

LEG/LEG Leg/SALT

20 July 1989
OCA 2292-89

STAT

MEMORANDUM FOR: ACIS

ATTENTION:

FROM:

STAT

Legislation Division
Office of Congressional Affairs

SUBJECT: Report of a Monitoring System for the INF Treaty

Attached for your information is a relevant portion of the Congressional Record for July 17, 1989, wherein, discussion was held concerning the monitoring system for the INF Treaty.



STAT

Attachment

OCA/LEG/ (20 July 89)

STAT

Distribution:

Original - Addressee (w/att)

- 1 - OCA Records (w/att)
- 1 - D/OCA (w/att)
- 1 - OCA/LEG/Subject File: Arms Control, (w/att)
- 1 - Signer (w/o att)
- 1 - OCAREad Library

STAT

July 17, 1989

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8043

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREAUX). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. May I inquire of the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator controls 47½ minutes; the Senator from Rhode Island controls 29½ minutes.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I want to say to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island that I am prepared to yield back my time if he feels that he can do so.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would be prepared to do so, but after these amendments that we are considering now.

Mr. HELMS. I would say I want to look further at the Taiwan amendment. It looks pretty good, but let us go ahead and do the other two.

Mr. PELL. And we will leave it open on Taiwan. If you do approve that, then I will be yielding back the time. If you do not approve it, then I think we ought to see.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Moynihan amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 276

(Purpose: To require a report regarding a monitoring system for the INF Treaty)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I believe has been cleared on both sides. I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 275.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 145, after line 22, and the following new section:

SEC. 915. REPORT ON A MONITORING SYSTEM FOR THE INF TREATY.

The Secretary of State is requested to report to the Senate by September 30, 1989, why the United States' Cargoscan x-ray monitoring system for the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty was not installed at the United States' Votkinsk Portal Monitoring Facility inside the Soviet Union by December 1, 1988, as provided for in the terms of the Treaty, and further, when the Cargoscan system will be operational at Votkinsk.

On page 5, in the table of contents, after the item relating to section 914, add the following new item:

"Sec. 915. Report on a monitoring system for the INF Treaty."

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the U.S. Cargoscan x-ray machine is already 6 months overdue. It should

have been installed in the Soviet Union this past December 1. This amendment merely requests a report on why the Cargoscan is overdue and when the Cargoscan will be installed. As I indicated, there is agreement on both sides on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 275) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I yield such time as may be required. I ask unanimous consent that the pending Moynihan amendment be laid aside again so that Senator DOLE may offer an amendment.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Republican leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 276

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PELL, and Mr. LUGAR, proposes an amendment numbered 276.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At an appropriate place in the Bill insert the following:

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Stockholm Document of September 19, 1986, the first East-West security accord in more than ten years, brought into force significant confidence and security-building measures in Europe.

(2) The United States has entered into the Negotiations on Confidence and Security Building Measures with the goal of a more stable and secure Europe.

(3) These negotiations have focused on measures to reduce mistrust and misunderstanding about military capabilities and intentions by increasing openness and predictability in the military environment.

(4) The Congress supports President Bush's efforts to make progress in all areas of arms control and supports his recent initiatives in the area of conventional arms control.

(5) The United States and the Soviet Union signed the Agreement on the Prevention of Incidents on and Over the High Seas on May 25, 1972.

(6) The United States and the Soviet Union signed the Nuclear Risk Reduction Center Agreement on September 15, 1987.

(7) The United States and the Soviet Union signed the Agreement on the Prevention of Dangerous Military Activities on June 12, 1989.

(8) The Congress believes that a direct military-to-military communications link between NATO and the Warsaw Pact could prevent misunderstanding in the event of unpredicted military activities or incidents, such as the recent incident in which a Soviet MiG-23 transited NATO airspace and crashed in Belgium.

(9) The Congress believes such a direct military to military communications link could complement U.S. efforts in the area of confidence-and security-building measures.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings in subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that—the President should raise and request that our NATO allies consider the concept of a direct military to military communications link between NATO and the Warsaw Pact at the appropriate NATO forum.

(c) PRESIDENTIAL REPORT.—The President shall submit to Congress not later than December 1, 1989 a report on the technical feasibility, operational characteristics and costs of establishing a direct military-to-military communications link between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is my understanding this amendment has been discussed with the chairman, Senator PELL, and the ranking Republican, Senator HELMS, and they have no objection to the amendment. I would like to give a little background information.

Mr. President, recently, as we all know, a runaway Soviet Mig-23 fighter crashed into a farmhouse in Belgium killing a 19-year-old man. The plane crashed after a 600-mile flight over West Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium.

None of these countries was given any warning that the plane was heading their way. In fact, it took the Soviets 10 hours to acknowledge the stray fighter.

It seems to me that this type of incident might not have resulted in the loss of a young man's life had there been a direct channel of communication between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. And, let us face it, unexpected events, even if totally unintended, still set off alarms in each side's military forces.

Unfortunately, at present, only the United States and the Soviet Union have such a direct channel of communication—the so-called hotline.

Representatives from the Federal Republic, the Netherlands, and Belgium proposed shortly after the incident that NATO establish an emergency communications link with the Warsaw Pact.

I'm sure this is a possibility that President Bush will want to explore. I'm also sure that all my Senate colleagues would support such an effort. Therefore, the distinguished majority leader, Senator MITCHELL, as well as Senator PELL and Senator LUGAR have joined me in offering an amendment requiring the President to take a hard look at setting up a direct military to

S 8044

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 17, 1989

military communications link between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The President would report to the Congress on the technical feasibility and cost of establishing such a NATO-Warsaw Pact link. In addition to this report, we hope that the President would raise this idea within NATO. NATO is devoting considerable time to arms control, especially with regard to the conventional arms control talks in Vienna.

It seems to me that an emergency military communications link would complement the types of proposals the West is seeking support for in Vienna, especially at the confidence- and security-building measures talks—also known as the CSBM talks.

As you know, the CSBM talks are aimed at increasing the stability and security of Europe. At the CSBM talks the United States and its NATO Allies have proposed measures that would increase openness and predictability in European military affairs.

Increasing predictability and reducing misunderstanding is what this amendment is all about.

On a bilateral level, the United States has reached similar agreements with the Soviet Union. My colleague from the State of Virginia, Senator WARNER, negotiated the agreement on the prevention of incidents on and over the high seas in 1972. Senator WARNER and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN, played a key role in the establishment of the nuclear risk reduction centers in 1987.

As we learned from those experiences, establishing such links requires not only technical effort, but political effort as well. A direct link between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is only as good as the commitment to use it at the right time. This link will not reduce tensions in and of itself, but, if used appropriately, it could reduce the potential for misunderstanding.

We have all seen promising signs of greater openness in Eastern Europe. Now is the time to expand our efforts at better communication between East and West to NATO and the Warsaw Pact. I would hope that in this new era of glasnost, an opportunity to extend such military openness may be seriously considered.

Mr. President, I have explained the amendment. It could be an important first step. I think it would be welcomed by President Bush.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the amendment I am pleased to cosponsor with the distinguished Republican leader calls on the President to study the advisability of an additional confidence- and security-building measure in Europe. The measure which this amendment proposes is a direct military-to-military communications link between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The possible value of such a link was illustrated in the recent episode when a Soviet military aircraft flew from Poland across NATO territory until it

crashed in Belgium. Despite the fact that NATO was aware of the aircraft in sufficient time to track it and to have our own NATO aircraft follow it and establish that the pilot had ejected, no attempt was made to communicate with Warsaw Pact authorities. Indeed, such an attempt was virtually impossible on such short notice.

The military-to-military link which this amendment proposes would provide an existing and established channel for use in such incidents, where unpredicted military events could lead to unfortunate incidents between the two sides.

As the members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact proceed to explore ways to reduce tension and enhance confidence and security in the ongoing negotiations in Vienna, it is my view that it could prove fruitful to explore the possibility and feasibility of a military-to-military communications link such as that proposed in this amendment. I hope the President will explore this concept seriously with our allies and will find that it can be included as part of the set of measures being negotiated in Vienna.

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

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I think this is an excellent amendment and I am very glad, indeed, to be a cosponsor of it. It is a little bit different than the hotline because the existing United States-Soviet hotline runs through the Defense Department to the White House and is essentially designed for communication between political leaders. My understanding in the past was the reason the Soviets did not want it to go from military to military was they want to keep more of a control on it. The proposed NATO-Warsaw Pact communication link, by contrast, will provide for better communication between military personnel in order to avoid misunderstanding. The fact they are willing to go from military to military in this one is I think a good sign, showing they are more willing to trust the military than they were before. I for one look forward to voting for the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment. Is there further debate on the amendment?

The amendment (No. 276) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the distinguished Senator from North Carolina

[Mr. HELMS] as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Who yields time?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I have been listening to the debate with regard to the amendment offered by my friend, the senior Senator from New York, feeling that it indeed is not appropriate. The reasons for my opposition have been very ably outlined by others, including the administration. But I really literally will just take 2 or 3 minutes to express my own reservations.

I guess as we review things here we all wonder how long things last. I think it was a colleague I cannot recall who 10 years ago said, "nothing ever dies around here." I just do not understand what purpose it is to continue to bedevil and beleague the Iran-Contra issue. We have spent millions of the taxpayers' bucks on this issue, all to no avail, unless they really want to impeach George Bush now, which seems like not really an appropriate thing to do at all. I would hope we would not seek to impeach George Bush.

Where does all this lead? What is the purpose of it? How long does it go on? It is an extraordinary effort to micromanage the conduct of foreign policy in this country to an extent that is really almost hard to imagine. How long is the exquisite agony of this thing to go forward? I do not understand.

But the amendment goes far beyond even that. It would inhibit the conduct of foreign policy by creating the specter of potential criminal liability for any U.S. Government employee who acts to further a policy for which funding has been denied. Now, think of how many times in the course of our times here, our travail and our work, we deny funding to certain agencies or for some reason to some part of the Government. And that would be done whether that action is made with intent or knowledge to circumvent some congressional prohibition.

I think it is all very well to cut off funding. That is our job. We do that. We are all skilled at that. You are going to cut off funding if they do a number on you. We do that sometimes in a clumsy way. I have done that, cut off funding for programs or policies that we feel to be unwise or not in the best interests of the United States. But I think it is quite another matter, Mr. President, for us to impose criminal liability—and that is the way I read this—or to require a cutoff of funding to a foreign country which might act to support a policy for which Congress has refused funding.