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the progress towards the peaceful use of ***nuclear energy*** in the nineteen seventies has been accompanied by an increasing struggle on behalf of the second and third world countries to overcome the efforts of the two superpowers to maintain their control and monopoly in this area.

in recent years, the output of electrical ***energy*** from ***nuclear*** powered generators in any one of the countries, france, west germany, britain, sweden or switzerland has roughly equaled or even surpassed the share of electricity generated by such plants in the total output of the unite states or the soviet union. many third world countries are determined to develop their own ***nuclear energy*** resources as a means of accelerating their economic development and consolidating their national independence. brazil, argentina, chile, mexico, india, pakistan, egypt and libya have all been building or plan to build their own ***nuclear*** powered stations. iran, an oit-rich country, has also drawn up a massive ***nuclear*** power programme.

the development of plutonium technology has made available a ***nuclear*** fuel that is more effective than enriched uranium. one consequence of this is that the manufacture of ***nuclear*** weapons is now within the reach of many countries.

in the face of these developments, the two superpowers have sought means to restrict the ***nuclear*** programmes of other country in order to sustain what remains of their monopoly in this field.

in addition to its customary strict control over plutonium technology, the unites states proposed in 1975 the establishment of a "multi-national centre for ***nuclear*** fuels". its intention was to prevent other countries from recovering plutonium by reprocessing radiation elements by themselves. it called on those countries which have gained the technological ability to recover plutonium, to refrain from doing so in return for its own promise to suspend or delay the development of plutonium technology. it also called for a ban on the sale of plutonium fuel, technology and equipment.

though its ***nuclear*** technology is not as advanced as the united states, the soviet union has proved just as intransigent, if not more so, in seeking to maintain its ***nuclear*** dominance. while maintaining a tight grip over the eastern european countries, the soviet union has gone to great lengths to restrict the ***nuclear*** development of second world and especially third world countries by appealing to a policy of "non-proliferation of ***nuclear*** weapons".

to speed up development of its own ***nuclear*** power industry, the soviet union has taken over the ***nuclear*** resources of eastern european countries. over 90 per cent of czechoslovakia's yearly output of uranium ore goes to the soviet union and this accounts for one-fifth of the soviet union's annual yield of uranium. the extraction of uranium deposits in the german democratic republic and hungary is also under moscow's control.

while using eastern european countries' technology and equipment to build its own ***nuclear*** power plants, the soviet union, under the pretext of "international division of labour", prevents these countries from having their own independent ***nuclear*** industry. their 1981-1990 plan for the production of ***nuclear*** equipment is to be included in a multilateral agreement of the council for mutual economic assistance.

the soviet union has set up an "international combine for the manufacture of atomic power-generating equipment" to control the making and use of ***nuclear*** generating equipment in the eastern european countries. this "international combine" is justified under the names "specialization" and "cooperation".

the soviet union has taken various steps to obstruct the development of ***nuclear*** technology and industry in other countries.

first and foremost it has gone out of its way to press these countries to accede to the "treaty for the non-proliferation of ***nuclear*** weapons". this treaty, (devised in conjunction with the united states in 1968), declares that "the task to consolidate further the system of non-proliferation by widening the circle of the participants in the treaty, remains a pressing one."

in addition, it tries to block the development of ***nuclear*** technology in other countries by propositions such as "the outlawing of all ***nuclear*** tests" and "a termporary suspension of ***nuclear*** explosions used for special purposes".

second. the soviet union preaches the "establishing of an international order" and the instituting of "a system of international guarantees and supervision". the soviet union called on all countries to sign, as soon as possible, supervision agreements with the "international atomic ***energy*** agency" in order to place "all (their) ***nuclear*** activities" under the supervision of this agency. in a word, moscow wants to subject all the medium-sized and small countries to the "order" and "system" of the superpowers while itself remaining at large.

third. it calls for the reorganization of the "***nuclear*** club" and the establishment of "a ***nuclear*** fuel tank" for the sole purpose of maintaining ***nuclear*** monopoly. in 1976, the soviet union and the united states induced a number of countries to set up the 15-nation "london club". agreement was reached after many meetings on the so-called "rules governing ***nuclear*** exports" under which those countries importing ***nuclear*** technology and fuel are required to accept international supervision. working hand in glove with the united states, the kremlin also advocated the formation of a "***nuclear*** fuel bank". under the terms of this "bank", other countries will only be granted the right to deposit ***nuclear*** fuel in it or draw ***nuclear*** materials from it. they will not be allowed to produce their own ***nuclear*** fuel. it is on account of the rapid development and dispersion of ***nuclear*** technology throughout the world that the superpowers are attempting to exercise their ***nuclear*** monopoly.

one consequence of this is that the medium-sized and small countries are forced to stand up and fight against such control and monopoly. furthermore, they are contemptuous of such blatant manipulation. the french paper "le monde" reported on may 7 last year when the french president, giscard d'estaing, firmly stated france's position: "france has a national policy of ***nuclear energy*** decided by france itself and it will continue to maintain the right to shape its own ***nuclear*** policy."

every country is justified in developing ***nuclear*** power stations to serve its own needs. in recent years, contracts on the peaceful utilization of ***nuclear energy*** have been concluded between west germany and brazil and between france and pakistan. in addition, japan held talks with britain and france aimed at concluding contracts on the processing of ***nuclear*** wastes. all this poses a challenge to the ***nuclear*** monopoly maintained by the two superpowers.

opposition to this monopoly is steadily growing in the third world. the president of the argentinian commission on atomic ***energy*** read admiral madero said: "we refuse to sign the ***nuclear*** non-proliferation pact because of its discriminative character." indian prime minister desai declared on may 6, 1977: "even if the whole world is going to have atomic weapons. i am not going to be a party to it." yugoslavia called for the need to strengthen cooperation in ***nuclear*** technology among the non-aligned countries.

the third world countries are stepping up cooperation concerning ***nuclear*** technology with the second world countries. this is in response to the constant increase in their economic capability and consequent needs. common interests in the struggle against the two superpowers' ***nuclear*** control and monopoly have led to a daily strengthening of the unity of the second and third worlds. the days are gone forever for ***nuclear*** monopoly by the soviet union and the united states.

**End of Document**



[***brazil gets european credit for hydraulic power station***](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3SJ4-DXC0-000B-41TK-00000-00&context=1516831)

The Xinhua General Overseas News ServiceXinhua General News Service

APRIL 27, 1978, THURSDAY

**Length:** 213 words

**Dateline:** peking, april 26; Item No: 042635

**Body**

a credit of 250 million u.s. dollars for the construction of a brazilian hydraulic power station was contracted in paris on april 24 between the state-owned brazilian electricity enterprise (electrobras) and a west european consortium, according to a paris report.

the consortium is composed of the commercial credit of france, the hanover manufacturers ltd. and the international bank for the financing of ***nuclear energy***.

the financed power station, the largest of its kind in the amazonian region in north brazil, is to be built on the tocatins river in para state. it will have an installed capacity of three million kilowatts upon the completion of the first phase of the project. france agreed to lend a hand in april 1976 when brazilian president ernesto geisel was there on a visit. last month, agreements were signed between brazil and a number of french industrial firms on the supply of the required installations and equipment by the latter.

at a paris press conference held in connection with the signing of the credit agreement, shigeki ueki, brazilian minister of mines and ***energy***, made it clear that his government would examine with france the question of cooperation in ***nuclear energy*** for which the two countries had already signed agreements.
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france is making much headway in its self-reliant efforts for peaceful uses of ***nuclear energy***. work has started on a new fast-breeder, "super-phoenix", which will produce a tremendous amount of power, much more than the "phoenix" it built a few years ago.

the fast-breeders are so named because they reprocess radiation elements to recover plutonium, resembling in a sense the mythical bird which consumed itself in fire and then rose anew from its ashes.

the french fast-breeders are remarkable because they produce more plutonium than they consume and make it possible to make fuller use of uranium. since they transform the less active u238 into plutonium, they can turn 60 to 70 per cent of uranium material to good account. in comparison, light-water or other ***nuclear*** reactors consume only one to two per cent, because they operate only with u235, which constitutes only 0.7 per cent of the naturally occurring uranium.

as a country dependent almost entirely on imported oil, france has long since conducted research in ***nuclear energy*** for peaceful uses. it began research in the fast-breeder in the early fifties, and built the "phoenix" by the end of 1972. for practical purposes, it initiated its programme for a 1.2 million-kilowatts "super-phoenix", which is expected to be commissioned in creys-malville by 1982. another project, a "hyper-phoenix" with a capacity of 1.8 million-kilowatts will be started in 1980.

such fast-breeders will bring enormous economic benefit to france. they will not only enable it to save a lot on oil consumption, but also reduce its demand on natural uranium and turn to good account u238 which becomes waste in ***nuclear*** reactors.

france is going ahead of the two superpowers in the development of fast-breeders. its rapid progress testifies to the technological advance of the country and also its steadfastness in promoting science and technology along its own lines. the fast-breeders symbolize the accomplishment of the hard-working and intelligent scientists and technicians of france.

the "phoenix" and "super-phoenix" are a blow to the two superpowers' attempt to control and monopolize the utilization of ***nuclear energy***. french president valery giscard d'estaing has reiterated france's position "to continue to maintain the right to shape its own ***nuclear*** policy." last july france and west germany formed a corporation for the two countries to cooperate in the field of fast-breeders. the enterprise has been joined by italy, belgium and the netherlands. this shows the trend in western europe to pool efforts and develop the ***nuclear*** industry in its own way.
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In the Burger era, the U.S. Supreme Court has consistently tired to narrow the scope of judicial power. Last week, re-emphasizing that philosophy, the Justices accused the prestigious U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia of unwarranted interference with Federal ***nuclear-energy*** policy. The unanimous opinion, written by Justice William Rehnquist, said the appeals court was "engrafting" its own notions on a Federal agency "to further some vague, undefined public good."

Opposition: At stake is the operation of two ***nuclear*** plants, one by Vermont Yankee ***Nuclear*** Power Corp. near Vernon, Vt., and one by Consumer Power Co. near Midland, Mich. Environmentalists have stranuously opposed the plants for a decade. They claim that the power companies lacked a satisfactory plan to dispose of dangerous ***nuclear*** waste, and that the ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission failed to cinsider ***energy*** conservation as an alternative to the plant's operations. The court of appeals agreed and ordered the commission to examine these issues.

The case was fought at the Supreme Court level on esoteric legal grounds - in short, whether the commission had followed proper adminstrative procedures in deciding to grant the licences. These procedural challenges have been a favorite tactic of environmentalist groups in fighting ***nuclear-energy*** development. The court of appeals had ruled that some arguments relating to ***nuclear*** power were not specifically taken into account. The Supreme Court, in effect, found that this was an unwarranted intrusion into the regulatory process.

The decision is likely to make it more difficult for consumer and environmentalist organizations to challenge Federal agencies. The Supreme Court, for instance, criticized Michigan envoironmentalists for not making their charges against the ***nuclear*** plant specific enough. "It places a fairly heavy burden on the public-interest groups," concedes Ed Kuhlmann, chief of litigation for the Citizens Communications Center. "They may lack the resources to do everthing the Court wants."

Tactic: But the Supreme Court judgment may raise obstacles for business and industry as well. Often faced with strict regulations set by government agencies, they have used their financial strength to pursue lengthy, oftern sucessful, cases in the court of appeals, a tactic that will be limited now. For instance, the Interior Department promulgated new rules governing stripmining last December and within a month 220 mine operators challenged those regulations in court. Justice Rehnquist's opinion seemed less concerned about the mertis of ***nuclear*** plants than about the apparent judicial meddling. "***Nuclear energy*** may some day be a cheap, safe source of power or it may not," he said. "But Congress has made a choice to at least try. The fundamental policy questions . . . are not subject to reexamination in the Federal courts." The opinion treated the District of Columbia appeals judges a bit like law students who had written a bad exam. Rehnquist referred to "Monday-morning quarterbacking" and to "Kafkaesque" judgments. He said the appeals court "fundamentally misconceives the nature of the standard for judicial review."

As frequently happens after a Supreme Court opinion, the case itself is far from resolved. The power companies were pleased, but the environmentalists who brought the suit were not dismayed. They noted that after the Court made its judgement, the Justices nevertheless sent the case back to the appeals court for another look. It still could be years before the ***nuclear*** plants get final permission to operate.
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The lower house of parliament approved deliveries of enriched uranium to Brazil Feb. 1 under the condition that Brazil agree to strict safeguards against the use of the material for weapons. The motion also called for the expansion of the ultracentrafuge uranium enrichment plant at Almelo, near the West Germany border.

[See 1977, p. 566E3]

The Almelo plant was owned by Urenco, a joint West German-British-Dutch company created to produce enriched uranium. The Dutch had been under increasing pressure from Britain and West Germany to approve the export measure. According to press reports Feb. 1, the West Germans had threatened to drop Holland from the project if it did not quickly approved ***nuclear*** exports to Brazil.

The Dutch government only succeeded in pushing through the export termination after three days of bitter debate. The center-right coalition government of Premier Andreas van Agt had too few seats in parliament to overcome the anti-inuclear lobby led by the opposition Socialist party without compromises, such as the promise to increase safeguards.

The terms under which the Dutch parliament passed the motion meant that the government would have to press West Germay, Britain and Brazil to finish ***nuclear*** safeguards' negotiations before the first deliveries of ***nuclear*** fuels in 1981.

*Almelo A-Plant Protest Held* -- An anti-***nuclear energy*** demonstration was held in the small town of Almelo March 4 to protest plans for the expansion of the atomic plant on the site. The expanded facility was intended to supply Brazil with enriched uranuium fuels.

It was the largest anti-***nuclear energy*** demonstration ever held in Holland. Over 25,000 persons gathered in the town center and later marched past the plant. About 5,000 of the protesters were from West Germany.

The demonstration was orderly and no disturbances or injuries were reported.
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foreign ministers of ecuador and argentina reaffirmed in a joint declaration that the two countries will strengthen economic cooperation and advance the integration of latin america, according to a report from quito.

the joint declaration was signed by ecuadorian foreign minister jose ayala and his argentine counter-part oscar antonio montes on april 12 at the conclusion of the latter's visit to ecuador.

the two foreign ministers agreed that the current world economic situations has made it more and more urgent for latin american countries to accelerate the integration process. they expressed the hope that measures will be taken to revitalize the latin american free trade association. cooperation, integration and economic complementation are effective ways to a harmonious development of countries, the two foreign ministers pointed out in the joint declaration.

they reaffirmed the sovereignty and jurisdiction of coastal countries over waters up to 200 miles away from their coasts. they held that the international seabed rules should ensure joint participation by all countries in the peaceful utilization of this region.

the two foreign ministers believed that their countries, observant of a cooperation agreement signed between the two countries last april on the peaceful use of ***nuclear energy***, have made significant progress in their cooperation in the use of ***nuclear energy***, which enables the two countries to share the benefits derived from the peaceful use of atomic ***energy*** and provide themselves with the appropriate alternative as ***energy*** demand is mounting.

the two foreign ministers agreed to advance cooperation between the argentine petroleum deposits administrative bureau (ypf) and ecuador's state petroleum corporation (cepe). now, the two companies are conducting associated oil exploration in the forest areas in eastern ecuador with the ypf providing the funds, technology and equipment.

the joint declaration said the ecuadorian foreign minister expressed the support of his government for the argentine government in the latter's exercise of sovereignty over the malvinas islands.
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brazil is in favour of solution to international differences by peaceful means and negotiation and does not accept or acquiesce in any interference, expansionism and hegemonist ambitions, declared brazilian president ernesto geisel in his recent annual message to the national congress.

according to a report from brasilia, the president in the message criticized the ***nuclear*** armament race between the united states and the soviet union. "the arms race between the great powers continues in all environments, even in outer space," he pointed out. "this race, which is chracterised by the unlimited use of ***nuclear energy*** for military ends, represents a serious factor adding to international instability and the fear of all mankind." defending the right of all countries to acquire ***nuclear*** technology for peaceful purposes, he praised the brazilian-west german cooperation agreement on peaceful utilization of ***nuclear energy***, an accord opposed by the two superpowers.

recalling brazil's foreign relations in 1977, president geisel said that there were closer relations between brazil and countries of latin america and africa which are linked with it geographically, historically and culturally. brazil had deepened its policy of cooperation and understanding towards africa, he said, noting the government's participation in the maputo international conference in support of the peoples of zimbabwe and namibia and in the lagos world conference for action against apartheid.

referring to relations with china, the president pointed out: "our relations with the people's republic of china have been equally satisfactory"; last year "brazil concluded with the people's republic of china, whose growing importance in international arena is widely recognized, a trade agreement which should regulate the already promising trade exchange". brazil's relations with the west and with the united states and the soviet union were also mentioned.

turning to economic questions, the president said that brazil last year exported more than 12,000 million dollars' worth of goods and scored a favourable trade balance of 138 million dollars. the economic growth rate was little less than 5 per cent, the gross domestic product 164,000 million dollars, and per capita income 1,452 dollars. inflation stood at 38.8 per cent, measured by the increase in the general price index. he added that brazil's foreign debts went up to the tune of 31,200 million dollars but international reserves showed an unprecedented high of 7,200 million dollars.

referring to internal politics, president geisel said that the government in 1978 "will continue the dialogue with all sectors of the national community so that consensus can be reached on the most ugent political reforms".
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the first caribbean conference on ***energy*** and development was held in the puerto rican capital of san juan last week, according to reports from that city.

at the four-day conference, representatives from over 30 countries discussed questions arising from dependence on oil import and stressed the need for research into the ways of finding and utilizing new ***energy*** sources.

it is reported that the caribbean countries except venezuela, mexico and trinidad and tobago rely on oil import to meet their domestic ***energy*** need. with a view to changing this situation, a number of countries have made efforts in recent years to open up new ***energy*** sources and already scored some achievements.

at the conference, representatives stressed the need to find out ways of regional solutions to ***energy*** sources and explored the use of solar, ***nuclear***, geothermal, oceanic and wind ***energy*** in the caribbean. the mexican and brazilian representatives addressed the conference on the use of geothermal and ***nuclear energy*** and the replacement of gasoline with alcohol extracted from bagasse.

some representatives were reported to have said that the conference has laid the foundation for caribbean cooperation in the use of ***energy*** in the region.
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Special to The Globe and mail

HAMILTON - A group of 100 randomly selected residents will act as a

jury in a debate on ***nuclear energy*** in Hamilton this month in the first

demonstration of a new method of testing public opinion.

Each juror will be paid $50 for listening to an all-day debate on

whether Ontario should continue building ***nuclear*** reactors for generating

electricity.

The jurors will cast ballots for or against the question at the end of

the day.

This fee will encourage participation by the general public, rather

than a special interest group, Douglas Scott, who devised this method of

informing and testing public opinion on a complex issue.

The city is contributing up to $6,000 to the project, which has been

called the Hamilton Experiment.

If for no other reason than the advertising value, the city is getting

a good bargain, Mayor Jack MacDonald said.

Sponsored by the Canadian Institute on Public Affairs, the debate will

take place at McMaster University on April 15, with Judge Horace Krever

of the Ontario Supreme Court acting as moderator.

Participants in the debate will be William Morrison, director of

design and development for Ontario Hydro, and J. A. L. Robertson,

assistant general manager of the the Chalk River ***nuclear*** laboratories,

speaking in favor ***nuclear*** development, and Gordon Edwards, chairman of

the Canadian Coalition for ***Nuclear*** Responsibility, and Ian Connerty,

national co-ordinator of the coalition, speaking against it.
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Special to The Globe and Mail

LONDON, Ont. - Legislation to require two-thirds Canadian equity

ownership of new uranium mining and milling operations in Canada will be

ready for tabling in Parliament in about a month, according to O.C.

Runnalls, senior adviser on uranium and ***nuclear energy*** in the federal ***Energy*** Department.

The legislation will be retroactive to the time when the federal

Government first announced its majority Canadian control policy for new

uranium operations.

As a result, the possibility that the bill might not be passed by

Parliament until after an expected spring or summer federal election

should not pose any major problems for either the legislation or the

uranium industry.

In fact, it will surface just after the final recommendations of a

special Saskatchewan inquiry into the timing and speed of development of

major uranium discoveries in northern Saskatchewan in recent years.

Observers are predicting that Saskatchewan will approve new uranium

development and the existence of the federal legislation should minimize

the possibility of further bureaucratic delays.

Under the bill, foreign companies or individuals holding more than a

33 per cent combined control in a uranium development in Canada will have

to divest themselves of sufficient direct or indirect interests to give

Canadians a minimum 67 per cent control of any operation. Existing

operations that are foreign controlled are exempted under the

bill.
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The current rather soft market in world oil, with a potential oversupply

of between two million and three million barrels a day, is likely to

prevail through the early 1980s, says Ulf Lantzke, executive director of

the International ***Energy*** Agency.

As a result, the IEA expects stable oil prices, in real terms, up to

1985 and an average annual increase of about 2.5 per cent thereafter when

tighter conditions are likely to prevail, Mr. Lantzke said.

We are confident that with combined strong ***energy*** policies in member

countries we shall be able to avoid price explosions.

However, despite some progress by members of the Organization for

Economic Co-operation and Development in reducing over-all ***energy***

consumption since the oil crisis, there has been no progress as regards

crude oil, which accounted for 52 per cent of the total, unchanged from

1972, he said.

According to preliminary figures, oil consumption in OECD member

countries increased 12.1 per cent in 1977 to 1.28 billion tons from 1.14

billion in 1972.

Mr. Lantzke said coal could turn out to have a considerable potential

late in the 1980s if decisions are taken now. ***Nuclear energy***, which

accounted for 3 per cent of over-all ***energy*** consumption in 1977, compared

with 1 per cent in 1972, could contribute between 6 and 7 per cent in

1985 provided there are no further cuts in members' ***energy*** programs.
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Water policy and ***energy*** production were the two chief topics at the annual winter meeting of the National Governors' Association in Washington Feb. 26-28.

The governors held two closed sessions on ***energy*** policy with Administration officials Feb. 26 and 27.

Participants in the first, which was held at the Executive Office Building near the White House, included ***Energy*** Secretary James R. Schlesinger and Interior Secretary Cecil D. Andrus.

The session Feb. 27 was with President Carter, who reportedly told the governors the Administration was working on a "comprehensive" new plan for disposing of radioactive waste from ***nuclear*** power plants. [See p. 144F2]

The consensus of the governors, according to a statement released by the association, was that "greater federal funding be allocated to ***energy*** in general and to renewable and essentially inexhaustible ***energy*** sources in particular," such as solar and geothermal ***energy***. [See 1977, p. 719A2]

The governors said "a firmer commitment to ***nuclear energy*** must be articulated by the President" or the nation's ***energy*** needs would outstrip its supplies.

The governors adopted a resolution on water policy Feb. 28. It stated that the states should have "the primary authority and responsibility for water management" and that conservation "must be the fundamental consideration" in water management. [See p. 34D1-F1]

*Vance Talks vs. Protectionism* -- Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance addressed the association at its formal session Feb. 27. He urged the governors to support the Administration in its effort to resist "a strong impulse" toward "protectionism" in trade policy.

Trade barriers against foreign imports to protect domestic industries and jobs were self-defeating and would lose more jobs than they saved, he said.

"Protectionism against our trading partners," Vance said, "breeds protectionism by our trading partners against us."
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With Congress and the Administration at odds over the Clinch River breeder reactor, the ***Energy*** Department had prepared a compromise proposal by which the Clinch River project would be terminated, but additional funding would be devoted to alternative breeder designs. The proposal, described in the New York Times March 17 and the Wall Street Journal March 23, was apparently the product of negotiations between ***Energy*** Secretary James Schlesinger and Rep. Walter Flowers (D, Ala.). [See p. 183D2]

(Flowers was chairman of the subcommittee on fossil and ***nuclear energy*** research, development and demonstration of the House Science and Technology Committee.)

The Administration had opposed the Clinch River project as unneeded, uneconomical and a threat to the effort to control the spread of ***nuclear*** weapons. The Clinch River breeder reactor would produce plutonium, which could be used to make atomic bombs.

Congress had supported the project, however, seeing in it a path to U.S. ***energy*** independence. The reactor was designed to convert a nonfissionable uranium isotope into plutonium, thus creating more ***nuclear*** fuel than it used while operating.

An $80-million appropriation for Clinch River provided the focus for the dispute between Congress and the Administration. President Carter wanted to use the money to shut down the Clinch River project, but Congress had written the legislation so as to bar that possibility.

The compromise proposal involved a two-year study to investigate alternatives to the Clinch River technology. Schlesinger, in a letter to House Science and Technology Committee Chairman Olin Teague (D, Tex.), said, "The Administration believes the breeder program should be reoriented to evaluate designs for a larger advanced fission facility."

The study would look at breeder reactors designed to produce power in the range of 650 to 900 megawatts, which would be double to triple the capacity of the Clinch River project. The uranium-thorium fuel cycle, considered safer than the uranium-plutonium cycle, would presumably be studied, as would new technologies considered to be more secure from the point of view of weapons proliferation. [See p. 144F2]

The compromise proposal did not, however, include a definite commitment to construct a new breeder reactor. The decision on construction would be deferred until the study was completed. Some members of Congress indicated they could nt accept a compromise on the Clinch River issue that lacked a commitment to construction. Rep. Mike McCormack (D, Wash.), quoted in the New York Times March 17, said the proposal as reported was "not satisfactory." "Why in the world," he continued, "should Congress give up everything we've fought for?"
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Rising radiation fear in Great Slave area fought by federal officials

By NANCY COOPER

Special to The Globe and Mail

YELLOWKNIFE - There are rising fears among Northwest Territories

residents about the long-term hazards of radiation, and federal

authorities in charge of cleaning up a Soviet ***nuclear*** satellite that fell

from orbit in the area are moving to quell them.

A joint statement made by several federal departments yesterday told

residents that the radioactive particles discovered in the Great Slave

Lake region are no more than undesirable nuisances and there is no

justification for any change in lifestyle or recreation.

The statement is a clear attempt to combat conflicting scientific

opinions that have given rise to a sudden wave of concern in the

satellite fallout area more than a month after the out-of-kilter Cosmos

954 fell to earth before dawn on Jan. 24.

Fears rose last week with the announcement that helicopter crews had

unexpectedly discovered the widely scattered remains of the satellite's

***nuclear*** reactor core in an area where they had not even been looking.

The particles, ranging in size from birdshot to pepper grains, blew

with the wind and settled in a broad band that includes the populated

areas of Pine Point, Fort Resolution and Snowdrift, as well as the

southern part of Great Slave Lake and areas around the town of Hay River

and Wood Buffalo National Park.

There are numerous indications of growing concern:

When a public meeting was called in Pine Point to discuss the issue,

about 400 of the town's 1,400 people jammed the hall.

When 15 or more dogs died in the past couple of weeks in Fort

Resolution, people began blaming radiation. Authorities hope to combat

this belief by sending a dog carcass for analysis, which they feel will

reveal distemper.

A Yellowknife hockey coach taking his team into Pine Point this week

called each of the players' parents to ask if there was any objection to

their children entering a town where several radioactive particles have

been found in the past two days.

After an Atomic ***Energy*** Control Board employee held a public

question-and-answer session in Fort Resolution this week, the nurse

stationed in the settlement felt there were so many questions still

unanswered that she asked her superiors to send a qualified radiation

health expert to answer queries.

A Yellowknife newspaper has called for the establishment of a federal

task force to study the radiation issue.

Fears have been fuelled further by the broadcasting on the only

northern radio network of conflicting advice and opinions from sharply

divided ***nuclear*** phycisists and scientists about the possible effects of

the radiation.

The NWT also finds itself becoming the newest arena for the broader

***nuclear-energy*** debate. The Canadian Coalition for ***Nuclear*** Responsibility

is telling northerners that the long-term hazards could be both

frightening and grave, a sharp contradiction to the soothing press

releases from the Department of National Defence.

. . . Fission products can be concentrated over a period of years in

the food chain to the point where they may reach levels which are quite

undesirable in food. So there is a problem, which, if it isn't addressed

now, is going to be an uncontrollable problem for the future, Gordon

Edwards, chairman of the anti-***nuclear*** coalition, said on a radio program

this week.

The week before, an Alberta scientist advised listeners not to drink

the water of Great Slave Lake and not to eat wild game.

It's time someone is going to have to go out on the line and say

something, said Dan Billing, the chief emergency measures and health

protection officer with the NWT Government. His concern prompted the

territory to echo the Fort Resolution nurse in asking federal health

authorities to send a medical expert with a background in radiation

effects to come up with some answers.

Two days ago, the AECB began fighting the adverse publicity. It flew

in a chemical engineer from the Chalk River ***nuclear*** plant to meet the

northern media and spread the message that there is virtually no danger

to any person, animal, bird, fish or body of water in the satellite core

debris area. Jack Werry, Atomic ***Energy*** of Canada Ltd.'s head of health

operations in the Chalk River plant, held a steady round of interviews on

Wednesday in an attempt to allay the uneasiness.

He said there is no health hazard in any of the NWT communities where

particles have been found. The level of radiation in the particles is far

below the maximum acceptable, he said, and even if someone strapped a

particle to his chest for a week there would be no after-effects. He said

it is perfectly safe to eat the fish from Great Slave Lake and to eat

game meat.

It's fear of the unknown that has caused this, he said. I'm concerned

because I'm afraid some of the benefits (of ***nuclear energy***) are going to

be denied the public because of this fear. He added that he is more

frightenend driving in traffic than he is working in a ***nuclear*** plant.

The satellite publicity is already taking a toll on some northern

businesses. Sport fishing lodge owners in the Great Slave Lake area have

already received cancellations from long-standing customers.

The tourism industry is receiving inquiries about the dangers of

canoeing this summer on northern lakes and rivers, particularly the

Thelon River, where the largest pieces of debris have been found.

Especially twitchy is the Great Slave Lake fishing industry, which

last summer took three million pounds of fish from the lake. The

fishermen are not worried; there's no danger, NWT Freshwater Fish

Marketing Board chairman George Helmer said in a telephone interview from

Hay River. The only danger is if the environmentalists get on the

bandwagon.

He said he is afraid environmentalists may succeed in pressuring to

have the lake closed to commercial fishing this summer.
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LONDON (AP) - Britain and France appear to be heading for a major clash

with the United States over billion-dollar plans to produce plutonium, a

material used in making atomic weapons.

The United States is committed to steering the world away from what

has been called a plutonium economy - meaning over-reliance on the

manmade element. But the British and French want to head off future

***energy*** shortages by developing their ***nuclear*** reprocessing facilities.

Washington already has tried to block deals under which France and

West Germany have contracted to supply reprocessing technology and

equipment to Pakistan and Brazil. And officials say the United States has

warned Britain and France not to count on foreign orders to finance

development of their facilities. The informants declined to be named.

The United States has the right in its ***nuclear*** co-operation agreements

to buy back spent uranium discharged by ***nuclear*** power stations in

countries operating U.S.-built reactors.

The United States also can veto the reprocessing of the waste uranium

and have made it clear they will give no blanket authorization for this.

Instead, all requests for reprocessing will be considered by Washington

on a case-by-case basis.

Britain is close to a decision on whether to carry out a vast

expansion of its ***nuclear*** reprocessing plant at Windscale in the Cumbria

district of northwest England. By a vote of 186 to 56, Commons approved

the $1.2-billion project. Another vote will be taken after Easter on a

motion related to planning approval. But in light of the 130-vote

majority, it seems certain the project will proceed.

France has begun construction of similar facilities despite political

and public opposition. A plant at La Hague is expected to cost about as

much as the Windscale development.

Japan is covering about 50 per cent of the cost of the British and

French projects and expects in return to get reprocessed fuel in the form

of plutonium. Japan, with no oil of its own, is increasingly reliant on

***nuclear*** power for its vast ***energy*** needs.

British officials say President Jimmy Carter may intervene to try to

block or slow Japanese participation.

The Windscale project - if approved by Parliament - almost certainly

will come up this week during Prime Minister James Callaghan's meetings

with Mr. Carter in Washington.

Mr. Carter's concern over the European projects, according to

information here, is that both could prejudice, if not pre-empt, current

talks in Washington aimed at permitting all countries to achieve their

own ***nuclear energy*** needs while reducing the possible spread of ***nuclear***

weapons.

Meanwhile, Senator John Glenn of Ohio, chairman of the Senate

subcommittee on ***nuclear*** proliferation, and four other U.S. lawmakers have

urged Mr. Carter to reaffirm his opposition to reprocessing before U.S.

allies invest too much and proceed too far with their plans.
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MADRID (NYT) - Spain is caught in what is considered its gravest

economic crisis since the civil war.

Compounding the problems, the minority Government of Prime Minister

Adolfo Suarez that emerged from last June's elections has not been able

to gain the confidence of Spain's jittery financial class even though it

has begun to move to the right. In searching for a larger constituency,

Mr. Suarez has frightened the wealthy with talk of such things as a large

income tax, but he has yet to give his centre-right Union of the

Democratic Centre a firm popular base.

Grim economic realities have taken the euphoria out of Spanish

politics. Big industries, internationally uncompetitive because of

decades of protectionism, are tottering toward bankruptcy, hurt by a

persistent recession in Europe, high labor costs and laws that make it

difficult or costly to dismiss workers. Babcock and Wilcox Espanola, a

huge equipment manufacturer in Bilbao, has gone into receivership. The

Banco de Navarra collapsed and had to be rescued by the Bank of Spain, a

fate that may soon befall five other small banks.

The Spanish steel industry may go almost a billion dollars into the

red this year, and Altos Hornos del Mediterraneo, a large steel

manufacturer in Valencia, is facing bankruptcy.

To avoid bankruptcy, thousands of companies have simply stopped making

their social security contributions. The Government is $2.5-billion short

in social security payments, which in Spain are a disguised form of

taxation.

Feeling ignored in the higher councils of Mr. Suarez's Government,

businessmen at the beginning of the year began organizing mass meetings

and protests, accusing the Prime Minister of economic treason. At the

same time, some of Mr. Suarez's closest advisers, alarmed by the

Government's slump in the opinion polls and signs of a big decline in

investment, urged swift remedial action.

At the end of February, Mr. Suarez moved - dropping his unhappy Deputy

Prime Minister for Economic Affairs, Enrique Fuentes Quintana, and four

other economic ministers. A respected economics professor, Mr. Fuentes

Quintana had trimmed the inflation rate impressively from an official

26.4 per cent at the end of 1977 to what was looking like half of that

this year and through devaluation of the peseta had improved a worrisome

balance of payments situation.

But tight money policy had broken the confidence of investors,

unemployment had risen swiftly - more than a million Spaniards in a work

force of 13.5 million do not have jobs - and Mr. Fuentes Quintana and his

allies had further unsettled advocates of free enterprise by broaching

the idea of nationalizing ***nuclear energy*** plants and electric power. The

last straw was Mr. Fuentes Quintana's insistence on holding down

agricultural prices, an affront to small farmers in central Spain whom

Mr. Suarez perceives as his natural constituents.

To replace Mr. Fuentes Quintana, Mr. Suarez elevated a handful of

uninspiring confidants, like himself long-time members of the upper

reaches of government bureaucracy, and, to appease business, brought in

Agustin Rodriguez Sahagun, an outspoken entrepreneur and organizer of the

anti-government rallies, as Minister of Industry and ***Energy***.

Mr. Suarez is expected to try to breathe some life into the economy

and shore up ailing industries, keeping in mind the key municipal

elections that are supposed to be held later this year.
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Q. Mr. O'Leary, how much truth is there to criticism that the new Department of ***Energy*** is confused and demoralized?

A. That was a fairly good criticism until recently, but as of today, DOE is functioning well. Everything is in place. About 95 percent of the people know who their boss is.

Q. Has the failure of the Congress to pass an ***energy*** bill added to organization problems?

A. Not purely organizational problems, but it has created uncertainties about what policies the department will be required to pursue - utility-rate reform, conservation programs and so on.

Q. What progress have you made in cutting red tape in the ***energy*** field?

A. As we become familiar with the incredibly complicated rules and regulations we inherited, we're finding ways to improve the old system. Take crude-oil sales, for example. By transferring the regulation of crude oil from the wellhead to the refinery level, we can concentrate on regulating 300 to 400 U.S. refiners instead of trying to police about 12,000 oil producers.

Decontrol of retail gasoline prices also is under consideration. We think market forces can keep prices within bounds.

If Congress approves, we'll get rid of that cumbersome regulation.

Q. Whey do oil firms complain that your department is collecting vast amounts of information, adding to their cost of doing business?

A. We're trying to clean up a regulatory morass of rules going back to 1974 and 1975, when there was enormous confusion in applying price regulations. Those old rules are still on the books, but for the first time we are interpreting them consistently. Once this process of clarifying is behind us, industry will find the regulatory load easier to bear.

Q. If DOE was created to get rid of waste and overlapping of ***energy*** agencies, why are you asking for a big increase in your budget this year?

A. The increase is mostly in the strategic-petroleum-reserve program, which calls for storage of approximately a 10-monthly supply of oil in this country to protect us against another embargo or any other disruption in our oil supplies. This billion-dollar increase is a one-time proposition, and the program will be completed by 1985. We're not buying manpower with that money. We're simply buying a big insurance policy.

Q. Does this mean that the department plans to hold the line on manpower?

A. The budget does not include any money for increasing personnel. We've been able to handle a temporary increase in personnel needed for regulatory activities by taking personnel from other programs. Within two years, the refinery-audit phase will be completed, and there should be a substantial reduction in money and manpower spent on regulation.

Q. Has DOE's creation eliminated any of the confusing overlap in ***energy*** policy?

A. I think so. DOE is enabling the government to take its first abroad look at ***energy*** programs and decide where the money should be spent.

For example, we found too much emphasis on research and development in heavy technologies, such as ***nuclear energy***, and too little on so-called light technologies. As a result, we're taking the first serious look at wind power.

We are going to double the budget for the biomass process, which produces ***energy*** from wood and other plant life. Indications are that biomass is a cheap source of power that is essentially going to waste at the moment. Research on coal and shale liquefaction is getting more emphasis.

In short, we are trying to product some ***energy*** instead of focusing on long-term projects in research and development.
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New York Times Service

NEW YORK - The coal business in the United States faces an upheaval as a

result of the 112-day miners' strike, which was estimated to have cost

the industry 120 million tons in lost production, $2-billion in

unretrievable sales and $200-million in vanished profits.

In interviews, coal experts said the settlement would accelerate a

trend toward fewer but larger companies, give companies whose labor force

is not dominated by the United Mine Workers an advantage over UMW

companies, and cost producers of metallurgical coal considerably more

than producers of steam coal.

But few said they believed the costly settlement would significantly

change the role of coal as a source of ***energy***.

Coal prices will certainly go up substantially as a result of the

settlement, said Kenneth Leung, a coal analyst with Wall Street's Smith

Barney, Harris Upham and Co., and there is a faint hope that incentive

programs will now increase productivity. But the settlement will not mean

a fundamental shift in the nation's future ***energy*** makeup.

As their main observations about the impact that the new contract will

have on the industry and the country's ***energy*** users, the coal analysts

said:

- The settlement would hurt producers of metallurgical coal most

because the productivity of this high-grade variety, which accounts for

about one-quarter of total production and is used in making steel, is

lower than the productivity of steam coal, used mainly by utilities to

make electricity. The contract's impact on per-ton costs varies directly

with productivity, and the market for metallurgical coal is too soft to

allow much cost pass through.

- UMW companies would suffer more than non-UMW and non-union

companies, because productivity is higher among companies whose labor

force is not dominated by the UMW. The reason for this is the greater

absenteeism and more numerous wildcat strikes at UMW mines.

Since coal prices on the spot market should be stronger for the next

several months, smaller companies, many of which sell coal on the open

market rather than under long term contract, should do well for a while.

But the windfall will be short-lived, and the ensuing profit squeeze will

undoubtedly force some of the smaller mines out of business.

- Between now and 1985, the settlement would have no impact on coal's

appeal as a power plant fuel as compared with ***nuclear*** fuel, since plans

for construction during the next seven years are already locked up.

Thereafter, the lengthy strike would tend to make utilities lean toward

***nuclear energy***, but not that much.

- Eastern coal, which is mined largely by UMW workers, will continue

to lose ground to western coal, which in recent years has accounted for

the bulk of the increase in coal production.

President Jimmy Carter has emphasized eastern over western coal in his

***energy*** plans, primarily because a relatively small proportion of eastern

coal is strip-mined and because it is much closer to the main utility

markets.

While the impact on the U.S. ***energy*** position may be longer term and

relatively slight, the impact on the coal industry and its customers will

be both immediate and sizable.

This is a very costly settlement, said Joel Price, a coal analyst with

Dean Witter Reynolds Inc. It has to be inflationary, and it has to have

dire consequences for upcoming labor negotiations. We're particularly

concerned about the Teamsters' a year from now.

According to Mr. Price, the settlement amounts to a 20.5 per cent

increase in the first year and a 37.6 per cent increase over the

following three years, including the added Social Security costs that the

companies will incur. That translates into a $3 increase immediately, to

almost $11 an hour, and a $5 increase by 1981, to almost $13 an hour.

Mr. Leung of Smith Barney estimated that this would mean an average

increase in coal prices of between 8 per cent and 12 per cent. But, he

added, there will be a wide range making up that average.
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ROBERT MacNEIL: Good evening. President Carter took his consciousness- raising caravan to Brazil today, the second stop on his four-nation foreign trip. He`ll stay twenty hours in Brasilia, the ultramodern capital, and then he will have a day of rest in Rio de Janeiro, where the Presidential psyche can catch up with the whirlwind schedule before plunging across the South Atlantic to Africa. Tonight we pause with him to take a closer look at the phenomenal country Brazil is and will become, a nation we now have to rate very differently than in the past. Jim?

JIM LEHRER: Robin, everything about Brazil is big, and mostly unknown by us North Americans. So first a few facts: geographically Brazil is the fifth largest nation in the world, making up half of the entire South American continent. Its fast-growing population is now at 115 million, seventh in the world. It has vast natural resources and a mechanized agricultural and industrialized economy that has been labeled a modern miracle. The nation is ruled by a military government which took: power fourteen years ago. Brazil has always been considered an ally of the United States and that is still the case, but there have been problems of late, particularly over U.S. criticism of Brazil`s human rights and ***nuclear energy*** development policies. Those problems are at least part of the reason President Carter put Brazil on his travel itinerary; the other reasons are simply tied to the fact of Brazil -- its bigness, its growing importance as a world power.

We want to try and put that new role into perspective now with Dr. Riordan Roett, Director of Latin American Studies and Director of the Center of Brazilian Studies at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies here in Washington. Doctor, let me read a quote from Henry Kissinger: "Brazil is conveniently divided into two parts, one part which is super developed and one part which is slightly underdeveloped, and therefore can conduct a foreign policy as it chooses, either joining the industrial nations or leading the third world, whatever is more useful at the moment." Is Kissinger right? Does Brazil have a foot in both camps?

RIORDAN ROETT: Brazil does have a foot in both camps, but it`s important to point out that Brazil is not playing a game, in that Brazil is indeed part of the South, or the third world, today; but increasingly Brazil feels itself entitled to play a role in international relations with the major industrialized countries -- and, I believe, can do so.

LEHRER: You mean it can have it both ways.

ROETT: Both ways in the sense that it deserves to play this intermediate role, and I think its level of development entitles it to do so right now.

LEHRER: All right. In terms of its role within the third world, how important is that? Does it give real leadership to the third world?

ROETT: No. Brazil has never been a leader in the third world, preferring to play a more passive, supportive role for third world initiatives. It doesn`t see itself as a dynamic and aggressive leader of the third world.

LEHRER: What does it do, then, within that developing nation context?

ROETT: It plays an important role in highlighting the need for change, for example, in the international economic and monetary system. It`s played an important role in establishing the right of third world countries to have a 200-mile territorial sea; it has played an important role in pointing out the commodity question in third world and industrialized world trade matters, therefore it highlights and, I think, pinpoints important changes that should be taking place in the international economic system.

LEHRER: All right. Now to this other role in the dual role, which is as an industrialized world power. Does it exercise real leadership in South America?

ROETT: That is a very complex question. Brazil for many years, or decades, felt itself to be isolated from its Spanish-American neighbors. I think in the last eighteen months, and in part a result of the change in the relationship with the United States, Brazil has begun to play a far more active and participatory role in South America. One good example would be the initiative in December of last year to bring all the countries together bordering on the Amazon to begin discussing the development of the Amazon by those countries in South America and not with outside powers.

LEHRER: But is it that important that the way Brazil goes, so goes South America?

ROETT: That was a very unfortunate comment by someone -- I don`t remember who said it -- but it does seem to me that Brazil plays a sufficiently important role on the continent that indeed it serves as an important point in developing certain programs. It is not a power that determines the way the rest of Latin America develops. Latin America is too complex today.

LEHRER: All right. In which role does its main importance to the United States lie?

ROETT:I think in its increasing industrial capacity, in the increasing strength of its economy, and obviously, as the most important other nation- state in this hemisphere in terms of our own national interest and the future development of our own foreign policy.

LEHRER: All right, thank you. Robin?

MacNEIL: For most of this century Brazil represented enormous potential, a country of the future. But the future began arriving with an extraordinary spurt of economic growth, which recently pushed Brazil to the tenth largest economy in the world. Huge developments in industry and food production have made it the world`s fifteenth largest exporter. Massive programs of highway building, hydroelectric power and mineral exploitation have sucked in vast amounts of foreign capital, much of it from private U.S. sources, and last year Brazil had foreign debts totaling $31.2 billion.

The negative side of this dazzling performance has been a staggering inflation rate, running at nearly thirty-nine percent last year. But despite inflation, the oil crisis and recession in other Western countries, Brazil`s growth rate has continued, running at five percent last year. It`s given the teeming population and average income of $1,452 per capita, the highest of any developing country.

One expert on Brazil`s breathless growth is Albert Fishlow, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and now Professor of Economics at Yale. Dr. Fishlow, how does all that amazing economic growth affect this country?

ALBERT FISHLOW: I think it adds up both to an opportunity and to a challenge. We see the challenge in terms of the competition with exports; we rarely see the opportunity in terms of sales to a very rapidly growing market, which we have in fact exploited. The United States is the largest foreign investor in Brazil and also the largest single exporter to Brazil.

MacNEIL: It`s an intriguing concept that a developing third world country should suddenly become a competitor of ours economically. In what way is it a competitor of ours?

FISHLOW: It`s a competitor selectively. I think it`s important not to exaggerate Brazil`s economic capacity. Its exports still consist of lightly processed manufactures rather than heavy manufactures, and consist of textiles, shoes, leather products and the like. The competition tends to come in the agricultural sector; Brazil`s the second largest producer of soybeans. And the fate of American soybean producers is very closely linked to what happens in Brazil.

MacNEIL: You mentioned shoes and textiles. One of the complaints of Brazilians, I understand, is that we have erected barriers, or maintained barriers, to their exports. Are we guilty of encouraging economic development and then trying to stifle it when it becomes inconvenient?

FISHLOW: I think we`re guilty of not fully recognizing the problems of exporting from developing countries. Over the last fifteen years there has been a revolution in industrialization capacity, and of course this gives fruit to a very much more rapid rate of growth of exports. There is another side to the story, however: the Brazilians have subsidized their exports very heavily, and it`s clear that within the international system there has to be a set of rules that all countries have to abide by if there`s going to be an expansion of freer trade.

MacNEIL: They are, like Japan, as some people view it, not yet in the twentieth century in terms of trading relationships.

FISHLOW: Well, I think they may be in the twenty-first century, which is what gives people some pause for thought. The problem that is suggested by the Brazilian strategy, which has been copied by a number of other countries, is of course that the internal growth now becomes much more dependent upon their sales abroad. This encourages a set of policies, obviously, to export as much as can be done.

MacNEIL: You say the twenty-first century. How big could Brazil actually become? I remember being told down there, back in the sixties, that they could ultimately support a population of something like 800 million. Is that conceivable?

FISHLOW: Well, I think that goes a little bit beyond the bounds. I was just looking, at some numbers today which suggested a stationary population of an order of magnitude of perhaps 350 million, which is still large enough by any standards.

MacNEIL: And what would that size mean to us, if they continued to industrialize?

FISHLOW: Well, I think that size -- in conjunction, one might add, with the Mexican size of, say, 250 million --would mean a substantial shift of population and of industrial capacity south of the border and would require us to change very substantially our views about the hemisphere, as well as about the role of the third world in general.

MacNEIL: Thank you. Jim?

LEHRER: Moving now from economics to politics, and the government of Brazil. The army took control in a 1964 coup provoked primarily by left- wing political activity in the country, and the army has been firmly in charge ever since -- some say too firmly. The current Brazilian president is Ernesto Geisel, a former military man who ran the state owned oil company before the army generals put him in charge of the government in 1974. Geisel has been committed to a process called "decompression," a gradual return to democratic government. He relaxed press censorship, told the army to quit torturing political prisoners, and allowed some measure of freedom for an opposition political party.

Critics in Brazil, led primarily by leaders of the Catholic Church, say Geisel has backed off of decompression, and there are renewed charges about the harsh way dissent is being handled. A Brazilian newspaperman familiar with the internal politics of his country is Edgardo Costa Reis, Washington correspondent for O Globo, one of Brazil`s leading newspapers. How strong is the support- o the government now?

EDGARDO COSTA REIS: Well, I should say now, now it`s really a question that`s very hard to answer because now we know that if you take in account that the elections for president -- the people do not participate in these elections, you must take as a level of this support the election for the parliament. In the last elections in `74, the opposition had the bigger majority. But this trend was opposed in the last elections when the Arena, the official party, had the majority in those elections. But there is one main point of this, because all the support if you can measure the support in Brasilia, if you measure the overall support there is three cultural centers, I mean the strongest centers in Brazil, like Sao Paulo, Rio, and other centers, that they reflect really the political feelings of the people -- perhaps of the intellectual people -- and in these centers the opposition is very strong.

LEHRER: What kind of people are opposed to the government, and over what issues? What are they dissenting about?

COSTA REIS: Well, mainly the fact now is that -- well, first the election; they think that this group of intellectuals and perhaps some groups like you said before, that there is an intention of redemocratization of the country. There is a large group inside of the armed force, perhaps, that they think that now the ten years of the revolution since `64, now it`s time to have the people able to elect and participate more directly in the government. This is one of the (unintelligible), and the second group that could support this thinking is that Brazil should come back to a democracy, but...

LEHRER: Back to electing presidents.

COSTA REIS: Yes, back to electing presidents, and to a full democracy, not only with the two political parties. We have two political parties that were split from you know where. Well, we had ten, and now we have two represent the same thing as before.

LEHRER: Well, look, on this whole question of human rights, what is the situation there? First of all on the case of the press, you and other members of the press in Brazil: do you have freedom of the press?

COSTA REIS: Yes, this is a situation that prevails, I think, since `75, when President Geisel went to power. Till `74, `75, we had a strong censorship in the press, and now as far as the press in Brazil is concerned I think there is complete freedom of the press, but there is some publications, for instance, that still have censorship or there is a censor working together with them.

LEHRER: What about the treatment of prisoners, particularly political prisoners?

COSTA REIS: Well, the political prisoners -- I think that on the human rights aspect in Brazil there was some improvement. I`m not saying that this is the ideal situation, but there was an improvement, because you know that before, there were people arrested with no formal charge and they simply disappeared, and a big majority was tortured, and so on. And now the situation`s changed. I must recognize that the situation changed in the last few years, I would say. Now, for instance, there are arrests for political activities, they still exist, but now we know the conditions: they arrest, but you have a formal charge. But the fact was that in all these situations there was something two weeks ago that I don`t know how we could consider it-- there was an arrest of a lieutenant colonel for criticizing the armed force, and...

LEHRER: A colonel in the Brazilian army criticized the government, and he was arrested.

COSTA REIS: Yes. And after this eleven people were arrested.

LEHRER: All right, thank you. Robin?

MacNEIL: The diplomatic substance of the Carter visit centers on two areas of disagreement. Brazil was angered by U.S. criticism of the government`s imprisonment and torture of political dissidents. Last year Brazil abruptly canceled military and economic assistance pacts with the United States. Mr. Carter is not expected to rub salt in that wound.

But there was deeper anger over U.S. efforts to dictate ***nuclear*** policy. Vice President Mondale tried to persuade West Germany to stop the sale of ***nuclear*** reactors because they would give Brazil fuel reprocessing capability from which atomic weapons could be made. The West Germans refused and the Brazilians criticized us for interfering. Then everybody got into the act. Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher struck out in Brasilia; he was followed by Secretary of State Vance, who had no better luck; now Mr. Carter will try his persuasive skills on the Brazilians, who care more about a substitute for scarce oil than about the dangers of ***nuclear*** proliferation.

One strong supporter of the Carter policy is Congressman Jonathan Bingham. The New York Democrat is author of the ***Nuclear*** Anti-proliferation Act of 1978. Congressman, did the U.S. handle the ***nuclear*** issue well with Brazil?

Rep. JONATHAN BINGHAM: Well, I know the negotiators involved, and I think they`re skilled negotiators; they`re not brutal or overly blunt people. I think that the problem was one that was bound to create friction, because the deal had been made between Germany and Brazil -- it`s a huge deal, you know, it involves perhaps up to ten billion dollars over a period of years, and it does involve very sophisticated technologies, particularly reprocessing of spent fuel to produce plutonium; and this is something that we have abandoned ourselves, we`ve decided not to do this, we`ve tried to persuade other countries not to do it, and I think it was bound to create a certain amount of friction with Brazil.

MacNEIL: Do you think we can win on this issue with the Brazilians and the Germans? The Brazilians certainly don`t show any signs of changing their mind, and neither do the Germans.

BINGHAM: I think time is going to be on our side here. I think that both the Germans and the Brazilians may come to realize that the reprocessing venture that they`re going into at great expense is not going to be economic for them. It really doesn`t make sense at this stage of their ***nuclear*** development. We`re quite prepared to have them go ahead with ***nuclear*** power plants; in fact, we are anxious to sell them our light water reactors. And we just don`t think that the reprocessing technique makes sense economically, aside from its danger in the proliferation sense. And I think several of the European countries that started out hostile to our policy in this regard have begun to swing over -- even Germany, I think, has moved quite a bit toward the Carter policy -- and I think perhaps Brazil will in the end. So since these developments aren`t anticipated for several years, we`re hopeful that time will help to straighten out this situation.

MacNEIL: What would you say, as a supporter of the Carter; policy, to a Brazilian who might say, "Oh, it`s just U.S. sour grapes. You couldn`t sell us your reactors, now you don`t want us to buy the other ones"?

BINGHAM: Well, bear in mind that we were trying to sell reactors, there`s no question; but we were not trying to sell a reprocessing technique. And in fact, since the Ford administration we decided that this was a dangerous thing to do, to have reprocessing that produces plutonium; and if you have plutonium become an article of international commerce and widely traded in throughout the world, you have a nightmare beyond belief because terrorists and others will get hold of it. That`s the objective of our worldwide policy, and Brazil -- we`re not making a special case of Brazil at all.

MacNEIL: Isn`t it a little arrogant of the United States to be telling Brazil in effect how to solve its great dependence on foreign oil, because it has very little of its own oil, when we can`t solve our dependence on foreign oil?

BINGHAM: Well, first of all we have many other sources of ***energy***; so do they. They have enormous hydroelectric potential in the Amazon basin. You have to bear in mind that ***nuclear energy*** is not going to solve their ***energy*** problem for them; all that ***nuclear energy*** does is produce electricity, and that`s probably only a third of their ***energy*** needs. So if ***nuclear energy*** can take on perhaps one third or one half of their electricity needs, that`s perhaps a sixth of their total ***energy*** needs; that`s not going to make them self-sufficient in ***energy***.

MacNEIL: Thank you. Jim?

LEHRER: Dr. Roett, what`s your feeling? Was it the policy difference or was it the way the United States handled this that caused the problem with Brazil?

ROETT: I think it`s very important to remember -- and I guess I disagree here with Congressman Bingham -- that style is as important as substance. And the style of the United States dealing with Brazil during the past year has not been very good. This doesn`t mean...

LEHRER: In what way?

ROETT: It seems to me that the visits by American officials to Brazil last year were not well thought-out beforehand, that there`s a lag time in this country, it seems to me, in understanding the growing importance of Brazil and therefore the sensitivity of Brazilian political leaders to any assertion that they should change their foreign policy or in some way cannot act as independently as they wish to act in protecting their legitimate interests.

LEHRER: Mr. Costa Reis, what`s your view on that?

COSTA REIS: Well, I think that`s- on the ***nuclear*** question, but what I see that Brazil thinks on this is that first, they think that the ***nuclear*** technology, that in this case Brazil promotes the ***nuclear*** nonproliferation; but what Brazil thinks is that no country can impose it. It`s some kind of intellectual non-proliferation. It thinks that any ***nuclear*** danger could be much more observed, if I car. say this, with the ***nuclear*** activities than with the technology. I mean, I give you the technology, but this does not imply that you have (unintelligible). You must check on my ***nuclear*** activities. And secondly...

LEHRER: Simple arrogance, then, to use the word Robin used a moment ago -- that`s what really annoyed the people of Brazil, U.S. arrogance?

COSTA REIS: No, it`s not, because I think that Brazil went to West Germany for this contract because it`s a good deal for West Germany. Like the Congressman said, it`s almost a ten billion dollar deal with Brazil.

And secondly, with the United States specifically, I think that this is some kind of position that Brazil would take, and not because Brazil is needing now of ***nuclear energy***; this is something that Brazil will use in the year 2000, not now. But the hydroelectrical potential of Brazil was completely exploited in Brazil. I mean, that`s the end for the hydroelectrical power.

LEHRER: Dr. Fishlow, what is your view on that? You`re familiar with the Brazilian economy. Your reading of this decision was that it was not political but that it was an economic decision based on the needs of Brazil?

FISHLOW: I think it was based primarily on the assumption that it was an opportunity to establish Brazil as a first-rate industrial power. The important aspect of the deal was the control over the technology and the capacity to reprocess; and I think any attempt to interpret the issue without regard for that key element on which the recent Brazilian growth has been built misstates the problem, and I think it makes Representative Bingham perhaps too optimistic about being able to resolve it over time.

LEHRER: Well, Congressman, that`s what occurred to me. Nothing`s changed; all of these trips to Brazil by Mondale, et cetera, and now the President - - all they`ve done is agreed to disagree, have they not?

BINGHAM: I think that`s true up to date. But as I`ve suggested, I think there may be a change in the whole attitude of ***nuclear*** experts in the next few years to many of the ***nuclear*** problems. For example, our own ***nuclear*** industry in this country has come to the consensus recently for the first time that reprocessing really does not help the waste disposal problem, which has been one of the arguments for it.

I`d like to say, about the way in which our negotiations with Brazil were handled, perhaps we didn`t take account of the fact that Brazilians might be more sensitive to an approach that we would make on this subject than were, say, our European allies or Japan. We`ve had serious disagreements with Britain and with Japan and with France and with Germany on these subjects, but they haven`t caused the kind of feeling that we were trying to impose or dictate from a superior position to some on an inferior level, and I thin; perhaps there was a failure to recognize the extreme sensitivity that the Brazilians would show on this issue.

LEHRER: Will you buy that, Dr. Roett?

ROETT: Yeah, I think the insensitivity point is very important, and as Al Fishlow pointed out very well...

LEHRER: He`s not saying insensitivity, he`s talking about special sensitivity on the part of the Brazilians compared with the French and the rest of the world.

ROETT: I wouldn`t call it special sensitivity, I`d call it a good old sense of nationalism and growing feeling that they should assert their own rights in international affairs; and I see nothing wrong with that, and the U.S. could well learn a lesson in dealing with the hemisphere by understanding that is a continuing and new given in our relations with Latin America.

LEHRER: Maybe they have. Robin?

MacNEIL: Mr. Fishlow, looking at it both diplomatically and economically, what are the dangers if Tae do not overcome these current frictions quickly with Brazil? Are we in danger of driving them out of the Western

Hemisphere`s sphere of influence and more into the arms of either the third world or the Europeans? What is the danger?

FISHLOW: I think that the danger is not to harness Brazil`s ***energies*** in trying to reach multilateral solutions to important economic and political problems. The kinds of economic problems that exist in the area of international trade and money have to be solved internationally rather than bilaterally. We cannot resolve the subsidy problem with Brazil alone.

MacNEIL: Which is a theme Mr. Carter was stressing in Venezuela in his speech there.

FISHLOW: Exactly. So it`s an international setting, and I think we have to try to harness those particular ***energies***. I think that we`ve come a long way from the special relationship mentality, which we haven`t mentioned up till now, that was announced by Secretary Kissinger just a couple of years ago, to one which recognizes Brazilian desire to reach out, Brazilian desire to diversify their own relationships; and I think we have to be respectful of that and cognizant of it. We will never be close as bilateral partners so much as having some areas of overlap of interest.

MacNEIL: Can you tell me, Congressman, briefly why you think it`s important that we patch up our quarrels with Brazil?

BINGHAM: Well, Brazil is perhaps the most important country, from many points of view, in the entire hemisphere. And it`s one that is bound to be increasingly important in our relations in this hemisphere in the future.

MacNEIL: Mr. Roett, what are the dangers of not patching things up?

ROETT: I think we have to be careful that we don`t overstress those dangers; I do think the dangers are that we further weaken what has been a very strong historical relationship. I think it is also true that we will not make as much progress as we should in multilateral resolution of outstanding economic and political problems. And finally, we`ll lose an opportunity, I think, to consolidate a new relationship -- not special, but a new relationship -- between the two most important countries in the hemisphere.

MacNEIL: Well, thank you. I`m afraid that`s our time for this evening. Thank you, Mr. Costa Reis, Mr. Roett. Good night, Jim.

LEHRE R: Good night, Robin.

MacNEIL: Thank you, Congressman, Mr. Fishlow. That`s all for tonight. Jim Lehrer and I will be back tomorrow night.I`m Robert MacNeil. Good night.
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CARTER WENTWORTH, Kensington, New Hampshire: I`ve grown up in this community, and I don`t like what they`re doing to it. You know, I don`t want to see the radiation in this area. I`m kind of here speaking for the plants and the animals who I think we are here to protect and care for....

JIM LEHRER: An anti-***nuclear*** power protest in New Hampshire a year ago. Similar demonstrations at other ***nuclear*** sites are planned this spring, as the government tries to clear the bureaucratic and legal way for more plants to be built and the emotional battle over ***nuclear energy*** goes on.

Good evening. Separate actions in the last forty-eight hours by the U.S. Supreme Court and the administration could drastically speed up the development of ***nuclear*** power in this country. Monday the Supreme Court told the lower federal courts to quit interfering in the procedures for licensing ***nuclear*** power plants. It was a tough-worded, unanimous decision involving plants in Michigan and Vermont delayed by court action. ***Nuclear energy*** may someday be a cheap, safe source of power or it may not, said the court`s opinion, but Congress has made a choice to at least try ***nuclear***- ***energy***, establishing a "reasonable review process in which the courts are to play only a limited role." Then, on Tuesday, ***Energy*** Secretary James Schlesinger-went before a House subcommittee to push for enactment of the administration`s new ***nuclear*** licensing bill. It`s designed to eliminate much of the government red tape now involved in getting a ***nuclear*** power plant in operation. The administration`s stated goal is to cut in half the ten to twelve years it now takes to get the proper approvals and licenses. Tonight, a look at these two developments and their possible effects. Robert MacNeil is off; Charlayne Hunter-Gault is in New York. Charlayne?

CHARLAYNE HUNTER-GAULT: Jim, it`s been twenty years since the first commercial reactor went into operation in the United States in the late 1960s. Advocates of ***nuclear*** power estimated that by the year 2000 there would be 2,000 ***nuclear*** generating plants turning out electricity around the nation. Those optimistic figures have since been revised substantially downward. It`s now estimated the United States will have between 350 and 400 operating reactors by the turn of the century.

Up to now, the federal government has licensed sixty-eight ***nuclear*** reactors in this country. These generating plants produce about thirteen percent of our electricity supply. Construction permits and authorizations to go ahead on locating sites for plants have been granted at ninety-four locations around the nation. It is expected that ninety-three reactors will be on line -- operating, that is -- by 1980. An additional forty-nine new reactors are in the planning stage. These reactors have been ordered, and work is proceeding on the early development of these reactor projects. The United States has the industrial capacity to produce thirty reactors a year, but the soft market has left the industry with an average of only eleven orders a year for ***nuclear*** generating plants. Jim?

LEHRER: In recent years power companies have definitely backed off building ***nuclear*** power plants. Their reasons are delay and cost, and the two are related. As I said a moment ago, it now takes roughly twelve years to get a reactor project from planning to production. That time is eaten up by court and other challenges from environmental and local citizens` groups, basic government approval procedures, and construction hassles of various kinds. The government estimates that a year`s delay for the average reactor costs an additional $120 million a year in inflation and interest. For instance, a project that would cost just under $250 million if built in six years would jump in cost to over one billion dollars by the time it hits the ten- year mark, half in inflation and interest. Just on the procedural timetable alone, it usually goes something like this:

Two years from the time a utility decides to build a ***nuclear*** plant, to prove the need and apply for a construction permit. Another two years to get something called an LWA, a Limited Work Authority, to begin preliminary site preparation. Another year to get the actual construction permit; then roughly seven years to build it and get an operating license to generate power.

The administration`s bill wants to dramatically cut down that time, and the principal architect of the plan is John O`Leary, the Deputy Secretary of ***Energy***. He was formerly Administrator of the old Federal ***Energy*** Administration, and before that, Director of Licensing for the Atomic ***Energy*** Commission. Mr. Secretary, everything having to do with ***nuclear*** power, as you know, tends to be complicated, but as simply as possible let`s run through how you want to change things. First, how are you going to speed up the time it takes to get a site approved for a ***nuclear*** project?

JOHN O`LEARY: Well, we`re not actually going to speed it up; we`re going to detach it from the rest of the process. Right now a utility says, I want to build a plant, I want to build it here, and he begins a twelve year process. If it aborts it somewhere along the line -- if, for example, the site for one reason or another is not acceptable -- seismic, environmental, or what have you -- then he has to start all over again. What we`d like to to is completely divorce the site selection from the construction of the plant itself, permit the utility to go out well in advance of its requirement for the reactor, select a group of sites, work it down to one or two or three, and then put them in a bank.

LEHRER: Get them all approved ahead of time, and put them all in a bank.

O`LEARY: Yes. And then when he needs the power, when he needs the reactor, then he can go out and in a period of five or six or seven years at the outside he can select and construct his reactor, with the question of whether or not a reactor can go on the site, which is now the crucial question, settled and behind it.

LEHRER: Okay. Next step, approval of the kind and type of reactor to be built: how are you going to speed that up?

O`LEARY: Right now there is no particular incentive in the system for the development of what we call standardized plants. We have a number of people who design the hot side, the ***nuclear*** steam supply system -- there are four manufacturers in the United States now; there were five up until a year ago -- we have...

LEHRER: In the simplest terms, you`ve got an awful lot of people but an awful lot of different kinds of plants.

O`LEARY: A dozen people who build the plants, or more. And what we have to is narrow down the options and get this down to something like Detroit does, where there are a few fundamental designs with all sorts of nice things on the side, but a very few fundamental designs.

LEHRER: So then if a fundamental design has been approved for one person or one utility and another utility comes in proposing the same basic design, it would cut down the time?

O`LEARY: Radically.

LEHRER: All right. Now the construction process and the permits to construct. How are you going to cut that down?

O`LEARY: Well, the construction time is going to be cut down by the manufacturer, the person who does the building of the plant -- the architect/engineer -- repeating something that he`s done before. We`ve had, for example, some indications from people who have done this that the first pad in a series of six plants took forty-one months; the second one took thirteen months. That kind of time can be taken off simply be cause of familiarity. That will help enormously, and of course when we are dealing with a known, which is the standardized plant, the permitting -- the issuance of a license -- time can be reduced very substantially as well.

LEHRER: And this would apply also to the final license to actually operate the plant.

O`LEARY: Indeed it would.

LEHRER: All right. Your bill also includes a restriction on the number of times a similar environmental objection can be raised. Now, what does that mean?

O`LEARY: Well, that means that we`re going to change the present system under which a single issue -- for example, need for power -- can be raised time and time and time again through the process. We will have a situation whereby if that issue is on the table and the intervener chooses to open it, it can be fully adjudicated, heard, and a decision come to. If it`s on the table and the intervener chooses not to open it, that will be regarded as the end of the process. Right now we hear the same issue in a given case or in a series of cases time and time and time again, and we will seek to end that.

LEHRER: One point we need to make here, we`re talking about the administrative procedure here. This has absolutely nothing to do with it later being challenged in the courts.

O`LEARY: No, indeed.

LEHRER: All right. Finally, your plan calls for earlier public notice. How much earlier, and how would that affect things?

O`LEARY: Well, right now the public really doesn`t become a participant in the licensing process until perhaps two years into the process. By that time there have been a series of excursions between the utility proposing the plant and the ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission, and they may well have come to agreement after a great deal of disagreement for as much as a year. What we`d like to do is introduce the public into that process immediately, so when the utility decides to build, it must advise the public.

LEHRER: I see. And also the bill provides for the paying of some of the costs of people who might want to protest the construction of any given ***nuclear*** site, is that correct?

O`LEARY: Yes. One of the things that the government has been experimenting with -- we`ve done a little bit of it first in FEA and now in DOE -- is assisting interveners in the preparation of some of their cases, for the cost associated therewith, and we will extend that into the ***nuclear*** licensing cycle now.

LEHRER: All right. Thank you, Mr. O`Leary. We`ll now find out what some of the interested parties think of your bill. Charlayne?

HUNTER-GAULT: Both the utilities and the ***nuclear*** reactor industry have been pushing the Carter administration to rewrite the ***nuclear*** reactor licensing laws. George Gleason is Executive Vice President of the American ***Nuclear Energy*** Council, an industry lobbying group that represents utilities, manufacturers, architects and engineers. Mr. Gleason is a ten-year veteran of the ***nuclear*** licensing debate. Mr. Gleason, how does industry feel about Mr. O`Leary`s bill?

GEORGE GLEASON: Well, we like to think of it as the President`s bill. Mr. O`Leary has done an awful lot of work on it. The fact is that it is sponsored by the administration. The best thing I can say for the bill right now is that it does finally put the Carter administration on record as indicating that ***nuclear*** power plants have a very significant role to play in the future ***energy*** needs of this country, and we think it`s very good that Mr. Carter has recognized that there are indeed problems in the licensing process that can be remedied through legislation; and we support this one hundred percent. Now, I must be frank with you: there are problems with this bill. It`s before the Congress now; we will be working with the Congress to improve it -- it needs a great deal of improvement. There are good things in it and bad things in it, but it certainly is a good starting point for Congress` consideration of this important matter.

HUNTER-GAULT: All right, let`s talk about some of the good things. What elements in the bill do you think would be helpful to industry?

GLEASON: Well, I think Mr. O`Leary has touched on some of them. I think the most significant one is the fact that putting a provision in there allowing you to separate the considerations of site from the plant that would go on it will provide the public with an opportunity to get involved in the proceedings five to six years before they get involved now. And let me say that the industry firmly believes that it`s necessary to have early and full public participation in these proceedings, because the public must be satisfied they`ve had an opportunity to participate and the plants are safe. So we approve of this early citing consideration. It will expedite the hearing process; essentially the bill would incorporate the legal doctrine of res judicata -- in other words, once you`ve settled something, it`s come up and you`ve settled it, you don`t bring it up again. And we approve of that. It will eliminate the duplication, to some extent, that exists now between the states and the federal government in terms of environmental review. And finally, it`ll authorize; when the plant is ready to go, it`s built, there are some technical things outstanding but the safety design is approved, it`ll allow it to operate on an interim basis until a full license is issued. Those are all good things; we approve of those things.

HUNTER-GAULT: All right, how about the things you would like to see changed?

GLEASON: Well, it`s the other side of the coin; a lot of the good things have some bad seeds in them, simply because they don`t go far enough. One significant thing which is missing in the bill is that while we now have a Department of ***Energy*** which has the overall ***energy*** responsibility for the government, the Department of ***Energy*** is assigned absolutely no role in this bill, and this bill is essentially a power planning piece of legislation. We think that there is a need at the federal level to coordinate these responsibilities and to give the Department of ***Energy*** a strong role. The bill does not go far enough in eliminating the overlapping jurisdiction at the state level. Sure, it`ll take care of the environmental responsibilities now handled by the federal government, but many states have a number of laws in addition to that, all of which can impact on licensing, and the bill does not get into that area at all. Finally, there`s the possibility that one state could lock out a ***nuclear*** plant to the detriment of its neighbor. There`s not enough consideration of regional needs in the bill.

HUNTER-GAULT: Okay. We`re going to pursue some of those points in a minute. Let me just ask you one quick question: in a word, do you think that this bill will cut the process in half -- that is, will allow a plant to go into operation within six years?

GLEASON: It`ll take a wise man to know whether or not that`s actually going to happen. I think it needs improvement if that objective is to be realized fully.

HUNTER-GAULT: All right, thank you. Jim?

LEHRER: This bill may not be perfect in industry`s eyes, but environmentalists see even more flaws with it. One of those critics is Richard Pollock, Director of the Critical Mass ***Energy*** Project, a Ralph Nader consumer organization. Mr. Pollock, what are your objections to the bill?

RICHARD POLLOCK: Well, I think that perhaps the one thing that Mr. Gleason and I will be able to agree on tonight is that we find the bill to be inadequate. As far as the environmental and the consumer organizations in Washington and elsewhere are concerned, we believe that this is the last straw in terms of the Carter administration. As the Natural Resources Defense Council said on the day that the bill was introduced into the Congress, they believe that this licensing bill represented the final corruption of the President`s moral and political courage on the ***nuclear*** issue.

LEHRER: What are your objections to the bill, though, specifically?

POLLOCK: Well, we believe that this is first and foremost an anti-people legislation. It excludes the public from many of the vital safety and other types of reviews and hearings and proceedings that are so vital to having an open process for the determination about the safety of ***nuclear*** power plants.

LEHRER: In what way are they excluded? We heard what Mr. O`Leary just said, that that actually puts them in at an earlier stage. You don`t agree that that`s what the bill does?

POLLOCK: Well, it limits a tremendous number of grounds upon which interveners or average citizens might be able to be involved. Additionally, this particular legislation will preclude the raising of certain issues if other interveners or other citizens elsewhere might raise a very important issue.

LEHRER: In other words, the idea that it restricts it to only being raised one time. You think that`s unfair?

POLLOCK: Absolutely.

LEHRER: Why?

POLLOCK: Well, it`s very important that when a proceeding is going on, let`s say, in Cleveland and another proceeding is going on in Pennsylvania, there may be some very important unresolved generic issues, across the- board issues that must be addressed, particularly with that site-specific plant. And in many instances citizens that are raising one particular issue concerning the conditions in one area would want to raise it in another area because it affects the operation and performance of that particular plant.

LEHRER: In other words, information gleaned from proceedings elsewhere if it came too late to be introduced in another proceeding -- is that what you`re saying?

POLLOCK: That`s correct. And also if there is new information that is brought up later in the proceedings, it`ll be very difficult to go back and proceed. In addition, we believe that this particular piece of legislation will not address the central issue about ***nuclear*** power licensing, and that is it will not change the delays. The delays are in the manufacturing area, in the delivery area, in the labor area; they are not in the area of intervention or citizen involvement. Every single independent report has proven that: the Federal Power Commission report, the report that...

LEHRER: So it`s not the procedural thing at all, then.

POLLOCK: Absolutely. I think that it`s very important that your audience understand that the major areas of slippage`s in construction are on the site itself. There are seventy permits that are now out for construction of ***nuclear*** power plants, and on only fifty-seven of those plants actual work has begun. In the remainder there has been no construction, and all of the regulatory areas have already been cleared, all of the hearings have been concluded.

LEHRER: As a matter of principle, are you opposed to speeding up the process at all?

POLLOCK: We believe that as long as safety factors are concerned, as long as environmental, public health considerations are taken into account, if the industry can speed up the manufacturing of equipment, the construction of the plants, we would have no problem with that. But do not sacrifice these very important public interest issues in the name of simply speeding up or accelerating ***nuclear*** power itself, because the long- term costs are going to be ghastly if there should be a ***nuclear*** reactor accident.

LEHRER: All right. Charlayne?

HUNTER-GAULT: Okay. Mr. Pollock has just said that this legislation is anti-people. How about that, Mr. O`Leary? Do you feel this legislation is anti-people?

O`LEARY: Well, to answer that you really have to ask yourself, where is this country now with regard to ***energy***? And I think that that is fairly easily summed up, particularly when you think about a base load generating unit, one that operates all the time and is the fundamental backbone of the generation of electricity in this country. Up until a few years ago we had a wealth of choices: oil was a choice that you could make, before the embargo, freely; up until just three or four years ago we thought natural gas was a choice; coal is a remaining choice; and ***nuclear***. We`re right down now, if we`re going to expand our use of ***energy***, to two choices: ***nuclear*** and coal. We don`t have solar, won`t have it for another fifteen years; and this department, the Department of ***Energy***, is working as hard as it can to make that fifteen-year projection come true, but we don`t have it now. So right now it`s coal or ***nuclear***. And if you project the environmental impact and the costs to consumers that are associated with an all-coal generating economy from now on out, I don`t think you want it. My own view is this: I don`t like either. I don`t like ***nuclear energy*** particularly, and I don`t like coal. They`re far from perfect. I would much rather move tomorrow to a solar generating world. But we`re not in that !happy stage, and so here we are.

HUNTER-GAULT: But I think part of his objection, as I understood it -- you correct me if I`m wrong, Mr. Pollock -- was that this does not allow people to get involved in the process early enough. Do you think that the bill the way it`s set up allows people to have as much input as they might otherwise?

O`LEARY: Yes; I think, as a matter of fact, it provides more input at more meaningful places in the process. It brings the public, the interveners, in earlier, it doesn`t take the intervener out of a single point of contact that he has with the process today; it simply says that when he comes forward he must come forward with genuine issues, not old, retried issues that have gone stale and been tried time and time and time again and are used now purely and solely for delay.

HUNTER-GAULT: Okay. Let me ask you this, Mr. Gleason. We talked earlier about the delays, and there is room in the legislation to try to cut down on the delays. Mr. Pollock says the delays are caused by industry -- by labor problems and other problems. Do you agree with that?

GLEASON: A ***nuclear*** power plant is a great, big, complex piece of equipment that takes a lot of men and a lot of material and a long time to build. I would not tell you that ***nuclear*** power plants, like any large industrial project -- chemical plants, fossil plants, whatever -- don`t have all the problems which Mr. Pollock mentioned; they certainly do. They don`t have them to any greater extent or any lesser extent than any other industrial project.

The fact is that this bill recognizes that out of this ten to twelve years it now takes to get a license to operate a ***nuclear*** power plant there is considerable fat in there. Figures which we generated for hearings before Congress indicated that there are some thirty-eight months of delay simply because of duplication and inefficiencies, which can be eliminated.

Now, let me tell you what the importance of that is. The chart that you had out at the beginning of the program showed that every year of delay adds millions of dollars to the plant. Fifty percent of the cost of the plant in a ten-year licensing process is simply the cost of carrying the money all that period of time. Now, that comes out of the consumer`s pocket. We don`t think the consumers ought to pay twice what the plant costs. We think you ought to be able to reduce the-time and therefore reduce the costs without in any way impairing the public`s participation or safety, which is paramount.

HUNTER-GAULT: Thank you. Jim?

LEHRER: Mr. Pollock, how do you respond to that argument?

POLLOCK: Well, the Federal Power Commission undertook a review of twenty- three ***nuclear*** power plants to take a look at what kind of slippage there might have been on schedules, and they discovered that 224 plant-months, as it`s called, were directly attributable to manufacturing problems, to problems concerning delivery of equipment, to malfunction or defective equipment, to labor problems and to financing. They discovered that regulatory changes and legal challenges by consumers represented only thirty-two plant-months of delay.

Now, among those thirty-two months they discovered -- and this is the Federal Power Commission`s own statistics -- that nine months was attributable directly to citizen intervention, or citizen contesting of a particular license proceeding. This nine months of delay, as far as the FPC was concerned, was only one category above the least cause of delay, and that was bad weather. As far as we`re concerned, not only the FPC but the General Accounting Office statistics and the Library of Congress report, the Congressional Research Service report -- all three of them show conclusively that the cause of delay is at the manufacturing and construction stage, and we would like to see that trimmed down because we`re very concerned about consumers paying more, too.

LEHRER: Mr. O`Leary, you haven`t been heard on the delay question.

O`LEARY: Well, first of all, the Supreme Court yesterday spoke to the question of delay, and I think all you have to do is, read that or read the press clippings on it and you`ll find that they are very much concerned with these interventions that have gone into the courts and really have been very costly, from the standpoint of delay.

LEHRER: But Mr. Pollock says that that`s not so.

O`LEARY: Well, then Mr. Pollock and the Federal Power Commission can work that out with the Supreme Court. I`m really not here to argue that. What I`m here to argue is that the process, that twelve-year process, starting from A and going to Z, is wrong. And we want to make it legally possible to start the A through the M over here, on a totally different track than the rest of the alphabet -- that is to say, to separate the site decisions, let them go on a totally separate track, get to the point where you have an identified site, and then you can`t tell me that this country, that can build a refinery in about four years, can`t built a reactor in six. The Japanese can do it in four and a half or five.

Now, with regard to labor difficulties, there have been a number of labor difficulties over time. But in the last month there`s been a general agreement between the trade unions and the vendors and the utility industry that I think will lead to minimization of that.

LEHRER: Let me pick up on the Supreme Court decision in the couple of minutes we have left -- first to you, Mr. Gleason: how do you react to that decision? Do you feel that`s a good one, from the industry`s point of view?

GLEASON: I`ve not yet had a chance to read the decision, but my understanding of it simply confirms a well-established principle of administrative law, which is that courts should not interfere with the discretion of administrative agencies when they`re operating within the mandate laid down by Congress. It`s not new law, it simply is a recognition of what the situation has always been.

LEHRER: Do you feel it could have an effect in terms of speeding up the construction of ***nuclear*** power plants?

GLEASON: I don`t think directly it`ll have an effect on that, not at all. I do think that this bill, if it gets the kind of improvements in it we think are necessary, could have a good impact.

LEHRER: How do you feel about the court decision on Monday, Mr. Pollock?

POLLOCK: Well, of course we`re somewhat satisfied with the decision by all of the justices that the issue concerning radioactive waste management be remanded to the U.S. Court of Appeals. In this particular Vermont case, we contended that the utility in their environmental impact statement must state how they`re going to dispose of radioactive waste. The Supreme Court indicated that they were not convinced that the federal government or the utility had demonstrated that there was in fact a solution for radioactive waste, and they wanted the U.S. Court of Appeals to determine that.

LEHRER: But what about the basic point of that decision that was written by Justice Rehnquist, that the courts ought to back off of interfering in this whole process of ***nuclear*** licensing?

POLLOCK: I think that what Justice Rehnquist was trying to say was that in the procedural area they do not want to have procedural questions blocking the licensing process or other procedures that should go on. And we concur wholeheartedly. What the Justice said was that we must decide the particular complaints of interveners or, industry on the merits of the case and not on these nit-picking different procedural matters. And on that we are absolutely convinced that if we can go before the courts and present the merits -- and the justices, by the way, did not say that the merits should not be adjudicated in the courts -- if that is the case, then we welcome it, because we are convinced that we`ll be able to prevail under those circumstances.

LEHRER: Mr. Gleason, in a word, do you feel that the court decision plus this bill, if it`s passed, improved the way you want it improved, really will suddenly give a great boon to the development of ***nuclear*** power in this country?

GLEASON: I think these things are important, but there are other problems which have got to be addressed. I think it`s crucial that we reduce the licensing times. I think that the court has taken a wise step with respect to this waste disposal program. There are other things beyond that which we really must address to get the whole thing moving again.

LEHRER: Well, we can`t do it tonight, I`m sorry. Mr. Gleason, thank you in New York. Good night, Charlayne.

HUNTER-GAULT: Good night, Jim.

LEHRER: Mr. Pollock, Mr. O`Leary, thank you. We`ll be back tomorrow night. I`m Jim Lehrer. Thank you and good night.
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For the first Easter in 61 years, tHe Vimy Bell will be rung tomorrow

morning.

Vimy has a special place in the hearts of many for the heroic stand

made by Canadians at the battle of Vimy Ridge in 1917.

After the battle Major Roland Parsons was given a steeple bell from

one of the local churches which had been destroyed. He later became a

brigadier-general and after his death his widow gave the church bell to

Brig.-Gen. T. E. Snow for the Royal Canadian Military Institute Museum.

It was on display for many years and then was sent to storage.

The idea of using it as a memorial came from Lt.-Col. William A.

Maddox, an account manager with IBM. He arranged with Rev. Gordon Bruton,

rector of All Souls Anglican Church at Bayview and Shepperd Avenues, to

have it given, with a gift, to the church as a memorial to his mother,

the late Florence Yarrow Maddox Dix.

The RCMI museum committee liked the idea of it being put to a

practical use and the only proviso made was that if for any reason the

bell was to be taken out of the church, it would be returned to the

institute.

The bell is unfortunately not allowed to be rung outdoors because of a

North York anti-noise pollution bylaw - so it has been set up inside the

vestry and is rung three or four times to announce the beginning of each

service. It has a most beautiful tone.

Canadian Tapestries 1977 is the first tapestry exhibition ever created

by Canadians. It's a project of Fay Loeb, art collector and patron.

She persuaded 23 top Canadian painters and sculptors to prepare

designs for tapestries, a field in which none of them had worked before,

and then established a workshop in Mexico, where she and her husband

Jules have a winter home.

The tapestries are hand-hooked in a knotted tufted form, not the

traditional flat weaving, and so there's a rich depth to the work.

Instead of using wool, which is hard to clean and easily harmed by

weather and parasites, Mrs. Loeb employed a new acrylic fibre and thiS

results in a new play of light.

The 23 designs, done in limited editions of 25 each, sell for $900 to

$1,500 and each one is signed and numbered. The tapestries are quite

large, up to nine feet high by seven feet wide, and so are particularly

suited to public buildings.

The collection has been shown in the Art Gallery of Ontario as well as

in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Calgary and Charlottetown.

The first exposure in the United States was at the Canadian Embassy in

Washington and Mr. and Mrs. Loeb were there for the opening, as was the

curator of the collection, Peggy Irwin Hogarth of Kingston.

This week Canadian Tapestries 77 opened in Dallas at the Texas

Agricultural and Mechanical College. There to open it was Dennis Eugene

Norman Burton, one of the artists whose tapestry is in this unique

exhibition.

Other Toronto artists in the group are Ronald L. Bloore, Sorel Etrog,

Gershon Iskowitz, John MacGregor, John Meredith, Gordon Rayner, Michael

Snow, Harold Town and Joyce Weiland. The late JacK Bush and the late

William Kurelek were also part of the project.

Five new volunteer governors have been elected to the board of the

Bishop Strachan School Association. They are: F. Martin Crispo,

vice-president of the National Life Assurance Co. of Canada; Winfield C.

McKay, customs broker and member of the Metro Toronto Police Commission;

E. W. H. Tremain, vice-president of Consumers' Gas; Irving R. Gerstein,

president of Peoples Credit Jewellers and treasurer of Mount Sinai

Hospital; and Mrs. James W. Whittall. Each has a daughter at the

school.

J. Christopher Barron, president of Cassels Blaikie and Co. Ltd.

stockbrokers, is board chairman; the two vice-presidents are Gordon D.

Bacque, vice-president of the development Toronto College St. Ltd., and

Mrs. Arnold Agnew, a member of the volunteer committee of the Art Gallery

of Ontario and a director of the Current Events Club.

The University of Western Ontario is doing big things to celebrate its

100th year. Next week, for instance, there will be a three-day conference

titled Petroleum and Beyond to discuss the financing, exploration,

production and distribution of world ***energy*** resources.

Sponsored by Western's School of Journalism and the Canadian

International Development Agency, its aim is to provide journalists with

first-hand information about the world ***energy*** situation from experts.

Twenty-five North American journalists have been invited and the

conference is also open to members of the working media who wish to cover

the sessions.

Of the 10 experts scheduled to speak, six are from the United States,

plus one each from Belgium, France, Venezuela and Canada. The Canadian is

O. J. C. Runnalls, senior advisor on uranium and ***nuclear energy*** to the

federal Department of ***Energy***, Mines and Resources.

The conference will be held in Spencer Hall from March 30 to April 1.

There is no charge for registration but the cost of food and

accommodation will be $40 a day. The co-ordinator is Brian T. O'Connor,

adjunct professor of journalism at Western, and vice-president of Garwin

Ltd., a Toronto marketing communications firm. For further data, his

phone number is 363-1873.
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By FLORA LEWIS

New York Times Service

COPENHAGEN - Losing confidence and patience with U.S. policy, Western

European leaders have decided to try harder to organize their own

economic recovery program.

Questions about President Jimmy Carter's grasp of world affairs and

the consistency of his purposes, as well as the basic intentions of the

United States, have spread among authorities in Western Europe, pushing

the leaders to new efforts, which they have been unable to start on their

own up to now. Thus, the European Economic Community resolved to start

its own recovery plan in a major new effort to reduce its vulnerability

to the vagaries of the U.S. dollar and to what government leaders now

consider the unpredictability of U.S. policy.

That was the main result of the Common Market summit just completed

here. And while European hopes have yet to be translated into concrete

decisions, they reflect a turning point in attitudes which the commission

president, Roy Jenkins, called very exciting for the long-term

implications of European unity.

It was starkly clear that the new impetus - for more concerted growth

rates and more reliable exchange rates among European Economic Community

currencies - came once again as a reaction to what is now considered

intolerable outside pressures, this time from the United States, rather

than a spontaneous move toward co-operation.

For nearly three years since the recession gathered momentum, the

Europeans have been arguing among themselves and waiting, more or less

listlessly, for Washington to take a decisive lead. Now, with the 1976

campaign long past and the Carter Administration well beyond the period

of honeymoon indulgence, they have come to the conclusion that they must

look to themselves for relief and reduce their dependence on decisions

from the United States.

The practical steps implied are, of course, far more difficult than

the resolution, and it remains to be seen whether they will lead to a

virtual confrontation with President Carter at the Bonn economic summit

in July or produce a more satisfactory level of trans-Atlantic

co-operation.

But the decision was based on the line of reasoning put forward by Mr.

Jenkins in his report to the government heads, and it focused directly on

the period of preparation for the Bonn summit.

He stated flatly that only by presenting a 'powerful common front'

to the United States at the Bonn meeting would there be a chance of

reviving not only European but general economic activity which might

begin to reduce unemployment and restore investment. Otherwise, he

warned, the industrial summit might have a flabby outcome which would

provoke a confidence-weakening cynicism.

Put more plainly, the European consensus has come to blame the

uncertainties of the dollar and what it considers the lack of firm,

decisive world economic leadership in the United States for much of the

sluggishness and the resultant political and social problems here.

The sharp U.S.-European split over ***nuclear energy*** policies and

resentment at Mr. Carter's manner of exercising authority - seen as

inconsistent and unforeseeable - have aggravated the assessment and

irritated individual leaders.

The crux of the matter goes deeper, however. Top European leaders, who

each have their own domestic political problems, are aware of the complex

relationship between Congress and the executive in the United States. But

from their point of view the vital question is not how U.S. decisions are

made, it is whether they are made, when, what they are, and how firmly

their full implementation can be expected.

In the European analysis, the key reason for the U.S. dollar's

weakness is the lack of a vigorous U.S. ***energy*** policy and the continued

growth of oil imports. Whether it's the fault of the Congress, or the

President, or somebody else, U.S. failure to hold a strong, effective

position that will keep the value of its money steady is seen as

undermining its allies by weakening everybody's sense of assurance in the

economic future.

The lack of confidence is seen in businessmen's unwillingness to

invest, in uneconomic and unproductive flows of capital and in the

ineffectiveness of such measures as the recent U.S. Treasury agreement

with West Germany on measures to strengthen the dollar, which the leaders

feel might have succeeded in another climate.

The effort to tighten their own links so as to present a stronger

front to Washington is not, at this stage, meant to provoke a conflict.

It is seen as defensive, and there is hope that it may provide support

for those elements in the United States that are trying to restore a

stronger international position.

Thus the Danish Premier, Aker Jorgensen, the current president of the

European Economic Community, said that the nine members wished Mr. Carter

all good luck' in pushing through an ***energy*** policy that would promote

conservation and block rising imports of petroleum.

A measure of the Europeans' impatience, and even their despair at

achieving Western goals if the situation is allowed to bumble on, was the

willingness of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany to concede to

his community partners what he has repeatedly refused to grant in the

face of intense pressures from the United States.

That was an agreement to stimulate the West German economy to greater

growth and, in effect, to accept higher imports. The nine countries set a

growth goal of 4.5 per cent for the 1979 fiscal year, an unexpectedly

high target since the 1977 calendar year produced a rate of only 1.9 per

cent throughout the market. If the goal is to be approached, it will

require a major effort from West Germany.

But his community partners had something to offer Mr. Schmidt in

return that he has been unable to obtain from the United States - the

promise of an attempt to achieve greater currency stability to lessen the

mark's virtual solo flight into the realm of high-value money, along with

the Japanese yen and the Swiss franc.

It is now acknowledged that if more stable money relations within the

community are to be achieved, national governments must try to make their

economic policies converge, holding down inflation where it is highest

and stimulating where prices have settled down, mainly in West Germany.

Whether the Common Market countries will be able to agree on the hard

issues that will follow their agreement on objectives is far from

assured. But they have now set a course.
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Jimmy Carter was irritated. Brazil's Foreign Minister, Antonio Azeredo da Silveira, had suggested that Carter invited himself to Brazil and wasn't all that welcome. In Brasilia last week, at the skull session that procedes all Presidential press conferences, Carter mulled over an appropriate response if that subject came up. Finally the President grinned and remarked: "May be I should say that I find it hard to believe that the Foreign Minister of a major world power could say something so stupid."

The comment was made jokingly, a participant said later. But it pointed up the recent strains in U.S. Brazilian relations. And Carter wasn't joking about Brazil's new status as a "major" nation. With the eighth strongest economy in the West, Brazil is an emerging superpower set to go its own way.

Only two years ago, Silveira was boasting of his country's "special relationship" with the U.S.; now Brazil is loosening its traditional ties with Washington and doesn't want to be lectured to by Carter or anyone else. Even before Carter had left the military air-field outside Brasilia at the start of his visit, Gen Ernesto Geisel, Brazil's austore, iron-handed President, said stiffly that he would be pleased if the trip provided Carter with "a fair opinion of Brazilian reality." His handpicked heir apparent, Gen. Joao Baptista Figueiredo, is more blunt: "We are no longer little boys to have our ears pulled," Figueiredo said recently. "Today . . . we create our own alternatives."

Optimism: The self-confidence and optimism of the Brazilians - whether one encounters them in the boutiques, hotels and high-rise office buildings of Sao Paulo or in the hillside slums of Rio de Janeiro - are palpable. In one of those slums, or *favelas,* a woman whose husband sometimes works as a house painter said last week: "We may be poor, but our children won't be." A government propaganda slogan of a few years back - "This is a country that's moving ahead" - is now an article of faith. It appears on bumper stickers on the backs of horse-drawn carts as well as on Mercedeses, along with such other favorites as "God Is With Us" and "God Is Brazilian."

For years, Brazilians joked that they lived in the country of the future - and always would. But in many ways the future has finally arrived. The United States, as everyone knows, is the world's largest food exporter. Brazil is second. It makes engines for Ford Pintos sold in the U.S., assembles Volkswagens for Algeria and ships prefabricated housing to the Middle East. "Brazil is no longer an emerging nation," says State Department planner Luigi Eianudi. "It is already an economic and political power."

Brazil also has become a surprisingly active arms producer. It makes most of its own automatic rifles, heavy machine guns, armored personnel carriers, rockets and missiles. Several hundred personnel carriers that it sold to Libya performed so well in last year's border skirmishes with Egypt that other Arab nations may soon order the vehicle. Another Brazilian factory makes tail assemblies for American F-5E jet fighters. But Brazil also manufactures a rudimentary jet bomber of its own called the Xavante, and exports a larger transport and reconnaissance plane to Chile and Uruguay, countries with human-rights records so bad that most Western countries won't sell them arms.

Spending Cutback: The Brazilian economic boom faltered but didn't collapse when world oil prices quadrupled in 1974. Though the government couldn't sustain the heady annual growth rate of 10 per cent that Brazil had enjoyed for most of the previous decade, the bright civilian technocrats who run the economy softened the blow with massive overseas borrowing. When that led to 50 per cent inflation, President Geisel ordered a cutback in public spending. This mix of remedies led to the layoffs of tens of thousands of workers and slowed construction of the Trans-Amazon highway. But inflation was cut, the growth rate today is a respectable 5 per cent and the confidence of international, especially U.S., investors in Brazil's planners have turned to ***nuclear energy*** to fulfill the country's long-term ***energy*** needs. The U.S. has approved a large shipment of enriched uranium to fire a Westinghouse reactor going up on a heavily guarded beach south of Rio de Janeiro. But the Brazilians wanted additional ***nuclear*** plants, and signed a multibillion-dollar more reactors by the end of the 1980s. The basic contract with Bonn will also give Brazil uranium enrichment and reprocessing technology, the essential building blocks of a ***nuclear*** arsenal. Last year, the Carter Administration unsuccessfully put intense pressure on Brazil and West Germany to block the deal. Angered by Carter's interference - and by U.S. criticism of Brazil's unappetizing human-rights record - Geisel terminated his military-aid agreement with Washington. And less than a month before Carter's visit, he pointedly flew to Bonn to sign three more ***nuclear*** pacts.

Will Brazil build the bomb? The government says no. "Three times no," Mines and ***Energy*** Minister Shigeaki Ueki said recently. "There is no possibility whatsoever. We have more essential needs than that." More disinterested parties aren't so sure. "I think the generals are sincere when they say they have no plans to build a bomb," says a foreign military analyst. "But you get the feeling that they want to keep that option open if the perceived need for the bomb ever arises."

Despite Carter's criticism, Geisel has moved much further than his predecessors to restore some liberties. Soon after taking office in 1974, he lifted censorship of much of the press (though not of radio and television), enabling Brazilians to read about the excesses that had roused the conscience of the West - and of Jimmy Carter. The army's frequent torture of political prisoners fell off dramatically, and there were many fewer cases of dissidents dropping permanently out of sight. At the same time, the arbitrary brutality of the state police increased. Rio's "death squads" - off-duty police vigilantes who execute anyone they decide is causing trouble - took hundreds of lives last year in a single slum called Baixada Fulminense. The victims, dumped by roadsides or in vacant lots, were often found with signs hung around their necks displaying a skull and crossbones and the words: "We are cleaning up the city - Ha, ha, ha."

One-Party State: Each military regime since the 1964 coup that swept away Brazil's last elected government has promised a return to democracy. President Geisel has more or less stopped promising. Last April, he suspended Congress for two weeks and decreed changes in the electoral laws that effectively made Brazil a one-party state. Liberals took some comfort from the fact that Geisel passed over more authoritarian candidates when he announced that Gen. Figueiredo will succeed him next year. But for such human rights advocates as Cardinal Paulo Evaristo Arns - whom Carter made it a symbolic point to see last week - democracy simply doesn't flow from one-man decrees.

"Geisel's great defect is that he wants to resolve everything paternalistically," Cardinal Arns told NEWSWEEK before Carter's arrival. "The policy doesn't work anymore. The main defect of [the 1964 military take-over] is this idea of the government giving the people something. It has given the people very little and taken away much - our freedom. Fourteen years enough."

Some Latin American experts in the U.S. State Department believe that Carter's human-rights campaign has made him even more popular among Brazilians than President John F. Kennedy was. Someday - despite the odds - Brazil may develop the open political institutions it needs to unleash the full potential of its vast, still largely untapped wealth and, even more, of its variegated and vibrant population. If it does, Jimmy Carter can take some of the credit for nudging Latin America's most-important country toward democracy.
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**Highlight:** Five months ago, a cabinet-level Department of ***Energy*** emerged from a number of warring agencies. Now it, too, seems mired in red tape and bureaucratic infighting.

**Body**

The Department of ***Energy***, President Carter's first try at streamlining the government, now finds itself the target of charges that it is mired in disarray and frustration.

It opened for business five months ago with 19,500 employes, a budget of 10.4 billion dollars and hopes that the first U.S. cabinet-level bureaucracy created in 11 years would be a model for future reorganization efforts.

Today, critics charge, the administration has been slow to fill key positions in the department. Employe morale is said to be low. And bureaucratic infighting is even keeping DOE from occupying its Washington headquarters.

Insiders report that fierce struggles over research funds are being waged between advocates of ***nuclear*** and solar power. ***Energy*** Secretary James R. Schlesinger is accused by staffers of being remote and inaccessible.

And the one instrument that could give the new department a sense of cohesion and direction - President Carter's national ***energy*** plan - still awaits congressional approval.

The Department of ***Energy*** officially came into existence last October 1, consolidating the Federal ***Energy*** Administration, the ***Energy*** Research and Development Administration, the Federal Power Commission and a number of smaller ***energy***-related agencies.

Those in charge of the reorganization effort say that DOE is 12 to 18 months ahead of the pace set by the Department of Transportation when it opened for business in 1967.In an interview on page 31, John F. O'Leary, deputy secretary of DOE, denies stories of internal disorganization and bickering.

"Incredible red tape." Unhappy employes and outsiders who deal with DOE, however, stand by the criticisms. Consumer activist James F. Flug, director of Washington-based ***Energy*** Action, Says: "Despite all the ballyhoo about ***energy*** reorganization, despite the passage of a law to establish the new department, there really is as yet no Department of ***Energy*** There is not only incredible red tape, duplication and overlapping, but also utter chaos with a potential for real disaster" Simple and vital administrative tasks often take weeks and months, he says.

From inside DOE comes this complaint from one middle-ranking bureaucrat: "We are supposed to be organizing here, but this is the most disorganized place I've seen in my 20 years of government jobs. The whole place is marked by absolute ineptitude. Nevertheless, I think we'll probably muddle through."

Although President Carter has been criticized in the past for his slowness in naming key ***energy*** officials, the DOE executive ranks today are almost full. Most of the department's 22 presidential appointees have been named, even though some of those who have been appointed have run into trouble winning confirmation. "If we wanted to hire God, it would take us six months to get Him confirmed," complains one high-level official.

Many employes without bosses are uneasy about their future. Some of those working on existing programs reportedly are "just marking time" until new adminsitrators start to work.

DOE official complain that morale problems have multiplied because the department's 8,000 Washington-area employes are scattered around the capital in 17 buildings. Telephone numbers and mailing addresses change frequently as workers are shifted from building to building, leading some employes to wonder how DOE can ever hope to solve the nation's ***energy*** problems when it can't cope with its inter-office mail system.

"Guerrilla warfare." There are plans to house the DOE bureaucracy in the Forrestal Building, which will be the department's headquarters, and two other structures. Although President Carter ordered the Forrestal Building emptied by October 1 of last year, almost 5,000 U.S. Army and other Defense Department personnel still are fighting their ouster with what one ***energy*** official describes as bureaucratic "guerilla warfare."

If the Army had fought as hard in Vietnam coma ***Energy*** Secretary James R. Schlesinger is fond of saying, the U.S. would have won the war.

Because of such delays, Schlesinger and his top aides will not move into their offices until April at the earliest, and possibly as late as June. The entire headquarters staff probably will be unable to occupy its new offices until the spring of 1980.

Meanwhile, employees complain that Schlesinger remains inaccessible in his White House office, isolated except to a small number of aides. Some employes have accused Schlesinger of trying to organize DOE like the Central Intelligence Agency, which he headed in 1973, and say that he is overzealous in attempting to enforce conflict-of-interest rules.

This issue became public earlier this year when a U.S. district court in Washington ordered the department to stop equiring high-level employes to reveal detailed information on their financial, social and personal lives.

Employes also are chafing at a recent memo notifying them that all mail will be opened and routed at a central checkpoint unless marked personal.

Over all, however, past and present employes at DOE give Schlesinger high marks for his administrative abilities. They claim that strong, centralized management is necessary if Schlesinger hopes to exert control over what had been independent agencies.

Clash with interior? At the same time, consolidation of all ***energy*** activities and decision making in a single cabinet-level department apparently has not eliminated divisions over ***energy*** policy within the government.

DOE, observers say, often seems to be working at odds with the Interior Department, which still is in charge of leasing and supervising production of ***energy*** from public lands, and with the Environmental Protection Agency, which is playing an increasingly active role in ***energy*** matters.

For example, Schlesinger and Interior Secretary Cecil D. Andrus have clashed over administration plans to place off limits to ***energy*** development millions of acres of Alaskan land believed to contain oil and natural gas. Within the department itself, the most publicized dispute exists between backers of ***nuclear energy*** and solar-power programs.

Too many "nukes"? Solar boosters fear that the department's research effort is tilted toward the atom. They complain that too many "nukes" - ***nuclear*** advocates - occupy key positions in the department. Cited is the fact that Schlesinger and O'Leary, the No. 2 man at DOE, once worked for the old Atomic ***Energy*** Commission.

DOE's new budget fails to support such criticism. It shows a definite tilt toward neither type of technology, although O'Leary says that future research will focus more on so-called soft technologies such as solar and wind power, which has made backers of ***nuclear*** power unhappy.

The broad criticism being heard outside the department is that DOE's performance is contradicting President Carter's promise to halt the growth of the federal bureaucracy and reduce government red tape. They point out that Carter has proposed boosting DOE's budget to 12.6 billion dollars in fiscal 1979, a 22 percent increase over current spending. Instead of eliminating red tape, they say, ***energy*** bureaucrats are collecting vast amounts of data from ***energy*** companies.

The companies themselves are complaining that most of the information already is available in Washington. And Shell Oil Company alleges that complying with a government subpoena issued recently for company records would require the efforts of an estimated 200 people working daily for a year - at a cost of about 9 million dollars.

The company adds that the subpoena, which it is fighting in court, follows more than 200 formal requests and countless informal requests for information. "Much of the information being demanded is irrelevant, such as who made the computers we use in our data processing and how do they work," says a Shell spokesman.

Department officials, however, claim that the information they seek is necessary to fulfill their congressionally mandated duties of regulating ***energy*** prices and providing unbiased data on oil, gas and other ***energy*** production. In the past, they say, the government often has relied on industry to provide ***energy*** information - and some congressmen suspected that the numbers in industry's reports were manipulated in favor of industry.

Recent events, however, have raised doubts that reports compiled by DOE bureaucrats will be more credible.

Last December, for instance, the Professional Audit Review Team, a six-member interagency group established in 1976 to monitor the goernment's collection of ***energy*** information, accused the administration of manipulating numbers projecting future ***energy*** supplies and future demand in favor of Carter's ***energy*** program.

The costs of the new department, which is Washington's eigth largest in number of employes and 10th in the size of its budget, also are coming under fire.

Oil-industry publications, for instance, claim that the department's 10.4-billion-dollar budget adds up to a dime for every gallon of gasoline that was consumed in 1977.

Schlesinger, however, points out that only 170 million dollars in the new budget is allocated for regulation and information-gathering activities. More than 70 percent of the total budget is earmarked for ***energy***-related research - and oil companies are among those that are receiving research grants from the government.

Charitable critics. Despite their dislike of government regulation, oil companies are among the most charitable critics observing DOE's birth pains.

Says the Washington representative of a major oil company: "Any judgment of DOE, at this time, would be unjust without recognizing that the department is just treading water until Congress comes to grips with the nation's ***energy*** problems first."

Lobbyists for oil companies point out that the federal ***energy*** bureaucracy has been in an almost constant state of turmoil since 1973, when it started as a small office in the White House.

"We don't like regulations, but we obviously are going to have to live with it," according to one lobbyist. "If DOE can bring some sense and consistency to government ***energy*** policy, no one will be happier than the oil industry."

DOE officials admit that some complaints about confusing regulations are justified, and they have moved to elimiate some of the problems. Schlesinger, on his part, has named O'Leary to head a new regulatory-reform task force that will attempt to simplify and translate into "straightforward English" all department regulations. "I want to see to it that producers devote their ***energies*** to production rather than to unnecessary bureaucratic paper worker," he says.

DOE recently proposed freeing gasoline prices from government controls, and has asked for congressional approval of the plan. Officials say that the cumbersome controls, which were imposed in 1971, no longer are necessary to protect consumers from soaring prices and shortages.

Schlesinger also promises that his new agency will not follow the traditional path of Washington bureaucracies - expanding yearly by increasing its budget and adding employes.

Past experience, however, shows that bureaucracies continue growing year after year, and even the strongest of Presidents have been unable to reverse the trend. And critics doubt that the nation's newest cabinet-level department will do any better.
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**Highlight:** No sooner were difficult talks with Israel behind him than Carter prepared to fly to Latin American and Africa to discuss oil, human rights, ***nuclear*** know-how and what racial strife would do to the dark continent.

**Body**

Three months after his grueling trip to Asia, Europe and the Mideast, President Carter was ready for another show-the-flag swing overseas - this time to buttress old ties and to soothe bruised feelings in Latin America and black Africa.

Carter's seven-day, 14,600-mile mission to Venezuela, Brazil, Nigeria and Liberia had two major purposes:

To convince black Africa of the depth of Washington's commitment to help eliminate white-minority rule in Rhodesia and Namibia and to ease restrictions against blacks in South Africa. Carter's stated determination is to avoid a racial war that could throw all of sub-Sahara Africa into choas.

To put U.S. relations with Latin American countries on what Zbigniew Brzezinski, the President's national-security adviser, describes as "a more normal, a more mature basis."

This meant eliminating what many Latins are convinced is America's patronizing exploitation of the continent. At the same time, Carter wanted to impress upon Latin nations that they no longer can expect special treatment. Except in extraordinary cases, future problems of individual Latin American nations will be dealt with in a regional or global context.

Brzezinski declares: "We are now pursuing a policy which maintains bilateral relationships, takes into account regional concerns [and] increasingly the fact that many of Latin America's concerns are the same as global concerns."

The President's travels were to take him far from the foreign-policy dilemmas that confronted him in Washington. Among them: general erosion of detente with the Soviet Union, deadlocked ***nuclear***-arm talks with the Kremlin, the fading prospect of a Mideast peace and refusal of Russia and Cuba to pull their troops out of Ethiopia.

There were also gnawing domestic difficulties. Persistent inflation, a huge trade deficit, a weakened dollar, welfare and tax reform, urban revitalization and failure of Congress to act on his ***energy*** program was just some of the woes plaguing Carter's administration.

Yet U.S. officials emphasized that the President's trip was not designed to divert public attention from his problems or to give him a rest from White House tensions. They pointed out that he was to be in constant touch with Washington and would react immediately to any crisis.

Aura of success. Carter's tour was set against the backdrop of his first major foreign-affairs victory - Senate approval, after weeks of debate, of one of two Panama Canal treaties. Fate of the second treaty, which would turn the waterway over to Panama by noon on Dec. 31, 1999, still is in doubt and may not be decided until late April.

Latin America's reaction to Carter's first-stage success on the canal treaties is mixed. On the one hand, he is criticized for accepting a Senate-imposed provision allowing the U.S. to send troops into Panama after the year 2000. Latin view this as "Yankee interventionism."

On the other hand, the victory enhanced Carter's credibility in a region where military leaders had been struck by his inability to get his programs through Congress.

Carter needed all the prestige he could muster in Latin America. Venezuela is a major source of U.S. oil imports and is considered a close friend. But President Carlos Andres Perez advocates higher oil prices, and the U.S. has been urging him to hold the line against sharp boosts.

Carter also wants Perez to help curb the arms race in Latin America. Venezuela enjoys considerable influence in Ecuador and Peru, two countries that are now building up their military forces.

Brazil threatened to confront Carter with a major diplomatic test. Its size and industrial strength make Brazil the most important nation on the continent, but relations with the U.S. have deteriorated in the wake of White House attacks on human-rights abuses in Brazil and Carter's effort to scuttle President Ernesto Geisel's program to build ***nuclear*** power plants with the help of West Germany. Carter's goal: to bolster relations with Brazil, even while urging Geisel to improve his human-rights record.

Inauguraiton of a multiracial transitional government in Rhodesia added special urgency to the President's scheduled talks in Lagos with Lt. Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo. Nigeria's military ruler opposes the "internal solution" that Prime Minister Ian Smith reached in Salisbury with three black-nationalist leaders. The accord calls for black-majority rule in Rhodesia by December 31.

Carter himself doubts that the Salisbury agreement will lead to a "genuine" transfer of power from whites to blacks. He backs a joint British-American plan that calls for participation by an alliance of black guerrillas know as the Patriotic Front, which is waging war against the Smith regime.

The President hopes Obasanjo will use his influence to persuade Front leaders to join a new high-level conference on Rhodesia's future, a proposal they have rejected in the past. Carter's aim is to end the guerrilla conflict and ward off a civil war among opposing black forces in Rhodesia.

The only worry-free stop on Carter's two-continent itinerary is Liberia, a stable and prosperous nation established 131 years ago by former black slaves in the image of the U.S., where they had been given their freedom.

Why did the President select Venezuela, Brazil, Nigeria and Liberia for his second overseas tour to 1978?

This answer from administration officials: Aside from some nagging nation-to-nation problems, the trip would underscore Carter's decision to move the U.S. away from its preoccupation with Russia into a closer relationship with the long-neglected nations of the Third World.

Stop 1 Venezuela

Stop 1: Venezuela

Importance with which the White House views U.S. relations with Venezuela is underscored by selection of Caracas as the site of one of Carter's two major speeches on his tour.

The nation headed by President Carlos Andres Perez not only is a major oil producer and a leader of the Third World, but it also is an energetic, stabilizing democracy on a continent dominated by military regimes.

American officials say relations with Caracas are "better than good." They cite particularly Venezuela's support for the President's human-rights campaign and his drive to prevent the spread of ***nuclear*** arms.

Topics high on the Carter-Perez agenda include: ***energy***, human rights, ***nuclear*** nonproliferation and tensions between the world's "have" had "have not" countries. Carter is particularly interested in seeing the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights become more vigorous.

Welcome visitor. Perez strengthened his U.S. ties during a Washington visit last summer and again by attending the signing of the Panama Canal pacts in September.

Yet there are some nagging disagreements with the U.S.

Venezuela is the third largest supplier of U.S. oil imports after Saudi Arabia and Nigeria, accounting for about 10 percent of the daily total. But as a member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), it lobbies strongly for steady increases in the price of oil.

Perez pushed hard for a 5 to 8 percent hike at the OPEC meeting in Caracas last December - a move blocked by Saudi Arabia and Iran - and is expected to renew his bid for higher prices at the next meeting in June. Oil income, he says, is being cut by inflation in industrial nations.

Since he took office in 1974, Perez also has been in the forefront of Third World leaders who demand a bigger share of the world's goods for developing countries. He has repeatedly criticized U.S. policy toward poorer nations.

Trade ties remain strong, however. Direct U.S. investment in Venezuela at the end of 1976 totaled 1.1 billion dollars, 9 percent of the Yankee stake in Latin America.

Stop 2 Brazil

Stop 2: Brazil

Primary purpose of the President's stopover in Brazil is to repair relations that one American official describes as "at an all-time low - the worst in the last 30 years."

From the point of view of President Ernesto Geisel, the U.S. during Carter's Presidency has been unncessarily harsh with Brazil on at least two issues:

***Nuclear energy***. The U.S. is dead set against a 4-billion-dollar Brazilian deal with West Germany of purchase of a ***nuclear***-fuel-recycling plant. Brazil is just as determined to go through with the arrangement. It is nearing the end of its hydroelectric power resources, and oil imported from the Middle East is too expensive.

Human rights. Brazilians are furious over U.S. criticism of their human-rights policy. They contend that Washington is trying to dictate to Brazil as if it were a "banana republic," while ignoring similar, or worse, situations in other nations. To show its displeasure, Brazil rejected a 50-million-dollar credit to buy American military gear and canceled five military pacts with the U.S.

"Brazilians," says one U.S. official, "want us to get off their backs on human rights, accept their resolve to go ***nuclear*** and to give them access to U.S. markets."

Washington experts claim, however, that Brazil recently has made "considerable" progress in human rights. They believe Geisel is trying to end abuses, both to reduce Carter's criticism and to improve Brazil's image abroad. For its part, the U.S. can't ignore a nation that leads Latin America in size, population, wealth and industrial and farm output. On the verge of major-power status, Brazil achieved a gross national product of 164 billion dollars in 1977 and expects its GNP to hit 215 billion by the end of the century.

Nevertheless, U.S. officials say Carter wants to end America's "special relationship" with Brazil, mainly because other Latin America nations are suspicious of the military government that has ruled Brazil for 14 years.

On signal of Carter's intent: He plans no major speeches either in Brasilia, the capital, or in Rio de Janeiro.

Stop 3 Nigeria

Step 3: Nigeria

Carter's 2 1/2-day stay in Nigeria points up the dramatic about-face in American policy toward black Africa.

At one time, U.S.-Nigerian relations were so frigid that Lagos turned down a proposed visit by then-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Nigerians were particularly critical of Washington's reluctance to move against white-minority regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa.

Now, all that has changed, due largely to American efforts to bring black-majority rule to Rhodesia and Carter's pressure on the South African government of Prme Minister John Vorster to ease restrictions on blacks.

Nigeria's military ruler, Lt. Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo, is determined to repay the warm welcome given him on his October, 1977. visit to Washington. Carter is to deliver and important foreign-policy address at the capital, Lagos, and will hold extensive talks with government leaders.

The U.S. needs Nigeria as a friend. It is Africa's richest and most populous black nation and is a member of OPEC and the United Nations Security Council. It has played a key role in mediating African disputes - most recently the Ethiopian-Somali war - and has championed America's position in a number of African and global forums.

Vital oil source. Nigeria, moreover, is the second largest supplier of oil to the U.S. In 1977, it shipped 2 million barrels a day to American markets, giving it a 15 percent share of U.S. imports. Carter wants this oil to remain available in the event of another Arab embargo.

Nigeria also is a profitable area for U.S. businessmen who have invested close to 1 billion dollars in the country, mostly in petroleum production. But American officials point out that Nigerian efforts to attract more U.S. investors could be complicated by Obasanjo's vow to boycott companies that have economic links with South Africa.

Above all, Nigerians want a renewed pledge that the U.S. is committed to black "liberation." Says one American official: "There is no doubt that the No. 1 reason for Carter's visit is the situation in southern Africa."

Stop 4: Liberia

U.S. ties with Liberia, a republic founded nearly a century and a half ago by freed black slaves from America, are stronger than those with any other black nation.

Yet Carter will be only the second American President to visit the Tennessee-size country. Franklin D. Roosevelt, returning home from the Casabalanca Conference in January, 1943, stopped over for lunch at the Monrovia airport with then-President-elect William V. S. Tubman.

American roots. Liberia has its roots deep in the U.S. Its history dates from 1816 when the Congress gave the American Colonization Society, a private group, a charter to resettle freed slaves on the west coast of Africa.

President James Monroe helped finance the purchase of land from tribal chiefs in the Cape Mesurado area, now the site of Monrovia, the capital. The first settlement was built in 1822, and independence was declared in 1847 with a Constitution and government modeled on those of the U.S. Liberia was Africa's first independent republic.

To this day, descendants of the original settlers control much of the nation's economic and political life. American currency is used, and English is considered the official language, although there are 28 African tribal languages.

The U.S. is Liberia's major trading partner and has provided the country with about 260 million dollars in aid since the end of World War II. Economic assistance now ranges between 5 miillion and 20 million dollars a year, and military aid about $675,000. Private U.S. investment is estimated at between 500 million and 600 million dollars.

American officials say there are no serious issues between the two countries. Carter's main purpose in stopping in Monrovia is to meet William R. Tolbert, who became President in mid-1971 and last visited the U.S. in 1976.

Rich in resources and with a population of just 1.7 million, Liberia is well managed and comfortably fixed economically, with a trade surplus accumulated mainly through exports of iron ore and rubber. Other exports include timber, gold, diamonds, rice, coffee and sugar.

**Graphic**
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Mexico is to build a uranium enriching plant with a capacity of 1,000

tons a year, using Swedish technology, according to the ***nuclear energy***

institute, INEN. Mexico, which recently claimed the discovery of large

new uranium reserves, is anxious to develop its own ***nuclear*** industry, but

the United States has refused to deliver enriched uranium or supply the

necessary technology for its production.
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The Argentine Government has announced that it will start developing the

country's largest uranium field early next year. The Sierra Pintada field

in Mendoza province has known reserves of 12,000 tons of uranium, located

at a depth of less than 200 metres in an 80-by-20-kilometre area.

The state-owned ***Nuclear*** Mendoza has signed an agreement with the

***Nuclear Energy*** Commission to set up a concentrated uranium plant to

supply the country's 300-megawatt atomic reactor and other ***nuclear***

facilities that are in the planning stages.
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the heavy equipment building plant at the atomic power station belonging to the ***energy*** investment corporation in sarajevo was commissioned at a ceremony yesterday, according to yugoslav press reports.

among those present at the ceremony were d. culafic, vice-president of the yugoslav federal executive council and president of the federal ***nuclear energy*** commission, and m. renovic, president of the executive council of the republic of bosnia and herzegovina.

reports indicate that the equipment for the plant was designed and built in yugoslavia itself.
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argentina's first plant producing radioisotopes of high activity was officially inaugurated at the country's ezeiza atomic ***energy*** centre on march 14, according to a report from buenos aires.

the plant produces cobalt-60. when in full operation, it will make argentina self-sufficient in radioisotopes and radiation sources. radiation treatment will soon be used for medical purposes.

the plant was designed by experts from the ezeiza atomic ***energy*** centre, and 90 per cent of the materials and equipment used in the plant have been locally made.

argentina is foremost among latin american countries in developing ***nuclear*** technology. the argentine government deems it a sovereign right of each country to conduct ***nuclear*** research and develop ***nuclear energy*** for peaceful purposes. hence argentina has refused to sign the so-called "***nuclear*** non-proliferation agreement".
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An official of the federal Department of ***Energy***, Mines and Resources has

said he was misinformed when he said a moratorium was lifted on uranium

exploration in the Baker Lake area of the Northwest Territories.

The statement by O.C. Runnalls, senior adviser on uranium and ***nuclear***

***energy*** for the department, was reported Saturday. He said he was not

aware that the federal Cabinet had passed an Order-in-Council on March 23

extending the deadline of the one-year moratorium to April 14.

Dr. Runnalls said a member of a geologists' group associated with the

uranium business had told him about two weeks ago that the moratorium was

being lifted. I had presumed this source was accurate.
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LONDON, Ont. (CP) - An experimental canister considered safe enough to

contain high-level ***nuclear*** waste when placed in an underground depository

should be ready in a couple of years, a University of Western Ontario

professor says.

Prof. William Frye, head of the university's geology department, told

a symposium on ***nuclear*** waste disposal that the experimental canister

would probably be made of copper.

He said more attention can be paid to ***nuclear energy*** as a power source

once a safe canister is designed and related problems of how best to

store it in underground beds or tunnels are solved.

Prof. Frye said he has been experimenting with canisters for about a

year and was confident his research team could develop a canister safe

enough to prevent radiation leaks for millions of years.
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An official of the federal Department of ***Energy***, Mines and Resources has

said he was misinformed when he said a moratorium was lifted on uranium

exploration in the Baker Lake area of the Northwest Territories.

The statement was reported on Saturday in the Report on Business.

O.C. Runnalls, senior adviser on uranium and ***nuclear energy*** for the

department, said he was not aware that the federal Cabinet had passed an

order-in- council on March 23 extending the deadline of the one- year

moratorium to April 14.

Dr. Runnalls said last night a member of a geologists' group

associated with the uranium business had told him about two weeks ago

that the moratorium was being lifted. I had presumed this source was

accurate.
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peruvian scientists have succeeded in the experiments of applying gamma rays to preserve food, the press here reported today.

scientists of the peruvian institute of ***nuclear energy*** said that the preservation of food by the application of gamma rays would help stabilize food prices and ensure uninterrupted food supply.

they pointed out that three tons of potatoes were preserved for eight months by this method and that the effect was so good that only a few potatoes germinated. this method could also be applied to preserve onions and other tubers.

similar experiments had been made on such fish as hake and soles. the fish so treated remained nutritious. such fish could be transported to the mountainous areas without using refrigerator vans.

experts of the institute said that this method of preserving food had also the advantage of eliminating depredatory insects.
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President Carter signed legislation Friday that he signed was a major step toward the U.S. policy of providing ***nuclear*** fuels for other countries while at the same time limiting development of ***nuclear*** weapons.

Carter said the measure would apply "rigid constraints which would prevent the acquisition of explosive capability by nations that are not presently part of the ***nuclear*** club."

The new law could be used to halt ***nuclear*** fuel shipments from the United States to nations without ***nuclear*** weapons if the receiving nations detonates a ***nuclear*** device or abandons its adherence to internationally accepted safeguards.

The legislation was written to set out guidelines governing U.S. cooperation with other nations in the peaceful use of ***nuclear energy***, the White House said.

The measure does not limit any "third-party" arrangements a nation may reach to gain ***nuclear*** material from suppliers other than the United States, according to White House spokesman Marc Henderson. During his comments in the Cabinet Room, where he signed the legislation, Carter did not say whether he thought nations trying to develop ***nuclear*** weapons capabilities might turn to other ***nuclear*** powers to get the fuel.

The president also expressed his hope that the administration will have evolved by next year a comprehensive proposal for the first time on the disposal of ***nuclear*** wastes.

Carter said that the United States has begun an effort to study the international ***nuclear*** fuel cycle, which, in part, will attempt "to deal with the unsolved question of the disposition of spent ***nuclear*** fuels."

"This is one of the most complicated questions that presents itself to the international community," Carter said.

In a written statment released after he signed the meausre, Carter said:

"Preventing ***nuclear*** proliferation will not be easy - some have called this task impossible. I believe, however, that halting the spread of ***nuclear*** weapons is imperative. We must rpess forward in our efforts. Fear of failure cannot be allowed to become a self-fulfilling prophecy."

The bill was part of Carter's overall policy designed to limit the spread of ***nuclear*** weapons capacities and controlling ***nuclear energy*** development. It:

Provides for supplying ***nuclear*** fuels for nations supporting U.S. non-proliferation objectives.

Provides U.S. initiation of negotiations to improve international safeguards.

Allows for application of strengthened criteria for existing ***nuclear*** agreements and licenses.

Establishes stricter criteria for new ***nuclear*** agreements.
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In a test of European unity, leaders of the nine nations of the Common Market began work Friday on an international program designed to steady the non-Communist world's trade and money systems.

The closed-door summit focused on ways of countering the slide of the U.S. dollar. The government chiefs also were reported ready to deal with the Japanese threat to Europe's trade strength.

The conference in its first day was distracted by the issues of the neutron bomb and ***nuclear energy***, however.

President Carter announced in Washington that he was deferring production of teh neutron bomb, a controversial weapon most U.S. allies in Western Europe officially have backed. Spokesmen for European governments generally saiCarter's move was understandable.

On ***nuclear energy***, French President Valery Giscard support of the other members in his protest of Carter's insistence the Common Market agree by Sunday to renegotiate security rules for its ***nuclear***-cooperation agreement with the United States.

The renegotiation is required by a law signed by Carter last month to halt the spread of material that can be made into ***nuclear*** bombs. This does not relate to development of the neutron bomb.

The other nations gave their support to France on the condition that the Carter administration be advised the Market nations will go ahead with rengotiations in due course.

On the economic plan, Giscard d'Estaing said "a great organizing effort" will be needed to stabilize Europe's currency exchange rates - let alone to steady Europe's monetary relationw with the United States and Japan.

The French president told reporters that the problems stem from the fact that some European countries are economically stable but not expaning without being stable.

The plunging value of the dollar against European currencies endangers the basis of Europe's export trade by making American goods more attractive on the world market.

Danish Prime Minister Anker Joergensen said before the summit that theh participants would discuss the possibility of bringing European currencies closer together to stabilize them and to rival the dollar as the leading currency in world trade.

It was reported Friday that the European leaders also were ready to make new demands on Japan to ease its restructions on imports or face reprisals. The influx of goods from Japan, which this year will have an estimated $14 billion surplus of exports over imports, has undermined the European economy.

Market leaders believe Japan is not fulfilling earlier promises to reduce its huge surplus.

"In such a situation," one foreign minister here said privatley, "the Common Market certainly will have to consider ways of slowing if not stopping the flow of Japanese goods into Europe. Studies of that problem already hhave begun.

On another matter, the summit participants set June 7-10, 1979, as the dates for the first election of a Parliament of Europe, a Common Market-wide legislative body to be chosen bu universal adult suffrage.
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Laserphoto COP3

**End of Document**



[***No Headline In Original***](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3SJ4-G2P0-0011-30DX-00000-00&context=1516831)

The Associated Press

March 27, 1978, AM cycle

Copyright 1978 Associated Press  All Rights Reserved

**Length:** 348 words

**Byline:** By ROBERT B. CULLEN, Associated Press Writer

**Dateline:** WASHINGTON

**Body**

President Carter will confine discussions with Brazilian officials on human rights to such matters as strengthening the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, a State Department official said Monday.

Asked whether Carter would speak to Brazilian officials about alleged human rights violations in their country, the official responded, "The president is not going to Brazil to discuss internal politics."

If Carter does confine himself to international considerations, it will represent a change from the administration's initial human rights approaches to Brazil, which resulted in an abrupt cooling of relations shortly after Carter took office last year.

At that time, Brazil said it would rather do without American military and economic assistance than submit to the human rights scrutiny that Congress and the administration require of nations receiving American aid.

The State Department official, who asked that his name not to be used, said the administration hopes that the "misunderstandings" over human rights and ***nuclear energy*** which marred the first year of Brazilian-U.S. relations under Carter will be replaced by mutual understanding.

On the ***nuclear*** issue, the official said the United States has not changed its position opposing the spread of technology for reprocessing spent ***nuclear*** fuel and producing the type of ***nuclear*** material that could be used to make atomic weapons.

Brazil is in the process of purchasing reprocessing technology from West Germany in a deal that the United States has opposed.

Nonetheless, the official said that the United States is in "basic agreement" with Brazil on ***nuclear*** issues.

The official did say, in a briefing for reporters prior to Carter's trip to Latin America, that the president will meet with a group of Brazilians during a rest stop in Rio de Janeiro after his official meetings in Brasilia. The official said that the group will include some church leaders and other "respected figures in Brazilian society," but he declined to identify them or to characterize them as people who oppose the present military government in Brazil.
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Representatives of environmental and consumer organizations charged Monday that ***Energy*** Secretary James R. Schlesinger has been allowed to "undermine, and worse, remake" the ***energy*** policies which President Carter promised in his election campaign.

They issued a joint statement urging Carter "to make his proper role as the leader in development and implementation of an ***energy*** policy." They asked him to stick with his original intention of pushing ***energy*** conservation and such "renewable" resources as solar power, leaving ***nuclear*** power to be the "last resort" as Carter once called it.

Signers of the statement included consumer advocate Ralph Nader and representatives of: Natural Resources Defense Council, Friends of the Earth, Environmental Policy Center, Environmental Action Foundation, Environmentalists for Full Employment, Wilderness Society, Consumer Action Now, Sierra Club, Critical Mass ***Energy*** Project, Environmental Defense Fund, the National Parks and Conservation Association, and the National Consumers League.

The statement charged that "President Carter has abandoned the progressive and far-reaching ***energy*** policies of his campaign and his first months in office, in favor of the tired, discredited policies which he ran against less than two years ago."

But its real target appeared to be Schlesinger, a former chairman of the Atomic ***Energy*** Commission, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Secretary of Defense under the Republican administrations which preceded Carter.

Despite his past service to Republican presidents, Schlesinger has been installed by Carter as the nations's first ***energy*** secretary.

The environment-consumer community has been suspicious of Schlesinger all along. He headed the Atomic ***Energy*** Commission - whose mission in part was to promote ***nuclear energy*** - which they, on the other hand, tend to oppose.

The joint statement Monday sought to blame on Schlesinger much of the Carter administration's ***energy*** policies since Carter's election. It said "the administration has a Jekyll-and-Hyde personality when it comes to formulating and promoting national ***energy*** policy.

"Although the President makes bold, visionary statements about ***energy*** policy," it said, "his ***Energy*** Secretary, James R. Schlesinger, is backsliding every day to the wornout, inadequate ***energy*** policies of the Republican administrations in which he served."
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Britain and France appear to be hiding for a major clash with the United States over billion-dollar plans to produce plutonium, a material used in making atomic bombs.

The United States is committed to steering the world away from what has been called "a plutonium economy" - meaning overreliance on the manmade element. But the British and French want to head off future ***energy*** shortages by developing their ***nuclear*** reprocessing facilities.

Washington already has tried to block deals under which France and West Germany have contracted to supply reprocessing know-how and equipment to Pakistan and Brazil. And officials say the United States has warned Britain and France not to count on foreign orders to finance development of their facilities. The informants declined to be named.

The United States has the right in its ***nuclear*** cooperation agreements to buy back spent uranium discharged by ***nuclear*** power stations in countries operating American -built reactors.

The Americans also can veto the reprocessing of the waste uranium and have made it clear they will give no blanket authorization for this. Instead all requests for reprocessing will be considered by Washington on a case-by-case basis.

Britain is close to a decision on whether to carry out a vast expansion of its ***nuclear*** reprocessing plant at Windscale in the Cumbria district of north-west England. By a vote of 186 to 56, Commons approved the $1.2 billion project. Another vote will be taken after Easter on a motion related to planning approval. But in light of the 130-vote majority, it seems certain the project will proceed.

France has begun construction of similar facilities despite political and public opposition. A plant at La Hague is expected to cost about as much as the Windscale development.

Japan is covering about 50 percent of the cost of the British and French projects and expects in return to get reprocessed fuel in the form of plutonium. Japan, with no oil of its own, is increasingly reliant on ***nuclear*** power for its vast ***energy*** needs.

British officials say President Carter may intervene to try to block or slow Japanese participation.

The Windscale project - if approved by Parliament - almost certainly will come up this week during Prime Minister James Callaghan's meetings with Carter in Washington.

Carter's concern over the European projects, according to information here, is that both could prejudice, if not preemt, current talks in Washington aimed at permitting all countries to achieve their own ***nuclear energy*** needs while reducing the possible spread of ***nuclear*** weapons.

Meanwhile, Sen. John Glenn, D-Ohio, chairman of the Senate subcommittee on ***nuclear*** proliferation, and four other U.S. lawmakers have urged Carter to reaffirm his opposition to reprocessing before America's allies invest too much and proceed too far with their plans.
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A ban on new ***nuclear*** power plants could cost the nation millions of jobs and billions of dollars, according to a study issued Thursday by the Heritage Foundation.

The foundation, a policy research group favoring free enterprise and a strong national defense, sponsored the study to assess the impact of a possible ban or limitation of ***nuclear energy***.

Its analyst, Milton Copulos, predicted the nation's safety margin of electric generating capacity would quickly be eaten away by growth of demand if new ***nuclear*** plants were barred or existing ones shut down.

If only future ***nuclear*** plants were blocked, he concluded, an electricity shortage could develop which would eliminate more than 5.2 million jobs by 1986.

But if all ***nuclear*** power plants were shut down, he said, the loss could rise to more than 8 million jobs by 1986.

In his study, Copulos assumed that practical limitations would prevent complete replacement of the absent ***nuclear*** power by coal-fired powerplants.

However, despite calls for a moratorium on new ***nuclear*** plants, the Carter administration continues to support ***nuclear energy*** and has even proposed legislation to speed up approval of plant construction.
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The ***Energy*** Department issued a study March 15 that said spent fuel from ***nuclear*** power plants, which would remain dangerously radioactive for over 100,000 years, could be safely stored in geologic formations.

The findings and recommendations of the report were to be used as a basis for a study that would propose final recommendations for ***nuclear*** waste management. The final policy study would be performed by an interagency task force appointed by President Carter. The task force was supposed to complete its work by Oct. 1. [See 1977, p. 794F1]

At a press briefing March 15, John M. Deutch, ***energy*** research director for the ***Energy*** Department, said that the "earliest possible date" by which a national waste repository could begin operations would be 1988. Until recently it had been projected that a permanent disposal site would be ready by 1985.

The report urged that a test permanent disposal site be opened in New Mexico by 1983. The New Mexico demonstration project would be suitable for storing up to 1,000 used fuel assemblies in an area of no more than 20 acres. The spent fuel could be retrieved from the disposal site for up to 15 to 20 years if the government decided to approve reprocessing technology.

The study said that reprocessing of spent fuel was not a necessary part of a permanent waste disposal policy. There was not a significant difference between spent fuel that had not been reprocessed and that which had been reprocessed, according to the study. Some experts had suggested that reprocessing would ease disposal problems by reducing the volume of the wastes that had to be disposed. The Carter Administration, however, had opposed reprocessing, for the present at least, because it produced material that could be used for atomic weapons.

Deutch said that states would be able to veto plans to locate a permanent disposal site within the state. The precise way in which a state would exercise this right had not been determined.

Deutch said he did not know what action the federal government would take if all of the 36 states that were thought to have salt or hard rock suitable for repository sites refused to harbor the facilities.

Cost estimates for the waste disposal program over the next 23 years ranged from $13 billion, assuming there was no growth in ***nuclear*** power, to $23 billion, if more ***nuclear*** power plants were opened. If the ***Energy*** Department charged utilities the full cost of disposing of their wastes, utility power costs would be increased by 4% to 5%, Deutch estimated.

The report said the federal government should take responsibility for all forms of ***nuclear*** waste disposal. In particular, the report recommended the government take over six commercial waste burial sites currently used for wastes of low radioactivity. "The longevity of management required," the report said, "clearly transcends most private enterprises."

The ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission should have licensing authority over all waste disposal operations, the report said.

The report drew criticism from some foes of ***nuclear*** power. Richard Pollock, director of Ralph Nader's Critical Mass ***Energy*** Project, said March 15, "We take major issue with the fundamental conclusion that radioactive waste can be disposed of safely in geologic formations." He continued, "It is somewhat dishonest to say this is a safe method when the site, technical design and material of the repository is unknown."
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By JEFF CARRUTHERS

Special to The Globe and Mail

OTTAWA - The federal Government has given approval in principle to a

one-year, $200,000 ***nuclear*** information program aimed at helping

communities overcome local fears about ***nuclear***-related development.

The program, to be undertaken by the Science Council of Canada and the

Royal Society of Canada, stops well short of the national inquiry into

Canada's ***nuclear*** development that has been demanded by anti-***nuclear***

groups in recent months - which will likely be regarded as good news by

the ***nuclear*** industry.

However, since the ***nuclear*** program will initially focus on helping

communities assess and resolve local ***nuclear*** issues, it is already

expected to become a focus for increased public opposition by

anti-***nuclear*** groups. Current plans call for the Committee on ***Nuclear*** Issues in

the Community

(an independent body to assist communities to assess ***nuclear*** issues of

local concern) to be organized by mid-April and to be available for the

first community meetings in late April or early May.

One possibility already under consideration by organizers would be to

hold the first meeting in Thunder Bay in response to concern there about

the prospect of ***nuclear*** fuel waste disposal sites being located in

Northern Ontario.

Members of the committee are being nominated by a number of groups,

including the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Royal

Society, the Science Council, the Canadian Labor Congress, the Federation

of Canadian Municipalities (which will distribute information to

communities on the availability of the committee) and the Canadian Public

Health Association.

If Ottawa considers the program a success after a year a operation,

financing at higher levels would be made available for up to two

additional years. The committee, which initially will have only one research

assistant,

will likely depend heavily on ***nuclear*** information supplied by government

agencies.

There is also some question whether all of its community meetings will

be open to the public, especially in cases where local councils prefer

closed meetings, according to one organizer.

***Energy***, Mines and Resources Minister Alastair Gillespie first proposed

a ***nuclear*** information program to the Cabinet after a survey by the

Canadian ***Nuclear*** Association revealed a higher-than-expected level of

ignorance among Canadians about ***nuclear*** power and ***nuclear*** issues.

Atomic ***Energy*** of Canada Ltd., the federal ***nuclear*** development agency,

which has been criticized for recent proposals on export reactor sales

and domestic ***nuclear*** waste storage and reprocessing, has been

intensifying its own ***nuclear*** information program.
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The Carter Administration March 17 presented legislation that would, the Administration claimed, eventually reduce the time it took to license and build an atomic power plant from the current 10-12 years to about six and one-half years.

Most of the time savings projected by the Administration would come from expediting the licensing process. Currently, approval of construction of a plant and approval of operation of the plant required two separate licensing processes.The bill would combine the two.

The bill would allow sites for ***nuclear*** power plants to be selected in advance of specific proposals to build a plant. States would thus be able to "bank" number of sites for future development.

The bill would limit reconsideration of issues that had already been dealt with in earlier hearwings. Under the bill, only state agencies (rather than state agencies and the ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission) would determine whether a site was acceptable and if there was a need for a new power plant.

The Administration also proposed that atomic reactor designs be standardized. Standardization would allow advance approval.

The bill also provided for government subsidies to parties, such as environmentalists, that wished to take part in the licensing hearings.

The Administration reckoned that the bill, if enacted, would eventually shorten the time for licensing from the approximately four years taken at present to one year. The effects of the bill would not be immediate, because it would take states some time to build up banks of approved sites for ***nuclear*** plants.

Construction time would be shortened to five and one-half years from seven years, it was estimated, through the use of standardized reactor designs.

***Energy*** Secretary James Schlesinger, at a news conference March 17, commented, "At the present time, the ***nuclear*** option is barely alive." To make ***nuclear*** power a real option, Schlesinger said, "we must have reform of the ***nuclear*** licensing process."

Schlesinger said that delays caused by the licensing process sometimes added hundreds of millions of dollars to the cost of ***nuclear*** power plants.

*Sharp Criticism* -- Spokesmen for some environmental groups sharply criticized the proposal. A statement by the Natural Resources Defense Council said, "The announcement today that President Carter is sending Jim Schlesinger's version of ***nuclear*** licensing reform legislation to Congress represents the final corruption of the President's moral and political courage on the ***nuclear*** issue."

Critical Mass ***Energy*** Project, a Ralph Nader organization, said the bill would "discourage public participation in regulatory hearings and cause deep potential harm" to the environment.

Criticial Mass further claimed that delays with ***nuclear*** power plants stemmed chiefly from labor difficulties and problems with equipment, not licensing requirements. [See 1977, p. 917D2]

***Nuclear*** industry spokesmen, while less critical, were still not completely pleased with the bill as proposed. A spokesman for Commonwealth Edison, the Chicago-based operator of seven ***nuclear*** plants, said the bill would probably "eliminate a fari amount of the duplication involved in licensing now." The spokesman added, "Still, it isn't apparent from what we see in the bill how they'll come anywhere near the kind of time savings they are projecting."
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President Carter signed legislation March 10 imposing new and stricter controls on the export of ***nuclear*** technology and fuel. The main purpose of the bill was to prevent the spread of ***nuclear*** weapons. [See p. 82E2]

The bill provided that the U.S. would end ***nuclear*** exports to any country without ***nuclear*** weapons that developed such weapons. Exports would also be cut off, under the bill, if a cuntry violated international atomic safeguards.

The legislation barred countries from re-transferring without U.S. consent fuel they had received from the U.S. Consent would also be required for reprocessing spent ***nuclear*** fuel.

The bill included provisions designed to assure other countries that the U.S. would be a reliable supplier of ***nuclear*** fuel and equipment, provided the countries abided by the safeguards against weapons proliferation. The U.S. hoped that such assurances would persuade other countries to refrain from using reprocessing technology or building breeder reactors.

(Breeder reactors and reprocessing technology were particularly attractive to countries without domestic supplies of uranium. They would free the countries from reliance upon a supplier country. However, those technologies -- in the form in which they had been most developed -- would also produce plutonium, which could be used to make atomic weapons.)

The U.S. ***nuclear*** industry had opposed the export-controls legislation. The industry contended that foreign countries would simply turn to other nations for their ***nuclear*** supplies, thus evading the controls and diminishing U.S. exports and profits.

Carter, when he signed the bill, called it a "major step forward in clarifying our own nation's policy."

Carter said he felt "very strongly that we should continue to use in an increasing way atomic power . . ." He added, however, that light water ***nuclear*** reactors were adequate for the present and that it would be a mistake to build a production model breeder reactor.

As a consequence of the bill's export controls, Carter said, "Some of our friends wil have to readjust their policy." Observers interpreted the remark as a reference to France and other nations that had not signed an international treaty to prevent the spread of ***nuclear*** weapons.

The bill had cleared Congress Feb. 9 when the House of Representatives approved it by voice vote. The Senate had passed it Feb. 7 on an 88-3 vote.
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By JOHN MARSHALL

Some of the people most involved with Canada's ***energy*** resources have

shown the least interest in getting involved in an ambitious general look

at ***energy*** problems.

The week-long Canadian ***Energy*** Exposition starts tomorrow at Toronto's

Harborfront, but I have a hunch the oil companies are not willing to face

the public, said Ken Burkhardt, chairman of the exposition.

With 150 exhibits, 60 speakers at various seminars, theatre,

solar-equipment competitions, poster contests and kite and bike

workshops, the exposition will explore new ways of living in a future

that threatens to be short of conventional ***energy*** sources.

The final day, May 3, has been designated as Sun Day and will be

marked by similar displays, sunrise ceremonies, discussions and other

events in many Canadian cities and in 22 other countries to increase

public awareness of the potential of non-polluting, renewable ***energy***

sources.

Exposition organizers say they received no financial support and

little program participation from those in the conventional ***energy***

industry, although companies were told the idea was to give the public a

full and factual look at all facets of the ***energy*** problem.

Mr. Burkhardt, acting director of the Ryerson ***Energy*** Centre, one of

the exposition sponsors, said he wrote to all major oil company

presidents inviting them personally, or their representatives, to

participate in the program.

He also made a pitch at a three-hour meeting of the Canadian ***Energy***

Institute, held in the TransCanada Pipelines office and attended by

representatives of major oil, gas and coal companies.

The institute's president, D. E. Salter, an official of Shell Canada,

has been helpful in many ways, Mr. Burkhardt said, but the members turned

down his invitation that their companies assist the exposition.

He got the same reaction from the Canadian Petroleum Association,

Canadian Gas Association and the Coal Association of Canada. The Ontario

Electrical League referred him to Ontario Hydro, which will have an

***energy*** conservation display at the exposition.

The Canadian ***Nuclear*** Association would not help in financing but will

pay $400 rent for display space, and spokesmen will be participating in

the program.

It was when the various associations of the conventional ***energy***

industries turned him down that Mr. Burkhardt approached individual

companies for funds and for speakers. One man said they wanted to educate

the public all right, but that they wanted to do it in their own way.

The contribution of the huge petroleum industry will be two film

displays and a mini-symposium on fossil fuels that will be restricted to

high-school science teachers. Mr. Salter, along with a chemist and an

engineer from Shell, will be among those taking part.

There also will be a booth set up by the Petroleum Association for

Conservation of the Canadian Environment, an Ottawa-based organization of

major oil companies that has, among other things, lobbied against

sea-pollution laws it considered unfair to the industry.

The most enthusiastic participation, as expected, was in the matter of

renewable ***energy*** and came from educational institutions, environmental

groups and the federal and Ontario governments, both of which have

promised $1,000 in display-space fees.

The entire project, for which tentative planning started last

November, will cost an estimated $4,000, which Mr. Burkhardt expects will

be covered by rentals and a few donations. Initial bills are being

covered through the Ryerson ***Energy*** Centre.

Others involved in organizing the event are the Solar ***Energy*** Society

of Canada, Ateed Centre for Environmental Communities, Canadian Institute

of ***Energy***, Canadian ***Nuclear*** Association, ***Energy*** Probe, the University of

Toronto's Institute for Environmental Studies, and the federal and

Ontario ***energy*** ministries.

Some industry representatives who refused to get involved said they

were not being given sufficient time. (The special meeting of the

Institute of ***Energy*** was held in February.

And Mr. Burkhardt concedes that despite the involvement of many people

since early winter there have been organizational delays.

A Solar Olympics, in which there were to be various events testing

devices activated by solar ***energy*** in time trials, will not be up to

expectations, he said, because there was not enough time to invite

participants to design devices to specific standards.

But there will be plenty of solar devices on display, and possibly

some informal competition.

It's all part of a badly needed public education campaign, he said.

The ***energy*** problem is, fortunately, beginning to get through to the

children, who come home and turn off switches, but we've got a long way

to go with the general public.
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BY DOUGLAS PATRICK

Britain's wealth in North Sea oil comes forward in a new series of

postage stamps

The first special stamps to be produced by the British Post Office in

1978 will spotlight the national wealth of ***energy*** resources. Next year

will see North Sea oil coming ashore in large quantities for the first

time.

Oil, coal, natural gas and electricity are featured in the four-stamp

issue that went on sale on Jan. 25. Each of the four stamps is devoted to

one of the major ***energy*** resources in the nation. One at 9-pence

highlights oil with the design depicting a production platform in the

North Sea. The 101/2-pence stamp features coal and shows a modern

pithead. In the 11-pence issue natural gas is symbolically represented by

a flame rising out of the sea. The 13-pence stamp shows an

electricity-producing ***nuclear*** power station and the design includes a

diagram of uranium atom. They have been designed by Peter Murdoch who was

also responsible for the design of the Commonwealth Heads of Government

stamp earlier this year and the European Communities stamps in 1973.

Britain is luckier than many countries having its own natural ***energy***

supply. With North Sea oil, the country should be self-sufficient in

***energy*** supply by 1980. Gas from the North Sea will last into the next

century and coal reserves could last another 300 years. But no matter how

carefully Britain's natural ***energy*** resources are used, the supply will

fall short of present needs by the year 2000. By the end of the century

Britain's natural ***energy*** reserves will be so valuable that they will be

used only where they are of major importance. In the past 30 years oil

became the dominant primary fuel in the world. Demand for oil has grown

so great that 80 per cent of the known reserves will have been consumed

by 2000.

Coal - the fuel upon which Britain's industrial strength was built

will be of crucial importance in the future pattern of ***energy*** supply.

With increased production it can make good some of the shortfall in gas

and oil. Coal mining has featured on a previous British stamp, the

81/2-pence value of a series issued in 1976 to honor the work performed

by social reformers over the years. This stamp recalled the terrible

conditions under which miners had to work for many years.

Uranium - used as a fuel for ***nuclear*** power stations making electricity

is one of the most concentrated ***energy*** sources known. It has a far

greater ***energy*** content pound for pound than fossil fuels. But supplies of

uranium are finite and, on current usage, there could be a shortage

before the end of the century. In 1966, a Canadian stamp showing Douglas

Point ***Nuclear*** Power Station emphasized that atomic ***energy*** must be put to

peaceful use.

While sources of ***energy*** are invaluble they represent only part of the

natural resources of this world. A stamp from the Canadian Post Office in

1971 serves as a reminder that the land, the sea, vegetation, fish and

animals are also part of the wonder of this world - and all must be

treated with respect.
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*Our decision about* ***energy*** *will test the character of the American people and the ability of the President and the Congress to govern this nation. This difficult effort will be the "moral equivalent of war"* . . .

Jimmy Carter, April 18, 1977

*Of all the major countries in the world, the United States is the only one without a national* ***energy*** *policy. And because the Congress has not acted, other nations have begun to doubt our will.*

Jimmy Carter, April 11, 1978

The first anniversary of the nation's ***energy*** plan arrived this week, but for President Carter, there wasn't much to celebrate. A year after he sent his complex ***energy*** package to Congress for quick action - the test of his Administration, top aides said - it is still there, ensnarled in political maneuvering, procedural wrangling and a protracted fight over natural-gas pricing. In the absence of any official ***energy*** policy, U.S. oil imports rose to a shocking $45 billion last year, helping to drive the dollar to record lows on foreign money markets. Domestic supplies of oil and gas continued to decline as the nation ate into its finite reserves - setting the stage for a severe ***energy*** crunch that most experts say is inevitable, perhaps as early as 1985.

But even without a bill, there was considerable ***energy*** progress in the last year. Higher ***energy*** prices spurred both conservation and exploration. The rush to insulate homes has produced such a shortage of materials that insulation manufacturers have asked Congress not to pass an insulation tax credit. New cars now average almost 19 miles per gallon, up from 13.9 in 1974. Offshore oil drilling has started in the Atlantic Ocean, and oil from Alaska is flowing in such quantities that there is a massive, if temporary, oil glut on the West Coast. And despite the four-month coal strike, countless utilities and manufacturers are converting their boilers from oil or gas to coal, America's most plentiful fossil fuel. "There is an entirely different consciousness about ***energy*** today," says ***Energy*** Secretary James Schlesinger, "a new willingness to consider small cars, insulation, ***energy***-saving devices. It's a remarkable turnaround."

INTO THE FRAY

Schlesinger insists ***energy*** legislation is still needed, and for the first time in months the outlook is good. Last week, Carter personally jumped into the fray over natural-gas pricing, summoning House and Senate conferees to White House negotiations. "There was a sense that this is it," said press secretary Jody Powell, "that if we didn't get it [the ***energy*** bill] wrapped up now, we never would." Agreement seems near. Both sides have now accepted gas deregulation in principle and only some procedural details remain. If the deal goes through, it will mark the end of a gas-pricing battle that started with the Natural Gas Act of 1938, and it will pave the way for the tax on crude oil, the other main element in Carter's legislation.

If the compromise falls apart once again, Carter will accept the three parts of his plan that the conferees have already approved: legislation mandating coal conversion (most utilities and industries could not burn oil or gas after 1990), modest electric-rate reform (public-utility commissions must consider higher prices for big users) and tax credits to spur conservation (including help for homeowners who install solar heating units, page 38). "They'll take anything they can get," said Rep. John Dingell of Michigan, describing the White House mood on ***energy***. Carter will then slap a $5 to $6-a-barrel tariff on imported oil, raising average oil prices by fiat to the level that would have been provided legislatively by the crude-oil tax. "This is certainly not the most desirable solution," Carter said last week. "But one way or the other, oil imports must be reduced."

Carter also intends to announce soon, probably by May 1, the details of what is called National ***Energy*** Plan II. His first ***energy*** proposals stressed conservation and coal conversion, and Carter was widely criticized for not doing more to promote new production and supplies. NEP II is his answer, although instead of promoting oil and gas production, it will use Federal loans and price guarantees primarily to produce synthetic liquid and gas fuels from coal and oil shale.

A FUEL GLUT

For all the consciousness-raising of the last year, experts still disagree over the seriousness of the ***energy*** problem. Most believe that demand for oil and gas will outstrip supply by the mid-1980s. But others say that high prices are spurring so much conservation that long-term ***energy*** demand is being permanently moderated. "I don't see the inevitability of a crunch," says John Lichtblau, executive director of the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation. "The problem is there, but it's not a crisis."

If the average citizen shares this view, it is understandable. There are no fuel shortages at the moment and in many places there is actually a glut. In California, the surplus oil flowing into the state from the Alaska pipeline now exceeds a half-million barrels a day. As a result, the price of bunker oil, the fuel that powers commercial ships, has dropped from $14 to $8 a barrel. The bunkering business around Los Angeles has tripled in four months, with as many as twenty ships at a time lined up to buy cheap fuel. Ships are even veering off course by 100 miles or more to fill up in Los Angeles. Fuel savings range from $60,000 to $150,000. "Long Beach and Los Angeles are becoming the service stations of the Pacific," says Bob Shinn, California ***Energy*** Commission adviser.

Elsewhere around the world, the glut has been caused by a surprising decline in demand brought on by higher prices and conservation. In the non-Communist world, oil consumption dropped by 3 per cent in the first quarter of this year, according to an early estimate, and oil production from the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries exceeds demand by two to three million barrels a day. "This is an incredible development for a time in which the world is not in the midst of a major recession," says a European oil executive.

DON'T THUMP THE DESK

At least one OPEC specialist in Europe believes the glut has led to increasing tensions in the cartel, and may have been why Saudi Arabia forced a last-minute postponement of a meeting earlier this moth. "It was the wrong time to thump the desk," this source told NEWSWEEK'S Alan J. Mayer. "There was no level of cohesion." No one expects the cartel to collapse, but some businessmen and ***energy*** experts think the demand for petroleum has fallen so significantly that supplies will not be a problem until well into the 1990s, if then.

But many others, including Administration officials and international ***energy*** experts, take a gloomier view. They note that the drop-off in ***energy*** growth has been accompanied by a slowdown in economic growth as well, particularly in Western Europe. "Unless very low rates of economic growth are to be accepted," warns a report issued by the Rockefeller Foundation last month, "the current glut should be viewed as ephemeral." An internal study prepared for the Ford Foundation also predicts a crunch. Even if demand grows at the modest rate of 2.5 per cent a year, OPEC producers will be hard-pressed to keep up, the study says. By 1985, in fact, the International ***Energy*** Agency calculates that Western oil demand may exceed OPEC production by anywhere from 2 million to 12 million barrels a day.

In the U.S., oil imports are up 45 per cent since 1975 (charts), though the nation is using less ***energy*** per dollar of GNP. NEWSWEEK has learned that new Department of ***Energy*** forecasts say imports are likely to double in ten or fifteen years. That means, says Lincoln Moses, head of the DOE's ***Energy*** Information Administration, "a quadrupling of our imported-oil bill around 1990 or 1995." Thus, even if supplies are adequate, the prices may be prohibitively high.

NO QUICK FIXES

Carter has argued all along that his legislation is necessary to reduce dependence on foreign oil. He projected it would save the U.S. 4.5 million barrels a day by 1985, though ***energy*** experts have now scaled that back to 2 million - a saving of at least $10 billion a year. His biggest ***energy***-saving proposal is supposed to come from the tax on crude oil. It would raise the price of U.S. oil - now only $8.75 a barrel - to wold price levels. Economists have estimated that the tax, which Carter wants to rebate to the public, would increase gasoline prices by 7 cents a gallon. Still, no element of the Carter plan would provide a quick fix to the nation's ***energy*** problems, and most analysts believe its primary importance is as symbolic as it is substantive - to show other nations that the U.S. is serious about conservation, and thus to strengthen the dollar. "Passage of an ***energy*** program by Congress would have a real confidence effect around the world, and it would be immediate," predicts UlfLantzke, executive director of the IEA.

Many Carter people blame the Congress for not moving faster on ***energy***."All they can concentrate on is their own little hobbyhorse," complains a White House aide. But John O'Leary, Deputy ***Energy*** Secretary, excuses the delay by pointing to the size of the package before Congress - "113 distinct pieces of legislation is one hell of a mouthful," he says.

PARKING PLACES

Some Carter aides are unexpectedly candid about their own failure to shepherd the bill, or to repel the sophisticated lobbyists arguing against it. "If we'd mobilized our resources the way we did on Panama, which is becoming a cliche around here, we'd have been a lot better off," admitted a White House staffer. "But the way things were around here last April, most of us were doing well to find our parking places."

Carter himself is not blameless. Once he declared the moral equivalent of war, he never really returned to the theme and stayed aloof from the Congressional fight. Americans, says O'Leary, looked at the Carter proposals and asked, "Where's the war?" The Bert Lance affair also diverted Carter from ***energy*** for a long time last summer, and the President didn't see trouble coming in the Senate after his bill virtually sailed through the House. "There was a false sense of confidence aroused by the success in the House," admits one of Carter's domestic-policy staffers. "By the time it dawned on us that it wasn't going to be that easy [in the Senate], it was too late."

The President, however, does have three-fifths of the legislation he requested, and of that, the coal-conversion bill is probably the most significant. Carter wants coal to generate nearly 25 per cent of the nation's ***energy*** by 1990 (compared with 18 per cent now), and most experts believe that can be done. Electric utilities already have plans to build 250 new coal-fired plants by 1985, which would nearly double electrical-***energy*** production of coal. The chief difficulty with coal involves air-pollution regulations that restrict its use. The conflicting goals of clean air and more coal have not been resolved yet, largely because utilities have resisted using stack-gas-scrubbers and other pollution-control technology. But every 100 million tons of coal saves 400 million barrels a year of imported oil - and $5 billion a year on the balance of payments.

THE ***NUCLEAR*** OPTION

***Nuclear*** power is in less favor in the Carter Administration. Candidate Carter called it the "option of last resort," and as President he has opposed construction of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. Even Schlesinger, a former head of the Atomic ***Energy*** Commission, once said the ***nuclear*** option was "barely alive." Nevertheless, Schlesinger last month delivered a 56-page ***nuclear***-licensing bill to Congress that would reduce the time required to build ***nuclear*** plants from twelve to six and one-half years, and by 1990, ***nuclear*** power may be supplying 11 per cent of the nation's ***energy*** needs. "The ***energy*** problem is not simple enough to solve over the short term without going ***nuclear***," says a Carter ***energy*** expert.But in the absence of solutions for its most critical problem - waste disposal - ***nuclear*** power will grow slowly, and Carter is unwilling to encourage the industry with big subsidies. "It's time for it to compete," says this expert. "It's been too much a pampered child of the Federal government."

Alternate ***energy*** sources and synthetic fuels, like solvent-refined coal, will grow even more slowly between now and 1990, although they would seem more appealing if the price of oil and gas rises substantially. Whether that happens depends in part on the outcome of the Congressional debate over natural-gas pricing. The debate has been a difficult one because the House and Senate passed fundamentally different bills: the House voted to keep gas-price controls, while the Senate decided to remove them. "This is like trying to square the circle," says Michigan's Dingell, a Democratic member of the conference committee. Both sides have finally accepted the inevitability of deregulation by 1985 - and even agreed to the price schedule. But they disagree over how big a burden consumers should bear immediately after the price controls come off. Many conferees believe Dingell is holding up a final bill with trivialities. He demurs. "All I want is some shred of decency for the consumer," he says.

Whatever happens to the gas legislation - and ultimately to Carter's bill - the Administration has made a serious assault on a problem that seems certain to get worse before it gets better. "We have to look at ***energy*** as we did civil-rights and environmental issues," O'Leary declared. "Every session of Congress will have significant legislation dealing with it until we get it right." And that will probably occupy the nation for the rest of the century.
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New Mexico State Judge Edwin L. Felter March 2 awarded United ***Nuclear*** Corp. a default judgment against General Atomic Co. [See 1977, p. 895D2]

The ruling came on a lawsuit involving 1973 and 1974 contracts committing United ***Nuclear*** to deliver 31 million pounds of uranium to General Atomic. (General Atomic was a partnership of gulf Oil Corp. and the Royal Dutch/Shell Group of Companies; United ***Nuclear*** originally signed the contract with Gulf.)

The prices set by the contracts were under $12 a pound. In its lawsuit, United ***Nuclear*** said that when Gulf signed the contracts it knew from its participation in an international uranium cartel that uranium prices would climb dramatically in the future. (Currently, uranium was quoted at just under $43 a pound.)

In signing the contract, Gulf aimed to keep a large amount of competing uranium off world markets, United ***Nuclear*** charged.

Judge Felter's ruling apparently released United ***Nuclear*** from the contracts. About 27.5 million pounds of uranium remained to be delivered under the contracts. That amount would fetch about $1.2 billion at current prices, more than three times what the contracts provided.

United ***Nuclear*** had also asked for $2.27 billion in damages. Felter's decision did not cover damages. He siad they would have to be established in subsequent proceedings.

A spokesman for General Atomic characterized Felter's decision as "outrageous and unprecedented." The ruling, he continued, "shows an utter disdain for General Atomic's right to due process and for the facts in this case."

In issuing the default judgment, Felter cited General Atomic for a "willful and deliberate policy throughout this litigation . . . of concealing, rather than in good faith revealing, the true facts . . ." concerning the case."

Felter's default judgment was issued in connection with some documents held by a Gulf affiliate in Canada. United ***Nuclear*** claimed the documents would substantiate its charges, and that General Atomic had arranged for their shipment to Canada to put them out of the reach of the court. (The Canadian government, soon after the first reports fo the uranium cartel came out, head restricted disclosure of any information about the cartel operations.)

Attention focused on Felter's ruling because, in addition to the large amount of money at stake, Gulf was defendant in two other suits alleging injury from the uranium cartel operations, and Gulf was a target of a federal antitrust probe. Felter's decision included a number of findings of fact that, if upheld, would undermine Gulf's legal position. [See 1977, pp. 895F1, 479A2]

Among Felter's findings:

\* The Canadian government "encouraged" Gulf Oil's Gulf Minerals Canada Ltd. to join the uranium cartel, "but in no way required or mandated the membership." Gulf and General Atomic claimed the Canadian government compelled membership.

\* Gulf, following an agreement with the cartel, "restricted and withheld production of uranium at Mount Taylor in New Mexico, with the specific intent to limit the supply and control the production of uranium in New Mexico with the independent intent to monopolize New Mexico uranium reserves." (New Mexico held about 25% of the world's know uranium reserves.) Gulf had consistently said that delays in starting production at the still unfinished Mount Taylor mine did not stem from any intent to limit production or monopolize reserves.

\* Gulf "knew and intended" that the cartel's policies would raise uranium prices in the domestic U.S. market. Gulf claimed that the cartel had "little, if any" impact on domestic uranium prices.

\* In accord with "the cartel's express inclusion of the U.S. market and U.S. buyers in its price-fixing scheme, Gulf [and other Gulf-controlled units] quoted uranium to U.S. utilities at cartel prices." Gulf insisted that cartel documents showed that the U.S. was specifically excluded from being a cartel target.
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By KEN ROMAIN

The early 1980s will see the arrival of black-box technology and

on-board computers in the automotive industry, a period in which car

sizes will be further reduced, according to F. James McDonald, executive

vice-president of General Motors Corp. of Detroit.

By 1981, General Motors will be turning out millions of cars and

trucks equipped with computers to improve performance and mileage while

reducing exhaust emissions, he told the annual meeting of the Automotive

Industries Association of Canada in Toronto.

The association represents manufacturers making parts for the

automobile after-market in Canada.

Mr. McDonald said there is already increasing use of electronic engine

controls in cars and the move to electronic components will result in the

use of on-board computers on virutually all GM gasoline-powered cars

within the next decade.

An emission control device, once installed, can then be designed to

perform many other functions for little additional cost. Initially it

will be used to monitor and control such engine functions as the mixture

of air and fuel, spark timing and idling speed. But it could also be

easily expanded to monitor and diagnose problems within the emission

controls system by flashing a light that would direct the owner to take

the car in for servicing.

Mr. McDonald said GM has embarked on a massive program of reducing its

car sizes to meet mandatory fuel standards, which will mean that by the

start of 1980 virtually every car the company builds will have been

redesigned.

At that time, it will have to start the slimming process all over

again to meet the fuel standards set for 1985 of 33 miles per gallon. We

think we'll have to take about as much weight out of our full-size cars

the next time as we did for 1977.

He said that in the next 10 years, cars will be continually

redesigned, with increasing use of lighter but costlier materials such as

plastics, high-strength, low-alloy steels and aluminum. A-NEXT

Diesel engines, which give 25 per cent more miles per gallon than

gasoline engines, will be increasingly used in the next decade and will

become the power plant for all family-size cars of the future. At the

same time as cars become smaller, the move toward front-wheel-drive cars,

which are easier to package in a small vehicle, will become more more

attractive.

Progress is also being made on battery-powered cars for urban and

suburban use. GM hopes it will be ready to sell battery-powered vehicles

- either a car or a delivery van - some time in the mid-1980s.

Mr. McDonald said laboratory work is under way on a zinc-nickel oxide

battery, which is lighter and has more storage capacity than present

lead-acid batteries.

Electric cars will be an alternative to the present internal

combustion engines for many uses; they will decrease the transportation

industry's almost total dependence on petroleum by using ***energy*** generated

by ***nuclear*** power and coal.

Mr. McDonald said the electric-powered car will probably precede the

gas turbine engine as the next likely candidate for a power plant. But

the gas turbine engine can burn almost any combustible liquid, including

methanol made from plant life, or biomass as it is now called.

Changes in the automotive industry in the coming years will present

new opportunities for the automotive replacement parts industry

represented by the association. As new components, engines and

electronics reach the marketplace there will be new types of replacement

parts to offer customers. Every new development will require service

parts to keep the new features operating to the satisfaction of

customers.
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From the day they arrived in Washington, Jimmy Carter and his Georgians have been looking warily, back over their shoulders for California's quirky Gov. Jerry Brown - and last week they discovered to their unease that he was there. What brought him jetting cross-country from Sacramento was, ostensibly, the national governors' conference, a twice-yearly fraternity meeting he had always disdained in the past. But what occupied Brown on the ground was a thoroughly de-zonked round of state visits and media events normally associated with incipient Presidential candidacies. "You'd have to be stupid not to see the signals," said one topside Carter strategist. "The guy's telling everybody exactly what he's doing. He's running."

That a mere three-day incursion could make such a splash so long before Election Day owed an important part to the ennui of the Captial and its press corps after thirteen months of the Age of Jimmy. But it flowed as well from the widely held suspicion that Brown does mean to challenge Carter for the 1980 Democratic nomination, for keeps if Carter seems vulnerable, for practice if he does not. The President himself is said to share this view, after five beatings by Brown in the late 1976 primaries and a warning memo from pollster Patrick Caddell that Brown, not the GOP, is the "largest single threat" to his re-election. By two men was palpable. Ohio's Sen. Howard Metzenbaum, who lent the hotel-shy governor lodgings in Washington, thought it politic to notify the White House first - and Brown, who hadn't packed a tux anyway, was conspicuously missing from Carter's black-tie reception for the governors.

On Tour: He seemed otherwise to enjoy his trip, and not to care whatever discomfiture it might cause the President. He started at an AFL-CIO meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla., begging money to retire his 1976 primary debts and persuading an ambivalent George Meany that he must be running for *something* . He did the obligatory "Meet the Press," praising Carter faintly as a "fall guy" doing his best with hard problems. He lunched with Washington newsmen, keeping his medium cool even when the lead-off questioner asked him pointblank who he is. He stole the show from his nettled fellow governors by working such Presidential issues as taxes and ***energy*** - matters in which he and Carter are in contention. He talked trade with Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, lobbied Congress for a California state space satellite, and paid fifteen minutes' court to Senate Finance chairman Russell Long - an occasion spoiled a bit when Brown later inquired airily just what Long was chairman of.

If his resulting notices were pre-Presidential, Brown's short-term aims were at once more modest and more urgent: wining a second term in Sacramento as imposingly as possible. Despite some erosion in his ethereally high popularity ratings, he is in no danger in the Democratic primary and little in the general election. The Republicans are still trying to sort a credible candidate out of a crowded field including Evelle Younger, the bland state attorney general; Ed Davis, the hard-lining ex-police chief of Los Angeles; Pete Wilson the moderate mayor of San Diego, and Ken Maddy, a mediagenic young Fresno assemblyman whose dark-horse candidacy has lately struck some sparks. All run far behind Brown in the polls - so far that one group of party fat cats tried in vain to jolly a Californian-come-lately named Gerald Ford into the race.

Slippage: But for a man of Brown's ambitions, winning will not be enough. "We've got to win big," one senior strategist said. "It's premature to be thinking about 1980 when you could get your ass kicked in your own state." The normal corrosions of three years in office have heightened that possibility. Brown has at one time or another offended liberals by stinting on social programs and shredding mental-health budgets, big ***energy*** users by opposing ***nuclear*** power, businessmen by insisting on tough environmental requirements - and environmentalists for softening his small-is-better rhetoric to win back business. His press has taken on a tinge of acid, and some first flickers of trouble have shown up in home-state opinion soundings. "The bloom is off the rose for Jerry Brown," says polltaker Mervin Field.

Tidings like these have cheered the White House; the governor is unloved there - off-the-record epithets begin at "lightweight" and get worse - and staffers venture wishfully that he may simply flame out. Toward that end, they have made some small beginnings at using Carter's incumbency to poach on Brown's home turf. Carter himself invited California's old new-leftist Tom Hayden to the White House - a flattery reciprocated by a kindly Hayden article on Carter in The Los Angeles Times. Press secretary Jody Powell went out stumping for two endangered California Democratic congressmen, presumably in hopes of dividing their loyalties in the bargain. A $25 million youth-training grant that Los Angeles was counting on went to Seattle instead.

He Wants It: None of this will count for much, of course, if Carter fails as President. His best defense, says one of his 1976 handlers, is a good offense - "get into issues that are winnable, move a little more surefootedly, and pay a little bit more attention to politics." Brown's space-trippy style masks what one economic brain-truster, Michael Boskin, describes as a "risk-averse" political temperament; he might be willing to lose as seasoning for a serious run against Vice President Mondale, say, in 1984 - but not to look foolish in the process.

His strategy accordingly is to play it as it lays - to preserve his options, stay within striking range, and in the meantime enjoy the little *frissons* he sets off in the press and the White House simply by setting foot in Washington or announcing that he is "not locking any doors" on 1980 or beyond. "Of course he wants to be President," says one aide. "He has his mind set on it. We talk about it all the time." What he does not have, this staffer insists, is a fixed date or a Carter-style master plan. He is a practitioner of the politics of improvisation; the presumption in Sacramento as in Washington Iis that if the flow is going with Jerry Brown in 1980, Jerry Brown will go with the flow.

**Graphic**

Picture, Brown suits up for a plant stop: 'He's running', Stephanie Maze - San Francisco Chronicle
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the united states and britain yesterday jointly conducted an underground ***nuclear*** test at the nevada test site, according to reports from washington quoting the ***energy*** department announcement.

two ***nuclear*** warheads were set off within a two-hour interval.

this is the seventh joint united states-united kingdom ***nuclear*** test since the two countries signed an agreement in 1958 for cooperation on the use of atomic ***energy*** and mutual defense purposes.

british defence secretary fred mulley said at the lower house on april 6 that the test was needed to maintain the effectiveness of britains ***nuclear*** weapons.
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Special to The Globe and Mail

OTTAWA - Two dozen South Korean industrialists are in Canada for two

weeks, visiting government and private ***nuclear*** installations to determine

whether South Korean companies might start manufacturing ***nuclear***

components.

A spokesman for Atomic ***Energy*** of Canada Ltd., the federal ***nuclear***

development agency, said the businessmen have been studying both the

U.S.-style light water reactors and Canada's heavy water reactor

system.

Canada has already sold one Candu ***nuclear*** reactor to South Korea. It

is under construction. South Korea has previously indicated interest in

buying more reactors from Canada, if possible.

Canadian ***nuclear*** component manufacturers currently have a

technological edge over competitors in the heavy water Candu-style

reactor field. However, India has its own Candu technology; and Canada

has licenced an Italian group of companies to build Candu reactors and is

negotiating a licencing agreement with Romania.
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A California ***energy*** official said Tuesday the federal government is going ahead too rapidly in disposing of ***nuclear*** wastes without enough scientific information to know the possible hazards.

"What I am saying is, let's take our time and do it right," said Emilio E. Varanini III, a commissioner of the California ***Energy*** Resources Conservation and Development Commission.

Varanini said he conducted an exten sive study of the problem of what to with highly toxic radioactive ***nuclear*** material and found federal Department of ***Energy*** is going ahead with plans for deep underground storage facilities, no one knows what will happen to nuclearwaste after hundreds of years, he said in testimony before a Senate environment subcommittee.

The subcommittee headed by Sen. Gary Hart, D-Colo., is to consider various proposals for improving federal regulation of ***nuclear*** waste material.

"The DOE plan seems to reflect an eagerness to get a hole in the fround rather than considering what will constitute an adequate demonstration of safetty and devising the necessary experiments," he said.

He said before the government licenses undergrouns storage facilities, it should create a model storage facility with dummy containers and subject them to extreme heat and other stresses.

The containers could then be tested to find out what might actually happen if they had contained ***nuclear*** waste.

The Department of ***Energy*** is currently seeking one or more national depositories for commercial ***nuclear*** waste, to be opened by 1988.

Spent ***nuclear*** fuel rods are currently in temporary under water storage at ***nuclear*** power plants around the country, but space is growing short.

Varaninmi said while most federal officials are planning on placing the wastes in deep salt mines, there is no guarantee such caverns are safe.

"We may be in the wrong medium" he said. Granite caverns may be better, Varanini said.

Varanini said he fears the federal government will decide on one form of waste disposal costing tens of millions of dollars, then refuse to reverse it self when scientific evidence shows five or 10 years later that some other method is safer.

"we see it a an absolute Catch 22, an absolute policy dilemma," he said.
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The Carter administration will propose legislation next week to simplify the licensing of ***nuclear*** power plants, ***Energy*** Secretary James R. Schlesinger said Wednesday.

The legislation could cut the licensing process to six years, Schlesinger told the Senate ***Energy*** Committee. It now takes 10 to 12 years.

The changes would give states the prime responsibility for deciding environmental issues and for approving sites for ***nuclear*** plants, Schlesinger said.

And he said the ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission would be able to give speedy approval to proposed plants that conform to a "standardized" design.

"That should increase the certainty of licensing and reduce risks," Schlesinger said.

Testifying on the agency's $12.6 billion budget for next fiscal year, Schlesinger chided Congress for failing to reach final action yet on President Carter's ***energy*** program. "The clock continues to tick," Schlesinger said.

***Energy*** Committee Chairman Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., said Senate ***energy*** negotiators are close to resolving their own differences over natural-gas pricing, a dispute that has stalled action on the ***energy*** plan for months.

He said Senate negotiators have pretty much agreed on a formula that would gradually lift price controls from "new" natural gas by 1985 or possibly somewhat earlier.

The only remaining major hangup is in deciding how to define "new gas," Jackson said. He said a compromise might be ready in the next day or two.

Schlesinger predicted that House ***energy*** conferees would accept whatever compromise Senate negotiators offer.

"The House side is eager, waiting, panting for the Senate to come to a decision," he said.

The House passed President Carter's proposal to keep price controls on natural gas.The Senate voted to lift them after two years. The administration has indicated it would accept some form of phased deregulation in order to break the impasse.

Schlesinger also repeated an earlier claim that he will take administrative steps to allow U.S. producers to reap slightly higher profits on domestic oil - but only if Congress passes the other major part of the president's ***energy*** bill, a tax on U.S. crude oil that could raise the price of gasoline seven cents a gallon, with revenues rebated to consumers.

"That's blackmail," protested Sen. Dewey Bartlett, R-Okla.

Schlesinger replied that blackmail was too strong a word. "It's an inducement for Congress to act," he said.
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Workers without security clearance have access to potential ***nuclear*** weapons fuel in some government-regulated plants, a member of the ***Nuclear*** Regulatory Commission said Thursday.

NRC Commissioner Victor Gilinsky also told the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee that he thought there was no reasonable likelihood an employee could abscond with enough fuel to make a ***nuclear*** bomb.

Gilinsky testified as the committee continued hearings on the danger of terrorists obtaining ***nuclear*** arms.

Sen. John Glenn, D-Ohio, chairman of a subcommittee on ***nuclear*** proliferation, said Gilinsky's testimony disclosed "a big gap in our security that we are going to have to fill in."

Spokesmen for the Defense and ***Energy*** departments testified that they do have security clearance requirements for employees in plants under their jurisdiction.

Zilinski said the NRC has no such requirements. He said most of the weapons-grade fuel in NRC-regulated facilities is intended as fuel for naval reactors, and the employees are consequently subject to the Defense Department clearance requirements.

But he said no such requirements apply to the remaining highly enriched uranium, less than 5 percent of the total, that is intended as fuel for test and research reactors. Nor, he said, do the rules apply to several hundred kilograms of plutonium in commercial plants, which is used for research and development.

"Do you mean there are employees outside Department of Defense control working at these facilities, and these people have potential access to plutonium and highly enriched uranium," Glenn asked.

"Yes," Gilinsky replied.

"Incredible," Glenn said.

Plutonium and highly enriched uranium are usable in the manufacture of ***nuclear*** bombs and other weapons.

Gilinsky said the material is guarded and the NRC has proposed new rules to strengthen security because "we have decided that we will want more protection in the future than we have been satisfied with in the past."

Sen. John Danforth, R-Mo., asked a series of questions about what might happen if he got a job in one of the plants.

"Is there a reasonable likelihood that I could abscond with enough to make a weapon," he asked.

"I don't think so," Gilinsky replied.

Thomas J. O'Brien, director of security plans and programs for the Defense Department, testified that no ***nuclear*** weapon has ever been stolen from the department and that it is tightening security to see that this doesn't happen in the future.

"There are occasional situations where someone wanders nearby and these events are reported and reacted to, but none has proved to be a serious threat to ***nuclear*** weapons," O'Brien said.

Donald M. Kerr, acting assistant secretary of ***energy*** for defense programs, said there had been "no serious attempts to illicitly acquire" strategic ***nuclear*** materials or weapons under ***Energy*** Department control.
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Nobel Prize-winning physicist Burton Richter said Tuesday that almost limitless ***energy*** from ***nuclear*** fusion could be harnessed 10 or 15 years faster if the government began immediate work on all necessary research instead of performing it step by step.

Addressing the Fifth ***Energy*** Technology Conference here, Richter said the government's present long-range research schedule is "kind of slow" and probably too poorly funded to meet even its own distant deadlines.

***Nuclear*** fusion is the joining of hydrogen nuclei to form heliun, releasing enormous amounts of excess ***energy***; it is the reaction that powers the sun and the hydrogen bomb.

Since hydrogen is plentiful on earth as a constituent of water, scientists hope they can learn to tame the ***energy*** release of the fusion reaction and tap an almost unlimited source of power.

Fusion is also attractive because its hydrogen fuel is not naturally radioactive, as are the uranium and plutonium that power today's ***nuclear*** power plants.

But fusion power has a long way to go and scientists are not even sure they can control it well enough to produce more usable ***energy*** than it takes to set off a reaction in the first place.

Richter said the ***Energy*** Research and Development Administration, now absorbed into the Department of ***Energy***, had planned a long schedule for fusion development.

He said ERDA had sought first to prove the reaction could be controlled and could "break even" on ***energy*** output and then, about 1935, decide how to develop a workable powerplant, which might not be built until around 2005.

"I think that schedule is hind of slow," Richter said. "If we are serious about fusion, I think we could do the research in parallel," meaning that research on basic physics, design of reaction containers and possible power systems could proceed simultaneously.

Richter said he thought simultaneous development of all of the technical aspects of fusion power "could pull 10 to 15 years off that time schedule."

Richter also said "I have about the 1935 date" target for selecting a pathway to fusion power.

"The basic research is not now funded at a suitable budget level to name a rational choice by 1935," he said.

Large amounts of ***energy*** must be applied to hydrogen to start its fusion reaction, and current research has concentrated mainly on pumping in that ***energy*** through magnetic fields or by laser light.

Richter suggested, however, that the ***energy*** could be applied by bombarding the hydrogen target-pellet with charged, heavy atoms such as gold, with very high force.

He said the cost of gold would be no obstacle because the process would not require very much of it. About 2.5 grams of gold could be enough to run a fusion reaction for a year, he said.
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Exxon Corporation said Monday that nations around the world are beginning a slow shift away from oil and natural gas as ***energy*** sources but will still need increasing oil supplies from the Middle East at least into the 1990s.

Exxon officials issued the giant ***energy*** company's lates testimates of the U.S. and world ***energy*** outlook, emphasizing that these are not firm predictions but only their best guesses based on today's conditions.

James W. Hanson, Exxon's chief economist, and W. W. Madden, coordinator of strategic planning for U.S. operations, said they expect economic growth in the nation and the world to proceed more slowly in the future than in the past.

This will result in slower growth of ***energy*** demand, they said, while conservation will cut ***energy*** use still further.

Hanson said that by 1990, total world ***energy*** demand could be some 20 percent lower than it might otherwise be if past trends simply continued.

Nonetheless, Madden said U.S. ***energy*** demand will continue to grow while its petroleum production cannot entirely keep pace, so that imports which now provide about 43 percent of U.S. oil supply will have to provide about 51 percent by 1990, in spite of ***energy*** conservation.

The U.S. natural gas supply, he said, would continue to decline but new discovieries may tend to slow the slippage and allow a production rate in the late 1990s of around 13 trillion cubic feet a year, compared with about 20 trillion now.

Madden's estimates showed the United States turning gradually away from gas and oil to coal and ***nuclear*** power.

He estimated that oil's share of the U.S. ***energy*** supply would slip from around 48 percent now to about 43 per cent by 1990; natural gas would plunge from 27 percent to 17 percent: and hydroelectric, geothermal and solar ***energy*** would barely hold their own, slipping perhaps from around 4 percent to about 3 percent.

But coal's contribution would increase from 18 to 27 percent of the nation's total ***energy***, Madden estimated, while ***nuclear*** would climb from 3 percent to 10 percent.

Hanson's analysis of non-Communist world ***energy*** supplies showed a similar pattern of gradual shifting from oil and natural gas to coal and ***nuclear*** power, with a small injection of solar ***energy*** and synthetic fuels.

Hanson and Madden said their estimates assumed that world oil prices would remain stabilized, rising only at the same pace as monetary inflation, and they did not try to guess at future political actions or their impacts, such as the still-pending passage of U.S. ***energy*** legislation or future production decsions by the foreign oil-exporting nations.
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President Carter begins his third official overseas trip Tuesday, leaving the White House shortly after dawn for a seven-day journey to Latin America and Africa.

His first stop is Caracas, Venezuela, for consultations with President Carlos Andres Perez on ***energy***, human rights, ***nuclear*** non-proliferation, and Latin American political issues.

He planned to fly on Wednesday to Brazil. Later in the week he will cross the Atlantic Ocean to begin the first state visit by a U.S. president to sub-Saharan Africa, visiting Nigeria and Liberia.

The trip is the second half of the grand tour of the third world that he planned for late last year. That journey was broken into two sections to allow the president to remain in Washington while Congress worked on ***energy*** legislation.

"In the area of human rights and ***nuclear*** non-proliferation, Venezuela has often been in the front of our policies and has given us wise and useful counsel on the next steps that we can take," an administration official said, predicting that those issues would be central in the talks between Carter and Perez.

Venezuela sends the United States one million barrels of crude and refined oil eacy day, placing it behind Saudi Arabia and Nigeria. The supply has been reliable and, during the 1973-74 oil embargo, Venezuela increased its exports to the United States.

Joint ***energy*** cooperation, and the U.S. desire to see oil prices held down, are likely topics, U.S. officials said.

On his first overseas trip in office, Carter visited England and Switzerland last May. His second trip took him to Poland, Iran, India, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, France and Belgium in December and January.
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The chief of the International ***Energy*** Agency said today failure of the U.S. Congress to enact a strong ***energy*** conservation plan could undermine international efforts to stave off another oil crisis.

Dr. Ulf Lantzke, a West German, told the Foreign Correspondents Club of Japan the United States is importing far too much oil, mostly because of a decrease in domestic production.

"Alaskan and Mexican oil will not result in a substantial decrease in imports," he said.

The IEA chief said reductions in America's atomic ***energy*** program will force the nation to import an additional 2 million barrels a day of oil from the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. He warned that world demand for oil by 1985 will top 42 million barrles a day, while OPEC production will be between 36 and 40 million barrels.

Unless the 19 IEA members, including the United States, keep imports to less than 26 million barrels a day, price increases will become inevitable, he said.

He emphasized the importance of the United States in any concerted world ***energy*** policy, pointing out that America accounts for half the petroleum demand generated by all 19 IAE members.

Lantzke is here for a meeting Wednesday and Thursday of his agency's governing board to discuss world coal supplies. But he said coal gasification and liquefaction programs could not be expanded to meet a sudden oil shortage.

Natural gas is the only realistic alternative to oil for a long time to come, he said.

"It is unrealistic to think that solar, ***nuclear*** or geothermal ***energy*** combined will account for more than 3 to 5 percent of the world's sources of ***energy*** by the year 2000," he declared.

The agency was established in November 1974 by the oil-consuming industrial nations to coordinate plans for meeting future price rises and embargos by OPEC.
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Businesses across the country are being sent phony bills for services never rendered and often receive high-pressure telephone calls demanding payment, postal officials said Tuesday.

The U.S. Postal Service endorsed a bill by Sen. John Glenn, D-Ohio, allowing it to stop an operator's mail after proving that he used the mail to get money through misrepresentation.

Kenneth Fletcher, chief postal inspector for the western states, told a subcommittee hearing chaired by Glenn, that in a recent 2 1/2-year period, the Postal Service received more than 50,000 complaints about false billings.

"Generally, the basic premises of these schemes is that a significant percentage of the businesses to which the phony bills are sent will not take the time to verify the existence of a bona fide obligation, particularly if the amount is relatively small," Fletcher said.

A recent variation to this scheme is the use of telephone solicitations together with the phony bill Fletcher told the Governmental Affairs subcommittee on ***energy***, ***nuclear*** proliferation and federal services.

This combined approach "has sharply increased the take for promoters," Glenn said.

Fletcher said the Postal Service has arrested about 60 people on mail fraud charges with many of the arrests on the West Coast. However, he said the additional enforcement tools in the Glenn bill would help put the operators out of business.

Allen Zack, a spokesman for the AFL-CIO, also endorsed the bill, saying some operators have posed as representatives of labor unions to try to sell ads in non-existent directories of union locals.

From complaints made to the AFL-CIO he said the pattern seems to be for a threatening telephone call to be made to a businessman about the supposed debt.

Say no and you're liable to be asked if you'd like 'a picketlite' around your business or for 'some organizers' to visit your employees," Zack testified.

Douglas Wiegand, an official of a trade association of clothing store owners, said some of the phony bills are paid inadvertently by "busy or uninformed personnel,"

"There appeared to be no question that the practice of sending phony bills is widespread," Wiegand said?
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