is that the Department of Energy is presently conducting studies in different parts of the country in different types of rock formations, in very large salt formations at the Hanford project, the granite formations in Nevada, and a couple of other formations, in tuffs, which is a type of volcanic rock. At the present time these studies have been, of course, going on for a long time, and they are continuing. They are expanding.

Mr. DINGELL. Are they complete?

Mr. McCORMACK. They will probably never be complete, I suspect, not for 50 years.

This year they will be putting heaters, electric heaters, in these facilities to study the effect of heat, and within a year they will be putting in canisters of waste that have already been made for a demonstration in research, canisters of spent fuel just for research purposes. But, after all, it is a fairly simple

concept. One digs a shaft like a mine shaft several thousand feet into the Earth in a stable geologic formation, pushes tunnels in the side, and then puts holes in for these canisters to be put into. It is handled by remote-control equipment. We are really ready to go ahead with the project; otherwise I would not have agreed with the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DINGELL. Can the gentleman from California tell me, these studies have not yet been completed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the gentleman from Washington addressed himself to that particular question.

Mr. DINGELL. Have there been any recommendations from the DOE, from the NRC, or from the USDA with regard to this matter?

Mr. GOLDWATER. This is a subject that is not new. I am sure the gentleman is well aware of that. It has been discussed. There have been recommendations.

Mr. DINGELL. Are there any official recommendations?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The point of my amendment is to quit discussing it and quit recommending and to proceed with a definitive program. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Have the States been consulted with regard to this?

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) has raised a very significant issue that clearly must be dealt with by our Government in order to meet the needs of a nuclear program.

This amendment directly affects the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee and the committee chairman must regretfully object to it and urge my colleagues to reject it. The Interior Committee has jurisdiction over the siting and construction of permanent repositories for nuclear waste. Mr. GOLDWATER has introduced a bill similar to the amendment before us today, H.R. 1852, which has been referred to our committee, along with the Science and Commerce Committees. The amendment includes provisions which are highly controversial and which should be fully considered prior to enactment. These include:

First. A deadline by which a repository must be constructed which is 7 years earlier than the most optimistic projections of when that could be accomplished.

Second. A requirement that the Government pay for construction of a small-scale repository which would only hold 1,000 tons of waste. Such an idea was rejected by interagency review because it would be a huge investment for too small a use. Repositories are expected to be designed to hold about 10,000 tons of waste.

Third. The repository could only accept for storage wastes from civilian reprocessing operations. We do not have enough such waste to fill the repository. The repository could accept neither defense high level waste nor spent nuclear fuel from power reactors.

I hope the House will agree that this amendment is not an appropriate addition to the DOE authorization.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHARP. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the gentleman may be a little bit misled here as to what is going on. The gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) did have a bill of his own, which is one bill, but the amendment he is offering today is not similar to the original bill that the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) submitted to the House. The bill today is similar to H.R. 4818, which was referred by the Parliamentarian of the House to the Committee on Science and Technology only. So there is no question of jurisdiction involved in this amendment. I think there is confusion in the gentleman's mind, and if he would check it, he would see that this problem really does not exist in this particular amendment.

Mr. SHARP. I will tell the gentleman from New York that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, among others, has jurisdiction over licensing and siting of some of these projects and will clearly have a role to play in this. I am sure if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) were here, he would vigorously defend that role.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHARP. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I think the gentleman points out a very important problem. It is not enough just to solve these problems by rewriting the Federal statute. In other words, the problems that affect nuclear storage, that is to say, long term or, as the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) pointed out, permanent, is a very serious problem. For instance, the gentleman from Washington points out that these shafts are sunk through, I guess the testing he is talking about, rather stable geologic formations. But the thing is we are talking about tens of thousands of years that these materials would have to remain in a semipermanent type of repository. We are not talking about a very light topic.

□ 1610

In addition, of course, we are saying we should demonstrate this and we should demonstrate this capability very quickly, but we also ought to do it on the basis of what we know and what we do not know about this period.

As the gentleman from Washington pointed out, there are a number of studies that are going on, the salt depository studies that are carried on show a certain amount of plasticizing of the material. These salt caverns which were at one time thought to be bone dry have water going through them. Also hydration, as my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), indicates.

This is not a simple "yes, we ought to go ahead; no, we ought not." The problems that emanate from a permanent disposal site will be with us for a very long time. Everyone would like to solve that problem. We would like to solve that threshold thing. I think the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have worked out away-from-reactor storage proposals in this measure which will provide the most prudent way to go so we can meet the near-term needs in terms of spent fuel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. VENTO, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SHARP was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I think we should have a look at that proposal as being a near-term solution and then let the studies go on, as the gentleman from Washington pointed out, with the heat and the different geologic formations, the chemistry and minerals and substances in these rocks so we do not end up creating any more problems.

We have temporary storage on site, for instance, which has been expanded, it is controversial, it ought to be controversial; we are talking about away-from-reactor storage here and this proposal which will negate any negative effect that is coming with regard to nuclear power in terms of meeting the storage needs.

I agree there has been a great deal made out of long-term or permanent storage and, indeed, there ought to be. There is a basic question about whether we are going to reprocess materials or go into long-term storage. Those are questions that are of some moment and we are not going to solve that problem by just setting up another problem with a demonstration, permanent type of storage which will create more problems than it will really solve.

I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SHARP) yielding. I would urge we vote against the Goldwater amendment at this time and deal with the type of solution that has been thought out and constructed in this bill with regard to the away-from-reactor storage.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I would just add I think a vote against this amendment in no way suggests an absence of commitment and an absence of concern about getting on with a clear-cut policy on permanent storage of waste materials in this country. I think it is a question of the prudence with which we move on the issue and, therefore, I would urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect and affection for the author

of the amendment. I also have great respect for the committee system. I am not able to tell the House where this amendment would go. A more careful reading of the amendment and an analysis of the comments made by the gentleman from California indicates the House should proceed with rare care in adopting this amendment.

The gentleman tells us on the basis of surveys this program is going to cost $350 million. However, he said that the surveys and studies are old. This means we may be taking on a liability of double that or triple that and, if the gentleman from California can deny we are taking on a $700 million to $1 billion liability, I will yield to him right now so he can deny it.

Mr. Chairman, a reading of the amendment is very interesting. The gentleman from California says that the storage program will take place on public lands. However, later he tells us that the Secretary—as the language of the amendment reads, that as soon as he deems necessary the Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation or otherwise, construct, operate and maintain such facilities, major items of equipment, real property including, where appropriate, any interests therein which may be necessary to meet the objectives of this section. Free title to all such facilities, items of equipment and real property shall be vested in the United States.

So, essentially, we are taking on apparently a large land acquisition program. Now, there are some other things about this. The Department of Energy shows us the program cannot be completed in terms of preparing the studies necessary until 1984 or 1985. This means that we will not be ready to engage in a sensible program of site selection, which is authorized by this construction, which is authorized by this, reprocessing of the waste or converting it into solids until at least that time.

Let me read you the last paragraph, if you want to hear some curious language. This is curious language that literally sets my hair on end as a legislator.

I read from paragraph (j) of the amendment:

> Any amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall remain available until expended—

Now, that is all right. It is subject to a point of order but it is all right—

> and any amount authorized for any fiscal year prior to the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, but not appropriated, may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year through the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983.

Now, we have here a proposal which falls in the jurisdiction of three committees, the Committee on Science and Technology, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It must be pointed out while hearings have been held in each of these committees, no hearings have been held on this particular proposal. The Department of Energy tells us they are not ready to go forward on the program and, indeed, there are provisions made for going forward in an intelligent and a rational way in connection with the West Valley program. We have programs to permit the vitrification of waste up there and to finally move toward an intelligent resolution of the handling of that particular waste.

The program calls for only 1,000 tons, but it is not beyond the realm of possibility, given the amount of waste that is here and everything else, that we might wind up with a 10,000-ton program.

If we are troubled about the fact we are setting up a large program we might think about where we are going to put it. It has been said that it could be put in salt domes. Well, all of a sudden we find out salt domes are not dry, that water exists in the salt domes, that salt domes exist in the region of aquifers. The heat of these processes which go on in connection with nuclear wastes will cause it to melt down through the salt and will cause water hydration which is present in the salt to release itself with the result that these bodies of solidified waste will sink to goodness knows where, perhaps until they go down to some aquifer.

Now, perhaps that is not a problem here, I do not know. Perhaps we have ourselves a very nice and tidy resolution by simply saying we will have a program in place by 1985.

Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to think the Congress of the United States would want to proceed on the basis of careful studies which would analyze and find out where this is going to be done. In other words, whose State, whose geographical area, whose congressional district is going to be blessed with this? What kind of formation is going to take place?

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from New York. Perhaps he wants to tell me he wants it in his district. I will yield to him if he does want it.

Mr. WYDLER. No, and I do not think those kinds of remarks really help the Committee arrive at a sensible solution to a problem.

Mr. DINGELL. Well, I am raising questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has expired.

(On request of Mr. SHARP, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DINGELL was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I will be glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that those kind of comments really help.

What I tried to do is give the gentleman some thought. This amendment is, in effect, a bill that was introduced here in the House of Representatives. I tried to tell the last gentleman, the number of the bill is H.R. 4818——

Mr. DINGELL. And no hearings have been held on it.

Mr. WYDLER. No, that is true, but it was referred to the Committee on Science and Technology.

Mr. DINGELL. And what the gentleman is telling me is that in its wisdom the Committee on Science and Technology has not gotten around to considering legislation. And that wisdom, I must confess, I probably applaud.

Mr. WYDLER. If the gentleman will let me finish he might want to agree with me, I do not know, but at least if he would let me finish my thought.

Mr. DINGELL. I am always anxious to agree with the gentleman when he is right.

Mr. WYDLER. If the gentleman would let me finish my thought it might be helpful.

Mr. Chairman, this was sent to our committee so there is really no jurisdictional question here. The reason it was sent to our committee is that this is not the American program for waste disposal. This proposes a demonstration project so that we can try to find out how a waste disposal system might work so that the gentleman's committee, in due course, in considering how to proceed with the matter, might have this experience in its possession so it could make a wise and informed judgment.

□ 1620

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the point the gentleman raises; but will the gentleman deny that we have a demonstration project here in the form of the West Valley project which the gentleman supports?

Mr. WYDLER. Well, I certainly do.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman disagree with the project?

Mr. WYDLER. Of course, I disagree with it. If the gentleman would consider the fact that at West Valley what we are proposing to do, and this would be part of that if the gentleman would think about it.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not aware that this says this will be the West Valley project or that it shall be joined with the West Valley project.

Mr. WYDLER. I am trying to tell the gentleman——

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will permit, the way I read it, the way it says we are going to have two projects.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. What we are trying to do at West Valley, and that is proposed in this bill, too, is to take the liquid waste at West Valley and solidify that waste and put it somewhere, so we are going to have to take it somewhere. It would be very nice if we were to have a project where we could take it and deposit it to find out how the waste disposal system works.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not have any problem with that.

Mr. WYDLER. Then why not support the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. But as I read this, this amendment also authorizes a program of solidification and other things with regard to waste.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. There are places we can put that waste. We can put it in Hannaford, we can put it in Sheffield, Ill. There are a number of sites where it can be placed.

What we are talking about here is a permanent disposal site for nuclear waste. I guess that is the intent of it. That is the way I read it.

The point is that if we would use basic logic, if we would use the best information that we had available at one particular time and the dominant concept in what was the appropriate waste, we would not put it in some salt domes that ended up having water come into them, which definitely represented a danger in terms of the problem, in terms of permanent waste.

Now, in addition to that, I do not think we need that type of experiment or demonstration with regard to this type of waste. I think that the author of this amendment and I have the same goal; that is, of course, to eventually solve the problem of permanent or long term storage of nuclear waste.

It does not do us well, we are really going to set back the cause of solving that if, indeed, we create another problem when we dump into this before we have all the information, before the studies are done, before we give the opportunity to the departments to come up and testify.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. DINGELL. I think the gentleman raises an excellent point. There are several points here.

One thing that my good friend, the gentleman from New York ignores is that in the amendment it authorizes practically a whole duplication of the West Valley project; so instead of one demonstration project—well, I will refer the gentleman to section G(1).

If the gentleman will read it, the gentleman will find he is authorizing a whole other project. So now we have the West Valley project and we have another project.

The author of the amendment says it is going to cost $350 million. The gentleman says it is going to be on the basis of old figures. I do not know how old the figures are, but I know that old figures have a way of doubling and redoubling when you talk about estimates.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VENTO. In reading the amendment, it talks about there is hereby authorized to be appropriated by the Secretary not to exceed—you know, that sounds to me like an appropriation bill in an authorization bill. That is what it sounds like to me. I think the gentleman read that and meant to make that point.

Mr. DINGELL. I read that and I am referring to subsection J, which is the last paragraph in the amendment.

The responsibilities we are assuming here in this amendment, which has never been heard by any of the committees of jurisdiction on which the Department of Energy indicates they cannot meet the deadlines, that they have no talent to carry this matter forward in the time fixed, when we have other demonstration projects under consideration, makes very poor sense and the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important, a couple of things are important to understand. First of all, we are talking about a test facility. We really are not getting into the turf of other committees with a test facility. We have already determined that in our agreements on this bill that we have before us today.

Second, we have had hearings in the committee on the Goldwater bill from which this amendment was redrafted into a much smaller proposal and a much smaller operation.

In the testimony before our committee, the representative of the Department of Energy said in response to this sort of a discussion:

> We think that the use of intermediate scale facilities if such an acceptable opportunity were available would be useful from a technical point of view in terms of the knowledge generated.

And so on.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is the key point. We are talking about a small technical facility, some place in the country where using whatever the Department of Energy believes is the best rock formation for this test at this time, we make a small facility and take the waste that we have available and put it in as a test.

Now, we will have the West Valley waste and when it is classified under the West Valley program, it will simply be stacked in the canyon at West Valley in the canyon building there. We will want to move it someplace. It is a beautiful opportunity to test out the concept of storing this waste underground.

Now, I think one may legitimately criticize the idea of bringing up this big package as an amendment to a bill on the floor. I wrestled with this problem myself. I toyed with the idea of what to do with this, because I think that we have to move forward, and yet I have problems with putting this big an amendment on a bill.

I think the thing to remember is this. We are not going to have another opportunity at this this year. If we do not put this amendment for this test facility on this bill now, we are going to lose a year in the United States in demonstrating the storage of nuclear waste.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is my understanding correct that this committee has had two sets of hearings on this issue this year and last year? Is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Twice?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So that the argument that there have been no hearings is not true.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not correct. There have been hearings held on this subject.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee and the House have to consider the quandry we are in as a nation if we ever want to solve the nuclear waste problem. I am sure all of us realize that those who do not want nuclear energy use the argument that we have a waste problem and we have not solved it yet as a very good argument against nuclear energy in general. It is a very good argument.

The proponents of nuclear energy want to solve the waste problem; but then when we try to solve it, we immediately run into a question where somebody comes forth, as we have it now, saying that unless you can solve the whole problem here and now with a total answer to every question that can be raised, we are not going to go forward.

Well, we are putting ourselves in a situation where we will never deal with this problem. We have got to take it one step at a time, and this is an intelligent first step from which we will learn and from which the other committees will be able to exercise their jurisdiction wisely and well.

So I would only suggest to the House, this is an important first step on a long road that this country and the world has to follow to totally solve the nuclear waste problem; but if we do not take the first step, we are not likely to make much progress at all; so I hope the House and the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we solve that problem; but I would ask that we not be quite as irrational as those that suggest we oppose nuclear power.

Yes, it is being used, because it is somewhat a legitimate argument; but it is not a threshold decision right now in terms of whether we build or do not build nuclear powerplants; but there has to be a resolution of it. By crowding this in, you are liable to do more damage to your cause than if you actually agree with the proliferation of nuclear powerplants than you are to do good.

You are not going to solve this simply by adding this language.

So I would ask the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from New York to wrestle a while more with their consciences and I want to assure them that the Interior Committee has had innumerable hearings on waste disposal over the last years. Let us continue the research work in this area. We have somewhat of a start and let us continue it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. VENTO, and by

unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his point.

I think there is one thing that we have to remember here. I do not think I am exaggerating the case when I say this is our only chance this year. If we do not do it now, we lose it this year. I think we are all of us adults enough to know that this bill has got a long way to go.

□ 1630

It is going to go into conference, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are going to be involved in the conference with a bill from the Senate which has similar figures in it. I am anxious to work with the Members of the other body in conference on agreeing to a compromise and responding to the issues that have been expressed. But we should do something now, and I think if we recognize this as a vehicle and a starting point, we can work together and get something that is worthwhile passed this year.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that if wishing could make it so, then we would have a solution right now to the long-term waste disposal problem in this country and in other countries. But we have not yet had any conclusive proof that there is a satisfactory long-term answer which scientists can even agree that we ought to go forward on, on a permanent basis.

There is still a substantial difference of opinion in the scientific community as to whether or not there is either a facility or a technique which deserves to have a consensus of opinion from the scientific community. Instead, there is substantial opposition from within that scientific community.

I think this amendment proposes the people who live near Hanford, Wash., the Nevada test site, and possibly Carlsbad, N. Mex., among others, will be subjected to an experiment. I fear that the areas that are proposed for the construction of these facilities would be endangered by the repositories, and they may become the victims of a dangerous thermonuclear Ponzi game.

While we enjoy the political benefits of claiming to have solved the nuclear waste problem, we are saying to other people, "We are going to experiment with you in long-term waste disposal." And then if it does not work out in 10, 20, or 30 years, we would say that today we were simply not willing to accept the fact that we can store nuclear wastes away from reactor sites or in expanded on-site storage. Indeed, we can do this for another 10, 15, or 20 years by reracking the spent fuel storage pools and licensing away from reactor facilities. But no, this amendment would rush pellmell into an ostensibly long-term solution of this question without having had a sufficient scientific, investigatory analysis of the prospective sites now being analyzed by the Department of Energy and other Federal agencies. If this amendment is approved today, I think what we may have done is rush to judgment without any need to do so.

Those Members who are proponents of nuclear power can stand here and say to those of us who believe that there has not been a satisfactory answer to many questions that we are being obstructionists, and that we are being in our own way reactionary. That is not the case at all.

What we are saying is that the Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, as part of the Interagency Review Group on Nuclear Waste Management, all say that proceeding to a first repository in the next year would be a very dangerous proposition. There is major scientific field work, there are field investigations, and there are engineering studies which are all necessary prerequisites before we can assure the safety of that first site.

Let me call your attention to the final report of the Interagency Review Group, which was comprised of 14 Federal agencies and chaired by the Department of Energy. They just returned in March of this year their final report, and it is the most definitive work which to this point has been done. It states that there are major scientific, engineering, and institutional questions with respect to long-term nuclear waste disposal. The earlier Federal mood of easy optimism has now clearly changed.

The Interagency Review Group analysis states that the first permanent waste repository could not be completed until 1988 or 1992 at the earliest. I think this finding is something that should not be taken lightly. It should not be dealt with in an on the floor, lack of full analysis manner, with no scientific environmental analysis, and with the offering of this kind of an amendment.

I think that continued surface storage of nuclear waste is possible through the period of time that the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) is addressing. I think the gentleman indeed is the one who is prejudging this question.

I think it is important for us to understand that surface waste disposal will bring us to 1985, the period with which the gentleman is concerned. We have the time needed to allow us to make a careful analysis of all the technologies which are being considered. At the same time, surface storage will preserve the gentleman's right to continue to be an advocate of the nuclear industry. But based upon the facts that are arrived at by the National Academy of Sciences, by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, by the Department of Energy, the U.S. Geologic Survey, the EPA. I remain at this point unconvinced that it is possible for us to have a site on line by September of 1985, much less than that proposed for later years, which is what the agencies which have responsibility for this are recommending. In fact, on June 27 before the Energy and Power Subcommittee hearing on nuclear waste storage, Dr. Worthington Bateman, Acting Deputy Under Secretary of the Department of Energy, testified that the 1988-92 time frame is optimistic.

So I would urge all of those Members, whether they be nuclear proponents or opponents, to recognize that any judgment which is made at this time is premature and it is ill-conceived. The amendment which is being proposed here by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) is ill-advised at this point in time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it will ultimately lead to an endangering of the environment and those human beings who are in the near vicinity of any waste disposal facility which is selected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. SHARP, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARKEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and point out that this amendment requires that the Department of Energy establish a nuclear waste repository to be in operation no later than September 30, 1985. And that is so whether or not we have adequate information and whether or not the studies that are still on-going at that time are favorable or unfavorable.

Furthermore, I point out that this is hardly just a small demonstration, and that the facility contemplated here, which is called a technological demonstration repository, is to be capable of receiving up to a thousand tons of high-level radioactive wastes and transuranium contaminated wastes resulting from civilian nuclear fuel reprocessing operations.

This is a very substantial facility indeed, going well beyond any scientific demonstration stage.

Lastly, I would like to express my severest concern about short circuiting or the possible short circuiting of NRC licensing review. I think that the NRC is gradually building for itself some credibility in the field of assuring public safety. Short circuiting that agency is going to lead to grave doubts in people's minds about whether indeed the public is being safeguarded.

The amendment does not indicate whether the repository should be licensed by the NRC. However, the time frame indicated by the amendment would not enable the NRC to conduct a thorough licensing investigation and review of the proposed site or facility, even if it were decided that NRC should make that review. So the licensing has not been mandated.

Mr. Chairman, I think for even the proponents of nuclear energy it would be unwise to proceed with a large-scale facility of this kind before the studies are actually in.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I agree that this is not really a pro or con position on the question of nuclear power. The question is how we are going to move prudently to solve the critical pollution problems that we face.

It is very clear in this bill that we provide for the conducting of tests on how to handle the storage of nuclear wastes in the ground. It is clear that we move ahead with $70 million for permanent sites for the storage of nuclear waste. It is also clear that the proposal pending before us is not simply a research and development project; it is a full-fledged facility that has to be licensed.

This clearly falls in the jurisdiction of other committees outside the Committee on Science and Technology. It should be reviewed thoroughly by them.

The amendment has the question of a deadline in it, and it establishes the construction of a considerable and sizable facility at considerable expense. I do not think that we should set a waste disposal deadline, Mr. Chairman, and the adoption of this amendment, I believe, would only feed the fuels of public doubt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. OTTINGER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARKEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I should say that this is not a pronuclear or an antinuclear question. It is a prosafety question.

We have ample facilities already with reactor storage and onsite storage which makes it possible for us to keep securely and safely the waste which we have right now, and we can do that into the indefinite future—50 years or a hundred years, if we have to, until we establish a safe method of permanent underground disposal.

I think a judgment which we would make right now would be premature. It is a judgment that does not have to be made. It confuses decisiveness with a logical decisionmaking process. I think for us to make a decision right now would be to prejudge criteria which are made by people far wiser than those of us on the floor of the House of Representatives during a debate which takes place in half an hour or an hour on this question and which has such long-term ramifications for the health and safety of the people of this country. We do not need a crash project. We need a safe project.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the adoption of this amendment.

□ 1640

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

A few facts: Cost of facility:

The DOE Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Waste Management, April 1979, serves as the basis of the $350 million cost figures.

Thus, we are within 3 months of that time.

Site selection. The two priority sites are Hanford, Wash. (basalt formations) and the Nevada "test site" (granite). These are already contaminated areas and they do not now involve Federal intrusion, condemnation, buying up of other private lands, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are being asked by our constituents: What about the waste disposal problem? What are you doing about the waste disposal problem?

I think we have made some progress in this energy bill. I think this amendment goes a long way toward furthering that progress. This amendment is not pulled out of thin air. The Committee on Science and Technology and the Subcommittee on Energy, Research, and Production have gone over the question of waste management and disposal time and again in the last several years. This amendment results not from in haste, as the opponents state, but over time, with a studied consideration of the different variables.

It is so interesting, to me, that some of the biggest opponents to progress in the area of nuclear energy, of moving ahead with safety, are the same people who have time and again risen on the floor of this House to kill one element or another of our energy supply, our energy production future. I was just thinking about New England. New England gets right now 60 percent of its electricity from oil, and that oil is imported oil. New England, 60 percent; the Mid-Atlantic region 35 percent; and California 70 percent, need to give their people—California, in particular since they have a State law currently blocking new licenses—the kind of intelligent reassurance that the waste disposal problem is being handled. That we are making progress, that we in the Congress are not just bogged down in study after study after study and jurisdictional disputes among committees with differing philosophies toward the very technology itself. The people want to see a clean start on waste management and this Nation has the goods to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have had a chance to compare the language of H.R. 4818 against the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

We have been advised—and I think in good faith—by our colleagues that these two are the same. They are emphatically not. For example, in connection with the authorization appropriation, section 7, such funds as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the act may be authorized. The appropriation provisions of this authorized appropriation, reappropriation, authorization of any funds that have ever been appropriated here.

In addition to this, there are to be fees paid.

In addition to that, I would point out that there is to be a site selection of three candidate areas under the proposal which is in H.R. 4818. There is only one in the proposal here before us. They are not the same. I imagine there are other differences that have not come to the attention of my dear friend, the gentleman from New York, and I am sure that he may, perhaps, on more careful scrutiny, tell us what they are.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, what I said, and what I am saying again, is that the amendment that has been offered to the bill before the committee today is based on the bill that the gentleman is holding in his hand, and which I gave him just a few moments ago, and that the substance of the two are identical.

Mr. DINGELL. They are not identical.

Mr. WYDLER. There obviously have to be some differences between an amendment and a piece of legislation. But the substance of the two is identical.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield further, they are not identical. They are most emphatically not identical. As a matter of fact, it has this extraordinary language, which says:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980 to carry out the project. Any amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall remain available until expended, and any amount authorized for any fiscal year prior to the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, but not appropriated, may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year through the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983.

There are other differences. I would be glad to read them to the gentleman. I know the gentleman says in good faith they are the same. They are not.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like a clarification from the author of the amendment or the gentleman from Washington, with respect to the requirement that the NRC license such a facility. It was not specific in my previous statement, but as I have been told later, it may indeed specifically say that the NRC licensing procedure is not required.

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman from California would respond to the gentleman, I think the gentleman from New York raises a very good question. Does the NRC have the authority to license the demonstration facility that he proposes in his amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the gentleman

will yield, according to the Reorganization Act of 1974, a research and test demonstration facility, a research and test facility, does not need to be licensed. There is no requirement for licensing.

I think this would, in fact, this low-scale demonstration project, provide some questions that I am sure the regulatory process would be asking and, therefore, another reason why we need to proceed ahead.

Mr. OTTINGER. If the gentleman will yield just briefly, I have here a fact-sheet that I presume has been distributed by the gentleman from California, saying what the amendment will do and what it will not do. It says it will not provide a legislative veto for the States, it will not require the facility to obtain a license.

Mr. VENTO. I think that the gentleman from California has agreed with the fact that it would not be licensed. I think that the safeguards contained in the licensing process are put in place for a very good reason.

I will be as brief as I can. I think that the proposal here is brought forth in good faith. There is a lot of criticism with regards to the solving of the permanent disposal problem, but I think the net effect of this amendment might very well cause a greater loss of credibility than nuclear power even suffers from today. I think that if the Members would stop and think: yes, there is a great hue and cry about the safety of nuclear power plants—and maybe in your minds it is justified, maybe it is unjustified—but why raise the possibility of causing another incident in terms of permanent disposal, which indeed will not only seal the fate, in terms of the waste, but would seal the fate of finding a solution to this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would submit to my colleagues there are two proposals, there are two measures, which I think are positive steps toward solving this problem, the West Valley proposal, in terms of vitrification, and, of course, away from reactor storage. There are no special problems with regard to storage, and the decisionmaking process with regards to whether we trust or do not trust commercial nuclear plants. There are no real limitations in that particular sense. So I do not think we ought to grasp at irrational proposals to solve this problem simply because opposition seems to be irrational. In other words, this body has a responsibility to be very prudent, to be very careful. These decisions will indeed seal the fate of nuclear power if they are made in the wrong context. So I do not see what the rush is to make this decision. We have no threshold problems with regard to the construction of nuclear powerplants. So let us move ahead. We are moving ahead with research in terms of these questions, and we ought to really resolve those questions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOLDWATER

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GOLDWATER: Page 10, after line 10, insert the following:

(4) Intermediate Scale Technology Demonstration Project (site unspecified)—

(a)(1) As soon as practicable, but no later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make a preliminary determination on (A) the location of one or more sites suitable to serve as a technology demonstration repository, and (B) suitable techniques and methods for the design, construction, and operation of a technology demonstration repository. In making such determination, the Secretary shall specifically consider candidate sites located on Federal Government lands in basalt media at Hanford, Washington, and in tuff or granite media within or immediately contiguous to the Nevada Test Site.

(2) The Secretary shall report his preliminary determination to both Houses of Congress by written communication within fifteen days after the date such determination is made.

(b)(1) Within six months after the preliminary determination required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall recommend a specific site for a Federal technology demonstration repository and suitable techniques and methods for the design, construction, and operation of such repository. Upon selecting such site, techniques, and methods, the Secretary shall (A) submit a report to both Houses of Congress specifying the reasons for making such selection and an estimate of the total costs of such repository, and (B) authorize the initiation of detailed design activity and completion of site—specific geology directed toward the ultimate construction and operation of such repository.

(2) Any actions taken under this subsection shall take into account, as fully as possible, the preliminary determination made by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(c) The Secretary shall submit to both Houses of Congress a report, by no later than September 30, 1980, specifying the construction schedule for the technology demonstration repository; *Provided*, That such schedule shall insure that the repository is in operation by September 30, 1985. Such schedule shall, to the maximum extent possible, include specific dates for the commencement and completion of construction on such repository.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not to exceed $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980 to carry out the project.

□ 1650

Mr. WYDLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his objection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I have not had an opportunity to see this amendment. I have no idea what it does to the original amendment. So therefore, I would like to have the Clerk read it unless I can get a copy of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the substitute.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I offer the amendment, but it is one of the problems that we get into when very complex amendments are offered to bills, and when they really have not been thoroughly considered in hearings.

I think what we have, and I do not object to the thrust of the amendment originally offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER), that we should move forward and do something about waste management. But I think what we have here in the substitute amendment that has been offered, offers a study to be made by the Secretary of Energy and to go into really copying some of the language that the gentleman from California offered about the location of different sites, suitable techniques and methods and design and construction and the operation of some of the demonstration repositories and in the other preliminary determination sent to both Houses of the Congress and then this report be submitted to the Congress, both Houses, by September 30, 1980, specifying a construction schedule and technology demonstration depository to determine if they can be in operation by the time specified in here and that may not hold true, and to include specific dates and so forth, and really a plan of action and authorizing $2 million for the first year to carry out this act.

I think this gets us out of some of the problems that we were in earlier. I think that it simplifies the amendment to the point that I hope that the Members could agree to it, and I think it will ultimately accomplish the same purposes that the gentleman from California intended to do with the amendment that he offered.

I urge the adoption of the substitute amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment completely guts the whole intent of the original amendment, which was designed to stop studying this question and begin doing something about it. I am only taking the lead of the President of the United States as addressed to the Congress, a need to expedite as soon as possible some of our major energy sources, one of which, the President emphasized, is nuclear energy.

One of the great stumbling blocks in nuclear energy development is what we do with waste.

We have in California a number of nuclear facilities which have been jeopardized, as well as if in fact killed, because we do not have in this Nation any means of handling nuclear high-level waste.

The waste efforts and intentions of this gentleman, taking the lead of the President, are to offer a very small-scale technology demonstration project, which would have in place in a specific time a repository for high-level waste.

It just seems to me that if we adopt the substitute offered by my chairman, that once again, we are going to have another study.

I point out to my colleagues that this issue has been studied to death. The Congress, and our own Science and Technology Committee, has had 2 years of hearings on waste management. We have before us an interagency review group draft and final report that was issued in the spring of 1979 on this issue, requested by the President. The Batelle Institute has made numerous studies of it. The ARC has studied this thing to death. The AEC has studied this thing to death.

There is currently in place in a variety of locations around the country measure devices, geologists and other scientists studying this question of waste disposal.

Now, how long do you want to study it? That is the question.

If we accept the amendment, we are going to study it some more. If you adopt my amendment, we will begin, and have by 1985, a small-scale test facility to demonstrate this question of whether we can safely store waste material.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I might point out to my good friend that in the substitute amendment I have offered there is nothing in here that does any less than your amendment would have done by September of 1980, and then at that time hopefully, after a plan has developed similar to what we are doing at West Valley, then we can move forward with a specific plan of action to implement the recommendations that they make.

So, if we adopted the gentleman's amendment, it would not accelerate anything any faster than it would be by the substitute.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Well, I would suggest that it does do substantial damage to my amendment, if for no other reason than my amendment says it shall be built by 1985.

All we do with the gentleman's substitute is to study it and report to the Congress by 1980, and at that point we can decide whether we are going to proceed or not. That is the major difference. If we want to build it, if we want to initiate and put in place a program that will ensure that there is a repository for nuclear waste, then we vote down the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) and adopt the Goldwater amendment.

If we are interested in more studies, then we adopt the substitute amendment. That is basically the difference between the two.

□ 1700

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, last year it was my privilege to serve as a member of the assembly in California on the energy committee, and that is where I got started on this issue of nuclear energy and disposal of waste. It was fascinating to me to listen to the scientists who came before our committee last year on the issue of whether or not we would go forward with the building of a Sun Desert facility way down in the south of California near Blythe. The scientists told us, one after another in our committee deliberations, that the evidence is that we have the technological capacity at the present time to store waste safely and on a long-term basis; that we have a political decision or a political problem which prevents us from reaching a very necessary step on the part of the National Government; hence, this amendment that the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) and myself have offered.

I would like to just read to the Members very briefly some of the comments by several of the scientists of repute who have given us the benefit of their judgment.

> In our judgment, there exists sufficient confidence in glass as a waste encapsulent system that it should be used to begin a national waste solidification program as soon as possible.

Those are the words of Dr. Larry Hench of the University of Florida.

Dr. Raul Deju, director of the basalt waste isolation program at Hanford, said as follows:

> In conclusion, investigations to date give further confidence that dry storage of various waste forms is feasible and that ultimate disposal of nuclear waste can be ascertained regardless of the solid waste forms being considered for disposal.

In other words, the scientific evidence is overwhelming that we have the capacity to store this waste on a long-term basis. I say we should in this forum have the courage politically to go down the road of laying the foundation for storing waste. We can do it at one of the facilities designated in the amendment, not the substitute. We do not have to go out and buy more land. There are existing at least two Federal facilities where this waste storage capacity can take place.

The substitute of the gentleman from Florida is quite clear. He seeks to establish another study. I say we do not need another study, we have studied it enough. It is time to get on with this project of deciding that we are going to store long-term waste.

I sometimes suspect, although I cannot prove this, that there are those around who seek to use the issue of not having solved the storage of waste on a long-term basis as a means of preventing further utilization of nuclear energy in our country. I cannot really say that is true, but sometimes I suspect that. I am satisfied there are none of those in this Chamber, and for that reason I am sure they will base their vote solely on the basis of the scientific evidence that we can do that and defeat the substitute and adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOLDWATER) there were—ayes 38, noes 32.

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3000) to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian programs for fiscal year 1980 and fiscal year 1981, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 4930, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1980

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-391) on the resolution (H. Res. 389) waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 4930) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 1980, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION'S ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1978—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers; referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation's Annual Report for 1978. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 10 of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Act of May 13, 1954, and covers the period January 1, 1978 through December 31, 1978.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 26, 1979.*

□ 1710

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO APPOINT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4389, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4389), making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year 1980, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BAUMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time only to ask what the program for tomorrow is going to be.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, responding to the gentleman from Maryland, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

H.R. 2462, maritime authorizations, fiscal year 1980;

H.R. 3633, nurses training amendments;

H.R. 4034, Export Administration Act Amendments of 1979.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION AS TO VOTES

(Mr. DANIELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present on the floor of the House of Representatives during two rollcall votes on Monday, July 23, 1979, and during one rollcall vote on Wednesday, July 25, 1979. I would like to announce how I would have voted on each of these had I been present.

Rollcall No. 369, July 23, 1979, the House agreed, by a vote of 214 yeas to 4 nays, to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole. I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 370, July 23, 1979, the House agreed, by a vote of 217 yeas to 5 nays, to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole. I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 377, July 25, 1979, the House agreed, by a vote of 387 yeas to 5 nays, to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole. I would have voted "yea."

ORANGE COAST NATIONAL URBAN PARK

(Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill with my colleague from California, ROBERT BADHAM, which provides for the stablishment of the Orange Coast National Urban Park. The purpose of the bill is to protect the rich natural and cultural resources of the Irvine Coast, Laguna area of California, including the last remaining portion of undeveloped shoreline along the Irvine Coast.

The bill will provide for the urban recreation needs of millions of people and it will assist the State and local governments in providing for a balance of planned urban development and open space and recreational opportunities.

This legislation recognizes the need to exercise fiscal restraint at the Federal level. It authorizes $38 million in matching Federal funds for the acquisition of lands within the park.

This authorization will match the commitment by the State of California to purchase portions of land within the boundaries of the proposed park.

In addition, the bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate a cooperative agreement with the State of California to manage and administer the park. This joint pooling of State and Federal funds should insure maximum protection and preservation of the area with the limited amount of Federal dollars provided for in the bill.

The proposed Orange Coast National Urban Park encompasses approximately 19,000 acres of land that stretches 3.5 miles along the Irvine Coast between Corona Del Mar and South Laguna Beach, Calif., and reaches as far as 3 miles inland. The terrain includes steep walled canyons, ridges, marine terraces, sea cliffs, beaches, and two inland lakes and offers vistas of both the ocean and inland portions of the county.

The sea coast and marine resources in the area are of national significance and should be protected. Fossil records have been identified in the area which date back as early as 17,000 years ago. The proposed park contains numerous known archeological and paleethnological sites which can provide us with valuable information pertaining to the occupational history of the region.

Five rare and endangered species of birds are known to have ranges within portions of the proposed park and the cottage community of Crystal Cove, which is in the proposed park, has been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places as an historic district.

In addition to its natural and cultural resources, the proposed site for the Orange Coast National Urban Park can offer a diversity of recreational opportunities to serve the needs of southern California residents.

The park is within 1 hour's drive of at least 10 million people and will be easily accessible to many forms of mass transit.

In this time of energy conservation and gasoline shortages it is necessary to redirect our Federal park acquisition funds away from the great open spaces which are far away from centers of populations, to areas where they are accessible to the 70 percent of Americans who live in urban areas.

A national urban park will help to make up the deficit in parks and recreation areas which currently exists in the area. The Southern California Association of Governments projected in 1978, that Orange County will need an additional 33,250 acres for regional parks by the year 2000.

The Federal interest in urban recreation and in the Irvine Coast Laguna area, dates back to 1976 when Congress mandated the Interior Department to take a close look at recreation in the county's urban areas to determine the appropriate role of the Federal Government in providing for these needs. The heritage conservation and recreation service and the National Park Service in its national urban recreation study, listed the site of the Orange Coast National Urban Park as,

One of the most significant open space and recreational resources which should be preserved and developed for recreational use.

There is widespread support for a national urban park in Orange County. The area has, for years, been the subject of much controversy at the local level. The demand for housing and urban growth has put tremendous pressure on local governments to intensively develop this only remaining open space area. It is increasingly evident that local land use regulations and ordinances will no longer be an effective means for preserving the area. In addition, the local budgetary restraints imposed by proposition 13 will further threaten the Irvine Coast Laguna area.

The legislation Congressman BADHAM and I are introducing today meets this concern by sharing the responsibility to protect and manage the area with the State of California. The bill will also insure that the transportation needs of the region will not be hindered by a national urban park.

The major landowners, the Irvine Co. and the Aliso Viejo Co., have been extremely cooperative and supportive of efforts to preserve the land. A national urban park has widespread public support. A number of private conservation and public interest groups have been working actively for years to preserve and protect the area.

The State of California has been interested in the area for several years and is in the process of negotiating with the Irvine Co. to acquire $38 million worth of land within the park. The California Coastal Commission, under the mandate of the California Coastal Act of 1976, is interested in preserving much of the proposed park and is currently reviewing development plans prepared by the Irvine and Aliso Viejo Companies.

The Federal interest in the area came to a focus last year when Congress passed the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978. The act authorized the Park Service to study the area to determine the feasibility and desirability of including it as a part of the National Park System. The Park Service study, which comprised about 24,000 acres in the Irvine Coast Laguna area, identified four alternatives as feasible strategies for preservation and use of the areas significant land resources. The bill I am introducing today is a combination of several of the alternatives proposed by the Park Service.

The 19,000 acres of land in my bill represents the greatest area of concern for preservation and protection and reflect a variety of diverse and often conflicting interests. It is intended that this bill will provide the necessary vehicle for further consideration and study of the area, by the public, the Congress, and the administration, to determine exactly how much of the land can be and should be acquired by the Federal Government for a national urban park.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare occasion when the gentleman who represents California's 38th Congressional District (Mr. PATTERSON) and I agree on issues which come before this House. However in the case of legislation to establish an Orange Coast national urban park in California, we are in full agreement—thus the joint sponsorship of the measure we are introducing today.

My support for a park in the Irvine Coast area of southern California dates back to the late 1960's. As a member of the California State Assembly, I and then State Senator Dennis Carpenter were responsible for obtaining $7.6 million in earmarked State park funds to purchase the Irvine Coast and two main canyons for 50 percent of the appraised value. This, incidentally, represented practically all of the useful parkland in the area. Unfortunately, this purchase was blocked.

Today that $7.6 million is part of the State's $38 million which has been designated for land acquisition in the Irvine Coast area. The legislation we are jointly introducing today authorizes the Federal Government to match the State of California's appropriation of $38 million for the purchase of some truly beautiful acreage in Orange County for the purpose of a national urban park.

The National Park Service recently completed a congressionally mandated study of the proposed park area. Negotiations between Mr. PATTERSON and me have resulted in what I consider to be a fair and equitable bill which will protect the taxpayers' pockets, while protecting the Irvine Coast area for all to enjoy. I hope this legislation will receive the swift and favorable consideration of my colleagues.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, although I was present to vote on all of the amendments to the Amtrak authorization bill, I was detained yesterday and unable to vote on its final passage. Since my constituents have a right to know my position on the bill, I would like to enter in the record that I would have voted "yes" for passage of H.R. 3996 as amended.●

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE MEDAL OF HONOR TO HERMAN MILLER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BOB WILSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to authorize the President to present the Medal of Honor to Mr. Herman Miller, a centenarian and long-time resident of San Diego County.

Mr. Miller was recommended for the Medal of Honor on May 18, 1900, by his company commander for heroism during a 3-day engagement against Philippine insurgents in the village of Batac in mid-April 1900. Unfortunately, the recommendation was apparently swallowed up in the morass of military paperwork and subsequently shunted aside by the growing unpopularity of the U.S. involvement in the Spanish-American War. His last hopes were dashed when Congress in 1918 wiped the slate clean on unresolved Medal of Honor requests.

Mr. Miller and his daughter, Mrs. Eva McGinnis, have waged a battle over a period of years for his Medal of Honor, but without success, despite indications of interest and support from a wide variety of individuals and organizations. Former Congressman Edouard Victor Michel Izac introduced a private bill in Mr. Miller's behalf during the 77th Congress. The measure was dropped into the hopper on December 9, 1941, but, needless to say, was put aside in the sequence of events which followed the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor 2 days earlier.

When Mr. Izac left Congress after World War II, the matter was put to rest for a number of years. I am today reintroducing the identical language of Mr. Izac's bill. With the recent renewed interest in several individuals who were denied the Medal of Honor because of a lack of timeliness in presenting their cases to the chain of command, I feel that the time is ripe for a reconsideration of Mr. Miller's case. He is a spry and personable gentleman whose patriotism and national pride would bring tears to your eyes. In these days of national self-denigration, it is important to remember that it is men and women like Mr. Miller who have made America strong and free.

It is an honor to represent Mr. Miller's Medal of Honor request to the Congress and I would urge favorable consideration.●

THE REGIONAL ENERGY CORPORATION BILL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce legislation to create regional energy corporations.

These regional energy corporations may be formed by three or more eligible States. An "eligible State" is defined in the bill as—

A State which is adjacent to two or more States . . . two States should be deemed to be adjacent if such States have a common boundary.

This bill proposes to facilitate, finance, and stimulate projects with a regional impact on the cost, supply and efficient use of energy. The corporations proposed by this bill would contribute to the work of all areas of the partnership—Federal, State, private—and hopefully do away with many of the stumbling blocks now slowing or interfering with energy development.

This bill is different from H.R. 2511, introduced on February 28, 1979, in that H.R. 2511 is restricted to the Northeast while the bill which I introduce today is national in character; in short, all 50 States stand to benefit from it and not those confined to one region of the Nation.

This bill also provides production facilities for nuclear energy; H.R. 2511 does not mention nuclear.

The Congress will create the corporations and clearly set forth the areas of their jurisdiction and power. The Corporations will be quasi-public in character. They will be responsible to and administered by a board of directors which will consist of five members appointed by the President, subject to Senate approval; a member appointed by the Governor of each State which joins the Corporation; and finally, the private sector which will select two members.

A corporation may be organized when three adjacent States enact the legislation necessary for that purpose. The board of directors will prepare the terms and conditions which financial institutions and private industry located or involved in the region may subscribe to the corporation's capital stock.

The bill authorizes the corporations to take part in financing energy-related projects through guarantees, loans and equity investments or other forms of aid. Funds for this purpose will be available by borrowing through the issuance of bonds or notes, which will be secured by a Federal guarantee at a ratio of 15 to 1 which will be established on the basis of capital contributions.

Projects which will be encouraged include transportation and distribution facilities; promotion or production of conservation techniques; new technological developments related to energy; and production facilities for coal, and optimum siting decisions on nuclear plants.

The environmental regulations promulgated by the National Environmental Policy Act as well as all other Federal regulatory requirements and all other laws must be adhered to by the corporation.

What is the Federal role? Simply stated, it is to authorize formation of the corporations, and to provide capital for desirable projects in those cases where there is inadequate private support; and to provide necessary oversight through constant scrutinization of audits and reports.

Mr. Speaker, the corporations, then, will not supersede Government agencies already in existence, they will supplement them. Their purpose is to assist desirable projects in those instances which private business, standing by itself, cannot implement. In every instance, the corporations will work side by side with private financial institutions, and assist them in every reasonable way.

My bill is also intended to encourage State participation in regional efforts to commercialize synthetic fuels technology and speed the utilization of these new fuels by industry. Certain regions must await resolution of specific technical problems before synthetic fuels can be produced at commercial scale.

Caking coals mined in the Eastern United States, for instance, cannot be converted to gas with off-the-shelf technology. The States should have the capability to fund planning to encourage gasification projects for pipeline quality product tailored to these needs. The regional corporations should engage in cost sharing with the Department of Energy and regional industries.

The corporations should provide the States with the capability to work with the proposed Federal Energy Security Corporation in meeting the administration's goal of 2½ million barrels per day of oil substitute by 1990. Unconventional gas from the shales of the East, the tight sands of the West, and the brine off the gulf is to provide 20 percent or more of that goal. The corporations should be involved in these enhanced recovery projects and should address the questions of distribution of this gas as well as the desired overall fuel mix by State.

Liquefaction is the crucial technology which provides a direct oil substitute for the transportation sector. The Energy Security Corporation is to provide up to $88 billion of backing for synthetic fuels production chiefly through construction of full-scale plants. Regional corporations must participate in evaluating the tradeoffs to be made in determining which liquefaction technology is preferable. There is considerable opportunity for the regional energy corporations to serve as a sort of commercialization broker between regional industries and the Department of Energy.

I also envision the States working with the Energy Mobilization Board through the corporations. The board is intended to eliminate redtape by assuring that decisions on energy projects are made in a timely fashion. The States have a major stake in seeing that such projects go ahead without compromising public health and safety. The Board will have the right to establish schedules for Federal, State, and local permit processes. The corporations should provide a regional perspective that will reduce parochialism in siting and scheduling such priority energy projects.●

U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, August 1 marks an important date in the history and progress of the U.S. Capitol Police Force, which began when the seat of our Federal Government was moved from Philadelphia to Washington, D.C., in 1801. I feel that the Members of the House of Representatives should be fully informed about this event for it is only with their support and cooperation that it has been achieved, and the progress obtained can be continued.

Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the results of the second Capitol Police biennial promotional process will become effective. The first competitive promotion examination was an experiment only 2 years ago. In May of 1977, the Capitol Police Board, with the encouragement of the Committee on House Administration and the concurrence of the House, adopted the policy that promotional matters for members of the Capitol Police force shall be governed by a competitive process, based entirely upon merit, and without regard to means of appointment or political affiliation.

It was not until 1965 with the appointment of James M. Powell as chief of police that the U.S. Capitol Police began to come into its own as a respected member of the law enforcement community. In less than a decade and half, much progress has been made. With the advent of our new promotional system, we have journeyed a long way toward the professionalization of our police force.

Today the U.S. Capitol Police has an authorized strength of over 1,000. Today, we have a modern, up-to-date program for both academic and firearms training. Today, we have our own special operations unit for use in time of disturbances and disorders. We have one of the most modern communications systems in the area. We have a patrol detail consisting of foot patrolmen, K-9 patrols, scout car patrols, as well as motorbike patrols. We have a well-trained professional photographic and identification section, as well as an investigations division.

In brief, here, as reported by Chief of Police Powell, is how the new promotional policy will be implemented to assure fairness and equity for all police officers:

In the most recent process, 473 candidates openly competed for numerical eligibility rankings in the grades of Sergeant, Lieutenant and Captain. The process consisted of a potential evaluation of candidates by their supervisors and a written examination. An additional Oral Review Board was required for candidates competing for the grade of Captain.

Each participant will be personally apprised of his composite score and a list will be published, with the identity of the participants encoded in such manner as to ensure the confidentiality of the individual, in order that the participants will be fully aware of their standing in relation to the remaining participants for the same rank.

As openings in various ranks become available through attrition, retirements, etc., the Chief of Police will submit the names of the first three individuals on the list to the Capitol Police Board for consideration. As

promotions are made, interdepartmental memoranda will be published, identifying the individuals promoted, by their encoded designation. This will enable each member of the force to compare his composite score with that of the individual receiving the elevation in grade.

If there should be any appeal by members of the force as a result of this procedure, it will be addressed to the Capitol Police Board for resolution.

As I have indicated, we are extremely proud of the progress made by the Capitol Police in recent years. We believe the combined capabilities and professional expertise of the force are equal to any law enforcement agency in the Nation.●

THE SYNFUELS MISTAKE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WEAVER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed a bill to develop synfuels and more legislation in this area is on the way. However, the development and use of synfuels in sufficient quantities to offset our insatiable demand for foreign oil is not without serious problems. To clearly explain some of these problems, I heartily recommend to my colleagues the consideration of the following article by Gordon J. MacDonald, which appeared in the Washington Post on July 26, 1979. The author is a former member of the Council on Environmental Quality and is a professor of environmental studies at Dartmouth College.

The article follows:

THE SYNFUELS MISTAKE

(By Gordon J. MacDonald)

The president and the Congress have presented the nation with the exciting prospect of solving the energy problem by building plants that will convert our abundant coal resources into more readily usable fuel, such as oil or "natural gas." In an almost crisis atmosphere of the moment, the true environmental and economic costs of synthetic fuels have been overlooked in the apparent desire to provide an easy answer to a complicated problem.

The most important environmental issue associated with a major commitment to synthetic fuel is the possible worldwide change in climate resulting from the loading of the atmosphere with carbon dioxide. This gas, present in minute amounts, absorbs heat that would otherwise radiate from the earth out into space. Carbon dioxide acts as a blanket keeping the earth warm. Increasing the carbon dioxide context of the atmosphere will increase the number of blankets and raise the temperature of the earth.

These changes in temperature could bring about significant worldwide changes in the way people live. The changes are today poorly understood—but could have far-reaching implications for human welfare in an ever more crowded world, would threaten food supplies and present a further set of intractable problems to organized societies.

When will the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere increase to levels where the effects become noticeable? The answer depends on how fast the world increases the use of carbon-based fuels, natural gas, oil and coal, and on whether or not synthetic fuels become an important element in the world fuel economy. To make synthetic fuels, energy must be used. That use of energy produces carbon dioxide, as does the burning of the synthetic product. The net result is that synthetic fuels produce two to three times more carbon dioxide than do the natural fuels.

If the world continues along the lines of the past 30 years, and if the current mix of gas, oil and coal is maintained, then the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere will double in about 50 years. If, on the other hand, the world shifts to coal and synthetics, then the doubling will come in about 30 years. The 20-year acceleration may not seem large, but it could eliminate the time needed to develop the alternative fuel of the future—solar, fusion or nuclear.

The basic policy question associated with the climatic impact is that we may not be absolutely certain that the earth is warming up until 1990 or 1995. By that time, if synthetic-fuels investment and infrastructure are in place, it will be extraordinarily costly in economic and social terms to move away from a synthetic-fuel economy. Once hooked, the cure for synthetic-fuel addiction would be very costly.

The energy challenge is obviously worldwide and cannot be resolved by one nation acting alone. The communiqué from the Tokyo summit made it clear that the Western nations recognized the longer-term economic and environmental issues of using carbon-based fuels. However, the United States provides leadership on many international issues. The elements of policy I propose here are for the United States, but they apply as well to the world:

1. *Acknowledgement of the problem:* The CO_2 problem is one of the most contemporary environmental problems, is a direct product of industrialization, threatens the stability of climates worldwide and therefore the stability of all nations, and can be controlled by controlling fuel policies. No technical means of controlling carbon dioxide exists today. Steps toward control are necessary now and should be part of the national policy in management of resources of energy.

2. *Conservation of carbon-based fuels:* The element of any policy that offers the hope of being effective is conservation. Limitation of the rate of exploitation of fuels is possible. The rate is controlled currently by price, taxation and regulation. It can be controlled as a matter of policy. All actions of government should be reviewed to determine effects on the total use of carbon-based fuels.

3. *The choice of carbon-based fuels* and the use made of them bears heavily on the amount of CO_2 released to produce a unit of energy. Natural gas is by far the best carbon-based fuel for limiting carbon-dioxide production.

The proposals for a massive synthetic-fuels program arise from the misconception that the United States is running out of natural carbon-based fuels. That assumption is wrong. For example, over the past few years I have studied the probable reserves of natural gas. I am convinced from my work and that of my colleagues that, in the continental United States, there exist vast resources of natural gas in both shallow and deep basins that have not been exploited. The lack of exploitation flows from the fact that historically, in terms of constant dollars, the energy content of natural gas has been underpriced by 10 to 30 percent with respect to coal, 100 percent with respect to domestic oil and 200 percent with respect to imported oil. As a result, there has been little economic incentive to develop this resource, which in burning produces less carbon dioxide than any of the other carbon-based fuels. In the longer term, solar, fusion and nuclear power may provide alternative options that are both environmentally and economically compatible.

My idea is that before we commit ourselves to the construction of a major synthetic-fuels infrastructure involving the investment of billions of dollars, we should make every effort to understand not only the short term benefits and the costs, but also the longer-term consequences to the generation that must live with the decisions taken today.●

SHATTER THE SILENCE, VIGIL 1979

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of the project "Shatter the Silence, Vigil 1979" I come before you today to add the names of Solomon Inditsky and his family to our list of Soviet Jews who have been denied permission to emigrate from the U.S.S.R.

Solomon Inditsky, his wife, Khana, and daughter, Isabella Novikova, and her 13-year-old son, Mark, applied for permission to emigrate to Israel in 1971. During the last 6 years they have received five refusals for a variety of reasons including secrecy, although there was nothing classified about the work Solomon Inditsky was involved in as an electrical engineer. Other reasons for refusal have ranged from technical excuses to: "You'll be here a long time to come."

Because the family applied for exit visas, family members lost their jobs and have since been unable to work despite the fact that they possess skills which are valuable assets to the labor force: Khana is a pediatrician and Isabella is an electrical engineer.

Last October, young Mark was to become a bar mitzvah in Moscow. Soviet authorities would not allow him to be called to the Torah in the synagogue because he is a "refusenik"—one who has applied to emigrate and has been refused. Mark's bar mitzvah had to be held in secrecy, in a private apartment.

The Inditsky family has committed no crime. The family simply wishes to live in Israel with close relatives and among the people in the land of their fathers. It would seem that no one and nothing should prevent the achievement of such an aspiration, since it complies in full with Soviet laws and does not harm Soviet interests.

It is my hope that "Shatter the Silence, Vigil 1979" will help improve emigration for Soviet Jews who find themselves in situations similar to the Inditsky family. To date 38 Members of Congress have participated in the 1979 vigil, each pleading the case of a "refusenik" before the House of Representatives.

There is a great need to ease the exit requirements for Soviet Jews and to end the official and unofficial harassment of people who strive to gain their individual freedom. My colleagues and I pray that

the appeals we have made in behalf of the "refuseniks" will assist these noble people in their struggle for freedom.●

SALT II AND THE POLITICS OF FEAR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AuCoin) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, despite the passing of weeks since the national debate on SALT II began, I have read few pieces that put the case against SALT II in better frame than a recently rediscovered column by Seymour Weiss in the Wall Street Journal. The fundamentally flawed antitreaty arguments, which lean on fear of Russians for credibility, are reproduced again and again. And no scrutiny of new information seems to be able to affect the pace and pitch of the old hawkish cant.

Seymour Weiss warns us (Wall Street Journal May 24), that being afraid of the epithet "warmonger" is no reason to buy SALT, suggesting such a fear motivates the administration and those who see benefit in SALT II. He parades before us a litany of past Soviet sins that presumably disqualifies the Soviet Union as a partner to any treaty, ever. Mr. Seymour ties the beginning of this rancorous doubt to the end by invoking "political context," which he alleges to be lacking, except in the form of another buzz-word, "appeasement," and completes his overkill with rhetorical references to Hitler, Munich, and totalitarianism.

In a climate of mutual suspicion, the easiest choice is continued mistrust. Therefore, it is a cheap effort to prey on the American public's fear and suspicion of Soviet intentions and to encourage the false belief that by signing SALT II President Carter compromises national security, or that by stalling ratification a vaguely defined danger is averted.

Moreover, it is irresponsible to exploit the administration's commitment to honesty by alleging that the admitted "imperfections" in SALT II are invalidating. Negotiation between two parties necessarily involves compromise in both directions. And, in negotiation between heavily armed antagonists an agreement will be of value to the extent that it limits destructive capability and the likelihood of conflict: In theoretical terms it will be "imperfect" to the extent that it fails to disarm the potential adversaries. Therefore, the argument as to whether or not a treaty is "good" must hinge on an analysis of what the agreement does and does not accomplish. SALT II does:

Set a weapons ceiling on intercontinental nuclear weapons for the first time ever, with a further decrease of 150 nuclear launchers in force by 1982;

Oblige an actual decrease in the total number of Soviet nuclear delivery systems now arrayed against American targets;

Allow the United States to deploy an additional 190 ICBM launchers—if we wish—including the MX mobile missile capable of carrying up to 10 separately targetable nuclear warheads;

Force a deceleration on rapid Soviet progress in the technology of nuclear delivery systems by limiting both signatories to one new type of intercontinental ballistic missile;

Open the way for further negotiation in the direction of nuclear weapons control and on other important matters; and

Reduce uncertainty and the possibility of a calamitous "mistake."

SALT II does not:

Forbid deployment of the air-launched cruise missile;

Alter the present status quo of rough parity between the United States and U.S.S.R. in favor of the Soviet Union;

Limit American surveillance; it enhances data collection;

Compromise the ability of the United States to respond to nuclear assault with so great a counterattack as to make the "first strike" option impossibly costly to the Soviets. (Both superpowers now have the nuclear might to obliterate all life on this planet several times over); and

Cost more in taxpayer dollars than without SALT II, at a time of budget constraint and inflation. (Actually, under the treaty the Pentagon could spend an estimated $30 billion less for strategic weapons over the next 10 year.)

Many Americans will find it difficult to accept the idea that the Soviets fear U.S. strategic strength, that the Russian leadership could feel wary of the intention of such a well-meaning people as we believe ourselves to be. That others view us in this different light is uncomfortable at best, but to ignore the reality of the Kremlin's concern is a case of very risky myopia. And if overwhelming superiority in nuclear armaments is so significant an enhancement of our interests, how do SALT opponents interpret America's humiliating failure to work its will in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Southeast Asia in the years of undisputed American strategic superiority? We ought to have derived something from our recent history besides a more exercised attitude of antagonism.

The relationship of the two superpowers is of vital concern to all nations. The entire planet would pay the price of instability if it led to nuclear confrontation. If Mr. Weiss seeks the political context of SALT II, he may take stock of the politics of planetary survival as the sufficient context for United States-Soviet negotiation. Therefore, the moral responsibility we share with the Soviet Union in concluding the interim pact known as SALT II would be best served if the U.S. Senate ratifies the treaty.

On May 27, Rev. Jesse Jackson told a crowd of 13,000 at the University of Rhode Island commencement:

> There are few issues, if any, that are more critical to our two countries and the world than that SALT II be ratified.

He is right. Members of the House and Senate must support the treaty.

BILL INTRODUCED TO AMEND CHARTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Pease) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H.R. 4976, which I am introducing today, is to amend in several respects the corporate charter granted to Trinity College in Washington, D.C., by the act of April 8, 1935, 49 Stat. 113:

First, to increase the number of persons who may serve as trustees of the college.

Second, to clarify that the board of trustees shall elect officers of the board of trustees as well as officers of the college.

Third, to provide that the officers of the college need not be members of the board of trustees.

Presently, the trustees must number not less than 8 nor more than 15. The present charter does not specifically grant the trustees the power to elect or appoint officers of the board of trustees but does provide that the officers of the college must be members of the board of trustees.

This bill was introduced at the request of the board of trustees and officers of Trinity College. These changes in the charter are proposed as part of an extensive self-evaluation and improvement of the college's administration structure pursuant to a grant under title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-329, as amended. The proposed changes will permit the election or appointment of additional trustees to meet the increased workload of the evaluation and the resulting proposals. The removal of the officers of the college from membership on the board of trustees will avoid the overlapping of roles, responsibilities and interests of these separate and distinct components of the administrative structure.

BACKGROUND

Trinity College of Washington, D.C., was founded in 1877 for the higher education of women. It is located on Michigan Avenue and Franklin Street NE. More than 800 students are enrolled in the college primarily in undergraduate studies in the liberal arts, and in graduate programs in professional fields. Graduate programs are coeducational.

Trinity College was originally organized and operated under certificate of charter filed in 1897 pursuant to the incorporation provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia. In 1935, Congress enacted the special Charter Act of April 8 (49 Stat. 113), which was similar to legislation enacted for the benefit of other colleges and universities in the District of Columbia.

From its founding, Trinity College has drawn students from all over the United States as well as from many foreign countries. The college has become a national institution recognized for the excellence of its programs. Accredited in 1917 by the Association of American Universities, it was in 1921 accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.●

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4388

Mr. BEVILL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4388) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 96-388)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4388) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 15, 25, 26, 33, 34, and 35.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 12, 13, 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 32, and 36, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,371,147,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$228,279,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$588,249,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$36,015,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$142,145,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$34,451,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$213,053,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$34,761,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$34,614,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 14, 17, 22, 24, 30, and 37.

TOM BEVILL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOHN M. SLACK,
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS,
BILL CHAPPELL,
JOHN W. JENRETTE, Jr.,
JULIAN C. DIXON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN T. MYERS,
CLAIR W. BURGENER,
VIRGINIA SMITH,
SILVIO O. CONTE
(except as to amendments Nos. 18, 30, and 37),
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
WALTER D. HUDDLESTON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
JIM SASSER
(except amendment No. 30),
DENNIS DECONCINI,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
HENRY BELLMON,
JAMES A. MCCLURE,
JAKE GARN,
HARRISON SCHMITT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4388) making appropriations for energy and water development for fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

OPERATING EXPENSES

Energy supply, research and development activities

Amendment No. 1: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment appropriating $2,048,523,000 for Operating Expenses, Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities, instead of $2,050,623,000 as proposed by the House and $2,053,823,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The funds appropriated for Operating Expenses, Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities are allocated as shown in the following table:

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—OPERATING EXPENSES

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Solar applications:		
Systems development	$46,000,000	$52,000,000
Demonstrations:		
Buildings	33,500,000	35,750,000
Agricultural and industrial process heat	14,000,000	14,000,000
Federal photovoltaics demonstrations		10,000,000
Market development and training	24,300,000	20,500,000
Program direction	2,341,000	2,341,000
Total, solar applications	120,141,000	134,591,000
Solar technology:		
Solar thermal electric power systems	72,905,000	72,905,000
Photovoltaics energy development	122,700,000	139,700,000
Wind energy conversion system	48,860,000	45,260,000
Ocean systems	23,600,000	28,600,000
Program direction	2,892,000	2,892,000
Total, solar technology	270,957,000	289,357,000
Geothermal:		
Hydrothermal resources	37,850,000	42,250,000
Geopressured resources	35,700,000	35,700,000
Geothermal technology development	41,800,000	41,800,000
Program direction	1,802,000	1,802,000
Total, geothermal	117,152,000	121,552,000
Biomass:		
Technology support	$16,000,000	$16,000,000
Production systems	5,700,000	5,700,000
Conversion technology	23,000,000	22,500,000
Research and development	8,300,000	7,800,000
Support and other	1,500,000	1,500,000
Program direction	796,000	796,000
Total, biomass	55,296,000	54,296,000
Hydropower:		
Low head hydroelectric development	8,000,000	8,000,000
Feasibility studies loan program	10,000,000	10,000,000
Program direction	324,000	324,000
Total, hydropower projects	18,324,000	18,324,000
Nuclear fission:		
Converter reactors:		
Thermal reactor technology	36,500,000	69,000,000
Advanced reactor systems	9,700,000	4,700,000
Program direction	2,016,000	2,016,000
Total, converter reactors	48,216,000	75,716,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Nuclear fission—Continued		
Commercial waste management:		
Terminal isolation research and development	$158, 100, 000	$146, 350, 000
Waste treatment technology	14, 200, 000	14, 200, 000
Support programs	2, 100, 000	2, 100, 000
Program direction	1, 365, 000	1, 365, 000
Total, commercial waste management	175, 765, 000	164, 015, 000
Spent fuel storage:		
International spent fuel storage	4, 200, 000	3, 000, 000
Domestic spent fuel storage	13, 800, 000	8, 000, 000
Program direction	482, 000	482, 000
Total, spent fuel storage	18, 482, 000	11, 482, 000
Advanced nuclear systems:		
Space and terrestrial applications	34, 300, 000	34, 300, 000
Advanced systems evaluations	2, 600, 000	2, 000, 000
Program direction	1, 206, 000	1, 206, 000
Total, advanced nuclear systems	38, 106, 000	37, 506, 000
Breeder reactors:		
Liquid metal fast breeder reactor base program	348, 900, 000	308, 900, 000
Water cooled breeder reactor	57, 900, 000	57, 900, 000
Gas cooled breeder reactor	19, 988, 000	19, 988, 000
Fuel cycle research and development	21, 100, 000	21, 100, 000
Program direction	11, 398, 000	11, 398, 000
Total, breeder reactors	459, 286, 000	419, 286, 000
Total, nuclear fission	739, 855, 000	708, 005, 000
Magnetic fusion:		
Confinement systems	83, 500, 000	83, 500, 000
Development and technology	48, 000, 000	48, 000, 000
Applied plasma physics	62, 100, 000	56, 600, 000
Reactor projects	39, 100, 000	42, 100, 000
Program direction	2, 905, 000	2, 905, 000
Total, magnetic fusion	235, 605, 000	233, 105, 000
Electric energy systems and storage:		
Electric energy systems power supply:		
Power supply and system management	16, 900, 000	16, 900, 000
Power delivery	8, 600, 000	18, 300, 000
Program direction	1, 340, 000	1, 340, 000
Total, electric energy systems	26, 840, 000	36, 540, 000
Energy storage systems:		
Battery storage	32, 000, 000	32, 000, 000
Thermal, mechanical and other storage	30, 840, 000	30, 840, 000
Program direction	1, 302, 000	1, 302, 000
Total, energy storage systems	64, 142, 000	64, 142, 000
Total, electric energy systems and storage	90, 982, 000	100, 682, 000
Environment:		
Environmental research and development:		
Overview and assessment	$58, 400, 000	$55, 000, 000
Biomedical and environmental research:		
Human health studies	30, 280, 000	26, 580, 000
Health effects research in biomedical systems	47, 790, 000	47, 790, 000
Environmental studies	46, 160, 000	45, 660, 000
Physical and technical studies	23, 880, 000	23, 880, 000
Carbon dioxide effects research/assessment	6, 280, 000	6, 280, 000
Subtotal, biomedical and environmental research	154, 390, 000	150, 190, 000
Program direction	9, 369, 000	9, 369, 000
Total, environmental R. & D	222, 159, 000	214, 559, 000
Decontamination and decommissioning:		
Management of surplus radioactively contaminated DOE facilities	9, 000, 000	9, 000, 000
Remedial action for former DOE contractor installation MED/AEC sites	11, 500, 000	11, 500, 000
Remedial action for inactive uranium mill tailing sites	11, 500, 000	11, 500, 000
Program direction	199, 000	199, 000
Total, decontamination and decommissioning	32, 199, 000	32, 199, 000
Total, environment	254, 358, 000	246, 758, 000
Basic energy research:		
Basic energy sciences:		
Nuclear sciences	30, 700, 000	30, 700, 000
Material sciences	81, 300, 000	79, 000, 000
Chemical sciences	58, 800, 000	55, 100, 000
Engineering, mathematical and geosciences	23, 900, 000	20, 100, 000
Advanced energy projects	16, 600, 000	10, 000, 000
Biological energy conversion and conservation	6, 900, 000	6, 000, 000
Program direction	2, 116, 000	2, 116, 000
Total, basic energy sciences	220, 316, 000	203, 016, 000
Technology assessment projects:		
Assessment projects	3, 000, 000	2, 500, 000
Solar powered satellite	7, 500, 000	5, 000, 000
Program direction	466, 000	466, 000
Total, technical assessment project	10, 966, 000	7, 966, 000
University research support:		
University institutional agreements	2, 300, 000	2, 300, 000
University reactor fuel assistance	1, 700, 000	1, 700, 000
Program direction	171, 000	171, 000
Total, university research support	4, 171, 000	4, 171, 000
Tech program and policy analysis	2, 417, 000	2, 000, 000
Total, basic research	237, 870, 000	217, 153, 000
Total, operating expenses	2, 140, 540, 000	2, 123, 823, 000
Unobligated balances		−75, 300, 000
Total, energy supply, research and development—operating expenses	2, 140, 540, 000	2, 048, 523, 000

The conferees agree with the Senate report language which recognizes the market potential of solar thermal repowering. Repowering oil and gas-fired plants in the Southwestern States could provide a sufficient initial market for commercialization of the central receiver system and substantially reduce foreign oil imports. The Department is directed to proceed in fiscal year 1980 with a solar repowering experimental program and make sufficient funds for that purpose available from within the large thermal power systems program.

The conference allowance of $139,700,000 for Photovoltaics is to provide the funds recommended by both Houses for additional flat plate and concentrator experiments, as well as funds to continue those development and demonstration projects expressly noted in the House and Senate reports accompanying the fiscal year 1979 appropriations bill. Before proceeding to construction of the solar national exemplar project, the Department is directed to submit the report of the results of the studies for this project for approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

The conferees agree with the Senate report language requesting the Department to analyze the need for a national wind energy test facility.

The conferees also agree with the Senate report language with regard to the Hydropower small-scale construction loan program.

The conferees' allowance of $69,000,000 for Converter Reactors, Thermal Reactor Technology provides $3,600,000 for light water reactor reprocessing and refabrication technology at Hanford, Washington, $11,500,000 for the Barnwell Nuclear Fuels facility as provided in the Senate allowance and $4,400,000 for Thorium Recycle as provided in the House allowance. As reflected in the Senate report, the Department is directed to evaluate possible international and domestic uses for the Barnwell facility at the conclusion of the International Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE) and report to Congress on those possible uses no later than April 1, 1980.

Within the funding provided for commercial waste management, the Department is directed to provide necessary technical support to study and recommend a nuclear waste solidification program at West Valley, New York, and to assist the State of New York as appropriate in developing such a program.

The conferees agree to the redirection of $2,500,000 in Energy Storage Systems as reflected in the Senate allowance. This redirection provides $2,000,000 for hydrogen storage and $500,000 for magnetic storage concepts.

The conferees agree with the Senate report language regarding the Department's role as lead agency for the nuclear medicine program.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Uranium supply and enrichment activities

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $60,523,000 for Operating Expenses, Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities, as proposed by the House instead of $64,523,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which makes anticipated revenues from enrichment services available for obligation for the purposes of 31 U.S.C. 665 in order to insure continuity of production activities.

The funds appropriated for Operating Expenses, Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities, are allocated as shown in the following table:

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES—OPERATING EXPENSES

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Uranium resource assessment	$74,415,000	$56,415,000
Program direction	4,108,000	4,108,000
Total, uranium resource assessment	78,523,000	60,523,000
Advanced isotope separation technology	46,200,000	46,200,000
Uranium enrichment	$764,283,000	$780,069,000
Program direction	2,326,000	2,326,000
Total, uranium enrichment	766,609,000	782,395,000
Less uranium enrichment revenues	−782,542,000	−828,595,000
Unobligated balance carried forward	−63,000,000	
Total, uranium supply and enrichment activities—Operating expenses	45,790,000	60,523,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

General science and research

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $336,900,000 for Operating Expenses, General Science and Research, as proposed by the Senate instead of $334,050,000 as proposed by the House. The funds are allocated as shown in the following table:

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH—OPERATING EXPENSES

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
BASIC SCIENCES		
Life sciences research and biomedical applications:		
General Life Sciences	$22,910,000	$22,910,000
Biomedical Applications	17,590,000	17,590,000
Program Direction	237,000	237,000
Total, life sciences research	40,737,000	40,737,000
High energy physics:		
Physics Research	71,850,000	71,850,000
Facility Operations	105,100,000	105,100,000
High Energy Technology	37,050,000	37,050,000
Program Direction	589,000	589,000
Total, high energy physics	214,589,000	214,589,000
Nuclear physics:		
Medium energy physics	$41,700,000	$41,700,000
Heavy ion physics	33,600,000	33,600,000
Nuclear theory	6,100,000	6,100,000
Program direction	174,000	174,000
Total, nuclear physics	81,574,000	81,574,000
Total, general science and research—Operating expenses	336,900,000	336,900,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

Atomic energy defense activities

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $2,371,547,000 for Operating Expenses, Atomic Energy Defense Activities, instead of $2,350,547,000 as proposed by the House and $2,388,147,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds are allocated as shown in the following table:

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES—OPERATING EXPENSES

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Inertial confinement fusion	$108,890,000	$111,890,000
Naval reactors development:		
Submarine propulsion reactors	160,100,000	160,100,000
Surface ship propulsion reactors	55,600,000	55,600,000
Supporting R. & D	16,900,000	16,900,000
Program direction	8,767,000	8,767,000
Total, naval reactors development	241,367,000	241,367,000
Weapons activities:		
Research and development	421,143,000	415,000,000
Testing	198,000,000	213,000,000
Production and surveillance	732,000,000	718,000,000
Program direction	34,958,000	34,958,000
Total, weapons activities	1,386,101,000	1,380,958,000
Verification and control techology	36,800,000	36,800,000
Materials production:		
Production reactor operations	$170,800,000	$180,000,000
Processing of nuclear materials	77,200,000	81,600,000
Supporting services	55,714,000	64,000,000
Flourinel processing of nonproduction fuels and related activities	21,390,000	21,390,000
Program direction	944,000	944,000
Total, materials production	326,048,000	347,934,000
Defense waste management:		
Interim waste operations	125,851,000	120,000,000
Long-term waste management technology	94,449,000	74,449,000
Terminal storage	20,800,000	6,000,000
Decontamination and decommissioning	2,000,000	2,000,000
Transportation R. & D	5,000,000	5,000,000
Program direction	1,522,000	1,522,000
Total, defense waste management	249,622,000	208,971,000
Nuclear materials security and safeguards	43,227,000	43,227,000
Total, atomic energy defense activities—Operating expenses	2,392,055,000	2,371,147,000

For inertial confinement fusion, the conferees have provided $44,200,000 for glass laser experiments; $29,300,000 for gas laser experiments; $12,200,000 for electron and particle beam experiments; $5,000,000 for the national laser users laboratory; $7,900,000 for the industrial laser program; $12,200,000 for other supporting research; and $1,090,000 for program direction.

The allowance of $6,000,000 for terminal storage research in Defense Waste Management is to provide operations through March 31, 1980. This will allow ample time for resolution of program goals and objectives in authorizing legislation. The conferees have provided these funds solely for the purpose of continuing activities for the long-term storage of defense wastes.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Departmental administration

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $228,279,000 for Operating Expenses, Departmental Administration, instead of $237,329,000 as proposed by the House and $228,029,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which earmarks $6,165,000 in the bill for the Office of Inspector General.

The funds are allocated as shown in the following table:

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION—OPERATING EXPENSES

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
SALARIES AND EXPENSES		
General management:		
Office of the Secretary	$2,544,000	$2,544,000
Office of the Controller	7,959,000	7,959,000
Inspector General	3,357,000	4,977,000
Procurement and Contracts Management	6,517,000	6,399,000
Administration	16,990,000	16,525,000
General Counsel	11,091,000	10,439,000
Assistant Secretary for Intergovernmental and Institutional Relations	8,262,000	7,800,000
Assistant Secretary for Policy and Evaluation	5,652,000	5,652,000
Assistant Secretary for International Affairs	4,170,000	4,170,000
Subtotal, general management	66,542,000	66,465,000
Program administration:		
Assistant Secretary for Energy Technology	1,946,000	1,441,000
Assistant Secretary for Resources Applications	661,000	544,000
Assistant Secretary for Environment	2,800,000	2,420,000
Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs	2,140,000	1,751,000
Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Solar Applications	519,000	455,000
Office of Energy Research	1,192,000	779,000
Subtotal, program administration	9,258,000	7,390,000
Field offices:		
Operations offices	50,651,000	50,351,000
Regional representatives	5,698,000	5,229,000
Regional counsels	3,347,000	3,066,000
Power marketing coordination	436,000	436,000
Subtotal, field offices	60,132,000	59,082,000
Other expenses:		
Other salary expenses	$7,491,000	$7,102,000
Benefits	14,825,000	15,594,000
Travel	5,312,000	5,600,000
Services	89,906,000	89,906,000
Subtotal, other expenses	117,534,000	118,202,000
Total, salaries and expenses	253,466,000	251,139,000
Program support:		
Policy analysis and systems studies	16,500,000	16,500,000
Intergovernmental and institutional relations	35,906,000	32,546,000
International cooperation in nonnuclear technologies	2,000,000	2,000,000
International policy studies	1,500,000	1,500,000
In-house energy management	3,600,000	3,600,000
Security investigations	16,400,000	16,400,000
Cost of work for others	24,994,000	24,994,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−109,754,000	−121,660,000
Changes in inventories	19,260,000	16,260,000
Total, program support	10,406,000	−7,860,000
Total, operating expenses	263,872,000	243,279,000
Unobligated balances		−15,000,000
Total, departmental administration—Operating expenses	263,872,000	228,279,000

For Salaries and Expenses the conferees have provided $251,139,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $247,233,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees recognize that the Department will undoubtedly have to have some flexibility to redirect, or reallocate positions in order to respond to potential energy initiatives by the Congress and the Administration, and in order to meet other circumstances and changed conditions that may evolve. Therefore, the Committees on Appropriations will carefully consider any proposed changes in yearend strengths from the allocations shown in the following table and which will not exceed a total end strength of 4,677 full-time positions.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION SUMMARY OF STAFFING

	Fiscal year 1979	Fiscal year 1980	
		Request	Recommendation
YEAREND POSITIONS			
Office of the Secretary	85	85	85
General Counsel	311	361	350
Inspector Generel	100	100	155
Administration	715	715	696
Procurement	218	222	217
Controller	30;	299	299
International Affairs	131	131	131
Policy and Evaluation	190	176	176
Intergovernmental and Institutional Relations	292	263	250
Subtotal	2,347	2,352	2,359
Assistant Secretary for Energy Technology	47	47	44
Assistant Secretary for Resource Applications	19	18	18
Assistant Secretary for Environment	71	71	71
Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs	62	60	60
Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Solar Applications	15	15	15
Office of Energy Research	30	25	23
Subtotal	244	236	231
Operations offices	1,816	1,806	1,806
Regional counsels	75	119	109
Regional representatives	264	157	157
Power marketing coordination	15	15	15
Subtotal	2,170	2,097	2,087
Total	4,761	4,685	4,677

The allowance includes $6,165,000 and 155 positions for the Office of Inspector General.

The conferees have provided $32,546,000 for Intergovernmental and Institutional Relations instead of $32,296,000 as proposed by the Senate and $33,596,000 as proposed by the House. The allowance provides:

$10,574,000 for Technical Information Services;

$10,000,000 for Education, Business, Industry and Labor Affairs;

$2,550,000 for Consumer and Public Affairs;

$750,000 for Indian Affairs; and

$8,672,000 for Community Assistance.

The Committees on Appropriations will favorably consider a reprogramming request from the Department to insure sufficient funds for Los Alamos community assistance in the event that impact aid under Public Law 874 is reduced below levels anticipated in the formulation of the fiscal year 1980 budget request made to the Department by Los Alamos.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Energy supply, research and development

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment appropriating $448,478,000 for Plant and Capital Equipment, Energy Supply, Research and Development, instead of $413,878,000 as proposed by the House and $444,478,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The funds are allocated as shown in the following tables:

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT—CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
SOLAR APPLICATIONS		
Systems development	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
Demonstrations: Buildings	2,000,000	1,000,000
Total, solar applications	3,000,000	2,000,000
SOLAR TECHNOLOGY		
Solar thermal electric power system	3,000,000	3,000,000
Photovoltaics energy development	7,300,000	7,300,000
Wind energy conversion system	1,400,000	1,400,000
Ocean systems	700,000	700,000
Total, solar technology	12,400,000	12,400,000
GEOTHERMAL		
Hydrothermal resources	800,000	800,000
Geopressured resources	300,000	300,000
Geothermal technology development	2,100,000	2,100,000
Total, geothermal	3,200,000	3,200,000
Biomass	500,000	500,000
NUCLEAR FISSION		
Converter reactors:		
Thermal reactor technology	500,000	500,000
Advanced reactor systems	300,000	300,000
Total, converter reactors	800,000	800,000
Commercial waste management:		
Terminal isolation R. & D	9,300,000	9,300,000
Waste treatment technology	2,500,000	2,500,000
Total, commercial waste management	11,800,000	11,800,000
Spent fuel storage: Domestic spent fuel storage	2,000,000	2,000,000
Advanced nuclear systems: Space and terrestrial applications	2,100,000	2,100,000
Breeder reactors:		
Liquid metal fast breeder reactor base program	22,000,000	22,000,000
Water cooled breeder reactor	2,100,000	2,100,000
Gas cooled breeder reactor	1,500,000	1,500,000
Fuel cycle research and development	2,500,000	2,500,000
Program direction	21,000	21,000
Total, breeder reactors	28,121,000	28,121,000
Total, nuclear fission	44,821,000	44,821,000

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
MAGNETIC FUSION		
Confinement systems	$10,950,000	$10,950,000
Development and technology	7,550,000	7,550,000
Applied plasma physics	4,450,000	4,450,000
Reactor projects	6,850,000	6,850,000
Total, magnetic fusion	29,800,000	29,800,000
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE		
Electric energy systems power supply:		
Power supply and system management	100,000	100,000
Power delivery	400,000	700,000
Total, electric energy systems	500,000	800,000
Energy storage systems:		
Battery storage	1,100,000	1,100,000
Chemical mechanical and other storage	1,060,000	1,060,000
Total, energy storage systems	2,160,000	2,160,000
Total, electric energy systems and storage	2,660,000	2,960,000
ENVIRONMENT		
Environmental research and development:		
Overview and assessment	2,200,000	2,200,000
Biomedical and environmental research	11,900,000	11,900,000
Total, environmental R. & D	14,100,000	14,100,000
Decontamination and decommissioning: Management of surplus radioactively contaminated DOE facilities	400,000	400,000
Total, environment	14,500,000	14,500,000
BASIC RESEARCH		
Basic energy sciences:		
Nuclear sciences	1,300,000	1,300,000
Material sciences	6,500,000	6,300,000
Chemical sciences	4,200,000	3,600,000
Engineering, mathematical, and geosciences	1,450,000	1,250,000
Advanced energy projects	200,000	200,000
Biological energy conversion and conservation	300,000	300,000
Other capital equipment	100,000	100,000
Total, basic energy sciences	14,050,000	13,050,000
Technology assessment projects: Solar-powered satellite	500,000	500,000
Total, basic research	14,550,000	13,550,000
Total, capital equipment	125,431,000	123,731,000

ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Project No.	Construction projects	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	SOLAR TECHNOLOGY		
	Solar thermal electric power systems:		
76-2-B	10 MWe central receiver solar thermal powerplant, Barstow, Calif.	$36,500,000	$36,500,000
80-ES-2	Shenandoah large scale experiment, Shenandoah, Ga.	4,800,000	4,800,000
80-ES-19	Small communities systems application experiment No. 1.	3,795,000	3,795,000
	Total, solar thermal electric power	45,095,000	45,095,000
	Wind energy conversion systems:		
80-ES-1	Wind energy systems test center building, Rocky Flats, Colo.	2,140,000	2,140,000
80-ES-20	Multiunit mod 2 wind farm 10 MWe	14,600,000	14,600,000
	Total, wind energy conversion system	16,740,000	16,740,000
79-1-M	Ocean systems: Ocean test facility	10,700,000	10,700,000
79-1-Q	Solar energy research institute facility: Solar energy research institute facility.	27,000,000	10,000,000
	Total, solar technology	99,535,000	82,535,000
	GEOTHERMAL		
	Hydrothermal resources:		
80-G-1	50 MWe geothermal demonstration, Valles Caldera, N. Mex.	20,450,000	20,450,000
80-G-2	Second 50 MWe demo powerplant, site undetermined.		4,000,000
	Total, geothermal	20,450,000	24,450,000
	BIOMASS		
80-B-1	Thermo chemical experimental facility	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
	NUCLEAR		
	COMMERCIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT		
	Terminal isolation R. & D.:		
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$0)	500,000	500,000
80-ES-12	Near surface test facility phase 2, Richland, Wash.	3,600,000	3,600,000
80-ES-13	Near surface test facility phase 1, Richland, Wash.	2,900,000	2,900,000
	Total, terminal isolation R. & D	7,000,000	7,000,000
	Waste treatment technology:		
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$0)	2,800,000	2,800,000
80-ES-7	Plant operation maintenance facility, Richland, Wash.	2,000,000	2,000,000
	Total, waste treatment technology	4,800,000	4,800,000
	Total, commercial waste management	11,800,000	11,800,000
	SPENT FUEL DISPOSITION		
79-1-P	Domestic spent fuel storage: Spent LWR fuel storage facility, site undetermined.		5,000,000

ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT—Continued

Project No.	Construction projects	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	BREEDER		
	Liquid metal fast breeder reactor:		
80-ES-3	Test reactor area physical security and safeguards, INEL, Idaho Falls, Idaho.	$1,200,000	$1,200,000
80-ES-11	Idaho laboratory facility, phase I, Idaho Falls, Idaho.	4,000,000	4,000,000
80-ES-4	Laundry decontamination facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho.	2,200,000	2,200,000
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$14,985)	12,300,000	16,300,000
80-ES-5	Modifications to reactors, various locations	2,800,000	2,800,000
80-ES-6	Boilers, heat ventilating, fuel tank, and room replacement.	400,000	1,900,000
79-1-C	Security improvements, Richland, Wash	4,500,000	4,500,000
79-1-H	Maintenance and storage facility, Richland, Wash.	13,700,000	10,700,000
78-6-C	Safety research experimental facility, Idaho, National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho (A. & E., long-lead procurement and limited construction only).	3,000,000	8,000,000
78-6-E	Liquid metal engineering center modifications, Santa Susana, Calif., (A. & E. and long-lead procurement only).	5,500,000	5,500,000
78-6-F	Fuels and materials examination facility, Richland, Wash.	36,000,000	53,000,000
77-4-D	Fuel storage facility, Richland, Wash	5,500,000	5,500,000
	Total, liquid metal fast breeder reactor	91,100,000	111,600,000
	Gas cooled breeder reactor:		
80-ES-14	Core flow test loop, Oak Ridge, Tenn	3,212,000	3,212,000
80-ES-15	In pile safety test loop, INEL, Idaho	1,300,000	1,300,000
	Total, gas cooled breeder reactor	4,512,000	4,512,000
78-5-B	Fuel cycle research and development: Advanced fuel recycle integrated equipment test facility, Oak Ridge, Tenn.	6,400,000	6,400,000
	Total, breeder	102,012,000	122,512,000
	Total, nuclear	113,812,000	139,312,000
	MAGNETIC FUSION		
	Confinement systems:		
80-MF-1	PDX neutral beams, Princeton, N.J	6,600,000	6,600,000
80-MF-2	Doublet-III neutral beams, San Diego, Calif	2,500,000	2,500,000
78-3-A	Mirror fusion test facility, Livermore, Calif	33,200,000	28,200,000
	Total, confinement systems	42,300,000	37,300,000
80-MF-4	Development and technology: Large coil test facility, phase I, Richland, Wash.	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
80-MF-3	Applied plasma physics: EBT—Proof of principal experiment.	9,100,000	9,100,000
	Reactor projects:		
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$1,400)	4,900,000	4,000,000
78-3-B	Fusion materials irradiation test facility, HEDL, Washington (A. & E. and long-lead procurement).	10,000,000	10,000,000
76-5-A	Tokamak fusion test reactor, Princeton, N.J	30,100,000	30,100,000
	Total, reactor projects	45,000,000	44,100,000
	Total, magnetic fusion	98,400,000	92,500,000
	ENVIRONMENT		
	Biomedical and environmental research:		
80-ES-8	Modifications and additions to biomedical and environmental research facilities, various locations.	3,500,000	3,500,000
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$6,000)	2,500,000	2,500,000
	Total, environmental research and development.	6,000,000	6,000,000
	BASIC RESEARCH		
	BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES		
	Materials sciences:		
80-ES-9	Intense pulsed neutron source-1 upgrade, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Ill.	2,400,000	2,400,000
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$0)	250,000	250,000
78-13-A	National synchrotron light source, BNL, Upton, N.Y.	9,000,000	9,000,000
	Total, materials sciences	11,650,000	11,650,000
80-ES-10	Chemical sciences: Chemical sciences addition, LBL, Berkeley, Calif.	6,300,000	6,300,000
	Total, basic energy sciences	17,950,000	17,950,000
	Total, construction	358,147,000	364,747,000
	Unobligated balances		−40,000,000
	Total, capital equipment	125,431,000	123,731,000
	Total, energy supply, research, and development—Plant and capital equipment.	483,578,000	448,478,000

The conferees agree to the deletion of funding proposed by the House for Project 80-ES-21, Mod 3, advanced megawatt scale, two wind turbines in the wind energy program with the understanding that the parallel development of this system technology will proceed in the development program funded under Operating Expenses.

The managers are in agreement that the Department of Energy should proceed without further delay with the development of a 50-MW binary-cycle conversion geothermal demonstration plant as authorized in P.L. 95-238 and for which $4 million is appropriated in this bill for architect/engineering design studies and long lead-time materials. To this end, the managers direct the Department of Energy to select a site for this demonstration plant within three months.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Uranium supply and enrichment activities

The conferees agree with the allocations proposed by the Senate for Plant and Capital Equipment, Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities, instead of those proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which makes anticipated revenues from enrichment services available for obligation for the purposes of 31 U.S.C. 665 in order to insure continuity of production activities.

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		
Uranium resources assessment	$3,110,000	$2,500,000
Advanced isotope separation technology	8,000,000	8,000,000
Uranium enrichment	23,430,000	23,430,000
Less uranium enrichment revenues	−26,540,000	−31,430,000
Total, capital equipment	8,000,000	2,500,000

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Project No.	Construction projects	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
80-GPP-1	Uranium resource assessment: General plant project (1979—$1,500).	$2,500,000	$1,500,000
80-GPP-1	Advanced isotope separation technology: General plant project (1979—$10).	800,000	800,000
	URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES		
	Gaseous diffusion operations and support		
0-UE-1	Control of gaseous effluents, gaseous diffusion plants.	2,300,000	2,300,000
80-UE-2	Control of water pollution, gaseous diffusion plants.	7,500,000	7,500,000
80 UE-3	Plant facilities security improvements, gaseous diffusion plants.	4,500,000	4,500,000
80-UE-4	Power recovery demonstration cells, gaseous diffusion plants.	3,500,000	3,500,000
80-UE-5	Motor and switchgear upgrading, gaseous diffusion plants.	7,900,000	7,900,000
80-GPP-1	General plant project	16,200,000	16,200,000
80-UE-6	UF6 tails cylinders and storage yards, gaseous diffusion plants.	7,000,000	7,000,000
71-1-F	Process equipment modifications, gaseous diffusion plants.	$64,600,000	$64,600,000
	Total, gaseous diffusion operations and support.	131,500,000	113,500,000
	Gas centrifuge operations and support:		
79-2-D	Techology test facilities, various locations (A. & E. and long-lead procurement only.)	13,000,000	13,000,000
76-8-G	Enriched uranium production facilities, Portsmouth, Ohio.	322,675,000	322,675,000
	Total, gas centrifuge operations and support.	335,675,000	335,675,000
	Revenues	−500,918,000	−449,975,000
	Unobligated balance end of year	49,243,000	
	Total, uranium enrichment activities	−2,500,000	−800,000
	Total construction	800,000	1,500,000
	Total, capital equipment	8,000,000	2,500,000
	Total, uranium supply and enrichment activities—plant and capital equipment.	8,800,000	4,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Atomic energy defense activities

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $588,249,000 for Plant and Capital Equipment, Atomic Energy Defense Activities, instead of $546,249,000 as proposed by the House and $618,249,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds are allocated as shown in the following tables:

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT—CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Inertial confinement fusion	$8,500,000	$8,500,000
Naval reactors development:		
Submarine propulsion reactors	10,725,000	10,725,000
Surface ship propulsion reactors	3,900,000	3,900,000
Supporting research and development	1,175,000	1,175,000
Total, naval reactors development	15,800,000	15,800,000
Weapons activities:		
Research and development	55,990,000	48,990,000
Testing	21,810,000	21,810,000
Production and surveillance	26,200,000	26,200,000
Program direction	164,000	164,000
Total, weapons activities	104,164,000	97,164,000
Verification and control technology	1,060,000	1,060,000
Materials production:		
Production reactor operations	$10,400,000	$10,400,000
Processing of nuclear materials	9,800,000	9,800,000
Supporting services	9,800,000	9,800,000
Flourinel processing of nonproduction fuels and related activities	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total, materials production	35,000,000	35,000,000
Defense waste management:		
Interim waste operations	8,575,000	7,000,000
Long-term waste management technology	2,985,000	2,985,000
Terminal storage	440,000	440,000
Total, defense waste management	12,000,000	10,425,000
Nuclear materials security and safeguards	3,400,000	3,400,000
Total, capital equipment	179,924,000	171,349,000

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES, PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Project No.	Construction projects	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	Inertial confinement fusion:		
80-PE&D-1	Plant engineering design	$1,500,000	$1,500,000
80-AE-11	Target fabrication facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico.		1,000,000
80-AE-12	Target fabrication facility, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, California.		1,000,000
78-4-A	High energy laser facility (NOVA), Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, California.	56,000,000	56,000,000
75-3-B	High energy laser facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico.	12,000,000	12,000,000
	Total, inertial confinement	69,500,000	71,500,000
	NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT		
	Submarine propulsion reactors:		
80-AE-1	Fluids and corrosion test facilities upgrading, various locations.	12,100,000	12,100,000
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$0)	2,300,000	2,300,000
	Total, submarine propulsion facilities	14,400,000	14,400,000
	Surface ship propulsion reactors:		
80-AE-1	Fluids and corrosion test facilities upgrading various locations.	4,425,000	4,425,000
80-GPP-1	General plant project	800,000	800,000
	Total, surface ship propulsion reactors	5,225,000	5,225,000
	Supporting research and development:		
80-AE-1	Fluids and corrosion test facilities upgrading, various locations.	1,375,000	1,375,000
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$200)	200,000	200,000
	Total, supporting research and development	1,575,000	1,575,000
	Total, naval reactors development	21,200,000	21,200,000
	WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
	Weapon research and development:		
80-AE-4	Addition to computer facility, Sandia Laboratories, Livermore, Calif.	2,800,000	2,800,000
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$18,400)	25,400,000	22,400,000
79-7-B	Fire protection improvements, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.	2,500,000	2,500,000
79-7-C	Proton storage ring, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico.	14,700,000	14,700,000
79-7-L	Systems research and development laboratory, Sandia Laboratory.	12,000,000	12,000,000
78-16-C	High explosive flash radiography facility, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, California.	2,000,000	2,000,000
78-16-G	Radioactive liquid waste improvement, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico.	4,000,000	4,000,000
78-16-I	Laboratory support complex, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico.	3,000,000	3,000,000
	Total, weapons research and development	66,400,000	63,400,000
	Weapons production and surveillance:		
80-AE-5	Ground launch cruise missile, production facilities, various locations.	7,000,000	4,000,000
80-AE-6	Utilities restoration, equipment replacement upgrade, various locations.	39,400,000	25,000,000
80-AE-7	Relocate water towers, Mound Laboratory, Miamisburg, Ohio.	1,400,000	
80-AE-8	Advanced size reduction facility, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colo.	5,000,000	5,000,000
80-AE-9	New polymer production facility, Kansas City, Mo.	1,400,000	1,400,000
80-AE-10	Additional loading facilities, Savannah River, S.C.	3,500,000	3,500,000
80-PE&D-1	Plant engineering and design (1979—$10,000)	3,600,000	2,500,000
79-7-E	Production and assembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Tex.	8,000,000	8,000,000
79-7-N	Utilities system restoration, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn.	$13,300,000	$13,300,000
79-7-O	Universal pilot plant, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Tex.	3,900,000	3,900,000
78-16-D	Weapons safeguards, various locations	2,000,000	2,000,000
77-11-C	8-inch artillery fired atomic projectile production facilities, various locations.	4,600,000	4,600,000
71-9	Fire safety and adequacy or operations condition project, various locations.	7,000,000	7,000,000
	Total, weapons production	100,100,000	80,200,000
	Total, weapons activities	166,500,000	143,600,000
	MATERIALS PRODUCTION		
	Processing of nuclear materials:		
80-AE-2	Replace obsolete processing facilities, H-B line, Savannah River, S.C.	8,200,000	8,200,000
78-18-E	Environmental safety and security improvements to waste management and materials processing facilities, Richland, Wash.	17,000,000	17,000,000
	Total, processing of nuclear materials	25,200,000	25,200,000
	Supporting services:		
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$1,500)	13,000,000	13,000,000
80-PE&D-1	Plant engineering design (1979—$1,500)	2,400,000	2,400,000
79-7-I	Transmission and distribution systems upgrading, Richland, Wash.	11,400,000	11,400,000
	Total, supporting services	26,800,000	26,800,000
	Flourinel processing of nonproduction fuels and related activities:		
80-AE-3	Steam generation facilities, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho Falls, Idaho.	10,000,000	10,000,000
80-GGP-1	General plant project (1979—$0)	2,000,000	2,000,000
80-PE&D-1	Plant engineering and design (1979—$0)	1,000,000	1,000,000
79-7-H	Utilities replacement and expansion, Idaho Chemical Processing Plent, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho.	3,200,000	3,200,000
77-13-A	Flourinel dissolution process and fuel receiving improvement, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.	53,400,000	53,400,000
	Total, flourinel processing of nonproduction fuels and related activities.	69,600,000	69,600,000
	Total, materials production	121,600,000	121,600,000
	DEFENSE WASTE MANAGEMENT		
	Interim waste management:		
80-GPP-1	General plant project (1979—$2,000)	8,880,000	4,000,000
80-PE&D-1	Plant engineering and design (1979—$0)	6,820,000	2,000,000
79-7-K	Waste management facilities, Savannah River, S.C.	14,000,000	14,000,000
78-18-B	High level waste storage facilities, Savannah River, S.C.	11,000,000	11,000,000
	Total, interim waste operations	40,700,000	31,000,000
80-PE&D-1	Long term waste management technology: Plant engineering and design (1979—$6,000).	14,500,000	6,000,000
77-13-F	Terminal storage: Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast New Mexico.	55,000,000	22,000,000
	Total, defense waste management	110,200,000	59,000,000
	Total, construction	489,000,000	416,900,000
	Total, capital equipment	179,924,000	171,349,000
	Total, atomic energy defense activities—plant and capital equipment.	668,924,000	588,249,000

The conferees have provided $5,000,000 in Operating Expenses for the National Laser Users Facility, which was not requested in the President's budget, and $7,900,000 in Operating Expenses for the industrial laser program, an increase of $300,000 over the budget. The conferees consider that these funds will allow pursuit of aggressive laser fusion programs at these facilities and have deferred, without prejudice, for future consideration funds for further facility upgrading.

The conferees have provided $6,000,000 for Project 80-PE&D-1, Plant Engineering and Design for the Defense Waste Management program, the same level as in FY 1979 pending resolution of the construction program in authorizing legislation.

Considering the significant differences in authorizing legislation being considered in the House and in the Senate, $22,000,000 has been provided for Project 77-13-F, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Southeast New Mexico, to continue selected project activities through March 31, 1980. This will permit resolution of project status and objectives by the Congress in the authorizing legislation. The $22,000,000 includes $10,000,000 for land acquisition and $12,000,000 for project design and development. These funds are provided solely for the purpose of continuing project activities related to the storage of defense wastes.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Departmental administration

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $36,015,000 for Plant and Capital Equipment, Departmental Administration, instead of $31,015,000 as proposed by the House and $40,515,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds are allocated as shown in the following tables:

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION—PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		
Program support:		
General support	$4,305,000	$4,305,000
Intergovernmental and institutional relations	510,000	510,000
Total, program support	4,815,000	4,815,000

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION—PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Project No.	Construction projects	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT		
	In-house energy management:		
80-DA-1	Modifications for energy management, various locations.	$19,700,000	$15,000,000
80-DA-2	Automated energy management system, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois.	4,500,000	
80-DA-3	Process waste heat utilization, Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Ohio.	4,200,000	4,200,000
80-DA-4	Automated energy management system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Tex.	4,000,000	4,000,000
80-DA-5	Conversion of boiler No. 5 to high sulfur coal firing, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois.	5,000,000	5,000,000
	Total, in-house energy management	37,400,000	28,200,000
	OTHER SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES		
80-PE&D-1	Plant engineering and design—Nondefense plant engineering and design (1979—$3,000).	$9,000,000	$3,000,000
	Total, construction	46,400,000	31,200,000
	Total, capital equipment	4,815,000	4,815,000
	Total, departmental administration—plant and capital equipment.	51,215,000	36,015,000

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 12: Deletes language proposed by the House permitting the purchase of one fixed wing aircraft.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $122,800,000 for Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of $124,900,000 as proposed by the House.

The managers agree with the Senate report language expressing concern regarding the cost of space for WAPA Headquarters, and the Senate position that none of the funds provided are to be used to pay for space in Denver if the costs are higher overall than locating near the Federal Center.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which permits transfer of not to exceed 5 percent of selected appropriations between such appropriations with the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

Amendment No. 15: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to reduce the total amount of budget authority for the Department of Energy by $6,880,000 for reduction of motor vehicle use. The Department has extensive responsibilities for transportation of special nuclear material, the guarding and protection of sensitive sites and construction and maintenance of key electricity transmission systems, all of which must be provided for in DOE appropriations to meet essential needs.

The conferees encourage the Department to achieve at least a 10 percent reduction in the use of motor vehicle fuels, including fuels for all vehicles owned by the Federal Government, commercial rental, leased, trip and interagency motor pool vehicles as defined in the Federal Motor Vehicle Fleet Report, dated September 1978, of the General Services Administration. The Committees on Appropriations intend to review further the Department's efforts and achievements in reduction of motor vehicle fuel consumption in connection with the review of the FY 1981 budget.

PROGRAM COSTS

The following table reflects the program cost and outlay level associated with appropriations provided for in the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—PROGRAM COSTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimates	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
OPERATING EXPENSES		
Energy supply, research and development:		
Solar applications	$132,360	$143,260
Solar technology	263,004	277,229
Geothermal	113,377	116,337
Biomass	53,838	53,838
Hydropower projects	17,568	17,568
Fission	755,599	741,349
Fusion	234,158	242,858
Electric energy systems and storage	89,441	96,691
Environment	244,958	239,258
Basic research	234,024	227,061
Total, energy supply R. & D.	2,138,327	2,155,449
Uranium supply and enrichment activities:		
Uranium resources assessment	74,293	60,793
Advanced isotope separation technology	48,500	48,500
Uranium enrichment	763,949	763,949
Less uranium enrichment revenues	−782,542	−812,809
Total, uranium supply and enrichment activity	104,200	60,433
General science and research	332,038	329,188
Atomic energy defense activities:		
Inertial confinement fusion	$114,490	$119,240
Naval reactors development	249,567	249,567
Weapons activities	1,341,841	1,349,700
Verification and control technology	35,600	35,600
Materials production	308,948	339,312
Defense waste management	230,286	195,548
Nuclear materials, security, and safeguards	39,227	39,227
Total, atomic energy defense activities	2,319,959	2,328,194
Departmental administration	259,114	245,571
Total, operating expenses	5,153,638	5,118,835
Capital equipment	324,382	317,289
Construction	970,730	909,585
Total, plant and capital equipment	1,295,112	1,226,874
Power marketing	75,786	77,886
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	66,406	59,600
Special Foreign currency	883	883
Geothermal resources development fund	1,000	1,000
Grand total	6,592,825	6,485,078

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENQUIRER—CIVIL

General investigations

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $142,145,000 for general investigations instead of $142,296,000 as proposed by the House and $140,795,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have provided $200,000 under the Big Sandy River study to continue the reevaluation of the Haysi Lake, Virginia project.

Within available funds, the Corps should review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Los Angeles and San Gabriel rivers and Ballona Creek, California published as House Doc. 838, 76th Congress, and any other pertinent reports, with a view to determine whether a modification of any of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time, in the interest of landslide, soil erosion, and drainage problems, and related matters with particular reference to the Baldwin Hills area, vicinity of Los Angeles County, California.

The conferees agree with the Senate report language which directs the Corps of Engineers to utilize available operation and maintenance funds to develop a comprehensive plan for control and treatment of wastewater that flows into Greer's Ferry Lake, Arkansas, and a plan for solid waste management in the area around the lake.

The conferees have recommended $400,000 to continue the Ben Franklin Lock and Dam study. However, the conferees are aware of the objections that have been raised to the proposed Lock and Dam and emphasize that inclusion of these study funds does not represent a determination that the project should, in fact, be built. Among the items to be studied are the impacts the proposed project would have on fishery resources, ground water tables in the Hanford area, future uses of the Hanford site, cultural resources, and the unimpounded reach of the Columbia River.

The conferees agree with the Senate report language regarding the Kentucky River and tributaries, Ky. study and the Green and Barren Rivers, Ky., navigation study.

Amendment No. 17: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which inserts language relating to the study of the diversion of Lake Michigan water at Chicago.

The funds appropriated are to be allocated as shown on the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—STATE AND PROJECT

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	ALABAMA		
(FDP)	Brewton and East Brewton	$69,000	$69,000
(N)	Little Lagoon at Gulfshores		62,000
(N)	Mississippi River Navigation System—Adequate mooring facilities for watercraft.	200,000	200,000
(SPEC)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway	477,000	900,000
(N)	Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Ala. and Miss	200,000	200,000
	ALASKA		
(FDP)	Kuskokwim River basin—Bethel Bank stabilization		260,000
(FDP)	Small hydroelectric plants	350,000	350,000
(FDP)	South-Central Railbelt area	385,000	385,000
(N)	South-Central region of Alaska	308,000	308,000
(N)	St. Paul Island Harbor		100,000
	AMERICAN SAMOA		
(N)	Harbors and rivers	200,000	200,000
	ARIZONA		
(FDP)	Gila River and tributaries, Arizona and New Mexico.	430,000	550,000
(FDP)	Metropolitan area of Tucson	330,000	330,000
	ARKANSAS		
(N)	Arkansas River hydro study		300,000
(FDP)	Arkansas River in the vicinity of Fort Smith-Van Buren.	50,000	50,000
(FDP)	Little Rock metropolitan area	180,000	180,000
(FDP)	Ouachita River basin	730,000	1,200,000
(FDP)	Pine Bluff metropolitan area	90,000	90,000
(FDP)	Poteau River, Arkansas and Oklahoma		170,000
(COMP)	Red River below Denison Dam authorization report Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas.	145,000	145,000
(N)	St. Francis River navigation	109,000	109,000
(COMP)	White River Basin authorization report, Arkansas and Missouri.	150,000	150,000
(FDP)	White River basin reservoirs, Arkansas and Missouri.	250,000	250,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FDP)	Alamada Creek upper basin	140,000	140,000
(N)	Bolinas Lagoon		55,000
(FDP)	Calleguas Creek (phase I)	120,000	120,000
(FDP)	Carmel River and tributaries	255,000	255,000
(SP)	City of Alameda shoreline		95,000
(N)	Coast of northern California (harbors for light-draft vessels).		70,000
(N)	Crescent City Harbor		100,000
(FDP)	Eel River		160,000
(FDP)	Guadalupe River	242,000	242,000
(N)	Humboldt Harbor and Bay		190,000
(FDP)	Los Angeles County drainage area review	400,000	400,000
(N)	Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors (including San Pedro Bay model study).	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	Morrison Creek stream group (phase I)	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	Northern California streams	125,000	125,000
(N)	Oakland inner harbor		100,000
(N)	Oceanside Harbor	95,000	95,000
(FDP)	Sacramento River and tributaries (bank protection and erosion control).		600,000
(N)	Sacramento Valley navigation	115,000	115,000
(FDP)	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	150,000	150,000
(FDP)	San Diego County streams	285,000	285,000
(N)	San Francisco Bay area (in depth)	280,000	280,000
(FDP)	San Francisco Bay shoreline		150,000
(FDP)	San Joaquin River basin	475,000	700,000
(FDP)	San Lorenzo River		75,000
(N)	San Pedro Bay ports	400,000	400,000
(FDP)	Santa Ana River basin and Orange County	400,000	400,000
(FDP)	Santa Ana River (phase I)	680,000	680,000
(FDP)	Whitewater River	640,000	640,000
	COLORADO		
(FDP)	Arkansas River and tributaries above John Martin Dam (phase I).	$200,000	$200,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(N)	Bridgeport Harbor	115,000	115,000
(COMP)	Connecticut River basin authorization report, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire.	85,000	85,000
(SPEC)	Long Island Sound—dredged material containment study.	350,000	350,000
(FDP)	Rippowan River	126,000	126,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	Delaware Estuary, salinity intrusion	100,000	100,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(SPEC)	Metropolitan Washington water supply	700,000	700,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	Apalachicola River below Jim Woodruff lock and dam	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	Bayou Texar		100,000
(FDP)	Canal 18-Jupiter inlet—Loxahatchee River, central and southern Florida	150,000	150,000
(FDP)	Central and southern Florida water supply	200,000	200,000
(N)	Choctawhatchee River and tributaries (Pea River), Florida and Alabama		50,000
(SP)	Dade County (north of Haulover Beach Park)	99,000	99,000
(N)	Fort Pierce Harbor	125,000	125,000
(SP)	Flagler County Beach		20,000
(N)	Golden Gate Estates		100,000
(N)	Gulf Coast Passes, IWW, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River		80,000
(N)	Jacksonville Harbor	170,000	170,000
(FDP)	Jacksonville Metropolitan Area	172,000	172,000
(FDP)	Kissimmee River—Lake Okeechobee	150,000	150,000
(SP)	Martin County	63,000	63,000
(N)	Okeechobee Waterway (St. Lucie Canal)	131,000	481,000
(N)	Pensacola Harbor	60,000	60,000
(FDP)	Pinellas County		80,000
(SP)	Sarasota County		50,000
(FDP)	Shark River slough area		100,000
(FDP)	Withlacoochee River region		100,000
(N)	Tampa Harbor study		30,000
	GEORGIA		
(FDP)	Metropolitan Atlanta area	251,000	251,000
(FDP)	Metropolitan Savannah area	250,000	250,000
(N)	Savannah Harbor comprehensive study	70,000	100,000
	GUAM		
(N)	Harbors and rivers	330,000	330,000
	HAWAII		
(FDP)	Harbors and rivers in Hawaii	200,000	200,000
(N)	Hilo area comprehensive study	325,000	325,000
(FDP)	Kihei District	100,000	100,000
	IDAHO		
(FDP)	Columbia River and tributaries, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington	1,150,000	1,250,000
(FDP)	Heise-Roberts area		20,000
(FDP)	Upper Snake River and tributaries, Idaho and Wyoming	450,000	450,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	ILLINOIS		
(SPEC)	Carlyle Lake and Lake Shelbyville	$50,000	$50,000
(FDP)	Chicago—south end of Lake Michigan, Ill. and Ind.	200,000	200,000
(FDP)	Chicago and underflow plan (phase I)	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FDP)	Degognia and Fountain Bluff lock and dams and Grand Tower D. & LD.	147,000	147,000
(SPEC)	Diversion of Lake Michigan water at Chicago	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	East Cape Girardeau, Clear Creek, N. Alex, Preston, and Miller, D. & LD.	70,000	70,000
(FDP)	Fox River and tributaries, Illinois and Wisconsin	420,000	420,000
(FDP)	Illinois shore of Lake Michigan		200,000
(N)	Illinois shore from Waukegan to Illinois-Wisconsin State line.		100,000
(FDP)	Mississippi River, Coon Rapids Dam to Ohio River, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Wisconsin.	300,000	300,000
(N)	Mississippi River, year-round navigation, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri and Wisconsin.	98,000	98,000
(FDP)	Quad-Cities urban study	247,000	247,000
(FDP)	Richland Creek	270,000	270,000
(FDP)	Rock River at Rockford	175,000	175,000
	INDIANA		
(FDP)	Little Calumet River (phase I)	750,000	750,000
(COMP)	Wabash River Basin authorization report, Indiana and Illinois.	150,000	150,000
	IOWA		
(FDP)	Des Moines River bank erosion, Iowa, Missouri	178,000	
(FDP)	Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa and Minnesota	150,000	150,000
(FDP)	Metropolitan Sioux City and Missouri River, Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota.	149,000	149,000
	KANSAS		
(FDP)	Arkansas River, Great Bend, Kans. to John Martin Dam, Colo.	155,000	155,000
(FDP)	Arkansas River, Great Bend, Kans. to Tulsa, Okla.	270,000	270,000
(FDP)	Grand (Neosho) River, Kans. and Okla.	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	Kansas and Osage Rivers	850,000	850,000
(FDP)	Stranger Creek basin	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	Verdigris River, Kans., Okla.	160,000	160,000
	KENTUCKY		
(FDP)	Camp Ground Lake, Ky. (phase I)		250,000
(FDP)	Kentucky River and tributaries		150,000
(N)	Lower Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers below Barkley Canal, Ky. and Tenn.	125,000	125,000
(FDP)	Tug Fork Valley, Ky., Va., and W. Va. (phase I)	283,000	283,000
(FDP)	Upper Cumberland River Basin, Ky. and Tenn.	150,000	150,000
	LOUISIANA		
(FDP)	Aloha Rigolette area		150,000
(N)	Gulf IWW Louisiana-Texas section, Louisiana, Texas.	370,000	370,000
(FDP)	Louisiana coastal area	100,000	150,000
(FDP)	Mermentau, Vermilion, and Calcasieu Rivers and Bayou Teche.	100,000	100,000
	MAINE		
(N)	Eastport	60,000	60,000
(SPEC)	Passamaquoddy Tidal power	860,000	860,000
(N)	Portland Harbor (debris study)	20,000	20,000
(N)	Searsport Harbor	30,000	30,000
(FDP)	St. John River	76,000	76,000
	MARYLAND		
(SPEC)	Chesapeake Bay study, Maryland and Virginia	2,515,000	2,515,000
(N)	Chesapeake City Bridge	72,000	72,000
(FDP)	Monongahela-Youchiogheny River Basin, Md., Pa., W. Va.	436,000	436,000
(N)	Smith Island		95,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(N)	East Boat Basin		35,000
(FDP)	Housatonic River Basin, Mass. and Conn.	180,000	180,000
(N)	Lynn Harbor	60,000	60,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels and harbors, Mich., Ill., Ind., Minn., Ohio, Pa., N.Y., Wis.	740,000	740,000
(FDP)	Great Lakes, particularly Lakes Ontario and Erie, Mich., Minn., N.Y., Ohio, Pa., Wis.	613,000	613,000
(SPEC)	Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway navigation SSN extension, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin.	2,300,000	750,000
(N)	Little Girls Point	106,000	106,000
(SPEC)	Water levels of the Great Lakes, Mich., Ill., Ind., Minn., N.Y., Ohio, Pa.	550,000	550,000
	MINNESOTA		
(SPEC)	Great River resources management study, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin.	1,423,000	1,423,000
(FDP)	Minnesota River Valley	365,000	365,000
(N)	Reservoirs at Headwaters of Mississippi River	230,000	230,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	Biloxi Bay to East Harrison County industrial park		$50,000
(N)	Mississippi Sound and adjacent areas	$486,000	486,000
(FDP)	Pascagoula River Basin	276,000	276,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor		35,000
(N)	Pearl River, Miss. and La.	80,000	80,000
(FDP)	Pearl River Basin, Miss. and La.		500,000
(FDP)	Sowashee Creek (phase I)	250,000	250,000
	MISSOURI		
(FDP)	Cape Girardeau-Jackson metropolitan area	263,000	263,000
(FDP)	Metropolitan region of Kansas City, Mo. and Kans.	65,000	65,000
(FDP)	Plattin Creek	46,000	46,000
(FDP)	Prosperity Lake (phase I)	150,000	150,000
(N)	St. Louis Harbor, Mo. and Ill.	317,000	371,000
(FDP)	St. Louis metropolitan area, Mo. and Ill.	450,000	450,000
(FDP)	White River Basin, county line lake	100,000	100,000
	MONTANA		
(FDP)	Flathead and Clark Fork River Basins	173,000	
	NEVADA		
(FDP)	Truckee Meadows	275,000	275,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(N)	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, N.H., Maine.	110,000	110,000
(FDP)	Southeastern New Hampshire	128,000	128,000
(FDP)	Winnipesaukee River	80,000	80,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(SP)	Barnegat Inlet (phase I)	200,000	200,000
(FDP)	Cape May Inlet—Lower township (phase I)	80,000	80,000
(FDP)	Hackensack River, N.J. and N.Y.	255,000	255,000
(FDP)	Passaic River basin, N.J. and N.Y. (phase I)	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FDP)	Raritan River basin	380,000	380,000
(N)	Raritan River, Washington Canal and South River	80,000	80,000
(FDP)	Third River	120,000	120,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FDP)	Rio Grande and tributaries (Rio Puerco/Rio Salado) (phase I).	580,000	580,000
(FDP)	Rio Grande and tributaries, New Mexico and Colorado.	430,000	430,000
	NEW YORK		
(N)	Buffalo Harbor		100,000
(FDP)	Delaware River tributaries in New York State	170,000	170,000
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River (All-American Canal)	200,000	200,000
(N)	Hempstead Harbor		55,000
(N)	Howland Hook channel area		50,000
(FDP)	Irondequoit Creek	150,000	150,000
(N)	Jones Inlet and Freeport, Long Island		40,000
(SP)	Lake Ontario shoreline study		300,000
(FDP)	Morrisonville and vicinity	26,000	26,000
(FDP)	Oswego River Basin	300,000	300,000
(N)	St. Lawrence Seaway, additional locks	500,000	500,000
(COMP)	Susquehanna River Basin authorization report, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.	200,000	200,000
(FDP)	Upper Allegheny River Basin, N.Y. and Pa.	250,000	250,000
(FDP)	Wallkill River (black dirt area), New York and New Jersey (phase I).		200,000
(FDP)	Westchester County streams, New York and Byram River, Conn.	74,000	74,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(SP)	Bogue Banks and Bogue Inlet	130,000	130,000
(FDP)	Lumber River, N.C. and S.C.	175,000	175,000
(FDP)	Roanoke River (South Boston and vicinity), North Carolina and Virginia.	260,000	260,000
(SP)	West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet		20,000
(SP)	Wrightsville Beach	153,000	153,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FDP)	Grafton (phase I)	200,000	200,000
(FDP)	Pembina River (phase I)	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	Red River of the North, N.D. and Minn.	624,000	770,000
	OHIO		
(FDP)	Central Ohio survey	300,000	300,000
(N)	Cleveland Harbor (phase I)	245,000	245,000
(N)	Gallipolis locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia (phase I).	450,000	450,000
(FDP)	Grand Lake St. Marys	150,000	150,000
(SPEC)	Lake Erie—wastewater managment, Ohio, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, and Indiana.	652,000	652,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	275,000	275,000
(FDP)	Miami River, Little Miami River and Mill Creek	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	Western Lake Erie shore	210,000	210,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FDP)	Canadian River and tributaries, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas.	190,000	190,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
(FDP)	Red River and tributaries above Denison Dam, Okla. and Tex.		$150,000
(FDP)	Tenkiller Ferry Lake	$230,000	230,000
(FDP)	Tulsa urban study	300,000	300,000
	OREGON		
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington.	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	Days Creek Lake (phase I)		400,000
(N)	Rogue River at Gold Beach		260,000
(COMP)	Williamette River basin authorization report	156,000	156,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(FDP)	Beaver River Basin, Pa. and Ohio	150,000	150,000
(FDP)	Chartiers Creek	50,000	50,000
(FDP)	Clarion River acid mine drain (phase I)	150,000	150,000
(FDP)	Delaware River Basin, Pa, N.J. N.Y., Del	170,000	170,000
(N)	Delaware River dredging disposal study, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.	200,000	200,000
(FDP)	Kiskiminitas River Basin	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	Lehigh River Basin		50,000
(FDP)	Lock Haven (phase I)	75,000	75,000
(SP)	Presque Isle Peninsula (phase I)	500,000	500,000
(N)	Schuylkill River review	64,000	64,000
(FDP)	Wyoming Valley (phase I)	200,000	200,000
	PUERTO RICO		
(N)	San Juan Harbor (phase I)	170,000	170,000
	RHODE ISLAND		
(FDP)	Pawcatuck River and Narragansett Bay drain, basin, river, Massachusetts.	350,000	350,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	Charleston Harbor	100,000	100,000
(N)	Georgetown Harbor		100,000
(FDP)	Lynches River	40,000	40,000
(FDP)	Waccamaw River		40,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(FDP)	Eastern South Dakota and Upper Big Sioux River, S. Dak. and Iowa.	243,000	243,000
(FDP)	Missouri River, S. Dak., Neb. N. Dak. and Mont	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	Western Dakotas region of South Dakota	225,000	225,000
	TENNESSEE		
(FDP)	Memphis metropolitan area	200,000	200,000
(FDP)	Metropolitan region of Nashville	375,000	375,000
	TEXAS		
(FDP)	Brazos natural salt pollution control (phase I)	300,000	350,000
(FDP)	Brazos River and tributaries	70,000	70,000
(FDP)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	Colorado River and tributaries	260,000	260,000
(FDP)	Denison Dam—Lake Texoma, Tex. and Oka	50,000	50,000
(N)	Galveston Bay area navigation	265,000	300,000
(SP)	Galveston County shore erosion		300,000
(N)	Guadalupe River, channel to Victoria	200,000	200,000
(FDP)	Lake Texoma water supply facilities, Texas and Oklahoma.	115,000	200,000
(FDP)	Little Cypress Creek		125,000
(FDP)	Nueces River and tributaries	191,000	191,000
(FDP)	Palo Blanco Creek and Cibolo Creek	160,000	160,000
(N)	Sabine River navigation	400,000	600,000
(FDP)	San Diego Creek		100,000
(FDP)	San Jacinto River and tributaries	39,000	150,000
(FDP)	Walnut Branch		50,000
	UTAH		
(FDP)	Colorado River and tributaries above Lee's Ferry, Utah, Ariz., Colo., N. Mex., Wyo.	50,000	150,000
(FDP)	Jordan River basin	150,000	150,000
	VIRGIN ISLANDS		
(FDP)	Puerto Rico—Virgin Islands pipeline study, Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.	$400,000	$400,000
	VIRGINIA		
(FDP)	Chowan River, Va. and N.C	88,000	88,000
(N)	Deep Creek, Newport News	100,000	100,000
(N)	Hampton Roads drift removal	110,000	150,000
(N)	Norfolk Harbor, Craney Island	67,000	67,000
(SP)	Norfolk vicinity Willoughby Spit	265,000	265,000
(FDP)	Richmond (phase I)	189,000	189,000
(FDP)	Roanoke River, upper basin	140,000	140,000
(FDP)	Virginia Beach (phase I)	200,000	200,000
	WASHINGTON		
(N)	Ben Franklin lock and dam		400,000
(FDP)	Chehalis River and tributaries	200,000	300,000
(COMP)	Puget Sound and adjacent waters	809,000	1,152,000
(FDP)	Puyallup River		120,000
(N)	Seattle Harbor, Duwamish Waterway	200,000	450,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(N)	Big Sandy River, W. Va., Ky., Va	300,000	500,000
(FDP)	Guyandotte River Basin, vicinity of Logan and Mullens.	125,000	125,000
(COMP)	Kanawha River Basin authorization report, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Virginia.	230,000	230,000
(FDP)	Metro region of Huntington, W. Va.; Ashland, Ky.; Portsmouth, Ohio.	200,000	200,000
	WISCONSIN		
(FDP)	Wisconsin River at Portage	127,000	127,000
	Total, all States	59,736,000	68,905,000
	Coordination studies with other agencies	5,665,000	5,665,000
	NATIONWIDE STUDIES		
(SPEC)	Hydropower resources study	2,900,000	2,900,000
(SPEC)	National waterway study	2,045,000	2,045,000
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS		
	Restudies of deferred projects	168,000	253,000
	Review of completed projects (sec. 216, Public Law 91-611).	267,000	342,000
	Neches River Basin, additional hydropower at Town Bluff Dam, Tex.		(75,000)
	Review for deauthorization (sec. 12, Public Law 93-251).	100,000	100,000
	Total, review of authorized projects	535,000	695,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA		
	Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	550,000	550,000
	Precipitation studies (National Weather Service)	300,000	300,000
	International water studies	105,000	105,000
	Flood plain management services	8,510,000	8,510,000
	Hydrologic studies	330,000	330,000
	Scientific and technical information centers	300,000	300,000
	Coastal data collection	1,550,000	1,550,000
	Transportation systems	400,000	400,000
	National program of inspection of dams	30,000,000	30,000,000
	Total, collection and study of basic data	42,045,000	42,045,000
	Research and development	20,240,000	20,240,000
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages		−350,000
	Total, general investigations	133,166,000	142,145,000

Type of project:
(N) Navigation
(FDP) Flood Damage Prevention
(SP) Shoreline Protection
(SPEC) Special
(COMP) Comprehensive
(Phase I) Authorized for Phase I Stage of Advance Engineering and Design in the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 or 1976

Construction, general

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $1,467,566,000 for construction, general as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,440,481,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees have not included funds for the Burlington Dam project in North Dakota based on testimony by the Corps of Engineers that previously appropriated funds are sufficient to complete current preconstruction planning efforts involving design improvements to be included in forthcoming reauthorizing legislation.

None of the funds provided in fiscal year 1980 may be used for the construction of the reregulating dam portion of the Libby Additional Units and Reregulating Dam, Montana.

The conferees agree that the allowance of $5,000,000 for the Aquatic Plant Control Program should be used for the most critical needs nationwide.

The conferees agree with the Senate report language regarding the Continuing Authorities Program. It is the conferees intent that projects approved by the Chief of Engineers, for which firm local cooperation agreements are available, proceed to construction in a timely manner. Toward this end, the Corps should exercise the same transfer procedures between the continuing authorities programs as are used for individual projects in the regular construction program.

The funds appropriated are to be allocated as shown on the following table:

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL—STATE AND PROJECT

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980			
		Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	ALABAMA				
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam	$3,500,000		$3,500,000	
(N)	Mobile Harbor (Theodore ship c hannel)	8,300,000		10,300,000	
(N)	Montgomery to Gadsden, Coosa River channel				$1,000,000
(N)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss	165,000,000		165,000,000	
(FC)	Fort Toulouse Bank stabilization			1,000,000	
	ALASKA				
(MP)	Bradley Lake power project		$1,700,000		1,700,000
(FC)	Chena River lakes	27,500,000		27,500,000	
(N)	Hoonah Harbor	2,793,000		2,793,000	
(N)	Kake Harbor		195,000		195,000
(N)	Metlakatla Harbor	3,705,000		3,705,000	
	ARIZONA				
(FC)	Indian Bend Wash	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Phoenix and vicinity (stage 2 and remaining work)	208,000,000		3,400,000	
	ARKANSAS				
(MP)	Degray Lake	800,000		800,000	
(N)	McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, locks and dams, Arkansas and Oklahoma	5,500,000		5,500,000	
(FC)	McKinney Bayou, Ark. and Tex		155,000		155,000
(MP)	Norfork Lake—Highway bridge	6,800,000		6,800,000	
(MP)	Norfork Lake—Power units 3 and 4		200,000		200,000
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (1960 act)	400,000		20,400,000	
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	Alhambra Creek		200,000		100,000
(FC)	Bear River				340,000
(N)	Bodega Bay		106,000		106,000
(FC)	Cottonwood Creek		1,100,000		1,100,000
(N)	Crescent City Harbor	1,100,000		120,000	
(FC)	Cucamonga Creek	13,000,000		13,000,000	
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) lake and channel	49,300,000		49,300,000	
(N)	Fishermans Wharf				200,000
(FC)	Goleta and vicinity		100,000		100,000
(N)	Los Angeles—Long Beach Harbors	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Merced County Streams		880,000		880,0000
(MP)	New Melones Lake	12,000,000		12,000,000	
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor		240,000		240,000
(FC)	Pajaro River		135,000		135,000
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River Bank protection project	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	1,500,000		400,000	
(N)	San Diego River and Mission Bay	220,000		220,000	
(N)	San Francisco Bay to Stockton (J. F. Baldwin and Stockton ship channels)	650,000		460,000	
(FC)	San Luis Rey River		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Santa Maria Valley levees	2,000,000		150,000	
(FC)	Walnut Creek	6,400,000		6,400,000	
(FC)	Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks	11,200,000		650,000	
	COLORADO				
(FC)	Bear Creek Lake	2 400,000		2,400,000	
(FC)	Trinidad Lake	1,260,000		1,260,000	
	CONNECTICUT				
(FC)	New London	900,000		900,000	
(FC)	Park River	8,800,000		8,800,000	
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
(FC)	Potomac Estuary pilot water treatment plant	2,100,000		2,100,000	
	FLORIDA				
(BE)	Broward County (reimbursement)	2,850,000		2,850,000	
(FC)	Central and Southern Florida	6,300,000		6,300,000	
(FC)	Dade County	2,600,000		2,600,000	
(BE)	Fort Pierce Beach	923,000		923,000	
(FC)	Four River basins	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor	11,300,000		11,300,000	
(N)	St. Lucie Inlet (sec. 201)	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(N)	Tampa Harbor (main channel)	23,100,000		23,100,000	
	GEORGIA				
(MP)	Hartwell Lake, Ga. and S.C. (5th unit)	2,800,000		2,800,000	
(MP)	Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, Ga. and S.C	45,000,000		45,000,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor extension	9,100,000		3,000,000	
(MP)	West Point Lake, Ga. and Ala	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	HAWAII				
(N)	Barbers Point deep draft harbor, Oahu	10,000,000		6,000,000	
(N)	Honolulu Harbor, Oahu	4,716,000		1,716,000	
(FC)	Kahoma Stream, Maui		150,000		150,000
(N)	Kikiaola small boat harbor, Kauai		85,000		85,000
(N)	Maalaea small boat harbor, Maui		95,000		95,000
	IDAHO				
(MP)	Dworshak additional unit		275,000		275,000
(MP)	Dworshak Dam and Reservoir	7,200,000		7,200,000	
(MP)	Lewiston-Clarkston Bridge, Idaho and Washington			8,500,000	
(FC)	Placer Creek		280,000		280,000
	ILLINOIS				
(FC)	East Moline	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Eldred and Spankey drainage and levee district		325,000		325,000
(FC)	Fulton	3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Hartwell drainage and levee district		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Hillview drainage and levee district		220,000		220,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Dresden Island lock and dam (rehabilitation)	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Starved Rock lock and dam (rehabilitation)	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Kaskaskia Island drainage and levee district	13,200,000		3,300,000	
(N)	Kaskaskia River navigation	5,200,000		5,200,000	
(FC)	Little Calumet River			50,000	
(N)	Lock and dam 26, Mississippi River, Alton, Ill. and Missouri	20,000,000		20,000,000	
(N)	Locks and dam 52, Illinois and Kentucky (rehabilitation)	720,000		720,000	
(N)	Locks and dam 53, Illinois and Kentucky (rehabilitation)	290,000		290,000	

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project	Construction, general—State and project	Fiscal year 1980			
		Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(FC)	McGee Creek drainage and levee district	$2,000,000		$3,500,000	
(FC)	Meredosia, Meredosia Lake and Willow Creek D & LD		$200,000		$200,000
(FC)	Meredosia, Willow Creek and Coon Run drainage and levee district		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Milan	12,045,000		400,000	
(N)	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (regulating works), Illinois and Missouri	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Moline	20,468,000			250,000
(FC)	Nutwood drainage and levee district		230,000		230,000
(FC)	Rock Island	780,000		780,000	
(FC)	Rock River, areas 2, 3, 4, and 5		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Rockford	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(N)	Savanna Harbor		50,000		50,000
(N)	Smithland locks and dam, Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky	8,800,000		8,800,000	
(FC)	South Beloit		75,000		75,000
	INDIANA				
(FC)	Evansville	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	1,068,000		1,068,000	
(FC)	Patoka Lake	1,494,000		1,494,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	1,467,000		1,467,000	
	IOWA				
(FC)	Clinton	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Coralville Lake	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Evansdale (sec. 201)		65,000	265,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, old lock 14 (rehabilitation)	2,492,000		2,492,000	
(FC)	Missouri River levee system (L611–614 only)	12,130,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(N)	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	2,600,000		2,600,000	
(FC)	Red Rock Dam—Lake Red Rock	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Lake	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Waterloo	4,900,000		4,900,000	
	KANSAS				
(FC)	Big Hill Lake	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Clinton Lake	2,253,000		2,253,000	
(FC)	El Dorado Lake	10,800,000		10,800,000	
(FC)	Hillsdale Lake	6,800,000		6,800,000	
(N)	Kansas River navigation		140,000		140,000
(FC)	Onaga Lake		275,000		275,000
(FC)	Towanda Lake		300,000		
	KENTUCKY				
(FC)	Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, Ky. and Tenn	13,600,000		13,600,000	
(FC)	Cave Run Lake	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(FC)	Dayton	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(MP)	Laurel River Lake	3,600,000		3,600,000	
(FC)	Paintsville Lake	4,700,000		4,700,000	
(FC)	Southwestern Jefferson County	5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Taylorsville Lake	3,000,000		10,000,000	
(MP)	Wolf Creek Dam—Lake Cumberland (rehabilitation)	6,200,000		6,200,000	
	LOUISIANA				
(N)	Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black	4,900,000		4,900,000	
(FC)	Grand Isle and vicinity (sec. 201)		107,000	157,000	
(FC)	Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity (hurricane protection)	11,000,000		11,000,000	
(FC)	Larose to Golden Meadow (hurricane protection)	7,800,000		7,800,000	
(N)	Mermentau River	2,370,000			
(N)	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge-Gulf Mexico—SW pass and bar	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice (hurricane protection)	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(N)	Overton-Red River Waterway (lower 31 mi only)	5,800,000		5,800,000	
(N)	Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin Bayous		120,000		120,000
(N)	Red River emergency bank protection, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas	3,900,000		3,900,000	
(N)	Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport	70,000,000		70,000,000	
(FC)	Red River Waterway, Shreveport, La., to vicinity of Index, Ark		200,000		200,000
(N)	Vermilion lock (replacement)	3,400,000		3,400,000	
(FDP)	West Agurs levee				50,000
	MAINE				
(MP)	Dickey-Lincoln School Lakes		710,000		710,000
	MARYLAND				
(FC)	Bloomington Lake, Md. and West Virginia	18,300,000		18,300,000	
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(N)	Cape Cod Canal highway bridges (rehabilitation)	4,100,000		4,100,000	
(FC)	Charles River natural valley storage areas	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	North Nashua River	600,000		1,000,000	
(BE)	Revere Beach		100,000		100,000
	MICHIGAN				
(N)	Cedar River Harbor		50,000		50,000
(N)	Cross Village Harbor		70,000		70,000
(N)	Muskegon Harbor (rehabilitation)	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Red Run drain and lower Clinton River		550,000		550,000
(FC)	Saginaw River	500,000		500,000	
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	Bassett Creek		280,000		280,000
(FC)	Big Stone Lake—Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak	709,000		709,000	
(FC)	Chaska		220,000		220,000
(FC)	East Grand Forks		165,000		165,000
(FC)	Mankato and North Mankato	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, lock and dam 1 (rehabilitation)	7,800,000		7,800,000	
(FC)	Rochester (phase I)		270,000		270,000
(FC)	Roseau River	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Wild Rice River, South Branch and Felton ditch	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Winona	2,800,000		2,800,000	
	MISSISSIPPI				
(N)	Yazoo River, Belzoni Bridge (advance participation)	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(N)	Yazoo River		200,000		200,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980			
		Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	Blue River channel, Kansas City	$2,500,000		$2,500,000	
(MP)	Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir	12,600,000		12,600,000	
(MP)	Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir	33,000,000		33,000,000	
(FC)	Little Blue River channel	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Little Blue River Lakes	13,000,000		13,000,000	
(FC)	Mississippi River, agricultural area No. 8, Elsberry	675,000		675,000	
(FC)	Perry County drainage and levee districts 1, 2, and 3	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Pine Ford Lake		$500,000		$500,000
(FC)	Smithville Lake	7,000,000		7,000,000	
	MONTANA				
(FC)	Flathead River at Kalispell		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Great Falls	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(MP)	Libby additional units and reregulating dam	20,000,000		20,000,000	
(MP)	Libby Dam, Lake Koocanusa	6,100,000		6,100,000	
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	Bank stabilization and recreational development (sec. 707, Public Law 95-625), Nebraska and South Dakota				500,000
	NEVADA				
(FC)	Humboldt River and tributaries				200,000
	NEW JERSEY				
(FC)	Elizabeth	8,000,000		6,200,000	
(N)	Manasquan River (rehabilitation)	3,055,000		3,055,000	
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	Abiquiu Dam (rehabilitation)	1,970,000		1,970,000	
(FC)	Los Esteros Lake	3,240,000		3,240,000	
(FC)	Rio Grande Floodway, Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs) unit		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Santa Fe River and Arroyo Mascaras		395,000		395,000
	NEW YORK				
(FC)	Ardsley (sec. 201)		100,000		100,000
(N)	Cattaraugus Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Dansville and vicinity		90,000		90,000
(N)	Dunkirk Harbor	800,000		800,000	
(BE)	East Rockaway Inlet—Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay (part I)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Ellicott Creek	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet—Montauk Point		600,000		600,000
(N)	Irondequoit Bay	170,000		170,000	
(N)	New York Harbor collection and removal of drift, New York and New Jersey	2,000,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Port Ontario Harbor		210,000		210,000
(FC)	Saw Mill River at Elmsford and Greenburgh		71,000		71,000
(FC)	Scajaquada Creek	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Yonkers	3,200,000		3,200,000	
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(N)	AIWW—Replacement of Federal highway bridges	1,270,000		1,270,000	
(FC)	B. Everett Jordan Dam and Lake	5,500,000		5,500,000	
(FC)	Falls Lake	27,700,000		27,700,000	
(BE)	Fort Fisher and vicinity		300,000		300,000
(N)	Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay			2,000,000	
(N)	Masonboro Inlet jetties	2,145,000		2,145,000	
(FC)	Randleman Lake		650,000		650,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Lake Oahe	120,000		120,000	
(FC)	Sheyenne River		240,000		240,000
(FC)	Williston, N. Dak., water intake			480,000	
	OHIO				
(FC)	Alum Creek Lake	2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC)	Caesar Creek Lake	7,700,000		4,400,000	
(FC)	Chillicothe	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(N)	Cleveland Harbor (rehabilitation)	5,300,000		5,300,000	
(FC)	Cuyahoga River basin	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	East Fork Lake	5,079,000		5,079,000	
(N)	Geneva-on-the-Lake (sec. 201)		140,000		140,000
(FC)	Muskingum River lakes (rehabilitation)	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Newark	1,560,000		1,560,000	
(FC)	Point Place, Toledo	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Reno Beach—Howard Farms area		50,000		50,000
(N)	West Harbor			100,000	
	OKLAHOMA				
(FC)	Arcadia Lake	59,600,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Arkansas—Red River basins chloride control, Oklahoma, Kansas and Texas		3,185,000		2,200,000
(FC)	Candy Lake	4,800,000		4,800,000	
(FC)	Clayton Lake	11,300,000		11,300,000	
(FC)	Copan Lake	11,600,000		11,600,000	
(MP)	Lake Texoma (perimeter access roads), Oklahoma and Texas				50,000
(MP)	Fort Gibson Lake—Power units 5 and 6		280,000		280,000
(FC)	Skiatook Lake	9,400,000		9,400,000	
	OREGON				
(FC)	Applegate Lake	30,000,000		32,000,000	
(MP)	Bonneville 2d powerhouse, Oreg. and Wash	126,000,000		126,000,000	
(N)	John Day lock (rehabilitation)			1,700,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam—Lake Umatilla, Oreg. and Wash	1,433,000		1,433,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River Bank protection, Oreg. and Wash	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(MP)	McNary lock and dam, Lake Wallula, Oreg. and Wash	4,700,000		4,700,000	
(N)	Nehalem Bay (rehabilitation)			3,000,000	
(N)	Umpqua River	9,800,000		9,800,000	
(FC)	Willamette River basin bank protection	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FDP)	Willow Creek Lake			3,200,000	
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FC)	Chartiers Creek	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Cowanesque Lake	9,500,000		9,500,000	
(N)	Emsworth locks and dam (rehabilitation)	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Hay Creek, Birdsboro		100,000		100,000
(N)	Monongahela River, locks and dam 3 (rehabilitation)	4,200,000		4,200,000	
(BE)	Presque Isle Peninsula	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Tamaqua		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Tioga—Hammond Lakes	2,400,000		2,400,000	

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980			
		Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	PUERTO RICO				
(N)	Ponce Harbor		$150,000		$150,000
(FC)	Portugues and Bucana Rivers	$7,300,000		$7,300,000	
	RHODE ISLAND				
(N)	Bristol Harbor		100,000		100,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(N)	Cooper River, Charleston Harbor	15,900,000		26,000,000	
(N)	Little River Inlet, S.C. and N.C.	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(N)	Murrells Inlet	2,220,000		2,220,000	
	TEXAS				
(FC)	Aquillia Lake	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Arkansas-Red River basins chloride control, area 8	7,600,000		7,600,000	
(FC)	Aubrey Lake			500,000	
(FC)	Baytown	34,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Big Sandy Lake		350,000		350,000
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor	3,600,000		3,600,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries—Addicks and Barker Dams (rehabilitation)	800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Clear Creek		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Cooper Lake and channel			500,000	
(N)	Corpus Christi ship channel	2,450,000		1,700,000	
(FC)	El Paso	8,200,000		8,200,000	
(FC)	Freeport and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	1,353,000		1,353,000	
(N)	GIWW—Chocolate Bayou	840,000		840,000	
(FC)	Highland Bayou	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Lakeview Lake	32,000,000		32,000,000	
(FC)	Lavon Lake modification and East Fork Channel improvement	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Lewisville Dam (rehabilitation)	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Millican Lake		300,000		300,000
(N)	Mouth of Colorado River	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Neches River and tributaries salt water barrier		500,000		500,000
(FC)	Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	2,800,000		2,800,000	
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark. and La	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	San Antonio channel improvement	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	San Gabriel River	5,231,000		5,231,000	
(FC)	Texas City and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(N)	Texas City channel industrial canal	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Three Rivers	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Trinity River project		840,000		840,000
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayous	830,000		830,000	
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	Elizabeth River, Southern Branch (sec. 201)	3,425,000		3,425,000	
(FC)	Four Mile Run	2,638,000		2,638,000	
(FC)	Richmond filtration plant		225,000		225,000
(FC)	Virginia Beach streams, canal No. 2		80,000		80,000
(BE)	Virginia Beach (reimbursement)	200,000		200,000	
	WASHINGTON				
(MP)	Chief Joseph Dam additional units	17,000,000		17,000,000	
(N)	Grays Harbor				600,000
(MP)	Ice Harbor additional units	1,700,000		1,700,000	
(MP)	Little Goose additional units	2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC)	Lower Granite lock and dam			1,400,000	
(MP)	Lower Monumental additional units	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(MP)	Lower Snake River F & WL compensation, Washington, Idaho, and Oregon	9,100,000		9,100,000	
(FC)	Mill Creek Lake (rehabilitation)	700,000		700,000	
(FDP)	Skagit River levee and channel improvement			1,000,000	
(MP)	The Dalles additional units, Washington and Oregon	1,119,000		1,719,000	
(FC)	Willapa River at Raymond		160,000		210,000
(FC)	Yakima River at Ellensburg		120,000		120,000
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	Beech Fork Lake	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Burnsville Lake	3,450,000		3,450,000	
(FC)	East Lynn Lake	1,464,000		1,464,000	
(FC)	Oceana		280,000		280,000
(FC)	R. D. Bailey Lake	6,800,000		6,800,000	
(FC)	Stonewall Jackson Lake	9,100,000		9,100,000	
	WISCONSIN				
(N)	Green Bay Harbor		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Prairie Du Chien	875,000		875,000	
(FC)	State road and Ebner Coulees		150,000		150,000
	MISCELLANEOUS				
(N)	Small navigation projects (sec. 107)	6,500,000		7,500,000	
(FC)	Small flood control projects (sec. 205)	18,000,000		18,000,000	
(BE)	Small beach erosion projects (sec. 103)	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Emergency streambank and shoreline protection (sec. 14)	3,700,000		3,700,000	
	Recreation facilities at completed projects	16,000,000		16,000,000	
	Small snagging and clearing projects (sec. 208)	500,000		500,000	
	Mitigation of shore damages attributable to navigation projects (sec. 111)	1,300,000		2,300,000	
	Streambank erosion control evaluation demonstration (sec. 32, 1974 act)	5,350,000		7,500,000	
	Shoreline erosion control demonstration (sec. 54, 1974 act)	1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Aquatic plant control (1965 act)	3,980,000		5,000,000	
	Employees compensation	4,536,000		4,536,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−96,626,000		−81,426,000	
	Subtotal	1,752,255,000	22,439,000	1,443,444,000	24,122,000
	Total, construction, general	1,774,694,000		1,467,566,000	
	Full funding requested for new construction starts not included in allowance	−354,943,000			
	Total, net construction, general (excluding full funding)	1,419,751,000		1,467,566,000	

Note: Type of project: (N) Navigation, (FC) Flood control, (BE) Beach erosion control, (MP) Multiple-purpose, including power.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries

The conferees earmark, within available funds, $750,000 for the Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana project as proposed by the Senate.

The Chief of Engineers is directed to review the current flood control regulation procedures for the Yazoo Basin Headwater lakes with a view toward determining whether modifications should be made in these procedures that would increase the downstream flow in the rainy nonfarming season so as to decrease soil erosion from the foothill area and enable the Corps to retard or stop the flow at such times as may improve the planting, cultivation and harvesting of crops on lands below the reservoirs.

No part of the funds in this bill shall be used to acquire flowage rights or property rights of any kind in connection with the Grenada Lake, Mississippi project, except upon the voluntary agreement of the owner of such property.

The Corps is urged to review the flood control problems associated with 20 Mile Creek and Little Browns Creek, Mississippi, and report back to the Committees on Appropriations with appropriate solutions to the problems.

Operation and maintenance, general

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $848,500,000 for operation and maintenance as proposed by the Senate instead of $850,314,000 as proposed by the House.

The funds appropriated are to be allocated as shown on the following table:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—STATE AND PROJECT

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	ALABAMA		
(N)	Alabama-Coosa rivers	$2,575,000	$3,500,000
(N)	Bayou La Batre	156,000	336,000
(N)	Black Warrior, Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers	5,414,000	8,000,000
(N)	Dauphin Island Bay	99,000	152,000
(N)	Dog and Fowl River	168,000	252,000
(N)	Gulf intracoastal waterway, Alabama, Flordia, and Mississippi (Mobile District).	2,601,000	4,600,000
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam	1,881,000	2,400,000
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam—William "Bill" Dannelly Reservior.	2,429,000	2,429,000
(N)	Mobile Harbor	4,215,000	4,215,000
(N)	Perdido Pass	147,000	300,000
(N)	Removal of aquatic growth (Hyacinths)	35,000	35,000
(N)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss	1,915,000	1,915,000
(MP)	Walter F. George lock and dam	3,026,000	3,026,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	Anchorage Harbor	1,149,000	1,149,000
(N)	Dillingham Harbor	461,000	461,000
(N)	Homer Harbor	287,000	287,000
(N)	Ninilchik Harbor	208,000	208,000
(N)	Nome Harbor	447,000	447,000
(N)	Stikine River	43,000	43,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	Alamo Lake	512,000	512,000
(FC)	Painted Rock Dam	277,000	277,000
(FC)	Whitlow Ranch Dam	52,000	52,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	Beaver Lake	1,513,000	1,513,000
(MP)	Blakely Mountain Dam—Lake Ouachita	2,151,000	2,151,000
(FC)	Blue Mountain Lake	455,000	455,000
(MP)	Bull Shoals Lake	2,199,000	2,199,000
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	2,458,000	2,458,000
(MP)	Degray Lake	2,439,000	2,439,000
(FC)	Dequeen Lake	473,000	473,000
(FC)	Dierks Lake	387,000	387,000
(FC)	Gillham Lake	313,000	313,000
(MP)	Greers Ferry Lake	2,364,000	2,364,000
(N)	Helena Harbor	188,000	188,000
(N)	McClellan-Kerr Arkanasa River navigation system, Arkansas and Oklahoma.	12,709,000	13,000,000
(FC)	Millwood Lake	700,000	700,000
(MP)	Narrows Dam—Lake Greeson	1,670,000	1,670,000
(FC)	Nimrod Lake	600,000	600,000
(MP)	Norfork Lake	1,602,000	1,602,000
(N)	Osceola Harbor	245,000	245,000
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	2,700,000	2,700,000
(MP)	Ozark—Jeta Taylor lock and dam	1,989,000	1,989,000
(N)	White River	925,000	925,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	Black Butte Lake	1,024,000	1,024,000
(N)	Bodega Bay Harbor	270,000	270,000
(FC)	Buchanan Dam—H. V. Eastman Lake	555,000	555,000
(N)	Channel Island Harbor	650,000	1,000,000
(FC)	Coyote Valley Dam (Lake Mendocino)	1,445,000	1,445,000
(N)	Crescent City Harbor	630,000	630,000
(FC)	Farmington Dam	71,000	71,000
(FC)	Hidden Dam—Hensley Lake	562,000	562,000
(N)	Humboldt Harbor and Bay	1,187,000	1,187,000
(FC)	Isabella Lake	1,293,000	1,293,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	2,334,000	2,334,000
(N)	Los Angeles—Long Beach Harbor model	75,000	360,000
(FC)	Merced County Stream group	131,000	131,000
(FC)	Mojave River Dam	207,000	207,000
(N)	Moss Landing Harbor	80,000	80,000
(N)	Napa River	1,315,000	1,315,000
(FC)	New Hogan Lake	972,000	972,000
(MP)	New Melones Lake (downstream channel)	191,000	191,000
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor	340,000	340,000
(N)	Oakland Harbor	886,000	886,000
(N)	Oceanside Harbor	600,000	600,000
(N)	Petaluma River	588,000	588,000
(FC)	Pine Flat Lake	866,000	866,000
(N)	Redwood City Harbor	20,000	20,000
(N)	Richmond Harbor	642,000	642,000
(N)	Sacramento River and tributaries (debris control)	355,000	355,000
(N)	Sacramento River	1,773,000	1,773,000
(N)	San Francisco Bay and Harbor (drift removal)	1,035,000	1,035,000
(N)	San Francisco Bay—Delta model structure	400,000	1,450,000
(N)	San Francisco Harbor	1,126,000	1,126,000
(N)	San Joaquin River	100,000	100,000
(N)	San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait	1,435,000	1,435,000
(N)	San Rafael Creek	350,000	350,000
(FC)	Santa Ana River Basin	2,181,000	2,181,000
(N)	Santa Barbara Harbor	400,000	400,000
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor	$590,000	$590,000
(FC)	Success Lake	883,000	883,000
(N)	Suisun Bay channel	240,000	240,000
(FC)	Terminus Dam (Lake Kaweah)	766,000	766,000
(N)	Ventura Marina	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	Yuba River	25,000	25,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	Bear Creek Lake	125,000	125,000
(FC)	Chatfield Lake	297,000	297,000
(FC)	Cherry Creek Lake	187,000	187,000
(FC)	John Martin Reservoir	590,000	590,000
(FC)	Trinidad Lake	267,000	267,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	Black Rock Lake	170,000	170,000
(FC)	Colebrook River Lake	178,000	178,000
(N)	Connecticut River below Hartford	364,000	364,000
(FC)	Hancock Brook Lake	47,000	47,000
(FC)	Hop Brook Lake	271,000	271,000
(FC)	Mansfield Hollow Lake	286,000	286,000
(FC)	Northfield Brook Lake	94,000	94,000
(N)	Norwalk Harbor	331,000	331,000
(N)	Stamford Harbor	404,000	404,000
(FC)	Stamford Hurricane Barrier	128,000	128,000
(FC)	Thomaston Dam	289,000	289,000
(FC)	West Thompson Lake	188,000	188,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	IWW, Chincoteague Bay to Delaware Bay	6,000	6,000
(N)	IWW, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.	7,919,000	7,919,000
(N)	IWW, Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay	210,000	210,000
(N)	Lewes Harbor of Refuge		700,000
(N)	Murderkill River	100,000	100,000
(N)	Wilmington Harbor	965,000	965,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(N)	Anacostia River basin, D.C. and Md	710,000	710,000
(N)	Potomac and Anacostia Rivers drift removal, District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia.	350,000	350,000
(N)	Washington Harbor	460,000	460,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	Apalachicola Bay	519,000	519,000
(N)	Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Fla. and Ga.	2,691,000	2,691,000
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	1,185,000	1,185,000
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	3,839,000	3,839,000
(N)	Charlotte Harbor	463,000	463,000
(N)	Clearwater Pass	220,000	220,000
(N)	Cross-Florida barge canal	816,000	816,000
(N)	East Pass Channel	151,000	151,000
(N)	Fernandina Harbor	1,742,000	1,742,000
(N)	Fort Pierce Harbor	225,000	225,000
(N)	IWW, Caloosahatchee to Anclote River	496,000	496,000
(N)	IWW, Jacksonville to Miami	1,789,000	1,789,000
(N)	Jacksonville Harbor	2,325,000	2,325,000
(MP)	Jim Woodruff lock and dam—Lake Seminole	4,026,000	4,026,000
(N)	Longboat Pass	250,000	250,000
(N)	New Pass, Sarasota	710,000	710,000
(N)	Okeechobee Waterway	1,366,000	1,366,000
(N)	Oklawaha River	36,000	36,000
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor	415,000	415,000
(N)	Panama City Harbor	218,000	218,000
(N)	Pensacola Harbor	1,136,000	1,136,000
(N)	Ponce de Leon Inlet	611,000	611,000
(N)	Port Evergaldes Harbor	300,000	300,000
(N)	Port St. Joe Harbor	400,000	400,000
(N)	Removal of aquatic growth (Hyacinths)	1,745,000	2,500,000
(N)	St. Augustine Harbor	882,000	882,000
(N)	St. Lucie Inlet	215,000	215,000
(N)	Tampa Harbor	1,294,000	1,294,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	Allatoona Lake	2,887,000	2,887,000
(N)	Atlantic intracoastal waterway (Savannah District)	1,035,000	1,035,000
(N)	Brunswick Harbor	1,729,000	1,729,000
(MP)	Buford Dam—Lake Sidney Lanier	3,783,000	3,783,000
(MP)	Carters Lake	2,944,000	2,944,000
(MP)	Clark Hill Lake, Ga. and S.C	2,896,000	2,896,000
(MP)	Hartwell Lake	4,443,000	4,443,000
(N)	Savannah Harbor below Augusta	1,537,000	1,537,000
(N)	Savannah Harbor	4,777,000	8,000,000
(MP)	West Point Lake, Ga. and Ala	2,379,000	2,379,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	HAWAII		
(N)	Hilo Harbor	$1,200,000	$1,200,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	Albeni Falls Dam	1,393,000	1,393,000
(MP)	Dworshak Dam and Reservoir	3,541,000	3,541,000
(FC)	Lucky Peak Lake	512,000	512,000
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind	325,000	325,000
(N)	Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (diked disposal).	660,000	660,000
(FC)	Carlyle Lake	1,870,000	1,870,000
(N)	Chicago Harbor (diked disposal)	280,000	280,000
(N)	Chicago River (diked disposal)	660,000	660,000
(FC)	Farm Creek reservoirs	080,000	80,00
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind. (LMVD)	841,000	841,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind. (NCD)	13,270,000	13,270,000
(N)	Kaskaskia River navigation	780,000	780,000
(FC)	Lake Shelbyville	2,628,000	2,628,000
(N)	Mill Creek and South Slough	30,000	30,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.—Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa (LMVD).	9,634,000	9,634,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.—Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa (NCD).	24,564,000	24,564,000
(N)	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers.	8,185,000	8,185,000
(FC)	Mouth of Sangamon River	75,000	75,000
(FC)	North Branch Chicago River		150,000
(N)	Ohio River locks and dams, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky.	24,293,000	24,293,000
(N)	Ohio River open channel work, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky.	4,602,000	4,852,000
(FC)	Rend Lake	1,567,000	1,567,000
(N)	Waukegan Harbor	380,000	380,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	Brookville Lake	275,000	275,000
(N)	Burns Waterway Harbor	2,215,000	2,215,000
(FC)	Cagles Mill Lake	242,000	242,000
(FC)	Cecil M. Harden Lake	513,000	513,000
(FC)	Huntington Lake	290,000	290,000
(N)	Indiana Harbor	1,325,000	1,325,000
(N)	Indiana Harbor (diked disposal)	85,000	85,000
(N)	Michigan City	135,000	135,000
(FC)	Mississinewa Lake	294,000	294,000
(FC)	Monroe Lake	278,000	278,000
(FC)	Patoka Lake	248,000	248,000
(FC)	Salamonie Lake	279,000	279,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	Coralville Lake	956,000	956,000
(FC)	Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr. to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota.	58,000	58,000
(N)	Missouri River, Sioux City, Iowa to the mouth	9,836,000	9,836,000
(FC)	Rathbun Lake	1,159,000	1,159,000
(FC)	Red Rock Dam—Lake Red Rock	922,000	1,480,000
(FC)	Saylorville Lake	1,051,000	1,414,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	Clinton Lake	659,000	659,000
(FC)	Council Grove Lake	311,000	311,000
(FC)	Elk City Lake	273,000	273,000
(FC)	Fall River Lake	359,000	359,000
(FC)	John Redman Dam and Reservoir	432,000	432,000
(FC)	Kanopolis Lake	653,000	653,000
(FC)	Marion Lake	379,000	379,000
(FC)	Melvern Lake	709,000	709,000
(FC)	Milford Lake	1,227,000	1,227,000
(FC)	Perry Lake	1,034,000	1,034,000
(FC)	Pomona Lake	663,000	663,000
(FC)	Toronto Lake	247,000	247,000
(FC)	Tuttle Creek Lake	787,000	787,000
(FC)	Wilson Lake	585,000	585,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	Barkley Dam—Lake Barkley	3,313,000	3,313,000
(FC)	Barren River Lake	557,000	557,000
(FC)	Buckhorn Lake	347,000	573,000
(FC)	Carr Fork Lake	443,000	443,000
(FC)	Cave Run Lake	270,000	270,000
(FC)	Dewey Lake	618,000	618,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Lake	561,000	561,000
(FC)	Grayson Lake	421,000	421,000
(N)	Green and Barren Rivers	777,000	777,000
(FC)	Green River Lake	571,000	721,000
(N)	Hickman Harbor	130,000	130,000
(N)	Kentucky River	2,542,000	2,542,000
(MP)	Laurel River Lake	462,000	502,000
(FC)	Martins Fork Lake	147,000	207,000
(FC)	Middlesboro	46,000	46,000
(FC)	Nolin Lake	628,000	628,000
(FC)	Rough River Lake	689,000	689,000
(MP)	Wolf Creek Dam—Lake Cumberland	2,049,000	2,049,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	Atchafalaya River, Morgan City to Gulf of Mexico	640,000	640,000
(N)	Barataria Bay Waterway	645,000	1,000,000
(FC)	Bayou Bodcau Reservoir	190,000	190,000
(FC)	Bayou Pierre	15,000	15,000
(N)	Bayou Teche and Vemilion River	40,000	40,000
(N)	Bayou Teche	$185,000	$185,000
(FC)	Caddo Lake	80,000	80,000
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	7,827,000	7,827,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	900,000	900,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway	6,708,000	6,708,000
(N)	Houma Navigation Channel	485,000	1,135,000
(N)	Lake Providence Harbor	165,000	165,000
(N)	Mermentau River	2,550,000	2,550,000
(N)	Mississippi River outlets, vicinity of Venice	510,000	510,000
(N)	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to gulf	19,515,000	25,915,000
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	5,595,000	5,595,000
(N)	Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport.	975,000	975,000
(N)	Removal of aquatic growth, Louisiana and Texas	1,163,000	1,163,000
(FC)	Wallace Lake	180,000	180,000
(N)	Waterway from intracoastal waterway to Bayou Dulac.	520,000	520,000
	MAINE		
(N)	Portland Harbor	1,874,000	1,874,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channels	2,470,000	3,470,000
(N)	Baltimore Harbor (drift removal)	125,000	125,000
(N)	Baltimore Harbor (prevention of obstructive deposits).	180,000	180,000
(FC)	Cumberland, Md. and Ridgeley	36,000	36,000
(N)	Lower thoroughfare and Deal Island	175,000	175,000
(N)	Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay	300,000	300,000
(N)	Parish Creek	185,000	185,000
(N)	St. Peters Creek	185,000	185,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	Barre Falls	236,000	236,000
(FC)	Birch Hill Dam	193,000	193,000
(FC)	Buffumville Lake	210,000	210,000
(N)	Cape Cod Canal	2,665,000	2,665,000
(FC)	Conant Brook Dam	77,000	77,000
(FC)	East Brimfield Lake	162,000	162,000
(FC)	Hodges Village Dam	292,000	292,000
(N)	Green Harbor		225,000
(FC)	Knightville Dam	232,000	232,000
(FC)	Littleville Lake	179,000	179,000
(FC)	New Bedford, Fairhaven and Acushnet hurricane barrier.	111,000	111,000
(FC)	Tully Lake	187,000	187,000
(N)	Wellfleet Harbor		280,000
(FC)	West Hill Dam	103,000	103,000
(FC)	Westville Lake	203,000	203,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	Arcadia Harbor	76,000	76,000
(N)	Big Bay Harbor	128,000	128,000
(N)	Black River (Port Huron)	265,000	265,000
(N)	Black River Harbor	128,000	128,000
(N)	Caseville Harbor		100,000
(N)	Channels in Lake St. Clair	774,000	774,000
(N)	Charlevoix Harbor	865,000	865,000
(N)	Cheboygan Harbor	87,000	87,000
(N)	Detroit River	6,565,000	6,565,000
(N)	Detroit River (diked disposal)	7,124,000	7,124,000
(N)	Frankfort Harbor	965,000	965,000
(N)	Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River	405,000	405,000
(N)	Grand Marais Harbor	121,000	121,000
(N)	Grand Traverse Bay Harbor	122,000	122,000
(N)	Harbor Beach Harbor	425,000	425,000
(N)	Holland Harbor	207,000	207,000
(N)	Inland route	160,000	160,000
(N)	Keweenaw Waterway	300,000	300,000
(N)	Leland Harbor	118,000	118,000
(N)	Little Lake Harbor	145,000	145,000
(N)	Ludington Harbor	136,000	136,000
(N)	Manistee Harbor	148,000	148,000
(N)	Monroe Harbor	683,000	683,000
(N)	Monroe River (diked disposal)	4,800,000	4,800,000
(N)	Muskegon Harbor	169,000	169,000
(N)	Ontonagon Harbor	315,000	315,000
(N)	Pentwater Harbor	120,000	120,000
(N)	Portage Lake Harbor	97,000	97,000
(N)	Presque Isle Harbor	86,000	86,000
(N)	Rouge River	596,000	596,000
(N)	Rouge River (diked disposal)	2,275,000	2,275,000
(N)	Saginaw River	3,021,000	3,021,000
(FC)	Sebewaing River	56,000	56,000
(N)	Sebewaing River	653,000	653,000
(N)	St. Clair River	752,000	752,000
(N)	St. Joseph Harbor	178,000	178,000
(N)	St. Joseph Harbor (diked disposal)	1,772,000	1,772,000
(MP)	St. Marys River	8,673,000	8,673,000
(N)	Whitefish Pointe Harbor	117,000	117,000
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River	87,000	87,000
(N)	Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis	1,041,000	1,041,000
(N)	Grand Marais Harbor	57,000	57,000
(N)	Knife River Harbor		89,000
(FC)	Lac Qui Parle Lake	173,000	173,000
(FC)	Lake Traverse, Minn. and S. Dak	297,000	297,000
(N)	Minnesota River	177,000	177,000
(FC)	Orwell Lake	99,000	99,000
(FC)	Red Lake Reservoir	48,000	48,000
(N)	Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River	1,240,000	1,240,000
(N)	St. Croix River, Minn. and Wis	118,000	118,000
(N)	Two Harbors Harbor	243,000	243,000
(N)	Warroad Harbor		347,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	Biloxi Harbor	$394,000	$394,000
(N)	Cadet Bayou	148,000	148,000
(N)	Gulfport Harbor	1,219,000	1,219,000
(FC)	Okatibbee Lake	521,000	521,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor	2,536,000	2,536,000
(N)	Pearl River, Miss. and La	99,000	99,000
(N)	Rosedale Harbor	91,000	91,000
(N)	Yazoo River	55,000	55,000
	MISSOURI		
(MP)	Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir	1,045,000	1,045,000
(FC)	Clearwater Lake	1,576,000	1,576,000
(MP)	Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir	2,650,000	2,650,000
(FC)	Long Branch Lake	345,000	345,000
(FC)	Meramec Park Lake	185,000	185,000
(N)	New Madrid Harbor	142,000	142,000
(FC)	Pomme de Terre Lake	941,000	941,000
(FC)	Smithville Lake	410,000	410,000
(MP)	Stockton Lake	1,384,000	1,384,000
(MP)	Table Rock Lake	2,446,000	2,446,000
	MONTANA		
(MP)	Fort Feck Lake	1,855,000	1,855,000
(MP)	Libby Dam-Lake Koocanusa	2,051,000	2,051,000
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	Gavins Point Dam-Lewis and Clark Lake, Nebr. and S. Dak.	4,197,000	4,197,000
(FC)	Harlan County Lake	1,370,000	1,370,000
(FC)	Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes	156,000	156,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and Tributaries Lakes	290,000	290,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	Martis Creek Lake, Nev. and Calif	185,000	185,000
(FC)	Pine and Mathews Canyon Lakes	51,000	51,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	Blackwater Dam	156,000	156,000
(FC)	Edward MacDowell Lake	223,000	223,000
(FC)	Franklin Falls Dam	964,000	964,000
(FC)	Hopkinton-Everett Lakes	408,000	408,000
(FC)	Otter Brook Lake	249,000	249,000
(N)	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River	475,000	475,000
(FC)	Surry Mountain Lake	327,000	327,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	Absecon Inlet	305,000	305,000
(N)	Barnegat Inlet	310,000	310,000
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania.	16,841,000	16,841,000
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton	1,560,000	1,560,000
(N)	Keyport Harbor	336,000	336,000
(N)	Manasquan River	155,000	155,000
(N)	Matawan Creek	336,000	336,000
(N)	New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway	702,000	702,000
(N)	Raritan River	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	Shrewsbury River	403,000	403,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	Abiquiu Dam	382,000	382,000
(FC)	Cochiti Lake	660,000	660,000
(FC)	Conchas Lake	539,000	539,000
(FC)	Galisteo Dam	91,000	91,000
(FC)	Jemez Canyon Dam	160,000	160,000
(FC)	Los Esteros Lake	248,000	248,000
(FC)	Two Rivers Dam	92,000	92,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	Almond Lake	192,000	192,000
(FC)	Arkport Dam	73,000	73,000
(N)	Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels	1,008,000	1,008,000
(N)	Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor	1,180,000	1,180,000
(N)	Bronx River	358,000	358,000
(N)	Browns Creek	60,000	60,000
(N)	Buffalo Harbor	1,270,000	1,270,000
(N)	Cape Vincent Harbor	590,000	590,000
(N)	East Rockaway Inlet	501,000	501,000
(FC)	East Sidney Lake	243,000	243,000
(N)	Hudson River Channel	1,898,000	1,898,000
(N)	Hudson River	1,735,000	1,735,000
(N)	Jamaica Bay	600,000	600,000
(N)	Jones Inlet	836,000	836,000
(N)	Long Island Intracoastal Waterway	460,000	460,000
(N)	Mamaroneck Harbor	1,120,000	1,120,000
(N)	Mattituck Harbor	143,000	143,000
(FC)	Mount Morris Lake	570,000	570,000
(N)	New York and New Jersey Channels, N.Y. and N.J.	956,000	956,000
(N)	New York Harbor	1,898,000	1,898,000
(N)	New York Harbor (drift removal)	2,426,000	2,426,000
(N)	New York Harbor (prevention of obstructive deposits).	590,000	590,000
(N)	Newtown Creek	168,000	168,000
(N)	Oswego Harbor	150,000	150,000
(N)	Rochester Harbor	1,140,000	1,140,000
(FC)	Southern New York flood control projects	272,000	272,000
(N)	Westchester Creek	840,000	840,000
(FC)	Whitney Point Lake	398,000	398,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (Willmington District)	$3,669,000	$3,669,000
(FC)	B. Everett Jordan Dam and Lake	255,000	255,000
(N)	Beaufort Harbor	262,000	262,000
(N)	Cape Fear River above Willmington	314,000	314,000
(N)	Channel Back Sound to Lookout Bight	138,000	138,000
(N)	Lockwoods Folly River	219,000	219,000
(N)	Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay	967,000	967,000
(N)	Morehead City Harbor	1,890,000	1,890,000
(N)	Ocracoke Inlet	591,000	591,000
(N)	Silver Lake Harbor	430,000	430,000
(FC)	W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir	705,000	705,000
(N)	Willmington Harbor	2,345,000	2,345,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	Baldhill Dam-Lake Ashtabula	500,000	500,000
(FC)	Bowman-Haley Lake	68,000	68,000
(MP)	Garrison Dam-Lake Sakakawea	4,150,000	4,150,000
(FC)	Homme Lake	97,000	97,000
(FC)	Pipestem Lake	252,000	252,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	Alum Creek Lake	313,000	313,000
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor	715,000	715,000
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor (diked disposal)	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	Berlin Lake	993,000	993,000
(FC)	Caesar Creek Lake	224,000	224,000
(FC)	Clarence J. Brown Dam and Reservoir	271,000	271,000
(N)	Cleveland Harbor	5,733,000	5,733,000
(N)	Conneaut Harbor	175,000	175,000
(FC)	Deer Creek Lake	439,000	439,000
(FC)	Delaware Lake	344,000	344,000
(FC)	Dillon Lake	199,000	199,000
(FC)	East Fork Lake	248,000	248,000
(N)	Fairport Harbor	787,000	787,000
(N)	Huron Harbor	376,000	376,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	420,000	420,000
(FC)	Massillon	10,000	10,000
(FC)	Michael J. Kirwan Dam and Reservoir	361,000	361,000
(FC)	Mosquito Creek Lake	358,000	358,000
(FC)	Muskingum River reservoirs (14 reservoirs)	3,109,000	3,109,000
(FC)	Newark	10,000	10,000
(FC)	North Branch of Koskosing River Lake	93,000	93,000
(FC)	Paint Creek Lake	354,000	354,000
(N)	Rocky River Harbor	680,000	680,000
(FC)	Roseville	10,000	10,000
(N)	Sandusky Harbor	725,000	725,000
(N)	Sandusky Harbor (diked disposal)	200,000	200,000
(N)	Toledo Harbor	2,385,000	2,385,000
(C)	Tom Jenkins Dam	160,000	160,000
(FC)	West Fork of Mill Creek Lake	217,000	217,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	Arkansas-Red River Basins chloride central data stations, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Texas.	547,000	547,000
(FC)	Birch Lake	319,000	319,000
(MP)	Broken Bow Lake	745,000	745,000
(FC)	Canton Lake	518,000	518,000
(FC)	Clayton Lake	74,000	74,000
(FC)	Copan Lake	233,000	233,000
(MP)	Denison Dam-Lake Texoma, Okla. and Tex	2,875,000	2,875,000
(MP)	Eufaula Lake	1,876,000	1,876,000
(MP)	Fort Gibson Lake	1,574,000	1,574,000
(FC)	Fort Supply Lake	265,000	265,000
(FC)	Great Salt Plains Lake	235,000	235,000
(FC)	Heyburn Lake	214,000	214,000
(FC)	Hugo Lake	627,000	627,000
(FC)	Hulah Lake	394,000	394,000
(FC)	Kaw Lake	672,000	672,000
(MP)	Keystone Lake	1,156,000	1,156,000
(FC)	Oologah Lake	759,000	759,000
(FC)	Optima Lake	248,000	248,000
(FC)	Pensacola Reservoir-Lake O' the Cherokees	5,000	5,000
(FC)	Pine Creek Lake	389,000	389,000
(MP)	Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir	1,666,000	1,666,000
(MP)	Tenkiller Ferry Lake	1,171,000	1,171,000
(FC)	Waurika Lake	299,000	299,000
(MP)	Webbers Falls lock and dam	1,711,000	1,711,000
(FC)	Wister Lake	238,000	238,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	Blue River Lake	85,000	85,000
(MP)	Bonneville lock and dam	5,325,000	5,325,000
(N)	Chetco River	289,000	289,000
(N)	Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash. and Portland.	4,217,000	4,217,000
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth Oregon and Washington	4,433,000	4,433,000
(N)	Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash. and The Dalles, Oreg.	219,000	219,000
(N)	Coos and Millicoma Rivers	100,000	100,000
(N)	Coos Bay	3,095,000	3,095,000
(N)	Coquille River	208,000	208,000
(FC)	Cottage Grove Lake	425,000	425,000
(MP)	Cougar Lake	580,000	580,000
(N)	Depoe Bay	84,000	84,000
(MP)	Detroit Lake	1,320,000	1,320,000
(FC)	Dorena Lake	210,000	210,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project		Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
(FC)	Fall Creek Lake	$385,000	$385,000
(FC)	Fern Ridge Dam and Lake	485,000	485,000
(MP)	Green Peter—Forster Lakes	1,100,000	1,100,000
(MP)	Hills Creek Lake	655,000	655,000
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	5,688,000	5,688,000
(MP)	Lookout Point Lake	1,735,000	1,735,000
(MP)	Lost Creek Lake	1,430,000	1,430,000
(MP)	McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	6,298,000	6,298,000
(N)	Port Orford	418,000	418,000
(N)	Rogue River Harbor at Gold Beach	1,044,000	1,044,000
(N)	Siuslaw River	973,000	973,000
(N)	Skipanon Channel	352,000	352,000
(N)	Tillamook Bay and Bar	423,000	423,000
(N)	Umpqua River	1,069,000	1,069,000
(N)	Willamette River above Portland and Yamhill River	71,000	71,000
(N)	Willamette River at Willamette Falls	365,000	365,000
(FC)	Willamette River bank protection	105,000	105,000
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	1,048,000	1,048,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	Allegheny River	3,274,000	3,274,000
(FC)	Alvin R. Bush Dam	138,000	138,000
(FC)	Aylesworth Creek Lake	67,000	67,000
(FC)	Beltzville Lake	311,000	311,000
(FC)	Blue Marsh Lake	238,000	238,000
(FC)	Conemaugh River Lake	313,000	313,000
(FC)	Cowanesque Lake	82,000	82,000
(FC)	Crooked Creek Lake	370,000	370,000
(FC)	Curwensville Lake	409,000	409,000
(FC)	East Branch Clarion River Lake	459,000	459,000
(N)	Erie Harbor	365,000	365,000
(FC)	Foster Joseph Sayers Dam and Reservoir	309,000	309,000
(FC)	Francis E. Walter Dam	272,000	272,000
(FC)	General Edgar Jadwin Dam and Reservoir	67,000	67,000
(FC)	Johnstown	9,000	9,000
(FC)	Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir	1,156,000	1,156,000
(FC)	Loyalhanna Lake	497,000	497,000
(FC)	Mahoning Creek Lake	322,000	322,000
(N)	Monongahela River	4,450,000	4,450,000
(FC)	Prompton Lake	175,000	175,000
(FC)	Punxsutawney	14,000	14,000
(FC)	Raystown Lake	1,085,000	1,085,000
(N)	Schuylkill River	577,000	577,000
(FC)	Shenango River Lake, Pa. and Ohio	1,079,000	1,079,000
(FC)	Stillwater Lake	100,000	100,000
(FC)	Tioga-Hammond Lakes	437,000	437,000
(FC)	Tionesta Lake	632,000	632,000
(FC)	Union City Lake	208,000	208,000
(FC)	Woodcock Creek Lake	352,000	352,000
(FC)	York, Indian Rock Dam	139,000	139,000
(FC)	Youghiogheny River Lake	893,000	893,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	Atlantic intracoastal waterway (Charleston District)	2,560,000	2,560,000
(N)	Charleston Harbor	3,945,000	3,945,000
(N)	Georgetown Harbor	2,270,000	3,020,000
(N)	Little River inlet, S.C. and N.C	138,000	138,000
(N)	Port Royal Harbor	450,000	450,000
(N)	Shipyard River	330,000	330,000
(N)	Town Creek	160,000	160,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	Big Bend Dam—Lake Sharpe	2,865,000	2,865,000
(FC)	Cold Brook Lake	72,000	72,000
(FC)	Cottonwood Springs Lake	179,000	179,000
(MP)	Fort Randall Dam—Lake Francis Case	3,880,000	3,880,000
(MP)	Oahe Dam—Lake Oahe, S. Dak. and N. Dak	4,055,000	4,055 000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	Center Hill Lake	1,649,000	1,649,000
(MP)	Cheatham lock and dam	2,243,000	2,243,000
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir	1,811,000	1,811,000
(MP)	Dale Hollow Lake, Tenn. and Ky	1,881,000	1,881,000
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir	1,486,000	1,486,000
(MP)	Old Hickory lock and dam	2,549,000	2,549,000
(N)	Tennessee River, Tenn., Ky., and Ala	4,339,000	4,339,000
(N)	Wolf River	209,000	209,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	Bardwell Lake	419,000	419,000
(FC)	Belton Lake	668,000	668,000
(FC)	Benbrook Lake	739,000	739,000
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	427,000	427,000
(FC)	Canyon Lake	485,000	485,000
(N)	Channel to Port Bolivar	55,000	55,000
(N)	Clear Creek and Clear Lake		140,000
(N)	Corpus Christi ship channel	5,484,000	5,484,000
(N)	Double Bayou		160,000
(FC)	Estelline Spring experimental project	44,000	44,000
(FC)	Ferrells Bridge Dam—Lake O' the Pines	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	Freeport Harbor	2,130,000	2,130,000
(N)	Galveston Harbor and channel	4,300,000	4,338,000
(FC)	Granger Lake	371,000	371,000
(FC)	Grapevine Lake	878,000	878,000
(N)	Gulf intracoastal waterway	6,135,000	7,000,000
(FC)	Hords Creek Lake	291,000	291,000
(N)	Houston ship channel	5,175,000	6,000,000
(FC)	Lake Kemp	169,000	169,000
(FC)	Lavon Lake	735,000	735,000
(FC)	Lewisville Dam	1,302,000	1,302,000
(N)	Matacorda ship channel	2,790,000	2,790,000
(FC)	Navarro Mills Lake	489,000	489,000
(FC)	North Fork Lake	227,000	227,000
(FC)	O.C. Fisher Dam and Lake	$373,000	$373,000
(FC)	Pat Mayse Lake	313,000	313,000
(FC)	Proctor Lake	393,000	393,000
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway	5,800,000	5,800,000
(MP)	Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir	1,879,000	1,879,000
(FC)	Somerville Lake	550,000	550,000
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Lake	551,000	551,000
(N)	Texas City channel		25,000
(MP)	Town Bluff-B.A. Steinhagen Lake	398,000	398,000
(N)	Trinity River and tributaries	653,000	653,000
(FC)	Waco Lake	636,000	636,000
(MP)	Whitney Lake	1,433,000	1,433,000
(FC)	Wright Patman Dam and Lake	1,220,000	1,220,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	Ball Mountain Lake	368,000	368,000
(N)	Narrows of Lake Champlain	23,000	23,000
(FC)	North Hartland Lake	341,000	341,000
(FC)	North Springfield Lake	472,000	472,000
(FC)	Townshend Lake	275,000	275,000
(FC)	Union Village Dam	145,000	145,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	Appomattox River	628,000	628,000
(N)	Atlantic intracoastal waterway	2,064,000	2,274,000
(N)	Chincoteague Inlet	280,000	280,000
(FC)	Gathright Lake	709,000	709,000
(N)	Hampton Roads, Norfolk, and Newport News Harbors (Drift removal)	186,000	186,000
(N)	Hoskins Creek		300,000
(N)	James River	1,006,000	1,006,000
(MP)	John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, Va. and N.C	2,801,000	2,801,000
(FC)	John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir	457,000	457,000
(N)	Norfolk Harbor (prevention of obstructive deposits)	210,000	210,000
(N)	Norfolk Harbor	2,190,000	2,190,000
(FC)	North Fork of Pound River Lake	340,000	340,000
(MP)	Philpott Lake	953,000	953,000
(N)	Waterway on the coast of Virginia	1,380,000	1,380,000
(N)	Wishart Point		200,000
	WASHINGTON		
(N)	Bellingham Harbor	440,000	440,000
(MP)	Chief Joseph Dam-Rufus Woods Lake	3,593,000	3,593,000
(N)	Columbia River at Baker Bay	155,000	155,000
(N)	Columbia River between Chinook and Sand Island	615,000	615,000
(N)	Cowlitz River	170,000	170,000
(N)	Ediz Hook	25,000	25,000
(N)	Grays Harbor and Chehalis River	3,490,000	3,490,000
(FC)	Howard A. Hanson Reservoir	444,000	444,000
(MP)	Ice Harbor lock and dam	2,335,000	2,335,000
(N)	Lake River	13,000	13,000
(N)	Lake Washington ship canal	2,498,000	2,498,000
(N)	Lewis River	81,000	81,000
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam—Lake Bryan	1,434,000	1,434,000
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam	2,382,000	2,437,000
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	3,137,000	3,137,000
(FC)	Mill Creek Lake	480,000	480,000
(FC)	Mud Mountain Dam	845,000	845,000
(N)	Neah Bay	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	Puget Sound and its tributary waters	1,055,000	1,055,000
(N)	Quillayute River	475,000	475,000
(N)	Seattle Harbor	255,000	255,000
(N)	Skamokawa Creek	25,000	25,000
(FC)	Stillaguamish River	30,000	30,000
(N)	Swinon ish Channel	235,000	235,000
(FC)	Tacoma, Puyallup River	25,000	25,000
(MP)	The Dalles lock and dam Washington and Oregon	4,352,000	4,352,000
(N)	Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River	110,000	110,000
(FC)	Wynoochee	544,000	544,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	Beech Fork Lake	332,000	332,000
(FC)	Bluestone Lake	466,000	466,000
(FC)	Burnsville Lake	539,000	539,000
(FC)	East Lynn Lake	553,000	553,000
(FC)	Elkins	105,000	105,000
(N)	Kanawha River	3,580,000	3,580,000
(FC)	R. D. Bailey Lake	317,000	317,000
(FC)	Summersville Lake	615,000	615,000
(FC)	Sutton Lake	1,217,000	2,000,000
(N)	Tygart Lake	407,000	407,000
	WISCONSIN		
(N)	Ashland Harbor	111,000	111,000
(N)	Cornucopia Harbor	64,000	64,000
(FC)	Eau Galle River Lake	374,000	374,000
(N)	Fox River	2,545,000	2 545,000
(N)	Green Bay Harbor	560,000	560,000
(N)	Kenosha Harbor	90,000	90,000
(N)	Kewaunee Harbor (diked disposal)	1,580,000	1,580,000
(N)	La Pointe Harbor	36,000	36,000
(N)	Manitowoc Harbor	305,000	305,000
(N)	Fensaukee Harbor	400,000	400,000
(N)	Port Wing Harbor	73,000	73,000
(N)	Saxon Harbor	72,000	72,000
(N)	Sheboygan Harbor (diked disposal)	1,735,000	1,735,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	Environmental and water quality operational studies	5,730,000	5,730,000
	Inspection of completed works	2,863,000	2,863,000
	Scheduling flood control reservoir operations	979,000	979,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

Type of project	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION		
Removal of sunken vessels and obstructions	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
Protection, clearing, and straightening channels (sec. 3).	200,000	200,000
Prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits	(980,000)	(980,000)
General regulatory functions	40,000,000	40,000,000
Drift removal	($4,122,000)	($4,122,000)
Removal of aquatic growth	(2,943,000)	(2,943,000)
Project condition surveys	3,379,000	3,379,000
Surveillance of northern boundary waters	1,000,000	1,000,000
General reduction for savings and efficiencies		−4,747,000
Total, operations and maintenance	825,500,000	848,500,000

Type of Project:
(N) Navigation
(FC) Flood Control
(BE) Beach Erosion Control
(MP) Multiple-Purpose, Including Power

Alaska Hydroelectric Power Development Fund

The conferees agree with the Senate report language regarding the Alaska Hydroelectric Power Development Fund.

Revolving Fund

The conferees direct that prior to the acquisition of new automatic data processing equipment the Corps is to submit a detailed plan to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations for approval.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General Investigations

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $34,451,000 for general investigations instead of $36,905,000 as proposed by the House and $34,176,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The appropriations are to be allocated as shown on the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—STATE AND PROJECT

	Fiscal year 1980 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1980 Conference allowance
ARIZONA		
Boulder Canyon, Hoover powerplant modifications	$252,000	$252,000
Colorado River storage project power peaking capacity (see Utah).		
Energy research and development program, geothermal (see California).		
Geothermal resource investigations (see California).		
Lower Colorado River water conservation and efficient use program (see California).		
Reclamation and energy resources, LMNRA Wilderness designation.	610,000	610,000
Water conservation opportunities, Imperial District (see California).		
Whipple Wash pumped-storage (see California).		
CALIFORNIA		
Central Valley:		
Fish and wildlife management study	200,000	200,000
Sacramento River division, Red Bluff diversion dam powerplant.	80,000	80,000
Sacramento River division, West Sacramento Canal unit reformulation.	95,000	145,000
Shasta division, Keswick powerplant enlargement	40,000	40,000
Delta support studies	700,000	835,000
Energy research and development (geothermal) (see Colorado).		
Geothermal resource investigations	910,000	910,000
Lahontan basin total water management study (see Nevada).		
Lower Colorado River water conservation and efficient use program.	30,000	30,000
Orland Stony Gorge-East Park powerplants	85,000	85,000
Susanville geothermal investigations	325,000	325 000
Truckee River basin study, Boca-Prosser powerplants	90,000	90,000
Ventura County water management	120,000	120,000
Water conservation opportunities, Imperial Irrigation District.	50,000	50,000
Whipple Wash pumped-storage	200,000	200,000
Wind-hydroelectric opportunities study	50,000	100,000
COLORADO		
Colorado River storage project power peaking capacity (see Utah).		
Dominguez Reservoir	100,000	100,000
Energy research and development	677,000	677,000
Front Range unit (Long's Peak division, P-SMBP)	105,000	105,000
Grand Mesa reformulation	100,000	100,000
Llano Estacado, Playa Lake water resources study (see New Mexico).		
Low-head hydroelectric evaluation and inventory	421,000	421,000
Platte River study (see Nebraska).		
Republican River Basin water management study (see Nebraska).		
Upper Colorado resource study	10,000	10,000
Water resources planning and engineering research	2,962,000	2,962,000
Wind-hydroelectric energy (see Wyoming).		
IDAHO		
Boise, Anderson Ranch powerplant—3d unit	10,000	10,000
Boise power and modification study	370,000	370,000
Minidoka, Minidoka powerplant rehabilitation and enlargement	35,000	35,000
Owyhee powerplant	106,000	106,000
Palisades powerplant enlargement	79,000	
Southwest Idaho water management study	105,000	105,000
Upper Snake River, Oakley fan division reformulation	10,000	10,000
Upper Snake River water management study	110,000	100,000
Llano-Estacado Playa Lake water resources study (see New Mexico).		
KANSAS		
Solomon River Basin water management study (P-SMBP)	$243,000	$243,000
MONTANA		
Republican River Basin water management study (P-SMBP) (see Nebraska).		
Canyon Ferry powerplant	95,000	95,000
Fort Benton reformulation	75,000	75,000
Gibson powerplant study (Sun River)	100,000	100,000
Hungry Horse, Hungry Horse powerplant enlargement and reregulating reservoir	50,000	50,000
Tiber powerplant study (Marias River)	75,000	75,000
Total water management study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota).		
Yellowtail afterbay powerplant study (Bighorn River)	75,000	75,000
NEBRASKA		
Farwell unit water conservation study (P-SMBP)	40,000	40,000
Little Blue unit reformulation (Blue division, P-SMBP)	150,000	150,000
Otoe-Cass unit (P-SMBP)		75,000
Platte River study (formerly Platte River water management study)	450,000	450,000
Republican River Basin water management study (P-SMBP)	255,000	255,000
Sparks unit (P-SMBP)	150,000	150,000
NEVADA		
Boulder Canyon, Hoover powerplant modification (see Arizona).		
Geothermal resource investigations (see California).		
Lahontan Basin total water management study	75,000	75,000
Lower Colorado River water conservation and efficient use program (see California).		
Reclamation and energy resources, LMNRA wilderness designation (see Arizona).		
NEW MEXICO		
Energy research and development program (see California).		
Geothermal resource investigations (see California).		
Llano-Estacado Playa Lake resources study (formerly Llano-Estacado total water management study)	200,000	200,000
Lower Colorado River water conservation and efficient use program (see California).		
Raton water supply	80,000	80,000
Santa Cruz Dam and Reservoir		50,000
Tularosa Basin water and energy study	200,000	200,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
Apple Creek unit (P-SMBP)		100,000
Garrison diversion unit, M. & I. water facilities (Garrison division, P-SMBP)	100,000	100,000
Total water management study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota).		
OKLAHOMA		
Geary	100,000	100,000
Llano Estacado Playa Lake water resources study (see New Mexico).		
Norman water augmentation study (formerly Norman modification)	8,000	8,000
Seward	70,000	70,000
OREGON		
Boise power and modification study (see Idaho).		
Grande Ronde River study		100,000
Klamath, Butte Valley division	30,000	30,000
Klamath project, main division, A-canal		50,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Lower Deschutes River study	$125,000	$125,000
Owyhee powerplant (see Idaho).		
Rogue River basin, Grants Pass division	95,000	95,000
Rogue River basin, Medford division reformulation	129,000	129,000
Siletz River basin	75,000	75,000
Umatilla basin	180,000	180,000
Upper John Day	125,000	125,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
Eastern South Dakota M. & I. studies, James division (formerly Oahe unit, M. & I. water facilities)	100,000	
Lower James, Fort Randall water diversion proposal	300,000	300,000
Kaspapi unit	75,000	75,000
Oahe riverside irrigation study	150,000	100,000
Total water management study, Missouri River upstream of Gavins Point (P-SMBP)	120,000	120,000
Web domestic water pipeline		100,000
TEXAS		
Llano-Estacado total water management study (see New Mexico).		
Nueces River Basin study	200,000	200,000
Texas Basin, Big Cow Creek	150,000	150,000
Texas Basin, Bon Wier	200,000	200,000
UTAH		
Colorado River storage project power peaking capacity	855,000	855,000
Energy research and development program geothermal (see California).		
Geothermal resource investigations (see California).		
Lower Colorado Basin water conservation and efficient use program (see California).		
Upper Colorado resource study (see Colorado).		
Wind-Hydroelectric energy integrated study (see Wyoming).		
WASHINGTON		
Yakima, Cle Elum and Tieton powerplants	210,000	210,000
Yakima Valley water management study	131,000	131,000
WYOMING		
Colorado River storage project power peaking capacity (see Utah).		
Palisades powerplant enlargement (see Idaho).		
Minidoka powerplant rehabilitation and enlargement (see Idaho).		
Upper Snake River, Oakley fan division (see Idaho).		
Upper Snake River water management study (see Idaho).		
Wind River Basin water supply study	$40,000	$40,000
Total water management study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota).		
Platte River study (see Nebraska).		
Wind-hydroelectric energy integrated study	5,946,000	3,946,000
VARIOUS		
Colorado River water quality improvement	2,456,000	2,615,000
General engineering and research:		
Atmospheric water resources management	7,871,000	9,371,000
Development of cloud seeding techniques	(500,000)	(2,000,000)
General planning studies	250,000	250,000
Special investigations:		
Environmental and interagency coordination activities	2,095,000	2,095,000
Investigations of existing projects	499,000	499,000
Minor work in connection with completed project investigations	915,000	915,000
Technical assistance to States	105,000	105,000
Print reports	35,000	35,000
Projects not yet identified	25,000	25,000
Total, various	14,260,000	15,910,000
Distributive charges for service facilities, unliquidated obligations, etc	−54,000	−54-000
General reduction due to slippage, savings, and carryover balances	−1,250,000	−1,250,000
Classified pay raise (Executive Order 12087)	500,000	500,000
Total, general investigations	34,320,000	34,451,000

Construction and rehabilitation

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $213,053,000 for construction and rehabilitation instead of $215,453,000 as proposed by the House and $205,953,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees direct that of the funds previously appropriated for the Auburn Dam, California, $20 million is to remain available pending completion of the study of the safety aspects of the project.

The conferees agree with the Senate report language regarding the Garrison Diversion Unit, N.D. and American Falls Dam, Idaho.

The conferees recommend an appropriation of $1,500,000 for the O'Neill Unit in Nebraska The Bureau of Reclamation is under court injunction prohibiting further project construction until additional information regarding site geology and dam stability is developed. Based on the current information it will take most of fiscal year 1980 to develop the information required by the court, thereby reducing the funding needed by $4,500,000. The amount recommended is required to develop and prepare a supplement to the final environmental impact statement. This action is based solely on budgetary grounds and is not to be construed as diminished support for this project. The conferees direct that within sound engineering practice and insofar as is reasonable and does not violate state law, minimal stream flow from the Norden Dam in the O'Neill unit complex shall be no less than 100 cubic feet per second (cfs) when water supplies permit and no less than 50 cfs even in time of drought or water scarcity as determined by the Bureau of Reclamation. The conferees hereby refer to Federal Government control over releases of water from Federal projects and do not intend to imply any change in the historic right of a state to allocate its own water supplies.

The appropriations are to be allocated as shown on the following table:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION—STATE AND PROJECT

	Fiscal year 1980			
	Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
CALIFORNIA				
Central Valley project:				
Allen Camp unit		$75,000		$75,000
Sacramento River division	$27,704,000		$27,704,000	
San Luis unit	4,810,000		4,810,000	
Auburn-Folsom South unit:				
Auburn Dam and Reservoir	926,000		926,000	
Auburn area facilities	100,000		100,000	
Folsom South area facilities	100,000		100,000	
All other Auburn-Folsom South unit facilities	11,779,000		11,779,000	
Subtotal, Auburn-Folsom South unit	12,905,000		12,905,000	
Miscellaneous project programs	12,077,000		12,077,000	
San Felipe division	20,884,000		20,884,000	
Total, Central Valley project	78,380,000	75,000	78,380,000	75,000
COLORADO				
Fryingpan-Arkansas project	24,727,000		24,727,000	
San Luis Valley project, closed Basin division	4,168,000		4,168,000	
IDAHO				
Teton Basin project, lower Teton division	500,000		500,000	
NEVADA				
Southern Nevada water project	$41,041,000		$41,041,000	
NEW MEXICO				
Brantley project	6,000,000		1,000,000	
OKLAHOMA				
McGee Creek project	115,400,000		9,000,000	
TEXAS				
Nueces River project	15,470,000		15,470,000	
Palmetto Bend project	2,560,000		2,560,000	
WASHINGTON				
Chief Joseph Dam project, Oroville-Tonasket unit	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Columbia Basin project:				
Irrigation facilities	30,736,000		30,736,000	
Block 26 laterals			1,500,000	
East High area environmental impact statement			100,000	
Third powerplant	9,100,000		9,100,000	
Total, Columbia Basin project	39,836,000		41,436,000	
Yakima project, Kennewick division		$300,000		$300,000

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION—STATE AND PROJECT—Continued

	Fiscal year 1980			
	Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
VARIOUS				
Colorado River comprehensive environmental statement		$900,000		
Drainage and minor construction:				
Boise project, Payette division, Idaho	$504,000		$504,000	
Klamath project, Oregon-California	1,626,000		1,626,000	
Leadville drainage tunnel project, Colorado	25,000		25,000	
Little Wood River project, Idaho	100,000		100,000	
Mann Creek project, Idaho	100,000		100,000	
Minidoka project, American Falls Dam, Idaho	224,000		224,000	
Miscellaneous engineering services, Colorado	10,000		10,000	
Mountain Park project, Oklahoma	100,000		100,000	
Recreation facilities at existing reservoirs, various States	240,000		240,000	
Rogue River basin project, Savage Rapids Dam fishway modifications, Oregon	193,000		193,000	
San Angelo project, Texas	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Solano project-Lake Berryessa recreational facilities, California	1,329,000		1,329,000	
Tualatin project, Oregon	600,000		600,000	
Ventura River project-Casitas Reservoir open space, California	4,510,000		4,510,000	
Washita basin project, Oklahoma	500,000		500,000	
Washoe project, Nevada-California	735,000		735,000	
Total, drainage and minor construction	11,796,000		11,796,000	
Rehabilitation and betterment:				
Carlsbad project, New Mexico	450,000		450,000	
Central Oregon irrigation district, Oregon	344,000		344,000	
Central Valley project, Georgetown divide public utility district, California	1,594,000		1,594,000	
Crooked River project, Ochoco Irrigation District, Oreg.	24,000		24,000	
Huntley project, Montana	600,000		600,000	
Lower Yellowstone project, Montana	500,000		500,000	
Minidoka project, Burley irrigation district, Idaho	195,000		195,000	
P-SMBP, Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	700,000		700,000	
Roosevelt water Conservation District, Ariz	700,000		700,000	
Salt River project, Arizona	942,000		942,000	
Shoshone project, Garland division, Wyoming	600,000		600,000	
Shoshone project, Willwood division, Wyoming	100,000		100,000	
Sun River, Greenfield division, Wyoming	900,000		900,000	
Yakima project, Grandvies Irrigation District, Wash	100,000		100,000	
Total, rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	7,749,000		7,749,000	
Safety of dams:				
American Falls Dam, Idaho			$19,200,000	
Bartlett Dam, Ariz			3,000,000	
Boise project, Black Canyon Dam, Idaho	$250,000		250,000	
Minidoka project, Jackson Lake Dam, Wyo	200,000		200,000	
Minidoka project, Island Park Dam, Idaho	1,761,000		1,761,000	
Newlands project, Lahontan Dam, Nev	2,076,000		2,076,000	
Orland project, Stony Gorge Dam, Calif	1,155,000		1,155,000	
Rapid Valley project, Deerfield Dam, S. Dak	700,000		700,000	
Safety of dams, miscellaneous construction, various States	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Sun River project, Gibson Dam, Mont	450,000		450,000	
Sun River project, Willow Creek Dam, Mont	500,000		500,000	
Total safety of dams	8,092,000		30,292,000	
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT				
MONTANA				
Lower Marias unit, Tiber Dam modifications	5,770,000		5,770,000	
NEBRASKA				
North Loup Division	11,950,000		11,950,000	
O'Neill unit	6,000,000		1,500,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Oahe unit	180,000		180,000	
Pollock-Herreid unit		$200,000		$200,000
WYOMING				
Riverton unit	4,517,000		4,517,000	
VARIOUS				
Drainage and minor construction:				
Dickinson unit, North Dakota	1,255,000		1,255,000	
East Bench unit, Montana	100,000		100,000	
Frenchman-Cambridge unit, Nebraska	134,000		134,000	
Helena Valley unit, Montana	100,000		100,000	
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming	70,000		70,000	
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	300,000		300,000	
Total, drainage and minor construction	1,959,000		1,959,000	
Total, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program	30,376,000	200,000	25,876,000	200,000
Unidentified anticipated unobligated balance brought forward	−56,000,000		−56,000,000	
Undistributed reduction based upon anticipated delays	−20,417,000		−27,517,000	
Subtotal	311,678,000	1,475,000	212,478,000	575,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	313,153,000		213,053,000	
Full funding requested for new construction starts not included in allowance	−106,400,000			
Total, net construction and rehabilitation (excluding full funding)	206,753,000		213,053,000	

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which inserts language relating to American Falls Dam, Idaho.

Colorado River Basin salinity control projects

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $34,761,000 for Colorado River Basin salinity control projects instead of $38,194,000 as proposed by the House and $32,348,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The funds appropriated are to be allocated as shown on the following table:

Colorado River Basin salinity control—State and project	Fiscal year 1980	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
TITLE II		
COLORADO		
Grand Valley systems improvement and management unit	$7,071,000	$3,650,000
Paradox Valley unit	3,175,000	3,163,000
NEVADA		
Las Vegas Wash unit	4,573,000	573,000
Subtotal, title II	14,819,000	7,386,000
VARIOUS		
TITLE I		
Measures below Imperial Dam	23,000,000	27,000,000
Classified pay raise (E.O. 12087)	375,000	375,000
Subtotal, title I	23,375,000	27,375,000
Total, Colorado River Basin salinity control	38,194,000	34,761,000

Operation and maintenance

The conferees call attention of the Department of Interior to the Senate report language regarding the Washoe Project, Nevada (Stampede Division) and agree that nothing with respect to this appropriation should be construed as ratification or approval of the current or past operations of the Stampede Division of the Washoe project.

Loan program

The conferees have included, within available funds, $368,000 for the Lewiston Orchards Irrigation District, Idaho, as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that the per acre repayment obligation in Block 26 of the Columbia Basin

project, Washington, shall be the same as those set forth in repayment contract 11 R 1444, dated October 9, 1945, as amended.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Appalachian regional development programs

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $356,500,000 for the Appalachian regional development programs as proposed by the House instead of $358,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Earmarks $229,000,000 for the Appalachian development highway system as proposed by the House instead of $224,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree with the report language of the House, including $14,300,000 for the recently authorized Corridor X development highway.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $257,000 for the contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of $383,000 as proposed by the House.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $363,340,000 for salaries and expenses of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of $358,340,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement includes a total of 3,034 permanent positions for fiscal year 1980.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $148,677,000 for payment of the Tennessee Valley Authority Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $146,177,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Water resources planning

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $34,614,000 for water resources planning instead of $37,556,000 as proposed by the House and $24,002,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Earmarks $2,788,000 for expenses to administer the act as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,330,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Earmarks $3,112,000 for preparation of assessments and plans as proposed by the House instead of $2,815,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Earmarks $3,134,000 for expenses of river basin commissions as proposed by the House instead of $3,119,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Earmarks $21,000,000 for title III grants to States as proposed by the House instead of $10,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Earmarks $4,000,000 for the Upper Mississippi Comprehensive Management Plan as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,400,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISION

Construction of an extension to the New Senate Office Building

Amendment No. 37: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate appropriating $57,480,700 for continued construction of the Hart Senate Office Building, establishing a ceiling on the total cost of the building of $142,627,700, providing for the transfer of personnel and property from existing buildings to the new building upon completion and directing the Architect of the Capitol to submit a report to the Senate on the costs of razing and/or renovating certain existing buildings.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1980 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1979 amount, the 1980 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1890 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1979	[1] $10,381,887,900
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1980—All titles	[2 3] 11,051,972,700
Titles I through IV	[3] (10,994,492,000)
House bill, fiscal year 1980—All titles	10,685,930,000
Titles I through IV	(10,685,930,000)
Senate bill, fiscal year 1980—All titles	10,886,495,700
Titles I through IV	(10,829,015,000)
Conference agreement—All titles	10,856,475,700
Titles I through IV	(10,798,995,000)
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1979—All titles	+474,587,800
Titles I through IV	(+417,107,100)
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1980—All titles	−195,497,000
Titles I through IV	(−195,497,000)
House bill, fiscal year 1980—All titles	170,545,700
Titles I through IV	(+113,065,000)
Senate bill, fiscal year 1980—All titles	−30,020,000
Titles I through IV	(−30,020,000)

[1] Includes supplemental appropriations (H.R. 4289) amounts.
[2] Includes request of $57,480,700 for New Senate Office Bldg. not considered by the House.
[3] Excludes $505,092,000 not allowed for full funding.

TOM BEVILL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOHN M. SLACK,
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS,
BILL CHAPPELL,
JOHN W. JENRETTE, JR.,
JULIAN C. DIXON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN T. MYERS,
CLAIR W. BURGENER,
VIRGINIA SMITH,
SILVIO O. CONTE
(except as to amendments Nos. 18, 30, and 37),
Managers on the part of the House.

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
WALTER D. HUDDLESTON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
JIM SASSER
(except amendment No. 30),
DENNIS DECONCINI,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
HENRY BELLMON,
JAMES A. MCCLURE,
JAKE GARN,
HARRISON SCHMITT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mrs. CHISHOLM (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for July 26, 27, and 30, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JEFFRIES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOB WILSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WYDLER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLPE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEAVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOWARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. AUCOIN, for 5 minuutes, today.

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROE, immediately following the remarks of Mr. MCCORMACK during consideration of H.R. 3000 in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHUSTER in two instances.

Mr. SYMMS in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in three instances.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. BROYHILL in two instances.

Mr. DOUGHERTY in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUDGER in two instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. WIRTH.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. WEAVER.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. SANTINI.

Mr. DINGELL in five instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. SHANNON.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

Mr. OBEY.

Mr. MARKEY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 27, 1979 at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2122. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations language for fiscal year 1979 and amendments to the requests for appropriations for fiscal year 1980 (H. Doc. No. 96–168); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2123. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize additional appropriations for the Department of State for Migration and Refugee Assistance for fiscal years 1980 and 1981; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2124. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting notice of a proposed new records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2125. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting notice of a proposed new records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2126. A letter from the president, U.S. Capitol Historical Society, transmitting the Society's audit report for the year ended January 31, 1979, pursuant to section 13(a) of Public Law 95–493; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2127. A letter from the Acting Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the seventh annual report on the ocean dumping permit program, covering calendar year 1978, pursuant to section 112 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2128. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a final environmental impact statement and supplemental information on the Kaskaskia Island Drainage and Levee District project, Illinois, pursuant to section 404(r) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[*Omitted from the Record of July 25, 1979*]

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2172. A bill to implement the International Sugar Agreement, 1977, between the United States and foreign countries, to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar industry, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 96–125, Pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted July 26, 1979*]

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 961. An act to amend the Speedy Trial Act of 1974; with amendments (Rept. No. 96–390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 389. Resolution waiving certain points of order against H.R. 4930. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96–391). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee:

H.R. 4967. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., for the William Levi Dawson Institute of Public Affairs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOWLER:

H.R. 4968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that in certain cases the net operating loss carryover period for a taxpayer who ceases to be real estate investment trust shall be the same as the net operating loss carryover period for a taxpayer who continues to be real estate investment trust; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 4969. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the waiting period for disability benefits shall not be applicable in the case of a disabled individual suffering from a terminal illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FISH, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARR, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DODD, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. FENWICK, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWRY, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MICA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. NELSON, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. PREYER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STACK, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. WIRTH and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4970. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce campaign contributions by nonparty multicandidate political committees for election for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 4971. A bill to promote commercial motor vehicle safety, to prevent injury to commercial motor vehicle operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 4972. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GORE, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARR, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GUARINI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 4973. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to impose penalties with respect to certain nondisclosures by business entities as to dangerous products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL (by request):

H.R. 4974. A bill to establish a Solar Energy Development Bank to help make available below-market interest rate loans for the purchase and installation of solar energy equipment in commercial and residential buildings in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON (for himself and Mr. BADHAM):

H.R. 4975. A bill to establish the Orange Coast National Urban Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEASE (for himself and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 4976. A bill to amend the act of April 8, 1935, to increase the powers and the number of members of the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 4977. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide outpatient medical services for any disability of a veteran of World War I as if such disability were service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TREEN:

H.R. 4978. A bill to establish minimum periods of time for the completion of the consultation procedure required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act in the case of permits related to drilling for oil or gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4979. A bill to establish minimum periods of time for the issuance of permits under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to drilling for oil or gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 4980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain coin-operated gaming devices from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT (for himself, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RODINO, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 4981. A bill to establish the Citizens' Commission for the Commemoration of the Federal Government Bicentenary Era for the purpose of encouraging and providing activities to commemorate the development of the Federal Government during the period 1776–1800; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 4982. A bill to authorize the creation of Regional Energy Corporations and to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide guarantees for the obligations of such corporations and other financial assistance to such corporation; jointly to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, and Mr. MCCLORY):

H.J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1980, as "Agriculture Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

271. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to dredging of the Amite and Comite Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

272. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to national health insurance; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Ways and Means.

273. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the standards of eligibility for medicaid assistance; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 4983. A bill for the relief of Ishrat Rahim and Umair Rahim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4984. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to Herman Miller; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2118: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2414: Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3053: Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 3106: Mr. PETRI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HEFTEL, and Mr. SHARP.

H.R. 3227: Mr. HANLEY, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 3255: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3286: Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, and Mr. JENRETTE.

H.R. 3349: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 4215: Mr. KOGOVSEK.

H.R. 4367: Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. LOTT, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 4685: Mr. LOWRY and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 230: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HINSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. GRAY.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. ATKINSON and Mr. PATTERSON.

H. Res. 302: Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. DOWNEY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 79

By Mr. TAYLOR:

—Page 21, after line 13, insert the following new section:

LOCAL RESIDENT PREFERENCE FOR APPOINTMENTS OF POSTMASTERS IN SMALL COMMUNITIES

SEC. 3. Section 1001(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "Officers" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(1) Subject to the provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of this subsection, officers"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) In making any appointment to the position of postmaster at any post office serving a delivery area which has a population of 25,000 or less, the Postal Service shall appoint to such position—

"(A) an individual who—

"(i) for the one-year period ending on the date on which such appointment is made, has been an employee of the Postal Service in such post office and resided within the delivery area of such post office or the city or town in which such post office is located; and

"(ii) otherwise qualifies for appointment to such position; or

"(B) in any case in which, at the close of the period during which applications for such position are accepted, no individual described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph has applied for such position, an individual who—

"(i) for the one-year period ending on the date on which such appointment is made, has resided within the delivery area of such post office or the city or town in which such post office is located; and

"(ii) otherwise qualifies for appointment to such position;

unless, at the close of the period during which such applications are accepted, no individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of this paragraph has applied for such position.

"(3) The Postal Service shall publish in the Federal Register its list of qualifications for appointment of an individual to a position of postmaster. Such qualifications may not limit consideration to an individual who is already a postal employee.

"(4) In any case in which the position of postmaster becomes available at any post office described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Postal Service shall provide to postal patrons of such post office adequate notice that such position is available and that any individual may apply for such position. At a minimum, such notice shall—

"(A) be displayed in a conspicuous place in such post office for the thirty-day period ending on the last date on which applications will be accepted for such position; and

"(B) include a list of the qualifications for appointment of an individual to such position, a description of the duties and responsibilities of the individual appointed to such position, and an explanation of the procedures which will be followed in making the appointment.

"(5) The determination of the population referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be based on the most recent census taken by the Secretary of Commerce under section 141 of title 13, United States Code.".

Redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly.

H.R. 3000

By Mr. HEFTEL:

—Page 40, after line 23, insert the following new subsection:

(c)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, an amount not to exceed $2,000,000 for the purposes of developing a plan for the consideration, establishment, and implementation of a reserve under the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Plan in the State of Hawaii in order to provide substantial protection against the interruption or reduction of petroleum imports to such State.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall transmit a copy of such plan to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate before the earlier of March 31, 1980, or the expiration of 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

—Page 79, insert after line 25, the following:

SMALL BUSINESSES

SEC. 814. (a) In order to carry out a policy that the Department maximize procurements of research and development from small businesses, not less than 25 percent, determined on the basis of value, of research and development projects and services procured by the Department with funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act shall be procured from small businesses, except as provided in subsection (b). The preceding sentence shall apply notwithstanding section 15 of the Small Business Act.

(b) If the Secretary determines that compliance with the 25 percent requirement set forth in subsection (a) is impracticable, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committees on Science and Technology, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Small Business, and Government Operations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources, Governmental Affairs, and Small Business of the Senate, a report which—

(1) apprises such Committees of the impracticability of compliance with such requirement,

(2) lists the reasons for such determination of impracticability, and

(3) presents the measures to be implemented by such Department in order to meet such requirement in subsequent years.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "small business" shall have the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Small Business Act.

By Mr. RAHALL:

—Page 2, line 4, strike out "$48,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$56,000,000".

By Mr. SYMMS:

—Page 40, after line 23, insert the following new subsection:

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of sub-

section (a)(2), no funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section may be used to promulgate, administer or enforce any regulation or to issue or enforce any order which would have the effect of continuing any mandatory allocation or price controls for crude oil or any petroleum product.

By Mr. VENTO:

—Add the following new section 202:

SEC. 202. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to the Department of Energy for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, for the promulgation and implementation of a regulation under authority available to the President under the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-159) providing for the mandatory allocation of middle distillate fuels in amounts specified in (or determined in a manner prescribed by) and at prices specified in (or determined in a manner prescribed by) such regulation. Such regulation shall apply to all middle distillate fuels produced in or imported into the United States.

(b) The regulation under subsection (a) shall take effect not later than fifteen days after its promulgation and, except as provided in subsection (c), may thereafter be amended by the President as provided for in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973.

(c) Any amendment to the regulation under subsection (a) of this Act which, with respect to a class of persons or class of transactions (including transactions with respect to any market level), exempts middle distillate fuels from the provisions of such regulation may take effect only as prescribed in subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 12 of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973.

H.R. 4034

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

—Page 8, add the following after line 24:

"(3) In issuing rules and regulations to carry out this section, particular attention shall be given to the difficulty of devising effective safeguards to prevent a country that poses a threat to the security of the United States from diverting critical technologies to military use, the difficulty of devising effective safeguards to protect critical goods, and the need to take effective measures to prevent the reexport of critical technologies from other countries to countries that pose a threat to the security of the United States. Such regulations shall not be based upon the assumption that such effective safeguards can be devised.

—Page 37, at the end of line 3, add the following new sentence: "If the President, upon receiving a recommendation from the Secretary of Defense under this subsection, does not notify such office or agency within thirty days after receiving such recommendation that he disapproves such export, the President shall notify Congress of the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense that such export be disapproved and that he has not disapproved such export.".

—Page 55, after line 10, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the succeeding paragraph accordingly):

"(2) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out its functions under section 5 of this Act the sum of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year 1980.

By Mr. SHANNON:

—Page 45, insert the following section after line 21 and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly:

EXPORTS OF HIDES AND SKINS

SEC. 110. Subsection (f)(1) of section 7 of the Export Administration Act of 1969, as such section is redesignated by section 104 (a) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "(f)(1)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), in order to carry out the policy set forth in section 3(7) of this Act with respect to cattle hides and skins, cattle hides and skins may not be exported in any year in an amount which is a greater percentage of the total supply of cattle hides and skins produced in the United States than the percentage of the total supply of cattle hides and skins produced in the United States which were exported during the years 1974 through 1978. The limitation set forth in the preceding sentence shall not apply if the President, after receiving the recommendations of the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, determines that—

"(i) countries which are major producers of cattle hides and skins and which, on the effective date of this subparagraph, have in effect restrictions on the export from those countries of cattle hides and skins resume reasonable levels of exports of cattle hides and skins; or

"(ii) during the last calendar year ending before such determination is made, the supply of cattle hides and skins produced in the United States, after deducting the amount of such hides and skins exported during that calendar year, was sufficient to meet the demands of the domestic economy.

The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the President recommendations so that the President has sufficient information to make the determination described in this subparagraph. Before making such recommendations, the two Secretaries shall hold public hearings, after providing reasonable notice thereof, and shall afford interested parties an opportunity to submit written comments, with or without oral presentation, at such hearings. Any determination of the President made under this subparagraph shall be valid for a period of one year.".

H.R. 4040

By Mr. CLAY:

—Page 28, line 6: strike the words "male persons" and insert in lieu thereof "citizens".

Page 28, line 17, strike the words "prepare and".

Page 28, line 18, strike the word "Congress" and insert in lieu thereof "states".

Page 28, line 23, strike the word "automatically" and insert in lieu thereof "magically".

Page 29, line 4, strike the word "induct" and insert in lieu thereof "invite".

Page 29, line 16, strike the word "also" and insert in lieu thereof "probably".

Page 29, line 18, strike the word "discretion" and insert in lieu thereof "mood".

Page 30, line 3, strike the word "considers" and insert in lieu thereof "dreams".

Page 30, line 6, strike the words "revise and modernize" and insert in lieu thereof "rehabilitate".

Page 30, line 20, strike the word "periodic" and insert in lieu thereof "spontaneous".

Page 30, line 20, strike the words "training exercises" and insert in lieu thereof "dress rehearsals".

Page 30, line 21, strike the words "training exercises" and insert in lieu thereof "dress rehearsals".

Page 30, line 23, strike the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "should".

Page 31, line 6, strike the words "further declares that" and insert in lieu thereof "thinks".

Page 31, line 8, strike the word "other" and insert in lieu thereof "government".

Page 31, line 12, strike the word "functions" and insert in lieu thereof "imagination".

Page 31, line 14, strike the word "reorganization" and insert in lieu thereof "modernization".

Page 31, line 5, strike the word "new" and insert in lieu thereof "special".

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

—Page 28, strike out line 3 and all that follows down through line 24 on page 30 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE REFORM

SEC. 812. (a) The President shall prepare and transmit to the Congress a plan for reform of the existing law providing for registration and induction of persons for training and service in the Armed Forces. Such plan shall include recommendations with respect to—

(1) the desirability and feasibility of resuming registration under the Military Selective Service Act as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.;

(2) the desirability and feasibility of establishing a method of automatically registering persons under the Military Selective Service Act through a centralized, automated system using existing records, together with a discussion of the impact of alternative methods of establishing such a registration system on privacy rights under the Constitution and under statutes protecting such rights (including section 552a of title 5, United States Code), and the impact of such alternative methods on other constitutional issues.

(3) the desirability of the enactment of authority for the President to induct persons registered under such Act for training and service in the Armed Forces during any period with respect to which the President determines that such authority is required in the interest of the national defense;

(4) whether women should be subject to registration under such Act and to induction for training and service in the Armed Forces under such Act;

(5) the desirability and feasibility of providing authority for the President to induct persons into the Individual Ready Reserve;

(6) whether persons registered under such Act should also be immediately classified and examined or whether classification and examination of registrants should be subject to discretion of the President;

(7) such changes in the organization and operation of the Selective Service System as the President determines are necessary to enable the Selective Service System to meet the personnel requirements of the Armed Forces during a mobilization in a more efficient and expeditious manner than is presently possible;

(8) the desirability, in the interest of preserving discipline and morale in the Armed Forces, of establishing a national youth service program permitting volunteer work, for either public or private public service agencies, as an alternative to military service.

(9) such other changes in existing law relating to registration, classification, selection, and induction as the President considers appropriate; and

(10) other possible procedures that could be established to enable the Armed Forces to meet their personnel requirements.

(b) The President shall transmit with the plan required by subsection (a) proposals for such legislation as may be necessary to implement the plan and to revise and modernize the Military Selective Service Act.

(c) The plan required by subsection (a), together with the proposed legislation required by subsection (b), shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 15, 1980, or the end of the three-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

Redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

By Mr. WOLPE:

—Page 23, line 25, after the word "Appropriations" add the words "Foreign Relations".

Page 23, line 25, after the word "Appro-

priations" add the words "Government Operations".

Page 24, strike line 11.
Page 24, strike lines 12–15.
Page 24, strike line 16.
Page 24, strike lines 17–18.
Page 24, strike lines 19–21.
Page 24, strike line 22.
Page 24, strike line 23.
Page 25, strike lines 1–3.
Page 25, strige line 4.
Page 25, strike lines 5 and 6.
Page 25, strike lines 7 and 8.
Page 25, strike lines 9 and 10.
Page 25, strike lines 11–13.
Page 25, strike lines 14–16.
Page 25, strike lines 17–19.
Page 25, strike lines 20–22.
Page 25, strike lines 23–25, and lines 1–3, page 26.
Page 29, line 1, strike the words "school records and".
Page 29, line 1, strike the words "school records" and insert in lieu thereof "FBI files".

H.R. 4440

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

—Page 13, line 16, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "$10,000,000".

Page 13, line 17, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "$5,000,000".

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHY THE UNITED STATES NEEDS A NEW OIL IMPORTING SYSTEM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1979

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times yesterday printed under the caption "Why the U.S. Needs a New Oil Importing System" a letter from our distinguished colleague, JOHN CONYERS. I also believe the letter to be noteworthy and, accordingly, bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

To the Editor:

President Carter's July 15 speech to the nation, to the extent that it dealt with the energy crisis, was riddled with inaccuracy and evasiveness, despite his assertion that the American people want honest answers, not easy or evasive ones. His view that we can substantially reduce our use of foreign oil over the next several years is highly misleading.

His assertion the next day in Kansas City that the world lacks enough oil to meet demand is diversionary cant. His lack of any reference to the role of the oil industry, alongside the OPEC cartel, in engineering shortages, impeding new crude oil development in non-OPEC countries as well as heavy oil production on Federal lands in the U.S., and in promoting exorbitant prices is a glaring evasion.

The public anxiety about oil is not only directed at its soaring price and uncertain supply, but more profoundly reflects their perception of the lack of control over this basic resource. The picture of small number of oil-producing countries and a handful of multinational oil companies arrogantly lording over this essential wealth is understandably an infuriating one.

The latest OPEC prices for oil are a hundred times or more the cost of its production put aboard a tanker. This extraordinary spread between cost and price and the remarkable absence of any competitive challenge is the measure of the price-fixing, supply-restricting powers of the OPEC cartel and the market power of the big oil companies. The greatest fear of both is another world oil glut that would depress prices and undermine their control over supply. A recent study commissioned by the World Bank indicates there are vast untapped petroleum reserves outside of OPEC that could sustain current demand for another few hundred years.

After all, over 80 percent of all oil wells ever drilled exist in North America. The cartel could not survive without the support of "big oil," so heavily committed to the OPEC states through ownership, investment, contractual service and privileged markets, and its collaboration in synchronizing worldwide production, shutting down operating wells, and limiting purchases from non-OPEC producers.

Nothing can be of greater importance than to devise an alternative to the existing oil import structure. That alternative has to create four things: (1) an independent purchasing agent for all foreign oil used in the U.S.; (2) a capability to engage in government-to-government purchases from OPEC countries and create long-term contracts with non-OPEC producers in order to spur development of their reserves; (3) a Federal authority to oversee imports and their allocation in times of shortage, that the U.S. alone among the industrial powers lacks; and (4) a public oil corporation to develop the half of all our domestic energy resources, including competitively priced heavy oil, that exist on Federally owned lands.

The Oil Imports Act of 1979 (H.R. 3604), which Representatives Benjamin Rosenthal, Charles Rose, and myself, along with 42 other members, have sponsored, provides that workable alternative. It would establish a Federal nonprofit corporation whose sole responsibility is to purchse foreign oil at the lowest prices and from the most diverse sources. It would resell the oil in the U.S. in ways that spur competition among domestic marketers, insure equitable distribution and maximize domestic refining capacity.

A new system of oil importing is needed to curb the cartel's pricing power. A public energy corporation to develop energy resources on Federal land would furnish the competitive force so lacking in the industry today. Presidential disregard of the oil market marriage of OPEC and "big oil" is bound to lead to still-born policy.

JOHN CONYERS,
Member of Congress,
First District, Michigan.●

LOUISIANA "MINUTEWOMAN"—HARRIET DAGGETT

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1979

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I applaud Congresswoman SCHROEDER's "Minutewomen" series and join her celebration of America's outstanding women and their contributions to our history and heritage.

One of Louisiana's energetic daughters, Harriet Spiller Daggett, was the first woman to hold a full-time professorship at a law school accredited by the American Association of Universities and Colleges. As professor of law at Louisiana State University, she produced hundreds of articles and eight books; taught more than a thousand fledgling lawyers; and became the Louisiana authority on mineral law, community property, successions, donations, and laws affecting children. Her book, "The Community Property System of Louisiana" was published in 1931, reprinted in 1945, and is still the basic authority on Louisiana community property law.

At President Harry Truman's invitation, Dr. Daggett acted as technical specialist for the midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1950. She also worked with the Louisiana Library Commission and the Children's Code Commission and was instrumental in establishing the family court of East Baton Rouge Parish which now serves as a sort of living monument to her energy and competence.

Coming from an oil-rich State, her contributions to mineral law were especially valuable. In 1953, she founded the Louisiana State University Mineral Law Institute to help acquaint lawyers with mineral rights in Louisiana. She was one of the principal architects of the Louisiana Mineral Code.

Dr. Daggett died in 1966 and is honored by a formal portrait in the law building at Louisiana State University. Her contributions to Louisiana jurisprudence and her eloquent defense of the rights of women and children have earned her a place of high regard in Louisiana's history.●

SPEEDING UP OUR PROGRAM FOR FUSION ENERGY

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1979

● Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I wrote to acting Under Secretary of Energy, John Deutch, requesting that the Department of Energy consider an aggressive acceleration of the magnetic fusion energy program. The goal of this accelerated effort would be to have a magnetic fusion electric demonstration plant on the line before the end of the century. I consider nuclear fusion to have the greatest future potential of any advanced energy technology; and I believe that we must move forward aggressively to realize the promise of this infinite and cheap supply of usable energy.

A copy of the letter follows:

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.