

Congressional Closeup by Ronald Kokinda and Susan Kokinda

Tuition tax credits sped through committee

After months of languishing in committee, and all but abandoned for passage this session of Congress, the Senate version of a bill, already passed in the house, to grant tuition tax credits to parents who send their children to non-public schools, was reported out of the Senate Finance Committee on Sept. 16. The concept of tuition tax credits has been supported by President Reagan but has drawn fire from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and other defenders of the public school system. Opponents believe that with severe cuts in federal funding, the diversion of federal monies to support private school attendance represents a potentially fatal attack on public education.

The AFT had earlier taken issue with the proposal, announcing that they would not support candidates for office who supported the bill. This brought them head-to-head with New York Democratic Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who, although the representative of one of the highest concentrations of AFT members, has been the leading proponent of the bill. Earlier this summer, the AFT confronted Moynihan regarding his position and received indication that, pressed by a fall re-election bid, he would abandon the bill; before the August recess, the bill was stalled in committee apparently due to the Senator's efforts.

But during the week of Sept. 13, the issues that had bogged down the legislation—anti-discrimination provisions, income eligibility, and financing—were tackled and the bill marked up, with Moynihan playing a prominent role. Contacted just before the markup, a press spokesman for the AFT in Washington, D.C. was livid

about Moynihan's actions. Curiously, however, the following Sunday, Sept. 19, in his weekly column in the *New York Times*, AFT president Albert Shanker urged readers to vote against candidates such as Utah Sen. Orrin Hatch and New York Mayor Ed Koch, who support tuition tax credits, yet somehow omitted Moynihan's name.

The bill is expected to be filed on Sept. 23, and could reach the Senate floor as early as Sept. 27.

Cut European troops, says Senate subcommittee

By a 12-1 vote, the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee Sept. 22 called for reducing U.S. troop strength in Europe from 355,045 to 331,705. Led by Majority Whip and Subcommittee chairman Ted Stevens (R-Ark.), who has frequently advocated the use of the troop pull-back threat as a bludgeon against Europe, the vote also reflected the fiscal squeeze on Congress to find cuts in the military budget now that President Reagan and Defense Secretary Weinberger have refused to submit to Congress a list of possible defense cuts.

Sen. Jake Garn (R-Utah) described the vote as sending Europe a message that "we're tired of being your lackey." Others who voted for the resolution included Senators Weicker (R-Ct.), Schmitt (R-N.M.), Kasten (R-Wisc.), D'Amato (R-N.Y.), Rudman (R-N.H.), Proxmire (D-Wisc.), Inouye (D-Ha.), Hollings (D-S.C.), Johnston (D-La.), and Huddleston (D-Ky.). The only opposing vote came from Sen. John Stennis (D-Miss.), who said that the resolution would weaken the United States in arms negotiations with the Soviets and comes at a time of instability in West Germany.

Senate convenes hearings on Youth Corps bill

A bill to create a Nazi-style youth corps was promoted during hearings of the Public Lands subcommittee of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on Sept. 22. The bill, S.2061, introduced into the Senate last February by Daniel Moynihan (D-N.Y.), and *Global 2000* depopulation plan sponsor Charles Mathias (R-Md.), would found an American Conservation Corps which would send unemployed citizens under 25 to rural work camps.

Testifying for the bill, in addition to Moynihan and Mathias, were Sen. Jennings Randolph (D-W.Va.), Rep. Ralph Regula (R-Ohio), Rep. Douglas Bereuter (R-Neb.), television actor Raymond Burr, and former football player Calvin Hill. John Capozzi, a spokesman for the AFL-CIO youth group, Front Lash, also spoke for the bill.

The legislation specifically calls for the creation of "labor-intensive" jobs in cleaning parks, energy conservation, cleaning monuments, etc. for youths between 16 and 25. Participants would live in barracks and would have their rooms and board automatically subtracted from the federal minimum wage they receive—leaving less than \$1 per hour. In Germany in the 1920s this kind of program moved unemployed youth into camps and subsequently into the Nazi movement.

An identical bill to S.2061 was introduced into the House by Rep. John Sieberling (D-Ohio) last October. In December, Moynihan sought out Mathias in order to make a bipartisan effort in the Senate. Moynihan's bill seemed to peter out after its introduction in February; however, the companion legislation passed the House in

June by a 291-102 vote.

Subcommittee chairman Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyo.), cousin to the Queen of England, prefers that participants be given below minimum wage, or better, that they work as "volunteers." Wallop was optimistic that a more "cost-efficient" proposal would come out of recent hearings. To date, the Reagan administration is opposing the bill, primarily also for fiscal considerations.

Bill "Bailout" Bradley does it again

Bill Bradley, the Democratic Senator from New Jersey, took the floor of the Senate on Sept. 20 to warn again of the dangers of international financial calamity and to call for a U.S. bailout of the monetary system.

Several days later, on Sept. 23, the International Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by *Global 2000* advocate Charles Mathias (R-Md.), held an unusual closed-door hearing on the world debt situation. The subcommittee, whose chief staff members recently returned from the IMF's Toronto conference, was briefed by the CIA, and it is expected to hold open hearings on the same topic before the Senate recesses in early October.

Bradley's floor speech, entitled "Lending Risks in the Developing World," singled out Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina as countries worthy of special concern in the world debt situation. True to the hardened image of a "neo-liberal," Bradley advocates ferocious IMF dictates as the solution to Latin America's debt problem, and attacks the "labor, leftist and nationalist groups [who] are likely to oppose

both the outside interference and the austerity of the necessary policies."

Bradley reiterates four proposals from his earlier speeches. He proposes that central banks become "lenders of last resort" for illiquid financial entities, in essence calling for the Federal Reserve Board to bail out the \$1.7 trillion Eurodollar market. Secondly, he calls for the Bank for International Settlements or the IMF to provide the mechanism for that bailout, in exchange for imposing conditions on future bank lending to the developing sector. The U.S. and other nations, he says, should significantly augment their contributions to the IMF to create a special emergency fund to bail out Western banks at the same time that further conditionalities are imposed on Third World nations in exchange for a trickle of future lending.

Harrimanites propose fascist restructuring

Under the delphic title of "The Rebuilding America Act of 1982," Senators Moynihan (D-N.Y.) and Gary Hart, Bill Bradley (D-N.J.), Alan Cranston and Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) have introduced legislation which would establish the mechanism for top-down control over the American economy through the triage and restructuring of American infrastructure. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House by Bob Edgar (D-Pa.), the chairman of the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition and Congress's leading opponent of water development, along with Tip O'Neill (D-Mass.), and Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.).

The legislation has the dual function of furthering the destruction of Congress by taking "pork-barrel"

infrastructure out of constituency-controlled hands and ultimately establishing a Third Reich-like apparatus which will ration infrastructure spending.

The "neo-liberals" and "Atari Democrats" are gravitating toward variations of this proposal, under the "buzzwords" of "capital budgeting"—separating capital expenses from operating expenses. But behind the systems-analysis jargon stands its true genocidal content. A July *New York Times* article quotes one proponent who explained why central control over infrastructure was needed: "When the New York City government suggested that it could no longer afford to maintain basic facilities in the South Bronx, where many buildings have been abandoned, there was a storm of protest and the suggestion was dropped."

Should this effort succeed, it would represent consummation of the cutoffs of essential infrastructural spending begun by the Carter administration and continued by the Reagan OMB. Rather than introducing a real "development plan," it would simply end Congress's ability even to fund basic needed infrastructure on a case-by-case basis.

An opening shot in this fight was sounded on the floor of the House on Sept. 23, when Bob Edgar objected to passage of the continuing resolution (which maintains federal funding until various appropriations bills are passed) because he and his Malthusian colleagues would not be able to offer amendments to kill the Tennessee-Tombigbee water project and the Clinch River breeder reactor. While beaten back at present, Edgar and allies have promised to make this year's fight over Clinch River and Tenn-Tom a major test.