

H 10016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 12, 1985

situation that my office is being used, the insinuation that Marwan is somehow a terrorist has a much broader implication. It is that those of Arab descent are evil and that, therefore, acts of violence against them are justified.

I spoke before you recently citing FBI records of terrorist acts committed against Americans. The record shows just what the damage of anti-Arab racism has been. Those of Arab background in this country live in real fear for their life, their property, their career. For, in fact, terrorism and racial discrimination have been visited on Arab Americans vastly more often than the American public is aware of. I would venture to say that my colleagues are unaware that in June the Islamic Center in San Francisco was ransacked after a radio host agreed with a caller that Shiites should be killed; or that in the same month the Islamic Institute in Dearborn, MI, was similarly vandalized; or that the Islamic mosque in Houston was bombed also in June; or that in August the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee office in Boston was bombed; or that the ADC office in Santa Ana, CA, was bombed in October, killing Alex Odeh; or that in July a young woman in Tucson, AZ, was brutally raped, beaten, and a carving made in her chest. And for what reason? Because she was dating a man of Palestinian background. I would venture to say you are unaware of these things because the press does not give them widespread publicity. They are, after all, acts done against Americans of Arab descent. When can you remember having heard or read something positive about an Arab?

I said that code words connote more than they denote. By attaching the code PLO to Marwan, the Christian Broadcast Network has done much more than put Marwan in danger. It has made an indirect slur against the hostage families and their efforts to have their loved ones returned safely to them. The Christian Broadcast network has insinuated that their actions are secretly controlled by the PLO. One has to wonder at the motivation of those who would take the suffering of others and use the effort to bring an end to that suffering as a tool to inflict further suffering. This is not a Christian act in my view. Much closer to what I understand to be Christian action is the work of Marwan Burgan. His Christian upbringing taught him that he was to practice the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, and true to these Christian counsels, he has tried to aid the suffering hostage families. If Marwan were a member of the PLO and if he were working as selflessly as he has been working, I would defend him as strongly as I am defending him now. But, in truth, Marwan has been branded by the Christian Broadcast Network not because he is a member of the PLO but because he is Arab. And we just cannot sit idly by

and see this racist stereotype of Arabs continue. Marwan is a good man doing good work and thus work cannot be undermined by racist attacks.

In fact, my dear colleagues, America is full of Arab Americans in which the citizens of this country should take justifiable pride. Yet, some of these people are not recognizable by surname as Arab Americans and possibly would not want to be recognizable for fear of the racist acts that might befall them were they to be recognized. I had considered telling my colleagues about some of the contributions these outstanding Americans have made in politics, diplomacy, journalism, the arts, science and medicine, but to respect their possible desire to avoid publicity, I will just mention two publicly known examples to make clear why these people might wish to maintain their privacy. Many of us in the Congress know Candy Lightner as the mother who founded MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving. She is an Arab American. Recently, she was honored by an Arab American organization for her stand against drunk driving. Shortly after receiving the honor she was demoted from her job. I do not know if there is any connection between the two events, but it leaves at least a question in my mind. Young people know Casey Kasem as the host of the long-lived and popular "Top 40 Show." Casey is an Arab American. During the last Presidential campaign when Casey held a fund raiser for Presidential candidate Jesse Jackson, Casey's home was picketed by an anti-Arab group.

As I said, the list of distinguished Arab Americans is a long one. It includes Members of Congress, senior diplomats, consumer advocates, leading political journalists, well-known entertainers, writers, producers, musicians, medical researchers, doctors, and scientists.

Few of us are aware of the hundreds of thousands of Arab Americans who are employed in every walk of life this country has to offer. That is as it should be. These people are as deserving as you or I of enjoying and taking pride in their ancestry without fear of retribution. America is culturally rich. America's diversity is part of what makes it such a great place to live. Arab Americans are contributors to this robust culture of ours, this American culture. These people are loyal, hard-working, patriotic Americans, just like you and me. These people are just as capable of feeling compassion for a fellow human being held hostage as you are, as I am, as Marwan Burgan is. These people are as deserving of security and a sense of well-being in their homes and workplaces as you are, as I am. I pray that there will be a day when Marwan Burgan and his family will again have that security which we enjoy without thought.

Mr. Speaker and Members, thank you very much for this opportunity to bring this very important message to

you, so that this great disservice committed against Marwan Burgan can be brought to the attention of the public, and hopefully corrected without delay.

□ 2020

THE GROWTH OF NARCO-TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern over the ever increasing relationship between narcotics trafficking and international terrorism. This relationship has grown so strong in recent years that a new term—"narco-terrorism"—has become all too common. The "narco-terrorists" have become so powerful in some nations that the 1984 report of the United Nations International Narcotics Control Board warned that "the very security of some States is threatened." As a result of the growing intensity of narcotics control efforts by some nations there has been a corresponding increase in violence, subversion and corruption by the "narco-terrorists" to impede these efforts. It is clear that many terrorist groups are both directly involved in narcotics production and trafficking, and indirectly involved through the financing of terrorist activities from the enormous profits derived from the illicit narcotics trade. As the use of violence against international narcotics control efforts increases we must recognize the serious threat involved and do everything in our power to combat it.

In the past few weeks we have witnessed two deplorable examples of the types of "narco-terrorism" to which I have referred. On November 3, reports surfaced of "The Day of the Dead Massacre"—of the brutal murders of 22 Mexican police officers in Mexico's southeastern swamplands at the hands of a band of drug smugglers. The Mexican policemen were murdered after they were ambushed by the band of smugglers, who were involved in transferring about 6 tons of marijuana from trucks to a launch on the Rio Coahuila. After they were ambushed they were taken to a nearby farm, where they were tortured and then murdered. I am certain that every Member of this body joins me in expressing our deepest sympathies to the families and friends of these brave men and to the Government of Mexico. It is heartening to learn from recent reports that at least 16 arrests have been made in this brutal case, and that the commander of the Mexican Federal Judicial Police, Florentino Ventura, believes that the information obtained from these suspects will lead directly to the capture and conviction of all those responsible. We stand ready to provide whatever support and assistance we can in that effort.

November 12, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 10015

station edited out Alex's condemnation of terrorism and broadcast only his remarks on the PLO. I consider what that television station did a despicable act. It deliberately distorted the public appearance of a man I knew to be a true humanitarian, making it appear that he did not condemn the hijacking. Many people in southern California feel that this edited interview signed Alex Odeh's death warrant.

On Tuesday, November 5 of this year a similar act of distortion occurred on television. This time the act was done against a young man who is not only a friend of mine but is also a member of my congressional staff. His name is Marwan Burgan. Now, as in the case of Alex Odeh, Marwan's family fears for Marwan's safety, as do I. And Marwan has to wonder whether he can leave his family unprotected. And I have to tell you that the anger I feel toward those who have placed him and his family in this situation is well beyond the power of words to express. My anger is intensified by the fact that Marwan was put in his present situation by a religious network, the Christian Broadcast Network, the fourth largest network in the country. I am a Christian, but in my brand of Christianity we are taught that it is wrong to lie. We are taught that it is wrong to place the lives of others in danger. Apparently access to the airwaves has given CBN a certain largesse to stun the Christian tenets that the rest of Christianity observe.

Let me tell you the truth about Marwan before I proceed to the broadcast lie. I met Marwan through his brother Sam, then a student at Howard University School of Law. I invited Marwan to serve a congressional fellowship in my office. I was so impressed with Marwan's intelligence, his competence, his positive attitude toward work, and his gentlemanly manner that I hired him part time. And I hope to hire him full-time next year. Marwan is a social psychologist by training. He did his undergraduate work at Southern Illinois University, and his graduate work here in Washington at American University. He has been an honors student throughout his training. In light of the present discussion, it is ironic that Marwan's research specialization is content analysis of media presentations.

Marwan was born in Jordan, lived in England for a time, and came to live in the United States in the mid-seventies. Just before Marwan began working for me, I had become interested in the plight of the American hostages who are still held in Lebanon. I was concerned that they had been held so long that the fact of their captivity was slipping from the public consciousness. I feared that without public pressure our Government might not place a high enough priority on winning their release. I assigned my administrative assistant Dr. David Johnson, to contact each hostage

family and find out what we could do to help. That inquiry resulted in a special order here on the House floor in which many of you participated. I resolved after that special order to find ways to keep the situation of the hostages before the eyes of the public, and before the eyes of their representatives in the Congress.

I wanted the families themselves to have an opportunity to come here and tell Members of Congress of their anguish. Because Marwan had so deep a personal knowledge of the Middle East, I thought it appropriate to give him the assignment. He too quickly found his heart going out to these families. The meeting he coordinated between the families and Members of Congress was a moving experience. Moreover, it succeeded in renewing public consciousness of the hostages since the meeting was covered nationally by all sectors of the press. Out of that meeting came a plan to compose a congressional support group for the hostage families, and to recommend the creation of a task force on terrorism within the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Marwan has worked tirelessly to bring both the support group and the task force to fruition.

When the CBN story on Marwan was broadcast, Marwan quickly realized that attention on him would deflect attention from the truly important matter here which is to win the release of the hostages. Marwan suggested to the hostage families that it might be in their best interest if he were to stop his efforts and allow some other staff member to take over. The hostage families, to their everlasting credit, would hear nothing of this. They insisted that Marwan continue his effort on their behalf. If the hostages are returned safely, Marwan Burgan will be one of those deserving of credit. His work has helped the families to maintain hope, and his work has kept the fact that there still are American hostages in Lebanon before the public consciousness. Moreover, his work may ultimately lead to Congress taking a careful look at the fact of terrorism, its causes, and the means by which its incidence might be reduced.

Now let me proceed to the broadcast lie which appears to have been first aired on the "700 Club" program which, as many of you are aware, is a nationally broadcast religious program with a very large audience. Footage of Marwan was shown while the commentator made three stunningly inaccurate allegations. While the commentator was correct in noting that Marwan had been helping the hostage families, it was also alleged first, that Marwan had come into my office to steer the activities of the office toward matters involving the Middle East; second, that Marwan is affiliated with the PLO; and third, that his PLO affiliation places him in a conflict of interest situation in any matter involving the Middle East.

Just recounting these lies makes my anger begin to rise once again. The contempt the broadcast showed toward the Congress is itself contemptible. The outright racism contained in the broadcast should make every Christian, indeed every American of whatever faith, deeply ashamed. Who can find the words to express the smallness of those who could insinuate that the desperate efforts of the hostage families and their helpers to bring their loved ones safely home again is somehow tainted, somehow wrong? And who can condemn strongly enough broadcasters who would place innocent lives in danger for no better reason than to manufacture baseless sensationalism?

Let me take the broadcast's allegations one by one. First, the broadcast insinuated that Marwan came into my office with an agenda and that he is now using my office to his own ends. As I have mentioned, Marwan was given the hostage family assignment well after the time that another staff member, Dr. Johnson, had begun work on the project at my direction. In his work, Marwan has always followed my direction. I would have been happy if Marwan had come into my office with the intention to help the hostage families. But in fact this was an assignment he took on at my request, not the other way around. The larger issue here, however, is the insinuation that Members of Congress are no more than the unsuspecting prey of unscrupulous outsiders bent on prostituting the Congress. That is an insinuation that affronts me because it denigrates the integrity of this whole body. It denigrates the judgment of the American people in electing us to represent them. To insinuate that we can be used so easily is to insult the Congress and the American people. This is not a matter that should go unnoticed by the Members of this body. The more so in this case because it is an attitude projected by people who purport to be the spiritual leaders of the Nation. To me, their insinuation belied their belief in the death of a spirit, the spirit of democracy itself.

We are all familiar with code words. They are signals that connote much more than they denote. Calling Marwan an affiliate of the PLO was such a code. Rightly or wrongly, the PLO has come to be associated with terrorism and the name is used to elicit negative feeling toward those of Arab background. To say that a person is a member of the PLO is to signal that it is alright to be hostile toward that person because that person is bad. Marwan is of Arab background. He is not affiliated with the PLO. But what value does setting the factual record straight have once the damage has been done? We all know how difficult it is to correct the public perception of a person or event once an incorrect perception has been sanctified by the media. As with the in-

November 12, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 10017

The second deplorable act of violence occurred a few days later in Colombia, when on November 6, about 25 leftist guerrillas shot their way into the Palace of Justice and seized a number of hostages, mostly judges. The Palace of Justice is the site of the courtrooms and offices for Colombia's 24 Supreme court justices and 20 other Federal judges. The guerrillas were part of M-19—Movement-19—which takes its name from the April 19, 1970, date on which populist ex-Dictator Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, who had ruled since seizing power in 1953, was defeated in a Presidential election that his followers and others charged was fraudulent. Since this urban-based group opened up rural fronts in 1981, it has been directly involved in a gun-for-drugs nexus, and that connection clearly continues today.

On November 7, President Belisario Betancur, who has led one of the most forceful and effective antinarcotics campaigns of any producing nation over the past 2 years, ordered an all-out assault on the Palace of Justice after promising the rebels only that the Government would guarantee they would not be killed and would get a fair trial if they surrendered. The President added "The Government could not negotiate something that was nonnegotiable—the respectability of our institutions." The result of the assault by Colombian Government security forces was devastating. The Palace of Justice was gutted, and at least 85 corpses of magistrates, rebels, court employees, visitors, soldiers and police have been found.

While no direct drug relationship has been established for the Palace of Justice takeover, two things are clear. First, as President Betancur pointed out in his address to his nation after the assault, hundreds of court files that included cases of people being sought for extradition to the United States for drug offenses were destroyed by the guerrillas. Second, regardless of the ultimate motives of the rebels, the financing of their operations is directly linked to the drug traffickers.

As disturbing as these recent events in Colombia and Mexico have been they are only the latest in a series of drug related violence in these two nations. In April of 1984, the Minister of Justice of Colombia, Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, a firm and outspoken opponent of the drug trade, was murdered at the hands of the drug traffickers, and only recently the judge assigned to investigate the assassination was murdered. In addition, the drug traffickers in Colombia have threatened the lives of Americans living in Colombia in response to our requests for extradition of known Colombian drug traffickers to the United States. Early this year, in Mexico, the drug traffickers were responsible for the brutal murder of American Drug Enforcement Administration agent Enrique Camarena Salazar, setting off a period

of extremely tense relations between our two nations.

Narco-terrorism is rampant throughout the drug producing nations of South America. The "narco-terrorists" have created a climate of complete lawlessness in Bolivia, especially in the drug producing region of the Chapare. The traffickers intimidate and kill Chapare peasants who do not wish to cooperate in the production and trafficking of narcotics. Even the police are not immune from attack. A group of seven Bolivian policemen were murdered in 1982, when it appeared that the Government was attempting to increase narcotics control efforts. The threat posed by the drug traffickers is not limited to direct incidents of violence. There continue to be persistent rumors that members of the far left and the far right are involved in the financing of political activities through drug trafficking, arms smuggling and other related illegal activities.

In Peru, narcotics related violence has been increasing since late 1983, especially in the Upper Hualaga Valley cocaine producing region. Police units and eradication workers have been repeatedly attacked and these attacks culminated in the November 1984, brutal murders of 19 coca eradication and survey workers, and the murder of the mayor of Tingo Maria.

Narco-terrorism is not limited to this hemisphere. The relationship between insurgency and narcotics trafficking is particularly evident in Burma and in Thailand. In Burma, most of the principal insurgent groups rely on heroin smuggling to finance their activities. These groups control the main areas of opium production in northeastern Burma where rough terrain and the shortage of modern military equipment prevent the Government from establishing any authority. All of the insurgent groups are heavily involved in the production, transport, and sale of heroin, and the Burmese Government is continuing to wage a determined struggle to restrict their activities, despite the heavy odds against them. While similar activities are weaker in Thailand, they do exist, and efforts by the Thai Government to suppress these activities are beginning to yield some success.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the scourge of drug trafficking and drug abuse, and related "narco-terrorist" activities, have reached epidemic proportions worldwide. As the ranking minority member of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I have worked closely with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] in seeking to raise the consciousness of our own Government and all governments throughout the world to the deadly nature of the drug trade and its related terrorist activities.

The ruthlessness of the drug traffickers knows no bounds as they seek to spread their poison to every corner of the globe. Narcotics trafficking is a

key ingredient in overall global lawlessness. It must be stopped. If nothing less, we must work with supportive governments to end the direct involvement of some governments in supporting such terrorist activities. Only a firm and coordinated commitment by every nation will lead to a halt of the international drug trade. We must spare no effort and utilize every resource in the fight. The sooner we fully recognize the threat at hand the sooner we will put an end to the tragic events we have experienced in the past few weeks.

Many government leaders have already expressed a firm commitment to the war on narcotics. Along with the efforts already initiated by the Governments of Mexico and Colombia, newly elected Peruvian President Alan Garcia stated in his inaugural address:

A historic scourge threatens our country: drug trafficking, whose prospects of bringing a sudden fortune corrupts people and has destroyed many Peruvian institutions. Neither Peru nor any other country can be identified as an exporter of poison.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain, Margaret Thatcher, has told the drug traffickers:

We are after you. The pursuit will be relentless. The effort will get greater and greater until we have beaten you. The penalty will be long prison sentences. The penalty will be confiscation of everything you have ever got from drug smuggling. So stop it—we shall make your life not worth living.

And in Malaysia, Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamed has declared:

There will be no compromise with those who are slowly killing our people.

Mr. Speaker, those words should become our battle cry—that there can be no compromise with these merchants of violence and death. Greed is the driving force behind their every action. They allow nothing to stand in their way. But we can and must stand in their way, and join together as a world community to end drug production and trafficking and its associated violence once and for all. For the sake of our children we can do no less. I urge my colleagues to join with me and to speak out in this effort.

□ 2030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. GAYDOS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT NOTIFICATION AND CONSULTATION ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

H 10018

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 12, 1985

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, we had general debate today on a bill, H.R. 1616. This bill is commonly called the Labor-Management Notification and Consultation Act of 1985.

Now, during the debate, many Members of Congress, the proponents of this bill, at least, claimed that this was a narrowly gauged bill, that this is simply a notification bill, that this bill is going to protect jobs, that this bill, they inferred and some may have said that this bill would stop the loss of jobs and possibly stop the closing of plants.

I would like to take first, Mr. Speaker, the first part of the proponents' argument, that this is a narrowly gauged bill, that this is a finely honed piece of legislation, that this is just a simple little peace of legislation. My experience in the legislative process going over 7 years is that when anybody tells you it is a simple bill, you had better look out, because it has also been my experience that some people bring a simple bill to the floor of this House and do not tell you the whole story that may be in the bill, so I would like to very briefly start this evening by pointing out and briefly going through what this bill is.

This bill only pertains, supposedly, to 50 or more employees that may be laid off or that will be laid off in a plant closing.

Now, the affected employees means employees who have been employed by an employer for more than 6 months. Why they picked 6 months, I do not know. I guess it is to say if you have been employed more than 6 months, you are a permanent employee. Frankly, I think if you are employed for a year so that you qualify for some benefits and you qualify for at least vacation makes you a permanent employee. We will get into later about how important and how onerous just that little part of the bill is about employees who have worked for more than 6 months.

It also goes even further and says that you have to comply with this bill if you reduce the number, and I am quoting: "if you have a reduction in hours of work of more than 50 percent during any 6-month period" which means that if you have to make a business decision and your plant is in trouble and you are trying to save the jobs of probably more than a majority of the people working in the plant, if you have to cut, for instance, the work-week of some employees of all employees, especially if you have 50 or more employees, then you have to comply with this bill.

Now, also they will say, and I quote from the bill: "If there are unavoidable business circumstances that prevent the employer from withholding such closings or layoffs until the end of such period," which means that the plant can for some unavoidable business circumstances, and frankly they do not define what unavoidable business circumstances are, then you can shut down the plant or lay off employees.

Now, who is going to determine what unavoidable business circumstances are? They wait until you go into a punitive process, punitive on the employer, a punitive process to determine whether you had to close that down quickly because of unavoidable business circumstances.

Now, we go on and get into the consultation part of the bill. First, you are notified with in 90 days that the plant is closing and/or a major layoff of 50 or more employees. Not only do you notify the employees or their representatives, in case it may be a union shop, you also must notify the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service that you are shutting the plant or laying off employees. That immediately puts it in the realm of the Federal Government and in that case the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has the ability in this bill to extend beyond the 90 days that you cannot close your plant or lay off your employees any period of time it sees fit to do so.

Now, it goes even further than that. In section 5 of the bill it says that the employer must provide the representative of the affected employees with "such relevant information as is necessary for the thorough evaluation of the proposal to order a plant closing or plant layoff."

Now, I do not know why they even put in there this kind of language. What they should have said is, "Mr. Employer of the plant, you will open your files and books to the employees and the representatives and show everything that you have to show," because everything in a business decision is used in that business decision, everything that a plant has, whether it be books, files, customer records, credit notices, loans, notes, everything is pulled in then in making a decision such as this. If you do not do that, then you are subject to "such protective orders as the Secretary of Labor may issue."

Now, this also goes further to say and gives authority to the Secretary of Labor, as it says in subsection (2) of section 7 that the Secretary of Labor determines whether you have given sufficient information to make these decisions in order to negotiate—and that is a big word, negotiate the closing of the plant or the laying off of employees.

□ 2045

It gives the authority to the Secretary of State to petition any district

court of the United States for any district in which the violation is alleged to have occurred. In other words, the Secretary of State can go to court and receive injunctive relief, which means we put it off a little further as for as shutting down a plant or laying off people.

The injunctive relief is spelled out in the bill. First, it requires the employer to give notice. It also extends the consultation period and requires the employer to consult "in good faith during the period as extended," and (c) requires that reinstatement of back pay and related benefits. We are talking about a plant that is in monetary distress enough to have to be closed or to lay off employees, and then we require, well, not only can you not lay off these employees, you cannot shut down your plant, but you are going to pay all back pay and benefits to those employees, putting even more pressure on the plant to be closed.

Now we go even further, not just to the Secretary of State, but we also set up class action suits in the bill, and it says under section 7(b):

Any employer who orders a plant closing or mass layoffs in violation of this Act or a court order under subsection (a) shall be liable to each employee who suffers an employment loss as a result of such closing or layoff for reinstatement or damages, or both.

Unbelievable.

Also, it says that employees or their representatives may sue, either for himself or for other persons, setting up class actions suits. And damages shall include back pay and related benefits for each day that the employer is in violation, including general and punitive damages, or both. Punitive damages, which goes right next to the net worth of the owner of the plant, and could be substantial. There is no limit on the punitive damages. All it says is that they can recover punitive damages.

If that is not bad enough, as usually happens in this Congress, we always protect the lawyers. We go on to another section, section 3, and says that while all this litigation is going on, if this guy who is under monetary distress enough to be considering shutting down a plant or laying off employees, loses this how-long-do-we-know civil actions suit, and these suits could go on for years, if it happens to be in Houston, TX, it takes 5 to 8 years to settle many civil actions in the overcrowded courts in that area. But even at that, after all this, then, as I call this bill a full employment for attorneys, then we allow the court to bring a judgment to pay any reasonable attorneys' fees. They have to be paid by the defendant, the owner of the plant.

It just does not make sense. We have more in the section entitled "Civil Actions Against Representatives of Employees." We also allow that any representative who brings action to the

Ter Vor Lim

November 5, 1985

S 14860

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

(and Mr. DOMENICI) to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 372), supra; as follows: At the end of the Packwood amendment No. 957 add the following new section:

Sec. reports on national defense Reports shall be submitted to Congress containing the following information:

A. The Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget shall each estimate the amount of defense and non-defense outlays, budget authority and other budgetary resources to be sequestered at the level of detail specified in the other sections of this Act, for the possible cases of a September 25, 1986 sequester order, at the levels of \$10 billion, \$20 billion, and \$30 billion dollars;

B. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on how the levels of defense spending reductions estimated by OMB and CBO pursuant to Sec. (a) above would be allocated to each program, project, or activity receiving a uniform percentage reduction as specified in the other sections of this Act, and shall report on the impacts of such reductions. This report shall be submitted no later than 60 days following enactment of this Act.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the information of the public that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations will hold a hearing on November 14, 1985, at 9:30 a.m., in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, on regulatory activities of the Office of Management and Budget. Those wishing additional information should contact Margaret Wrightson, 224-4718, of the subcommittee staff.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the information of the public that the Committee on Rules and Administration will be holding a hearing on S. 1787.

The hearing on S. 1787, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for the public financing of Senate General Election Campaigns will be held on Tuesday, November 5, 1985, at 9:30 a.m., SR-301, Russell Senate Office Building.

WITNESS LIST

The Honorable Gary Hart, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC. 20510.
The Honorable George J. Mitchell, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC. 20510.
The Honorable David Boren, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.
The Honorable John F. Kerry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.
The Honorable Henry S. Reuss, 1825 I Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

PANEL

Philip Stern, 2000 P Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
Whitney North Seymour, Jr., Esquire, Brown & Seymour, 100 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10017.
Dr. Amitai Etzioni, George Washington University, Washington, D.C. 20052.
Professor Jeffrey M. Blum, State University of New York at Buffalo Law School, Buffalo, New York 14260.

Burton D. Sheppard, Esquire, Sullivan & Worcester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 5, to conduct a hearing on S. 1787, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, to provide for the public financing of Senate general election campaigns.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 5, at 9:30 a.m., to mark up the following bills:

H.R. 664, amending the Panama Canal Act of 1979 regarding the payment of interest on the U.S. investment in the Panama Canal;

H.R. 720, the Panama Canal Amendments Act of 1985 dealing with the settlement of claims for accidents occurring outside the Canal Locks; and

H.R. 1784, the Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act of fiscal year 1986.

Further, to consider the following nominations:

Carol Johnson Johns, of Maryland, and Mario Efrain Ramirez, of Texas, to be members of the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences; and

Richard N. Holwill, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of the Panama Canal Commission.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 5, to conduct a hearing on matters relating to Deputy Director of OMB.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE POLICY

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 5, 1985, in order to conduct a hearing on asylum procedures.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 5, to conduct a meeting on the nomination of James Curtis Mack, Deputy Administrator of NOAA.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 5, to conduct a meeting on regional airlines.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECENT TERRORISM

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, as founder and cochairman of the Senate Anti-Terrorism Caucus, I rise today to call attention to the pressing problem of international terrorism, including the most recent terrorist incident involving the hijacking of the Italian cruise liner, the *Achille Lauro*. In doing so, I first want to praise the swift and decisive action of the President in capturing the PLO terrorists who perpetrated this inhuman act of violence. We, as Americans, are united with all freedom-loving peoples of the world when we applaud the President's resolve to fight terrorism, and his decision to intercept the hijacker's attempt to flee from justice.

Recently, several of my colleagues and I formed an anti-terrorism caucus to promote a continued, constructive dialog on terrorism in an effort to develop an effective U.S. response. As we recently saw, however, the President amply demonstrated the importance for us to take the upper hand in this new type of warfare. The President's words must stand as a warning to terrorists everywhere: You can run, but you can't hide.

In recent history, we have witnessed several major anti-U.S. terrorist incidents. Among these, the hijacking of Trans World Airways flight 847 on June 14 clearly reflects the type of amoral behavior we have learned to expect, but never justify, from terrorist groups. On board were 145 passengers and 8 crew members, 104 of whom were American citizens. The two original hijackers, later joined by several more heavily armed terrorists, expanded their demands to include not only the release of 700 Lebanese Shiite Muslims imprisoned in Israel, but also 17 imprisoned in Kuwait and 2 in Spain—all of whom were criminal terrorists themselves.

Our President refused to bargain. Israel also refused. Periodically, women and children were freed and allowed to leave the plane, but we all know the tragic end to this drama as

November 5, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 14859

For purposes of the preceding sentence, program outlays are the outlays authorized by law as described by the designated account numbers set forth in the Budget of the United States Government, 1986—Appendix.

(B) Further, such term shall not include outlays in the following accounts that result from prior legal obligations to the Government:

Veterans Administration loan guaranty revolving fund (36-4025-0-3-704);
Agricultural credit insurance fund (12-4140-0-3-351);
Agency for International Development, housing and other credit guaranty programs (72-4340-0-3-151);
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (71-4030-0-3-151);
Rural development insurance fund (12-4155-0-3-452);
Economic development revolving fund (13-4406-0-3-452);
International Trade Administration operations and administration (13-1250-0-1-376);
Government National Mortgage Association, guarantees of Mortgage-backed securities (86-4238-0-3-371);
Federal Housing Administration fund (86-4070-0-3-371);
Credit union share insurance fund (25-4468-0-3-371);
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation fund (82-4037-0-3-371);
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation fund (16-4204-0-3-601);
Maritime Administration, war risk insurance revolving fund (69-4302-0-3-403);
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fund (12-4085-0-3-351);
Aviation insurance revolving fund (69-4126-0-3-402);
Export-Import Bank of the United States, limitation of program activity (83-4027-0-3-155);
Small Business Administration lease guarantees revolving fund (73-4157-0-3-376);
Small Business Administration surety bond guarantees revolving fund (73-4156-0-3-376);
Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Insurance development fund (58-4235-0-3-451);
Federal Emergency Management Agency, National flood insurance fund (58-4236-0-3-453);
Nuclear Regulatory Commission salaries and expenses (31-0200-0-1-276);
Check forgery insurance fund (20-4109-0-3-803);
Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement financing fund (69-4411-0-3-401);
Energy security reserve (20-0112-0-1-271);
Small Business Administration, business loan and investment fund (73-4154-0-3-376);
Small Business Administration, pollution control equipment contract guarantee revolving fund (73-4147-0-3-376);
Low-rent public housing—loans and other expenses (86-4098-0-3-604);
Federal ship financing fund (69-4301-0-3-403);
Federal ship financing fund, fishing vessels (13-4417-0-3-376);
Rural housing insurance fund (12-4141-0-3-371);
Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund (14-4410-0-3-452);
Rail service assistance (69-0122-0-1-401);
Office of Personnel Management, employees life insurance fund (24-8424-0-8-802);
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (51-8419-0-8-371);
Veterans Administration, servicemen's group life insurance fund (36-4009-0-3-701);
Veterans Administration, United States Government life insurance fund (36-8150-0-7-701);
Veterans Administration, National service life insurance fund (36-8132-0-7-701);

Service-disabled veterans insurance fund (36-4012-0-3-701);

Veterans special life insurance fund (36-8455-0-8-701);

Veterans reopened insurance fund (36-4010-0-3-701); and

Veterans insurance and indemnities (36-0120-0-1-701).

For purposes of the preceding sentence, program outlays are the outlays authorized by law as described by the designated account numbers set forth in the Budget of the United States Government, 1986—Appendix.

(C) Further, such term shall not include regular State unemployment benefits, the State-funded share of extended unemployment benefits, and loans to States from the Federal unemployment account.

(D) Further, such term shall not include non-federal funds appropriated for the District of Columbia.

(E) Further, such term shall not include outlays for net interest (all of budget function 900).

(F) Further, such term shall not include outlays which result from private donations, bequests, or voluntary contributions to the Government.

(G) Further, such term shall not include outlays from intragovernmental funds to the extent that such outlays are derived from other Federal Government accounts.

(H) Further, such term shall not include offsetting receipts.

(I) Further, such term shall not include outlays due to increases in the number of program participants.

(J) Further, such term shall not include outlays for prior-year obligations, except that such term shall include obligations for existing contracts except—

(i) those multiyear contracts which include a specified penalty for cancellation or modification of the contract by the Government and which, if canceled or modified by the Government would result, due to such penalty for cancellation or modification, in a net loss to the Government in the first year; and

(ii) those contracts the reduction of which would violate legal obligations of the Government.

For purposes of subsection (b), the term "existing contracts" shall include all Federal military and civilian contracts existing at the time a sequester order is issued. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any contract entered into or modified by the Federal Government after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution shall contain a provision that the contract may be modified, renegotiated, or terminated to the extent necessary to implement a sequester order issued under clause (ii) of subsection (b)(1)(A), and a provision that any penalties that would otherwise be payable by the Federal Government under the contract by reason of modification, renegotiation, or termination of the contract shall not be payable if the modification, renegotiation, or termination is made pursuant to a sequester order issued under clause (ii) of subsection (b)(1)(A).

(K) Receipts credited to an account shall not be deducted from outlays for the purpose of determining the amount to be sequestered pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii).

(8) The term "sequester" means the permanent cancellation of budget authority, obligation limitations, other budgetary resources, or direct and guaranteed loan limitations, to the extent necessary to reduce each controllable expenditure by a uniform percentage.

(9) The term "other budgetary resources" means unobligated balances, obligated bal-

ances for existing contracts (as provided in paragraph (7) of this subsection), reimbursements, receipts credited to an account, and recoveries of prior-year obligations.

(10) The amount by which the deficit for a fiscal year exceeds the maximum deficit amount for such fiscal year shall be treated as "statistically significant" if the amount of such excess is greater than 5 percent of such maximum deficit amount. For purposes of the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1985, the preceding sentence shall be applied by substituting "0" for "5".

RIEGLE (AND CRANSTON) AMENDMENT NO. 964

Mr. RIEGLE (for himself and Mr. CRANSTON) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 957 proposed by Mr. PACKWOOD (and Mr. DOMENICI) to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 372), supra; as follows:

At the end of the amendment of Mr. PACKWOOD, insert the following:

Sec. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, for the purposes of section 204 of this Act the following shall apply with respect to outlays for the Veterans' Administration programs, benefits, and accounts referred to in this section: Expenditures from the Veterans' Administration medical care account (36-0160-0-1-703) shall be deemed not to be controllable expenditures; a provision of law making an appropriation to such account for a fiscal year shall be deemed to be a provision of Federal law requiring an automatic spending increase to take effect during such fiscal year; the amount of outlays from such account that shall be considered the amount of the outlay increase to be reduced by a uniform percentage during a fiscal year (hereinafter in this clause referred to as the "current fiscal year") under subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) of such section is any amount exceeding the total of all outlays made from such account for the preceding fiscal year (as estimated by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office) plus the amount of outlays which the Director of the Congressional Budget Office estimates will be needed during the current fiscal year for increases in outlays (over outlays during the preceding year as so estimated) for salaries and benefits in order to maintain employment under such account of the same number of full-time-equivalent federal employees employed under such account as were so employed during the preceding fiscal year; no provision of law increasing or authorizing an increase in a rate or rates of compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation, as defined in section 101 (13) and (14), respectively, of title 38, United States Code, or of a benefit paid under chapter 11 or 13 of such title shall be considered a law requiring an automatic spending increase; no expenditure for such compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or benefits shall be considered a controllable expenditure; and no amount of budget authority for such compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or benefits shall be sequestered.

HART (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 965

Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SASSER, and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 957 proposed by Mr. PACKWOOD

November 5, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 14861

40 innocent civilians were held hostage for several days, and 1, American naval diver Robert Stethem, was cruelly beaten and murdered.

We must also not forget the six other American hostages who still remain in captivity in Lebanon. Someday they, too, must return home safely to America.

Neither should we forget the terrorist seizure of the United States Embassy in Iran which resulted in the detention of 52 hostages for 444 days. Two days after President Reagan took the oath of office, all were released. From the day forward, the President has held fast to his commitment to combat terrorism, an insidious disease that has plagued us for far too long.

Terrorism is a cancer. It is a cancer eating away at world order and at every legitimate process of laws established to secure and maintain this order. It is a cancer that is growing, even in the face of stepped up security measures worldwide. Terrorists seeking to impose their political will over others through threats, murder, and destruction are as old as history, but there comes a time in history when we must say enough is enough. Terrorism must be brought to heel, and this must be done under the very process of laws that it seeks to overthrow.

In the words of Secretary of State George Shultz, "international terrorism has rapidly become one of the gravest challenges to American interests around the world." Only recently have we begun to tabulate acts of terrorism worldwide, and the statistics are staggering. Since 1968, U.S. personnel and institutions have been the targets of over 50 percent of all terrorist acts. Within the last 12 years, there have been over 6,000 terrorist incidents worldwide, resulting in the deaths of approximately 4,700 innocent people. Last year alone, Americans suffered more than 100 casualties. But we do not suffer alone. By virtue of the free and open nature of democratic societies, all Western democracies are vulnerable to terrorist attacks.

During 1984, according to the Department of State, the total number of terrorist incidents was up roughly 30 percent—a total of 650 compared to 500, the figure for 1983 and the average of the previous 5 years. Western Europe had over 250 incidents, up one-third; the Middle East had nearly 200 incidents, up two-thirds, and Latin America had between 110 and 120 incidents.

When I look at these statistics, I am outraged. I try to imagine the warped minds of those in the PLO who are bent on using murder and violence as bargaining tools, but it is difficult. I know who they are and where they gain their assistance, but it is difficult to find an effective solution against their cruel and inhuman attacks on innocent people.

To address the difficulty of developing an effective solution to terrorism, Senators DIXON, DENTON, DeCONCINI,

and I formed the Senate Anti-Terrorism Caucus in response to the growing threat of terrorism, especially against Americans abroad, and the growing outrage against terrorism by the American public. It is the hope of the members of this caucus that the fruits of our hearings will add to the work of the standing committees handling these issues, as well as the work of the administration, in formulating an effective policy to counter terrorism.

The caucus convened its first hearing on the 24th of October to investigate the roots of Middle East terrorism and possible solutions. We heard from Ambassador Robert Oakley, Director of the Office for Counterterrorism and Emergency Planning at the State Department, regarding the nature of the terrorist threat and the groups involved in terrorist activities. Groups involved in terrorism include Muslim fanatics, Syrian-backed Palestinians, the PLO, and radicals in Libya, each of which seek to disrupt stability and create a forum of terror to advance their respective causes.

But we must ask ourselves, what can be done to stop their senseless killing? What is being done to create an international forum? Is there international cooperation to thwart terrorist expansion? The answers to these questions are mixed and varied. As Ambassador Oakley affirmed, it is difficult to gain international cooperation. For example, during the Iranian crisis in 1983, the United States tried to impose economic sanctions against the Iranian Government as pressure for the release of the American hostages, but there was little or no international cooperation. If we are to put an end to terrorism, all affected nations must be uniformly resolved to take the necessary action. There must be no weak links in the international chain to bind those people who either sanction or carry out terrorist activities.

We also heard from Peter Hill, a former hostage aboard TWA flight 847, who offered his personal experiences during this hijacking and suggested the placement of sky marshals aboard international flights as a preemptive solution. He suggested many instances in which the hijackers of that flight left themselves vulnerable to attack. I do not believe this to be an isolated case in which hijackers have left themselves open and vulnerable. We must, therefore, seriously consider the viability of this initiative as a preemptive solution to future acts of air piracy.

We heard from Sue Franceschini, the sister of Reverend Jenko, one of the six American captives currently being held in Beirut, on the need to make the American people more aware of the increasing threat of terrorism and its effects on the victim's families. As we all know, terrorism strikes not only the immediate victim, but also that victim's family and friends. Angered by the difficulty in obtaining her brother's release, Ms. Franceschini

has contacted many State and local officials throughout the Union to gain their increased attention to terrorism. With the assistance of women like Ms. Franceschini, our Nation will properly place the issue of terrorism on the top of our national agenda.

Finally, we heard from Yohan Alexander, a noted scholar in the uncharted academic field of international terrorism, on the proliferation of terrorist activities in recent months, which indicates a renewed effort of low-intensity warfare against the United States. Although we have been fortunate that relatively few terrorist attacks have occurred within the borders of the United States, our citizens overseas are under constant threat.

It is absolutely critical that we, as members of Congress, maintain a continued, constructive dialog on possible solutions to terrorism to free the innocent people of this world from senseless murder and destruction. Our struggle to find ways to combat terrorism will continue, but, unfortunately, terrorists will continue to prey upon these innocent victims unless we find a viable solution.

As I have stated, the President recently showed us the solution to terrorism, and that is: to fight fire with fire. The U.S. response to terrorism has been on an ad hoc basis for far too long and has involved a broad range of tactics, from direct negotiations to international cooperation. But these efforts are no longer effective against the emergence of state-supported, state-sponsored terrorism.

The Palestine Liberation Organization, the organization behind the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro*, is an outlaw terrorist organization. They are a people without a state, bound by a cause they cannot win, and supported by states to perpetuate the murder and destruction that has plagued the innocent for years.

The 1978 Arab summit in Baghdad, Iraq, mandated that the major oil-exporting Arab states were to give \$300 million a year to the PLO for 10 years between 1979 and 1989. This money is channeled through the Palestine National Fund to Yasser Arafat, the recognized spokesman for the PLO who has final control over this money. Contributing states and their apportionments this year, in millions of dollars, were: Saudi Arabia, \$85.7; Kuwait, \$47.1; Libya, \$47.1; Iraq, \$44.6 million; the United Arab Emirates, \$34.3; Algeria, \$21.4; and Qatar, \$19.8 million. These nations also provide sanctuary, training, and logistics to tens of thousands of PLO militants.

During the 1970's Yasser Arafat succeeded in gaining recognition as the PLO's sole credible voice of the stateless Palestinian people in many parts of the world, but, in recent years, Arafat's recognition has diminished. In 1982, he was driven from his military stronghold in Lebanon. As a result, the PLO has been forced to disperse

S 14862

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 5, 1985

around the Arab world. More recently, his Tunisian camp was destroyed by Israeli jets, and on October 10, President Reagan succeeded in apprehending four of Arafat's Palestinian terrorists for hijacking the *Achille Lauro*. Now Arafat has even been denied the opportunity to address the United Nations.

Mr. President, the events on October 11 must stand as a message to terrorists everywhere that the United States will no longer stand idly by as innocent people are victimized by this senseless violence. President Reagan's actions on October 11 clearly demonstrate his leadership of the American people and his resolve to combat terrorism.

Initially, the President reacted with caution to the seizure by Palestinians of the Italian cruise liner, and carefully weighed his options to end the drama. As in most PLO terrorist incidents, American lives were at stake, thus, every precaution had to be taken to ensure their safety. Communication lines were opened to Italy, Egypt, and Israel and were kept open around the clock as the drama developed. Keeping his options open, the President sent several military ships into the area to be available if needed. He was content, at least initially, to let the Italian Government take the lead. Negotiations with other nations were underway to end the crisis, but no concessions were to be made to the terrorists.

After identifying themselves as members of the Palestine Liberation Front, a faction of the PLO known to support Arafat, the hijackers demanded the release of other Palestinian terrorists currently jailed in Israel—threatening to take the lives of innocent Americans if their demands were not met. They soon realized, however, that their demands would not be met. Coldly and cruelly, the four Palestinian terrorists attempted to force the world into submission, but still no concessions to their demands were made.

Their mission failed the hijackers were talked off the ship and allowed to leave the *Achille Lauro* by boat. But when Nicholas Veliotis, U.S. Ambassador to Egypt, visited the ship to make certain no hostages were harmed, he discovered that Leon Klinghoffer, a 69-year-old man confined to a wheelchair, had been shot, and in a despicable and inhuman gesture, his body had been thrown overboard.

After learning what had happened, to Mr. Klinghoffer, President Reagan waited for the opportunity to strike. Poised and ready for their go-ahead command, the U.S.S. *Saratoga* waited in the Ionian Sea between Italy and Greece. The order was then given to launch four Navy F-14's into formation, and at 5:30 p.m. e.s.t. on October 10, the President issued their final orders to intercept the flight of Egyptian 737 airliner as the hijackers attempted to flee from justice.

Mr. President, I would like to reiterate my praise for our great President,

and commend him for his actions during this crisis. He has steered this Nation in the right direction to effectively combat terrorism, and he has enabled all Americans to once again stand tall in the face of this age-old cancer.

Terrorism cannot be allowed to flourish, and terrorists everywhere should heed our President's warning: You can run, but you can't hide.

Thank you, Mr. President. ●

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev are to succeed in devising a formula to significantly limit nuclear and space weapons, they should first take a very fundamental step. That is to immediately resume the negotiation of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

A comprehensive test ban [CTB] with rigorous on-site inspection and provisions could pave the way toward a freeze on the production and deployment of nuclear weapons. It could help put an end to the constant parade of destabilizing nuclear innovations, which have failed to enhance our security.

That is why I joined a bipartisan group of Senators in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 179, calling upon President Reagan to propose to the Soviet Union "the immediate resumption of negotiations toward conclusion of a verifiable comprehensive test ban treaty."

The administration abandoned CTB negotiations claiming that such a treaty would pose serious verification problems.

Yet the administration has failed to admit to the significant progress which had been made with the Soviets in resolving issues which had seemed insurmountable, on terms proposed by the United States.

Indeed, prior to United States withdrawal from CTB negotiations the Soviets had accepted a United States plan for conducting on-site inspections to help resolve compliance questions.

This was truly an historic achievement. Failure to reach agreement on the issue of on-site inspections was one of the main reasons it was possible to only conclude a partial rather than a comprehensive test ban in 1963.

In another major breakthrough on verification, the Soviets had accepted a United States proposal for deployment of a network of sophisticated seismic monitoring stations on their territory. Such seismic facilities inside the Soviet Union combined with our impressive existing national technical means of verification would give us a very effective basis for verifying a CTB treaty.

In addition, Soviet willingness to accept these seismic stations on their territory represents a dramatic advance in Soviet attitudes toward verification, with significant implications for future arms control agreements.

Mr. President, as vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I can tell my colleagues that the kind of cooperative measures which the Soviets have agreed to in previous CTB negotiations would serve as very valuable principles for our negotiators in Geneva—if they are implemented.

It is ironic that an administration which refuses to have arms control without progress on verification issues would refuse to implement significant breakthroughs that improve the verification capabilities of the United States.

Mr. President, last summer Premier Gorbachev proposed a 5-month moratorium on nuclear testing, through December 1985. Rather than dismiss Gorbachev's offer as the administration did, it could have used the Soviet proposal as a starting point for the resumption of the CTB negotiations. We could have insisted that the Soviets begin to implement some of the significant on-site inspection procedures to which they had previously agreed in the CTB negotiations.

These are objectives that can be achieved in Geneva. They are small steps which can have significant impact in creating the momentum required for the negotiation of a new treaty. We must have the courage to take these small steps. ●

EXPANDED CAPITAL OWNERSHIP AND THE IDEOLOGICAL HIGH GROUND

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I am introducing the second of four statements on expanded capital ownership. This is part of a position paper entitled "Project Economic Justice: A Revolutionary Free Enterprise Challenge to Marxism," prepared by Norman G. Kurland.

Mr. Kurland is president of the consulting firm, Equity Expansion International, and also of the nonprofit educational firm, the Center for Economic and Social Justice, chaired by Ambassador J. William Middendorf II. Mr. Kurland is recognized as one of America's leading authorities on the design and implementation of the employee stock ownership plan technique, which can be a powerful mechanism for connecting workers to future capital credit. Mr. Kurland drafted and spearheaded the campaign behind the original ESOP laws adopted by Congress and has developed a number of model ESOP's. I invite my colleagues to read this piece entitled "A Strategy for Expanding Capital Ownership."

The statement follows:

A STRATEGY FOR EXPANDING CAPITAL OWNERSHIP

(By Norman G. Kurland)

Few can argue that, given the rich cultural diversity of Americans, freedom and democracy have been raised to extraordinary levels in America. Our history continues to