to improve the Federal legislation, it has been apparent that the authorities we give to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration are executed with imagination, dedication, and administrative skill.

As a result, the number of disabled people rehabilitated through this program has increased annually for several years. In the fiscal year just ended, more than 130,000 disabled people were rehabilitated and entered suitable employment.

The research and demonstration program launched 10 years ago has added much to our knowledge of disabling conditions and what to do about them. I have followed this research program, as well as the training grant program, in my own State of Florida. Many highly valuable projects have been conducted there. One of the latest is a project which will help improve and expand the work being done in the field of Parkinsonism, which is one of the most difficult of the many severely disabling conditions which afflict large numbers of our people.

I also would like to pay tribute to the universities in Florida which have helped develop professional training programs to produce more skilled workers to serve the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, we have an excellent State program of vocational rehabilitation in Florida. We also have outstanding voluntary agencies serving the handicapped in a variety of ways. H.R. 8310 will help these agencies tremendously, both public and private, and I therefore hope the Congress will give its full support to this legislation. I assure you, my colleagues, that this is one piece of legislative action where every Member serves the citizens of his district and at the same time serves the total national interest.

I join the other sponsors of this legislation in urging its prompt enactment.

(Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MURPHY of New York's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TRADE EXPANSION LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill in the last Congress aimed at moderating the tariff-cutting proclivities of the State Department and the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. The bill, although introduced by more than 75 Members of this body, on a bipartisan basis, was not entertained by the Committee on Ways and Means.

As we all know, the negotiations in Geneva have dragged along and are not yet very far advanced. Therefore there is time to provide some much-needed guidelines for our negotiators. As I pointed out last year, the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations agreed to an approach in Geneva that is not contemplated in the legislation, that is, in the Trade Expansion Act itself. He agreed to a 50-percent reduction of existing duties across the board with a bare minimum of exceptions. Yet the legislation provided for detailed hearings by the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Trade Information, industry by industry and item by item.

Hearings were held in fact and they ran for 4 months and evidence was taken from some 800 witnesses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if Congress had intended a 50-percent tariff cut all along the line with a bare minimum of exceptions it could easily have said so. It would not have been necessary to put on a farce in the form of extensive public hearings which as it has turned out, were nothing more than window dressing. The details of an industry's competitive standing in the face of imports is useless information, if the amount of the tariff reduction—that is, 50 percent—is already a foregone conclusion.

There are industries in my State, particularly lace manufacturing, rubber footwear, textiles, and costume jewelry that cannot possibly survive such a drastic tariff reduction. In fact, the rates are already low enough to permit a level of imports that cause injury to the domestic producers. A further tariff reduction would for many companies represent a death sentence.

The present legislation that I am joining with others to introduce would repeat last year's bill quite closely but would add a few additional provisions that would improve the outlook for domestic industry and its workers.

Mr. Speaker, since the legislative intent of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 has been so freely disregarded by the executive branch, it is not only proper but imperative, if the authority of Congress over the regulation of foreign commerce is to be asserted, that we act to provide more specific guidelines.

It will be recalled that the act of 1962 set aside the peril-point provision that had been a part of our trade legislation throughout the 1950's. This provision represented a prudent approach to tariff reduction by requiring the Tariff Commission to determine the level below which any given duty could not be cut without causing or threatening serious injury. This was done before negotiations began and the peril points found by the Commission were useful as guides to our negotiators in Geneva.

This precautionary measure was eliminated in 1962. The elimination probably was interpreted by the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations as giving him free rein to cut all items 50 percent. That such an interpretation is not justtified follows from the hearings requirement that I have already mentioned.

To repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is therefore incumbent on the Congress to make its will more specific, to let it be known, for example, that when public hearings are provided for they are to be held for a reason, that reason being to provide a guide to our negotiators.

Section 221 of the act relates to "Tariff Commission Advice" to the President. In preparation for this advice the Commission is instructed under subsection (c) of that section to investigate the conditions, causes, and effects relating to foreign competition between the foreign industries producing the article in question; analyze the production, trade, and consumption of each like or directly competitive article, etc. The purpose was to advise the President of the Commission's judgment as to the probable economic effect of modifications of duties or other import restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask whether this language equates with a 50 percent reduction of duties with a bare minimum of exceptions. It seems to be clear enough that this was not meant. The conclusion is reenforced by the further instructions to the Commission. Paragraph 2 of Subsection (c) just quoted from requires the Commission to analyze the production, trade and consumption of each like or directly competitive article, taking into consideration employment, profit levels, and use of productive facilities with respect to the domestic industries concerned, and of such economic factors in such industries as it considers relevant, including prices, wages, sales, inventories, patterns of demand, capital investment, obsolescence of equipment, and diversification of production.

That is a large order, Mr. Speaker, but I have not even exhausted the instructions laid down. I have certainly presented enough of them to show how preposterous was the action of the President's Special Representative in agreeing to a flat 50 percent tariff reduction with "a bare minimum of exceptions." This agreement was made after the hearings had been finished, over 2 years ago. It was made with the other members of GATT—"The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade."

It is obvious from this highhanded procedure that a great impatience exists among those charged with carrying out the negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act to move as rapidly as possible toward dismantling our tariff in virtual disregard of the possible effect on domestic industry and employment. This impatience presumably accounts for the flouting of the congressional intent.

Only slowly is it becoming known that the highly touted adjustment assistance provisions of the 1962 act has run a record of complete negative results. The Tariff Commission has disposed of 17 cases, brought by industry, labor and individual companies seeking relief. Not one case has survived the Commission's proceedings. All but one were found by unanimous vote not to meet the requirements of the law. Complaints have been aimed at the Commission as a result of this record, but the onerous requirements of the law represented a decided tightening of the preceding legislation. When

it is remembered that even under the previous less onerous requirements the Tariff Commission found negatively in about two cases out of three, it should not have surprised anyone that the tighter conditions for relief laid down in the act of 1962 would beget a higher record of negative results. The record of 17 to 0 is very impressive indeed and it calls for modification of the law.

The legislation I am offering with others would eliminate the offending word "major" that was inserted into the act of 1962, substituted for the words "in whole or in part" of the previous legislation, to make a finding of serious injury more difficult. A tariff reduction must be the major cause of increased imports and the increased imports must be the major cause of the injury.

The proposed legislation would in effect establish a new style of peril point by providing that no product that is imported to the extent of at least 7½ percent of domestic production and has increased as much as 75 percent since 1958 would be subjected to another tariff cut under the present negotiations; or if imports already supply as much as 20 percent of the domestic market, while the number of production workers in the domestic industry has declined since 1958, no further tariff cut would be permitted. There are a few other criteria that, if met by imports of a particular product, would remove that item from the President's authorization to cut the tariff.

This part would not be automatic, but would be mandatory if any industry including a group of workers, applying to the Tariff Commission were found to meet one or more of the criteria. The Commission would certify this as a fact to the President who must then remove the item from the list of items subject to a tariff cut.

Mr. Speaker, in thus substituting the judgment of Congress for that of the executive branch the Congress would be in the position of exercising its constitutional responsibility. The items that would remain on the list, by far the great majority, in fact, would still be subject to tariff reduction. The Congress would simply say that in its judgment no further tariff cut is justified when imports have amply demonstrated their ability to enter this market and rise to certain specified levels; or if they would conflict with an agricultural program or legislation designed to assist our fisheries.

The present bill, recognizing the great impact made by rising imports on the domestic industries that are vulnerable to such competition, leading to feverish automation and rapid movement of investments abroad, would make possible the imposition of moderate import quotas to hold imports within reasonable limits, such as the average imports of the past 3 years, with a leeway for increased imports in proportion to increases in domestic consumption.

The wide gap that still separates American wages from those paid in other countries represents the single principal cause of the difficulties encountered by our industries in competing with imports. It was hoped that this wage gap would soon close but that hope has little reality behind it. In order to close the gap wages in this country must stand still 10 to 20 years, if not longer.

Those who press so eagerly for tariff reduction must sooner or later come out into the open and accept the implications of their position. The high wage policy of this country has neither been an accident nor has it been without beneficial fruit in the form of an abundant consumer purchasing power. What indeed is the source of the idea that holds that we can maintain our position when we are battered by low-cost goods from abroad; especially when it is incontrovertible that the low foreign costs come from the lower wages paid there? I ask what is the source of such a view because the connection between low foreign wages and destructive effect of many imports is too clear to escape detection.

The productivity of other countries has been rising phenomenally and this fact has given all the greater effect to their lower wages. There is not a company in Rhode Island, I daresay, that could not compete with imports from anywhere else in the world if it could substitute the foreign level of wages for the domestic.

Where then do we stand? Are we in favor of the high wage standards of this country, which provide the great volume of purchasing power needed to keep our factories producing and our workers employed, or do we wish to shake them down or hold them back so that other countries can catch up with us? Who believes on mature reflection that this would be a tenable or defensible policy? It is about time that we looked some facts in the face. Our system is away out front in costs of production and it cannot remedy this situation without carrying automation far past its present pace; and this would displace millions of workers beyond those already being menaced.

The trouble is that we have lost beyond recall the technological leadership that permitted us in the past to sit on a wage plateau surrounded by less productive economies. The lower wages of other countries were not too dangerous then because of the technological backwardness of our competitors. That day is gone and we should ourselves not be too backward to recognize its far-reaching implications. The effects are beginning to show unmistakably and they will demonstrate their relentlessness as time goes on.

We need a fresh new look at our foreign trade policy. The urgency is here and it is becoming more pressing each year. The proposed legislation is in the nature of a holding operation rather than a final solution; but I regard the need for it as compelling and entitled to a high priority. I believe that temporizing would be a mistake that would be greatly regretted later.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DYAL, for July 30 and 31, August 1 and 2, 1965, on acount of official business.

Mr. REDLIN, for an indefinite period, on account of critical illness of his mother.

Mr. RONCALIO, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD), for 2 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, July 29, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, following the remarks of Mr. GOODELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.
Mr. GROSS.
Mr. HALL.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. MORSE in three instances.
Mr. HALPERN in three instances.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
Mr. LINDSAY in five instances.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM and to include extraneous matter in his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today.
Mr. AYRES.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. CLEVELAND.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.
Mr. FINDLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. ROONEY of New York in two instances.
Mr. CALLAN in two instances.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. MULTER in three instances.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
Mr. HÉBERT.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in five instances.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.
Mr. DENT in three instances.
Mr. DYAL in three instances.
Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.
Mr. ICHORD.
Mr. DULSKI.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mrs. MINK.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. MATSUNAGA.