

tems in their new or existing homes if the same Federal programs which fund conventional systems were available to them.

In response to the need to provide the same financing benefits to homeowners who want to use solar power to heat and cool their homes as others get, I introduced, on April 10, H.R. 13143, the Solar Energy for Homes Act of 1976. The bill would extend the limits on Federal housing loan and insurance programs to take into account the increased initial cost of purchasing and installing solar energy systems. The bill does not presume to require or even to actively encourage solar energy conversion; it simply allows those who want to use solar energy systems in their homes to enjoy the same benefits as those who prefer conventional heating and cooling systems. And it does so without additional burdens on the Federal Treasury, since the programs involved guarantee private loans and do not provide direct Federal loans.

Montanans, indeed all Americans, should not be discouraged from using the sunlight which could warm and cool their homes. My bill will allow them to reap the full benefits of the power of solar rays.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CITIZENS AND PATRIOTS

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1976

Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in the celebration of our Bicentennial Year, I have found a growing awareness and interest of local residents throughout our Nation in the accomplishments of past citizens. Today, many of our community minded citizens are doing extensive research into the deeds of former local citizens who have made positive contributions to their community, State, Nation, and in general, our way of life.

The Sixth District of Indiana is fortunate to have many such people working on the performances of our patriotic Americans. I would like to bring to the attention of this House one such individual from my district, Becky Hardin of Mooresville. Ms. Hardin has done a considerable amount of research into our State's history and is presently in the process of publishing a book on origins and the historical nature of the State flag of Indiana. Its designer, the late Paul Hadley, also lived in the town of Mooresville. It is my understanding that this publication will not only be most informative about our State flag, but also a detailed synopsis of Paul Hadley and his input into the history of both Mooresville and the State of Indiana.

I look forward to reviewing this publication, and I would like to salute Becky Hardin and many other Americans who are digging into our history in order to bring light to the worthy accomplishments of many of our late citizens and patriots.

TURKISH BASES AGREEMENT: THIS YEAR OR NEXT?

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1976

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Washington Post carried a most thoughtful editorial on the recent agreement between the United States and Turkey with respect to our use of certain military bases and facilities in that country. The editorial suggests that perhaps the best course would be for the administration to make haste slowly in seeking congressional approval of the treaty and necessary implementing legislation.

As a member of the Committee on International Relations, which will have to act on the legislation implementing the treaty, I must say that there is a great deal to be said for the point of view expressed in the editorial. The failure of Congress to approve the agreement, a likely outcome this year, could well irreparably damage our relations with our important Turkish ally and eliminate our own ability to constructively influence events on Cyprus where progress toward a solution has not been satisfactory. It certainly seems to me that the rationale set forth in the Post's editorial should be seriously considered, both within the administration and the Congress.

Text of editorial follows:

THE NEW TURKISH BASES AGREEMENT

Did the administration really have to sign a new bases agreement with Turkey at this time? Or, having signed one, cannot the administration just let it lie there, without putting full vigor into efforts to gain Hill approval? We ask because a renewal of the executive-congressional battle on this issue is one of the most certain and least attractive prospects on the Washington political horizon. It is hard to see how anyone could benefit from letting the battle proceed.

Consider the scenario likely to unfold when the administration formally asks Congress to make a four-year \$1-billion military aid authorization so that the United States can reopen the 26 Turkish installations closed last year in retaliation for the temporary American arms embargo. All the old wounds will be reopened. Turkey and its supporters in the American bureaucracy will be accused of trampling on Cyprus, whose partial occupation by Turkey remains the basic source of the dispute, and of further alienating Greece. Greece and its supporters in the American electorate will be accused of undermining vital American strategic interests. The Secretary of State will let it be known that the basic issue is whether the executive is to be allowed to conduct any foreign policy at all. His critics will sharpen their interpretations of his character and psyche. Everybody will start explaining the unwarranted political considerations motivating the fellows on the other side.

No doubt some Turks are eager to have the matter thrashed out. It would be a boon to Turkish national pride and a coup for the Turkish government to restore firm relations with the United States and to gain a pledge of long-term military aid, without having to make concessions on Cyprus. Some in Ankara may even feel the administration

can deliver. We suspect, however, that thoughtful Turks understand how harmful to Turkey it would be if the Congress rejected the bases agreement. At the moment, this seems likely: Not only is there strong congressional sentiment for prior Turkish movement on Cyprus but there are objections to the length of the aid authorization and to the amount of aid. Simple prudence gives the Turks reason to wait at least until after the American elections, rather than to submit some substantial part of their fate to a harsh debate in an American presidential campaign. The possibilities for reactivation of the NATO bases in Turkey, and for NATO supply of pressing Turkish military needs, ought to be more fully explored.

The critical requirement, of course, is for progress on Cyprus. It is going on two years since Turkey conducted its two-stage intervention: the first and legitimate stage to protect the threatened Turkish minority, the second and unjustifiable stage to expand and tighten the Turkish hold. In the interim, the Greek Cypriots, consciously passing up the "Palestinian" option of letting their refugees fester, have built a new community life in their (southern) part of Cyprus. In the north the Turkish Cypriots have been hindered in any similar effort by the heavy-handed occupation policies of the Turkish military. The Greek side, we surmise, would welcome a decent political compromise if one were offered. But the Turkish side continues to demand terms tantamount to Greek humiliation.

Given the failure of both the imposition—and the lifting—of the arms embargo to move the Turks, no one can confidently say what will now work. We think the best chance for progress on Cyprus, however, lies in cultivating an atmosphere in which the United States is not seen as winking at the occupation and appeasing the Turkish side. That is the best argument for making haste slowly on the new bases pact.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1976

SPEECH OF

Hon. Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1976

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13172) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

Mr. RISENHOOVER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I am one of those who vote for public works bills which are designed to get people back to work. I am one of those who vote for the B-1's and Triads to help defend this country. I have also voted to be fiscally responsible. And I am not afraid that the Russians are coming, and one of the reasons is because the single greatest deterrent that we have is our great commitment to education.

I support the amendment. I think we can still be fiscally responsible and try to help our handicapped and older Americans, if we do not also try to be caretakers and a police agency for the rest of the world. Let us take care of our own problems, and this is one problem we should devote our attention to.