

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 33

DECEMBER 28, 1970, TO JANUARY 2, 1971

(PAGES 43589 TO 44876)

eral role in this area. There is no authoritative, comparative assessment of various forms of treatment, indicating which programs work for which types of people for which types of drug abuse. An ambitious effort in the Congress this past year to meet some of these needs and produce a federal treatment program adequate to the challenge was beaten back because of the priority given to law enforcement. Senator Hughes' bill, which I cosponsored in the House, would have consolidated the federal treatment programs within one office, giving it \$26 million more than is now provided, and assigning this office to the status, the priority, and the programs needed for the job. The confused jumble of ideologically competing treatment programs made it easier for the Congress to conclude that the tools for a massive assault were not yet available or properly assessed. More modest efforts, therefore, were considered appropriate, while we concentrated our greatest energies on a legal crackdown which is primarily visible in the law books alone.

The federal government is showing increasing interest in attacking the demand for dangerous drugs by educating young people to their dangers. We have begun to see that the nonsense peddled throughout this century by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics was simply an inept scare tactic, based on ignorance and arrogance. The F.B.N. warning about the dangers of the "killer drug—marijuana" from the 1920's and 30's now appears in pop art posters on college dormitory walls. In more recent times, the able agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs have not been much more effective in developing credibility on the campus. They have had the unenviable task of explaining and justifying the inadequately explored effects of drugs and the ineffective prohibitions on their use.

Consequently, the Administration has doubled the drug education budget to almost \$20 million for this fiscal year, establishing crash programs of lecture, courses, information, advertisements, panel discussions. The motivation is admirable, but the effects are questionable. We are only beginning to separate fact from folklore about drugs, and it is unlikely that any state or community yet has an adequate drug education program. We know that drug abuse is triggered by curiosity, peer group pressure, and experimentation, alienation, hopelessness, but we don't yet know how to meet this mixed bag of motivations effectively. The medical and educational outcry on soft drugs to date has been so exaggerated that most young people now shrug off even the most reasoned scientific evidence about the dangers of using hard drugs.

A recent poll by CBS indicates that the entire population is still largely uneducated on the drug problem: People's opinions are still based on fears rather than facts. Eighty-one percent think that marijuana is addictive and habit-forming. Forty-four percent think it is equally or more dangerous than heroin. Seventy-nine percent think the legal penalties for marijuana drug use should be kept the same or made stronger. These kinds of public attitudes are the underpinnings of the law enforcement approach to the drug problem. Public education on drug abuse for all sectors of the population is an indispensable part of any more enlightened national policy.

Another area where there is a clear bias for law enforcement and against any other approach is in research on drug abuse and how best to deal with it. Although it is clear that we lack the concrete evidence necessary to formulate adequate or sensible controls over many kinds of drugs, until recently, research has been met with indifference, hostility, or outright harassment. It is astonishing, given the chronic public alarm, that so many fundamental questions remain unanswered. The \$23 million to be spent this fiscal year on

drug research and other support compares with \$20 million on pesticides and insect research, \$132 million on arthritis, \$96 million on allergies. These are all necessary programs, but surely the levels of funding indicate that drug research should be far more liberally funded. Nonetheless, a bill I proposed a year ago to provide \$25 million to the National Institute of Mental Health for drug research has languished in the Congress.

Federal and state laws have been stumbling blocks to research, since we have been more worried about leakage of drugs to illicit channels than we have been about answering the questions about drug abuse. Our need for information about all aspects of drug abuse has been ignored in our drive to stamp out the problem. Consequently, many of the standard generalizations, such as "speed kills" or "Marijuana users tend to experiment with progressively harder drugs" or "drug use leads to crime" are the conclusions on which we base our facts. Some of the most crucial areas for research seem to be almost totally ignored. Who is trying to develop a synthetic replacement for codeine and morphine—the only legitimate uses for the opium poppy—so that we can call for a world-wide halt on poppy culture and opium production and trade? Why have we only begun to experiment with blocking drugs or narcotic antagonists such as cyclazocine and naloxone? Where are the crash programs from government and the drug industry that could contribute so greatly to destroying the demand side of the drug abuse picture? Less than \$4 million will be spent on opiate research this year. Why has there not been a careful evaluation of the British system for dealing with heroin addiction which seems to have been highly effective in reducing crime and other social problems associated with addiction? The legalized dispensing of heroin in state clinics has eliminated the black-market in this dangerous drug, discouraged the growth of a large addict population, and brought the addict back into contact with the supporting services necessary to break the pattern of addiction. It is hard to believe that we are really serious about our research effort until we begin extensive efforts in areas such as these.

Our so-called national program to control drug abuse is an impractical, fragmented approach to a poorly perceived problem, despite all the pledges for massive assaults that were zinging around our heads during the late, unlamented election campaign. Our misdirected, poorly funded attack on the problem promises only the faintest chance of quick success. The emphasis throughout this century on applying the criminal sanction as a solution is still prevalent today. In trying to break the supply of and demand for dangerous drugs, we are still cracking down on the suppliers and users with stronger laws but pathetically few law enforcers. We are only toying with an international effort to halt the flow of illicit drugs, relying on rhetoric and threats to cut off foreign aid instead of helping to supply the resources other nations need to combat the problem.

When drugs do reach the country, we pay only slight attention to education, treatment, and rehabilitation programs, applying band-aids to a cancer. We fumble around in the dark, grasping the weapon we feel most comfortable with—the harsh legal sanction. We put very little lead in our law enforcement pencil, however, relying on strong words to deceive ourselves and soothe the public panic. The limited scientific research of the past decades has produced little information to challenge the national conviction that this is the best and most effective approach.

We need a national program on drug abuse which will include as a minimum the following elements:

The development of a synthetic analgesic for morphine and codeine.

The development of a long-lasting, non-addictive blocking drug.

Research into both the sociology and pharmacology of marijuana, heroin, amphetamines, and barbituates, and how to combat their abuse.

Development of a realistic penalty structure.

Computer-bank control of drug pills throughout the production-distribution cycle, (manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber, druggist, prescribing physician), both nationally and internationally.

Application of advanced technology to the problems of detection of drug possession and manufacture, using such techniques as sniffers, infra-red detection, and satellite surveillance.

Increased appropriations for domestic enforcement personnel.

Increased support for UN sponsored programs for international control; such programs as crop diversification for opium poppy producing countries, road construction, light industry development, and preclusive buying of opium crops. The UN can also supply technical assistance for the development of national licensing and control programs to regulate drug manufacture and distribution, and satellite surveillance of poppy culture.

Education programs that have been carefully evaluated as to their ability to discourage drug use. These should be aimed not only at potential or actual users of drugs, but also at whole communities so that they may have a realistic understanding of drug problems and how to deal with them.

Development of a comprehensive, comparative assessment of various treatment methods so that we know which programs work for which types of people and which types of drug abuse.

Greatly expanded treatment and rehabilitation programs.

The drug problem shows no signs of melting away, and I don't expect to be joining any victory marches in the Bronx in the near future. We have to reach a national consensus on whether our drug programs should establish a high moral ethic enforced by criminal sanctions that fail to persuade or dissuade, or an intelligent, effective program based on careful research that addresses itself to the basic causes of drug abuse. We need a balanced attack on all aspect of the supply-demand equation, combining the criminal sanction with some of the other imaginative programs of international control, treatment, preventive education and research that together represent the social controls commensurate with the cost and the challenge.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS OR MANDATORY QUOTAS—WHAT DOES THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY REALLY WANT?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on the 19th of December I reported what I felt to be a most serious change concerning the conduct of the American textile industry with respect to the United States-Japanese efforts to reach a negotiated settlement of the textile issue.

While my charges were unofficial and from a source which I could not and cannot now disclose, I thought they were so potentially serious and so vital to the trade legislation then under consideration in the Senate that they should be brought to the attention of the Senate and the Nation.

I revealed reports then that the American textile industry, despite its insistence that it seeks quotas only as a stopgap until a voluntary settlement can be reached, was in fact working actively to prevent any settlement and had recently forced our negotiators to back away from what very probably could have

been a formal agreement with the Japanese.

Not surprisingly, this allegation met with immediate protest and denial from the White House and those supporting quotas.

But I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the reports of Secretary Stan's news conference of December 23 in which he admitted that the textile industry had officially opposed a settlement formula and that the talks had now been "temporarily suspended."

The transcript of Secretary Stan's news conference, at least through yesterday, was still not being released, but I would like to insert at the close of my comments a number of press accounts of that conference.

I believe they fully corroborate the allegations I made earlier, and demonstrate that the textile industry, as long as the administration continues to make political promises of legislated textile quotas, will continue to sabotage any real negotiated settlement with the Japanese.

I should add that the blame is not really to be placed on the industry. As long as the administration promises legislated quotas for textiles and hope thus remains for any easy elimination of foreign competition, one must expect the industry to prefer this outcome—as undeserved and potentially disastrous as it may be. I renew my plea to the administration, then, to abandon its political game; get out from under the thumb of the textile industry; and begin an honest pursuit of a negotiated settlement with the Japanese.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point that the articles referred to earlier in my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily News Record, Dec. 24, 1970]
U.S. MILLS DID OPPOSE THAT TEXTILE TRADE PLAN, STANS SAYS

(By Richard C. Sizemore and Richard Wightman)

WASHINGTON.—Despite reports to the contrary from the U.S. textile industry and the White House, Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans said Wednesday that the industry did oppose the formula reached in the U.S.-Japanese textile talks.

But Stans hedged by adding that the industry held no veto power.

Stans "guessed" that the current talks between Japanese Ambassador Nobuhiko Ushiba and Peter Flanigan, White House aide, would be "suspended" soon and renewed after a few weeks.

At the White House, Ronald Ziegler, press secretary, said, "I would prefer to say that nothing is scheduled for several weeks." The reason for the hiatus, according to Ziegler, is that the Japanese want to "go into further discussion back home" on the issues in the negotiations.

A Japanese Embassy spokesman said Ushiba was still awaiting instructions from Tokyo before requesting another meeting with Flanigan.

Stans said representatives of the U.S. textile industry met with him and other officials, whom he didn't name, last Monday night. That means the meeting came a few hours after Ziegler emphatically denied a charge by Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) that Flanigan had "backed away" from an agree-

ment with the Japanese after it had been rejected by U.S. textile manufacturers.

Ziegler agreed Wednesday with Stans that the domestic industry was unhappy with the way the talks were going, but he insisted the suspension had nothing to do with this. "I wouldn't draw that conclusion if I were you," he told reporters.

Ziegler denied that the meeting between Stans and the domestic mill men had anything to do with allegations made by Mondale to the effect that the mills had vetoed a prospective agreement.

He repeated that U.S. firms were only being "consulted" and "informed" on the progress of the talks.

On Tuesday a spokesman for the American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI) denied the Mondale allegation. He said the industry hadn't been asked to accept or reject anything and didn't know the White House talks had reached the point where the industry could be asked for comment. That was the day after the industry group had met with Stans.

Stans told a news conference Wednesday that "stories yesterday that the American industry doesn't believe the negotiations are pursuing the kind of formula that is workable" were "quite true." He didn't elaborate.

Stans said the American textile industry was concerned over the formula of the proposed agreement. He said it called for specific limitations on some categories of wool and synthetic textiles but no specific limitations on others.

It called for a trigger mechanism if certain textiles reached a significant level. But the negotiators bogged down over the mechanical formula for triggering a halt to imports at a certain level—over who determines when and where and other details, Stans said.

Stans, who was giving a year-end review of his accomplishments and disappointments, singled out the textile negotiations as his biggest disappointment. He said he had been involved in the negotiations for two years and added, "I guess it will be back with us next year."

He conceded he didn't know what the Japanese were thinking. "There are all kinds of theories as to what the Japanese are thinking," Stans said.

Looking ahead to next year, he said the position of the U.S. industry has worsened in the past year. He noted that the Presidential commitment to help the industry is as strong as it has ever been. "I think the problem is more critical now than ever," Stans said.

The Japanese, Stans said, "know we ran out of time with developments in the Senate, and they know the situation is getting worse all the time."

A Japanese Embassy spokesman said his country expects a new and possibly an even stronger U.S. trade bill next year. "We still feel that negotiating a bilateral agreement is necessary," he said.

Stans said he assumed that talks would be resumed at the White House next year. "I think Flanigan has met about 20 times (with the Japanese)," Stans said, "and I have met 40 times with him. We have a close working relationship and a strong total input" into the negotiations. "But it's very difficult to find an acceptable formula."

Stans was asked about renewed suggestions that U.S. and Japanese industry leaders meet to try for common ground. He said he doubted if anything significant would come from such a meeting. But Stans suggested something might be done if members of labor organizations on each side of the Pacific get together.

He claimed that the Japanese industry "is more splintered than ours and is unwilling to relinquish anything."

[From the New York Times, Dec. 24, 1970]

TALKS SUSPENDED ON TEXTILE CURBS

WASHINGTON, December 23.—White House negotiations with Japan over voluntary

curbs on textile imports will be suspended until early 1971, Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans said today.

Mr. Stans declared at a news conference that American textile manufacturers had advised him they felt the talks were not developing "the kind of formula that is workable."

Ronald L. Ziegler, White House Press Secretary, would not agree that the talks had been suspended, but said, "I don't think there are any talks scheduled for several weeks." He said Japanese authorities were in consultation on the negotiations in their homeland and anticipated a resumption of talks next year.

Industry representatives opposed the proposed mechanics of a draft agreement at a meeting with Mr. Stans in Washington Monday night, Mr. Stans noted.

"Under the circumstances I think there will be a short period of suspension," he said. "I assume there will then be a renewed attempt to find a solution in further talks at the White House."

Asked whether he felt the United States bargaining position had been weakened by the decision of Congress to recess without acting on a trade bill, under which mandatory import quotas could be imposed on textiles, Mr. Stans said:

"The Japanese know as well as we do that we just ran out of time because of delays in the Senate or there would have been a trade bill."

CONCERN EXPRESSED ON JOBS

The Japanese also are aware of the Administration's concern over the loss of an estimated total of 100,000 United States jobs in the textile and apparel industries in the last year, Mr. Stans added.

A major concern of his department in the next two years, Mr. Stans said, will be to strengthen the country's trade surplus. In three of four major foreign trade categories, the United States has either been falling to build surpluses or incurring larger deficits, he said.

The Secretary explained that in agricultural products the United States was approximately holding its own, in minerals and oil it was "building our deficit year by year" because of increased reliance on foreign supplies, and in low-technology manufactures, such as textiles and steel, "we are running very large deficits."

"Only in exports of high technology products do we have a substantial margin," Mr. Stans noted. "These include automobiles, computers, aircraft, nuclear power plants and other items—17 categories in all—in which we have been running a favorable balance of \$8-billion a year."

"But in the past couple of years this surplus has not been increasing. The technology is being transported overseas. . . . We've got to pull out all stops to insure that we maintain our technological superiority."

PROGRESS ALSO NOTED

At the same time, Mr. Stans reported what he called a very gratifying record of progress in at least a dozen major programs in the last two years, including the merchant-ship building program, the census, the promotion of minority-owned business enterprises, the United States travel service and oceanography.

The two major current problems, pollution and consumer protection, are being approached through voluntary, industrywide efforts at cooperation, Mr. Stans said.

He cited the work of the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, in collaboration with the Commerce Department, as an effective measure in remedying environmental problems.

The Secretary rejected the idea that the Government should pass a series of mandatory standards, calling it the "whipping-the-dog" approach. The benefits of the coopera-

tive approach are shown, he said, by the progress made in abating mercury pollution.

"Within a few months the business community went to work on that and stopped 90 per cent of the mercury going into streams," Mr. Stans said.

AGREEMENT EXTENDED

In another development, the United States and Nationalist China extended for six months their agreement limiting the flow of cotton textile exports to this country, the State Department announced yesterday.

The agreement would have expired December 31.

The department said the extension would give both parties additional time to complete the negotiation of a new agreement.

Over the six-month period, the extension provides these ceilings: aggregate textiles, 39.3 million square yards equivalent, consisting of 14.8 million square yards of apparel and 24.5 million square yards of non-apparel.

The ceilings correspond to one-half the 1970 level but also include growth at an annual rate of 5 per cent.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DODD

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, for the term of the 91st Congress it has been my privilege to sit next to Senator DODD of Connecticut. This relationship renewed and reinforced an old friendship that began when we were Members of the House of Representatives together. Tom got to the Senate before I did but when I arrived as a neophyte and newcomer he helped me in the orientation that is an inevitable part of the change from one body to another.

Senator DODD has been a valuable Senator. When for example we disagreed on such questions as gun control he was always courteous and understanding of differing points of view. His work on that bill, and many others, was of significant importance to the Nation.

The vote on Senator DODD's censure was the most difficult vote I have made since I came to Congress. Looking back perhaps he was more sinned against than sinning.

So I say farewell to a colleague and friend. Good luck TOM.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it was my great pleasure to take part in a unique celebration on December 15 in Austin, Tex.

There have been many victory dinners around the country since the November elections. But in Austin we paid tribute to a man who had suffered an earlier electoral defeat, the senior Senator from Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH.

RALPH YARBOROUGH will be sorely missed in the Senate, by Texans, by those of us who have been privileged to serve with him, and by his constituents throughout the country.

But the Austin dinner, was not an occasion for mourning.

Instead we honored a gifted public servant. We paid tribute to a record that is the obvious fruit of both boundless energy and matchless compassion. And we celebrated what has been, by any standard, a brilliant Senate career.

But perhaps the best portrayal of the spirit of that event can be found in the

dinner program and in news accounts that appeared in succeeding days in a number of Texas newspapers.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a number of excerpts from the printed program, followed by several articles and comments from the Austin Times of December 17.

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

PROGRAM

MIKE MANSFIELD

Not always is a public career distinguished at all times by high principle and great courage. I honor Ralph Yarborough as one of those in public life whose devotion to principle has been unwavering and whose immense courage, tested on countless occasions, has never been found wanting.

Leadership in the Senate of the United States is often a tedious and tiresome task. Faced with competing viewpoints, noble objectives are often sacrificed to the expedient of the quick compromise. That expedient, I am proud to say, was never adopted by Ralph Yarborough. Whether pressing for enactment of the Cold War GI Bill, or fighting to preserve the natural beauty of Padre Island, lying in the Gulf of Mexico, Ralph persevered to a victorious objective—and he did so without sacrificing those things in which he deeply believed.

The record is there. It is filled to the brim with such achievements; achievements that have been heralded across this nation. Without recounting them again for the people of Texas, it is enough to say that, in the field of education, he was the pioneer; on Veterans' benefits—where at all times he was out in front all alone—he saw his goals attained; his efforts in behalf of improved health benefits, of increased medical research, and of greater attention to the welfare of all Americans have been written into the law books for all time.

Frankly, I do not know which achievement Ralph would most prize. His record to preserve this nation's resources, its natural beauty and vast mineral reserves is one envied by many. Indeed, the great State of Texas is literally covered with monuments of America's heritage that will last for all time because of the foresight of Ralph Yarborough. There is, as well, his record to upgrade the status of the Federal worker. It has done much to instill needed pride and devotion throughout the Civil Service. But, perhaps his greatest achievement does not lie in any one legislative proposal or in any single project. Thus far, perhaps Ralph Yarborough's greatest success lies in the deep devotion to principle with which he has represented the people of Texas in the United States Senate for the past twelve years.

Surely, it is a great honor to be chosen to represent a State in the United States Senate and to render a judgment upon the great issues of the day. It is an honor as well to initiate proposals upon which those judgments were made during one's service. In Senator Yarborough's case, there were many proposals and they went a long way to change the very structure of American society in a lasting and most beneficial manner. Such great success can be attributed only to the greatest devotion to principle and it is for this that all future generations of Texans and, indeed, all future generations of Americans will be indebted to Ralph Yarborough.

Those generations will know that there are greater personal defeats than those suffered at the polls. There are the defeats suffered by the compromise of belief. On that score Ralph Yarborough has never suffered a loss.

He leaves the Senate a man of unimpeachable principle. He may stand proud with his shoulders back and his head high. Yarborough of Texas has left examples of integrity and courage that have made a better Senate and a better America.

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

It was my great privilege, for eight exciting years, to serve Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson as their liaison with Congress for the enactment of the historic legislation of the New Frontier and the Great Society. How senators and congressmen were going to vote was, you might say, for them to know and for me to find out.

But my staff and I never had to spend much time figuring out how Senator Ralph Yarborough would vote on those legislative matters of such urgent social concern.

Ralph Yarborough, we knew, would vote his conscience.

He would vote for what was best—the very best—for the people of the United States.

Ralph Yarborough's vote, we knew, would be a compassionate vote. It would recognize and seek to meet the critical needs of the people—in medicine, education, equal opportunity.

And it would be a courageous vote, dictated by no special interest but that of the people of his state and his nation.

As President Kennedy once said:

"This is a time when all of us who believe in government for the people, who believe in progress for our country, who believe in a fair chance for all of our citizens, who believe in the growth of Texas, who believe in the development of the United States, who believe in a strong United States as a great bulwark of freedom, who believe in a United States that is second to none in space, on the sea, on the land, a United States that stands for progress—all of those—I think Ralph Yarborough stands with them."

No senator ever devoted more time and energy to the people of his state than did Ralph Yarborough for his Texas constituents. In the months since his primary defeat last spring, it was a true measure of the man that he refused to recognize any so-called "lame duck" status, but seemed to drive his Senate office staff to even greater efforts to get every task in sight completed before his return to Texas.

The victims of Hurricane Carla in 1961, for example, will remember their senator's efforts—not only in prying loose assistance from the bureaucracies of Washington, but in slogging through the wreckage along the Gulf Coast asking, "What can I do to help?"

And now my good friend Ralph Yarborough is returning to Texas. But those who know him—and I believe I know him well—have no doubt that he will continue to be a major force for the Democratic Party, for Texas, and for his country.

JOE B. FRANTZ

Salud!—Although Ralph Yarborough has lived half as long as the State of Texas has been in existence, it is in the baker's-dozen years of his stewardship as its Senator that we salute him tonight. As Senator he has had his largest stage and therefore his greatest audience and opportunity.

Despite the noise engendered by a century and a quarter of Texas Senators, less than a half-dozen will survive the general anonymity of history: Sam Houston, John H. Reagan, Tom Connally, Lyndon B. Johnson—and Ralph Yarborough. Although temporary rejection, and sometimes bitter animosity, were not unknown among this quintet, they have surmounted the forgetfulness of time and their reputations continue to grow.

Why Ralph Yarborough among this group? In the first place, because the people sent him to Washington on three different occa-