

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 1

JANUARY 21, 1971, TO FEBRUARY 1, 1971
(PAGES 3 TO 1338)

his household goods, from Juneau to Anchorage to accept a position in the Indian Health Service. GAO rules that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in which the Indian Health Service is incorporated had no right to either advise Mr. Borbridge or pay Mr. Borbridge for his moving expenses because Native Affairs Officer, the position to which Mr. Borbridge had been accepted, was not listed as one in which a manpower shortage existed. Therefore, the Government had no liability for the costs of moving Mr. Borbridge incurred and which the Government subsequently and erroneously paid. However, Mr. Borbridge made this transfer to Anchorage with the assurances of the agency that he would be paid for his moving expenses. It seems grossly unjust to continue to hold Mr. Borbridge liable for these expenses. Therefore, this bill will relieve Mr. Borbridge of said liability and repay him any moneys received or withheld from him because of his pending liability.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 504) for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr., was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 505—INTRODUCTION OF A PRIVATE BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF MRS. RUBY S. COYLE

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I introduce today a private bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruby (Stonestreet) Coyle of Kenai, Alaska, for the purpose of including her period of employment with the Works Progress Administration—WPA—toward Federal civil service retirement.

Mrs. Coyle was employed in North Carolina, from November 3, 1939, to May 8, 1943, on Project No. 3783, under the WPA.

The civil service retirement law applies to employees in or under the Federal or District of Columbia governments. This has been construed by the Civil Service Commission to include only persons who: First, are engaged in the performance of Federal functions; second, are appointed or employed by a Federal officer. In the application of this test, the Civil Service Commission has held that service in the WPA on the administrative force of the central and field offices is creditable for retirement purposes. However, project employment is not creditable.

Mr. President, through agency interpretation, Mrs. Coyle has been denied credit of 3½ years toward Federal civil service retirement. No doubt others are similarly affected. I feel that Mrs. Coyle is entitled to credit for the period of her employment with the WPA, which at the time was a Federal agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 505) for the relief of Ruby S. Coyle, introduced by Mr. GRAVEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 509—INTRODUCTION OF THE "INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONTROL ACT"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this country is in a deadly struggle with international drug traffic.

And we are losing.

Drug addiction is killing thousands of our people, ruining a half million lives, stripping as much as \$8 billion every year from our economy, and right now destroying our great cities in a holocaust of crime and degradation.

It is dreadful enough that all this is happening to us. The unbelievable, disgusting irony is that we are letting it happen.

Opium is grown and made into heroin in a chain of corruption that links countries which are friends and allies.

For example, an estimated 80 percent of the heroin entering America comes from opium grown in Turkey, a NATO ally and recipient of \$5½ billion in U.S. aid since 1946.

Tons of this powdered death are processed each year in laboratories in France, another NATO ally and beneficiary of massive help from this country after World War II.

We have guarded the security of these nations. They are pledged to guard ours. Yet the heroin traffic—a threat within our common ability to control—continues to endanger the United States as much as any military invasion.

We cannot tolerate this horrible absurdity.

I am introducing here comprehensive legislation which would build an international quarantine to stamp out heroin traffic. The bill provides means to do this through fair cooperation with other countries. It offers assistance in diversifying crops and a major U.S. contribution to an international police campaign to break the drug network of processing and distribution.

But if this cooperation is not forthcoming, if others show evasion or indifference in our emergency, then my bill would call for strict penalties—the suspension of all U.S. military, economic, and other assistance, and ultimately an action to impose United Nations sanctions.

I know these are harsh measures. They are made necessary by the harsh realities of what the heroin traffic is doing to our Nation.

Though we have spent a half billion dollars on much-needed treatment over the past 3 years, the mounting heroin traffic mocks our effort. John Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, told the U.N. in September that it was "a situation which is impossible for us to handle alone. Every time one heroin addict is cured, more take his place because of the ever-increasing amount of heroin available."

The number of new drug addicts nationwide doubled between 1968 and 1969. The total number now may be as high as a half million, and it grows by thousands every year.

Addiction is rising astronomically in many regions. For example, in the last decade the increase in new addicts was 668 percent in Connecticut, 1,600 percent

in Florida, 982 percent in Louisiana, 425 percent in Michigan, and 559 percent in Virginia.

On the basis of a half million addicts and data gathered in New York and Washington on drug-inspired crime, all this addiction may cost us \$8 billion a year in theft, criminal justice proceedings and related expenses. And studies show that over 90 percent of criminal addicts are users of heroin.

Even if that \$8 billion is reduced by half, the heroin traffic would still cost us each year 7 times what we now spend to fight air and water pollution, nearly 4 times our budget for health research, almost twice our investment in elementary and secondary education.

From 1965 to 1969, there were 3,000 drug deaths in the United States, a 10-fold increase over the 1960-65 period.

Every day in New York three people die because of drug addiction. In the last decade, 3,565 men from New York State died in Vietnam. Over the same period, 4,254 died from narcotics in New York City alone. Heroin is now the greatest single cause of death for 18- to 35-year-olds in New York.

What have the administration and other governments done to stop this carnage of Americans?

As usual, too much of what we have done here is hidden from public and congressional view. There are claims of success. At the outset of the administration, a high official told the Washington Post that stopping drug traffic would be a prime foreign policy objective. If heroin smuggling persisted, he reportedly said:

You can mark it down a failure of this Administration.

Now, 2 years later, the real measure of our diplomatic efforts—the rising rates of addiction, deaths, and crime—is plain. Our failure to overcome diplomatic inertia and take serious action to stop the drug traffic amounts to a national scandal.

Though the Attorney General testified to the Congress last July that he would welcome legislation authorizing sanctions against opium-growing countries, the State Department promptly repudiated his words the next day in response to a protest from the Turkish Government.

Despite recurring press speculation that the United States would undertake a serious \$10 million program to diversify Turkish crops, I have authoritative information that any steps on this scale have been stifled within the administration for "diplomatic reasons."

Though the United States gave Turkey \$3 million loan last March to encourage a change from opium, and though Turkey claims progress on the basis that opium-growing provinces have been reduced from 21 to 4 over the last decade, the actual acreage under opium cultivation in Turkey will have increased by 5,000 acres between 1969 and 1971.

According to the New York Times, the real effect of this celebrated reduction in provinces has been to double the amount of opium actually produced in Turkey because of more intensive cultivation and illegal planting.

Yet in spite of this deception, the United States quietly approved this past summer a \$40 million aid loan to Turkey with no conditions regarding the eradication of opium production.

Though France is the site of most of the processing of heroin, and though the administration claims that we have moved the French to step up their anti-drug efforts many-fold, the New York Times reports that France still has only 30 policemen to combat the enormous international drug network, only one-tenth the number of officers they assign to domestic drug abuse.

Though the French claim large numbers of arrests and heroin seizures over the last year, the Associated Press reports that these arrests are in reality small drug addicts, that France will not pressure Turkey on the drug traffic, and that enforcement efforts have yielded no specific results in eliminating the big laboratories where most of the heroin is made for shipment to the United States.

Though the administration promised to make the heroin traffic a prime objective, it has continued to treat the effort as a bureaucratic stepchild. The Secretary of State's Special Assistant for Narcotics has had no staff, and important dealings with foreign governments have remained, as in the past, largely an adjunct job of the Department's legal adviser. Incredibly, our Government's liaison with Interpol, a key agency in fighting the world drug traffic, has been a low ranking official in the Treasury Department, hardly a sign of high priority to foreign governments or our own bureaucracy.

Interpol, the only international police organization with any chance of fighting drug traffic, continues as a skeleton communications organization with a total budget of less than \$850,000, staff of only 44 people, and no specific narcotics personnel. The United States is now 1 year behind in our contribution to Interpol.

Not only does all this have murderous results today in this country, but actually adds to the international problem. Because Turkey and others continue the heroin traffic unabated, Iran recently lifted its 13-year ban on opium production. This deplorable setback will mean probably 500 more tons of opium to poison America and other societies.

What can and must be done?

The answer, Mr. President, is broad, firm legislation from the Congress that will at last fulfill the unmet promise of this administration in fighting drug traffic.

We must act as we would combat any foreign invasion or the infection of a fatal bacillus. We must attack the heroin traffic at its source in opium cultivation. We must break the chain of drug traffic which processes and transships heroin. And we must find the means to stop the spiral of drug addiction and crime in this country.

I will shortly introduce a bill to deal with this latter problem of drugs and crime. Today, I am introducing legislative measures to quarantine the international heroin traffic.

In summary, the principal elements of my bill would amend foreign assistance legislation to:

First, help assist any country to make the economic adjustment in eliminating all but minimal medicinal production of opium, through aid to growers in diversifying crops and to governments for enforcement.

I want to be very clear on this provision of my amendment. This is not a proposal to buy up an opium crop, which would only encourage production. This is not a subsidy to foreign farmers to forego opium cultivation, which would be a waste of money.

My amendment calls for the immediate eradication of illegal opium crops. The legislation then provides for assistance to the opium-growing country—over a 5-year period—to help the affected farmers find a new livelihood and to help cushion the overall economic adjustment in the country.

The total cost of Turkish conversion from opium, for example, has been estimated at \$10 million. We now give Turkey \$200 million yearly in military and economic aid while their opium crop flourishes.

Second, for any country which continues to allow the cultivation or processing of illegal opium—except a strictly limited and controlled crop for medicinal export—the President shall prohibit all military economic and other forms of U.S. assistance forthwith.

Third, if these penalties do not induce compliance, the President should institute action in the United Nations looking toward the imposition of international economic sanctions against the opium-growing or processing state, on the grounds that narcotics traffic is a threat to the peace and security of a member nation of the United Nations.

Fourth, make compliance, penalties, compensation, a policy matter to be recommended to the President by an Executive Committee on International Narcotics composed of the Secretaries of State and Treasury, the Attorney General, a member of each party from both the House and Senate, and two public members—to be chaired by the Secretary of State; the Committee to report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress, at least annually, at such time as to allow prompt application of their recommendations in legislation, executive action, and so forth.

Fifth, urge the President to propose and help institute a special narcotics staff in Interpol. The United States should provide initial funding over a 5-year period. Funding should be adequate to mount a concerted attack on the international narcotics organizational apparatus.

The U.S. role in Interpol, would be coordinated by committee at the Under Secretary level, which would endeavor to establish liaison with other members at the same level of government.

Also, the President should seek an international treaty to arrive at uniform standards of enforcement and punishment for narcotics offenders.

Sixth, urge the President to negotiate an international treaty providing uniform world standards for enforcement and punishment of opium producers, processors, and dealers. This would replace the present jumble of laws which inhibits effective legal cooperation among nations in fighting drug traffic.

As I said at the beginning of these remarks, I realize very clearly that this legislation carries harsh measures. It is directed at no single country, yet the fact is inescapable that it could affect our relations with Turkey, France, Mexico and other long-time friends.

As a strong supporter of aid to developing countries and of a close Atlantic Alliance, I took the decision to introduce this bill only with long and difficult reflection.

But there is just no doubt of the fundamental international equities in this terrible problem.

We are talking about 110,000 Turkish opium farmers, and as many as 500,000 American drug addicts.

We are talking about opium adding \$5 to \$10 million each year to Turkey's economy, and as much as \$8 billion yearly as the total social costs of hard drug addiction to the United States.

We are talking about a criminal empire in France which is literally murdering hundreds of our young people before our eyes.

Other governments often tell us that drug addiction is an "American problem."

I ask the Turkish Government: would the export from the United States of a poison which killed 3,000 Turks in the past 5 years be only a Turkish problem?

I ask the French Government: would the destruction of Paris by a poison processed in America—as New York is being destroyed today by heroin processed in France—be only a French problem?

And I ask the President and Secretary of State to show the American people that any imaginable defense contribution by Turkey to our security could outweigh the damage done the United States each year by the Turkish opium crop.

We can stop international drug traffic through friendly, fairly compensated cooperation among countries. But it must be stopped, one way or another. Director Ingersoll has said it plainly:

As long as illicit narcotic drugs are available, our problem will continue despite the energy and determination with which we attack the demand for the illicit traffic.

The Congress must act now with all the urgency and determination the drug crisis requires—before it is too late for our children.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 509) to provide for increased international control of the production of, and traffic in, opium, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 511—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE AN EQUITABLE SYSTEM FOR FIXING AND ADJUSTING RATES OF PAY FOR PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the 91st Congress passed legislation which would have set up a more equitable system for fixing and adjusting rates of compensation for wage board employees. The measure enacted by the Congress did not embody all of the features I feel are necessary adequately to compensate and protect the more than 800,000 wage grade and nonaffiliated fund employees who would have been covered thereby. It was, however, a beginning.

President Nixon chose New Year's Day, 1971, to veto the measure. This came one day before the 91st Congress adjourned, and left no time for the supporters of wage board legislation to act against his veto. The veto was, in my opinion, an unjust treatment of the needs of the blue-collar employees of the Government. For many years, these workers have been governed by a system allowing discrepancy in pay for wage board employees and others performing identical functions within the same community.

I am, therefore, introducing today the Prevailing Wage Rate Determination Act of 1971. This will once more present the question of treatment of wage board employees to the Congress. I feel that early consideration and enactment of this legislation should be of primary importance to the 92d Congress.

This bill is of vital concern to more than one-fourth of all employees of the Federal Government. It directly affects their wages, their individual rights, and obligations as well as the rights and obligations of their union representatives who will represent them on the various wage board committees established by this act.

Basically, my bill is intended to organize and to standardize the Federal Government's procedure for fixing the rates of pay of employees working under the so-called prevailing rate system. I have received information from wage board employees from various parts of Oklahoma, which reveal serious discrepancies between rates of pay for wage board employees working in the same community performing identical services for the Government. Of the approximately 55,000 Federal employees in my State of Oklahoma, almost 21,000 are paid according to the standards of the wage board system. This bill would reduce the possibility of discrepancies and inequity for these workers.

While remedying abuses, the bill will preserve, nonetheless, the concept and procedures of the "prevailing wage" system. It thus is not a modification of the wage board system itself, but simply a measure to eliminate injustice and inequity by providing new mechanisms to establish basic regulations, to conduct wage surveys, and to adjudicate differences.

This bill I am introducing will set up 10 steps in pay differential. This will provide a sufficient range of pay rates to

make Federal wage board employees more in line with similar employees in private enterprise. The bill also provides for pay differentials for hazardous duty, and for shift work.

A statutory foundation will be provided by this bill for improved procedures for Wage Board rate determinations. The principal instrumentality provided by the bill to assure that such a policy is pursued is a newly created standing committee known as the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. This 11-member Committee has as its Chairman a person appointed by the President for a 4-year term; this person shall hold no other Government position. Five Committee members shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, from among labor organizations representing the largest number of prevailing rate employees under exclusive recognition in Government service. One employee of the Civil Service Commission, appointed by the Chairman of the Commission shall serve, along with the department head, or his designee, of each of the four executive agencies and military departments—not including the Civil Service Commission—having the largest number of prevailing rate employees.

A most important feature of this bill is the inclusion under its wage rate system of all employees who are now paid from so-called nonappropriated funds. These employees will no longer be considered outsiders to the Wage Board, or prevailing wage rate system. They will be assured equity and justice in the same manner as if they were receiving their pay from appropriated funds. This will remove the illogical distinction which results in variances in pay for an employee merely because he is paid from a different source of funds.

The Congress has already spoken on the need for change in the area of wage rate determination. Let us act swiftly to reenact this legislation to develop a fair and equitable method of wage determination for workers who so well deserve our consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 511) to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARRIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 518—MORATORIUM OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COAST GUARD AIR STATION AT COOS BAY, OREG.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, inasmuch as the representatives of our country and the U.S.S.R. have been meeting in Washington for renegotiation of the agreement regarding fishing in the eastern Pacific Ocean, this seems a good time to air the whole question of foreign fishing vessels off the Pacific coast, and to introduce legislation designed to help

correctly gather and report incidents of intrusion in our waters; and, therefore, ease somewhat the tension resulting from past experiences.

The bill I am introducing provides for the establishment of a Coast Guard air station at Coos Bay, Oreg., and the operation of an air unit from such station. In addition to providing proper surveillance of the Oregon coast, this air station would supply the search and rescue operations so needed in the area. Coos Bay has become in recent years one of the most active ports on the Oregon coast, with increased recreational activities as well as an access point to the Coos County timber yield.

I will be the first to admit that my primary purpose in desiring to establish a Coast Guard air station at Coos Bay is to cope with the reported intrusions by foreign fishing vessels into our territorial waters. This issue can no longer be so lightly explained away to our American fishing industry. It hardly heals the wound to say "our representatives are negotiating with the Russians or the Japanese, or the Koreans" while our west coast fishermen continue to report seeing those foreign vessels within our limits and hauling in the fish.

Since coming to the Senate 2 years ago I or my staff have discussed with officials of the Departments of State, Transportation, and Interior on numerous occasions the overall situation as well as particular incidents. We have always received deeply sympathetic words and very little action.

Now we find the United States preparing for a full-scale conference of the sea on an international level in 1973. At that time I assume the representatives of participating nations will tackle the problem of territorial limits, coastal fisheries, and seabed exploitation. Other difficult problems such as passage through straits will arise. But what are we going to do in the meantime? How are we going to point the direction our actions will take? Are we going to go into that conference with a backlog of unsuccessful negotiations which illustrate in an alarming manner our passive attitude where our own fishing and fishery resources are concerned?

We are standing by while Ecuador periodically seizes and fines one American tuna boat after another because they stray into the 200-mile limit the Ecuadorans have set for themselves; while back at the ranch we have no realistic means to prohibit the foreign fishermen from intruding into our 12-mile limit and depleting our natural fishery resources at an alarming rate.

A Coast Guard air station at North Bend, Oreg., temporarily established during the last fishing season—in a very limited fashion—demonstrated the effectiveness of a permanent installation at that location. The foreign vessels knew increased surveillance was in operation, and reports of intrusions ceased.

That kind of patrolling needs to be a permanent establishment; and my bill will authorize such an installation. Justification of such an installation is assured when we consider the search and