

16/24

M E M O

TO: PAUL

FROM: CHRIS C.

RE: Recommittal of DOD 80 Authorization to Conference

1. The language accepted by the Conferees followed yours. It added "from Rhodesia" to the end of the section. Your language inserted "from Rhodesia" in the middle of the section, a small distinction. The Conferees did not use the "national interest" language which you proposed.
2. Senator Stennis began the meeting by saying that two Senators had submitted compromise language for the conferees to consider. He then read both Helms' language (a binding lift on strategic materials) and yours.
3. The House people then proposed the "from Rhodesia" language. Representative Stratton tried to make it more complicated but was beaten back.
4. Stennis then proposed to accept the House language, which the Senate Conferees agreed to do unanimously.
5. Arguments used in support of the House language were:
 - a) the London Conference is going well.
 - b) the President would veto the bill if it contains a binding lift.
 - c) the original deal of a big nuclear carrier in return for backing off on sanctions was not worth disturbing.
6. Overall your participation helped balance the scales against Helms. Before the Conferees met, they had checked with House and Senate parliamentarians to see if "before Rhodesia" language would be acceptable. Therefore, it appears that several people came up with that language simultaneously because it was the easy, logical solution. Your role was to add political punch to that alternative.
7. There was not any perceptible resentment among the Conferees of your contribution to the Conference.