

## **Congressional Calendar** by Barbara Dreyfuss and Susan Kokinda

### **Congressional hearings into organized crime scheduled**

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, chaired by Senator Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) will initiate an investigation into organized crime and its links to international narcotics trafficking, organized labor and political corruption. The investigation, the first of its kind since the infamous McClellan hearings in the early 1960s, could last as long as five years according to the subcommittee. If the political networks which have run the recent Abscam and Brilab scandals are allowed to run the subcommittee's investigation, the country could be in for a five year gutting of the Democratic Party machine and its labor base.

While there are some indications that Senator Nunn could conduct a serious investigation of international narcotics trafficking and its financial underpinnings, it seems more likely that the subcommittee will follow the proclivities of its chief counsel, Marty Steinberg, and go for attention-grabbing investigations into labor racketeering and political corruption. That has been Steinberg's background as a member of the Organized Crime Strike Forces in Miami, Fla. and Buffalo, New York. Two unions in particular have already been mentioned as possible targets of a new "McClellan-style investigation"—the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) and the Laborers International Union (LIU).

In fact, the subcommittee is now claiming credit for having initiated the recently revealed "Brilab" FBI undercover operation with its several year old investigation into the activities of the Teamsters' central states pension fund and insurance

swindler Joe Hauser. Hauser was picked up by the FBI and used as bait in the set-up of former Louisiana governor Edwin Edwards, Sen. Howard Cannon (D-Nev.), and the majority leader of the Texas State House of Representatives.

### **Senators introduce omnibus intelligence reform**

The National Intelligence Act of 1980 was introduced into the Senate on Feb. 8, 1980 by Senators Walter Huddleston (D-Ky.) and Charles Matthias (R-Md.), both senior members of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. The bill differs substantially from other recently introduced bills which make limited changes in the CIA's reporting requirements to Congress and by making the revelation of another CIA agent's identity a crime. While the Huddleston-Matthias bill incorporates those reforms, it is much more sweeping, standing instead as an actual comprehensive "charter" for the CIA and other intelligence agencies.

Perhaps the most dangerous part of the bill is the provision allowing for "black bag" jobs against Americans at home and abroad, on orders from the President, following approval of such covert actions by a "secret court." Americans abroad can be targeted merely because the President may deem information concerning them "vital to national interests."

As far-reaching as the bill is, the administration is not yet supporting it because it does not go far enough on the issue of executive branch carte blanche in the con-

ducting of covert operations. While the Senate Intelligence Committee still demands prior notification of covert actions in all but the most extreme emergencies, the administration wants instead "timely notification." "Timely notification" means that the administration can wait until after the initiation or even completion of covert action before notifying the Congress.

Huddleston noted that he had "some doubts" about the provision governing Americans overseas, "because it permits the government to collect information by intrusive means on innocent Americans, but the executive branch has consistently maintained that this authority is needed." He further noted that the ability to keep covert operations in line was potentially very much dependent on whether the Senate version of prior notification holds sway or whether the administration gets "timely notification."

The House is expected to wait for Senate passage of the bill and then decide how best to proceed. In the meantime, both the House Intelligence Committee and the House

Foreign Affairs Committee are holding a series of hearings on intelligence collection and analysis in general, pursuant to later action on the Huddleston bill or on some of the less sweeping reforms.

### **Behind the scenes on the trucking deregulation issue**

The American Trucking Association was caught completely unawares by Howard Cannon's (D-Nev.) introduction of the Motor Carriers Reform Act in early February. The ATA had been working

behind the scenes with Cannon and the Senate Commerce Committee staff to develop legislation to curb Interstate Commerce Commission attempts to deregulate the industry by administrative fiat. The ICC, since the addition of three proderegulation commissioners last July, has been defying its legislative mandate to regulate the industry.

The ATA and probably the Teamsters had expected Cannon to introduce a bill which would curb the administrative excesses of the ICC while making some minor changes and cleaning out some bureaucratic red tape in the trucking industry. But Cannon introduced legislation which will in effect deregulate the industry. The ATA does not want to be put into a position of opposing the legislation because it fears that will give the ICC a free hand. Instead it will attempt to amend the bill in committee, a prospect which observers note will be very difficult.

Hearings on the bill are scheduled for Feb. 25-27 in the Senate Commerce Committee and mark up is expected sometime in March.

## **C**riminal Code Reform Bill ready for action in Senate

The Criminal Code Reform Bill, better known by its name in previous Congresses, S-1, is ready for floor action in the Senate and could be brought up as soon as March, according to staff aides. The bill will be managed by its prime sponsor, Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and floor action is hinging on Kennedy's schedule. The Criminal Code Reform Bill, in a somewhat

different version, passed the Senate last year, but was defeated in the House because of major objections that the bill seriously endangered the freedom of Americans in many areas.

The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice is in the process of marking up the bill and subcommittee staffers report that the bill could be ready for full committee consideration as early as next month. There are already significant and numerous differences between the bill as marked up in the Senate and as it stands in the House Judiciary Subcommittee. Some of

- The Senate bill does not allow for parole, while the House Subcommittee bill does;
- The Senate bill does not codify defenses, leaving it up to the court to do so, while the House Subcommittee bill does codify defenses;
- The Senate bill allows for the defendant and the government to appeal sentences while the House Subcommittee bill allows only for the defendant to appeal the sentence.

## **H**ouse debates naval budget

Navy Secretary Hidalgo told a hearing to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Strategic and Critical Materials that if the budget for the Navy as proposed by Defense Secretary Harold Brown is approved as it stands, then the U.S. would have 39 fewer combat ships after five years than we have today. Hidalgo's Feb. 13 testimony comes in the context

of a major fight that has broken out over the naval budget. The Congressional Budget Office issued a report in early February stating that it was not necessary to have a major increase in naval fighting capacity. It was only necessary to finance a naval capacity to show the American flag worldwide. Sources at the House Armed Services Committee say that most of the committee are opposed to this effort by the Congressional Budget Office to drastically curtail the Navy's fighting capacity, and to the Carter administration's efforts to reduce naval strength.

A source close to the thinking of the committee made the following assessment of the parameters of the debate: "The House and Senate Armed Services Committees disagree with the Congressional Budget Office. I guarantee that the Armed Services Committees will add money to the defense budgets and stick to it. I am surprised at the National Security Council. The NSC and the Budget Office are Rand strategists and central front strategists, you know. They believe that NATO and the Warsaw Pact are the key and have no understanding of maritime strategy.

"The committee is planning a program for the next 20 years with an objective to have 90-100 attack nuclear subs by 1984, to put cruise missiles to sea, and to have 110 frigates. We want to keep the number of destroyers at 108-112. The budget as proposed was \$6.1 billion and we want to increase it to \$7-\$8 billion.

"We don't pay any attention to the Congressional Budget Office. We are talking about a Navy that can defeat and sink the Soviet Navy and not just show the flag."