

~~SECRET~~



84 3408870

SSO

PAGE 001

NC 3408870

TOR: 171858Z FEB 84

OO RUEAIIB
ZNY SSSSS ZOC STATE ZZH
OO RUEHC RUEHTH
DE RUEHC #9071 0481857
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O 171631Z FEB 84
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY ATHENS IMMEDIATE 3552
BT
S E C R E T STATE 049071

E.O. 12356: DECL:OADR
TAGS: PTER
SUBJECT: MOYNIHAN REWARDS BILL
REF ATHENS 1834
1. SECRET --ENTIRE TEXT

2. SENATOR MOYNIHAN SEEMS TO HAVE ACCEPTED THE POINTS EXPRESSED IN REFTEL. NONETHELESS, HE HAS CHOSEN TO ENTER A MORE GENERAL BILL ON THE SUBJECT OF REWARDS LEGISLATION. HIS BILL, PROPOSED ON FEBRUARY9, WOULD ESTABLISH A GENERAL FUND OF TEN MILLION DOLLARS FOR-THE PURPOSE OF OFFERING REWARDS IN SUCH CASE WHEREIT MIGHT HELP TO BRING PERPETRATORS OF TERRORIST-ACTS TO JUSTICE.

3. THIS LEGISLATION WOULD EMPOWER THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN FOREIGN CASES, AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IN DOMESTIC - CASES, TO OFFER AND PAY LARGE REWARDS FOR INFORMATION LEADING TO APPREHENSION OF TERRORISTS. THE SENATOR OPINED THAT REWARDS OF AS MUCH AS ONE MILLION-DOLLARS MIGHT BE COUNTENANCED IN SOME CASES.

4. WHILE THE BILL DOES NOT SPECIFICALLY APPLY TO THE TSANTES CASE, THE SENATOR DID ALLUDE TO THAT CASE IN HIS INTRODUCTORY REMARKS. HE SUGGESTED THAT BOTH GREECE AND EL SALVADOR WOULD BE PLACES IN WHICH SUCH LEGISLATION AS HE IS PROPOSING MIGHT BE HELPFUL. DAM
END OF MESSAGE

SECRET

25X1



25X1

~~SECRET~~



February 9, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1267

interested in receiving allotments under the block grant.

The State's matching requirement would be reduced from 20 percent and 33 1/2 percent to 10 percent for each of the 3 fiscal years that authority is extended.

Under the revised block grant, States would continue to be required to fund Federal grantees during the first year States receive allotments, but at levels the State deems appropriate.

My bill would continue current law provisions for funding CHC's which meet the requirements of the section 330 categorical authority and which serve medically underserved populations, but would require the active involvement of the Governor of a State in the entire medically underserved designation process.

In addition to those criteria which the Secretary must now consider in designating medically underserved areas, he would also be required to take into account those factors deemed relevant by the Governor.

Finally, my bill would require the Secretary to prepare a report by March 30, 1985, which would review the current formula used for allotting funds to the States and would make recommendations on a more equitable distribution of funds to the States. Among other things, this report should examine the merits of using medically underserved populations in the determination of the amount of a State's allotment. I am confident these changes will encourage more States to be involved in primary health care service delivery and to apply for allotments under the primary care block grant.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2308

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that this Act may be cited as the "Primary Health Care Amendments of 1984."

REFERENCE

Sec. 2. Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Health Service Act.

PRIMARY CARE BLOCK GRANT

Sec. 3. (a) Section 1921(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) For grants under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated \$2,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 1984, and ending on September 30, 1987."

(b) Section 1922 is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 1922. For allotments under section 1924 and for grants under section 330, there is authorized to be appropriated \$340,000,000 for fiscal year 1985,

\$345,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and \$350,000,000 for fiscal year 1987."

(c) Section 1924 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) The Secretary shall conduct a study for the purpose of devising a formula for the distribution of funds available for allotment to States under this section which is more equitable than the formula specified under subsections (a) and (b). In conducting such study, the Secretary shall consider—

"(A) the financial resources of the various States;

"(B) the populations of the States;

"(C) any relevant conditions or circumstances which have changed since the date of enactment of this part, including any changes in the number of individuals in medically underserved populations; and

"(D) any other factor which the Secretary may consider appropriate.

"(2) In conducting the study required by this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with appropriate representatives of State and local governments.

"(3) By April 1, 1985, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to the Congress a report concerning the study conducted under this subsection which includes such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate."

(d)(1) Section 1926 (a)(1) is amended by striking out "1983 and 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1985, 1986, and 1987."

(2) Section 1926 (a)(2) is amended—

(A) by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "From amounts paid to a State under section 1925 for the first fiscal year for which such State receives an allotment under section 1924, and from the State funds required to be made available under paragraph (4) for such fiscal year, a State shall make grants to each community health center which received a grant for its operation under section 330 (d) for the fiscal year immediately preceding such fiscal year and which meets the requirements of this paragraph; and

(B) by striking out the second sentence.

(3) Section 1926 (a) (3) is amended—

(A) by striking out "1983 and 1984" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1985, 1986, and 1987";

(B) by striking out "fiscal year 1983" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the first fiscal year for which a State receives an allotment under section 1924";

(C) by striking out "fiscal year 1984" in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "any fiscal year succeeding the first fiscal year for which the State receives an allotment under section 1924"; and

(D) by striking out "for the fiscal year" each place it appears in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "for such succeeding fiscal year".

(4) Section 1926 (a) (4) (A) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) (A) In any fiscal year for which a State receives an allotment under section 1924, the State shall make available, from State funds, for the grants described in paragraphs (2) and (3) for such fiscal year and for State administrative expenses for such grants for such fiscal year an amount equal to 10 percent of its allotment."

(5) Section 330 (b) (3) is amended by striking out the second, third, fourth, and fifth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary may not designate a medically underserved population unless, prior to such designation, the Secretary consults with the chief executive officer of the State in which the population is located and local officials in such State. In

making recommendations to the Secretary, such chief executive officer and local officials may consider unusual local conditions which are a barrier to access to or the availability of personal health services. The Secretary shall prescribe criteria for determining the specific shortages of personal health services of an area or population group, which shall—

(A) take into account criteria recommended under the preceding sentences by the chief executive officer of a State or local officials in a State; and

(B) include infant mortality in an area or population group, other factors indicative of the health status of a population group or residents of an area, the ability of the residents of an area or of a population group to pay for health services and their accessibility to them, and the availability of health professionals to residents of an area or to a population group."

MIGRANT HEALTH CENTERS

Sec. 4. The first sentence of section 329 (h) (1) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "\$42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, \$43,200,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and \$42,600,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987".

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 5. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 2309. A bill to authorize the offer and payment of rewards for information and services concerning terrorist activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ANTI-TERRORISM REWARDS ACT OF 1984

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Anti-Terrorist Rewards Act of 1984, which would authorize a \$10 million fund to be available for payments for information and services leading to arrest, conviction or other appropriate resolution in cases of terrorist acts, including those acts abroad that are directed at U.S. persons and property.

If we in the United States begin 1984 with some trepidation—as we surely do—it is not only because the horrors of totalitarianism described by Orwell continue, but also because another barbarous phenomenon, known as terrorism, has come to challenge our civilization. Terrorist acts abroad this past year killed 274 Americans. Of the 1983 fatalities, most (241) were our marines who were shuffed out by one of the largest man-made explosions in history. There have been smaller nuclear explosions. Even before this incident, a car bombing of our Embassy in Beirut killed 17 Americans, as well as 63 foreign nationals.

While the bomb seems to be an increasingly popular weapon of terrorists, they also continue to employ more discrete methods. For example, in May, Lt. Comdr. Albert Schaufelberger, who served the U.S. Military Assistance Group in El Salvador, was killed in San Salvador on the campus of the University of Central America. In November, Navy Capt. George

S 1268

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 9, 1984

Tsantes, Jr., who served in Athens with the Joint Greece United States Military Advisory Group, was shot to death on his way to work.

As we mourn these victims, we must express gratitude that, at home, we have so far been largely spared. Yet we cannot ignore the awful possibilities. Terrorist bombs continue to explode in New York and other major cities. And who in this body did not sense our country's vulnerability as we stood on the spot where a bomb was detonated in the Capitol on November 7? It takes no stretch of the imagination to contemplate a group aching to perpetrate some outrageous act during the summer Olympic games in Los Angeles. Or elsewhere.

I say these things not to arouse emotions. No such inducement is required. To the contrary, we must be able to speak of these matters and consider what we might and must do without losing our composure or our liberties. Certainly, we say something of an overreaction in the Capitol when increased security procedures initially imposed undue restrictions on the press who cover our deliberations. Happily, however, this was soon rectified. And we can also take some comfort that our security officials did not require us to hang red or yellow identification badges around our necks, although this might avoid some embarrassment for us when we are not recognized by the Capitol Police.

It is clear that the times require our intelligence and law enforcement agencies to exercise especial vigilance. But they need help. It has long been the custom of our country, and other democracies as well, to offer payments to citizens and informants who assist in the detection of crimes and the apprehension of criminals. This concept might be extended to offering rewards for assistance in dealing with those who have committed or would commit terrorist acts against U.S. persons and property abroad. At present, there is no statutory authorization for the State Department to do so.

Mr. President, the bill I have introduced would create a \$10 million fund from which the Secretary of State could pay rewards for information or services, leading to arrest, conviction, or other appropriate resolution, concerning terrorist acts abroad directed against U.S. persons and property. I do not wish to be understood as suggesting that this measure would be sufficient in all terrorist cases. But it could be useful. The Secretary would be accorded broad latitude as to when and how to make offers and payments. For example, in cases where Americans were killed or U.S. property damaged in countries with whom we have friendly relations and which have operating judicial systems, the Secretary might make arrangements through their governments to post a schedule of rewards. This approach might well be taken with Greece and El Salvador with respect to the Tsantes and

Schauflberger cases. At present these cases remain unsolved. A substantial reward may provide an incentive for a citizen with information or, perhaps, a coconspirator to come forward.

Consider how a reward might help in the Tsantes case. The group claiming credit for his murder—"November 17," after the date of the suppression in 1973 of a demonstration against the former ruling military junta in Greece—also claimed credit for the 1975 assassination in Athens of Richard Welch who served there as the CIA's Chief of Station. There are other linkages; for example, ballistics tests show that the same gun was used in both killings. The Greek Government offered rewards totaling above \$130,000 for information concerning the Welch murder; no reward has been offered in the Tsantes case. No prosecution was ever brought in the Welch case and the Greeks appear no closer to apprehending those responsible for killing Tsantes.

It is doubtful that conventional police work will achieve any results. Mr. President, what is needed is a significant break—a witness, someone who will come forward and name names or provide a significant lead. The posting of a substantial reward, perhaps as high as \$1 million, might well prompt someone to come forward. If this bill passes, I would expect the State Department, to make such an offer in this case. It is worth a try. The principle that two of the world's foremost democracies will not tolerate terrorism is worth the price of such an award.

Mr. President, the foregoing are cases in which rewards might be used to help identify and apprehend terrorists. It is of paramount interest to prevent terrorist acts. To do so requires timely information—which is typically difficult to acquire as terrorist cadres do not lend themselves to penetration. The Secretary could fashion approaches to offers and payments which take this problem into account and provide incentives for coconspirators to betray their treacherous comrades.

The bill would also provide the Attorney General similar broad authority to offer and pay rewards concerning domestic terrorism cases. Again, knowledge that large payments are available to informants might well help deter terrorist activities. The Attorney General would draw on the same \$10 million available to the Secretary of State. In this connection, it should be noted that current authority to pay rewards is generally limited to \$25,000 to \$50,000 to any one person, except in the case of the Presidential Assassinations Act which has a \$100,000 maximum. One advantage of the bill would be to permit ample payments, even exceeding \$100,000 in meritorious cases.

In view of the broad authority which would be given to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, the

bill requires that they exercise it under guidelines which would be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress for review. Semiannual reports on all offers and payments of rewards would be required under this act.

As is generally the case in reward statutes, no payments could be made under this bill to any office or employee of the United States or any State or local government who furnishes information or renders services in the performance of his or her official duties.

Mr. President, I believe that this bill would make a modest, but nonetheless, important contribution to our Nation's efforts to combat terrorism. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.●

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2310. A bill to establish Senior Citizen Tutorial Volunteer Network programs which will provide opportunities for senior citizens to work in elementary and secondary schools and in the home with educationally disadvantaged children and their families; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

SENIOR CITIZEN TUTORIAL VOLUNTEER NETWORK ACT OF 1984

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation which would establish Senior Citizen Tutorial Volunteer Network programs to provide supplemental educational and related services to educationally disadvantaged children attending chapter 1 schools.

The purpose of this legislation is to upgrade the basic skills of educationally disadvantaged children. This would be achieved by utilizing the reservoir of skill and talent that exists among senior citizens and parents in the school community.

Specifically, under my proposal, senior citizen volunteers would work directly with disadvantaged children who would be benefited by tutoring. Most of the time of senior citizen volunteers would be spent in the classroom or in the home providing services to pupils in small groups or on a one-on-one basis as needed. The remainder of the time would be spent serving as liaison to the families of the children with whom the volunteer is working. The liaison activities could include:

First, assisting the parent in carrying out home learning activities in basic skills;

Second, advising and supporting parents in creating a home environment conducive to study, including work space, monitoring homework, time-management and scheduling;

Third, serving as a regular contact for reporting progress and sharing problems and concerns of such children.

Programs that involve senior citizens and parents in the education of their