

October 8, 1978

33223

sume the consideration of the unfinished business.

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

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALLEN ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on tomorrow the Senate will convene at the hour of 12 noon.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes with the usual 3-minute limitation on statements made therein, at the conclusion of which the Senate will resume the consideration of calendar order No. 378 (S. 425), the surface mining bill.

Amendments thereto will be called up. The pending question at the time the Senate resumes consideration of unfinished business tomorrow will be on the adoption of the Cook amendment.

Yea-and-nay votes will occur on tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:46 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 9, 1973, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 8, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Herman R. Staudt, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

Frank A. Shroutz, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations beginning Barbara J. Roy, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Martin J. Zigovsky, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 25, 1973.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY OF NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 3, Northeastern University began the celebration of its diamond anniversary. This university has grown rapidly and responsibly to serve Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, New England, and the Nation. In terms of the total number of students, it is the largest private university in the country. Its 75th anniversary is an important and joyful occasion and yet it is a time to reflect upon the present and future role of Northeastern and other great American universities.

The 75th anniversary convocation address was delivered by Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE. His thoughts on the future role of higher education and the needs of our society are indeed compelling. I know my colleagues will find Senator BROOKE's remarks of great interest.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE

It is an honor to speak at the Convocation beginning the celebration of Northeastern University's 75th birthday and to commemorate those first YMCA evening classes which marked the beginning of a great university. It is a happy thought to be reminded that there are indeed occasions and events to celebrate and that men do start enterprises that are causes for rejoicing by posterity.

It is not a small accomplishment to begin, to sustain, and to build a great university. Northeastern is now the largest private university in the nation in terms of the total number who study here. Seventy-seven thousand students have received degrees from Northeastern University over the course of its 75 years—tens of thousands more have studied here without obtaining a degree. Undoubtedly, some have attended without studying and possibly a few may have received degrees also without much studying—the last a tribute to the redoubtable ingenuity of students.

It is an especially happy note, particularly for an old personal friend, to acknowledge the presence of the man who perhaps more than any other expanded Northeastern not only in size but also in its vision of itself. I was privileged to attend the inauguration of Asa Knowles 14 years ago. In the short period since he has been President, Northeastern has added four new undergraduate colleges, established new graduate schools in law, arts and sciences, business administration, education, actuarial science, and professional accounting; and has begun 10 new Ph.D. programs. Under his administration, Northeastern has indeed become a total university. And during this rapid expansion, its reputation for academic excellence has not only been maintained but has grown. There are those who might say that the latter is due in great measure to the fact that the number of women students has grown from 300 to over 4,000 during the Knowles Presidency.

America has always placed great value upon education as a good unto itself; as a means by which a person could better his economic lot; and as a necessity for the successful functioning of a democracy. Thomas Jefferson argued that "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free . . . it expects what never was and never will be."

In the last decade and a half, American higher education experienced a remarkable

rate of growth. The World War II baby boom came of college age during the 1960's. The belief grew that a college education and increasingly graduate or professional education beyond, was an economic necessity in a modern economy. The federal government escalated its support to universities through huge sums for research and development grants—primarily in the natural but also in the social sciences. Federal funds were made available for the construction of facilities. And millions of students who otherwise would have been economically unable, attended college and graduate school as the number and size of federal student aid programs increased. Probably more than any other factor, federal aid to students accounts for the drastic rise in the proportion of young people who now go on to higher education. In 1955, prior to the passage of the National Defense Education Act, 27 percent attended college. Today, approximately one-half of all young people go beyond the secondary school level. And this latter statistic marks the United States as the first nation ever to move to mass higher education.

Yet this rate of growth in American higher education has now come to an abrupt and precipitous halt. The bulge in the number of college age students has come to an end. There are now calls for large cutbacks or terminations of federal education programs. Even should such drastic cuts not be made, however, it is doubtful whether the rate of increase in federal aid to higher education in the 1960's could have been sustained in view of our other national needs.

In addition to these serious shocks coming in rapid succession, there has also been a challenge to the economic justification of higher education. We are now told that within a very few years our economy will have more college graduates than it needs, as it already has a surplus of new Ph.D.'s in many fields.

Now in view of all these facts we must ask

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 8, 1973

ourselves, just what is the future of higher education? What should be the federal role in higher education now that we see how precariously dependent institutions of higher education and students became upon federal funds in the 1960's.

In answering these questions, we must recognize that in a post-industrial society the economic justification of higher education becomes an absolute. A post-industrial society demands a large number of highly trained, skilled, and educated paraprofessionals, scientists, engineers, technicians and managers. It requires substantial investment in research and development. The institutions which provide this training and advanced education essential for our national economic well-being are of crucial and continuing importance.

Universities, academic departments, and specialists requiring long periods of training cannot be created over night or turned on and off at will.

We have attempted to "buy" from our universities space programs, or tens of thousands of engineers, or a massive effort in cancer research with no thought for the institutions themselves. The argument is made that we must support this or that defense contractor during its lean periods because the presence of defense contractors is necessary for the well-being of the nation. Yet the people who make this argument are seldom heard to argue that we must support this or that university because the presence of universities are necessary for the well-being of the nation. Universities presumably are to survive or suffer in a market economy while defense businesses become sacrosanct institutions.

No one argues that inferior colleges or universities be maintained over the decision of student choices. But the government must show awareness that sudden, massive infusions of federal research monies for specific projects can cause disastrous dislocations when it is determined that the national purpose has been served and funds are abruptly withdrawn. And in a similar vein, the forms and amounts of federal student aid and the fluctuations therein can determine whether or not millions of students can attend college, graduate, or professional school.

The government must show more awareness too of the fact that "crash programs" to turn out large numbers of specific kinds of manpower may be the way we have been doing things, but it may not be the wisest or most economical way. And indeed it may not be a feasible way, considering the long periods needed to train highly skilled professionals and paraprofessionals. Universities, for example, may now be producing more scientists and engineers than presently needed, but some projections show that by the mid-1980's the United States may face a shortage of scientists and engineers through the end of this century. We cannot have a large supply of new scientists ready in the 1980's unless we are willing to begin training them in the near future—even though they are not yet needed.

But even though we accept the complexities involved in training the highly skilled manpower needed in a mature industrial society, we still find ourselves asking what we do with these scientists and engineers, for example, until we do need them.

And while we accept the undoubted need for great numbers of highly educated manpower in the future, we still find ourselves asking if the laws of the economy dictate an upper limit to this need.

The answers to both these questions rest in part upon our understanding of the fact that the economy and its manpower needs do not operate according to some remote, unalterable law. The economy reflects our de-

cisions about the kind of nation we want and the quality of life which we desire. This is our first year of peace in many years, the first year our national budget and appropriations bills reflect our peace-time priorities. It is crucial that we realize that we are now making decisions which should be turning points for the nation.

We have, for example, expended huge amounts of federal funds for research and development. In the mid-1960's more than half of all the scientists and engineers involved in research and development were dependent on federal monies. But the great bulk of this research has been in defense, space, and atomic energy. These areas still account for about 80% of federal research funds.

We must now turn adequate research and development efforts to the civilian sector—to health, housing, education, transportation and the environment—not to "make work" for the graduates of higher education but to meet needs—vital and immediate national needs.

Other industrially advanced areas of the world for several years have had more scientists, engineers, and technicians working on research and development in problems in non-defense areas—in industry and in environmental problems—than the United States.

At the present the United States government has virtually no research and development efforts to deal with many of our most pressing social and environmental problems. Despite the immediate energy crisis, for example, the government still proposes little research effort and funds to discover new sources of energy. The Department of Defense spends \$7 and \$8 billion annually for research and development. In contrast, despite the fact that better housing is one of our most urgent national needs, the Department of Housing and Urban Development spends only about \$35 million in research—or 1/4 of 1 percent of all federal research and development funds. The list is endless.

I argue the need for greater support for research and development in our civilian sector, not just for those concerned with social problems. I argue the need also with the pragmatic businessman who knows that America's commanding economic position has long depended not only on the abundance of her natural resources, nor on the skill of her work force, but on the existence and discoveries of her scientists and engineers.

I also urge that we move to meet our large, clearly defined, unmet manpower needs in such fields as health care and public services. And I argue for this not only on behalf of our poor but to arrest the deteriorating quality of life for the nation as a whole.

Higher education in turn must realize that reforms within higher education are needed, that there need be no conflict between providing a student with a liberal arts education and at the same time preparing him for a particular job. Northeastern's cooperative plan of education alternating classroom with actual work experiences has long proved that.

There are thus indeed serious economic and social questions about the future of higher education. But there may be more basic challenges in its future.

In the coming years, higher education will have to grope not only with the implications of mass higher education but also with the accelerating amount of information which man is discovering and accumulating at a faster and faster rate.

Today, it is rather comforting to know that the first two editions of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* could be written entirely

by "one or two men who were still able to take the whole of human knowledge for their province." Ten thousand experts and specialists were necessary for the 1967 edition, and one person has estimated that a first-class university research library may contain 200 million books by the year 2040 (which raises the prospect that they who live by the sword of "publish or perish" may die of the accumulations of that injunction.)

As the amount of our knowledge continues to explode, it will demand more and more specialization. Specialists may cease to have much of a common language among themselves, much less an intelligible language with the ordinary citizen.

This knowledge explosion and specialization will, therefore, place great strains upon the ordinary citizen, who already tends to be awed by the specialists and the "experts." In many instances, the citizen has already allowed the government to decide major policy matters because, supposedly, government alone knows and understands the facts involved and is therefore qualified to make judgments about national policy. What will this continuing explosion of knowledge, this increasing specialization, mean for the future of a democracy? For the self-confidence of a citizen about his ability to make common sense, value judgments about his country's future?

It may be ironic, but we may have to strengthen and preserve the individual against the growth of knowledge.

How do we strengthen him also against the growth of bureaucracy, of big business, of his government? Many citizens already feel powerless to effect any change in government policy as it becomes increasingly difficult to locate the levers of political power. Members of Congress, I might add, are not free of that frustration as we attempt to oversee hundreds of government programs and are confronted by the testimony of frequently conflicting experts.

As some institutions grow seemingly beyond control, while others weaken or become ineffective, what points of reference remain for the individual? The changes dictated by future technology may be so fast that we are cut off not only from the world of our parents but from our own yesterdays.

What counterpoints are there for the individual to the strains, the confusion, and the pains of modern life?

Few students ever stop to realize that their years in college or university provide them with the last long uninterrupted chance to think, to read, to question—largely unencumbered by economic pressures, family responsibilities, and the often irrational, constant, hectic demands of society—until they retire and start receiving Social Security. This is a rather sobering thought.

Thus may I close with a reminder of the non-economic aspects of higher education—with a celebration of its function in preparing citizens rather than serving the government, of answering an individual's spiritual and emotional as well as his economic needs.

Solzhenitsyn has said that by "means of art we are sometimes sent—dimly, briefly—revelations unattainable by reason . . . a realm . . . for which the soul begins to ache . . ." and that science is "needed not only by our intellect but also by our soul. Perhaps it is just as necessary for us to understand the world and mankind as it is to . . . have a conscience."

And as Kurt Vonnegut—required reading for all politicians since 18 years olds were granted the vote—recently said at another institution of higher education in Massachusetts, "I celebrate your having a library because it is the memory of mankind."

With a formidably unknown and unstable future, we may have even more spiritual and psychological need for the memory, the thoughts, the beauty, the poetry and the music of our past.

The future role of higher education will be to strengthen and enrich the individual by contact with these—and to serve not just one age group, but provide continuing education through a person's lifetime, to end the isolation and exclusivity of university life by becoming a part of the total life of a community.

The most crucial responsibility of Northeastern and other universities in the future may be to educate students not so much as specialists, not only for economic gain, but as citizens who remain firm in their insistence that not government, not the experts, not the machine, nor the definable God we have called progress—but man, the individual, be the measure of all things.

To no better purpose can you dedicate your second 75 years.

U.S. OFFICIALS BYPASS SEAT BELT SYSTEMS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a spot check by the Department of Transportation showed that 47 percent, almost half, of the top executives at Transportation have disengaged their seat-belt buzzer and warning light systems.

Evidently the top decisionmakers who have forced the American people to shell out money for a mandatory seat belt system believe the people should do as they say but not as they do.

The 1974 models are rolling off the assembly lines with a complicated and even more expensive seat belt system that cuts off the ignition if the belts are not buckled. This is necessary at least in part, we have been told by the Transportation Department, because too many people were able to defeat the old system.

I cannot help wondering, Mr. Speaker, how many employees at Transportation will succeed in disengaging this latest Government-mandated accessory. Once they do there is no telling what new system they will devise for the 1975 autos.

The article which appeared in the Detroit News, October 3, follows:

U.S. OFFICIALS BYPASS SEAT BELT SYSTEMS

(By Robert W. Irvin)

"Do as we say, not as we do," could be the motto of some federal employees when it comes to wearing seat belts.

A survey shows many top employees of the U.S. Department of Transportation have bypassed those seat belt systems with the warning lights and buzzers on their own personal cars.

The department's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has required the system on cars in recent years in an effort to push more people into wearing belts.

The buzzer-light system is designed to go off if a person tries to drive without buckling up.

However, it can be easily bypassed and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that is why the government has required 1974 models to be equipped with an ignition interlock system which is supposed to keep a person from starting the car before attaching a combined lap-shoulder belt.

The survey on reaction to the buzzer system in recent vintage cars was reported by the safety agency in its in-house newsletter called simply the "Weekly Bulletin."

Another newsletter, "Status Report," of the Insurance Institute For Highway Safety in Washington, told of the agency report. The insurance newsletter said:

"Apparently a lot of folks at Department of Transportation headquarters in Washington aren't too happy about the requirement."

"One day recently, the agency checked 93 employees' cars in the department's headquarters garage and found that nearly half—47 percent—had the seat belts circumvented on the driver's side and 43 percent had the front outboard seat circumvented."

The agency may not have detected all of the seat belt warning systems that were defeated on 1972-73 cars they checked because no attempt was made to start the vehicle to determine if the buzzer had been disconnected, the insurance group said.

By contrast, General Motors' Fisher Body Division researchers have found about 40 percent of the people with buzzers in their cars now using the belts, compared with only 13 percent in cars without the buzzers.

One industry observer said "it will be interesting to see what the government employs are going to do with the 1974 interlock system which is harder to defeat."

Meanwhile, a bill was introduced in Congress yesterday to ban the interlock on grounds it is an invasion of privacy.

HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, equal rights and full citizenship go hand in hand. The self-determination home rule bill to be voted on in the House next week has an enormous amount of public support.

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has voiced its support of this measure and of home rule for the District of Columbia in these words:

STATEMENT OF THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

For more than twelve years the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has endorsed Home Rule for the District of Columbia.

The Conference, a coalition of 132 national civil rights, labor, religious and civic groups has long worked to bring equal rights to all persons in the United States. There can be no more flagrant denial of equal rights than the denial of full citizenship to the men and women who live in the Nation's Capital. President Richard M. Nixon himself has called the District of Columbia's lack of self-government a national shame and has given his support to Home Rule.

The 93rd Congress has it in its power to correct this disgrace. This subcommittee can begin the task of making the District of Columbia a full, functioning entity in our democracy, by helping create a workable system of self-government.

On behalf of our participating organiza-

tions we respectfully urge this subcommittee to help correct a long standing injustice and restore to the residents of the District their right to elect the persons who govern them and their right to exercise some influence on the affairs of the city in which they live.

"GOVERNOR" LODGE RETURNS

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the White House announced that the President had accepted the resignation of our Ambassador to Argentina, John Davis Lodge. There are few Americans who have lived in this century to whom the name Lodge would not be familiar. Several members of the family have dedicated themselves to long and distinguished careers of public service to the American people, not the least of which has been Connecticut's own John Davis Lodge.

I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the coupling of the words Ambassador and Lodge do not roll off the tongues of his Connecticut friends as easily as the more familiar designation, Governor Lodge. To be sure, his career in foreign service far outspanned his time in Connecticut's executive mansion, but to many of his friends, the title cherished most is that of Governor. I would be remiss if I did not mention that he also served in this Congress and he distinguished himself here as well as the Representative from Connecticut's Fourth District, the seat I am now privileged to hold.

In a recent editorial, the Bridgeport, Conn., Post commented on the Governor's departure from Buenos Aires and at this point in the RECORD, I would like to share those thoughts with my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

MR. LODGE LEAVES

For some months there have been rumors that John D. Lodge would leave his position as ambassador to Argentina. He has now made it official.

For the past four years Mr. Lodge has served as the official envoy to a Latin American nation which most accurately is described as being "politically turbulent."

Most appropriately Mr. Lodge refrained from talking about Argentina's politics in public. His discreetness brought him criticism, which obviously was unfair.

Wisely, he stressed the cultural ties between the United States and Argentina and thus warded off suspicions that his country might entangle itself in the internal affairs of the nation in which he was stationed.

The administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson raised the expectations of Latin America. Congress was not as sympathetic and cut some of the aid programs. The Nixon Administration, while keeping an eye on our neighbors to the South, was nonetheless forced to devote a large amount of its diplomatic activities to other parts of the world.

Thus, it seems Ambassador Lodge, a former Governor of this state and resident of Westport, carried out his assignment in laudable

fashion by maintaining a low political profile and making new friends for the United States. Given the circumstances, what more would be asked of him?

I believe that to be a perceptive analysis of the Governor's characteristics for far more often than not, he demonstrated a keen ability to accurately evaluate a political situation and move with compassion and friendship, not confrontation.

At the age of 70 and after more than 30 years in public life, he will return now to his home in Westport, Conn. But I note with great interest, Mr. Speaker, the absence of the word "retirement" in any of the dispatches regarding his departure from Argentina. Most assuredly, the coming years should be filled with relaxation and be without care for him and his lovely wife, Francesca. However deserving, I cannot help but think it will not be that way for it would be out of character for a Lodge not to have an active interest in national and international affairs. I would add that there is little doubt in my mind that if his Nation called again, the Governor would be the first to serve.

As for now, however, Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to speak on behalf of his many friends and say: Welcome home.

JOSEPH GAVRISH—BOY HERO

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth District of Connecticut is proud to have among its citizens, Joseph Gavrich, a 14-year-old Beacon Falls resident. This young man distinguished himself in our community when he led his family from their burning home last January. In demonstrating the true meaning of bravery, Joseph was presented the Hartford Junior Fire Marshall Medal for heroism and was honored by Gov. Thomas J. Meskill in a ceremony last week.

I also applaud Joseph's preparation as a result of his participation in school fire prevention and safety education programs. In his actions, Joseph avoided what could have easily been a most tragic occurrence.

Joseph, an able and fine neighbor of mine, received statewide recognition when the account of this presentation appeared in a number of newspapers in Connecticut. I include a fine account of Joseph's recognition from the Waterbury Republican and American in the RECORD:

HONORS BOY HERO

HARTFORD.—Fourteen-year-old Joseph Gavrich may not have been thinking of medals when he led his family from their burning home last January, but he received another award Friday for heroism.

Gov. Thomas J. Meskill presented the Beacon Falls boy with the Hartford Junior

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fire Marshal Medal for heroism Friday. Winning the medal makes Joseph a candidate for the nation's top award for juvenile fire heroism, the Hartford Junior Fire Marshal Gold Medal, which will be given Oct. 21 by the International Association of Fire Chiefs.

Several months ago, Joseph was also commended by the Naugatuck chapter of the Red Cross.

Joseph Gavrich, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Gavrich, was awakened by his mother as flames spread through the family's second story apartment at 4 on the cold morning of Jan. 5. Finding the only stairway blocked by fire, Joseph leaped from a window to the ground, then caught his nine-year-old brother, Billy, who was dropped by Mrs. Gavrich.

Then Joseph, with the aid of neighbor Mrs. Bobby LaQuay, found a ladder, raised it to the window, and guided his 12-year-old sister, Maryann, his mother and his seriously burned father to safety before the fire completely destroyed the family's four-room apartment at 110 Munson Rd.

The Silver Medal is one of a series of juvenile fire heroism awards given by The Hartford Insurance Group in conjunction with its 27-year-old Junior Fire Marshal public service program of fire safety education.

A student at Long River Middle School in Prospect, Joseph has participated in fire prevention and safety education programs throughout his school years. In the early grades he took part in the Junior Fire Marshal program. More recently he learned to plan and practice a family emergency escape routine, Operation EDITH (Exit Drills in the Home), and the Gavrich family had subsequently devised and practiced their escape plan.

Joseph was nominated for the Silver Medal by James H. Bowen of Beacon Hose Co. No. 1, which responded to the alarm. Bowen, along with General Manager Leslie H. Gibbs and Marketing Manager Richard M. Kropf of the company's Bridgeport regional office, attended the Silver Medal presentation ceremony.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. VAUGHAN GARY

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the sadness occasioned by the death of the former Member from the Third Congressional District of Virginia, Vaughan Gary. He served here with great distinction, and was rated as one of the most dedicated and able men who was in this body during the two decades from 1945 to 1965. It will be recalled that he left Congress voluntarily.

Our departed former colleague fought a running battle for American taxpayers during his tenure here. He was a real patriot, devoted to the American heritage, and was a consistent and dependable supporter of an adequate defense posture for our country. This Congress would be a better Congress if we had more Members of Vaughan's caliber. The Third District, the Old Dominion, and the entire Nation can be proud of the extra-

October 8, 1973

dinary service performed in the Congress by this great American.

ITALY IS A TRUE FRIEND

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, we hear more and more about withdrawing American troops from Europe. In fact, language was added to the military procurement bill by the Senate to require that there be reductions in the numbers of troops overseas. But the fact that we maintain large forces in Europe is criticized most frequently. One of the reasons advanced for this criticism is that our newly prosperous European allies are not pulling their own weight, and if they do not care enough about their own defense to pay for it, why should we?

I have had the benefit of firsthand knowledge about what some of our allies are doing for the defense of the West. I was particularly impressed by what the Italians were doing to hold up their end of the common defense burden. Strangely enough, although the Italians have been a staunch ally, their defense contributions and the story of their warm friendship for the United States are seldom in the news. Naturally each country in NATO Europe presents its own particular circumstances, but the case of Italy is an outstanding demonstration of what one firm ally of the United States has been able to do in spite of its well-known complex political situation and vast economic and budgetary difficulties.

Let me take first the most obvious measure of a nation's contribution to defense: Its defense expenditures. Italy's defense budget for 1973—which supported an armed force of 625,000 men—was in the neighborhood of \$3.9 billion. This represented a 20-percent increase over the previous year. Compared to the size of the Italian gross national product, actual defense expenditures last year amounted to 3.5 percent of GNP. While somewhat below the NATO-wide average, there is one extraordinary fact about the Italian budget which I believe will illustrate the difficulties being faced by the Italian Government in appropriating additional moneys for defense. The fact is Italy's enormous budget deficit. The new budget being submitted to the Italian Parliament envisions a deficit of \$14.7 billion, which constitutes a third of its total budget. An equivalent deficit for us would be in the neighborhood of \$90 billion! And for every dollar in the defense budget there are the same conflicting domestic-social demands as in the United States. Yet, the Italian defense budget has been substantially increased. And let me note in passing that since 1962 Italy has bought over a half a billion dollars of military equipment from us, offsetting a substantial part of

the foreign exchange costs of maintaining our forces in Italy.

But there is another aspect to Italy's contribution to the common defense besides the budgetary one. This is the warmth with which the Italians as a government and as a people have welcomed our 14,000 armed forces personnel stationed on Italian soil. This figure includes units of the 6th Fleet homeported in Italian ports. Of note in this connection was Italian Government approval last year of the homeporting of a submarine tender in La Maddalena, Sardinia. This step, which the Italian Government took in the face of political sniping from the far left, has enabled us to increase greatly the efficiency of our Mediterranean fleet without any increase in the number of combatant units. Italian receptiveness to these U.S. forces reflects the traditional bonds of friendship between us as well as the broad acceptance of Italian membership in NATO among the great majority of the Italian people.

I am told that the problems existing in local communities where our Armed Forces are stationed—economic, drug and other problems sometimes associated with foreign stationing—are virtually nonexistent. And the Italian authorities have shown a most cooperative attitude in working with our local military commanders and diplomatic mission in solving the few problems that do arise.

It is of more than passing significance that the Italian armed forces have actively cooperated with U.S. forces in multinational exercises, in the NATO framework as well as on a bilateral or trilateral basis. Of special interest has been Italian Navy participation in exercises in the Mediterranean, which have led to marked improvement in the ability of allied navies to operate together in this vital area of defense.

I am convinced that the Italians are keenly aware that time and the international situation have changed, and that it is necessary for adjustments to be made in sharing the defense burden. They have been pursuing an active role among the Europeans in this regard. They appreciate our budgetary problems related to the stationing of U.S. troops in Europe, and I am confident that they will continue to contribute their fair share of NATO's defense burden despite competing domestic demands and extraordinary economic difficulties.

Above all, exposed as they are on NATO's southern flank, the Italians consider the role of U.S. troops in Europe as crucial to Western defense. I believe they would be shocked and disillusioned by major unilateral U.S. withdrawals unless they were reciprocal, realistic, and factual reductions by the Warsaw Pact.

Let us accept the fact that Italy's friendship for America is tangible and firm. It should be appreciated more.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MEMORY OF J. VAUGHAN GARY

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE OF MINNESOTA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to know J. Vaughan Gary while he was a Member of Congress. I noted the tremendous respect that all his colleagues had for him on both sides of the aisle right from my beginning days in Congress. When I came to know Vaughan well, I realized the reason. He was an extremely capable person, diligent in his work, and high in morality and integrity.

I will give him his highest mark on his vision and religious commitment, however, for he is one of those who met in prayer and fellowship with some of his colleagues in a group which finally developed into the Thursday morning prayer breakfast group. That group still continues to meet. During that hour each week, men of all political persuasions in the Congress, as well as all church backgrounds, have met in a bond that enables them to live more in grace with each other as they later differ on the House floor.

The memory of Vaughan Gary continues on because of his outstanding activities in the Congress. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for taking his time to enable those of us who knew this great gentleman to pay their respects.

SUPPORTS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL OF NEW YORK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, taxation without representation is the antithesis of a true democracy. The National Committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of America have voiced their support of the bill to give home rule and self-determination to the District of Columbia in the following resolution:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE, YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA

Unanimously adopted the following resolution on D.C. Home Rule at March 5th, 1972 at its New Orleans meeting:

Whereas taxation with representation is a fundamental tenant of true democracy; and

Whereas this situation does not exist in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas major leaders of the Democratic Party support Home Rule for the District of Columbia, including Senator Daniel Inouye (Hawaii), Chairman, Senate Appropriations District Subcommittee,

Be it resolved that the Young Democratic Clubs of America fully support the present efforts of the District of Columbia Home Rule Committee led by Mr. Richard Clark of Common Cause.

Sponsored by Mr. Anson Chong, National Committeeman from Hawaii.

SIX CHANGES ACCOMMODATE MAJOR RESERVATIONS OF MEMBERS TO H.R. 9682, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SELF-GOVERNMENT BILL

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR. OF MICHIGAN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, because of the unusual parliamentary situation, the original committee sponsors will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the floor debate on H.R. 9682, the self-government bill for the District of Columbia.

The substitute contains six important changes which were made after numerous conversations and sessions with Members of Congress and other interested officials and citizens. These changes clarify the intent of H.R. 9682 and accommodate major reservations expressed since the bill was ordered reported last July.

Other than these changes, the committee substitute follows the committee bill, H.R. 9682.

The changes made by the substitute are as follows: First, budgetary process—no change in the congressional appropriation role; second, change election for Mayor and City Council from partisan to nonpartisan; third, authorization of power for the President over the local police in an emergency; fourth, further Federal oversight re the City Council; 30-day layover for effective date of legislative actions of the City Council; Presidential authority to sustain veto by the Mayor.

Fifth. Judiciary: Continued Senate confirmation of judges; automatic reappointment for judges rated "well qualified" or "exceptionally well qualified" by the tenure commission; and

Sixth. Reservation of congressional authority; additional limitations on City Council; Prohibit Council from changing functions or duties of District of Columbia U.S. attorney and District of Columbia U.S. marshal; prohibit changes in statutes under titles 22, 23, 24 of District of Columbia Code—the Criminal Code.

It is agreed by the committee members who have carefully fashioned this bill after months of hearings and weeks of markup sessions that the bill will now carefully balance the local interest and Federal interest in the Nation's Capital. I trust the House will agree and give approval to this bill for an effective new government for Washington, D.C.

THE LATE HONORABLE WESLEY A.
D'EWART

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late Wesley D'Ewart served in this body for

October 8, 1973

10 years. The announcement of his recent death aroused much sorrow among his farmer colleagues.

Those of us who served with him knew him as "Wes." Always friendly and affable, he was known for his keen insight into legislative proposals, and particularly that which related to his own State of Montana. I recall his unusual attention given to the sheep industry. In matters relating to wool production his

knowledge and leadership were invaluable.

Wes D'Ewart was indeed a great American. He always put the welfare of the country ahead of petty partisan considerations. To me he was a personal friend and a valuable source of aid in the search for better solutions of issues in which we had a common interest. To his survivors I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.