
Interview

Senator Hatch talks about Brilab approach

The following is Part Two of Barbara Dreyfuss's exclusive interview with Sen. Orrin Hatch, the Utah Republican who chairs the Senate Labor Committee. Part One appeared in last week's issue of EIR.

EIR: The *New York Times* has taken the liberty of putting some words into your mouth and several weeks ago said that one of your main focuses will be on investigating corruption in the labor unions, mentioning the International Longshoremens's Association and the Teamsters. We understand that you will be interested in pursuing things other than continuing what we see as the Carter administration, the Carter Justice Department's witch-hunt against labor.

Sen. Hatch: I do not want a witch-hunt, but what I do want, and I think it's unfair for any reporter to misquote me because I have said that I think we ought to look into business-union corruption which rips off our blue-collar workers in America who are paying dues or into retirement programs. I frankly think any union leader worth his salt would want to get in and help us get rid of any corruption that exists. I think any business leader would want to do the same. I think we are on the verge of doing that.

What I am not interested in is having a great name, publicity, a set of hearings that maligns or hurts peoples' reputations. There's no question that we know there's some things wrong with business-union relations, that are illegal and some of them are criminal. Now, unlike some past investigations, I want to approach it in as reasonable and decent a manner as we can. Try and clear it up and get rid of the criminal elements.

But let's face it, there are four major unions that have been accused, that have been charged with being influenced by the criminal element. You know as well as I they are the ILA, Teamsters, Hotel and Restaurant, and Laborers unions. Now, whether it's true or not I don't know. But if it is true, we ought to root out crime. I think that's part of our committee's responsibility. But I don't think we should root it out unless it exists. It takes two to tango. Generally, where you have a criminal influence in



the union, you have it in the businesses as well.

EIR: Hearings on Abscam in Judge Pratt's courtroom in Brooklyn, N.Y. have drawn into question the entire legality of the FBI activities, the Organized Crime Strike Force and the way the Federal Witness Protection Program operates.

Sen. Hatch: I don't like the Abscam-type investigations. I personally feel that law-enforcement officials should never entice people to break the law.

On the other hand, if there is corruption, I think we should find it and root it out; that's part of our responsibility, and I think union leaders would want to assist us in rooting out corruption.

EIR: Will you look into the methods used by the Carter Justice Department in making their allegations against the unions?

Sen. Hatch: I think, by necessity, that would be part of the hearings, as there would be people complaining about the methods. I'm not certain it's our committee's responsibility. But I don't want to have false methods used to prove crime. We can do things in a legitimate constitutional way in this country, and to the extent we can do that, we ought to do that.

I'll tell you one thing I am interested in, and I think the unions and I agree on, among others, and that is total examination of sexual discrimination in the workplace. Why shouldn't a woman who performs equal work get equal pay for that? Why should they get only 59 cents compared to a male dollar?

And what about other forms of sexual discrimination—should they continue to exist? The answer is no. And we're going to get to the bottom of it. That's already one thing we've started hearings on.

There's another thing the unions and I are close on, closely identified with: I applaud the AFL-CIO's international labor relations program. I think they have done some tremendous service to this country and I have put at least three speeches into the *Congressional Record* on precisely that subject.

I have indicated to Lane Kirkland that I'll be supporting him at the ILO [International Labor Organization], and I'll probably be supporting him at the Madrid conference [Conference on European Security and Cooperation], where I will be a member of the commission.

So there are two very good areas where we can help.

I've also tried to get them to help me come up with ideas that will work in the youth employment area. They don't like our youth wage differential, so I suggested that they look at our Job Opportunities Bonus Bill, which may fit their needs and at the same time provide jobs for young people.

The youth differential does make clear that the minimum wage is not a sacred concept, by allowing employers to pay 75 percent of minimum wages during the first six-month training period. We think that would stimulate business, and particularly the small-business sector, in providing more jobs. The unions don't like it because they consider it an attack on their sacred minimum wage concept—I don't mean sacred sarcastically.

So what I've done is come up with the Job Opportunities Bonus Bill, which would give job opportunity bonuses of essentially the welfare money we'd give to that unemployed person anyway, to any business that employs that person on a 3-, 6-, 9-, 12-month basis, on a check-release basis after training, a formal training period where they pay the minimum wage or better. We think it has potential. We're not quite sure what the economic downside is, so we're still in the process of putting it together. That may be an alternative the unions may like, and another way we can work together.

It would put perpetually unemployed to work and instead of giving them welfare, we would pay the small businessman so he could employ them, put them to work, and gradually we would wean them off welfare after two or three years, so they'd be productive citizens who work every day and have the self-esteem that comes from working.

EIR: Are there other areas your committee will get into?

Sen. Hatch: Well, as you know, we will be very involved in health, education, handicapped matters, alcohol and drug abuse, employment and poverty—every one of those subcommittees has meaning. We have a new family and human resources committee which I think is going to be very important.

A lot of those aren't related directly to the labor movement . . . for example, on the health subcommittee, which I have brought into the full committee, I want to have a home health-care bill which will allow the aged to stay in their homes, where they feel comfortable and more secure, rather than forcing them to be institutionalized under Medicare. We think it would save taxpayers' money, and at the same time be more humane than we presently are.

Interview

Rep. Mottl on the anti-Volcker fight

The following is an interview by Anita Gallagher of the National Democratic Policy Committee with Rep. Ronald Mottl, a Parma, Ohio Democrat. Mottl is a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, and the Veterans Affairs Committee. He is cochairman and founder of the Congressional Suburban Caucus. On Feb. 18, Rep. Mottl introduced House Concurrent Resolution 44.

Q: What is your House Concurrent Resolution 44?

Rep. Mottl: Basically, it calls upon the Federal Reserve to re-examine its policies and to immediately lower interest rates to under 10 percent. In the resolution, it is implied that the interest rates have devastated two major industries in the United States that affect so many of the American people. First is the housing and construction industry, which is, in effect, at a virtual standstill, and the second is the automobile industry. . . . We hope that the Reagan administration will immediately change its policy, and I have urged Reagan on several occasions to ask Volcker to resign and put his own man in. . . .

Q: President Carter at one point attributed his election defeat to the policies pursued by Volcker and the Federal Reserve. In that light, how do you evaluate President Reagan's economic message of Feb. 18?

Rep. Mottl: I agreed with three-quarters of President Reagan's policies. The one-quarter that I didn't agree with was that the Federal Reserve was sacrosanct; that it's an independent agency, and that you can't do anything about it. That's the type of attitude that we have had in the past that has hurt our country. I think what we have to have is the President and a Congress that will say to the Federal Reserve, if they are not doing their job for the country, "Listen, let's change your policies, or change the personnel running the Federal Reserve. Or let's scrap the Federal Reserve altogether, and start a new system."

Q: At the governors' conference Feb. 23, Governor Rhodes of Ohio questioned Norman Ture from the administration extensively about the fact that their tax