

Congressional Closeup by Kathleen Klenetsky

New AIDS legislation in the hopper

Rep. William Dannemeyer is drafting federal legislation that would make it a crime for a person who knowingly carries the AIDS virus to engage in activities that could transmit the disease.

Such actions are "attempted murder," said Duane Crumb, a spokesman for the California Republican. Crumb told *EIR* that Dannemeyer is debating whether to classify such activity as a misdemeanor or a felony. "I would not be surprised if we came down on the side of making it a felony."

Earlier this month, Dannemeyer became the first federal official to endorse a California ballot initiative which would put AIDS on the state list of diseases subject to various public-health measures.

Crumb explained that Dannemeyer endorsed the initiative because, while "it doesn't do a great deal, what it does do is good," namely, requiring that people carrying AIDS virus be reportable to public-health authorities.

Dannemeyer has sent out a letter to all California state officials calling for them to support the initiative. Crumb said he doesn't expect much positive response, since "there is such a big homosexual lobby in the state," including in the Republican Party.

Anti-NATO gang gears up drive for troop pullout

With the House and Senate moving to complete action on the Defense Department authorization bill, various members of the anti-NATO gang on the Hill have stepped up their demands

that the U.S. military and financial commitment to Western Europe be drastically curtailed.

Pat Schroeder, a liberal Democrat from Colorado, will introduce an amendment to the DOD authorization bill calling for a 50% reduction in U.S. forces abroad by 1991.

It's "incredible" the United States has deployed troops to "defend other people and other continents," Schroeder asserted in a recent interview. She also called NATO a "foreign entitlements program," and assailed Europeans for "just wanting more SDI contracts, and more jobs on U.S. bases."

"The combined economies of the NATO countries in Europe are greater than ours," she charged. "They now have had almost ten years to do more [for NATO], and they haven't done it. And I don't think they're ever going to do it, until we give them a timetable and say, okay, we've got to start pulling down [troops] because we can't afford to do all of these things. It's like having all the burdens of empire and none of the benefits. . . ."

It's not just liberal Democrats who are sounding off against the Atlantic Alliance. Nebraska Republican Rep. Doug Bereuter took to the House floor July 21 to inveigh against Europe for its failure to share equally in the burden of its defense.

Quoting chapter and verse from Henry Kissinger's most recent pro-decoupling statement, a May 13 syndicated column published widely in European and U.S. papers, Bereuter said American troops should be withdrawn from Europe.

Describing Kissinger's logic as "forceful," Bereuter went on to repeat Kissinger's argument: "Continued deployment of U.S. forces at current levels in Western Europe is probably not the most efficient use of our per-

sonnel, equipment, or financial resources," Bereuter pontificated. "I believe that Europe can do more toward its own defense and that we can better handle our global responsibilities by positioning elsewhere—most likely in the United States—some of the troops now in Europe."

Is Congress serious about drug-money laundering?

A bipartisan group of Senate Judiciary Committee members will soon introduce legislation making it a felony to launder drug money, according to the June 21 *New York Post*. The chief sponsors of the bill include Judiciary Committee chairman Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.)

Joseph Biden (D-Del.).

Modeled on a draft prepared last year for Attorney General Edwin Meese and supported by the President's Commission on Organized Crime, the legislation will mandate sentences of up to 20 years and fines of double the amount of money laundered, for bank officials or casino operators convicted of wittingly laundering dope profits.

A few days earlier, two House subcommittees reported out separate but related bills that would also make money laundering a crime.

HR 5077 would create a new federal crime for money laundering and provide for a 20-year prison term and fines up to \$1 million for individuals and \$5 million for companies. It would also allow the seizure of assets of those who knowingly engage in money laundering.

The other House bill, HR 5176, would make it illegal to structure a financial transaction so as to evade

federal reporting requirements.

Also modeled on Meese's recommendations, the House bills share some of the same flaws as the Senate version. The chief problem is that they explicitly state that a financial institution involved in money laundering could only be held culpable if it *knowingly* engaged in such activity—something difficult to prove in a court of law.

Congress's renewed focus on money laundering raises some interesting questions about the fate of William Weld's nomination as assistant attorney general in charge of the Criminal Division. Weld, currently U.S. Attorney in Boston, created a huge scandal last year, when he gave the Bank of Boston a mere slap on the wrist for its role as a washing-machine for huge amounts of mafia dollars.

"The single event that sparked the greatest outrage over money laundering was the explosive revelation last year that the Bank of Boston . . . had laundered millions of dollars for the family of Boston's reputed organized-crime chief, Gennaro Angiulo," the *Post's* Deborah Orin reported.

"Over a period of years, the Bank of Boston, without raising a corporate eyebrow, let the Angiulo family bring in brown paper bags full of small bills and exchange them for bank cashier's checks. . . .

"The Bank of Boston was fined \$500,000 for that violation as well as other currency violations involving a total of \$1.2 billion.

"As Senator D'Amato (R-N.Y.) has noted, the fine was a piddling four ten-thousandths of the amount that went unreported—hardly a chilling penalty."

The Weld nomination will be a litmus test of just how serious D'Amato, Biden, et al are about their anti-drug

crusade. The Judiciary Committee has been supplied with ample material on Weld's drug-money connections. If Biden and his pals permit Weld to be confirmed, they'll be doing a major favor for the same international dope lobby they claim to oppose—and don't think they don't know it.

Whether Schroeder and her bipartisan coterie succeed in forcing a pull-down of the American military presence is open to question. Schroeder herself doesn't think her amendment will pass. "Obviously, the administration will fight it tooth and nail," she said. "They tend to win everything, so I guess I don't think" it will pass. She reported that the administration is "arm-twisting" fiscal conservatives in particular, a group Schroeder had hoped would back the measure on budget-cutting grounds.

Third term for Reagan?

Rep. Guy Vander Jagt (R-Mich.), chairman of the National GOP Congressional Committee, has delivered himself of a proposal which has raised quite a few eyebrows, even among Washington's jaded denizens. He wants to repeal the 22nd Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, for the purpose of allowing President Reagan to serve a third term in the Oval Office.

Vander Jagt has sent out a fund-raising mailing which includes an "Official Constitutional Petition" calling for the "immediate repeal" of the amendment. Ratified in 1951, the amendment prohibits persons from serving more than two terms as President. If he receives enough petitions, Vander Jagt says he "will personally introduce the legislation to repeal" the amendment.

"Ronald Reagan is one of the greatest American Presidents of all time, and I want to keep him on the job," Vander Jagt wrote in a fund-raising letter that was sent to 300,000 people. Should this effort fail, Vander Jagt has an alternative plan: running Reagan for Speaker of the House. That position is not limited to House members, but the Republicans would first have to win a majority of the seats.

Is Vander Jagt serious—or is he indulging in some creative fund raising? It's hard to tell. The congressman is by no means the only person who likes the idea of Reagan's staying on for another four years; a group was established last fall explicitly for this purpose. And Reagan himself has frequently suggested that the two-term limit be dropped—although he's always been careful to say that he would never consider serving again.

More fiddling on Gramm-Rudman

The chief sponsors of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings atrocity have come up with a new stunt for salvaging the law's automatic-trigger function, which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. After their proposal for making the General Accounting Office independent of Congress ran into a blank wall, Sens. Phil Gramm (R-Tex.), Warren Rudman (R-N.H.)

are proposing to empower the Office of Management and Budget to implement the cutbacks, thereby circumventing the separation-of-powers conflict which prompted the Supreme Court's action. OMB Director James Miller thinks this latest gambit is a great idea.