

lieve we must now make our determination regarding aid to Turkey on the basis of what is best for America.

When the Turkish Government banned the growing of the poppy it was reported that we had more than 600,000 heroin addicts on the streets of America and that up to 80 percent of the heroin they were using had its origin in the poppy fields of Turkey. The number of addicts, because of the ban, is now down to 230,000 so we can see the effect of the poppy ban was only good.

Despite millions of tax dollars and thousands of man-hours, the United States has been unable to keep illicit drugs from being smuggled into this country.

It is, therefore, ridiculous to believe the Turkish Government, with less money to spend and less manpower to commit, can prevent opium from being smuggled from that country.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the President has the power to stop economic aid to Turkey in this case, but I also believe it is time the House of Representatives stood up to show the Turkish Government that we will not stand idly by and let heroin epidemic sweep this country.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, and I hope my colleagues will do likewise, to vote against any further economic or military aid to the Government of Turkey.

The Turkish Government has apparently decided what is in its best interests and the Government of the United States can do no less.

A COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN REFORM BILL

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Administration Committee, I take this time to note that yesterday the committee completed markup of a comprehensive campaign reform bill and, by a vote of 21 to 0, gave tentative approval to it.

Following the Fourth of July recess, the committee will again meet to report a clean bill, and the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) has indicated his hope that the House will have an opportunity to vote on the bill some time later this month.

Mr. Speaker, before listing some of the major provisions of the bill, I want to say a word about Chairman HAYS, who sat through long and sometimes tedious sessions of the committee in an effort to shape a solid piece of legislation.

Although members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, including the gentleman from Indiana who is speaking, may have from time to time disagreed on some particular matter with the views of the chairman, I think all would agree that he was careful to insure that every member had an opportunity to express his views and offer amendments.

The Chairman of the Committee on House Administration (Mr. HAYS) worked long and hard on this bill as did a number of other members on the com-

mittee, both Democrats, and Republicans, and I believe we have written a sound campaign reform bill, one which merits the support of Members of the House of both parties.

Now Mr. Speaker, let me indicate the major provisions of the campaign reform bill that was yesterday agreed upon.

The bill includes strict limitations on expenditures and contributions for all Federal elections.

It simplifies reporting requirements and mandates that each candidate designate a principal campaign committee that would make all the candidate's expenditures and file a consolidated disclosure report for all the candidate's committees.

The measure also provides for an independent authority to administer the campaign laws by establishing a Board of Supervisory Officers and by creating a separate Assistant Attorney General to enforce these laws.

The bill approved by the committee provides for public financing of Presidential elections by strengthening and expanding the 1972 Dollar Check-off Law, which is now limited to public financing of Presidential general elections, starting in 1976.

The Committee bill would make the Dollar Check-off Law self-appropriating, thereby assuring that the dollars that have been checked off by individual taxpayers would, as they intended, be available for public financing, without a separate congressional appropriations bill.

The bill approved yesterday would also authorize up to \$2 million from the check-off fund for each major political party, and proportionately smaller amounts for minor parties, to meet the expenses of Presidential nominating conventions.

The bill provides an overall spending limit of \$2 million, from both public and private sources, for each political party to meet all convention expenses.

The bill also provides for limited public financing of Presidential primary elections by authorizing Federal matching payments—from the Dollar Check-off fund—for small private contributions of \$250 or less. Public funds for Presidential primary elections would not be available, however, until after obligations for nominating conventions and Presidential general elections were met.

Under the bill, no Presidential primary candidate could receive more than \$5 million in Federal funds, with an overall spending limit of \$10 million.

In order to qualify for the public funds, a Presidential primary candidate would have to raise at least \$5,000 in private contributions of 25 or less in each of 20 States.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, critics have charged that a defect in the Committee bill is its reliance on a Board of Supervisory Officers rather than a so-called independent Federal Elections Commission to enforce the election laws.

Let me note, however, that the so-called independent Elections Commission, which is included in the bill passed by the Senate earlier this year, would turn control of enforcement of the elec-

tion laws over to the Watergate White House by providing that all the members of the Commission be appointed by the President, with a majority coming from his own party.

Moreover, that majority would be authorized to appoint the staff director of the Commission to whom nearly all the responsibilities of the Commission could be designated.

Mr. Speaker, the Board of Supervisory Officers, which won overwhelming support from both Democrats and Republicans on the House Administration Committee, offers an effective mechanism to monitor campaign laws and to assure their enforcement.

And the provision for a new Assistant Attorney General to enforce the election laws and an independent legislative authorization for the Board will, coupled with the searchlight of public scrutiny, assure that the laws will be honestly and effectively enforced.

Mr. Speaker, some have attacked the Board of Supervisory Officers because Members of Congress would sit on it. But I would observe that there has been little serious criticism of the present supervision of the existing campaign laws as they apply to Members of Congress.

In light of recent events, the proposal to place control of these laws in the hands of the Watergate White House seems, to be gentle about it, a step backward for campaign reform.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said earlier, Chairman HAYS has indicated that he will introduce a clean bill shortly after the Fourth of July recess. The measure will be formally reported after the committee has had an opportunity to review the bill for any technical problems. We can, therefore, expect consideration of the campaign reform legislation by the House before the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, because I am sure many Members are interested in this most important legislation, I include in the Record a brief summary of its major provisions:

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1974

TITLE I—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENTS

A. Contribution Limits:

\$1,000 limit per election on contributions by any person to a candidate for Federal office.

\$5,000 limit per election on contributions to candidates for Federal office by multi-candidate committees.

\$25,000 limit on amount one individual may contribute in any year to all candidates for Federal office.

Prohibit contributions by foreign nationals.

B. Expenditure Limits:

Sets overall expenditure limitations for all Federal elections, including:

a) President:

General Election: \$20 million.

Primary Election: \$10 million.

b) Senate:

\$75,000, or 5¢ a voter, whichever is greater, in each of the primary and general elections.

c) House:

\$75,000 in each of the primary and general elections.

All candidates for Federal office would be able to spend up to 25% above these limits to meet fundraising costs.

Expenditure limitations would be increased by a cost-of-living escalator.

Prohibits a candidate for Federal Office from spending more than \$25,000 per election from the candidate's personal funds.

TITLE II—DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FUNDS

A. Simplifies reporting requirements. Provides for a single 10 day pre-election report instead of the 5 and 15 day pre-election reports required by existing law.

Requires a report 30 days after each election.

Waives quarterly reports if they fall within 10 days of a pre- or post-election report or if contributions or expenditures by the committee or candidate do not exceed \$1,000 during that quarter. The waiver would not apply to the quarterly report filed after December 31 of each year.

B. Principal Campaign Committee:

Requires that each candidate designate a principal campaign committee to make all that candidate's expenditures and to file a single disclosure report which consolidates the reports of all the political committees which support the candidate.

C. Independent Enforcement Entity:

Creates a Board of Supervisory Officers, composed of the Clerk of the House, the Secretary of the Senate, the Comptroller General, and one Member of each political party in the House and Senate; and a separate Assistant Attorney General for election law matters to supervise and enforce Federal election laws.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. Pre-empts State election laws.

B. Public Financing of Presidential Elections:

Strengthens and expands the existing Dollar Check-off Law, now limited to financing Presidential general elections, to authorize some public financing of all phases of Presidential elections.

a) Makes the Dollar Check-off Fund self-appropriating to assure that money in the Fund may be used without requiring a separate Congressional appropriation.

b) *Nominating Conventions*—provides up to \$2 million from the Check-off Fund for each major political party, and proportionately smaller amounts for minor political parties, to meet the expenses of Presidential nomination conventions. Also provides an overall expenditure limit of \$2 million for all convention expenses for each political party from both public and private sources.

c) *Presidential Primaries*—authorizes limited public financing of Presidential primary elections by authorizing Federal payments from the Dollar Check-off Fund to match small private contributions of \$250 or less. Public funds for Presidential primary elections would not be available, however, until after obligations for nominating conventions and Presidential general elections have been met.

No Presidential Primary candidate could receive more than \$5 million in Federal funds, with an overall spending limit of \$10 million. To qualify for the public funds, a Presidential primary candidate would have to raise at least \$5,000 in private contributions of \$250 or less in each of 20 states.

d) *Hatch Act*—allows State and local government employees to participate on a voluntary basis in certain partisan political activity.

TURKEY'S RESUMPTION OF OPIUM PRODUCTION

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Turkey has just thumbed its nose at you and the American people. They have announced officially a resumption of opium produc-

tion. They have taken the first step to reestablish the French Connection.

A majority—238 Members of this House, the majority leader, and the minority leader have introduced legislation to convey the intensity of our feelings—the debilitating effect breaking this agreement with us will have upon the youth of America and our military forces throughout the world. We met our part of this bargain authorizing \$35.7 million dollars to the Turkish Government. This money given to the Turks however never reached the farmers.

Before the Turkish ban, 80 percent of all heroin coming into the United States had its origin in Turkey—drug related crime was costing the American taxpayers \$27 billion annually. Since the ban, we have cut the addict population in the United States in half. Drug abuse in the military has been reduced because of the lack of availability of heroin produced in Turkey. What is more important—to walk the streets in safety or give aid to help the Government of Turkey?

Turkey says they will control production—they will not plant in seven provinces instead of four. Every responsible drug enforcement agency in the world, including our own says its impossible to control—the only control of Turkish opium will be in the hands of organized crime who will control the illicit supply to fill their coffers and the veins of American youth. I have just been authorized by Chairman MORGAN of the Foreign Affairs Committee to announce that hearings on our bill—House Concurrent Resolution 507, which will cut off all aid to Turkey—will begin during the week of July 9. If Turkey has declared a drug war on us as they have with this announcement, we must respond.

THE LATE SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING OF ALASKA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. YOUNG of Alaska addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska.

Senator Gruening was more than just an able and an outspoken representative of the State of Alaska. He was a courageous leader and a fierce fighter for the things in which he believed. The vigor and energy which Senator Gruening displayed, especially in his late years, is something of which we can all take note.

When I said that the late Senator Gruening was more than just a representative of Alaska, I meant more than to say he was a national political figure. More than any of the rest of us here in the Congress of the United States, Ernest Gruening helped create the State that he was destined to represent in this great body. Since 1939 when he was appointed Governor of the Territory of Alaska, Ernest Gruening labored long and hard to bring Alaska to the point when it was

ready for statehood and then to help it win that revered position. Once Alaska had achieved statehood he was given the responsibility of representing it in the Senate, a duty he fulfilled very admirably.

Like many of his colleagues, I always admired the strength and drive of the gentleman from Alaska. He was able, sooner than many, to see the error in our foreign affairs. Senator Gruening did not let his 1968 primary defeat keep him from serving the people of Alaska and of the United States. He remained active in national affairs, always ready to support those in whom he believed and anxious to share his insights with his former colleagues. Just a few months ago the late Senator visited the Senate on the occasion of his 87th birthday. At that time several of his former colleagues joined together to nominate him for the Nobel Peace Prize. I can think of no finer tribute to a man who has done so much for our Nation.

My wife Corrine joins me in expressing my deepest sympathy to the late Senator's wife Dorothy and to his family.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in sequel is ever written to President Kennedy's book, "Profiles In Courage," the first chapter would have to be devoted to Ernest Gruening. If each of the 535 Members of Congress had only a portion of his courage and foresight, the peoples' confidence in their legislation branch of Government would be significantly higher than the 21 percent found by a recent Gallup poll.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Gruening knew that blind obedience to immoral or amoral governmental policies ill serves either one's conscience or one's patriotic duty. That is why he became and remained until his life ended, one of our most articulate and tenacious opponents of the tragic war in Vietnam.

Although he played a major role in achieving statehood for Alaska, and did pioneering studies into the need for population planning, Ernest Gruening's most important contribution to our times was, in my opinion, his ceaseless effort to extricate the United States from Vietnam and to bring peace to that troubled part of the world. I suppose it is fair to say that that effort was, at one and the same time, his greatest achievement and bitterest disappointment. Senator Gruening could only have experienced disappointment when his counsel was rejected and his wisdom ignored on the war issue. After all, the Senator was right when most of his colleagues were wrong; he knew immediately that the consequences of our policies in Southeast Asia could only result in national disunity, soaring inflation, and personal tragedy for thousands of American families. How different our Nation and the world might be today if his warnings had been heeded in a timely fashion.

On the other hand, it would be unfair to the memory and accomplishments of Ernest Gruening, if we failed to acknowledge that his persistent and heroic opposition to the war did result in an earlier end to the conflict than would otherwise have occurred. The Nation owes him an enormous debt of grati-