

10.25.1993

Mrs. Rodgers SR 26.10.



British Embassy
Washington

BY FAX

JP 26/10
~~MR POWELL - TO SEE~~
MRS HYNES - TO PA
SHORT.

22 October 1993

J Margetts Esq
SIL
NIO(L)

3100 Massachusetts Ave N.W.
Washington D.C. 20008-3600

Telephone: (202) 898 4242
Telex: RCA 211427 or 216760-WUI 64224
Facsimile: (202) 898 4255

Der Jack,

BRADLEY: SHORTS

1. You will have seen a copy of my minute of 20 October about the flurry over Shorts in the Senate. The most unlikely people are now claiming credit for the defeat of Senator Bradley's amendment from the Flax Trust to the Irish Ambassador. In fact the measure moved so fast it was only the good sense of the majority of Senators that saved us from losing \$150 million worth of business for Shorts.
2. I now attach a copy of what Senator Bradley actually said in the Senate. As you will see the main thrust of his argument is fiscal: the Administration had not asked for this money and it would be wasted. The unfair criticisms of Shorts' employment record have simply been thrown into the speech to try to add weight to this argument. His staffers tell me that they do not believe he has been approached by Cossa (Shorts' Spanish rival). He did however have his ear bent a couple of weeks ago by an Irish-American constituent on the situation in Northern Ireland in general. When he saw that money was going to Shorts he probably remembered what he had been told about Shorts' record in the '70s. They do not believe there was an conspiracy or that Bradley was set up by outside forces on this point.
3. We are considering with Shorts how to follow-up. The Ambassador may write to Bradley or I may go in with briefing material to give his staff. Shorts themselves want to be the first to approach him and we will not cut across them. Senator Kennedy is also sending material to Bradley.

Yours truly
J-N Rg

J N Powell

/cc:

M
se
th
ex
gu
di
co
pla
ust
an
tio
tio
Gu
tio
Gu
M
the
Sen
the
Ann
will
suc
anc
M
guis



United States Secret

cc: G R Archer Esq, RID, FCO) BY
 P Taggart Esq, DED, Netherleigh, BELFAST) FAX
 PS
 Mr Webb
 Mr Westmacott
 Ms Mitchison
 Mr Bean
 Mr McNeill

Teletype Cover Sheet

Honorable Bill Bradley
 731 Hart Building
 Washington, D.C. 20510
 202-324-3334
 Fax # 202-324-8567

TO: JONATHAN POWELL

FROM: MARK FOWLER

DATE: 10/21/93

Remarks:

Reference to Short Book

If you do not receive 3 pages, including this cover sheet, please call 202-324-8567

M
se
th
ex
gu
di
co
pl
us
an
tio
tio
Gu
N
the
Ser
the
Arm
will
suc
am
M
gula

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 20, 1993

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

Telecopier Cover Sheet

Honorable Bill Bradley
731 Hart Building
Washington, D.C. 20510
202-224-3224
Fax # 202-224-8567

To: JONATHAN POWELL

From: MARK FOULON

Date: 10/21/93

Remarks:

References to Short Bros.

If you do not receive 3 pages, including this cover sheet, please call 224-8566

...the effort as a way to get ... the Short Co. without ... the money is ... the Short Co. They have ... their line of production ... they are not going to be ... these plans will be ... it will be reflected in a ... the United States, and Short will be the ... maintenance contractor.

... This is, in fact, what is happening ... with this amendment. The ... Senator from Alaska has ... out a very good reason why we ... spend the money. We should ... million, in Alaska. We should ... 1100 million plus for C-27's ... aimed at getting the money to ... company that, if it was ... they would receive ... because of their record of ... against Irish Catholics ... in Northern Ireland.

... Why are we insinuating ourselves ... into that debate on the side of the ... in Northern Ireland? That ... a question that has not been ... It is a question that I believe ... to spend the money this way.

... But the other reason is there are ... dollars. These are wasted ... all had said: You have given us ... places more than we wanted last year ... Why do we want another of this ... not spend the money this way.

... Citizens Against Government Waste ... in a letter on behalf of the 100,000 ... of the Council for Citizens Against ... Government Waste, write in support of ... the amendment to strike the \$150 ... for the Army National Guard. It is ... a waste of money.

... I hope the Senate would reconsider ... money and reject it. It is not ... There is \$226 million in this ... for tactical airlift for the Air ... National Guard already—\$226 million ... We do not need another \$150 million ... that, up until this moment on the ... floor was for unspecified purposes. ... would cost about \$30 million. The ... would not significantly more than ... million, and the money would go ... to the Short Co., which is one of the ... major Protestant firms in Northern ... Ireland that discriminates against ... Catholics.

... So Mr. Powell, I think that on the ... day of this, it makes good sense ... to reject the bill. The bill ... the amendment with the ... of \$150 million and ... the ... of a ... which has had a ... of ...

... The ...

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

October 20, 1993

about jet aircraft; we are talking executive jets. We are talking about the needs of the individual units that must be met on a priority basis and the priority will be set by the Guard Bureau itself.

MR. INOUE addressed the Chair.

MR. ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

MR. INOUE. Madam President, the item that was involved in this procurement was not plucked out of the sky. It was the result of intensive discussion we have had with Air National Guard officials and Army National Guard officials. And we very deliberately made it generic, without identifying. Furthermore, it is understood that if the National Guard desires not to spend the money, that is up to them.

But before I yield the floor, I would like to clarify one matter that the Senator from New Jersey brought up. He indicated that the National Guard was being downgraded or downsized and reduced. A reading of the report would clearly indicate that the Air National Guard will be increased by 2,060, not decreased, because new missions are being assigned to them, new activities have been assigned to them. The Defense Department recognizes this. So in its Bottom-Up Review, all of its reviews, they have decided to increase the number of the Air National Guard. Whereas all the other units have been decreased, the Air National Guard has been increased.

MR. STEVENS. If the Senator will yield just one moment there?

I urge the Senator from New Jersey to read the last sentence in the paragraph I put in the RECORD. It states:

The committee expects the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to prioritize procurement of aircraft to support cargo, medical evacuation, and emergency support missions.

Those are the main shortages in the Guard, in our opinion.

MR. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Matthews). The Senator from New Jersey.

MR. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I think this has been a very instructive exchange. Essentially what the distinguished Senator from Hawaii and the distinguished Senator from Alaska confirm is that the money for these planes in this appropriation shall be used for the C-212's or the C-23's, or any other aircraft that the Army National Guard wants—not the Air National Guard, the Army National Guard. This is money for the Army National Guard, not the Air National Guard.

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point? The Senator has repeated that. This is for the Guard Bureau. There are both Army and Air needs. The Guard Bureau will make that decision. There is no such limit in our provision of this amount of money.

MR. BRADLEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for that clarification.

At the moment, the Air Guard has an inventory of 1,750 planes. To the point that this was really a need to modernize, they have, since 1980, acquired 100 new C-130's. In fact, two-thirds of the inventory is modern.

So the argument that they have been getting the leftovers is not backed up by the fact that since 1980, they have gotten 100 C-130's, and that two-thirds of the inventory is modernized, and that the Air Guard already has 1,750 planes.

So I think this has been a very helpful exchange because there is now some clarity. It is clearly the intention of the appropriators that the money go to the C-212's. The distinguished Senator from Alaska points out, rightly, that there is a need for the C-212's in Alaska to replace the De Havilland planes. But to meet the needs of Alaska would cost about \$30 million. This is an appropriation for \$150 million.

The question then arises, where does the rest of the money go? It goes for procurement of C-23's, and other purposes and other planes that are not determined by anyone until the Guard decides how they will spend it. In other words we are giving them money and saying: Spend it the way you want.

There is a little more clarity now in that it is specified they will buy C-23's and C-212's. So let us address those purchases.

I would like to share with my colleagues what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, former Chairman Colin Powell, said about these types of planes.

The current inventory built to support a global war exceeds what is required for our regionally oriented strategy. The current excess is compounded by the fact that Congress continues to require the services to purchase aircraft neither requested or needed. In the last 2 years alone, Congress added on funds to the defense appropriations for some 15 C-12's, some 4 C-130's, some 10 C-21, 10 C-23's, 19 C-26's, and 12 P-180's, not requested by DOD.

It should be noted that this funding was not requested by DOD. DOD has not said we need more C-23's. Here is General Powell saying specifically: You have given us 10 more than we needed; we do not want them. This proposal would give another 10. This is really not a question about the National Guard. This is a question about the appropriations process. Should we appropriate blindly or should we require the money to be appropriated for specific purposes? But it goes to the question of the C-23.

We say, what is at work here? Why are we spending \$150 million, \$30 million of which would have taken care of the problem of the C-12's in Alaska? Why are we spending the \$150 million?

I suggest there is another effort going on here. I think it is important to recognize who produced the C-23's. The C-23 Sherpa is made by a Northern Ireland company, a Protestant company, called Shorts. They have a terrible history of discrimination against Catholics.

I view this effort as a way to get money to the Shorts Co. without mentioning that the money is actually going to the Shorts Co. They have discontinued their line of production. So they are not going to be producing this. These planes will be refurbished. It will be refurbished in a State in the United States, and Shorts will be the maintenance contractor.

This is, in fact, what is happening with this amendment. The distinguished Senator from Alaska has pointed out a very good reason why we should spend the money. We should spend the money for some C-212's, costing \$30 million, in Alaska. We should not spend \$100 million-plus for C-23's that are aimed at getting the money to the company that, if its name was mentioned, they would receive no money because of their record of discrimination against Irish Catholics, Catholics in Northern Ireland.

Why are we insinuating ourselves into that debate on the side of the Protestants in Northern Ireland? That is a question that has not been answered. It is a question that I believe cannot be answered. It is a reason to reject this amendment on its face.

But the other reason is these are taxpayer dollars. These are wasted dollars. The planes are not needed. Colin Powell has said: You have given us 10 planes more than we wanted last year. Why do we want another 10 this year? You should not spend the money this way.

Citizens Against Government Waste, in a letter on behalf of the 550,000 members of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, write in support of the amendment to strike the \$150 million for the Army National Guard. It is a waste of money.

I hope the Senate would reconsider this money and reject it. It is not needed. There is \$250 million in this appropriation for tactical airlift for the Air National Guard already—\$250 million.

We do not need another \$150 million that, up until this moment on the floor, was for unspecified purposes. Finally, on the floor, it is confirmed that is for C-212's and for C-23's. The C-212's would cost about \$30 million. The C-23's would cost significantly more than \$100 million, and the money would go to the Shorts Co., which is one of the major Protestant firms in Northern Ireland that discriminate against Catholic citizens.

So, Mr. President, I think that on the face of this, it makes very good sense to reject the \$150 million and support this amendment; save the taxpayers of America \$150 million and pull the United States out of a potentially embarrassing position behind the efforts of a company which has had a record of rather gross insensitivity.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

MR. INOUE. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii has 12 minutes 30 seconds.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

October 20, 1993

the 100 of us and 435 on the floor of this building. It is our reality, our constitutional obligation.

not believe, Mr. President, and I believe, that the Congress should be limited by any administration, this any other, in the exercise of its constitutional powers.

Yes, Mr. President, we are empowered and required by the Constitution to appropriate funds for purposes we deem proper. The fact that this administration or the prior administration did not request funds does not mean that they are not required.

What is involved here is a very important constitutional issue, and I think all of us should bear in mind that the Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain the Navy. It is also the responsibility of the Congress and authority and power to declare war.

Our Founding Fathers, we all agree, were not only dedicated and committed, but they were wise. I think their collective wisdom has proven itself time and time again. I do not wish, by this amendment, to change that provision in the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, how much time remains on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 8 minutes, 50 seconds; the Senator from Hawaii has 4 minutes, 40 seconds.

Mr. BRADLEY. The Senator from Hawaii has how much?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes, forty seconds.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I should like to salute the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his analysis of the Constitution. I certainly do not question the right of Congress to appropriate money for whatever purpose to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities. I am only questioning the wisdom of appropriating this money, \$150 million. It has not been requested by the administration. It is for unspecified purposes, at least until this debate, in this budgetary circumstance.

I am simply saying that \$150 million given to the Guard to spend the way it chooses to spend is not a wise taxpayer investment. When I am told in this Chamber that the money will be spent for C-212's because the planes they will replace are 20 years old, I think, well, the B-52 is 40 years old. It is still flying. Do we need new planes in Alaska every 20 years but the B-52, which was central to our strategic security, we can keep going for 40 years?

But even with that said, if we met the need of the distinguished Senator from Alaska for C-212's, that is \$30 million out of \$150 million. There is still \$120 million remaining. That goes to the purchase of C-23's, which again is really a back-door way of helping a company in Northern Ireland that has had a record of discrimination against

Catholic citizens of Northern Ireland. Now, that company could improve its record. I hope it will improve its record. But that is the reality out there.

There has not been any official statement of justification for these aircraft, no official statement of justification. Who has said we need these aircraft? The DOD has not done any objective study on the need for these aircraft. To the contrary, last year's DOD authorization law included a requirement that there be a report on the need for additional aircraft for the Guard.

Do you know what, Mr. President? The report was never done. The report was never done. So the Congress passes a law saying, Guard, if you are going to request more, you have to do a report to justify it. You have to have a report. They do not do the report.

This year coming back is another request of \$150 million on top of the \$250 million that is in this bill for tactical airlift capability for the Air National Guard. So this year, in this budget, there is \$400 million for tactical airlift. At a time when the Air Force is shrinking, the Army is shrinking, there will be surplus planes, not old planes, not useless planes, not giving planes to people because they are worn out, but making planes available because the personnel is not there to use the full inventory as when we had a much bigger military establishment.

So instead of taking those perfectly good planes and using them, not old planes but perfectly good planes, we are appropriating \$400 million more for tactical airlift. I am not objecting to the \$250 million. I am objecting to this \$150 million which, until this debate, was unspecified, its purpose unknown. And since it has been specified, C-212's and C-23's in particular, I think it is even more imperative that we reject this \$150 million.

We do not have the money to spend in this way. It will not further our national security interests, and it should be rejected.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, what is the time picture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time remaining to the Senator from New Jersey, 3 minutes, 53 seconds; the Senator from Hawaii, 4 minutes, 40 seconds.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum. However, at the same time I ask unanimous consent that the time for this call not be taken out of the allotted time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, we do not have any requests on our side. We

are prepared to yield the remainder of our time.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY. 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.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it is a joint motion by myself and Senator STEVENS to lay on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 21, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 319 Leg.)

YEAS—79

Alaska	Durenberger	McConnell
Baucus	Exon	Mikulski
Bennett	Feldstein	Moynihan
Biden	Ford	Murkowski
Bingaman	Gorton	Murray
Bond	Graham	Nunn
Boren	Gramm	Packwood
Boxer	Grassley	Pell
Braun	Hatch	Presler
Brown	Hatfield	Pryor
Bryan	Heflitz	Raid
Burns	Helms	Riegle
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hutchison	Roth
Chafee	Inouye	Sabates
Coats	Jeffords	Sasser
Cochran	Johnston	Shelby
Cohen	Kamelaum	Simpson
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Specter
Craig	Kennedy	Stevens
D'Amato	Kerry	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Wallop
DeConcini	Lieberman	Warner
Dodd	Lott	Wellstone
Dole	Mack	Wofford
Domenici	Mathews	
Dorgan	McCain	

NAYS—21

Bradley	Gregg	Metzenbaum
Bumpers	Harkin	Mitchell
Conrad	Kerry	Mosley-Braun
Danforth	Kohl	Nickles
Faircloth	Lautenberg	Robb
Feldgold	Levin	Simon
Glenn	Lugar	Smith

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1070) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from New

Mrs. Rodgers

10.20.1993 16:52

RECEIVED FROM 202 898 4255

6/8WHL

①

GC Mc Gubson

②

Mr. Teggart
Mr. Rodgers

FROM: J N POWELL

DATE: 20 OCTOBER 1993

cc:

PS
Mr Meyer
Mr Webb
Mr Browne
Mr O'Heir,
DED, Netherleigh,
BELFAST
(BY FAX)
J Margetts Esq,
SIL, NIO(L)
(BY FAX)
G R Archer Esq,
RID, FCO
(BY FAX)

RA SHORTS R

Seen already

SR 25.10

Mr Westmacott

SENATOR BRADLEY: SHORT BROTHERS

1. We had a little flurry this morning when we discovered, by a tip-off from Senator Kennedy's office, that Senator Bradley was about to put forward an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Bill to cut out the \$150 million appropriation for aircraft for the National Guard provided by Short Brothers. Part of his attack was based on unfair employment practices by Short Brothers in Northern Ireland. I spoke to Bradley's office who claimed the main thrust was fiscal rather than Northern Ireland.

2. Mr Webb and I managed to mobilise Short Brothers' office here rapidly. They approached Senator Leahy and we approached Senator Kennedy's office to see if they could take the floor to contradict Bradley's statement. We provided them with briefing material on Short Brothers' excellent record on fair employment, including a letter from Congressman Joe Kennedy congratulating Shorts on the progress that had been made. In the event, things moved too fast for either Senator to take the floor, but the amendment was turned down by 89 votes to 11.

3. Short Brothers believe misinformation was given to Bradley by their rival Cossa and their lobbyist Dave Gibbons (formerly of the NRA, fired for maligning Janet Reno before her confirmation hearings). They are arranging a meeting with Senator Bradley through their tame Congressman from West Virginia to put him right. Senator Kennedy's office also intend to have a quiet word with Bradley and show him material pointing out how unfair he has been.

4. We should also consider speaking to Bradley, who has been difficult on Northern Ireland issues in the past, to put the record straight. A decision on exactly how to do this should await a copy of Bradley's speech which we should get later today.

/We

10/20/93 16:52

RECEIVED FROM 202 898 4255

We could either write to Bradley pointing out his errors and underlining the steps that Shorts have taken, or the Ambassador might go and talk to Bradley about the issue more generally. Alternatively I could speak to his staffer who I know well.

JN

J N Powell

Mr Westmacott

SENATOR BRADLEY: SHORT BROTHERS

1. We had a little flurry this morning when we discovered, by a tip-off from Senator Kennedy's office, that Senator Bradley was about to put forward an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Bill to cut out the \$150 million appropriation for aircraft for the National Guard provided by Short Brothers. Part of his attack was based on unfair employment practices by Short Brothers in Northern Ireland. I spoke to Bradley's office who claimed the main thrust was fiscal rather than Northern Ireland.

2. Mr Webb and I managed to mobilise Short Brothers' office here rapidly. They approached Senator Leahy and we approached Senator Kennedy's office to see if they could take the floor to contradict Bradley's statement. We provided them with briefing material on Short Brothers' excellent record on fair employment, including a letter from Congressman Joe Kennedy congratulating Shorts on the progress that had been made. In the event, things moved too fast for either Senator to take the floor, but the amendment was turned down by 89 votes to 11.

3. Short Brothers believe misinformation was given to Bradley by their rival Cosca and their lobbyist Dave Gibbons (formerly of the NRA, fired for maligning Janet Reno before her confirmation hearings). They are arranging a meeting with Senator Bradley through their tame Congressman from West Virginia to put him right. Senator Kennedy's office also intend to have a quiet word with Bradley and show him material pointing out how unfair he has been.

4. We should also consider speaking to Bradley, who has been difficult on Northern Ireland issues in the past, to put the record straight. A decision on exactly how to do this would await a copy of Bradley's speech which we should get later today.