

*US Congress // Congressional Record*

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 11

MAY 9, 1974 TO MAY 16, 1974

(PAGES 13865 TO 15260)

The very safety of our citizens is dependent on our response.

I also ask unanimous consent that a recent editorial from the April 25, 1974, Washington Post commenting on the recent gas explosions and a letter to the editors from Mr. Ben T. Wiggins, president, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, which appeared in today's Post, critical of the funding of the gas pipeline safety effort, be printed following my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators DOLE, PERCY, and HUMPHREY be added as cosponsors of S. 3245.

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

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1974]  
GAS LINE EXPLOSIONS

The devastating explosion of a New York City office building earlier this week had officials perplexed only briefly as to the cause of the blast. After going through the wreckage that injured 70 persons in and around the 24-story building, the city's fire chief said the blowup was caused by "a free flow of gas into the basement through a six-inch opening in the pipe." The leaking gas was ignited by a spark and in an instant the building rocked with an estimated \$10 million in damage.

Although leaking gas accidents of this particular size are not daily occurrences, accidents of smaller proportions definitely are. According to the Office of Pipeline Safety in the Department of Transportation, 4,963 accidents occurred from 1970 to 1973. The number of deaths totaled 136 and injuries were 1,291; and these figures are only partial, owing to limits of federal inquiry. The public seldom hears of this destruction to human life and property, because the accidents occur singly; if attention is given to a blowup—such as the recent ones in Bowie, Md., and in Northern Virginia—it is short-lived and dismissed as "one of those things." Such a dismissal is unwarranted.

The picture that emerges from examining the issue of pipeline safety suggests an attitude of indifference and casualness far out of proportion to the death and injury rates. The Office of Pipeline Safety, for example, has been given funds for only 21 professional staff positions, with a meager budget of \$200,000 for research and development. With gas pipelines blowing up people and buildings with alarming frequency—and with about one million miles of these pipelines serving America's cities and towns—Congress acts with unusual calmness. Not since 1971 have oversight hearings been held on pipeline safety. Sen. Glenn Beall Jr. (R-Md.) recently sponsored an amendment to increase DOT appropriations by \$1 million for the study of pipeline safety; the amendment passed the Senate but a conference committee reduced the sum to \$275,000. It is true that the technology for pipeline safety is often complex, but it is not impossible; this should be a strong argument to seek more funds for staffing and research at both the federal and state level. At the moment, some states have only one person monitoring the dangers.

One group that is eager for increased attention to natural gas safety is the National Transportation Safety Board. Only a few weeks ago, it issued a detailed report on a 1972 Clinton, Mo., explosion that killed eight citizens, demolished one building and partially collapsed another. The ignition of a gas leak from a cast-iron main was the cause. Another recent explosion occurred in El Paso, Texas, killing seven and hospitalizing eight. In reports of both accidents, the board makes recommendations to the Office of Pipeline Safety: for new requirements for telemetering equipment which could give early warn-

ing of dangerous leaks in the distributions systems and for a new federal requirement for replacement or reinforcement of uncovered cast-iron natural gas pipeline facilities. Whether these recommendations are ever adopted is not known at the moment. An OPS official says they are being "evaluated."

Meanwhile, when and where will the next blowup occur? Until federal and state officials, not to mention the gas companies themselves, take the problem with more seriousness, the accident rate is not likely to go down. It may even go up, like the homes and buildings in the blasts.

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1974]  
FUNDS FOR PROMOTING GAS PIPELINE SAFETY

The association of state regulators heartily endorses the sentiments contained in the editorial entitled "Gas Line Explosions" carried in the April 25 editions of The Washington Post.

In particular we would underscore your observation that too often gas explosions and their attendant loss of life, personal injuries and property damage are shrugged off as "one of those things."

The state regulatory agencies, through their national organization, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), have for some years been fighting the battle of the budget to wheedle matching grant funds out of the federal government with the aim of mounting an effective national gas pipeline safety program in accord with the mandate of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act passed by Congress in 1968.

The figures thus far are not impressive as you can see from the following list:

Year:	Federal Grants-in-Aid Amount
1969 -----	0
1970 -----	0
1971 -----	\$500,000
1972 -----	750,000
1973 -----	875,000
1974 -----	1,175,000
1975 (in President's Budget) ----	1,200,000

Still, for every federal dollar forthcoming far more than one dollar to match it has been spent by the states who, in the process have built up, and are continuing to expand a formidable array of pipeline safety inspection programs and staffs to carry out those programs from less substantial beginnings six years ago.

As of today 49 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico take part in the national gas pipeline safety program, some without federal financial help.

Efforts by the states are of great assistance to the federal government since it is federal standards that are being enforced and the federal agency responsible—the Office of Pipeline Safety—has traditionally been woefully short of manpower to enforce them. Thus the states have, in fact, acted as federal surrogates by means of their expenditures which do far more than match the federal funds. Even if each state in the program received one federal dollar for every state dollar spent on pipeline safety, the program would cost far less than if the federal government tried to go it alone.

What is needed then to provide the public the protection it deserves and that your editorial called for is a nationwide array of programs much expanded over those now in force.

The main stumbling block has been the OMB which traditionally whittles down the badly needed budget request for federal matching grant money.

Each year the states appeal to congress for the maximum money possible, but the nature of the appropriations process makes it difficult to secure an appropriation for an amount greater than that budgeted by the administration.

The safety program fostered thus far as a result of cooperation between the Office of Pipeline Safety and the state regulatory agencies is a good one and could be bigger and better if more federal funds were made available.

In fact, it is far superior to the federal-state rail safety program mandated by Congress in 1970, but nearly smothered by the intransigence of the Federal Railroad Administration which has so far done little to get the program off the ground.

Perhaps the unfortunate accident in New York City will prompt those within the OMB to reconsider their attitude to this subject and help provide our citizens with the safety services they deserve.

BEN T. WIGGINS,  
President, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners.  
ATLANTA, GA.

S. 3339

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) were added as cosponsors of S. 3339, to amend the program of supplemental security income for the aged, blind, and disabled—established by title XVI of the Social Security Act—to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits provided thereunder.

S. 3398

At the request of Mr. HARTKE, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3398, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 10-year delimiting period for the pursuit of educational programs by veterans, wives, and widows.

S. 3403

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3403, to amend the act of August 31, 1922, to prevent the introduction and spread of diseases and parasites harmful to honeybees.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 190

At the request of Mr. SPARKMAN, the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) was added as a cosponsor to Senate Joint Resolution 190, to authorize and request the President to designate the period from May 26, 1974, through June 1, 1974, as "National Stamp Collecting Week."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATING TO OPIUM PRODUCTION IN TURKEY

(Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations)

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last week I wrote to President Nixon to urge him to take personal action to stop the Turkish Government from going further toward resumption of legal growing of opium in that country.

The halt of the Turkish opium production 2 years ago has been a major factor in our battle against heroin addiction in this country. It has reduced illegal heroin supplies drastically, driven up the price, and as a consequence, addicts are coming in off the streets and seeking help and treatment.

Before the Turkish ban, an estimated 80 percent of the illegal heroin in this country came from Turkey. Since the Turkish Government imposed a ban on opium production, the number of esti-

mated heroin addicts in the United States has dropped, according to some sources, more than 60 percent.

The time for action is now. The Turkish Government has authorized the germination of seeds, and according to news reports, a decision to go ahead with planting in the fall may take place soon.

During my recent visit to Europe, narcotics officials and foreign government leaders made clear to me that the key to combating illegal narcotics traffic is continued high-level American concern. If we do not make clear that we still care about this problem, then foreign governments, who have been cooperating with us, cannot be expected to maintain their high level of interest and dedication in stopping narcotics traffic.

I would hope that Watergate and the energy crisis and other concerns of the day would not lead us to lose sight of this very important struggle against narcotics addiction. I hope this administration, which has shown such tenacity in other areas, would show the same determination in continuing to fight against narcotics addiction.

Unfortunately this does not seem to be the case. The administration is considering starting up opium production in the United States for legitimate purposes. The drug companies are putting on the pressure and claim a shortage in the availability of opium. The White House seems favorably disposed toward the idea even though the head of the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration has stated that the extent of the opium shortage has been exaggerated by pharmaceutical companies. The White House seems completely indifferent both to the inherent risks of domestic opium production and the fact that this would make it impossible to hold back the floodgates of Turkish production. The administration seems to think it can follow a policy of telling the Turks to "do as I say, not as I do."

The story of the attitude of American officials in Ankara is no more encouraging. They seem to be no longer seriously pressing the Turkish Government to maintain the ban on opium, and worry more about our military bases there—bases which we could not use during the Arab-Israeli war while the Soviets carried on an airlift through Turkish airspace with impunity.

Our diplomats in Turkey seem more concerned about Turkish pride, about the Turkish rights to decide to do whatever they want, than they do about the fact that the lives and future of tens of thousands of Americans may be ruined permanently if the Turkish opium ban is lifted. I am frankly appalled at this attitude.

So at the highest level of this administration, it appears we are more concerned about growing opium ourselves than in maintaining a ban in Turkey. And at the lower levels, in the field, our diplomats are more concerned about Turkish pride than the lives of the young people who will be destroyed if cheap and plentiful supplies of heroin again flood the American market.

For this reason, in my letter I called the President's attention to the legislation which I introduced and which has become law, 22 U.S.C. sec. 2291. It re-

quires suspension of economic and military assistance, including military sales as well, upon determination by the President that a foreign government has failed to take adequate steps to prevent drugs from unlawfully entering the United States. Last year direct U.S. aid and military sales credit for Turkey was more than \$100 million. This year the administration plans to increase this to \$140 million.

I can understand Turkish sensitivities and realize that the possibility of an aid cut-off could hurt Turkish pride. That is not the objective. I do not want to infringe on Turkish sovereignty nor make life more difficult for the Turkish Government which is struggling back toward democratic rule. I am against growing opium in this country as well as in Turkey. I recognize that drug addiction is primarily an internal U.S. problem. But the Turkish people and the Turkish Government will have to understand that the growing of opium poppies is not just an internal Turkish problem. It affects the lives of Americans.

We cannot tolerate a situation in which Turkey takes actions which lead to the destruction of lives in this country while we continue to provide funds to protect the lives and improve the well-being of the people of Turkey.

So I have called upon the President to take prompt action and repeat that call today. I have not, however, received a response to my letter. To make clear the broad concern that exists on this issue, I have joined with Senator BUCKLEY, Congressmen RANGEL, RODINO, and WOLFF in sponsoring a Sense of the Congress Resolution that immediate negotiations should be undertaken to maintain the ban on opium in Turkey, and to terminate our assistance if it is not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution may appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. CON. RES. 84

Whereas the President of the United States in 1971 declared that the drug problem in our nation had "assumed the dimensions of a national emergency," and that "heroin addiction was the most difficult to control and the most socially destructive form of addiction"; and

Whereas it has been estimated that prior to 1972, 80 percent of illicit heroin entering the United States was produced from a Turkish opium base; and

Whereas in 1972, the Turkish Government agreed to ban the growing of the opium poppy in exchange for \$35.7 million in assistance to be provided by the United States to compensate losses accrued to the Turkish farmers and to assist in developing alternative crops; and

Whereas the Turkish Government's ban on opium reduction in both quantity and quality of heroin available on the streets of America, which has resulted in the reduction of the estimated number of heroin addicts by more than 60 percent; and

Whereas the Turkish Government has permitted the germination of poppy seeds which could be ready for planting this fall; and

Whereas the Turkish Government is presently deliberating over the possibility of lifting the ban on opium poppy production in Turkey; and

Whereas the Foreign Assistance Act au-

thorized the President of the United States to cut off aid to any nation that he determines had not taken adequate measures to prevent illegal drugs from entering the United States; and

Whereas the revocation of the opium ban in Turkey is counterproductive to measures precluding illegal heroin from entering the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) immediately initiate negotiations at the highest level of the Turkish Government to prevent the resumption of opium production; and

(2) if such negotiations prove unfruitful, exercise the authority provided by the Congress under the Foreign Assistance Act, to terminate all assistance to the Government of Turkey.

STANDBY ENERGY EMERGENCY AUTHORITIES ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1276 THROUGH 1280

(Ordered to be printed, and to lie on the table.)

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I am today introducing five amendments which I plan to call up next week during consideration of S. 3267, the Standby (Energy) Emergency Authority Act.

That bill like its predecessors is still addressed to the wrong part of our national energy problem. It does nothing to increase supplies of oil and gas. We must do more than simply spread shortages through rationing and other means. We must act to increase supply, otherwise this Nation will increasingly become dependent upon insecure foreign sources for our energy. These proposals are modest and largely noncontroversial. Three of them have previously been introduced separately, and as part of S. 1162.

These are:

First. An antitrust exemption for energy research agreements. I am convinced that more research on energy will bring quick results in terms of achieving the capability for energy self-sufficiency. I am also convinced that research in the private sector will be at least as fruitful and productive as the research purchased with Federal appropriations. Therefore, I would like to remove an inhibition that presently prevents cooperation among companies in pursuing this research.

Second. Authority for the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements for the purchase of low sulfur hydrocarbons produced from coal or oil shale. Assured purchases of equipment by the Department of Defense has long been the incentive and mainstay for development and production of aircraft and other needed products. This proposal would be a similar means of providing to producers the assurance that their product will find a market. With such assurance, the enormous capital requirements and other undertakings and commitments necessary to get such plants built can be met.

Third. A proposal to change the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to a Joint Committee on Energy. This is surely an idea whose time has come. It has been debated several times in this Chamber. It seems to me that without further ado we should take this modest step. We will shortly be considering the Energy Re-