

## Congressional Closeup by Ronald Kokinda and Susan Kokinda

### Population controllers escalate propaganda

On both sides of Congress, some of the most virulent forms of population control are gaining renewed support and visibility. On July 25, the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Population offered a forum to various congressmen to attack the Reagan administration's anti-population control position for the forthcoming U.N. International Population Conference in Mexico City. The subcommittee, which has been a locus of organizing activity on behalf of the notorious Global 2000 Report and other neo-Malthusian tracts, called the hearing to respond to the administration's new policy paper and to the naming of an anti-abortion delegation to the Mexico City conference.

Representative Peter Kostmayer (D-Pa.) labeled the Reagan policy—which opposes abortion and coercive measures of population control—“sheer madness.” The Global 2000 aficionado said that the new policy “will embarrass the U.S. abroad and at home” since it was the United States that was the “intellectual godfather and supporter” of population control in decades past.

Meanwhile, in the Senate, Finance Committee Chairman Bob Dole (R-Kans.) introduced S.J. Res. 334, a joint resolution of Congress to designate the month of November as “National Hospice Month.” Dole was backed by over a dozen other senators. Couching the bill in the context of “compassionate caring for the terminally ill,” Dole traced the evolution of acceptance for the idea of hospices, a thinly disguised cost-cutting form of euthanasia. He lauded the groundbreaking tax legislation of 1982 for including hospice “care” under medi-

care for the first time and declared that, now, an entire month should be set aside to educate the population about the important role of hospices, i.e., “death with dignity.”

### Immigration bill appears to be dead

Despite protestations to the contrary by its principal authors, the neo-Malthusian immigration reform legislation passed by the Congress appears to be close to death. The Simpson-Mazzoli bill, named after Sen. Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.) and Rep. Romano Mazzoli (D-Ky.) and pushed by the zero-growth lobby, would massively restrict immigration from Latin America—especially Mexico—in the tradition of the racist immigration legislation of the 1920s and 1930s. The current legislation would also impose rigid penalties on employers who hire illegal aliens.

In a July 26 press conference, Senator Simpson insisted that the legislation “is not dead, and we don't look on it as an inanimate hunk of plasma.” But, he was forced to concede that no action can take place on the bill until at least after the Republican convention because the issue is so politically charged and the legislation opposed by such a wide spectrum of groups.

The Senate passed the legislation in 1983, but the House only recently adopted their version of the measure by a very close vote of 216 to 211. Any House-Senate conference which changes the legislation at all will likely result in a defeat for the bill when it goes back to the House floor.

Simpson stated that he is trying to convince the Senate to adopt the House version of the bill thus avoiding a further House vote. But several senators

have indicated that they would try to filibuster such a move—a potent threat in an election-year congressional session with very little legislative time remaining. Meanwhile, the White House has indicated that it may veto the more costly House version of the legislation.

### Congressional moves around arms-control talks

With proposed September space arms-control talks the subject of controversy within the administration and other policy-making layers, both KGB and pro-defense elements in the U.S. Congress are making their positions known. And it may be that certain anti-Star Wars congressmen are backing off from their most virulent opposition to all aspects of the program, if the administration will agree to get into the arms control box in September and stay there.

At July 26 hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the committee's chairman, Dante Fascell (D-Fla.), who is no supporter of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) for ballistic missile defense, evinced grudging support for the beam-weapon defense research program as long as the administration carried out an “exhaustive” arms-control effort to prevent actual deployment of same. That, and other lukewarm support, may have been purchased with the votes of certain normally pro-defense congressmen in June who voted in favor of a moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons. Those several-dozen congressmen would not have voted for the moratorium without a go-ahead from some faction in the administration, probably the Kis-

singerian grouping pushing the September talks.

Former Secretary of State Dean Rusk argued at the hearings on behalf of maintaining the oligarchy's arms-control framework of the last 20 years. "It is of the greatest importance," he said, "that the two sides come to the negotiating table with the serious purpose of preventing the movement of the arms race into outer space rather than go there for the purpose of going through a dance of the gooney birds."

Arguing on behalf of the administration's SDI and against an arms-control ban of ballistic-missile defensive weapons, SDI coordinator Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson stated that "the options that the research program may provide could remove much of the military value of nuclear ballistic missiles, thereby acting as a powerful catalyst to meaningful, lasting arms control." Abrahamson warned that stopping the research program into beam weapons "would amount to unilaterally leaving this field, with all its potential, to others, who may have very different objectives than ourselves with a potential for very dangerous consequences to our nation."

A day earlier, Rep. James Courter (R-N.J.) testified before the same committee and cited the Soviet record of arms-control violations as one reason for proceeding very cautiously with the September talks. Courter called for studying "the wisdom of maintaining the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty" in light of Soviet violations.

## Moynihan, D'Amato hit nickel-and-dime drug deals

New York Sens. Daniel Moynihan (D) and Al D'Amato (R) introduced on July 25 the "State and Local Narcotics

Control Assistance Act," legislation that provides an annual \$750 million to state and local governments to enforce their existing drug laws and to carry out drug treatment and rehabilitation programs. The Senate bill, S. 2866, is a companion piece to H.R. 5990, introduced earlier by House Select Committee on Narcotics Chairman Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.).

D'Amato cites, as the model for the legislation, "Operation Pressure Point"—a drug crackdown on the lower east side of New York City that cleaned up a large quantity of drug activity. But it left intact the higher level "quality" layers involved in the drug trade.

Moynihan and D'Amato pride themselves as being anti-drug. However, in the spring of 1983 both participated in a drug lobby-instigated slander campaign against nine LaRouche Democrats running for school board positions in New York City who were campaigning on a strong anti-drug platform, including cracking down on those "citizens above suspicion."

One of Moynihan's staff members for the Senate Intelligence Committee, Eric Breindel, as early as 1981 wrote a slanderous article for the *New Leader* on Lyndon LaRouche, calling the politician who commissioned the writing of *Dope, Inc.* a "Nazi." In May of 1983, Breindel—who had been a college roommate of Bobby Kennedy, Jr.—was arrested for possession of heroin. Arrested with him was a Justice Department lawyer.

In March of 1983, Senator Moynihan again publicly associated himself with the drug lobby by appearing with *High Times* writer Dennis King in a libellous NBC-TV "exposé" on LaRouche, the subject of a case now in Virginia's federal district court.

## Nunn allies in House attack modernization

Under the direction of New York Rep. Joseph Addabbo (D), the House Appropriations Committee recently issued a report claiming that the United States is not militarily prepared to fight a war against the Soviet Union. Following this, on July 27, Addabbo appeared on national television to demand the further paring down of U.S. military capabilities so that the United States will be even less prepared to fight such a war.

Appearing on NBC's "Today" show, Addabbo attacked the Pentagon's policy of investment in nuclear weapons over "conventional" defense spending. "If you can't sustain yourself in a conventional mode," he said, "then you either surrender, which we have never done, or you go to the next step of nuclear—and there's no such thing as a small nuclear war."

Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, also appearing on the "Today" show, challenged Addabbo, pointing out that Addabbo's committee has consistently pared down *all* administration requests for military-aid allotments, and adding that Addabbo had sponsored boondoggle projects for his New York constituents that have siphoned off money that could have improved U.S. military capabilities.

The survey conducted by House Appropriations Committee staff concluded that the U.S. military's readiness to fight a war is declining and that American forces could not sustain combat against the Soviet Union, or even lesser powers. The report states that the navies of the Soviet allies and Third World forces "while not capable of defeating the United States Navy, could inflict damage tantamount to a national disgrace."