

June 12, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 7409

## AMENDMENT NO. 2077

(Purpose: To provide for charitable deductions for nonitemizers and to lower the threshold for phasing out the personal exemption).

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN], for himself and Mr. INOUE, proposes an amendment numbered 2077.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 1416, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. . CHARITABLE DEDUCTIONS FOR NONITEMIZERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (ii) of section 170 (relating to rule for nonitemization of deductions) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) RULE FOR NONITEMIZATION OF DEDUCTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who does not itemize his deductions for the taxable year, the applicable percentage of so much of the amount allowable under subsection (a) for the taxable year as exceeds \$200 (\$100 in the case of married individuals filing separate returns) shall be taken into account as a direct charitable deduction under section 63.

“(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable percentage shall be determined under the following table:

For taxable years beginning in:	The percentage is:
1987 or 1988 .....	50
1989 or 1990 .....	75
1991 or thereafter.....	100.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1986.

On page 1378, line 17, strike out “and”.

On page 1378, line 18, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and “and”.

On page 1378, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following new paragraph:

“(3) the direct charitable deduction.

On page 1381, line 13, strike out “and”.

On page 1381, line 15, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and “and”.

On page 1381, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following new paragraph:

“(3) the direct charitable deduction.

On page 1384, line 24, strike out the end quotation marks.

On page 1384, after line 24, insert the following new subsection:

“(i) DIRECT CHARITABLE DEDUCTION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘direct charitable deduction’ means that portion of the amount allowable under section 170(a) which is taken as a direct charitable deduction for the taxable year under section 170(i).”

On page 1387, line 13, strike out “5 percent” and insert in lieu thereof “12 percent”.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I say to the majority leader that tomorrow we will have an opportunity to discuss this amendment. It will be the pending business.

## THE MIDDLE CLASS IN KOREA

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, in June 1963, embroiled in the midst of a horrible war in Vietnam, several Buddhist monks immolated themselves. This was a silent but highly visible protest against a deaf and unyielding regime. That protest erupted into widespread media coverage and elevated public awareness of the Vietnamese situation.

Today, 23 years later, we are viewing similar events in South Korea. Two weeks ago, a 22-year-old student of Seoul National University climbed onto a third-floor ledge of the administration building. After shouting anti-Government and anti-U.S. slogans, he doused himself in gasoline, ignited himself and dove to his death, a human fireball. This latest suicide brought the total to five, including four college students who have immolated themselves in protest against the Chun regime.

As in 1963, these immolations are frightening examples of the dire measures that people will take when they have no recourse within their government. These radical students represent a minority of the 1 million Korean college students. Originally, they attached themselves to the opposition movement led by Kim Dae Jung. They have become impatient and have denounced the middle-class opposition, claiming that it is too conservative. However, the radical nature of the student movement adds an explosive element to an already volatile situation and, therefore, cannot be discounted. The national security of South Korea depends upon listening to the middle class. The middle class wants to peacefully petition their government for constitutional change. They do not shout anti-American slogans.

Recently, I introduced Senate Resolution 392 calling for the President of the United States to support diplomatic exchange and dialog between all opposition parties and the United States Ambassador to South Korea. This resolution urges the President to send a special envoy to South Korea to expedite a peaceful solution. It also expresses the Senate's support for the opening of high-level diplomatic talks between the U.S. Departments of State and Defense, the Chun government, and all leaders of the opposition. I feel that these actions could derail a potentially violent collision.

Democracy, Mr. President, affords us the luxury of diplomacy. It is only when groups feel that they have no effective avenue to pursue grievances within their government that they turn to the extreme measures that we have recently witnessed. Our own history demonstrates the importance of freedom and representation. Freedom to petition one's government, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly. This is what the middle class desires.

I would also like to cite a recently released report by Amnesty International regarding increases in the number

of people arrested in South Korea for criticizing the Government. This includes workers and farmers as well as students. The State Department says that reports of torture or cruel treatment of prisoners in South Korea have increased “significantly” from 1984 to 1985. This does not appear to be a country moving quickly toward democracy in 1989.

In the Declaration on Independence, Thomas Jefferson expressed the right of the people to change a repressive regime. I am hopeful that the moderate middle class in South Korea will be afforded the opportunity to influence this Government. The radical student groups are desperately reaching out. We cannot afford their despairing attitude to delegate the future. We must encourage dialog. History, Mr. President, will most surely repeat itself if ignored. But if we learn from it, perhaps we can avoid the mistakes of the past and find a peaceful solution.

## STINGER VICTORY

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, the Reagan administration decided to remove the Stinger missile from the Saudi Arabian arms sale package. Several Members of Congress had singled out Stingers as a reason for opposing this sale. Many of my colleagues have argued that some of these shoulder-fired missiles might fall into the hands of terrorists, who could use them against U.S. aircraft, civilian commercial jetliners, or military aircraft in the Middle East.

The administration hoped to eliminate the political sting from the Saudi package that both the Senate and House originally rejected by overwhelming margins. President Reagan's idea is that Congress is rightfully fearful that terrorists might acquire these convenient and lethal weapons, and withdrawing them makes the package much more acceptable. The President, in a letter to majority leader ROBERT DOLE, discusses “the particular sensitivity of Stingers being transferred to any country.”

Mr. President, supplying Stinger missiles without strict and protective safeguards is not in the national interest of the United States. This perspective has been clearly expressed by Congress in 1984 when the Reagan administration withdrew its proposal to sell thousands of Stingers to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. This view was repeated again when the administration recently withdrew the Stinger from the latest Saudi Arabia arms sale package.

Congress has recognized over the past years that Stingers could function as an ideal terrorist weapon. In the case of Saudi Arabia, elaborate safeguards and security measures have been devised as part of the letter of offer and acceptance in order to protect this weapon from falling into PLO

S 7410

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 12, 1986

hands. The Saudis allow the PLO to work with their military, and some who are sympathetic to the PLO might allow the Stinger to be stolen or sold.

This is my fear, Mr. President. I have introduced legislation which will prudently safeguard the Stinger missile when it is transferred to resistance efforts around the world. This reflects congressional and the administration's concern regarding the Stinger. This is a terrorism and security issue, not a reflection on the Saudis, Contras, or UNITA.

Secretary Shultz, in response to a question on countering terrorism with measures other than enhanced security and better intelligence, recently said:

I don't think purely defensive postures are adequate. We must think through as a society other aspects of this problem . . .

This involves preventive and prudent arms control measures now. We need to stop terrorist activities before they start. We must protect Americans both at home and abroad. Arms exported in a reckless manner today could seriously cripple American citizens and interests tomorrow. My legislation is not for or against resistance movements. This is legislation for America and American interests.

## ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 10:25 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPPOSING THE PARTICIPATION IN THE JULY 4TH LIBERTY WEEKEND CELEBRATION OF THE CHILEAN TORTURE SHIP "ESMERALDA"

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution disapproving the participation of the Chilean torture ship *Esmeralda* in our Nation's "July Fourth Liberty Weekend" celebration, upon which I hope the Senate will act quickly and favorably.

Although it has not always been so, the *Esmeralda* today is a ship of shame. It was the site of one of the cruelest chapters in the history of Chile—the brutal torture of over 100 men and women by Chilean authorities in the aftermath of the bloody coup by General Pinochet in September 1973. Because of this heritage of horror, the *Esmeralda* is a continuing symbol of the repression which persists in Chile to this day.

The Statue of Liberty would weep at the sight of the *Esmeralda* entering the gateway of freedom at New York Harbor. This ship is the antithesis of American freedom and should not be permitted to participate in the cele-

bration of America's liberty and democracy.

Nothing in this resolution is intended to detract from the noble heritage of the *Esmeralda* before the tragic events of September 1973. For generations prior to that date, Chile was renowned as one of the most stable and democratic nations in South America.

The name *Esmeralda* itself has a distinguished heritage in Chilean naval history. The original *Esmeralda* was a Spanish frigate captured by Chilean patriots and commissioned in the Chilean Navy in the War for Independence at the beginning of the 19th century. The present ship was built in 1952 as a training vessel to carry on the proud tradition of seamanship in the Chilean Navy.

But on September 11, 1973, a military junta led by Gen. Augusto Pinochet staged a bloody military coup, crushed Chilean democracy, and installed the repressive regime that has ruled in Chile ever since.

On the same day that Gen. Pinochet seized power, the junta rounded up 40 men and 72 women and held them naked in the dungeons of the *Esmeralda*. The prisoners were subjected to brutal torture and interrogation. For a period of nearly 2 weeks, they were beaten, tortured, subjected to electric shock, mock execution, sleep deprivation, and sexual abuse. Throughout this ordeal, the Chilean authorities ruthlessly interrogated the prisoners about their political activities prior to the coup.

Today, the *Esmeralda* is not used for torture. But to the Chilean people, it is a clear and present symbol of the pervasive terror they have endured in the 13-year dictatorship of Gen. Pinochet.

One survivor of the *Esmeralda* nightmare described his feelings about the ship in a sworn statement:

Up to September 10th, it had been for me, and for ten million Chileans, the "White Lady," the "National Pride." It represented Chilean democracy, manhood, the chivalry of Chilean officers and sailors. Today, it is a Torture Chamber, a Flagellation Chamber, a Floating Jail of Horror, Death and Fear for Chilean men and women.

*Esmeralda* means "emerald," a gem of extraordinary beauty. And the *Esmeralda* is one of the most beautiful tall ships in the world. Until the cruel coup in 1973, the vessel was a source of patriotic pride for the Chilean nation. But because of the coup that transformed the *Esmeralda* into a torture ship, the vessel no longer represents the people of Chile, or the democracy and freedom for which Chile is striving. Rather, it symbolizes the reign of terror in the days when General Pinochet's repressive regime was born.

Instead of evoking the pride of the Chilean people, the ship summons up memories of dead friends and missing relatives, midnight arrests and mysterious disappearances, detention in unknown locations and repression of a democratic nation.

Current reports by Amnesty International and other human rights groups document General Pinochet's continuing and flagrant attempts to crush any democratic opposition in Chile.

In March, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights condemned Chile's record on human rights and expressed its strong concern over the persistence of serious human rights violations, including disappearances, torture, abuses by security forces, and the denial of fundamental rights.

As long as repression continues in Chile and liberty is denied, the *Esmeralda* should not be welcomed in any celebration honoring America's own Statue of Liberty. On the day democracy returns to Chile, I will invite the *Esmeralda* to return in honor to the United States. But until Chile is free, the sails of that torture ship should not be permitted to darken our waters, let alone cast their abhorrent shadow upon our own precious symbol of liberty.

I hope the Senate will act promptly and favorably on this resolution. The *Esmeralda* is already on its way to New York. My hope is that the ship will turn back, and will choose not to participate in the July Fourth celebration. But in any event, I believe this resolution is necessary at this time. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some sworn testimony of survivors of torture on the *Esmeralda* and other materials, and I urge the adoption of the resolution.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution and other material in connection with this matter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## RESOLUTION

Whereas, Operation Sail has invited the Chilean naval vessel *Esmeralda* to participate in the July 4th Liberty Weekend celebration in New York harbor;

Whereas, the *Esmeralda* is the notorious vessel used for the torture of 112 political prisoners at the time General Augusto Pinochet seized power in a military coup in Chile in 1973;

Whereas, serious violations of basic human rights and civil rights continue in Chile under the Pinochet regime, of which the *Esmeralda* is an unfortunate reminder.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SEC. 1. The Congress deeply regrets the invitation extended to the Chilean vessel *Esmeralda* to participate in the July 4th Liberty Weekend celebration in New York City, and urges Operation Sail to withdraw that invitation.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted forthwith to the Chairman of Operation Sail.

May 21, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 6391

I have the full support of the other members of the New Mexico delegation and a similar bill has also been introduced in the House.

Thank you, Mr. President. ●

By Mr. HECHT (for himself and Mr. LAXALT):

S. 2506. A bill to establish a Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK ACT

● Mr. LAXALT. Mr. President, It is with a sense of pride and anticipation that I introduce a bill, with my distinguished colleague [Senator HECHT], to provide for the creation of the first national park in Nevada.

The park site is indeed a gem. It incorporates a significant portion of the South Snake range in eastern Nevada and includes the second highest peak in the State, Wheeler Peak. It will include some of the oldest living trees in the world, the Bristlecone pine (some being over 5,000 years old). It will also incorporate Lehman Caves National Memorial. The park will offer to the Nation the first interpretive example of a vast area of our national land mass called the Great Basin. Thus, the name chosen for the park will be the Great Basin National Park.

Mr. President, the Great Basin covers some 200,000 square miles of western desert. It includes almost all of Nevada and extends into portions of four other western States. It represents a significant proportion of our total land mass. It is called Great Basin because all the drainage systems are internal. They do not reach the ocean.

The Great Basin topography is characterized as "basin and range," alternating valleys and mountain ranges. This vast area includes a rich and varied flora and fauna, including a number of unique species. If I may paraphrase a description from author John McPhee, the mountain ranges of the basin and range stand on their own, like warships, "and the Great Basin is an ocean of loose sediment with these mountain ranges standing in it as if they were members of a fleet without precedent."

Great Basin ranges are not created by compressional forces which pile them on top of each other but rather by plate fractures which cause them to be created independently. The basins which separate them are 10 to 15 miles wide and are generally bone dry. Thus the faunas in the high ranges tend to be distinct from one another because of the island nature of each range. "Supreme over all is silence \* \* \* a soundless immensity with mountains in it." Such is the nature of the Great Basin we propose to interpret through a Great Basin National Park. Perhaps no area can adequately represent such a vast area with its isolated and distinct faunas. And certainly no park can adequately preserve the

serenity extant in much of it, but the Snake Range and surrounding area are very representative and beautiful in their own right.

The park has, in fact, been the subject of considerable interest in the past. Two bills have been introduced to establish the park in the same Wheeler Peak area. It is my hope we may succeed this time.

Specific features of our proposed park are 13,063-foot Wheeler Peak, the ancient bristlecone pine forests, the natural rock bridge known as Lexington Arch, one of the few active permanent glaciers in the lower States, Lehman caves, and many still unexplored caves, and numerous lakes, some of which are glacially fed.

The park boundaries have been drawn so as to preserve within the immediate vicinity of the park the traditional ranching and mining activities which have characterized man's activity since his arrival, providing that additional historic resource to park visitors.

The unique and fragile beauty of the Great Basin has, so to speak, been a candle kept under a bushel. Nevada's unique beauty includes the basin and range topography, as represented by the proposed Great Basin Park. It is time to make such beauty available to all our citizens. ●

By Mr. METZENBAUM:

S.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 7, 1986, as "Gaucher's Disease Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## GAUCHER'S DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

● Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution designating the week beginning September 7, 1986 as "Gaucher's Disease Awareness Week." This is a companion to House Joint Resolution 615 introduced in the House by Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH on April 29, 1986.

Gaucher's disease is an inherited, genetic disorder which occurs among all known racial and ethnic groups. It is the most common disorder in the family of painful and deadly enzyme diseases, and even more prevalent than Tay-Sachs among Eastern European Jews. Gaucher's disease may best be described as a genetic timebomb. With a carrier rate of 1 in 12 persons, the next generation is at high risk.

The disease is caused by the body's failure to produce an essential enzyme. The absence of this enzyme causes the body to accumulate abnormal quantities of lipids in the spleen, liver, bone marrow, and, in some cases, lungs, heart, and brain. It can cause deterioration of the nervous system, bone degeneration, enlarged spleen, and severe damage to the liver and other organs.

In the infantile form, death occurs within 2 years. In the juvenile form, the life span is dramatically foreshortened. In its chronic form, the occur-

rence and severity of symptoms are variable. There is no treatment as yet, but there is promising research.

At a number of medical centers in the United States and abroad, research focuses on three aspects of the disease: enzyme replacement, gene repair, and treatment programs. The research serves as a model for unlocking the mysteries associated with all the many enzyme disorders, and an estimated 300 other genetic diseases.

In 1984 the National Gaucher Foundation was established to promote and support Gaucher's research and to increase public awareness regarding this disease. It is essential to raise awareness of the genetic nature of Gaucher's disease, the critically high number of carriers, the possibilities inherent in prevention and treatment in this era of gene engineering, and the potential for victims of other genetic diseases.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this joint resolution so that we may focus attention on understanding and finding a cure for the victims of Gaucher's disease and for the victims of other genetic disorders. I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## S.J. Res. 352

Whereas Gaucher's disease is caused by the failure of the body to produce an essential enzyme;

Whereas the absence of such enzyme causes the body to store abnormal quantities of lipids in the liver and spleen and frequently has an adverse effect on tissues in the body, particularly bone tissue;

Whereas among Jewish persons, Gaucher's disease is the most common inherited disorder affecting the metabolism of lipids, which are one of the principle structural components of living cells;

Whereas there is no known cure for Gaucher's disease and no successful treatment of the symptoms of the disease;

Whereas the increased awareness and understanding of Gaucher's disease by the people of the United States can aid in the development of a treatment and cure for the disease;

Whereas the National Gaucher's Disease Foundation provides funds for research in the United States with respect to the disease; and

Whereas research and clinical programs with respect to Gaucher's disease should be increased: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning September 7, 1986, is designated "Gaucher's Disease Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. ●

By Mr. CHILES (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HECHT, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. LONG, Mr. NUNN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr.

S 6392

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 21, 1986

DOLE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. DeCONCINI, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CRANSTON:

S.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 5, 1986, through October 11, 1986, as "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION WEEK

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution to designate October 5-11, 1986, as "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week." I am delighted to be joined in this effort by Senators BURGESS, ZORINSKY, HOLLINGS, BRADLEY, HECHT, ABDNOR, STENNIS, MATTINGLY, LONG, NUNN, BUMPERS, DOLE, MOYNIHAN, LEVIN, THURMOND, DeCONCINI, COHEN, and CRANSTON.

I am also pleased to have the support of the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth. The federation will be holding its national convention during the week we are designating as "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week."

In recent years we have done much toward reducing the supply of drugs coming into our country. We have strengthened our border patrols, Coast Guard, and other police forces to curb the influx of illegal drugs into our cities and towns. But today drug abuse remains a national tragedy.

In addressing drug abuse, though, we too often focus only on the supply side of the program. The resolution I am introducing also encourages us to examine the demand side: the pressures that influence our young people to begin misusing drugs. It is my hope that National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week will stimulate interest in education programs both in school and at home which provoke discussions about drugs and encourage young people to develop realistic views about drug abuse and the resulting harmful effects. In addition to traditionally abused drugs, I hope that these discussions will include information about designer drugs, the most recent phenomenon in the illicit drug market.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the Drug Education Program which Ms. Joanne Riviere conducts in her fifth grade class at Palmetto Elementary School in Miami, FL. Last May, as part of their class study, her students wrote to me about a problem they had perceived with regard to certain chemicals which are diverted from legitimate industrial purposes to the production of illicit drugs. Their main concern was the chemical ether which is often used in the filtering stage of cocaine processing. In investigating this matter, I found that many other legitimate drugs are similarly used in producing illicit drugs.

On October 8, 1985, I introduced legislation—S. 1746—which directs the

Attorney General to study and recommend methods to control the diversion of legitimate precursor and essential chemicals to the production of illegal drugs. This bill is now pending in the Judiciary Committee. I urge that committee to address this important issue expeditiously, and I again applaud the efforts of Ms. Riviere and her students which led to this legislation. I further hope that the joint resolution I am introducing today for "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week" will encourage other teachers, students, and parents to focus their attention on this national problem. ●

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 419

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 419, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for one-half of the expenses paid by a self-employed taxpayer for individual health insurance premiums.

S. 1704

At the request of Mr. McCLELLAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1704, a bill to authorize an increase in the appropriation ceiling for the North Loup Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Nebraska.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1766, a bill to designate the Cumberland terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio Channel National Historical Park in honor of J. Glenn Beall, Sr.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1917, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance to promote immunization and oral rehydration, and for other purposes.

S. 1941

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1941, a bill to protect the security of the United States by providing for sanctions against any country that provides support for perpetrators of acts of international terrorism.

S. 1942

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1942, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the security of United States military installations.

S. 2064

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES] the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 2064, a bill to require the President to make an annual report on the national strategy of the U.S. Government to certain committees of Congress and to require joint Committee meetings to be held on such report.

S. 2081

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2081, a bill to reauthorize the Head Start Act, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, the Community Services Block Grant Act, for deferred cost care programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2083

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2083, a bill to amend the toxic Substances Control Act to require the Environmental Protection Agency to set standards for identification and abatement of hazardous asbestos in the Nation's schools, to mandate abatement of hazardous asbestos in the Nation's schools in accordance with these standards, to require local educational agencies to prepare asbestos management plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2220

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WEICKER] were added as cosponsors of S. 2220, a bill to provide for a mutual, verifiable moratorium on the testing of nuclear warheads, and for other purposes.

S. 2230

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HUMPHREY] were added as cosponsors of S. 2230, a bill to improve the management of the Government by establishing an Office of Federal Management in the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2274, a bill to provide that certain individuals who are not citizens of the United States and certain persons who are not individuals shall be ineligible to receive financial assistance under the price support and related programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

S. 2286

At the request of Mr. DeCONCINI, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2286, a bill to prohibit the

S 5506

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 7, 1986

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. DeCONCINI] proposes an amendment numbered 1833.

Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 124, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 504. RESTRICTION ON TRANSFER OF STINGER MISSILES.

(a) RESTRICTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no STINGER anti-aircraft missiles may be sold, donated, or otherwise provided, directly or indirectly, to democratic resistance forces in Afghanistan and Angola unless the President certifies to the Congress that the proposed recipient has agreed to the following conditions:

(1) Physical security of such missiles shall consist of the following:

(A) Magazines of reinforced concrete, arch-type, and earth-covered whose construction is at least equivalent in strength to the requirements of the Chief of Engineers (Department of the Army) drawings, 652-686 through 652-693, 27 Dec 1941 as revised 14 Mar 42, shall be provided.

(B) Lighting shall be provided for exterior doors and along perimeter barriers.

(C) Exterior doors shall be class 5 steel vault doors secured by two-key operated high security padlock and hasp (mil spec P-43607), and keys shall be secured separately to insure effective two-man control of access.

(D) Fencing shall be 6-foot (minimum) steel chain link on steel or reinforced concrete posts over firm base, and clear zones shall be established inside and outside fencing.

(E) A full-time guard force or combination guard force and intrusion detection system shall be provided.

(2) Such missiles shall be accounted for as follows:

(A) A 100 percent physical count shall be taken monthly with two-man verification, and records shall be available for United States inspection.

(B) A United States Military Training Mission shall conduct the United States inspection and inventory annually, and weapons expended outside of hostilities shall be accounted for.

(3) Movements shall meet United States standards for safeguarding classified material in transit.

(4) Access to such missiles and to classified information relating thereto shall be as follows:

(A) Access to hardware and related classified information shall be limited to military and civilian personnel who have the proper security clearance and who have an established need-to-know. Information released shall be limited to that necessary for assigned functions or operational responsibility and, where possible, shall be oral or visual only.

(B) No maintenance shall be authorized which required access to the interior of the operational system. Such maintenance shall be performed under United States control.

(5) The recipient shall report to the United States by the most expeditious means any instance of compromise, loss, or theft of any material or related information. This report shall be followed by prompt investigation and the results provided to the United States.

(6) The recipient shall agree that no information on Basic STINGER shall be released

to a third government or any other party without United States approval.

(7) The security standards applied by the recipient to protection of Basic STINGER information and material shall be at least equivalent to those of the United States at the identified security classification.

(8) The recipient shall use the information on Basic STINGER only for the purpose for which it was given.

(9) United States officers shall be allowed to inspect and assess physical security measures and procedures established for implementation of these security controls on an announced random access basis.

(10) Damaged launchers shall be returned to United States Armed Forces for repair or demilitarization prior to disposal by United States authorities.

(11) Two principal components of the STINGER system, the gripstock and the missile in its disposable launch tube, shall be stored in separate locations. Each location shall meet all physical security requirements applicable to the STINGER system as a whole. The two locations shall be physically separated sufficiently so that a penetration of the security at one site shall not place the second at risk.

(12) The principle components of the STINGER system, the gripstock, missile, and launch tube, may be brought together and assembled only under the following circumstances:

(A) In the event of hostilities or imminent hostilities.

(B) For firing as part of regularly scheduled training (only those rounds intended to be fired shall be withdrawn from storage and assembled).

(C) For lot testing (only proof round(s) shall be withdrawn and assembled).

(D) When STINGER systems are deployed as part of the point of defenses of high priority installations or activities.

(13) Field exercises or deployments wherein the use of STINGER system is simulated shall not create conditions for the assembly of the system.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

On page 124, line 7, strike out "Sec. 504." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 505."

Mr. President, I compliment Senator GOLDWATER and Senator NUNN for shepherding this landmark piece of legislation through the Armed Services Committee and to the Senate floor. With all of Senator GOLDWATER's achievements during his long and illustrious Senate career, this bill could well be his most important legacy.

The importance of this piece of legislation can best be put into focus by the fact that no major statutory changes in defense organization have occurred since 1958. Defense reorganization has always been a political hot potato and without the dedication and doggedness of Senators GOLDWATER and NUNN, this bill would never have reached the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The most important feature of the bill is that it designates the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the principal military adviser to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense. Enactment of this provision should have the result of making our individual military services components act as a team. This crucial provision would

never have been included in the final committee product without the leadership, persistence, and persuasiveness of Senators GOLDWATER and NUNN. Finally, I salute and pay tribute to Senator Scoop Jackson, who initiated a great deal of this seminal legislation.

THE RUSH OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. President, it was a talented and ambitious inventor, Francis Bacon, who issued the following warning on advancing technologies and the subsequent dangers involved:

It is well to observe the force and virtue and consequence of discoveries \* \* \* for these have changed the whole face and state of things throughout the world.

The Stinger missile represents this type of consequence.

This weapon epitomizes one of the most sophisticated and lethal American weapons, yet we are not taking preventive and prudent steps to assure its protection from terrorist hands.

Just recently at the economic summit in Tokyo homemade rockets were fired by a terrorist group at the building where the leaders of seven Western democracies were meeting.

We are all grateful that this was unsuccessful, yet the terrorists vow another attack.

These five homemade rockets were fired from 1.7 miles away.

The radical group later boasted of its ability to elude the tightest security net ever cast in Tokyo. A misplaced or stolen Stinger missile would give this terrorist group an increased 4 to 5 mile range, climbing 4,500 feet. This is a shoulder-fired missile triggered by a single person. Should this weapon fall into Russian, Cuban, PLO, or some other terrorist organization's hands, the boundaries of terrorist activity increase to staggering proportions. Preventive measures at airports jump from metal detectors and x-ray machines to roving helicopters, patrolling troops, and even pseudo star wars technology to effectively prevent missiles from engaging their targets once fired. The monetary costs are unimaginable. The potential cost of human life prohibitive.

Mr. President, this is precisely why this legislation seeks to prevent this nightmare. Picture an American jetliner filled with summer travelers as it takes off from a European city. Perched on a hilltop more than 3 miles away is a terrorist aiming a shoulder-held Stinger anti-aircraft missile at the jet. Within seconds, the airliner with its hundreds of passengers disappears in a bright orange inferno.

The scenario is hypothetical, but it is increasingly possible as the United States supplies Stinger missiles to resistance forces around the world. As a safeguard, this legislation before the Senate would require the President to insist on the same strict control over the missiles in rebel hands as we do for those we sell to our allies.

It is quite possible, given the loose structure of rebels' operations, that

May 7, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5505

bold thinking, precisely what is called for under many trying military conditions. Chairman GOLDWATER has put it well when he said that the advice that comes out of the Joint Chiefs "is often messy and poorly presented." Or as former Secretary of Defense Schlesinger has put it, "The proffered advice is generally irrelevant, normally unread, and almost always disregarded."

It is important to reemphasize that this legislation is not a criticism of any of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, past or present. They have been fine and patriotic men doing the best that they could do, often at a substantial sacrifice to their personal lives. The problem has not been the people. It's the system that has created the problem, and it's the system that needs to be fixed.

By making the JCS Chairman the principal military adviser, this lowest common denominator phenomenon will be abolished. At the same time, dissenting military advice from the other service chiefs will be passed on to the President, as it should be.

I am also heartened by the way this legislation strengthens the unified commands, our military leaders in the field. Unified commands have forces assigned to them from two or more different services and are responsible for a particular part of the world. While this is fine in theory, the setup to date has not worked too well in practice. As Senator NOWN has put it, "We have unified commanders but divided commands." Each unified commander has his own subordinate joint command, with a representative from each service, so that consensus must once again be reached among all the services. As the commander of the U.S. Readiness Command, Gen. Wallace Nutting, has said:

There is no unification below the Unified Command echelon. In this circumstance, the degree of operational unification in the readiness command and between its components is decidedly insufficient.

Unified commanders have little say on resource decisions. As Gen. Bernard Rogers, commander-in-chief of the European Command, has said:

There is an imbalance between my responsibilities and accountability as a unified operational commander and my influence on resource decisions.

This legislation would give the unified commanders a say in resource allocation decisions and would give him greater authority over the forces at his command. It also specifies that the chain of command run from the President to the Secretary of Defense to the combatant commanders. With this legislation, we will at long last answer President Eisenhower's call in 1958, nearly 30 years ago, "That each unified commander must have unquestioned authority over all units of his command."

The greater efficiency of defense management allows cutbacks to be made in headquarters staff, as it

should. A total of 8,232 positions in headquarters staffs will be eliminated, as will another 9,462 elsewhere in defense agencies, for a total of almost 17,700 positions. This will save several billion dollars in personnel costs alone over the next few years, and will eliminate duplication and mismanagement.

Madam President, this legislation is a rich tapestry of useful change in defense organization. It is long overdue, but it is here at last. These changes will do more to strengthen our security than any new weapon system. And unlike a weapon system, this legislation will save us billions, rather than cost us billions. This is especially important at a time of tight budgets. The need for change is urgent. The time for change is now. I am glad that the Senate is seizing this opportunity to make our military structure more effective, and more efficient, in defending our great country.

We may find in a year or two that we need some fine tuning on this bill, but I think this is one of the most, if not the most, significant things that has been done in the Senate in my 11 years here.

Again, I give my sincere thanks and congratulations to those who have worked so hard to make this day possible.

I yield the floor.

1420

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I thank my good friend for his comments.

I take this opportunity to remind him and in reminding him to remind all of my colleagues that one of our constitutional requirements is not just to raise the Army and the Navy but to maintain, in effect, oversight, something we really have not done.

I have served on the Armed Services Committee almost my entire time in the Senate, and while we once a year, in effect, look at how much money they want to spend on this, that, and the other thing, we have never really asked the question "Do you need it?"

I had an argument the other day with the Reserve Army and they want to buy four jet airplanes. "Why do you need four jet airplanes?" They said, "To accomplish our mission." I said "If you put a 20 millimeter cannon in the nose of that jet airplane I might buy it."

This is the kind of surveillance that every Member of this body can exercise all the time.

I will be the first one to tell you that we can save a lot of money. We are buying a lot of equipment, I hate to tell you, that we do not need. We just need a lot more of fundamental, down-to-earth weapons to go out and fight a war. We do not need all this fancy stuff. We can go back to throwing rocks and using spears and arrows, but I do not want to.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank Senator GOLDWATER and I tell him he has

warmed my heart because I have made that speech so many times. It is really gratifying to hear the chairman of this committee, who has had such an illustrious career in this whole area of defense, say those things. I could not agree more. I thank him for the comments.

Mr. COHEN. Madam President, earlier this morning the chairman, Senator GOLDWATER, indicated that if my colleagues were patient, I would have an eloquent statement to deliver later in the day. I do in fact have an eloquent statement to deliver, but I know that several of my colleagues have amendments they prefer to offer. Therefore, I will not impose my eloquence upon their patience.

I would, however, like to correct a statement I made earlier this morning. I suggested that the chairman had offered the Senate a new idea. I think we all know from biblical studies there is nothing new under the sun. With respect to maneuver warfare, for example, one can go back and quote from Sun Tzu, a great military strategist, who wrote on this subject over 2,000 years ago.

Defense reorganization is not a new idea. In fact, it is an old idea.

I would like to quote just a few words from President Eisenhower. He said:

Confronted by such urgent needs we cannot allow differing service viewpoints to determine the character of our defenses—either as to operational planning or control, or as to the development, production and use of newer weapons. To sanction administrative confusion and inter-service debates in these times, to court disaster. I cannot overemphasize my conviction that our country's security requirements must not be subordinated to outmoded or single-service concepts of war.

He made that statement in 1958. Nonetheless, because of an effort on the part of the Department of Defense over the years, that vision of his had not come to fruition.

Once again, I would like to praise Chairman GOLDWATER for his effort. Just as it took Richard Nixon to open the door to China, I believe it took BARRY GOLDWATER to open the door to the Pentagon for the winds of reform.

Although this is an old idea, it is an idea whose time has come. Without Senator GOLDWATER's leadership this measure would not be on the floor today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COHEN). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1033

(Purpose: To prohibit the sale, donation, or other transfer of Stinger antiaircraft missiles to democratic resistance forces in Afghanistan and Angola unless certain conditions are met.)

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

S 5872

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 13, 1986

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MELCHER] was withdrawn as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1823 intended to be proposed to S. 100, supra.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1951

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1951 intended to be proposed to S. 1999, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by providing for a uniform product liability law, and for other purposes.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 405—EX-  
PRESSING OPPOSITION TO  
THE IMPOSITION OF A FEDERAL  
LICENSING FEE FOR  
MARINE SPORTFISHING**

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

## S. RES. 405

Whereas the President has proposed the imposition of a federal licensing fee for recreational marine fishermen, to be implemented by the Secretary of Commerce;

Whereas the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has suggested imposing a similar fee on commercial fishermen;

Whereas the federal revenues raised by the proposed fees would not be contributed to enhancement of fisheries;

Whereas the revenues expected to be raised would far exceed federal expenditures in direct support of recreational fisheries;

Whereas there are over seventy million recreational fishing trips taken along the coastal mainland of the United States annually;

Whereas commercial and recreational fisheries together generate an estimated \$27 billion to the nation's economy, and provide employment for an estimated 900,000 individuals;

Whereas imposition of such a fee would discourage growth of the fisheries industries in this country, and harm related industries;

Whereas imposition of such a fee would have adverse impacts on state and local economies: Now, therefore, be it

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today I am submitting a resolution to express the sense of the Senate opposing the imposition of a Federal fishing license fee for recreational fishermen. I am pleased to be joined by my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, in submitting this resolution.

When the President submitted his budget proposal for fiscal year 1987, he included a recommendation to implement a Federal ocean sportfishing license. This proposal would require recreational fishermen to obtain a Federal license in order to fish off our coasts. The fee would be at least \$10, with \$5 going to the general treasury, and the remainder to the State in which the license was obtained. The administration proposes to raise \$200 million in revenues over the next 5 years through this program. None of

the Federal revenues generated from this fee would serve to enhance fisheries.

Fisheries represent an important segment of the economies of coastal States. Over 70 million recreational fishing trips were taken in the coastal waters of the continental United States. Combined, recreational and commercial fisheries generate an estimated \$27 billion in the United States, and employ approximately 900,000 individuals.

In my State, New Jersey, fisheries play a vital role in the State's economic well-being. An estimated 1.6 million salt water recreational fishermen reside in New Jersey, while another 1.2 million tourists come to our State each year to fish in the Atlantic coastal waters. There are 800 owners of large charter marine sportfishing charter boats in New Jersey. Recreational fisheries bring in between \$300 and \$400 million each year to the economy of New Jersey.

Mr. President, the imposition of a Federal ocean sportfishing license on recreational fishermen could have devastating impacts on State and local economies. In New Jersey, an overwhelming majority of those chartering marine fishing vessels do so only once each year. If a Federal fee of at least \$10 is imposed in addition to the cost of chartering a vessel, many of these one-time fishermen will find a fishing trip infeasible. The impact of this on charter boat owners, as well as on associated businesses would be severe.

The administration's proposal raised Federal revenues without any benefit accruing to the enhancement and enrichment of fisheries. This proposal attempts to raise Federal revenues at the expense of a small group. The National Marine Fisheries Service directly spends only about \$3 million to enhance recreational fisheries annually. The funds raised through this proposal would far exceed Federal expenditures in this area. Mr. President, this amounts to nothing more than a tax increase on recreational fishermen which is being disguised as a user fee.

This proposal is inappropriate, and I hope the administration will not pursue it further. This resolution is meant to put the Senate firmly on record in opposition to the administration's proposal. I am pleased to have Senator HOLLINGS as its original cosponsor, and urge my colleagues to support the resolution.●

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, today I join with my colleague Senator LAUTENBERG to submit a resolution expressing opposition to the administration's proposal to implement an ocean sportfishing license.

The plan would impose a fee of at least \$10 on the Nation's 17 million recreational anglers who fish in our coastal waters; \$5 of that license fee would go the Federal Government. The plan would generate hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue over the next few years.

Some might call this proposal a "user fee." But it is not. If it were, then recreational fishermen could expect to benefit directly from hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal services. Yet look at what they are getting—the National Marine Fisheries Service spends only about \$3 million a year on programs that directly enhance and support ocean sportfishing. And the administration wants to slash this agency's budget, to boot.

Ocean sportfishermen, who make more than 70 million fishing trips each year, are already paying for existing programs—through special taxes on the marine fuel and recreational equipment they purchase.

Thus, the administration's fishing license proposal is nothing more than a scheme to fleece the Nation's recreational fishermen of their hard-earned money in order to offset deficits they didn't create.

Mr. President, I have said for years that we can balance our Federal budget if the President and the Congress show the discipline necessary to do it. We've passed the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law to force us to exercise that discipline. But let us not look to hare-brained proposals such as this ocean sportfishing license to solve our deficit problems. It's not fair, it's not right, and it certainly won't get the job done.●

**SENATE RESOLUTION 406—HON-  
ORING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY  
OF CAMPING IN THE  
UNITED STATES**

Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. WEICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

## S. RES. 406

Whereas, in August of 1861, Frederick William Gunn, Headmaster of the Gunnery School in Washington, Connecticut, set out with his students on a forty-mile excursion to Welches Point on Long Island Sound in the first recorded organized children's summer camping experience in the history of our nation, and;

Whereas, the camp at Welches Point promoted the development and self-discipline of the participants, and was perceived to have been a valuable experience for the young students and adults who pitched tents and lived for two weeks in the out-of-doors, doing their own cooking, fishing, and chores, and enjoying songs and stories by campfire at night, and;

Whereas, since those origins in the late 19th century, organized camping has provided young people with activities designed to promote personal growth and development skills; to encourage positive behavioral change; and to foster the ability to communicate with both other children and adults; and;

Whereas, today over 11,000 camps, in 50 states, serve four million young Americans each year, and;

Whereas, 1986 is the 125th Anniversary of organized camping in the United States;

Resolved, That due honor and recognition be accorded the institution of organized camping in its 125th year of existence, with the acknowledgement of the contributions

May 13, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5871

amend chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit any former high-level Federal civilian officer or employee or high-ranking officer of a uniformed service from representing or advising a foreign principal for a period of at least 5 years after leaving Government service.

S. 2183

At the request of Mr. METZENBAUM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2183, a bill to improve services for individuals with Alzheimer's disease and their families.

S. 2206

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2206, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the windfall profit tax on crude oil.

S. 2273

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2273, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny the tax exemption for interest on industrial development bonds used to finance acquisition of farm property by foreign persons.

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL] were added as cosponsors of S. 2286, a bill to prohibit the sale, donation, or other transfer of Stinger antiaircraft missiles to democratic resistance forces in Afghanistan and Angola unless certain conditions are met.

S. 2327

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2327, a bill to amend the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to specify the method of determining State allotments.

S. 2347

At the request of Mr. BENTSEN, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2347, a bill to authorize the Corps of Engineers to issue permits under the Clean Water Act and the River and Harbor Act for construction of a water resource project in the State of Texas.

S. 2387

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2387, a bill to provide relief to State and local governments from Federal regulation.

S. 2411

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2411, a bill to prohibit possession, manufacture, sale, importation, and mailing of ballistic knives.

S. 2434

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2434, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prepare announcements for television on the health risks to women which result from cigarette smoking.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 311

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] and the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 311, a joint resolution designating the week beginning November 9, 1986, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 323

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 323, a joint resolution to designate May 21, 1986, as "National Andrei Sakharov Day".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 326

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 326, a joint resolution to proclaim May 21, 1986, as "Andrei Sakharov Honor and Freedom Day".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 333

At the request of Mr. ANDREWS, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. ABDNOR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WEICKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 333, a joint resolution designating the week of May 18, 1986, through May 24, 1986, as "National Food Bank Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 335

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 335, a joint resolution to designate May 8, 1986, as "Naval Aviation Day".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 337

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ARMSTRONG] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 337, a joint resolution designating May 18-24, 1986, as "Just Say No to Drugs Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 342

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. DENTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 342, a joint resolution to designate May 25, 1986, as "Missing Children Day".

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 125

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 125, a concurrent resolution recognizing the achievements of the Ireland Fund and its founder, Dr. Anthony J.F. O'Reilly.

SENATE RESOLUTION 381

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 381, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to United States corporations doing business in Angola.

SENATE RESOLUTION 385

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 385, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that certain action be taken to end hunger in the United States by 1990.

SENATE RESOLUTION 392

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 392, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the people of the Republic of Korea should be allowed to petition for a constitutional amendment to allow for the direct election of their president.

SENATE RESOLUTION 397

At the request of Mr. QUAYLE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. ABDNOR] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 397, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the lending practices of multilateral development banks.

AMENDMENT NO. 1823

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1823 intended to be proposed to S. 100, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by providing for a uniform product liability law, and for other purposes.

S 6394

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 21, 1986

from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. RUDMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. EVANS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MELCHER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HECHT] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 140, a concurrent resolution to pay tribute to the late William C. Lee and to designate June 6, 1986, as "William C. Lee Day."

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 141

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 141, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress for full representation by American ethnic groups in the awarding of Statue of Liberty medals.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 330

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 330, a resolution establishing a Special Committee on Families, Youth, and Children.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 409

At the request of Mr. MATTINGLY, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from California [Mr. WILSON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 409, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that the tax reform legislation, when that bill is signed into law, remain unchanged for a minimum of five years, for the purpose of promoting economic growth and opportunity.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1729

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 1729 intended to be proposed to S. 1004, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide for reclamation and other remedial actions

with respect to mill tailings at active uranium and thorium processing sites.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 143—URGING THE RESUMPTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES ORDERLY DEPARTURE FROM VIETNAM

Mr. DeCONCINI (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

## S. CON. RES. 143

Whereas the United Nations Orderly Departure Program for Vietnam has enabled more than 100,000 persons to leave Vietnam without facing the hazards of departure by sea, which has exposed thousands of Vietnamese to the risks of weather, unseaworthy vessels, and the depredations of pirates;

Whereas the international community, the United States Government, and the American people have expressed their support for the agreement reached between the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Vietnamese authorities in 1979 to establish the Orderly Departure Program for Vietnam (hereafter in this preamble referred to as the "Departure Program");

Whereas that agreement provides for both "family reunion and humanitarian cases" to depart Vietnam through the Departure Program and for the Government of Vietnam to provide the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the receiving countries with every facility to implement the Departure Program;

Whereas the President, in consultation with the Congress, proposed in September 1984, and reaffirmed in September 1985, that the United States was prepared to receive (1) persons of special humanitarian concern from Vietnam, in particular the "re-education camp" prisoners, thousands of whom remain imprisoned because of their past associations with United States programs and policies in the region or with the former Government of the Republic of Vietnam; and (2) the Amerasian children and their mothers and other close relatives remaining in Vietnam;

Whereas the United States and other concerned governments have earnestly sought improvements in the operation of the Departure Program at meetings organized by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees with representatives of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; and

Whereas the authorities of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on January 1, 1986, suspended the interviewing and processing of all applicants in Vietnam for resettlement in the United States, thus threatening to interrupt the flow of departures from Vietnam by those found eligible for admission to the United States as refugees or immigrants: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Congress hereby calls upon the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam—

(1) to permit the immediate resumption of interviewing and processing of applicants in Vietnam who have received preliminary approval from the United States Government for resettlement in the United States under the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Orderly Departure Program for Vietnam; and

(2) to permit the orderly departure of "re-education camp" prisoners, Amerasian chil-

dren, and other persons of special humanitarian concern to the United States.

● Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs, Senator MURKOWSKI, I am submitting today a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam should (1) immediately resume the interviewing and processing of applicants in Vietnam who have received preliminary approval from the U.S. Government for resettlement in the United States under the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR] Orderly Departure Program, and (2) permit the orderly departure of "re-education camp" prisoners, Amerasian children, and other persons of special humanitarian concern to the United States.

Mr. President, our good friend from Florida, Congressman MICHAEL BILLRAKIS, who traveled to Vietnam with Senator MURKOWSKI, Congressman McEWEN, and myself in January, will be introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

While the congressional members of the Murkowski Codel were in Hanoi pursuing the POW/MIA issue with Vietnamese officials, other members of our staffs visited the Phanat Nikhom Refugee Camp in Thailand. In subsequent reports to us, they underscored the importance of the Orderly Departure Program [ODP] continuing in an unimpeded manner.

Mr. President, the Orderly Departure Program was negotiated in 1979 between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam [SRV] and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in response to the flood of boat people who fled Vietnam in 1978 and 1979. Many of these "boat people" traveled in unsafe vessels and unnecessarily died as a result of storms, drownings, and attacks by pirates. The Orderly Departure Program was established to provide a humane and orderly way in which refugees could leave Vietnam and resettle in nations willing to accept them.

The Orderly Departure Program works like this:

Interest expressed. A person in the United States or in the SRV contacts the ODP office at the American Embassy in Bangkok, or a voluntary agency in the United States, expressing interest in the ODP. The ODP office requests an immigrant visa petition from the relative in the United States or proof of a past close association with the United States.

Documentation. Upon receipt of an approved immigrant visa petition [I-130] or of evidence of close past ties with the United States, the ODP office in Bangkok opens a file and requests the documents required to complete the application. When the ODP is satisfied with the documentation submitted, it then adds the name of the applicant to the list of names of

May 21, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 6393

sale, donation, or other transfer of Stinger antiaircraft missiles to democratic resistance forces in Afghanistan and Angola unless certain conditions are met.

S. 2291

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] were added as cosponsors of S. 2291, a bill to amend the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 to create an independent Nuclear Safety Board.

S. 2294

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as cosponsor of S. 2294, a bill to reauthorize certain programs under the Education of the Handicapped Act, to authorize an early intervention program for handicapped infants, and for other purposes.

S. 2332

At the request of Mr. BOSCHWITZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 2332, a bill to provide credit assistance to borrowers of loans made by commercial lending institutions, Farm Credit System institutions, and the Farmers Home Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2333

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DONN] were added as cosponsors of S. 2333, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to strengthen and improve Medicaid services to low-income pregnant women and children.

S. 2401

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 2401, a bill to prohibit the manufacture or distribution in, or the importation into, the United States of certain firearms.

S. 2410

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] were added as cosponsors of S. 2410, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for improved treatment of small rural hospitals and sole community hospitals under title XVIII and XIX of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2411

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Michigan

[Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2411, a bill to prohibit possession, manufacture, sale, importation, and mailing of ballistic knives.

S. 2421

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act.

S. 2444

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as cosponsor of S. 2444, a bill to reauthorize the Head Start Act, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, the community Services Block Grant Act, the dependent care State grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2453

At the request of Mr. COHEN, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2453, a bill to enhance the capabilities of the United States to combat terrorism and other forms of unconventional warfare.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 134

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 134, a joint resolution to designate "National Safety in the Workplace Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 169

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], and the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 169, a joint resolution to commemorate the bicentennial anniversary of the first patent and the first copyright laws.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 244

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 244, a joint resolution to designate October 8, 1986, as "National Fire Fighters Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 322

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 322, a joint resolution to designate December 7, 1986, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day" on the occasion of the anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 338

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY], the

Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HECHT] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 338, a joint resolution to designate November 18, 1986, as "National Community Education Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 346

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 346, a joint resolution to designate June 21, 1986, as "National Save American Industry and Jobs Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 347

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 347, a joint resolution to designate the week of May 19, 1986, through May 24, 1986, as "National Homelessness Awareness Week."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 131

At the request of Mr. HART, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HECHT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 131, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Soviet Union should immediately provide for the release and safe passage of Naum Meiman and Inna Kitrosskaya-Meiman.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 138

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 138, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to Farm Credit System agricultural loan restructuring.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 140

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from California [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAST], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. DENTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], the Senator

May 7, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5507

they could not satisfy the conditions, and in such cases the missiles should not be provided. We cannot afford to let these particular missiles, the ultimate terrorist weapon, slip into the wrong hands.

The U.S. Government has set strict guidelines for transportation and storage of Stinger missiles. When we agreed to sell this weapon to our allies, such as Saudi Arabia and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, stringent safeguards were required as conditions of the sale. These safeguards included storage in steel vaults, 24-hour armed security and keeping the launcher and missile locked up separately. We also stipulated the right to conduct an inventory and inspection at any time.

But the Reagan administration has reportedly begun covertly supplying rebels in Angola and Afghanistan with Stinger missiles without the same safety requirements. I do not believe we need to provide our most sophisticated weapons to the forces in Angola and Afghanistan for them to be successful. We can show our support for the rebel groups and provide for their defensive needs with weapons less lethal, mobile, or destabilizing than the Stinger.

I have grave concern that the Stinger might fall into the hands of Col. Muammar el-Qadhafi, the Palestine Liberation Organization, Iran, or even the Russians or Cubans, who maintain large numbers of advisers and troops in Angola and Afghanistan. A journalist who has covered the Afghan war described one rebel group there as being followers of the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Posters of the Ayatollah adorn the walls of their village.

The State Department has described some of the actions of UNITA, the Angolan rebel force led by Jonas Savimbi, as bordering on terrorist activity. For example, UNITA claims to have shot down at least three civilian Angolan aircraft.

The recent terrorist bombings of the West Berlin discotheque and the TWA jetliner are evidence of an increased threat to American targets. Colonel Qadhafi says he will export terrorism and "pursue U.S. citizens in their country and streets." The PLO faction leader Abu Nidal has also said that "America is our target." The United States must protect itself by being careful not to arm its enemies. President Reagan can help to ensure the safety of Americans at home and abroad by enforcing strict safeguards on the sale and use of Stinger missiles.

Vice President GEORGE BUSH issued his report on combatting terrorism in February 1986. His report documents the following statistics:

The number of incidents has generally risen since statistics were first compiled in 1968, with a trend toward bloodier incidents with more fatalities. Attacks caused 20 fatalities in 1968 compared to 926 in 1985;

During the past decade, terrorists have attacked U.S. officials or installations abroad once every 17 days. In the past 17 years, terrorists have killed as many U.S. diplomats as were killed in the previous 180 years;

In the bombing of one location, the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut, the United States lost nearly as many servicemen as the British lost in the entire Falklands campaign.

However, as astounding as statistics can be, you cannot quantify human life. Just ask the parents of Natasha Simpson, an 11-year-old American girl gunned down by terrorists in the Rome and Vienna airport massacre. Just ask the parents of U.S. serviceman Sgt. Kenneth Ford, who lost his life in the West Berlin discotheque. No, Mr. President, we should not make it easier for terrorists in this very dangerous environment today.

In Afghanistan, the black market provides abundant opportunities for terrorists to purchase numerous weapons of their liking. This is a chilling consideration. While I adamantly support the rebels' struggle against the Russians we must not introduce Stinger missiles into this area without protection in a cavalier manner. Millions of dollars in weapons have already fallen into the hands of a prolific black market. Many of the rebels are a lot closer politically and religiously to Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini. We must provide adequate resistance for freedom fighters while not endangering American freedom abroad and at home.

One of the many reasons for insisting upon safeguards is that before this century is over, the rush of technology will probably deliver into the hands of minuscule peoples highly sophisticated weapons of frightening power. The West and Russia live with arms competition between each other. We simply cannot tolerate a world where the Qadhafis and the Arafats can give a few terrorists the power to paralyze cities and kill thousands of innocent victims that do not accede to their demands. The physical safety of the West 10 years from now depends on its setting clear rules and prudent policies today. We can provide resistance efforts with capable and effective weaponry while not threatening American lives. This legislation seeks to protect our weapons and our citizens. After all, Mr. President, our Constitution reads:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

□ 1440

I am hopeful that my colleagues will accept this amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER and Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is never pleasant for me to have to oppose my colleague from Arizona. But first, this amendment has no business on this legislation. This legislation is an attempt to offer the Pentagon and the military Forces the opportunity to reorganize. An amendment that calls for the exact location and use of a certain weapon is out of place. But, nevertheless, I hope I can answer the Senator.

We are opposed to this, naturally. The subject the amendment seeks to address is very, very sensitive. The Chair and I have both served on the Intelligence Committee for many, many years. And if it is to be considered by the Congress, it should come to the floor only after it has received the most serious and searching examination by appropriate Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Intelligence Committees of the Congress.

I am very happy to see the chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee here.

The administration believes that it is inappropriate, therefore, for so sensitive a matter as that addressed by this amendment to be considered on the floor with this matter, and such an important piece of legislation as this is essentially irrelevant to the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. President, I have looked at the amendment. It is rather hard to believe. It is mostly a description of how these missiles should be stored. It does not tell who we sell them to or not sell them to, but I look, starting on page 2, at how the magazines shall be constructed, how lighting shall be provided, and that the exterior doors, that happen to be classified, are steel vault doors operated by two key-operated, high-security padlock and hasp.

I do not think Afghanistan ever heard of it. But, nevertheless, they have them; fencing, full-time guard force, 100 percent physical counts shall be taken monthly.

So the amendment is mostly taken up with how these weapons shall be stored, observed, and taken care of regardless of where they are.

I must say to my very good friend from Arizona that this type of weapon is not hard to get. The first one I ever saw was 25 years ago made by the French Government called a TOW. Every country that I know of in the civilized and some of the uncivilized world have shoulder-borne weapons that can be fired the same as a Stinger. The Stinger happens to be in my opinion the best. But this type of weapon even with this amendment is not going to stop the production or stop it being made available.

I would like, Mr. President, very much for the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator LUGAR, to comment on this amendment because it comes more under his committee

than it does under my committee. As I say, it has no place on this bill.

Mr. LUGAR addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER: The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the invitation of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee to comment on this amendment. I appreciate the importance of the legislation that is now before the body, and the work that the distinguished chairman, ranking member, and others have put in on this legislation.

I have come to the floor because I am concerned about the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona. My first comments parallel those of Senator GOLDWATER. The matter is a very sensitive matter. I think it is acceptable to talk hypothetically about such matters. But when press reports are described and then we move from those reports to this amendment, I believe it calls for the consideration of the Intelligence Committee, or at least for private sessions of the Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committees.

The Senator's motivation in offering the amendment is an important one. Stinger missiles have great potential for destruction. This is one reason why they are in great demand. But let me point out, Mr. President, that this particular amendment proposes actions that are best left to the discretion of the Chief Executive.

I'm making this point because we try so often to micromanage our foreign policy on the floor and to develop our foreign policy tactics. The President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense are fully aware of the potential dangers of Stinger missiles. That wisdom is not reposed just with concerned Senators. These are indeed destructive weapons. They have very great capability against aircraft because they can, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona pointed out, be carried by individuals.

In the event freedom fighters or ground troops are attacked by aircraft of Marxist regimes, hypothetically, the aircraft would typically prevail. The fact is that freedom fighters with a Stinger missile might have an equalizer in this hypothetical situation, and might even prevail.

As a general foreign policy proposition, the Congress has supported the President of the United States in his attempts to support those peoples who want freedom, who are fighting Marxist regimes, and who are trying to establish democracy. There are a number of such instances around the world. Each one of them is controversial and each one is unique. We have discussed them backward and forward at various times and in various places within the Senate.

The President of the United States also asserted from time to time that it may be important to employ overt,

and on occasion covert, means to further these objectives, and there are provisions under law for handling those situations.

As a practical matter, Mr. President, this particular amendment is aimed at Afghanistan and Angola by name. The prospects, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona has pointed out, of putting vaults and all of the other security safeguards to protect against loss of the Stinger missiles in Angola or in Afghanistan are remote indeed. The net effect of the amendment is to say to the President of the United States he is precluded, that he cannot provide this weapon system to these two particular countries whatever his best judgment, or that of the State Department, and the Defense Department, and the National Security Council.

I think, in terms of general philosophy, it is a mistake, Mr. President, to get into legislating specific weapons, specific countries, and hypothetical situations. Mentioning Afghanistan and Angola, however, raises some very important foreign policy questions.

If the Senator from Arizona wanted to debate the value of our backing the Afghanistan freedom fighters, that would be an important debate in itself. My own assumptions are that a majority of the Members of this body do favor support of the Afghan freedom fighters.

□ 1450

Let me just say that support is predicated on the expectation that the President of the United States has a number of ways of offering that support. The Afghan freedom fighters are not an army arrayed in such a way that you can see them and count them. They are engaged in what could be called guerrilla warfare. They face conditions in the field which hardly permits the same precise arrangements as are prescribed for Saudi Arabia, where they house their Stinger missiles.

In short, Mr. President, there is considerable foreign policy content in this amendment, and considerable supposition as to who is responsible for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, the specific tactics to pursue and the weapons that are to be used.

I found the amendment weak on all counts in that respect.

Once again, the Senator from Arizona has taken up the question of the freedom fighters in Angola. That is an interesting question. We have discussed that issue on various occasions. Some Members have said yes and some have said no to our support for these insurgents.

But this amendment gets us into the specific weapons, the specific requirements for the housing and care of those weapons in a situation where the freedom fighters are not a standing army, with battle lines and the characteristics that are evident in a conventional warfare. It is guerrilla warfare. And, it is tough business.

There is a Marxist government in Angola, a government which is not our friend. Furthermore, we want the Cubans out of Angola. We want the Soviets to stop supporting the Cubans. As a matter of fact, we want a number of changes in that country. With Savimbi we have an opportunity to show where we stood on that issue.

Mr. President, in addition to describing whether or not we want to help Savimbi, I think it is not advisable, as a matter of policy, that Congress should be dealing with specific weapons in the Angola struggle.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the distinguished Senator from Arizona will allow his amendment to be withdrawn from this particular debate and will attempt to work with the chairmen of the various committees which have relevance to the safety of American aircraft. He suggests the hypothetical situation of an American aircraft being shot down by a Stinger missile. That is a horrendous possibility in this world today and one which we should and must prevent from happening.

But, to think through every condition in which an American aircraft might be hit by a Stinger missile defies speculation. Frankly, it is not a useful debate.

It seems to me, this body can determine who are our friends, who are our enemies, who we want to help, and whether we want to give authority to the President for devising the tactics to be effective. Those, I think, are appropriate subjects for us to debate.

I would hope the amendment would be withdrawn and referred to the appropriate committees for closed discussion, since it involves very sensitive issues.

Finally, Mr. President, I would say that I share the thoughts expressed by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, and others who may have some sympathy for this amendment. We do need to be careful about safeguarding these missiles. They are indeed deadly. They are very effective. That is one of the reasons we might want to provide them to those who are fighting on our side; it could help equalize the sides rather substantially. But, in this particular debate I would hope the amendment would be withdrawn. In the event that it is not withdrawn, I would hope that it would be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair will recognize the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator speak to this amendment?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as co-sponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: Without objection, it is so ordered.

May 7, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5509

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I appreciate what the chairman of the committee, Senator GOLDWATER, has said, as well as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR, about sensitive information. It is that. But I also think it is an extremely important issue. I can fully appreciate why Senator GOLDWATER and Senator NUNN would hesitate to see adding this amendment to what is an enormously important piece of legislation in their effort to reorganize the Department of Defense. But I think when we have an issue such as this before us, it is one that does require some thoughtful analysis. It is not an attempt to micro-manage policy from here. It is an attempt to address what I think, as a matter of fact, is a decision which is a watershed for U.S. policy.

For the past 40 years we have followed a self-imposed ban on the use of top-grade American weapons in covert competition with the Soviets. Up until now we have given this weapon to only a few. It is not a question of saying who we should or should not give them to, but it is a question of setting, I believe, sound guidelines. These transfers we have made have always involved rigorous security requirements.

Stingers today cannot be bought on the black market and have not been lost in any war.

Serious questions are raised about whether the decision to send Stingers to rebel forces runs directly counter to our vigorous efforts over the past several years to control technology transfer and to ensure that our advanced technology, whether military or civilian, does not fall into the hands of the Soviet Union.

There has been a vigorous debate before on the floor of the Senate as well as elsewhere.

Sending this advanced technology to rebel forces is a dangerous proposition.

I would like to quote from our distinguished colleague, Senator PACKWOOD, at the time of a previous debate when he said the United States was considering the sale of Stingers with security controls. He said at that time:

There will not be an airplane or an airport in the civilized world which will be safe.

There is no certainty that the Stingers will remain in the hands of forces friendly to the United States. We have already seen captured Soviet surface-to-air missiles which have turned up in rebel hands in Angola and Central America. And we have also seen numerous reports that a large percentage of arms sent to Afghanistan end up in the black market in Pakistan.

Supplying Stingers to rebel forces, I believe, Mr. President, runs directly counter to our concern about curtailing terrorism. This Chamber has fully discussed the danger of sending Stingers to sovereign nations, such as Saudi Arabia. The danger of this weapon falling into terrorist hands is escalated in the case of sending these weapons to rebel groups.

Mr. President, supplying Stingers to rebel groups furthermore runs counter to another principal reason for our self-imposed ban on sending U.S. made weapons to support covert actions. We have followed this policy in order to maintain the right of denial so that these conflicts do not escalate. We should be thinking long and hard about whether we want to change this policy and whether the costs outweigh the benefits. I think they do not. Overall, I think sending Stingers to rebel groups will result in compromising our long-term security interests. I oppose this policy.

It is not just a question of a couple of countries; it is a question of really being sure we are thinking about long-term policy. It seems to me the course of direction is being turned and changed without any thoughtful debate.

□ 1500

Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas. Let me say, I agree with her.

Let me say that I understand the sensitivity of this issue. My colleagues know all about this. I have availed myself of briefings and confidential information; information which I cannot go into.

But this is information that is not classified. This lists all the requirements that we now require of our North Atlantic allies as well as the Saudi Arabians. It is public information which has been in the New York Times. We have a number of public articles in the Washington Post, and one in the New York Times of April 30, indicating that the administration had to fire Dr. Pillsbury for disclosing that Stinger missiles were going to be transferred to Angola and Afghanistan.

So I understand this concern that my colleague has about sensitivity.

As to the reason it is on this legislation, let me first say it is not my intention to disturb and disrupt a fine piece of legislation. If I had assurance that I could have a vote on this in the next few days, I would be more than happy to take my chances here. As we know in this body, you have to strike sometimes when the opportunity is ripe. This is a germane subject and one that I do not think can wait for the Department's authorization legislation.

When my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, raised the issue of debating support of the freedom fighters—I am more than happy to debate it because I firmly support them. I am for transferring weapons to them, including Stinger missiles if that is the decision, but with these safeguards. So we would be on the same side of any such debate here.

(Mrs. KASSEBAUM assumed the chair.)

Mr. DeCONCINI. What I am debating is whether or not we should ask

the President to certify to Congress that the same safety and security are provided for these transfers as they are to those in Saudi Arabia. That does not make this Senator opposed to the freedom fighters. As a matter of fact, I think it would be better if that were the case.

In the U.S. News & World Report of this week, there is a statement regarding the Stinger aircraft missiles supplied to the Afghan rebels by the CIA. It says insiders have said that the guerrillas missed 11 out of 12 Soviet aircraft. Maybe they need more training and maybe they need better security. I think we are begging for a problem if we do not put somebody in charge to tell us that those safety requirements have been met.

As to foreign policy concerns, this is our foreign policy. When we transferred Stingers in the past and if we transfer Stingers tomorrow to Saudi Arabia, the conditions set out in this amendment will have to be adhered to. If we transfer them to NATO allies, these same conditions are implemented. Certainly in foreign policy, this precaution and prudence is one policy that I wholeheartedly agree with.

Here we are, talking about Congress' involvement in foreign policy, and I think the Senator from Indiana agrees that we do that all the time. He disagrees with some of this and he is the architect of much of it. I agree with him in many areas where Congress does assert itself. We are saying in this amendment that if we are going to transfer these missiles to these two countries, we ought to have the same security that we have for NATO and Saudi Arabia.

Maybe there is something wrong with this amendment, Madam President. Maybe it is just too much commonsense. Maybe that is not supposed to be the order of the day here. But if we can require a set of standards for Saudi Arabia, which could easily have guerrillas and PLO members—we could think of all kinds of chilling scenarios, like guerrilla warfare in that country. We can imagine all kinds of scenarios of different combat and intrigue that could happen with those allies and we require them to have certain security provisions. Why should that not be the same policy when we hand these missiles over to any other freedom fighters?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of cosponsors I send to the desk be added to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The additional cosponsors referred to are as follows: Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HART, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. METZENBAUM, and Mr. KERRY.

OPPOSITION TO DeCONCINI AMENDMENT

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

S 5510

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 7, 1986

We all share the Senator's goal: To ensure that any weapon of this type we provide anywhere in the world—whether to an established government or to a democratic resistance group—not fall into unauthorized hands, particularly into the hands of terrorists or others who might intend us harm.

## LEGISLATION NOT NEEDED

I disagree, though, that the way to accomplish this goal is through legislation. This is essentially a management, not a legislative, problem—a significant one, to which we should give appropriate attention—but a management problem, nonetheless.

I am prepared to join in seeking from the administration assurances that this kind of equipment—or, for that matter, any kind of equipment—is properly controlled. I am confident we can work with the administration to get those kinds of assurances and work out appropriate controls. That is a matter that, in some cases, perhaps, can be worked out in the Armed Services or Intelligence Committee. But I do not believe it is a matter that requires, or is appropriate for, legislation.

## SAFEGUARDS FOR GUERRILLA WARS

I would also say that it may be necessary to tailor the safeguards and controls that are set up so that they make sense in the real world of contemporary, guerrilla-style warfare. The wars in Angola and Afghanistan are not conventional wars. It may be that conventional, bureaucratic controls will not turn out to be the best, or most practical, way to assure the kind of safeguards we need. Guidelines drawn up for peacetime situations, within internationally observed borders, where massive numbers of foreign troops are not waging aggressive warfare against indigenous freedom fighters—those kinds of guidelines may need to be adapted. Again, let's try to work out those adaptations cooperatively, with the administration, before we lay down wholly impractical, inappropriate guidelines in law.

## FREEDOM FIGHTERS NEED AND DESERVE OUR HELP

Freedom fighters in Angola and Afghanistan are being subjected to fierce, relentless attacks by marxist regimes, buttressed by tens of thousands of Soviet and Cuban troops and billions of dollars in Soviet military hardware. They are being bombed and strafed by advanced jet fighters and helicopters. They are dying at the hands of Soviet bombs and rockets. They have to be given the means to defend themselves, to fight back.

We can find a way to do that without compromising the safeguards we need to maintain on the material we give these freedom fighters. Let's get on with that important job, without sacrificing the freedom fighters to stand and die defenseless before their enemies.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I share Senator DeConcini's deep con-

cern and fear that Stinger missiles may eventually end up in the hands of terrorists and enemies of the United States. I hope Senator DeConcini continues in his efforts, working toward the goal of preventing Stingers from being transferred to areas and forces without guarantees that they will not eventually fall into the wrong hands.

The reason I shall vote to table this amendment at this time is that this amendment could be misconstrued as providing the President with a congressional endorsement and mechanism to send Stingers to Afghanistan and Angola if certain conditions are met.

I do not think Stingers should be in any place where there is the potential they may fall into hostile hands.

Further, I am concerned by the implication in the amendment that U.S. military forces would have to go to Afghanistan and Angola to see that the conditions were being met. Section 2(B) states that a U.S. military training mission shall conduct inspections and inventory annually.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will vote to table the DeConcini amendment but I want to make clear that I do so without passing judgment on the merits of the issue. Like many of my colleagues I need more time to study this complicated issue. At this point I tend to agree with the managers of the bill that the Defense reorganization bill is not the proper vehicle to deal with this issue and, more importantly, that the relevant Senate committees ought to be given a chance to pass judgment on this multifaceted issue before it is voted on in the Senate. Accordingly, while I vote to table this amendment, I reserve judgment on its merits.

Mr. COHEN. Madam President, just a couple of words. I think that the Senator from Kansas, the occupant of the Chair [Mrs. KASSERBAUM], raised a valid point when she said this is a watershed decision. It appears to me that both she and Senator DeConcini are correct when they say we should proceed with great deliberation and equate this with the sale of weapons to Saudi Arabia.

If in fact this is watershed, and it may be; if in fact, it is comparable to the AWACS sale—and it may be, it seems to me it should have the same deliberate debate that occurred with respect to the sale of AWACS.

It seems to me it should in fact be referred not only to the Intelligence Committee but also to the Foreign Relations Committee to have a full-fledged debate as to whether or not this country should adopt a policy of transferring a high-quality, high-level technology to rebel forces or freedom fighters in third-world countries.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. DeConcini] raises a valid question. If we support freedom fighters, the question is, "Do we arm them or do we give them nonlethal aid?" If we decide we are going to give them lethal aid, the

next question is, what kind of lethal aid? If we are going to give them effective lethal aid, would that include the ability to shoot down Hind helicopters now being supplied by the Soviets to forces in Angola, Afghanistan, and elsewhere? The Soviets have not hesitated to supply Hind helicopters to forces trying to suppress those who advocate a democratic regime. So the question becomes, if you are going to have an effective counter to those helicopters, what is it going to be?

Those are all very important questions, and they do deserve congressional deliberation, because Congress has a role to play; not only the administration, not only the Commander-in-Chief, not only those in the White House. Congress has a role to play in those kinds of decisions.

It seems to me this amendment is inappropriate. The senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has waited as long as President Eisenhower waited to effect the kind of reform contained in this bill. It is 30 years overdue. It seems to me it is entirely inappropriate to attach this amendment on this bill at this time, to raise this matter before the Senate.

I think the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. DeConcini] is entitled to prompt action by the Foreign Relations Committee, to have a full debate in that committee and on the floor, but not to jeopardize or indeed to impair the effort being made. It has been an extraordinary effort made in the Armed Services Committee under the leadership of Senator GOLDWATER. To add this amendment to the bill does not do justice to the senior Senator from Arizona and does not do justice to the quality of debate about Stingers, their protection, restrictions, and indeed, the role of Congress in approving the sale of weapons. I join my colleague from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] and urge we save this debate for another time that should not be too far away in order to have a full-fledged debate on the merits of the kind of aid we are going to supply to rebel or freedom-fighting forces in other lands.

(Mr. QUAYLE assumed the chair.)

Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Maine that this is not a debate and this amendment has nothing to do with shall we or shall we not transfer or donate these weapons. This Senator has not made a judgment on that. Quite frankly, I am glad to leave that to the Chief Executive and his advisers. This amendment only says that if there are transfers, then the President must certify that the same security is made available. I think that is important to the debate here.

As to whether or not it should be here, as I said before, I hesitate bringing it up on this bill for the many reasons the Senator from Maine has articulated. Senator GOLDWATER, Senator MURKIN, and the members of the committee have worked very diligently

May 7, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5511

for a long time on the bill. I acknowledge that and I thank them sincerely for producing this bill. But I do not see how this amendment, if it should pass, is going to kill this bill or hurt this bill dramatically. To me, it does not make a whole lot of sense that this amendment is going to be a killer amendment.

It is a simple amendment. It says if we transfer them, then safety and security have to be certified. That is all.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this amendment has no place on this bill. I say to my junior colleague that the authorization bill of the Armed Services Committee, we hope, will be on the floor within a month. That is the place to put it. I did not have this bill come to the floor to have it pose as a Christmas tree. I suggest we lay this amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make the motion to table the amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have made a motion to table the amendment.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona withhold that motion?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator can go ahead.

□ 1510

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Arizona is very concerned about this overall subject and I would say that his concern is well placed.

I think we do have some very tough, sensitive decisions in this area. It is obvious that, for instance, on a hypothetical basis what the Soviet Union is doing in Afghanistan is putting in some of their most sophisticated equipment and conducting air operations all over Afghanistan and they are very successful in terms of their devastating result. Hypothetically that is happening in other places in the world and so what the Senator from Arizona is saying is that we have a problem.

I would hope, though, the Senator from Arizona would consider not voting on this amendment. I do not have any vote count, and I would like very much to see this subject addressed in a serious way. I would think that the tabling motion by the senior Senator from Arizona would carry. I hope the implication would not be that the Senate of the United States is not concerned about this because it ought to be concerned. I hope, if that is the outcome, and if there is a vote, the Senator from Arizona would pursue other avenues like getting in touch with the Intelligence Committee and Foreign Relations Committee and the President himself and urging that wherever these missiles are sent in the world, hypothetically, in various locations—and I do not think we should discuss any of this in detail here on the floor—there be certain safeguards.

I would think the safeguards would have to be different in one situation

than another. If you have a NATO-type safeguard for missiles, you can have fixed-place, concrete-type containers, you can have locations that are well-known and designated. That is the way most of the NATO arsenals are supplied and stored. Adversaries know where they are. That is not good, but I think that is the way the situation has evolved over the years. But in any kind of hypothetical guerrilla warfare anywhere in the world, the safeguards that the junior Senator from Arizona has proposed, in all sincerity, would be like sending up red flares and saying "Here we are," to the Soviets, "come and get us." So the very safeguards that are in this legislation by their very nature, although perhaps applicable to NATO, even Saudi Arabia, are not applicable in any kind of hypothetical guerrilla warfare, certainly involving an adversary like the Soviet Union. I have chosen my words carefully here.

Mr. DECONCINI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NUNN. I will be glad to yield in one moment. I would support the tabling motion at this time, but before the senior Senator from Arizona pursues that motion, I would ask again for the junior Senator to consider the ramifications of having this tabled, if it is tabled, when the message he is trying to send may very well be a message that many, many of the colleagues who would vote to table would also like.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is debate allowed after a motion to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withheld his motion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I did not withhold it. I moved to table it.

Mr. DECONCINI. Will the Senator withhold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to table.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I move to table it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is what I thought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is on the motion to table. All those in favor say aye.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator

from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Leg.]

## YEAS—63

Abdnor	Garn	Moynihan
Andrews	Glenn	Murkowski
Armstrong	Goldwater	Nickles
Bentsen	Gorton	Nunn
Bingaman	Gramm	Pressler
Boren	Grassley	Quayle
Bumpers	Hatch	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hatfield	Roth
Chiles	Hecht	Rudman
Cochran	Heflin	Simpson
Cohen	Heinz	Stafford
D'Amato	Helms	Stennis
Denton	Kasten	Stevens
Dixon	Laxalt	Symms
Dodd	Levin	Thurmond
Dole	Long	Trible
Domenici	Lugar	Wallop
Durenberger	Mattingly	Warner
East	McClure	Weicker
Evans	McConnell	Wilson
Exon	Mitchell	Zorinsky

## NAYS—34

Baucus	Harkin	Melcher
Biden	Hart	Metzenbaum
Boschwitz	Hollings	Pell
Bradley	Inouye	Proxmire
Burdick	Johnston	Pryor
Chafee	Kassebaum	Riegle
Cranston	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Danforth	Kerry	Sasser
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Simon
Eagleton	Leahy	Specter
Ford	Mathias	
Gore	Matsunaga	

## NOT VOTING—3

Hawkins	Humphrey	Packwood
---------	----------	----------

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 1833) was agreed to.

□ 1540

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BIDEN be added as a cosponsor of S. 2295.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1834

(Purpose: To modify the provisions relating to the succession to duties of the Secretaries of the military departments make certain technical change)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, earlier today I put forth two amendments and then withdrew them. Since that time, the managers of the bill and others have had an opportunity to look over the objectives of these two amendments and I think we have now reached a consensus.

At this time, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

S 5512

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 7, 1986

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) proposes an amendment numbered 1834.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment reads as follows:

On page 44, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

"(11) The construction, outfitting, and repair of military equipment."

On page 44, line 17, strike out "(11)" and insert in lieu thereof "(12)".

On page 44, line 21, strike out "(10)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)".

On page 46, after line 25, insert the following:

(A) In subsection (a), by striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The Assistant Secretaries of the Army in the order prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the Secretary of Defense."

On page 49, line 1, strike out "(A)" and insert in lieu thereof "(B)".

On page 49, line 3, strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(C)".

On page 61, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

"(11) The construction, outfitting, and repair of military equipment."

On page 61, line 9, strike out "(11)" and insert in lieu thereof "(12)".

On page 61, line 13, strike out "(10)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)".

On page 66, strike out line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the order prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy and approved by the Secretary of Defense."

On page 88, after line 25, insert the following:

"(11) The construction, outfitting, and repair of military equipment."

On page 89, line 3, strike out "(11)" and insert in lieu thereof "(12)".

On page 89, line 5, strike out "(10)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)".

On page 93, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(A) In subsection (a), by striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force in the order prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force and approved by the Secretary of Defense."

On page 93, line 4, strike out "(A)" and insert in lieu thereof "(B)".

On page 93, line 6, strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(C)".

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. GRAMM, be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment—and it is in two parts—the first gives to each of the three service Secretaries, Army, Navy, and Air Force, clear statutory authority to perform, and I quote from the amendment, "the construction outfitting, and repair of military equipment." Of course, that is military equipment that falls under their jurisdiction. That provides these individ-

uals with direct supervision over this equipment.

I think it clarifies what I perceive to be an omission in the present draft of the bill.

The second portion of this amendment addresses the subject of the seniority of the Assistant Secretaries of the military services. This amendment provides uniformity for all three departments and the order of seniority will be established by the service Secretary, subject to approval of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, I note on the floor my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, with whom I had the privilege of serving in the Department of Defense for 3 years. He is quite familiar with these issues and I yield to him for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, as I understand the second part of this amendment, it is that within the department, the service Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, can determine the seniority of the Assistant Secretaries who work with him; is that correct?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I think that makes a good deal of sense. I think that when you have got somebody in charge within the department, namely, the service Secretary, I think we should leave it to that service Secretary to determine that seniority. You could easily have the situation where he would come in and have in place service Secretaries who had been appointed previous to his coming to the job, and the seniority that they might have amongst themselves might not be the seniority that that service Secretary would want. I think he should be given that privilege.

The alternative, of course, the normal situation, is he can just dismiss them, any one of them. He may not want to do that, but still may want to readjust the seniority that they have.

If there is a feeling that that gives him too much power, I notice you have a provision that it is in consultation with the Secretary of Defense. That seems to me to be a very fair proposal. I hope that will be acceptable to the managers of the bill.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CHAFEE. I would like to briefly speak on the other items, but perhaps we could finish the first one.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on this part of the amendment, I thank my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, because very often when a new administration comes in it is highly desirable to retain one or more Presidential appointees from a previous administration because of their expertise and experience. And if the service secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, does not have the authority to establish the order of seniority, that could be a deterrent, indeed, to retaining certain individuals.

I see the distinguished chairman on his feet.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we have no objection to this amendment. We have worked it over very carefully with the Senator from Virginia. I think we can accept it and I ask our friend from Georgia if that is correct.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I am in favor of the amendment. I looked it over carefully. I talked with the Senator from Virginia about it. The Senator from Rhode Island is a former Secretary of the Navy and has great expertise in this area. I think he made a very valid point. It is a good amendment. And the wonderful thing about it is it also applies to the Air Force and the Army.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the uniformity among the three branches of service is one of several contributions suggested by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I only regret I did not have the foresight to see that need earlier.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is getting ecumenical these days and I appreciate that.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator from Virginia will not be heard from further on this amendment.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I just want to say on the first part of the amendment, which they are prepared to accept, I think that is an excellent provision, too. I did not address that specifically, but I think that is very wise. I appreciate the manager and the minority member accepting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, of course, I will yield to the chairman, but if I could say another word about this amendment before we act on it.

This amendment now, based on our discussions and prior colloquy, would give a service department head—that is, the service secretary—the opportunity to move those military units that have to be moved in connection with performing any of the specific services enumerated in here. I think that is important to establish in the legislative history. And that is, he can move it for purposes of construction and outfitting and repair, be it an airplane or a tank or a ship. That is clearly the intention of the drafter of the amendment and, as I understand it, the managers in accepting it concur in that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we will accept this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, just a brief comment. I am in favor of this amendment. I urge our colleagues to accept it. It would be my position that that language is an amplification of the language already in, which includes servicing, administering, and maintaining, but it is a further clarification.

- full

May 5, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5265

thorities still have not brought his murderers to the bar of justice.

□ 1300

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATTINGLY). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

### CHERNOBYL NUCLEAR DISASTER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last fall it was my privilege to be a member of a bipartisan Senate delegation which traveled to the Soviet Union to seek better relations between our nations. On September 3, 1985, we met with General Secretary Gorbachev and discussed a variety of issues, including human rights and arms control. I believe it is fair to say that every member of that delegation, including this Senator, was impressed with General Secretary Gorbachev's personality and ability. He appeared to be more open to constructive dialog than any of his recent predecessors. In fact, last January, I told former Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin, during the course of a meeting in my office, that we presently had the opportunity and the leadership capability to substantially reduce the tensions which exist between our nations.

Unfortunately, recent events surrounding the Soviet nuclear disaster strongly indicate that expectations for increased candor by the Soviet leadership may be baseless. It would seem that fundamental civility would require the Soviet Government to advise the millions of individuals who may be affected by the Chernobyl meltdown of the extent of this tragedy and its health consequences. Nevertheless, it appears unrealistic to expect such full disclosure from a government which is concerned with the interest of the State, and not the individual.

This disregard for the rights of individuals to express views in opposition to the government is the reason Dr. Andrei Sakharov languishes under house arrest in Gorky.

Today, I announce my cosponsorship of Senate Joint Resolution 326, which would proclaim May 21, 1986, as Andrei Sakharov Honor and Freedom Day. It is appropriate to designate a day to honor this Nobel Peace Prize winner. His only crime is the advocacy of human rights, and particularly the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I am also pleased to announce my cosponsorship of legislation which hopefully will substantially reduce revenues received by the Marxist Angolan Government. Senate Resolution 381, sponsored by my friend, Senator DeCONCINI, requests that the President use his authority under the International Emergency Powers Act to block United States business transactions which conflict with our national security interests in Angola. Jonas Savimbi and his UNITA freedom fighters are sacrificing their lives to

fight communism by Angola. The Marxist Angolan regime, known as the MPLA, is supported by more than 35,000 Cuban troops and Soviet advisers. Oil revenues from the Gulf-Chevron Co. provide nearly 75 percent of the foreign exchange of the MPLA Government. When these funds are used to clothe, feed, and arm Communist troops, I believe the President should use his broad powers and take appropriate action.

The lessons of history are often repeated. The Soviet Government has confirmed its disregard for human rights by virtue of its response to the Chernobyl nuclear disaster. The Communist goal of world domination continues. It is clearly illustrated by Soviet involvement in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and Angola. Accordingly, we must strongly demonstrate our national support for freedom fighters like Dr. Andrei Sakharov and Jonas Savimbi.

### RESOLUTION COMMENDING ROGER CLEMENS OF THE BOSTON RED SOX

(In the RECORD of May 1, 1986, at page S5231, the RECORD inadvertently fails to reflect that the resolution commending Roger Clemens of the Boston Red Sox was agreed to. In the permanent RECORD the action of the Senate relating to the resolution will be printed as follows:)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A Senate resolution (S. Res. 393) commending Roger Clemens of the Boston Red Sox for his record-breaking performance.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

### STINGERS AND TERRORISM

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, last week I joined as a cosponsor of Senator DeCONCINI's legislation, S. 2286, regarding the sale of Stinger missiles to rebels in Afghanistan and Angola. This important legislation would require the same security measures for Stingers we send to Afghan and Angolan resistance forces as for the Stingers we have sold or transferred in the past to other countries.

The extremely accurate and dangerous Stinger is a terrorist's dream. It is fired from the shoulder and can destroy an airplane from several miles

away. A terrorist who got his hands on a Stinger would not have to worry about sneaking bombs or machine guns on airplanes. With this in mind, until recently the United States has always required that any country receiving Stingers provide strong security for them. Requirements have included separate storage of the missile and launcher sections, fenced-in storage areas, around-the-clock guards, and protection of information about how the weapons are operated. These measures are the main reason that Stingers have not been available to terrorists.

Now, with the recent delivery of Stingers to rebel forces in Angola and Afghanistan, we face a new threat that terrorists will acquire these weapons. A significant number of U.S. weapons bound for these rebels never reach their destination, and are diverted to the black market, where terrorists can acquire them.

Since we are not demanding that the rebels meet the security requirements we have always set for Stingers, we are opening the door for terrorists interested in shopping for Stingers. Our legislation says simply that Stingers sent to Angola and Afghanistan must be protected in the same way as the Stingers we have sent to other countries, such as Pakistan, Japan and Saudi Arabia.

Mr. President, S. 2286 is an act designed to protect Americans and other potential targets of terrorism from a new, highly lethal weapon. Last week Senator DeCONCINI, whom I commend again for his hard work on this issue, pointed out in the New York Times that without strict safeguards, the Stingers we manufacture and send to Angola and Afghanistan could easily be used to kill Americans. I ask unanimous consent that Senator DeCONCINI's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1986]

SELL MISSILES TO KILL AMERICANS?

(By Dennis DeConcini)

WASHINGTON.—Picture an American jetliner filled with summer travelers as it takes off from a European city. Perched on a hilltop more than three miles away is a terrorist aiming a shoulder-held Stinger anti-aircraft missile at the jet. Within seconds, the airliner with its hundreds of passengers disappears in a bright orange inferno.

The scenario is hypothetical, but it is increasingly possible as the United States supplies Stinger missiles to resistance forces around the world. As a safeguard, strong support should be given to legislation before the Senate that would require the President to insist on the same strict control over the missiles in rebel hands as we do for those we sell to our allies.

It is quite possible, given the loose structure of rebels' operations, that they could not satisfy the conditions, and in such cases the missiles should not be provided. We cannot afford to let these particular missiles, the ultimate terrorist weapon, slip into the wrong hands.

S 5266

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 5, 1986

The American-made Stinger missile is the most sophisticated of its kind in the world. The portable surface-to-air missile weighs less than 35 pounds. It has a range of five miles, can reach a height of 4,500 feet and is equipped with a sensitive infrared guidance system that permits firing at a target from any angle. The Army acknowledges that the Stinger could easily down a civilian or military aircraft.

The United States Government has set strict guidelines for transportation and storage of Stinger missiles. When we agreed to sell this weapon to our friendly allies, such as Saudi Arabia and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, stringent safeguards were required as conditions of the sale. These safeguards included storage in steel vaults, 24-hour armed security and keeping the launcher and missile locked up separately. We also stipulated the right to conduct an inventory and inspection at any time.

But the Reagan Administration has recently begun covertly supplying rebels in Angola and Afghanistan with Stinger missiles without the same safety requirements. I do not believe we need to provide our most sophisticated weapons to the forces in Angola and Afghanistan for them to be successful. We can show our support for the rebel groups and provide for their defense needs with weapons less lethal, mobile or destabilizing than the Stinger.

I have grave concern that the Stinger might fall into the hands of Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi, the Palestine Liberation Organization, Iran or even the Russians or Cubans, who maintain large numbers of advisers and troops in Angola and Afghanistan. A journalist who has covered the Afghan war described one rebel group there as being followers of the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini; posters of the Ayatollah adorn the walls of their village.

The State Department has described some of the actions of Unita, the Angolan rebel force led by Jonas Savimbi, as bordering on terrorist activity. For example, Unita claims to have shot down at least three civilian Angolan aircraft.

The recent terrorist bombings of the West Berlin discotheque and the T.W.A. jetliner are evidence of an increased threat to American targets. Colonel Qaddafi says he will export terrorism and "pursue United States citizens in their country and streets." The P.L.O. faction leader Abu Nidal has also said that "America is our target." The United States must protect itself by being careful not to arm its enemies. President Reagan can help to insure the safety of Americans at home and abroad by enforcing strict safeguards on the sale and use of Stinger missiles.

### RHODE ISLANDERS CELEBRATE 350 YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Rhode Islanders are celebrating 350 years of independence. We have always jealously guarded our independence, including our rights to think and say what we choose, live as we choose and worship as we choose.

Roger Williams was banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony and established the settlement he named Providence 350 years ago. Thirteen householders in the population of 32 in the first year formed the first genuine democracy—also the first church-divorced and conscience-free community—in modern history.

Rhode Islanders have always treasured independence. We are the smallest State with the largest name: "The State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations." We were the first of the colonies to declare independence on May 4, 1776.

That spirit of independence prevails today. Rhode Islanders only need to look at the top of our State House to see a statue—named the "Independent Man"—that watches over us as a reminder of our heritage and our commitment to welcome different people, fresh ideas and new concepts.

Sunday was Rhode Island Independence Day and Rhode Islanders kicked off a continuing series of events to celebrate. I ask unanimous consent that an article about those celebrations from the Providence Journal of May 5, 1986, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### R.I. THROWS A BIG BASH TO CELEBRATE ITS FOURTH

(By Donald D. Breed)

PROVIDENCE.—Thousands of Rhode Islanders made the State House lawn their playground yesterday, as the 310th anniversary of Rhode Island Independence Day became the first big event of the state's 350th birthday celebration.

The bright blues and reds of militia uniforms stood out against the fresh green grass and the white stone of the State House in the late afternoon. Eight Rhode Island militia units marched, piped tunes and cracked off muskets and cannon. Six of the units date from the days of the Revolutionary War.

Fireworks capped the day's festivities, as Rhode Island's Fourth once again got a two-month jump on the rest of the nation. The display was by the Grucci family, which had put on the New Year's Eve fireworks show that ushered in 1986, the 350th anniversary of the founding of Rhode Island.

Unlike that opening fireworks show, yesterday's was geared for families with small children; it concluded at about 9:15 p.m. The State House steps were packed with on-lookers, and the slopes of the lawn became an amphitheater for people who gaped at the bright colors sizzling overhead.

Despite the evening chill, exacerbated by the wind, many people lay flat on the grass to watch. A few farsighted people had brought chairs or blankets.

Those who would turn their back for an instant could see the multicolored glare of the fireworks reflecting off the Capital's dome, the grass and the spectators themselves.

Although there were some groans when the fireworks were delayed about 20 minutes, it still was finished by bedtime for many of the children in the audience.

Earlier, a lot of those children had been romping around, doing wheelies on bicycles, hanging from tree limbs and rolling down the hills. This last exercise they tackled cheerfully even though red marks on their hands showed they had been through the Trinity Repertory Company's ice cream social that offered people all they could eat in desserts from 25 restaurants and food suppliers.

And both adults and children got into the act when the lawn was wrapped with what the R.I. 350 Committee confidently expects will be a world-record birthday card. The card, which is still being added to, is made

up of small fabric billboards that an estimated 200,000 people have signed. It wound from Smith Street around the lawn and up the main walkway of the esplanade to the top of the State House steps.

Chief of Capital Police James H. Dodd estimated that 8,000 to 10,000 people had been at the State House as of 6 last night—and that was before the main events had started. Dodd said that, up to then at least, there had been "no problems at all." There was no evidence of alcoholic beverages (which were not permitted), and Dodd said guards had not found it necessary to warn anyone on that score.

Another index of attendance came from Trinity spokeswoman Simone Joyaux. She guessed that around 1,200 people had paid \$5 apiece for adults, and \$3 for children to enter the dessert tent, dubbed "Carbohydrate City" by a ticket-seller. (Joyaux said she wouldn't count the stubs and know the exact figure until today.)

The celebration was also marked by what may have been the shortest speech ever by a Rhode Island governor, Governor DiPrete, who knew that people were waiting for the fireworks, scrapped most of a prepared speech. He greeted the crowd, briefly thanked the sponsors, naming only WLKW radio, and remarked he'd been brushing up on his "civics" and had confirmed that "Rhode Island really was two months ahead of the other colonies" in renouncing allegiance to Britain.

"Rhode Islanders even then were brave and looking to the future," DiPrete said.

He came to the podium fresh from the new domed theater to the west of the State House, where he watched the multimedia show that promotes the state as an innovator in industry and other fields, both in the past and present.

The theater opened at 8 p.m., about three hours later than expected. It was explained that until black material for portions of the wall arrives from the manufacturer in Scotland, too much light will enter the dome for daylight performances.

But it was the militia units, more than the multimedia show or the fireworks, that best linked Rhode Island's present with its past. Col. John Lauth of the Newport Artillery said that Rhode Island militia have fought in every American war from the French and Indian War, before the Revolution, to Vietnam.

Col. Elmer Palmer of the Kentish Guards narrated a presentation of flags of the Revolutionary War, using it as an occasion to list the major battles and, of course, the outcome.

Units that marched were Newport Artillery, founded 1741; Kentish Guards, Pawtuxet Rangers and Gloucester Light Infantry, all founded in 1774; Bristol Train of Artillery, founded 1778; Federal Blues of Warren, founded in 1798; Vacuum Continentals of East Greenwich, founded in 1808; and the Second Rhode Island Regiment, an early federal unit.

Lori Griffith of Cranston, there with her children, said she "feels a little better about" Rhode Island after seeing the militia.

After the militia, the Picaders and Mafadors marching bands gave concerts. Although the confined space did not allow them to march, the music stirred one child, about 4 or 5 years old, to break-dance.

It was a long day for him. He showed up for the first event of the day, the Lap of America Road Rally, for which Providence was the eastern checkpoint. When the last car rolled through, 108 contestants were still in the running.