

plan almost identical to yours.

Wilkowski: That's right. My bill will plug right into the Humphrey-Javits legislation. The Carter Administration is solidly behind a youth employment program. My bill is a step in that direction. I have met several times while in Washington recently with Sens. Javits and Humphrey and their aides. They think the bill is great and were a big help to me. I guess my bill is very helpful to them.

Q: I understand that Gov. Rhodes vetoed the bill last November. Why was that?

Wilkowski: I'll be damned if I know. We have a wierdo governor. Here I was in his office only the day before he vetoed it and he tells me that he was going to sign it. I can't figure this wimp out. I introduced the bill last fall and it overwhelmingly passed the House. Then it passes the Senate by 32 or 33 to 1. It goes to the Governor's desk. He holds it for more than a week and he vetoes it. We need 60 votes in the House to override. The governor calls his troops into line and we can get only 59 votes, so the override fails. Well, now we have a veto-proof legislature. My bill will pass the Senate and the Governor can do whatever the hell he pleases with it. Then we override. He is saying that he would probably sign the bill — but who the hell knows with him. If his head is screwed on right he will. But I don't know.

Q: Is there any opposition to the bill? What about the labor movement?

Wilkowski: Let's just say the labor movement is not against it. Why should they be? It gives out-of-work kids jobs in a healthy environment. About the only people who are against it is the American Labor Party. They put up signs all over the state saying that I wanted to set up concentration camps—"Send Your Kid to a real summer camp, not a CCC concentration camp." They are a strange bunch. They don't take baths and they look scraggly, like bums. They came to hearings I held in Toledo and tried to break it up. But they look so scraggly and don't use shampoo, that they actually help me. Ha, ha. They help. Why, the fact that these people are against it will make many Republicans vote for it. They lobby a lot here in Columbus. Here, their people dress decently.

I'm surprised that they didn't do anything in the House. Maybe we caught them off guard, the bill came to the floor after only 1 hour of hearings. After all, it was the same as the one from the last session. I'm sure that they will be around, unbathed, for the Senate debate. I'm not afraid of them, not in the least.

Q: How many jobs will the program create?

Wilkowski: It's hard to say. Several thousand. But it is really dependent on the passage of Humphrey-Javits. In the 1930s, CCC programs put 2 million people to work. I think that we could have about 800,000 for starters here.

Q: Will these programs have any relationship to the energy crisis?

Wilkowski: Again that is tricky. We're studying it. This strip-mining reclamation is an indirect connection. Schlesinger, after all, said that he favored strip-mining regulation to incorporate environmental complaints. But I'm studying more direct possibilities, but you'll have to wait for the answer on that one until Carter unveils his program.

I will tell you that I am working now on some legislation that I regard as every bit as important as the CCC bill — if not more important. This involves state funding of an effort to construct large numbers of coal gasification plants. We have a lot of high sulfur coal in the state that environmental legislation prevents us from using. We can gasify it and use it to power our utilities instead of natural gas. (Sen. Jennings Randolph of West Virginia has legislation in Congress calling for this — ed.) I don't know why the hell we don't push coal gasification. Every time I bring it up the Public Utilities Commission says I'm nuts. Well I'm not nuts. The Germans have used it, and they have new processes which no one wants even to look at. The Governor is another problem. He has this group, Rhodes raiders. First he went to Quebec to get gas. Now he goes to Houston. Well why does he have to go to all these places? We have the coal right here in the state needed to produce gas. He has an interest in Wimpy's hamburgers. Maybe he's taking these trips to set up new franchises. I don't think the Governor has the slightest idea what the energy crisis is all about. He's a little crazy.

Senate Conservatives Position Themselves On Key Committees

At the closed door meetings of the Democratic and Republican Senate Policy Committees this week where permanent Senate committee assignments were finalized, conservative, growth-oriented Senators successfully retained contested chairmanships of key committees while strengthening their overall position on several important committees. The Senate conservatives fought hard to increase their weight on the pivotal Finance, Commerce, and Armed Services Committees, whose powers overlap the control over military, economic and foreign policy exercised by the Banking, Energy, and Foreign Relations Committees, all dominated by Wall Street allies. They are also working

behind the scenes to remove jurisdiction over nuclear energy from the Energy subcommittee of administration ally Frank Church (D-Idaho), and place it in a separate committee.

If they make use of the full constitutional powers of the committees they dominate, conservatives are in a position to challenge the Administration on every major foreign policy, military and economic question.

The Democratic Policy Committee voted to keep conservatives, many of them southern-based, as chairmen of seven important committees. These are:

Agriculture: Senator Herman Talmadge (Georgia)

Appropriations: Senator John McClellan (Arkansas)

Armed Services: Senator John Stennis (Mississippi)
Finance: Senator Russell Long (Louisiana)
Foreign Relations: Senator John Sparkman
(Alabama)
Rules: Senator Howard Cannon (Nevada)
Judiciary: Senator James O. Eastland (Mississippi)

The most hotly contested chairmanship post was the Finance Committee. Russell Long retained his chairmanship by a vote of 42 to 6 despite a vigorous lobbying effort and series of watergating attacks by Common Cause. Majority leader Robert Byrd, in a move to force those administration allies who opposed Long's reelection to the Finance post to publicly declare themselves, called for an unusual roll call vote of all Democrats on the question, and Long was overwhelmingly re-elected.

The decision of the Republican Policy Committee to appoint three conservatives to the Judiciary Committee allowed GOP conservatives to secure the minority leadership of the committee while at the same time maintaining their strong position on the Armed Services Committee. The Policy Committee placed Senators

Hatch (Utah), Wallop (Wyoming), and Laxalt (Nevada) on the Judiciary Committee, giving conservatives the clout to block Senator Mathias' (Maryland) from becoming the committee's minority leader. Strom Thurmond (S.C.) took over as ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, yielding his minority leadership position on the Armed Services Committee to his Texas ally John Tower. At the same time, Arizona's Barry Goldwater was elected minority leader of the Senate Intelligence Committee, the base of last year's Wall Street attack on traditionalist layers in the intelligence community.

Mathias' defeat for the Judiciary post is especially significant as he had been vigorously opposed by the independent oil and gas industry. The Judiciary Committee has been used in the past as Rockefeller-allied liberals' forum for so-called "divestiture" hearings into the energy industry, aimed at destroying the non-Rockefeller-controlled companies. Committee staffers now reveal that in light of the changed composition of the committee, the conservatives are considering using the upcoming divestiture hearings planned by Senator Edward Kennedy to go after the Rockefeller oil empire.

EXCLUSIVE

Opposition To Warnke Mounts In Washington

Since the U.S. Labor Party's testimony last week before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee opposing the confirmation of Trilateral Commission member Paul Warnke as director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and SALT negotiator (see Feb. 15 EIR), opposition to Warnke's appointment has grown rapidly in the defense community and among Congressional conservatives.

The growing recognition in these layers that Warnke's disavowal of U.S. research and development efforts and his dishonest denial of Soviet technological advances constitute a fundamental national security risk has spilled over into so-called "liberal" ranks, where the first defections among Warnke adherents are already occurring. On Feb. 16, Senator Richard Schweiker (R-Pa) announced at a press conference that he was withdrawing his support from Warnke and would appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee later this month to urge his colleagues to reject Warnke's appointment. Defense Department sources had told him, Schweiker said, that President Carter intended to make Warnke a virtual czar over arms control matters, much as he has made former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger a dictator on energy. Schweiker revealed that Carter will appoint Warnke to direct the National Security Council interagency panel on SALT verification, once he is confirmed as ACDA director and SALT negotiator. In this capacity, Schweiker charged, Warnke would establish arms control policy, carry out negotiations, and review his own work, without any outside independent check on his power.

In an interview with NSIPS, Schweiker's office pre-

dicted that the Senator's defection will be the first of many liberal Republicans and Democrats to desert Warnke, torpedoing the fiction that the controversy over his appointment is a "dove" versus "hawk" contest.

Defense and national security circles are equally concerned about the Warnke nomination because of the mounting evidence of the Carter Administration's determination to phase out nuclear power development beginning this year, a decision which has devastating effects on the nation's defense capabilities. In effect, spokesmen for these circles have acknowledged, Carter's decision to close down basic scientific research and development removes the cordon sanitaire which Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman General George Brown drew around the nation's basic industrial infrastructure in his military posture statement this year. Brown had maintained that defense of this sector was vital to national security.

Already Pentagon officials are conferring with members of the Senate Armed Services Committee to ensure that the upcoming Warnke hearings before that Committee address the central issue of technological development versus Carter deindustrialization for the U.S., against the backdrop of widely recognized Soviet technological breakthroughs. This week an MIT physicist got the ball rolling by bluntly telling the House Science and Technology Committee that Carter's announced budget cuts for nuclear power development "is a national security issue."

In the face of such level-headed thinking, both "dove" and "hawk" apologists for Carter's Schlesinger Doctrine of "reciprocal" bluff and bluster, are scurrying to cover