

Congressional Closeup by Ronald Kokinda and Susan Kokinda

China-U.S. nuclear trade placed in doubt

The House and Senate voted to approve the nuclear trade agreement which the Reagan administration concluded with the People's Republic of China, but each body put differently worded conditions on the agreement, which in its final version may essentially lock U.S. nuclear manufacturers out of the \$6 billion nuclear power construction program.

On Dec. 9 the Senate passed an amendment to the omnibus spending resolution, which prohibits nuclear technology sales unless the President certifies that China has agreed to allow verification by the United States that the technology is being used for peaceful purposes only. Sponsored by Sen. John Glenn (D-Ohio), a motion to kill the amendment was rejected by a vote of 59 to 28, and then was adopted by voice vote. The P.R.C. government denounced the Senate action as "completely unacceptable," while the administration said the language would "undermine" the agreement.

Then, on Dec. 11, the House approved by a 307 to 112 vote, an amendment which did not contain any prohibition of sales, but expressed concern about the lack of written assurance from the P.R.C. on what commitment they have to non-proliferation. The fight cut across partisan and liberal/conservative lines. Liberal Reps. Howard Wolpe (D-Mich.) and Ed Feighan (D-Ohio) circulated a letter urging their colleagues to back the Senate version in conference, because of their concerns about non-proliferation. Conservative Rep. Gerald Solomon (R-N.Y.) argued that the P.R.C. was not a firm ally of the United States, and indicated that the current government there was not necessarily stable.

He called the trade agreement "an open-ended formula for disaster."

But supporters of the agreement such as Rep. Marilyn Lloyd (D-Tenn.) pointed out that no nation has ever yet built a nuclear weapon based on a commercial nuclear energy production program.

Anti-Soviet fight in Angola 'not germane'

Senator Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyo.) led a losing battle Dec. 10 to convince the Senate to approve emergency aid to UNITA, the anti-Soviet force in Angola led by Jonas Savimbi. The effort, which came as an amendment to the continuing resolution H.J. Resolution 465, would have appropriated \$50 million for UNITA. It was defeated by a technical vote of 58 to 39, which determined that the amendment was not "germane" to the resolution.

The Senate leadership insisted that the resolution, which will continue to fund those government departments whose appropriations bills have not been passed by the Congress, be kept clean of "extraneous" amendments.

Wallop took this technicality head on, warning that the events in Angola are not determined by the legislative formalities of the U.S. Congress. "I do not bring up this amendment lightly. . . . This provides aid to UNITA, led by Jonas Savimbi, whose representatives . . . have been informed that a winter offensive, a wet-season offensive, under way since last Friday, is beginning to move in directions that are still unclear. But what is clear to them is that Soviet helicopters and MiGs are engaged in this battle today. Those forces do not have time for the niceties of congressional process.

Either we do stand or do not stand for aid to freedom fighters, particularly in Angola."

Wallop denounced a face-saving, but meaningless, resolution, which Senate Majority leader Bob Dole (R-Kan.)

will let everybody go home and feel comfortable for having done something, and not one bullet can be shot, not one life can be saved, not one Cuban foot advance can be halted. While Congress considers, the Soviets act."

Congressional sources report that the administration is preparing to introduce legislation for next year which will ask for \$15 million in "covert" aid to UNITA.

Solarz interferes in Philippines elections

The Asia and Pacific Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, chaired by Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.), held hearings on Dec. 11, in an effort to elicit information which can be used in the Philippines election campaign against President Ferdinand Marcos. Solarz is using his congressional subpoena power to try to investigate the extent of President Marcos's allegedly extensive real estate holdings in the United States. The subcommittee has issued a number of subpoenas to people who allegedly act as fronts for Marcos family investments in the United States.

Holding American real estate is not illegal under Philippines law. But the opponents of Marcos have already made it a campaign issue, charging that it is evidence of Marcos's "corruption." The only purpose for the Solarz hearings can be to provide campaign material for the opposition.

Solarz denounced Marcos in an op-ed in the Dec. 13 *Christian Science Monitor*, saying that the acquittal of Gen. Fabian Ver "represents yet one more chapter of chicanery, in the inglorious record of the one-man rule that President Marcos has established. Despite the acquittals, the Marcos government stands convicted in the court of world opinion for covering up the murder of its principal opponent and orchestrating the acquittal of the assassins who carried it out."

European SDI role called too expensive

Opponents of the Strategic Defense Initiative launched new flanking attacks against the program Dec. 10, this time for the impact that awarding U.S. SDI contracts to our allies would allegedly have on the U.S. domestic economy. Rep. John LaFalce (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House Banking Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, which held the hearing on the SDI and the U.S. Defense Industrial Base, Rep. Bruce Vento (D-Minn.), and Rep. Matthew Martinez (D-Calif.), all hostilely questioned the administration witness, Dr. Gerold Jonas, on why any SDI money would be spent abroad rather than in the United States.

Jonas told the panel that he assumed that the Congress would want the administration to proceed with the SDI in the quickest, most efficient, and most cost-effective manner possible. Contracts, therefore, would be given to firms of allied nations based on those criteria. To congressmen who do not want the SDI program to succeed, however, that argument did not seem reasonable. The impact "on our

high tech research capability, the competitive position of U.S. high technology industries, and U.S. employment and production could be substantial and warrants careful examination," LaFalce said.

In a written statement to the committee, SDI director Lt.-Gen. James Abrahamson made clear that "the fundamental basis for allied participation must be technical merit," and that "certain allied contributions could reduce both the schedule and the cost of the SDI research program." Abrahamson added that to derive the greatest benefit from allied expertise and to keep them as fully informed as possible for later consultations on deployment, the United States should develop "a meaningful allied role . . . consistent with our technical requirements, laws, regulations, and international obligations." He added that SDI had the potential not only to deter strategic nuclear attack on the United States, but "nuclear, chemical, and conventional attacks on our allies as well."

The aim of the SDI opponents was outlined by one witness before the committee, Alice Tepper Marlin, executive director of the Council on Economic Priorities. Claiming that if SDI "could ever become a reality, it would be worth virtually any price," Marlin then proposed a series of constraints on the program to ensure it would never become such a reality. She urged that Congress "significantly slow the SDI's funding growth rate," that it "be used as a bargaining chip" for Soviet offensive force cuts, that the Pentagon focus on basic research rather than on developing prototypes, and that the House "empower an independent review board to assess the economic implications of the pro-

gram, including cost, the possible drain on scientific and engineering talent; skewing of R&D spending, possible crowding out, potential spinoffs and effect on progress towards balancing the budget."

Another KGB attack on x-ray laser

Senator John Kerry (D-Mass.), the KGB's favorite spokesman on matters relating to the Strategic Defense Initiative, tried once again to kill the crucial x-ray laser component of the SDI. Kerry introduced an amendment to the continuing resolution which funds government agencies when their individual budgets have not yet been passed. The amendment would "prohibit the use of funds to conduct, in connection with the Strategic Defense Initiative program, development, test or evaluation involving any explosive device, which uses fissionable material."

In an explanation which would be laughable, were the matter not so serious, Kerry argues that President Reagan's description of the SDI as a "non-nuclear defense" against incoming missiles must preclude the x-ray laser, because it is driven by a tiny nuclear explosion.

In recent weeks, the x-ray laser has come under attack by the FBI, which forced the resignation of Dr. Roy Woodruff, director of Nuclear Weapons Programs at Lawrence Livermore, by the *New York Times*, and by Reps. Bill Green (R-N.Y.) and Ed Markey (D-Mass.). The *Times* and the two congressmen demanded that a crucial test of the x-ray laser be delayed because of alleged imperfections in the testing apparatus.