

of few, and only to a partial degree; but that, from the beginning of organic existence his consciousness has been induced, expanded, trained in the lines of sensitiveness; and that the rise of his faculties from a lower power to a higher, from a narrower to a wider field, may be due to the function of assimilating and storing outside force or forces. There is nothing unscientific in the idea that, beyond the lines of force felt by the senses, the universe may be—as it always has been—either a supersensuous chaos or a divine unity, which irresistibly attracts, and is either life or death to penetrate.”

Such is a picture of the direction science must take and the results it must produce, as sketched in outline by Bacon 300 years ago, and as filled in with detail by Adams at the beginning of the scientific century. The only error either made was to underestimate the speed of the increasing impact of science upon life. No longer do we have time to stop and contemplate. The question today is—and it demands an immediate answer: Will science elevate total civilization to heights beyond imagination? Or will it doom civilization to destruction and possibly oblivion?

It is disturbing to think that the most spectacular, though not necessarily the most far reaching achievements of science have been made under the spur of war, for purposes of destruction. The release of nuclear energy is the latest and most portentous. Can its known capacity for evil be chained, and tamed for good? It is just as simple as that.

The forces of nature which impinge upon man, and the science which explains the operation of those forces, may be indifferent to good and evil. Man is a force, and he responds to forces, says Adams. But man is more than a force. There resides in him a will, as Adams also insists, and we believe that will to be a reflection of that unknown universe beyond the lines of sensuous forces. A scientist is first of all a man, and secondarily a scientist; he cannot afford to be merely a follower of blind forces. Therefore it is my earnest hope that as you spend a few days of exploration in our beautiful and exciting State, and subsequently as you go about the business of preparing yourselves for most promising careers in the field of science, you may, as the ancient phrase puts it, dedicate all your efforts to the glory of God and to your own advancement in knowledge and virtue.

IMPORT COMPETITION

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that I have spoken in support of the industries and the workers in my district who are struggling to hold their own against import competition. My district has textile mills, lacemaking facilities, jewelry, rubber footwear and some machine tool manufacturing. All of them are under pressure from imports.

I have consistently championed their interests against low-cost imports that reflect the lower wages paid abroad. In recent years the competitive advantage of imports has broadened, if anything, because of the great advancement in technology in many foreign industries. I have in fact voted against the so-called reciprocal trade program over the

years. I supported the escape clause and the peril point legislation which were designed to provide a remedy against serious injury suffered from imports.

The peril point provision was eliminated from the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and the escape clause was greatly weakened. That was part of the reason I voted against that legislation. The so-called adjustment assistance provision by which the Government would compensate industries, companies or groups of workers that were seriously hurt by imports was substituted in great part for the escape clause. It was to be a great improvement over what it displaced.

As it has turned out after a year and a half, the adjustment assistance provision of the act was a sterile piece of legislation because it erected impossible or virtually impossible conditions as a condition precedent to its invocation. Not only was it necessary to prove that a tariff reduction was the major cause of the increase in imports that had occurred, but that the increase in imports was the major cause of the distress of which the industry, company, or labor group complained. The burden of proof was so onerous that all of the cases brought under the act since October 1962, when it first went into effect, failed to meet the requirements. Eleven cases have been processed. All 11 were rejected unanimously by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether it makes much difference to an industry or the people working in the plants and mills, what caused an increase in imports. It seems to me that what counts is how heavy the imports are, whether they are growing and what damage they are doing and are likely to do. If there was no duty reduction but imports increased in any case, what difference does it make what explains the rise in imports if they inflict serious injury on the domestic industry? I say this because the law was unfortunately addressed not to the substantive facts of a situation but to the question of whether a tariff reduction was to blame.

Such a view overlooks the fact that the tariff, whether reduced or not in the past, evidently was not high enough to restrain the increase in imports. It also overlooks the possibility that new technological advances combined with low wages abroad may have brought a competitive advantage to a foreign industry that did not enjoy it before.

The Trade Expansion Act was still an expression of the doctrine that tariff reduction is a good thing in itself. It overlooked the legitimate interests of industry and labor in what might be or might soon become ruinous competition from abroad. Somehow it was thought that the interests of imports stood at a higher level than the interests of the domestic industry and its employees.

Nevertheless the Trade Expansion Act did provide for full hearings before the Tariff Commission before tariffs were to be cut. The purpose was, no doubt, to assure domestic industry of its rights and to comfort it with the idea that it would not be exposed willy-nilly to deep tariff

cuts without first going through a fair hearing.

During the shapeup of the present GATT tariff conference hearings were indeed held by the Tariff Commission—4 months of them. The hearings process was honored.

Now, however, it is clear that the idea of wholesale, across-the-board tariff reductions has prevailed. This is wholly incompatible with the hearings and in fact makes a mockery of them. Nothing that was said there by hundreds of witnesses will produce any effect on the outcome. Nothing that was said by the many Members of Congress who went before the Commission will carry any weight. Why?

We have already heard the answer but it bears repeating many times over until it is heard and penetrates the minds of the hearers. The Tariff Commission hearings were rendered sterile when those who are in charge of negotiating the tariff reductions agreed as a condition of entering the negotiations that only the smallest number of exceptions would be made to the broad, across-the-board, 50-percent cut. Obviously if the tariff was to be cut uniformly in broad swaths there was no point at all in examining into each product by the Tariff Commission, probing how its competitive position differed from other products.

Mr. Speaker, there is evidence here that our negotiators are still laboring under the outdated notion that simply cutting a tariff is an act of economic virtue. Perhaps it never was, but it certainly is not now.

The reason lies in the vast changes that have occurred in recent years. These changes have put an entirely new face on the matter of international competitive standing of American industry. There is nothing complicated about the course of events that brought about the change.

We previously had the advantage of a great technological lead over other countries. In some cases, but not in all, this lead was wide enough to overcome the wage gap between our country and others. Today much of this technology has penetrated into other industrial countries. The rise in foreign productivity was a natural result, and it far outran the increase in foreign wages.

Many of our industries, recognizing this, shifted some of their investments overseas. By so doing, they were able to compete in countries to which we could no longer hope to continue exporting. As a result our foreign investments grew much faster proportionately than our investments at home. This was not good for our employment. Our industries did not grow as fast as those of Europe and Japan. One reason was that many of our industries were faced with great uncertainty. In many instances imports were rising rapidly and challenging our own producers in their home market. The cost advantage of imports was such that they were able to gain visibly on our own industries. The latter, therefore, held back with their invest-

ment in plant expansion because the prospects were not inviting.

Before long they found that they had to improve their cost position if they were not to be driven out of business. They, therefore, began investing more in modernization programs than anything else. The means by which the industries sought to save themselves—not always successfully, for many companies went out of business in the textile industry—was often at the expense of employment. The pressure to reduce costs simply meant that more laborsaving machinery must be installed.

This is something that those who try to assess the effect of imports on employment often completely overlook. They ask how many workers are displaced by imports, forgetting that many such displacements are indirect, as just indicated, that is, by bringing on labor-displacing installation. In yet other instances imports add to unemployment by discouraging business expansion because of the gloomy prospects brought on by rising imports. The new hands coming on the labor market are not employed as they would be in the absence of the import menace.

Mr. Speaker, bringing what I have said, to bear on the present legislation, I wish to say that I am strongly in favor of it. It will not help against past damage; but it will save many of our industries from unnecessary and in fact unwise future damage.

If the articles that fall under the criteria of the bill are spared further tariff cuts a great benefit will have been achieved even if it is of a preventive character. We should not under the momentum of a past frenzy to reduce tariffs throw off the degree of caution that was exercised in the past. There is no magic at the end of this tariff-cutting rainbow. I assure you that there is not only no magic but quite the contrary; namely, grim unemployment, sagging profits and gloom. It is too often thought that industry and employment can quickly shift into something else, something new. This is an unfortunate and damaging illusion. Let us not be led by such illusions into tariff-cutting action that we would soon have reason deeply to regret.

I join my colleagues gladly in introducing the bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act with the purpose of moderating the damage of further tariff reduction. I also join in asking for expeditious action on the bill.

VETERANS' PENSION ACT OF 1964

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which seeks a compromise solution to the problems of needed pensions for our veterans. This bill, the Veterans' Pension Act of 1964, provides increased pension benefits for veterans of all wars, but it is also designed to recognize the special problems of World War I veterans.

In 1960, Congress passed Public Law 86-211, which modified pension programs existing at that time. We have now had 4 years' experience with this new pension law, and there are several corrections which should be made. My bill provides for the following basic changes in existing law:

First. The present law does not require the accounting of veterans' life insurance in computing income. This deduction is now extended to cover private or commercial life insurance in the case of death claims by a widow.

Second. Under present law, the widow is not required to count expenses of last illness and burial of the veteran in computing her income. This provision is extended to the veteran by my bill. Under this bill the veteran would be allowed to deduct the expenses of last illness and burial for his wife or children when figuring his income.

Third. This bill would provide for a deduction from income of unusual medical expenses by either the veteran or the widow, for themselves or their children.

Fourth. The proceeds from a fire insurance policy would not be counted as income and income derived from the sale of a personal residence would not be counted.

Fifth. Under my bill, income received as payment for the discharge of a civic duty, such as jury service, would be exempt.

At the present time, a veteran must have a 10-percent permanent disability at age 65 to qualify for a pension, and this is resulting in expensive medical examinations which are disqualifying very few veterans. My bill would consider a 65-year-old veteran to be permanently and totally disabled, and he would not be required to take an examination. My bill would also permit pension benefits to be paid to a person suffering from active TB and hospitalized from the disease, even though the disability may not be permanent.

The aid and attendance allowance would be raised from \$70 to \$85 a month. There are 50,000 aid and attendance cases, and these veterans are badly in need of additional help because of their serious health problems.

This bill would also create a new category described as "permanently housebound," and this group would receive \$35 a month in addition to the regular pension. This concept is presently used in the service-connected compensation program and should be extended to the pension program.

One of the principal purposes of this bill is an adjustment of income limitation rates, commensurate with the rising cost of living. Overall income limitations are not raised, but the first and intermediate steps are increased and the first and intermediate pension rates are increased. For instance, under this bill, a single veteran in the low income category would receive \$90, a married veteran \$100, and a widow \$70. Under the proposed increase in the income limitation in the first and second step, veterans and widows could have more income and still qualify for the highest rate payable under the bill.

The recognition of the special problems of World War I veterans in the bill is the provision that, upon attainment of age 72, income limitations would be raised to \$2,400 for the single veteran and \$3,600 for the married veteran. The bill would pay these World War I veterans a pension of \$100 a month. Very few veterans are capable of working at that age, and medical expenses usually rise, either for the veteran or his wife. In view of these rising costs it is appropriate that income limitations be liberalized, for these World War I veterans who have reached the age of 72.

In addition, this bill provides recognition for the veteran who served in active military, naval or air service outside the United States during World War I, World War II or the Korean conflict. Provision is made for a 10 percent increase in the pension in these cases.

I have introduced this bill because I believe that there is a need for continually updating our veterans' benefit programs; because, as our country continues to pay billions every year in foreign aid, and other billions in welfare payments it is only right that we should be equally generous to those who have sacrificed for their country in a time of need.

I firmly believe that veterans of this century of world conflict have a right to expect a grateful country's help in their declining years.

This is not charity we are extending; it is part payment to men who left home and loved ones to fight wars that they did not start, on ground that was not theirs.

Our national veterans' organizations have all favored differing approaches to the problems of various groups of veterans. In drafting this bill, I have tried to find the best way to combine those differing viewpoints into a consensus which expresses the desire which all share: That, for those who have sacrificed to save our country, we should be willing to grant relief at the time of their greatest need.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

(Mr. MONTROYA (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months, I have been quite concerned over the adverse effect the increased importation of beef and beef products has had upon our domestic cattle industry. Of equal concern has been the closure of lead and zinc mines in New Mexico as a result of excessive imports of these commodities combined with a decline in metal prices.

I have appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission on numerous occasions to request that tighter tariff restrictions be placed on these products so important to the economy of my State.

The beef industry has been and is faced with a critical situation and their problem, in turn, translates into an economic dilemma for the State of New Mexico. For example, beef cattle sales are responsible for about 50 percent of