

U.S. Congress // Congressional

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 17

JULY 2, 1974 TO JULY 15, 1974

(PAGES 21993 TO 23308)

belonging, a feeling of getting just a little closer to our beginnings. But, I believe the Bicentennial offers us a much greater opportunity—it offers us the chance to know not only who we as Americans were, but who we are and where we are headed. I would hope that in addition to the gaiety of the parades, our celebrations will also be marked by a solemn reflection and reaffirmation of the ideals and principles that motivated those who first launched the American experiment.

Clearly, from a historical viewpoint, a 1-year celebration does not correspond to the years of the American Revolution. Some of the most well-known events in our history occurred after 1776—the great naval battles of John Paul Jones, the winter hardships endured by General Washington and his troops at Valley Forge, the decisive battle of Yorktown and, of course, the climax of the Revolution with the signing of the Treaty of Paris. Every school child in this Nation learns of these events, and they become an integral part of our American consciousness—that same sense of self which motivated our forefathers. We cannot celebrate the year in which we declared our independence without also celebrating those contributions which made that declaration a reality.

Perhaps of even greater importance is the fact that a 1-year observance does not afford sufficient time for taking the ideals and goals of our formative days and relating them to the lives we lead in contemporary America. The Bicentennial is an opportunity that will not recur in our lifetime. We must not let it pass without revitalizing that cohesiveness of spirit and purpose which served us well in 1776 and which can once again be our strength today. The Bicentennial is an opportunity for a Nation of over 200 million people of all races, religion, ethnic backgrounds, all economic levels to see ourselves not only as unique individuals but as significant and necessary parts upon which depends the type of society we are to have today and the heritage we are to leave to the future. We enjoy a heritage both rich in principle and daring in design. We should not be content to leave as our contribution a heritage any less inspiring.

Walt Whitman expressed the depth of the American experience when he said:

Did you, too, O friend, suppose democracy was only for elections, for politics, and for a party name? I say democracy is only of use there that it may pass on and come to its flower and fruit in manners, in the highest forms of interaction between men, and their beliefs—in religion, literature, colleges, and schools—democracy in all public and private life . . .

If we fail to recognize that depth, if the Bicentennial becomes a holiday time for empty clichés and tired sentiments, the spirit of the Revolution will have died. But if the Bicentennial can recapture the ideals, the wisdom, the courage, and forthrightness of early days and if the people take up these ideals once again and face the challenges ahead with wisdom and courage and justice, then we will have succeeded. But, we must first make a decision as to the importance which we place on this commemoration. Abraham Lincoln once said, "Be not

deceived, revolutions do not go backward." We will show something of ourselves as a people by the way in which we mark our 200th anniversary—whether we are a people who enjoy a reflective look at the past or a people who find even more rewarding a role in shaping the America of the future. By allowing ourselves adequate time, I am confident that our Bicentennial observance will show us as a people who revere the past, who improve the present, and who challenge the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed following my remarks.

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

S. 3732

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 7(a)(2) of the Act entitled "An Act to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes", Public Law 93-179, approved December 11, 1973, is amended by striking out "1976" and inserting in lieu thereof "1983".

(b) Section 7(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) An annual report on the activities of the Administration, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Administrator to the Congress and a final report shall be made to the Congress not later than December 31, 1983. The Administration and the Board shall terminate on December 31, 1983, or on the date of the filing of the final report, whichever is sooner."

SEC. 2. Section 10(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1977" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1983".

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution", Public Law 92-228, approved February 15, 1972, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1977" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1983".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 2422

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2422 to establish a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape and provide financial assistance for a research and demonstration program into the causes, consequences, prevention, treatment, and control of rape.

S. 2801

At the request of Mr. PROXMIRE, the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2801 to prevent the Food and Drug Administration from regulating safe vitamins as dangerous drugs.

S. 2938

At the request of Mr. JACKSON, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2938, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

S. 3096

At his own request, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3096, a bill to provide special assistance to small businesses affected by energy shortages.

S. 3666

At the request of Mr. PROXMIRE, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3666 for the relief of Marlin Toy Co. of Horicon, Wis.

S. 3717

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3717 to extend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to June 30, 1976.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 142

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 142 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, expressing the sense of Congress that certain responsibilities of the U.S. Customs Service should not be transferred to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 93

At the request of Mr. PROXMIRE, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 93 calling for a study by the Joint Economic Committee of the economy with special reference to inflation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A RESOLUTION

SENATE RESOLUTION 347

At the request of Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HUGH SCOTT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 347 to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make an investigation and study on the policy and role of the Federal Government on tourism in the United States.

AMENDMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1970—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1539

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

LIFTING OF THE TURKISH BAN ON OPIUM
PRODUCTION

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, a little more than a week ago, on June 28, the Turkish Government announced that it would resume the production of opium which it banned 3 years ago. Today I would like to describe the tragic impact this action will have on the American people, and explain why as a consequence, I propose that all forms of U.S. economic and military assistance to Turkey be suspended.

The Turkish decision to lift the ban is a major setback in the struggle to rid this country of the menace of heroin. Before the ban in 1971, Turkey supplied more than 80 percent of the illegal heroin in the United States. There was an estimated 600,000 heroin addicts in this country, but even more important, the growth in heroin addiction was staggering. In the mid-sixties the estimated number of heroin addicts was between 50 and 100,000, concentrated mainly in New York City. By 1971, heroin addiction had become an epidemic, increasing 5- to 10-fold and reaching into every major city in America. No social class or ethnic group was immune. Heroin was a source of tragedy not only for the welfare mother in the ghetto but for the well-to-do suburban family as well.

Until the recent Turkish decision, heroin had ceased being front page news. The cut-off in cheap and plentiful supplies of Turkish opiates in 1971 created a drought in the heroin market. The cost of supporting a habit became astronomical. The dramatic increase in heroin addiction was stopped and then turned back. Addicts, unable to maintain their habits, came in off the streets and enrolled in various Federal and State and local rehabilitation programs.

As a result, since the Turkish opium ban, the number of heroin addicts in the United States has dropped more than 60 percent. Today the President's Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention puts the total at less than 250,000. Here in the Nation's Capital the number of heroin addicts has gone from 16,000 at the end of 1971—the year the ban was imposed in Turkey—to only 2,000 today.

This dramatic progress in the fight against heroin is now placed in jeopardy. With Turkish opium again available to be made into heroin, pushers and dealers will now have access to easy supplies. The hard and painful work of rehabilitating addicts will be undermined. But what is worse, the pyramid sales game for heroin can start up again: pushers turning on more addicts to support their habit and each of the new addicts doing the same to support theirs, with the process repeating itself over and over. And the target market is the children of every one of us.

While the tragedy and human suffering may be confined to the individual addicts and their families, the social and economic cost will be borne by all of us. We all will pay for the crime and social disruption accompanying a renewed outbreak of the heroin epidemic. Firm data is difficult to establish, but the Drug Enforcement Administration estimates that the annual average cost of supporting a heroin habit is now more than \$18,000,

Using this figure, if heroin addiction again grows at the rate before the Turkish ban—more than 100,000 new addicts annually—we are talking about a \$200 million increase each year for the dope dealers—most of it financed through burglary, theft, prostitution, muggings, and turning on even more addicts. The bill for law enforcement, insurance, court action and social programs to help those who can be salvaged will be many times greater.

When foreign governments seize American property without compensation, the law requires the termination of economic and military assistance. For example, we threatened to impose the so-called Hick-enlooper amendment when Peru nationalized American oil companies worth approximately \$150 million. The decision of the Turkish Government will cost America lives and property on a scale that dwarfs the value of the industries seized by the Peruvians. If heroin addiction in the United States should again increase to the 1971 level, the cost could well run into the billions of dollars.

What excuse or rationale does the Turkish Government have for lifting the ban? The Turks say that it is economically necessary, that they can prevent illegal diversion of opium, and that it is a domestic political matter. Each of these deserves our close consideration.

First the economic argument. The legal production of opium before the ban accounted for less than 1 percent of Turkish GNP, so legal production is hardly a critical factor. As for the farmers who grew it, the Turkish Government was not sufficiently concerned for their economic welfare even to spend most of the \$35 million we provided to enable the farmers to switch to another crop.

In other words, when the Turkish Government 3 years ago agreed to ban opium production the United States appropriated money to pay the farmers for their losses. The Turkish Government did not even turn that money over in large part to the Turkish farmers who had suspended production of opium.

The economic argument only holds up if the Turks are talking about illegal opium production. That is where the money is made by those who grow it illegally, by a few rich families in Istanbul that finance illegal drug traffic, and by a few Turkish politicians who protect it. And that is the real economic incentive to lift the ban.

The Turkish Government, of course, claims it will closely control opium production and do everything in its power to prevent illegal diversion. Unfortunately that will not be good enough. The reason for a ban in the first place was because it was clear that opium production in Turkey could not merely be controlled. The financial rewards make corruption and bribery irresistible.

The personal and family relationships of many involved in the drug traffic go back decades if not centuries, and rival that of the so-called Mafia. In fact, many of the most notorious drug dealers have recently been let out of jail by the Government of Turkey.

If these facts were not enough, the way the decision was carried out and other actions of the Turkish Government make abundantly clear that there

will be no effective enforcement of controls.

The Turkish Government's decision to lift the ban was made without the prior notification which we had been promised.

The Turkish Government is actually expanding opium production beyond that of 1971. At that time, when Turkey was the source of 80 percent of the heroin in the United States, opium was grown in only four provinces; now it will be grown in seven.

No specific safeguards or control measures of any kind were spelled out in the Turkish announcement.

As I just mentioned, the Turkish Government last month released all the convicted narcotics traffickers in the course of a general amnesty.

Mr. Erbut, the chief of the national police, who is considered a highly competent professional by U.S. drug enforcement officials, and who has made clear that controlling opium in Turkey is impossible, has been eased out of office by the present government.

In sum, the Turkish decision to grow opium again was taken despite our entreaties and in the full knowledge at the highest level of the Turkish Government that there is no way that the Turks can prevent opium from being illegally diverted into heroin and onto American streets.

I consider this a reckless and hostile act by a country for which I have long had great admiration and respect. I appreciate that growing opium poppies is a serious political issue in Turkey. But lifting the opium ban precipitates even more grave domestic problems in the United States—it amounts to a declaration of war against our children.

What can and should we do about this? Clearly we will have to put even more resources in trying to defend ourselves from the onslaught of heroin—more money for local, State, and Federal enforcement, for customs control, international surveillance, and arrests. But I think we must do more.

Legislation which I sponsored and which was enacted into law, requires the President to suspend all economic and military assistance including military credit sales when he determines that a country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent drugs, originating in that country, from entering the United States.

I have called upon the President to use this authority with regard to Turkey, but I am not confident he will do so.

The 1971 Turkish ban resulted from an effort at the highest level of this government—including the President himself—to stop the spread of heroin in the United States and to halt its entry by stopping it at the source. That high-level commitment stands in marked contrast to the silence that greets the subject today by our administration.

I have talked to our Ambassador to Turkey who is now returning for consultations. I believe he has made a serious and strong effort over several months to persuade the Turkish Government to maintain the ban. I have been told that high-level backing here at home might have made the difference, but he did not get it. The President has remained silent, the Secretary of State has remained silent. In all of their travels they have

not once gone to Turkey to discuss this issue even though it directly threatens the lives of thousands of Americans. In fact at the most delicate stage of the negotiations to maintain the ban, President Nixon's aide Ken Cole startled newsmen that the administration was considering growing opium in this country.

With this record, we must be skeptical about the likelihood that the President will exercise his authority to terminate military and economic assistance to Turkey. We must be prepared to take direct legislative action instead.

There will be many objections to legislating a direct cutoff in economic and military aid. These objections should be faced squarely. We are certain to hear the same tired national security arguments about how we cannot do anything to jeopardize our strategic position in Turkey, about the importance of our military bases and intelligence facilities there. I, for one, think it is time to reconsider both the strategic value of these installations, and even more importantly, the priority we give abstract concerns about strategic position over the concrete, and in this case brutal, costs to be borne by the American public in the name of national security.

First, let us take a hard look at the strategic situation. Our relations with the Arab countries have markedly improved. We are no longer clinging to the northern edge of the Eastern Mediterranean. We are home-porting naval vessels in Greece which enables us to offset the expansion in the Soviet Navy's Mediterranean deployment. Our alliance with Turkey in NATO has done nothing to curb the Soviet naval buildup in the Mediterranean even though their lifeline runs right through the Bosphorus.

It is important to recognize that we cannot use our bases in Turkey except when Turkey is at war with the Soviet Union. Otherwise they are worthless. During the Arab-Israeli war last October, the Turks permitted the Soviet Union to overfly Turkey to resupply the Arabs, but would not let us use our bases there to refuel our reconnaissance aircraft. This example of favoritism to the Soviet Union provides a measure of how much our so-called strategic position in Turkey is worth.

In the remote case of conflict with the Soviet Union, our bases would be used to support the Turks. We apparently do not consider this threat imminent since a good portion of the U.S. aircraft in Turkey are based half of the time in Spain. We do not plan to mount strategic attacks on the Soviet Union from Turkey. In terms of overall strategic nuclear deterrence our bases there are obsolete—their real utility is to deter local aggression against Turkey. The Turks are not doing us a favor by letting us have bases; it is the other way around.

And what about our intelligence facilities there? Well, it is very easy to raise the specter of indispensable secret intelligence assets. But I believe that those who are truly knowledgeable in this area will support my contention that advances in satellite reconnaissance and other facilities are fully adequate to take care of our priority concerns without the use of those in Turkey.

The alleged strategic value of Turkey

should no longer control our decisions in this age of strategic nuclear missiles, intelligence satellites, détente with the Soviet Union and rapprochement with the Arabs. It is not worth the kind of bargain in which we give Turkey almost a quarter of a billion dollars in economic and military assistance, as we plan to do this year, and in return the Turks provide us with tens of thousands more heroin addicts and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of crime.

The American people are fed up with this kind of foreign policy. They no longer accept definitions of national security that leave their children more threatened and their property less secure. There is great concern that the American people are again growing isolationist. The reason for this trend is simple: The American people are continually asked to pay for foreign policies that give them little or nothing in return. In this case it is even worse: they are being asked to spend \$232 million this fiscal year on a country that will give back only misery and the conceit of some dubious strategic position.

The Turkish Government was aware of the possibility of an aid cutoff when it made its decision. So, I do not believe that we will lose our bases in Turkey as a result of terminating our aid. But if we do, so be it. For those who feel otherwise, I would only ask them to consider how many lives wrecked by heroin they are willing to pay for these bases.

It is inconceivable to me that in the light of the Turkish Government's decision the Congress will approve the administration's request for \$232 million in economic and military assistance including credit sales to Turkey. I am therefore proposing that all such economic and military assistance and all such sales be suspended until such time as a ban on the growing of opium poppies in Turkey is again in effect.

What good will an aid cutoff do? Will it help get the ban reestablished? I think the answer is "yes." Money is the cause of lifting the ban and it will only be reimposed if we talk the same language. We are the major source of support for the Turkish Army and a principle source of aid for the Government. This action will provide an incentive for the Turkish Government to reconsider its decision. The only other suggestion I have heard is to pay still more for the Turks to reimpose the ban. Apart from being repugnant, I do not think this will work, because the Turks have not even spent all the money we gave them the first time.

Cutting off aid also will make clear to other governments that we are indeed serious and committed to combating heroin. This will be important in order to get the cooperation we need to defend ourselves from Turkish opium. The French Government in particular has made an enormous and costly effort to knock out the infamous French connection. What further sacrifices will they be prepared to make if we stand idly by and do nothing in response to the Turkish action?

Finally action by Congress to cut off aid to Turkey will demonstrate to the American people that we are going to pursue a foreign policy that serves interests of the average American for a

change. This is essential if we are going to reestablish the broad popular support required for an effective foreign policy. And the support of the American people is more important strategically than Turkish friendship and Turkish real estate.

Mr. President, this year the administration proposes that we spend \$232 million of American taxpayers' money in military and other assistance to the Turkish Government which has just decided to resume and expand production of the death-dealing opium poppy which they know will end up in the form of heroin afflicting the lives of thousands and thousands of Americans.

I consider it an outrageous act, one that is totally unjustifiable, and one which this country cannot tolerate.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am introducing today, and will propose that it shortly be brought up as an amendment, legislation to terminate all sales to Turkey under the Foreign Military Sales Act and under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, until such time as the Director of the Drug Enforcement Administration determines that a ban on the growing of opium poppies in Turkey is again in effect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a proposed amendment terminating economic and military assistance to Turkey be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1539

On line 9 immediately before "That" insert "Sec. 1".

After line 7 insert the following new Section 2:

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

SEC. 2. That Section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following new paragraph (c):

"(c) The Government of Turkey, having announced its decision to resume the production of opium poppies, shall not be the recipient of economic and military assistance furnished under this or any other act, and all sales to Turkey under the Foreign Military Sales Act and under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall be suspended, until such time as the Director of the Drug Enforcement Administration determines that a ban on the growing of opium poppies in Turkey is again in effect."

AMENDMENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1540

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I am today introducing an amendment to S. 3680, the new Export-Import Bank authority bill, to require that all Eximbank direct loans be made at the prevailing market rate for loans of comparable maturity.

As my colleagues know, the original purpose of the Eximbank was to subsidize and assist American exporters, to enable them to develop export markets in countries where normal financing arrangements were unavailable. Through most of the life of the Bank, there has been an underlying assumption that the