

## Congressional Calendar by Barbara Dreyfuss and Susan Kokinda

### Administration pulling plug on CIA charter?

CIA Director Stansfield Turner stunned the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on Feb. 21 when he voiced strong opposition to more than a half-dozen sections of the National Intelligence Reform Act of 1980, and then said that the administration has been holding back more information from congressional intelligence committees than its members had previously suspected.

Turner's testimony visibly surprised committee chairman Birch Bayh (D-Ind) and the bill's author, Senator Walter Huddleston (D-Ky) who had both just finished saying that they thought differences with the administration had been narrowed down to just two points and that compromise was easily reachable. Huddleston, who has spent several years drafting the bill, which would give the CIA a legislative charter for the first time, said that the hardened administration position could jeopardize the entire measure. While the number of points of disagreement was unexpected, the central point of dispute remains the issue of prior notification to the Congress of all significant intelligence undertakings. The proposed charter would incorporate the "advance notification" requirement embodied in Senate Resolution 400, but Turner stated that, while in large part, he had had no trouble in complying with that resolution, he did not want it codified into force of law. Turner then told the committee members that they were not correct in their assumption that the administration had been notifying them in advance of

all covert actions and other undertakings of significance, and the administration instead wants a policy of "timely" or after-the-fact notification of the congressional committee. Such a policy would in fact place the CIA outside of effective congressional oversight.

While Turner tangled with Bayh, Huddleston and Sen. Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill.) over the issue of congressional notification, another faction on the committee took a very different posture. Led by Senator Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) a hard-line grouping went on record opposing any charter whatsoever for the CIA. Jackson, citing the British Intelligence Service as a model, declared "I have deep reservations about any kind of charter which tries to proscribe do's and don't's for the agency." Jackson was backed up by Malcom Wallop (R-Wyo.) and to a lesser degree John Chafee (R-R.I.), who is a long-time associate of Stansfield Turner. Capitol Hill observers noted that the end result of the administration's intransigence on the "prior notification" issue may be, in fact, no charter at all—precisely the position of Jackson and his allies.

### Fusion bill has 130 cosponsors

The Fusion Energy Research and Development Act, H.R. 6370, now has 130 cosponsors in the House of Representatives. Introduced by Rep. Mike McCormack (D-Wash.), chairman of the Sub-

committee on Energy Research and Production of the House Science and Technology Committee, the bill has an "Apollo-mission" orientation, mandating the production of energy from a commercial fusion reactor before the end of the 20th century, and would authorize as much as \$20 billion to achieve that mission. The legislation gets its first hearing before a congressional subcommittee on March 4, when McCormack's subcommittee takes up the 1981 Department of Energy authorization. H.R. 6370 calls for an increase in the 1981 fusion budget of \$100,000,000 over the administration request, and the March 4 hearing is being looked to as a litmus test in terms of both Congressional support and administration reaction.

House Minority Leader John Rhodes, a long-time proponent of an Apollo-style fusion program and a cosponsor of H.R. 6370, underlined his support for the bill in a statement in the February 21, 1980 Congressional Record. Rhodes noted that while one major scientific breakthrough is often looked to as the rationale for program funding increases, the fusion program has scored quiet, consistent breakthroughs which now necessitate funding for an engineering test facility. H.R. 6370 mandates funding for such a facility.

H.R. 6370 still lacks a sponsor on the Senate side, although GOP Presidential candidate Senator Howard Baker (R-Tenn.) is reportedly interested. Capitol Hill observers note that the backing of Senator Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Energy Committee, is crucial to the bill's success in

the Senate, and report that efforts are underway among political and scientific layers in Washington state to convince Jackson to introduce the bill. Four Washington state legislators have introduced a memorial urging the state to go on record supporting H.R.6370

## Senate & House committees hold hearings on trucking deregulation

Hearings were held in the Senate Commerce Committee and the House Public Works and Transportation Committee during the last two weeks in February on S. 2245, the Motor Carrier Reform Act, and its companion House version. Both bills are dangerous first steps toward the expensive and unsafe policy of deregulation of the trucking industry.

While testimony from major groups opposing the bill or calling for substantial modifications of it such as the Teamsters and the American Trucking Association, respectively, have yet to be heard, it appears clear that the prevailing forces on the committee will be in favor of further deregulation. Senate Commerce Committee chairman Howard Cannon (D-Nev.), while trying to hold a middle line, is under the shadow of one of the FBI's "Brilab" scandals for allegedly getting favors from the Teamsters. He is therefore expected to "prove" that he is not beholden to the Teamsters and will bend further in the direction of deregulation.

Interstate Commerce Commis-

sion Chairman Darius Gaskins, Jr. said he was "personally disappointed" that the legislation does not go further toward deregulation. Transportation Secretary Neil Goldschmidt said that the administration would like to toughen the bill further and would be "extremely disappointed" to see the deregulation thrust of the bill weakened. And the ranking Republican on the committee, Bob Packwood (R-Ore.), has also stated that he sees S. 2245 as just the first step toward deregulation.

## Calls for austerity gain momentum on hill

Testifying before the Senate Banking Committee on Feb. 25, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul A. Volcker declared war on the productive underpinnings of the U.S. economy, and defended the actions of speculators in international markets. Reaffirming that the Federal Reserve Board's high interest rates and tight money policy will continue unabated, Volcker called for brutal austerity measures to be imposed against wages and cost-of-living increases for those on fixed incomes. At the same time, he went on record saying "We cannot simply rail at 'speculators' in foreign exchange, or gold, or commodity markets if our own policies seem to justify their pessimism about the future course of inflation."

In addition to high interest rates and budget cutting, Volcker proposed the following:

- Further curtail our dependence on foreign energy, "even at the expense of increased costs in the short run,"
- Deregulation of certain industries,
- Curtail cost-of-living increases, including social security,
- "Resist pressures to protect industries from foreign competition, particularly those industries with relatively high wage structures and wage settlements."

In a related development, 43 senators introduced a resolution on Feb. 27 to seize the initiative in fighting inflation by slashing federal spending. The bipartisan group, led by Sen. William Roth (R-Del.), sought to force the Senate to cut some \$26 billion from Carter's \$616 billion fiscal 1981 budget by limiting expenditures to 21 percent of the Gross National Product. That would result in a \$1-\$10 billion budget surplus next year, as opposed to the \$15.8 billion deficit proposed by the President. Roth has vowed to filibuster if necessary to get a vote on the spending ceiling. "We cannot have business as usual," he said.

Supporters of the spending limitation plan, who range on the political spectrum from liberal Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wisc.) to most of the "Reagan" Republicans, foolishly view congressional budget slashing as the necessary complement to Volcker's high interest and tight money policies. They feel that Volcker has done all he can, and that the Fed's failure to thus far curb inflation with high interest rates is a result of the federal budget deficit.