

Congressional Closeup by Ronald Kokinda

Byrd, Dole, Hollings rip 'cosmetic' INF agreement

Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.), Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole (R-Kan.), and Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.) all took to the Senate floor on April 21 to caution against a hasty arms-control agreement on intermediate-range nuclear weapons (INF). Their statements echoed many of the concerns raised by U.S. NATO allies.

Byrd cited Gen. Brent Scowcroft who had written the day before in the *Washington Post* that the "administration erred in the first place by proposing the zero option in 1981." "Such an agreement may pose political risks for the NATO Alliance," Byrd said, pointing out Soviet conventional superiority. "Without the deterrent pledge of nuclear weapons, and without the credible threat of NATO first use of nuclear weapons in the event of a Warsaw Pact invasion, our European allies could be subjected to intense political pressure."

"I would caution the administration against racing into an agreement which is cosmetically attractive but works against the cohesion and steadfastness of the Atlantic alliance," Byrd said. "To have a chance for Senate approval, any agreement must advance our national security, and must make Europe more secure."

Hollings warned that racing to an agreement in the next 18 months was "not either in our best interests or that of our allies." Our deterrent relies on both conventional and nuclear forces, and if we reduce our nuclear capability, we must be prepared to build up conventionally. "I seriously question whether we are prepared to meet such needs," Hollings said.

He pointed out three major obstacles to any agreement: Soviet viola-

tion of existing treaties; the need for verification; and "the maintenance of the strongest U.S. technological base possible. It should be remembered that the main thrust of the Soviet Union in essentially every recent arms treaty has been to stop or slow down American technology."

Dole demanded that all short- and medium-range INF weapons be included in any agreement, and it should eliminate such weapons entirely to enhance verification, (the zero-zero option).

Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) gave a speech in Brussels, however, proposing that NATO consider major new arms-control proposals, obviously to ease the way to an INF agreement. Nunn suggested that NATO renounce first use of nuclear weapons in exchange for the Soviets pulling their tank armies away from the front, and that 2 U.S. divisions be pulled out of Europe in exchange for roughly 11 Soviet divisions pulled out of East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Moving Soviet troops a few hundred miles is obviously easier than returning U.S. troops and equipment to Europe. But such proposals fit in with Nunn's troop pullout, decoupling initiatives.

Broomfield: Abrogate the embassy accords

William Broomfield (R-Mich.) introduced House Joint Resolution 230 on April 6 to terminate the current U.S.-Soviet agreement allowing each nation a new embassy.

The move follows extensive criticism of the State Department handling of the construction of the new U.S. embassy in Moscow where portions of the building were constructed off site

and were implanted with Soviet electronic listening devices. A presidential team is currently evaluating whether the building will have to be torn down and rebuilt.

The move also follows criticism that the Soviets were allowed a choice, high-elevation location in Washington, D.C. by Henry Kissinger under Nixon, for their new embassy, giving them sweeping electronic surveillance capabilities.

The resolution directs the Secretary of State to notify the Soviet Union within five days that we are pulling out of the agreement signed on May 16, 1969, the "Reciprocal Allocation for Use Free of Charge of Plots of Land in Moscow and Washington," and renegotiate where the embassies will be. "The effect of my legislation is to wipe the slate clean," Broomfield said.

Broomfield said that recent events indicate that "we are facing a security, diplomatic, and intelligence disaster that is unparalleled in recent history. . . . I have introduced legislation to counter the Soviet electronic surveillance of the U.S. embassy in Moscow and to reverse the unsettling and flippant attitude of the bureaucracy to the threat of the Soviet espionage. . . ."

Broomfield may attempt to add the resolution to the State Department authorization which is ready for floor action.

Glenn, Humphrey, Markey put NRC under fire

At the moment that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has been nearing startup authorization for the Seabrook, N.H. and Shoreham, N.Y. nuclear plants, a gaggle of anti-nuclear

congressmen have launched a wave of attacks against the NRC. The same left-right combination of liberal environmentalists and fiscal conservatives that united to kill the Clinch River Breeder Reactor and nuclear power in the United States, is once again in evidence.

At a House Energy and Commerce subcommittee hearing on April 21, Rep. Ed Markey (D-Mass.), one of the more notorious anti-nuclear environmentalists, accused NRC executive director Victor Stello of "coaching" the owners of the Seabrook nuclear plant on how to get an operating license and that he "virtually implored" them to submit a 10-mile evacuation plan.

NRC Chairman Lando Zech told Markey and the committee that Stello was simply telling the utility "the facts of life," that the NRC was not going to approve a 1-mile evacuation plan as the owners have been fighting for.

Sen. Gordon Humphrey (R-N.H.) blasted the NRC for allegedly attempting to water down the emergency evacuation planning, complaining that the indication that evacuation not only can but "will" take place is missing from the NRC's statement. The NRC rule would make an evacuation plan acceptable if protective measures can be taken if there were "reasonable State or local governmental cooperation."

Sen. John Glenn (D-Ohio), called for the resignation of another NRC board member, Thomas M. Roberts. NRC documents showing safety defects at the Waterford Nuclear Plant near New Orleans were leaked from Robert's office and found in the company's files. "I have done no wrong, and I have no intention of resigning," Roberts said. "I welcome a review of these matters by the Justice Dept."

R&D facility proposed for highway building

Rep. Dan Glickman (D-Kan.) introduced H.R. 1621 on March 24 to provide a research and development facility for materials related to bridge and highway construction.

The bill would direct the Secretary of Transportation to put \$30 million per year for three years into a fund, in consultation with the National Research Council, the National Academy of Sciences, and the National Academy of Engineers, "to establish a highway research and development program focused on increasing the quality and durability of high-cost highways.

The bill specifically refers to seeking ways to improve asphaltic materials, concrete, the long-term performance of paved surfaces, procedures for administration and control of maintenance, methods to reduce the use of salt on highways and chloride contamination of bridge decks.

"It has been estimated that relatively small technological improvements made in such materials can save billions of dollars and more importantly, lives," Glickman said. "The National Research Council has estimated that nearly 40% of our nation's bridges are nearing the end of their 50 year design life, and over 20% have already been identified as structurally deficient. By 1995, an estimated 26,000 miles or 56% of our interstate highways will need resurfacing or major repair work," he said. The FHA recently told Congress that \$50 billion is needed, \$13 billion of that immediately, to ensure the safety of the nation's bridges.

Despite the huge size of the construction industry, it has had virtually no R&D program. The Glickman bill is a small part of more widespread and

growing interest relating to all areas of the construction industry on the Hill.

Senate committee rejects funds cut to Pakistan

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted 11 to 8 on April 23 to reject a cut in aid to Pakistan, an important U.S. ally.

The vote was a key rejection of efforts carried on by the anti-nuclear and pro-disarmament crowd to penalize Pakistan for reportedly attempting to acquire nuclear weapons. Both the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees have previously voted to warn Pakistan that an aid cutoff would have "adverse consequences" on its relationship with the U.S.

In the debate, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) warned that an aid cut "undoubtedly would be seen by Pakistan as a hostile act" by a formerly reliable ally.

Two liberal Democrats joined Republicans in the vote. Sen. Chris Dodd (D-Conn.) rejected the aid cut on the basis that such cutoffs are not effective policy. It "hasn't worked with India and won't work with Pakistan," Dodd said. He has said that encouraging a warming of relations between India and Pakistan is the best way to approach the proliferation issue. Sen. Kerry (D-Mass.) later told press that if Pakistan acquires a nuclear device, U.S. aid would be cut off anyway.

Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.), a major advocate of cutting \$100 million out of the \$625 million in aid to Pakistan proposed for FY88, claimed that the Pakistanis were "breaking statements made to the President and moving forward to a nuclear weapons capacity."