## AL RECORD — SENATE

May 1, 1986

on. Mr. President, I ask torial be printed in the

al follows: w York Times, Mar. 29, 1986]

R: NOT FREE AT LAST

te to widen your barge canal o dredge my harbor . . . In with politics, Americans have up with pork. Typically, the vest Pederal dollars in water had a lot to do with dealtle with economic merit. Now, lecade of stubborn effort by , the system is on the verge of

passed by both the House and ocal beneficiaries of improveer transport irrigation, flood nunicipal supply will have to he expense. Neither bill is perise's version, authorizing \$20 projects, is downright proflicost-sharing is likely to survive egislation and should progresthe most deplorable boondog-

wasteful or environmentally iter projects have sometimes ged in Congress, and occasion-But the battles have had to be t a time, and the odds against e always been long. Every Congress knows that the next attack may be his own.

Carter challenged this cozy 77, questioning wasteful water n under way and refusing to nes. President Reagan has kept sure, threatening vetos to entorium on all new projects until reed to reform. Now, after a out a single major new authoriegislators are reluctantly giving

issed by the Senate last week rehalf the cost of all inland navitruction be paid out of fuel fees would offset up to 45 percosts of harbor maintenance. ed control projects, communities to cover 25 to 35 percent of consts, with 5 percent paid up front. sharing provisions in the House nsiderably weaker. The House, chose to authorize dozens of at haven't even been declared the Army Corps of Engineers. istration, which originally asked ent cost sharing, sensibly warns compromise leaning toward the on will be vetoed.
e tough battles lie ahead, some

ems assured. Uncle Sam may connd water projects, including some be justified by economic criteria. on, however, users that reap most enefits will bear some of the

SERVICE CONTRACT EFORM ACT OF 1986

JMPHREY. Mr. President, on of this year, I introduced the Contract Reform Act of 1986. At this time, eight distin-Members, Senators Hechr, ND, EAST, HELMS, ZORINSKY, ng, Symms, and Gramm have ith me in cosponsoring this legislation. Support for S. also come from private-sector tions. On April 25, I received a

dent a bill close to the letter of endorsement for the reform measures of S. 2261 from Mr. David Y. Denholm, president of the Public Service Research Council of Vienna. VA. The Public Service Research Council has been a leading organization which aggressively has supported efforts in Congress to promote free and open competition in the workplace. I commend the PSRC for its excellent work in educating the public on the reforms of S. 2261. I ask that the letter of support from Mr. Denholm be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE RESEARCH COUNCIL. Vienna, VA, April 23, 1986.

The Hon. Gordon Humphrey, U.S. Senate,

Washington, DC.

DEAR GORDON: On behalf of the members of the Public Service Research Council, I want to express our strong support for the Service Contract Reform Act, S. 2261, which you introduced on March 27, 1986.

This is a very well crafted piece of legislation. It is responsive to the cornerns of those who desire to retain the original intent of the SCA while at the same time greatly lessening the ill effects inherent in such laws.

The urgent need for the government to eliminate waste and reduce spending should make S. 2261 a very popular proposal. We look forward to working with you to mobilize support for this vitally important legislation.

Sincerely yours, DAVID Y. DENHOLM.

President.

## STINGER MISSILES AND TERRORISTS

• Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased today to cosponsor Senator DeConcini's legislation, S. 2286, requiring strict security measures for all Stinger antiaircraft missiles sold by the United States. If enacted, this legislation will help prevent these dangerous and extremely accurate weapons from getting into the wrong hands. I would like to commend Senator DEConcini for his leadership on this issue, and for putting together this important bill.

It was revealed a few weeks ago that rebel forces in Angola and Afghanistan had begun receiving shipments of Stingers from the United States. This concerns me because of the danger that some of these shoulder-fired missiles, which have a range of 5 kilometers, might be diverted to the black market and become available to terrorists. The Stinger-with its advanced infrared targeting system and lethal precision—can destroy an airplane from 3 miles away, and is more advanced and reliable than comparable Soviet weapons. I have little doubt that the same fanatical terrorists who have recently singled out Americans for attack are greedily eyeing the Stinger.

The delivery of Stingers to rebels in Afghanistan and Angola provides a new opportunity for terrorists to obtain these weapons. Since they are

May 1, 1986

CONGRES!

being delivered to the Aghani and Angolan resistance forces without the strict security requirements we place on the Stingers we sell to other countries, the chances are greatly increased that Stingers could find their way into the hands of terrorists. Our legislation takes steps to prevent this.

The bill requires that the launcher and missile components of each Stinger be stored in separate areas. Each area must have a full-time guard and an intrusion-protection system, and must be surrounded by a 6-foot fence on steel or reinforced concrete posts. Other requirements include strict accounting of the number of missiles, inspection by U.S. officials, protection of information relating to the Stringer, and a separate key system under which two people are necessary in order to open the storage area.

Mr. President, I see no point to placing strict security requirements on the Stingers we send to some countries, but not on those we send to Angola and Afhanistan. Either we believe terrorists will try to obtain this weapon or we do not, and if we do, we must work to thwart them. I urge my colleagues to consider the tragic possibility of terrorists using the best of our military technology to shoot innocent Americans out of the sky. With that terrible scenario in mind, I hope they will support this legislation.

MARY THOMPSON HOSPITAL: A TRADITION OF EXCELLENCE

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize one of Chicago's oldest and most dedicated health care facilities.

On May 12, 1986, Mary Thompson Hospital, the city's second oldest existing hospital, will celebrate its 121st year of service to Chicago's Near West Side.

Mary Thompson Hospital has been, and continues to be, an important institution in the community and provides a diversity of high-quality medical services.

The hospital's founder, Dr. Mary Harris Thompson was the first female surgeon in the United States and a pioneer in community health care. When Dr. Thompson came to Chicago, neither of the two hospitals then open would allow women on their medical staffs, and one would not admit women or children as patients.

Chicago, at the time, was a thriving frontier town whose development had outpaced the growth of its health and sanitary facilities. The city was crowded with refugees uprooted by the Civil War, in addition to large numbers of needy soldiers' wives, widows, and orphans. Consequently, there was a tremendous need for medical care. Dr. Thompson opened her new hospital, called Chicago Hospital for Women and Children, in a large frame house at the junction of Rush and Indiana Streets. The hospital had a capacity of 14 beds and provided care for 766 pa-

fee for week. ( that ye

The ! the ho dedicat found plied 0 treated jured v tal mo times In 1

the fi the M tal. I North part c In 187 nursir the vi ical San of Mary in 18: hospi cance Chica for w first : Th.

> ty h sion: ing t in bo ciliti In nive: Tho: femi Chic ties

Thor

Hosp

com son! and M trat are med to ma th€ in : the COL

mo