

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15213

My resolution will implement it by authorizing the committee created to determine the number of persons in the several States whose right to vote in any election covered by the amendment has been abridged and upon the basis of those findings to determine the number of Representatives to the House to which each State shall be entitled.

The resolution further directs the committee to utilize the services of the Civil Rights Commission and the Bureau of the Census in obtaining its findings and in making its determinations. The resolution directs the committee to certify its findings to the House by March 1, 1964. If, 60 days after the submission of their findings, the House has not expressly disapproved it, the findings shall then take effect as a determination by the House of the number of Representatives for each State who qualify, in accordance with the 14th amendment, for membership in the House in the 89th Congress.

If we are to broaden democracy and include all of our eligible citizens in the democratic process the provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment should be implemented. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SALARY INCREASES

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of H.R. 7814, to increase Federal Civil Service Employee salaries:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 7814

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in behalf of H.R. 7814, which proposes a Federal salary increase to be effective on January 1, 1964. This legislation is urgently needed in spite of the fact that the second phase of the salary increase provided in the Salary Reform Act of last year will become effective on that date.

Last year's legislation was the first Federal pay legislation which specifically embraced the principle of comparability; that is, that Federal salaries should be comparable to salaries received in private enterprise for jobs having similar duties and responsibilities. The act provides that the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall make annual surveys of the rates of compensation for similar positions in the Federal Government and in private industry. Congress is then to use these statistics as a guide to keeping Government salaries in line with nongovernmental salaries.

The second step of last year's pay raise, which will take effect January 1, unless superseded by new legislation, is a step in the right direction, but was necessarily written without the benefit of the first of the BLS surveys. We now have an opportunity of correcting that situation. The results of this first survey were published in March of this year. It is only fair that we now revise the salary schedule in the light of the BLS findings, and bring Government salaries into line with the principle of comparability which we so warmly espoused in last year's

legislation. This is the time to assure Federal employees that we are indeed concerned with their financial welfare, and will live up to the standards which we set less than a year ago.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty facing us in considering a revision of the second phase of the salary increases provided for by last year's act is the timelag between the BLS statistics and the actual implementation of the new rates. The spirit of the comparability principle and natural considerations of equity require that the lapse of time be held to the minimum possible. This is the reason for the introduction of the bills we are considering today.

By our actions in this first year's test we can demonstrate that the Government has sincerely committed itself to the twin proposition of fair treatment of its employees and adequate compensation for recruitment and retention purposes.

The BLS statistics were collected during the period 1961-62. These statistics show that private enterprise salary rates increased in 1961-62, and there is no reason to believe that they have not continued to increase since that time.

The cost of living has also continued to rise. If Federal employees are to continue to make ends meet without undue difficulty, we must use our knowledge of present and future economic conditions to correct what could become an intolerable situation.

We have the finest civil service in the world, and we must make it clear that we intend to keep it that way. The necessity of competing with private industry for the best talent available should act as a stimulus to keep Government rates of compensation at a desirable level. Public service provides many intangible rewards to the dedicated employee, but it is highly unfair to ask that the Federal employee be satisfied with less than his counterpart in private enterprise—he can't raise his family on intangibles.

It is a fact that quality in this world, in any field, does not come cheaply. Private enterprise has long recognized this, and the Federal Government, in its legislation of last year, is just beginning to put this into practice.

The Federal Establishment has an urgent need for more and better qualified applicants for its multitude of jobs. The new and continuing challenges of the decades to come will provide an outlet for the talents of many thousands of workers. Never before has a National Government been faced with such an array of possible courses of action in so many fields of human endeavor.

Our action on these proposed salary increases is vitally important to the future. If we do not act now, thus reaffirming our confidence in our Federal employees, we may well find ourselves without the needed competent personnel in the days ahead.

President Kennedy described last year's Salary Reform Act as "the most important Federal employee pay legislation in 40 years." I do not agree with his evaluation—I believe that this year's pay legislation is the most important Federal employee pay legislation in 40 years. This is the crucial year—are we merely going to give lip service to the principles set forth in last year's act, or are we going to establish now, once and for all, a Federal salary policy which is in line with the 20th century?

The administration has also sent us a bill to adjust the salary schedules which are presently to take effect on the first of next year. The administration bill proposes increases which range from 2 percent to about 20 percent, and average slightly more than 3 percent. Because of the time difference, however, I am in favor of the more liberal H.R. 7814, which amends the President's plan to give employees in the low grades an additional 6 percent, which I feel is fully justified since private salaries have, as men-

tioned previously, continued to rise since the BLS surveys.

H.R. 7814 does not propose to raise the salaries of the top grades as much as the administration's bill does. The reason for this is because, in accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a study of Federal executive pay has just been completed. It is, of course, highly desirable, in the interests of equity and the solution of pressing problems in professional and administrative staffing, to achieve full comparability rates for all grades as soon as possible. As soon as the results of this report, prepared by a high-level citizens committee headed by Clarence Randall, can be evaluated a further revision of executive salaries will be proposed.

Another piece of legislation being considered by the committee at this time is H.R. 4800. I strongly favor incorporating its provisions into the overall pay legislation which we have been discussing.

This bill proposes to correct defects of last year's legislation with regard to certain postal service employees. It provides that employees in the first six grades of the postal field service who satisfactorily complete a specified period of service at one step would automatically move up to the next step within the grade. The passage of this legislation would be of great value to these employees, and I strongly favor its passage.

I urge the committee to give favorable consideration to these proposals, whose passage would assure Federal employees of our continued support for their fine work and loyalty.

(Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ASHLEY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 10, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962, ITS RECORD TO DATE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. WHITENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have discussed the subject of imports and textiles. Today I think is a very significant day on which to consider this particular problem in the economic life of our country. I say that today is significant because this is the day when an announcement was made of an arrangement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan with reference to textiles.

15214

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 27

Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of a release from the State Department just an hour or so ago. While I have not had an opportunity to thoroughly study it, I feel that it is of such importance that it should be made a part of the RECORD on this day.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may make this release by the Department of State a part of my remarks at this point, as well as the data attached to the release.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE BILATERAL TEXTILE ARRANGEMENT

The Governments of the United States and Japan today announced the conclusion of a bilateral arrangement covering trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States for the period 1963 through 1965. The purpose of this arrangement is to provide for the orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States. The notes effecting the arrangement, which was negotiated under article 4 of the Geneva Long-Term Arrangements Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles of February 9, 1962, were exchanged today by Ambassador Ryuji Takeuchi and Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs G. Griffith Johnson. Representatives of the Departments of State, Commerce, and Labor participated in the negotiations with the Embassy of Japan and with other representatives of the Japanese Government. Principal features of the bilateral arrangement are as follows:

1. For calendar year 1963 the level of Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States, as listed in annex A to the arrangement, is 287.5 million square yards equivalent. Within this aggregate limit, limits or ceilings are also provided for particular categories and groups of textiles.

2. The overall limit, and the limits or ceilings on groups and categories, will be increased by 3 percent for calendar year 1964, and these levels will be increased by 5 percent for calendar year 1965.

3. The two Governments will exchange such statistical data on cotton textiles as are required for the effective implementation of the arrangement. A set of conversion factors is specified in annex C of the arrangement to express various categories of cotton textiles in terms of a square yard equivalent.

4. The two Governments agree on procedures that would be applied in the event that an excessive concentration of Japanese exports of any particular product of cotton textiles, for which no limit or ceiling is specified, or of end items made from a particular type of fabric, should cause or threaten to cause disruption of the U.S. market.

5. The two Governments also agree on procedures which would be applied in the event that questions should arise concerning certain items not included in annex A of the arrangement.

6. The two Governments also agree to consult on any problem that may arise during the term of the arrangement.

Except as otherwise provided by the arrangement, the terms and provisions of the long-term arrangements will continue to be applicable to the trade between Japan and the United States in cotton textiles.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 27, 1963.

His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your note of today's date and

the bilateral arrangement attached thereto concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States which reads as follows:

"EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the recent discussions held in Washington by the representatives of the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, and to confirm on behalf of the Government of Japan, the understandings reached between the two Governments that, pursuant to the provisions of article 4 of the Long-Term Arrangements Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles done at Geneva on February 9, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as 'the long-term arrangements'), permitting 'mutually acceptable arrangements on other terms not inconsistent with the basic objectives of this arrangement,' and with a view to providing for orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, the bilateral arrangement attached hereto will be applied by the two Government for the period of 3 years beginning January 1, 1963, subject to the provisions thereof.

"I have further the honor to request you to be good enough to confirm the foregoing understandings on behalf of the Government of the United States.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration."

I have further the honor to confirm the foregoing understandings on behalf of the Government of the United States of America.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

FOR THE SECRETARY OF STATE:

Washington.

WASHINGTON, August 27, 1963.

His Excellency, DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State of the United States of America.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the recent discussions held in Washington by the representatives of the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, and to confirm, on behalf of the Government of Japan, the understandings reached between the two Governments that, pursuant to the provisions of article 4 of the Long-Term Arrangements Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles done at Geneva on February 9, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as 'the long-term arrangements'), permitting "mutually acceptable arrangements on other terms not inconsistent with the basic objectives of this arrangement," and with a view to providing orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, the bilateral arrangement attached hereto will be applied by the two Governments for the period of 3 years beginning January 1, 1963, subject to the provisions thereof.

I have further the honor to request you to be good enough to confirm the foregoing understandings on behalf of the Government of the United States.

I avail myself to this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CONCERNING TRADE IN COTTON TEXTILES BETWEEN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

Pursuant to the provisions of article 4 of the long-term arrangements, permitting "mutually acceptable arrangements on other terms not inconsistent with the basic objectives of this arrangement," the following arrangement will be applied by the two Governments for the period of 3 years begin-

ning January 1, 1963, subject to the provisions herein.

1. The purpose of this arrangement is to provide for orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States. To achieve this purpose:

a. The U.S. Government shall cooperate with the Japanese Government in promoting orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, and

b. The Japanese Government will maintain, for the period of 3 years beginning January 1, 1963, an annual aggregate limit for exports of cotton textiles to the United States, and annual limits for major groups and annual limits or ceilings for certain products within those groups, subject to the provisions of this arrangement.

2. The annual aggregate limit for 1963 shall be 287.5 million square yards. This limit shall be subdivided into four major groups as follows:

	Million square yards
Group I, cotton cloth.....	125.5
Group II, made up goods, usually included in U.S. cotton broad woven goods production.....	41.0
Group III, apparel.....	111.0
Group IV, miscellaneous cotton textiles.....	10.0
Total.....	287.5

Within these major groups, annual limits or ceilings for specific products are set forth in annex A. Within the annual aggregate limit, the limits for groups I, II, III, and IV may be exceeded by not more than 5 percent, provided that this provision for "flexibility" shall permit an increase only in the "other" categories referred to in each group in annex A.

Each group set forth above shall be deemed to contain the following categories which are defined in annex B:

Group I, categories 5 through 27.
Group II, categories 28 through 36, and part of category 64.

Group III, categories 39 through 62, and part of category 63.

Group IV, categories 1 through 4, 37, 38, and part of categories 63 and 64.

3. The aggregate limit for 1964 shall be increased by 3-percent over the limit for 1963. The aggregate limit for 1965 shall be increased by 5 percent over the limit for 1964. These increases for 1964 and 1965 shall be applied to each limit for the groups and to each limit or ceiling within the groups.

4. Wherever it is necessary for the purposes of this arrangement to convert units other than square yards (e.g., dozens, pieces, pounds, etc.) into square yard equivalents, the conversion into equivalent square yards shall be at the rates specified in annex C.

5. a. The two Governments undertake to consult whenever there is any question arising from the implementation of this arrangement.

b. If instances of excessive concentration of Japanese exports in any products within the scope of this arrangement, except those included in categories for which limits or ceilings are specified in annex A, or if instances of excessive concentration of Japanese exports of end products made from a particular type of fabric should cause or threaten to cause disruption of the U.S. domestic market, the United States Government may request in writing consultations with the Japanese Government to determine an appropriate course of action. Such a request shall be accompanied by a detailed, factual statement of the reasons and justification for the request, including relevant data on imports from third countries. During the course of such consultations, the Japanese Government will maintain exports in the products in question on a quarterly basis at

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15215

annual levels not in excess of 105 percent of the exports of such products during the first 12 months of the 15-month period prior to the month in which consultations are requested or at annual levels not in excess of 90 percent of the exports of such products during the 12 months prior to the month in which consultations are requested, whichever is higher.

c. The provisions in subparagraph b above should only be resorted to sparingly. In the event that the Japanese Government considers that the substance of annex A would be seriously affected due to the consultations in subparagraph b, the Japanese Government may request that the consultations include a discussion of possible modifications of annex A.

6. The two Governments recognize that the successful implementation of this arrangement depends in large part upon mutual cooperation on statistical questions. Accordingly, each government agrees to supply promptly any available statistical data requested by the other government. In particular, the United States Government shall supply the Japanese Government with data on monthly imports of cotton textiles from Japan as well as from third countries, and the Japanese Government shall supply the United States Government with data on monthly exports of cotton textiles to the United States.

7. As regards products in any category under specific limits or ceilings specified in this arrangement, the U.S. Government shall keep under review the effect of this arrangement with a view to orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, and shall furnish the Japanese Government once a year with available statistics and other relevant data on imports, production and consumption of such products such as would clarify the impact of imports on the industry concerned.

8. If the Japanese Government considers that as a result of limits and ceilings specified in this arrangement Japan is being placed in an inequitable position vis-a-vis a third country, the Japanese Government may request consultations with the U.S. Government with a view to taking appropriate remedial action such as a reasonable modification of this arrangement.

9. The two Governments understand that the terms and conditions of the long-term arrangements shall be applicable to trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States except as provided in this arrangement. The U.S. Government agrees that insofar as the exports from Japan of the products falling within the scope of annex A of this arrangement are conducted within the framework thereof the U.S. Government shall not invoke article 3 of the long-term arrangements with respect to such products.

10. a. This arrangement shall continue in force through December 31, 1965, provided that either Government may terminate this arrangement prior thereto effective at the beginning of a calendar year by giving 60 days' written notice to the other Government.

b. Each Government may at any time propose modification of this arrangement. The other Government shall give sympathetic consideration to such proposal.

ANNEX A

1. a. The following specific limits shall apply within the total annual limit of 125.5 million square yards for Group I—"cotton cloth":

	Thousand square yards
(1) Gingham (categories 5 and 6)	46,200
(2) Velveteens (category 7)	2,750
(3) Typewriter ribbon cloth (category 17)	987
(4) All other fabrics (categories 8 through 16 and 18 through 27)	75,563

b. Within the specific limit for "ginghams, combed" (category 6) shall not exceed 75 percent of the above specific limit.

c. Within "all other fabrics," the following specific ceilings shall not be exceeded:

	Thousand square yards
(1) Sheeting (categories 9 and 10)	30,000
(2) Poplin and broadcloth (categories 15 and 16)	30,000
(3) Print cloth, shirting type, 80 x 80 type, carded yarn (category 18)	20,000
(4) Other shirting (categories 19, 20 and 21)	32,000
(5) Twill and sateen (categories 22 and 23)	39,000
(6) Yarn-dyed fabrics, n.e.s. (categories 24 and 25 and part of category 32)	29,000
(7) Duck (part of categories 26 and 27)	1,750

d. Any shortfall below the limits specified in (1), (2), and (3) of paragraph 1a may be transferred to (4)—"all other fabrics."

e. Within "all other fabrics" total exports of fabrics made from combed warp and filling shall not exceed 34.65 million square yards.

f. Within "yard-dyed fabrics," total exports of handkerchief cloth shall not exceed 2.25 million square yards.

2. a. The following specific limits shall apply within the total annual limit of 41 million yards for group II—"Made-up goods, usually included in U.S. cotton broad woven goods production":

	Unit	Number
1. Pillowcases, plain (categories 28 and 29)	1,000	5,400.0
2. Dish towels (category 30)	1,000	7,200.0
3. Handkerchiefs, except for dedicated handkerchief cloth (part of category 32)	1,000 dozen	1,260.0
4. Table damask and manufactures (category 33)	1,000 pounds	3,100.0
5. Sheets (categories 34 and 35)	1,000	2,940.0
6. All other made-up goods (categories 31, 36, and part of category 64 as specified in par. 5, below)	1,000 square yards equivalent	2,494.0

b. Any shortfall below the limits specified in (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) of paragraph 2a may be transferred to (6)—"all other madeup goods".

3. a. The following specific limits shall apply within the total annual limit of 111 million square yards for group III—"apparel":

	Unit	Number
1. Gloves and mittens (category 39)	1,000 dozen	472.5
2. T-shirts, knit (categories 41 and 42)	do	535.0
3. Knit shirts, except in T and sweatshirts (category 43)	do	809.0
4. Men's and boys' dress shirts, not knit (category 45)	do	382.0
5. Sport shirts, whether or not in sets, not knit (category 46)	do	717.5
6. Raincoats, ¾ length or over (category 48)	do	60.0
7. All other coats (category 49)	do	120.0
8. Trousers, slacks, and shorts, outer, whether or not in sets, not knit (categories 50 and 51)	do	1,500.0
9. Blouses, whether or not in sets (category 52)	do	1,775.0
10. Dresses, not knit (category 53)	do	45.0
11. Playsuits, sun suits, wash suits, rompers, creepers, etc. (category 54)	do	180.0
12. Nightwear and pajamas (category 60)	do	120.0
13. All other apparel (categories 40, 44, 47, 55 through 59, and 61, 62, and part of category 63 as specified in par. 5, below)	1,000 square yards equivalent	1,428.0

b. Any shortfall below the limits specified in (1) through (12) of paragraph 3a may be transferred to (13)—"all other apparel".

c. Within the specific limit of 1.5 million dozen for "trousers, slacks and shorts, outer, whether or not in sets, not knit", the following specific ceilings shall not be exceeded:

	Unit	Number
1. Men's and boys' (category 50)	1,000 dozen	500.0
2. Women's, misses', and children's (category 51)	do	1,162.5

d. The aggregate volume of exports of the following apparel items manufactured of corduroy, where the chief weight of the item is corduroy, shall be limited to 21.35 million square yards equivalent based upon the conversion factors for the items in question which appear in annex C.

Category No.:	Description
46	Sport shirts.
48	Raincoats.
49	All other coats.
50-51	Trousers.
54	Playsuits.

4. a. The following specific limits shall apply within the total annual limit of 10 million square yards for Group IV—"Miscellaneous cotton textiles":

	Unit	Number
1. Zipper tapes, not elsewhere specified (U.S. "schedule A"), No. 3230 273.	1,000 pounds	810
2. Other (categories 1 through 4, 37, 38, and parts of categories 63 and 64 as specified in par. 5, below).	1,000 square yards equivalent	6,274

b. Any shortfall below the limit specified in (1) in paragraph 4a may be transferred to (2)—"Other".

5. With regard to categories 63 and 64 referred to in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 above, the following items or products as identified by present U.S. "Schedule A" numbers or parts thereof shall be included:

Category 63 (to be included in group III except as noted otherwise):

3113 000 ¹	3114 225
3113 362	3114 235
3113 365	3114 240
3113 958 ¹	3114 245
3113 962 ¹	3114 255
3113 965	3114 715 ¹
3113 969	3115 720 ¹
3113 970	3114 895
3113 971	3114 900
3113 972	3114 905
3113 973	3114 925
3113 974	3114 950
3113 975	3114 955
3113 995	Part of:
3114 001	3113 997 ²
3114 155	3113 998 ²
3114 165	3114 260 ²
3114 175	3114 960 ²
3114 180	3114 965 ²

I.E.: Pullovers, aprons, altar cassocks, beach wear sets, swim wear, baseball uniforms, sleeping bags for infants, halters, men's and boys' coveralls and overalls, diaper sets, scarves, dress shields,¹ sash belts,¹ apparel with bib, bibs,¹ belts for apparel,¹ and shoulder straps for brassieres.¹

Category 64 (to be included in group IV except as noted otherwise) (excluding in sets):

3030 000	3081 600
3030 100	3081 710 ²
3081 510	3081 730 ²
3081 530	3081 812 ²

Footnotes at end of list.

3081 815 ¹	3168 004
3081 818	3168 005
3081 852 ²	3168 006
3081 855 ²	3168 007
3081 858	3168 008
3081 912 ²	3168 009
3081 915 ²	3168 010
3081 918 ²	3200 012 ²
3083 500 ²	3200 015 ²
3083 700 ²	3200 400 ²
3083 900 ²	3220 130 ²
3084 112 ²	3220 202 ²
3084 400 ²	3220 205 ²
3086 600 ²	3220 207 ²
3086 730	3220 212 ²
3118 200 ²	3220 862
3124 200 ²	3220 865
3134 200 ²	3220 868
3144 200 ²	3224 000
3154 200 ²	3224 050
3158 020 ²	3224 100
3158 120 ²	3224 150
3159 020 ²	3224 200
3159 120 ²	3224 300
3163 001	3224 500
3163 002	3230 240
3163 003	3230 273
3163 004	3230 350
3163 005	3230 401
3163 006	3230 410
3163 580 ²	3230 431
3163 600 ²	3230 500 ²
3163 690 ²	3230 682 ²
3166 000	3230 685 ²
3166 200	3230 688 ²
3166 300	3903 300
3166 692	3969 010
3166 695	3230 232
3168 001	3230 235
3168 002	3230 278
3168 003	9439 950

¹ These items or products shall be included in group IV.

² These items shall be included in group II.

³ The two Governments shall consult as to whether or not any product other than the 17 products enumerated below the footnoted items may be classified as an addition to these items. Such consultations shall not cover shoe uppers, Japan items, belts (other than sash belts and belts for apparel), suspenders and braces.

ANNEX B

Definition of cotton textile categories—list of categories and unit

1. Cotton yarn, singles, carded, not ornamented, etc.: pounds.
2. Cotton yarn, plied, carded, not ornamented, etc.: pounds.
3. Cotton yarn, singles, combed, not ornamented, etc.: pounds.
4. Cotton yarn, plied, combed, not ornamented, etc.: pounds.
5. Gingham, carded yard: square yards.
6. Gingham, combed yard: square yards.
7. Velveteens: square yards.
8. Corduroy: square yards.
9. Sheeting, carded yarn: square yards.
10. Sheeting, combed yarn: square yards.
11. Lawns, carded yarn: square yards.
12. Lawns, combed yarn: square yards.
13. Voiles, carded yarn: square yards.
14. Voiles, combed yarn: square yards.
15. Poplin and broadcloth, carded yarn: square yards.
16. Poplin and broadcloth, combed yarn: square yards.
17. Typewriter ribbon cloth: square yards.
18. Print cloth, shirting type, 80x80 type, carded yarn: square yards.
19. Print cloth, shirting type, other than 80x80 type, carded yarn: square yards.
20. Shirting, carded yarn: square yards.
21. Shirting, combed yarn: square yards.
22. Twill and sateen, carded yarn: square yards.
23. Twill and sateen, combed yarn: square yards.
24. Yarn-dyed fabrics, n.e.s., carded yarn: square yards.

25. Yarn-dyed fabrics, n.e.s., combed yarn: square yards.

26. Fabrics, n.e.s., carded yarn: square yards

27. Fabrics, n.e.s., combed yarn: square yards.

28. Pillowcases, plain, carded yarn: numbers.

29. Pillowcases, plain combed yarn: numbers.

30. Dish towels: numbers.

31. Towels, other than dish towels: numbers.

32. Handkerchiefs: dozen.

33. Table damasks and manufactures: pounds.

34. Sheets, carded yarn: numbers.

35. Sheets, combed yarn: numbers.

36. Bedspreads, including quilts: numbers.

37. Braided and woven elastics: pounds.

38. Fishing nets: pounds.

39. Gloves and mittens: dozen.

40. Hose and half hose: dozen pairs.

41. Men's and boys' all white tee shirts, knit or crocheted: dozen.

42. Other tee shirts: dozen.

43. Knitshirts, other than tee shirts and sweatshirts (including infants): dozen.

44. Sweaters and cardigans: dozen.

45. Men's and boys' shirts, dress, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

46. Men's and boys' shirts, sport, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

47. Men's and boys' shirts, work, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

48. Raincoats, three-quarter length or over: dozen.

49. All other coats: dozen.

50. Men's and boys' trousers, slacks and shorts, outer, whether or not in sets, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

51. Women's, misses' and children's trousers, slacks and shorts, outer, whether or not in sets, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

52. Blouses, whether or not in sets: dozen.

53. Women's, misses', children's and infants' dresses (including nurses' and other uniform dresses), not knit or crocheted: dozen.

54. Playsuits, sunsuits, washsuits, creepers, rompers, etc. (except blouses and shorts; blouses and trousers; or blouses, shorts, and skirt sets): dozen.

55. Dressing gowns, including bathrobes and beachrobes, lounging gowns, dusters and housecoats, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

56. Men's and boys' undershirts (not tee shirts): dozen.

57. Men's and boys' briefs and undershorts: dozen.

58. Drawers, shorts and briefs (except men's and boys' briefs), knit or crocheted: dozen.

59. All other underwear, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

60. Nightwear and pajamas: dozen.

61. Brassieres and other body supporting garments: dozen.

62. Other knitted or crocheted clothing: units or pounds.

63. Other clothing, not knit or crocheted: units or pounds.

64. All other cotton textile items: units or pounds.

ANNEX C

Conversion factors

Category No.	Unit	Conversion factor
1.....	Pound.....	4.6
2.....	do.....	4.6
3.....	do.....	4.6
4.....	do.....	4.6
28.....	Number.....	1.084
29.....	do.....	1.084
30.....	do.....	.348
31.....	do.....	.348
32.....	Dozen.....	1.66
33.....	Pound.....	3.17
34.....	Number.....	6.2
35.....	do.....	6.2
36.....	do.....	6.9

Conversion factors—Continued

Category No.	Unit	Conversion factor
37.....	Pound.....	4.6
38.....	do.....	4.6
39.....	Dozen.....	3.527
40.....	do.....	4.6
41.....	do.....	7.234
42.....	do.....	7.234
43.....	do.....	7.234
44.....	do.....	36.8
45.....	do.....	22.186
46.....	do.....	24.457
47.....	do.....	22.186
48.....	do.....	50.0
49.....	do.....	32.5
50.....	do.....	17.797
51.....	do.....	17.797
52.....	do.....	14.53
53.....	do.....	45.3
54.....	do.....	25.0
55.....	do.....	51.0
56.....	do.....	9.2
57.....	do.....	11.25
58.....	do.....	5.0
59.....	do.....	16.0
60.....	do.....	51.96
61.....	do.....	4.75
62.....	Pound.....	4.6
63.....	do.....	4.6
64.....	do.....	4.6

¹ Floor coverings shall be measured by actual square yardages.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., August 27, 1963.

His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan,
Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: With reference to annex A of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States affected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to state the understandings of my Government that if any problem arises regarding the classification in the implementation of the arrangement, the two governments shall consult each other with a view to finding an appropriate solution. Particularly, when questions arise whether certain products fall within the scope of annex A, the two Governments shall study such questions taking into account, inter alia, such international standards as B.T.N. and S.I.T.C.

In view of the fact that category definitions may be affected as a result of possible future changes in the U.S. "schedule A," I hereby wish to state further our understandings that such changes shall be promptly notified to the Japanese Government, and that consultations shall be held to make such adjustments in the arrangement as may become necessary as a result of the changes.

I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government.

Sincerely yours,

For the Secretary of State:

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 27, 1963.

HON. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 27, 1963, which reads as follows:

"With reference to annex A of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to state the understandings of my Government that if any problem arises regarding the classification in the implementation of the arrangement, the two Governments shall consult each other with a view to finding an appropriate solution. Particularly, when questions arise whether certain products fall within the scope of annex A, the two Governments shall study such ques-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15217

tions, taking into account, inter alia, such international standards as B.T.N. and S.I.T.C.

"In view of the fact that category definitions may be affected as a result of possible future changes in the U.S. schedule A, I hereby wish to state further our understandings that such changes shall be promptly notified to the Japanese Government, and that consultations shall be held to make such adjustments in the arrangement as may become necessary as a result of the changes.

"I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government."

I wish to confirm on behalf of my Government the understandings set forth in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., August 27, 1963.

His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan,
Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: On the occasion of the exchange of notes with the arrangement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected thereby, I wish to state that there are certain items not included in annex A of the arrangement but which are classified as cotton textiles by the U.S. Government. A list of these items, identified by the U.S. schedule A numbers, is attached to this letter. It is the understanding of the United States Government that the Japanese Government does not consider some of the products within the first 22 items to be cotton textiles and does not consider any of the last 7 items to be cotton textiles.

Nevertheless, in the event imports from Japan in any of the items or products enumerated in the attached list should cause or threaten to cause disruption of the U.S. domestic market, the United States Government may request consultations with the Japanese Government for the purpose of finding an appropriate course of action.

The consultations shall be conducted in the manner provided in paragraph 5 of the arrangement if the item or product in question is considered a cotton textile by the Japanese Government, or in any other manner agreeable to both Governments if the item or product in question is not considered a cotton textile by the Japanese Government. The Japanese Government shall promptly notify the United States Government whether or not it considers the item or product in question to be a cotton textile.

While the U.S. Government agrees and prefers to seek a mutually satisfactory solution through the means mentioned above, it reserves its right, if such a settlement cannot be reached expeditiously, to invoke article 3 of the long-term arrangements regarding international trade in cotton textiles done at Geneva on February 9, 1962, concerning the items or products enumerated in the attached list.

I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government.

Sincerely yours,

For the Secretary of State:

ATTACHMENT

(1) 2061 400	(11) 3230 712
(2) 3224 800	(12) 3970 010
(3) 3224 900	(13) 3971 010
(4) 3226 110	(14) 3971 020
(5) 3226 300	(15) 3971 110
(6) 3230 238	(16) 3971 210
(7) 3230 275	(17) 3971 430
(8) 3230 277	(18) 3113 997 ¹
(9) 3230 352	(19) 3113 998 ¹
(10) 3230 451	(20) 3114 260 ¹

Footnotes at end of list.

(21) 3114 960 ¹	(26) 3224 700
(22) 3114 965 ¹	(27) 3230 461
(23) 2061 000	(28) 3230 670
(24) 2067 610	(29) 9439 950
(25) 2067 710	(in sets only)

¹Part of these items include, i.e., shoe uppers, belts (other than sash belts and belts for apparel), suspenders and braces.

WASHINGTON, August 27, 1963.

HON. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic
Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 27, 1963 which reads as follows:

"On the occasion of the exchange of notes with the arrangement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected thereby, I wish to state that there are certain items not included in annex A of the arrangement, but which are classified as 'cotton textiles' by the U.S. Government. A list of these items, identified by the U.S. 'schedule A' numbers, is attached to this letter. It is the understanding of the U.S. Government that the Japanese Government does not consider some of the products within the first 22 items to be cotton textiles and does not consider any of the last 7 items to be cotton textiles.

"Nevertheless, in the event imports from Japan in any of the items or products enumerated in the attached list should cause or threaten to cause disruption of the U.S. domestic market, the U.S. Government may request consultations with the Japanese Government for the purpose of finding an appropriate course of action.

"The consultations shall be conducted in the manner provided in paragraph 5 of the arrangement if the item or product in question is considered a cotton textile by the Japanese Government, or in any other manner agreeable to both Governments if the item or product in question is not considered a cotton textile by the Japanese Government. The Japanese Government shall promptly notify the U.S. Government whether or not it considers the item or product in question to be a cotton textile.

"While the U.S. Government agrees and prefers to seek a mutually satisfactory solution through the means mentioned above, it reserves its right, if such a settlement cannot be reached expeditiously, to invoke article 3 of the long-term arrangements regarding international trade in cotton textiles, done at Geneva on February 9, 1962, concerning the items or products enumerated in the attached list.

"I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government."

With regard to the above-stated understandings of the U.S. Government, I wish to confirm, on behalf of my Government, that these are also the understandings of the Government of Japan with the following reservation.

In the event the U.S. Government exercises its right to invoke article 3 of the long-term arrangements, the Japanese Government may exercise its rights as an exporting country in accordance with the various relevant provisions of the long-term arrangements, including the right to bring questions of interpretation or application of the long-term arrangements to the GATT Cotton Textiles Committee in accordance with article 8 of the long-term arrangements.

Sincerely yours,

WASHINGTON, August 27, 1963.

HON. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic
Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: With reference to annex A of the arrangement between the Gov-

ernment of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to state our understanding that the exports of uniquely Japanese products called Japan items shall not be included in annex A of the arrangement. The attachment to this letter provides for the definition of "Japan items" and enumerates those products which have been and are likely to be exported to the United States as "Japan items". Additional items may be added to the above attachment through agreement after consultations as may become necessary in the future.

It is further understood that the exports of "Japan items" shall be made with certification by the Japanese Government. In the event that the United States Government finds that any particular products imported from Japan as "Japan items" should not be properly classified as such, the United States Government may request consultations with the Japanese Government with a view to finding the appropriate classification of the products in question within annex A of the arrangement.

I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government.

Sincerely yours,

ATTACHMENT

1. DEFINITION OF "JAPAN ITEMS"

"Japan items" to be kept outside annex A of the said arrangement are the items which are uniquely Japanese products. Whether a particular product should be considered as "Japan items" or not will be determined on the basis of the following criterion.

Designed for the use in the traditional Japanese way of life, wearing kimono, living in "Tatami" rooms, decorating for traditional Japanese ceremonies or festivals, playing Japanese sports, etc. In other words, not in use in the regular western way of life except for hobbies or special likings.

2. LIST OF "JAPAN ITEMS"

The names of the items which have been and are likely to be exported as "Japan items" are as follows:

(a) Cloth

Kimono: Traditional Japanese style dress.
Yukata: A type of kimono, summer-wear made of Yukata-Ji (plain-woven light fabrics printed in simple colors).

Juban: Underwear for kimono, fundamentally same style as kimono.

Haori: Overcoat for kimono, usually less than three-fourth length.

Wafukukoto: Raincoat or duster coat to be worn over kimono, basically same style as kimono, different from haori in not being open in front and longer than three-fourth length.

Happi: Workers' overcoat, similar style with haori but not dressy.

Judogi: Kimono-style sports wear for judo, usually accompanied by slim and three-fourth length trousers and by belts.

Kendogi: Kimono-style sports wear for kendo, usually accompanied by Hak ma (men's skirts, full length). Different from judogi in being lighter, tighter and half-sleeves.

Kappogi: Apron to be worn over kimono with broad sleeves, chest and shoulders covered.

Momohiki: Carpenters' or Rikishamen's trousers, often coveralls to be worn in combination with happi. Different from western style trousers in being extremely light and small in lower ends, usually black in color. Combination sets of happi and monohiki are often traded as "carpenter apparel".

Sashiko: Quilted coat which is almost like happi, typically used by firemen.

(b) Clothing accessories

Obi: (1) Wide thick belts for kimono, usually a few inches wide or more. (2) wide, thin belts for men's kimono or Yukata, both longer than Western style belts by a few times; and (3) judo belts, narrow but approximately twice as wide and longer than western style belts, no buckles.

Obishime: Woven decorative belt to be used on top of the obi (1) above.

Tabi: Socks to be worn when one wears "kimono" made of woven fabrics, tightly in the form of foot, having a separate division for the big toe. Reaches just above the ankle and is fastened at the back by means of an overlap having mental hook tabs.

Koshihimo: Narrow, soft belt to be used between obi and kimono, or kimono and juban.

Erisugata: A length of stiff cotton cloth to be sewn inside "eri" collar to give a form or shape.

Sodeguchi: Extra broad sleeves which are based on the short sleeves of juban.

Homaekake: Men's working apron, thick and heavy. Big in size, usually simple in color.

(c) Household goods

Futon: Japanese style bedding, mattress and thick, large blankets. Mattress different from western style in the stuffing much softer and the covering cloth lighter. Blankets are as thick as an inch or more, also with soft stuffing.

Futon-Cover: Cover for "futon". Different from sheets as it covers the stuffing directly, also different in sizes as it is made to contain voluminous stuffing, usually printed or dyed.

Zabuton: Cushion to sit on in Japanese "tatami" rooms. Approximately a yard square, a few inches thick with soft stuffing.

Furoshiki: Wrapping cloth of about 1½-yard square. Different from scarf in the thickness of the fabric.

Koinobori: Artificial carp to fly on top of a long pole on the occasion of "Boys' Festival" in the Japanese custom.

Noren: Shop curtain to hang at the entrance of shops, short, with vertical cuts in several parts.

Tenugui: Oblong towel, woven, usually with Japanese decorative design.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 27, 1963.

His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan, Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 27, 1963, which reads as follows:

"With reference to annex A of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to state our understanding that the exports of uniquely Japanese products called 'Japan items' shall not be included in annex A of the arrangement. The attachment to this letter provides for the definition of 'Japan items' and enumerates those products which have been and are likely to be exported to the United States as 'Japan items.' Additional items may be added to the above attachment through agreement after consultations as may become necessary in the future.

"It is further understood that the exports of 'Japan items' shall be made with certification by the Japanese Government. In the event that the U.S. Government finds that any particular products imported from Japan as 'Japan items' should not be properly classified as such, the U.S. Government may request consultations with the Japanese Government with a view of finding the appropriate classification of the products in question within annex A of the arrangement.

"I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government."

I wish to confirm on behalf of my Government the understanding set forth in your letter.

Sincerely yours,
For the Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 27, 1963.

His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan,
Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: With reference to paragraph 5b of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to inform you of the views and intentions of the U.S. Government:

The U.S. Government recognizes that exports of the end products containing fabrics potentially falling under the so-called concentration clause are themselves subject to limits established in annex A of the arrangement. It further recognizes that changing demands in the U.S. market may, from time to time, lead to changes in the types of fabric appearing in imports into the United States. Considering these and other circumstances, the U.S. Government does not intend to invoke paragraph 5b on any type of fabric except in the case of a sharp and substantial increase from present levels in imports from Japan of that fabric in the form of end items. It is to be understood that a sharp and substantial increase would be considered to apply only in those cases where present levels of imports from Japan of the fabric concerned in the form of end items already are in substantial volume in relation to total consumption in the United States.

In any event, the U.S. Government would give the Japanese Government advance notice prior to any invocation of the clause under discussion.

I should be grateful if you would acknowledge on behalf of your Government the receipt of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

(For the Secretary of State)

WASHINGTON, August 27, 1963.

HON. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic
Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I acknowledge, on behalf of my Government, receipt of your letter of August 27, 1963, which reads as follows:

"With reference to paragraph 5b of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to inform you of the views and intentions of the U.S. Government:

"The U.S. Government recognizes that exports of the end products containing fabrics potentially falling under the so-called concentration clause are themselves subject to limits established in annex A of the arrangement. It further recognizes that changing demands in the U.S. market may, from time to time, lead to changes in the types of fabric appearing in imports into the United States. Considering these and other circumstances, the U.S. Government does not intend to invoke paragraph 5b on any type of fabric except in the case of a sharp and substantial increase from present levels in imports from Japan of that fabric in the form of end items. It is to be understood that a sharp and substantial increase would be considered to

apply only in those cases where present levels of imports from Japan of the fabric concerned in the form of end items already are in substantial volume in relation to total consumption in the United States.

"In any event, the U.S. Government would give the Japanese Government advance notice prior to any invocation of the clause under discussion.

"I should be grateful if you would acknowledge on behalf of your Government the receipt of this letter.

"Sincerely yours,

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the foregoing release and I can say without hesitancy that perhaps there has been no more important bit of news for the people whom I represent than the news contained in this release regarding the arrangement. I wish we could say that a solution has been found to the textile problem. But we cannot find it in any arrangement or agreement that may be made with just one country.

In 1962 when we were considering the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962 I was one of those who voted against the legislation. At that time I had serious concern as to the correctness of my vote. Today I have no concern about it whatever. I am convinced that the vote I cast was correct and in the best interest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, when the trade expansion bill was before Congress last year, one of the prime arguments in its support was based on the adjustment assistance provisions contained in the bill.

These provisions represented a recognition of the damage that might be inflicted on domestic industry as a consequence of the sharp tariff reductions provided for by other sections of the bill. In other words, it was acknowledged that the proposed tariff-slashing program was frankly designed to open our industries to destructive import competition. Such a course was regarded as a necessary undertaking to bolster our international diplomatic policy. This was an unabashed admission that American industry was to serve, at the expense of possible lethal injury, the ends of diplomacy as interpreted by the State Department and the Presidency.

As compensation for such a program of sacrifice, the bill made provision for various kinds of assistance to companies and workers that could satisfy the Tariff Commission and the President that they had been injured as a result in major part of increased imports caused in turn in major part by a tariff reduction.

This compensation was to be in the form of technical, financial, and tax assistance, so far as firms are concerned, and in the form of special payments to workers for retraining, relocation, and so forth, so far as assistance to workers is concerned.

By following such a course, industries could be reorientated in point of production to get out of the way of competitive imports and vacate the ground to them. Imports would have the right of way as emissaries of economic goodwill from other countries. We would not in the least contest their progress. We would automatically recognize the right of imports to capture our market from our

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15219

own industries on the very simple proposition that our industries convict themselves of inefficiency by their inability to compete. We have thus announced our willingness to vacate one industrial premise after another in deference to the ability of other countries to lay down goods in this country at prices below the level necessary to keep our industries alive.

While the trade expansion bill was put forward as a friendly gesture to industry and labor that would be victimized, albeit reluctantly, by the trade program, the language providing for the balm was so stringently drawn that in the 10 months since the Trade Act was passed not one cent of compensation has been awarded for technical, financial, or tax assistance to firms or for retraining, relocating and otherwise supporting the victimized workers.

To date no less than 11 cases have been processed by the Tariff Commission under the provisions of the new Trade Act. All 11 have been rejected by the Commission by unanimous vote. Five of the cases were brought by industries, four by the workers in individual companies and two by individual manufacturing firms.

This is the record under the Trade Expansion Act. This is the record made under the language of the bill as insisted on by the State Department.

At the present time the Commission has no new cases before it under the new act. Its docket is empty.

So far as the much-touted adjustment assistance provisions of the law is concerned, it is a dead letter.

The escape clause is dead. It was buried by the new trade bill. Yet the facts are that industries are being hurt as a result of past tariff reductions and face a yet more inhospitable outlook in the future when further cuts are to be made.

I was convinced when the trade bill was before this body that the escape clause would be severely crippled, but I did not believe that it would be completely disemboweled. The record speaks for itself. It would be no cause of surprise if the Tariff Commission's docket should remain empty in this field. Apparently no case can be made under the wording of the new statute.

Why should any industry, firm, or group of workers apply for relief under the record made to date?

The law should be changed radically to make it responsive to the needs of our industries and their workers.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to join my distinguished colleague in the remarks he is making today and commend him, as I have done so often for his continuing fight in behalf of the textile workers of this Nation. I think all of us who have served with him here can testify to the fact that he has been unrelenting in his demand that we retain the textile industry in a healthy economic condition.

I was unable to read the Japanese-American agreement thoroughly because of insufficient time, but I just happened

to think, in keeping with the gentleman's remarks, how many American jobs were given away or sold down the river in this trade agreement which has just been signed. I wonder whether or not this Government is asking those people in the textile plants all over this country if they can find any justification in giving away or selling away or bartering away American jobs. If I were dependent on the textile industry for my livelihood and if that had been my life work, and if I were over 40 years old and knew I could not be rehabilitated very easily, for it is not done anymore, certainly I would feel that my country was not looking after my best interests.

I want to join the gentleman and commend him and say to him, as his friend, his neighbor, and his colleague here in the Congress, that I salute his efforts on this occasion.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman. I say to him as I have said so many times that not only do I appreciate the interest which he has shown and the energy he has exerted in this area but I am sure that the people of my congressional district as well as the people of his own district appreciate his devotion to the cause of preserving the jobs of American people.

I, like the gentleman, have not had an opportunity to analyze thoroughly this Japanese-American arrangement, but I am familiar with some of the basic facts about which the gentleman has been concerned and I would like to mention those briefly at this point.

The U.S. imports of cotton textiles and apparel currently are running at an annual rate of 1.2 billion equivalent square yards. This rate is in excess of the 1.11 billion square yards which entered the country between October 1, 1961, and September 30, 1962. I would point out that this was a period in which imports from free-world countries other than Japan were to be restrained under the provisions of the international cotton textile trade arrangement. The arrangement was an outgrowth of the seven-point program of assistance to the domestic textile industry enunciated by President Kennedy on May 2, 1961. Its objective was to prevent cotton textile and apparel imports from exceeding the fiscal 1961 level of 812 million square yards. But in spite of that arrangement, the import increase was measured at about 37 percent. Meanwhile under U.S. Government cotton price policy, American mills are required to pay about one-third more for U.S. cotton than foreign mills pay for any cotton, including American grown cotton. This situation provides foreign mills with a cotton cost advantage which enables foreign made products to displace U.S. goods in markets both here and abroad.

This briefly is one part of the problem that confronts the American people who earn their living in the textile plants.

A few days ago in reading one of the leading textile publications, the Southern Textile News, I saw this little paragraph which I think is relevant to the discussion in which we are now engaged. It says:

The average wage in the textile industry in the United States as of last December was \$1.69 per hour. Meanwhile the average tex-

tile wage in Japan was 16 cents an hour, in Italy it was 27 cents, France 51 cents, Germany 46 cents, England 68 cents.

See why the United States textile industry is in trouble?

The gentleman from South Carolina and I take little pride in the knowledge that this industry average in America is not in keeping with the industry average, generally. The textile industry is, unfortunately, one of the lower paying industries. The people we represent in North Carolina and South Carolina in the textile area are buying automobiles made by \$3.50 an hour labor on earnings of \$1.69 an hour on the average. This is not the sort of condition we want our people to have to contend with. But, yet, with the type of wage structure that we find in these other countries, as pointed out in the paragraph I just read, it seems inescapable that we will not be able to have the type of wages for our people that we all want them to have unless something is done to halt this great growth in the import trade in the textile field.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. The thought occurs to me in the light of the gentleman's remarks that the American textile worker is a consumer of American goods. But the competing textile worker in Japan, Italy, and France does not buy American goods; he is not a consumer; he is not an American taxpayer; he has sent no sons or daughters to war for this country; he has done nothing to improve the lot of the American citizen of yesterday, today, or tomorrow. They have made so far as I can determine no sacrifice for this great country as have the textile people and their kindred throughout the generations I have known. It is a sad commentary to me that in the process of trade we have abandoned and neglected, and the Government has, you might say, snubbed its nose at these people. They are consumers, and as the gentleman very well points out, if we did not have to compete with these imports, we could pay these people more. They would have more dollars to spend as consumers. They would be occupying a greater and more important place in our economy and in the market places of the country generally.

That is what you and I want for them and what everybody should want for the American citizen. Give him as much consumer power as possible because it is that consumer power that makes the wheels go round.

Mr. WHITENER. I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina has read with the same degree of interest that I read a report on imports of man-made fibers, fabrics, and manufactures which was recently—in fact, on August 6, 1963—prepared by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute. The information contained there is quite shocking, or should be, to all Americans. This, to state it briefly, shows that imports of broad woven fabrics in June 1963 were 28 percent above the same month in 1962 and 101 percent above the corresponding month in 1961. Then when we

15220

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 27

get to man-made fiber fabrics in square yards, the total imports of man-made fiber products were up 14 percent in May 1963 from what they were in May 1962 and showed a 103 percent rise for the same month, that is, the month of May, over 1961. These statistics are so interesting, Mr. Speaker, that I ask unanimous consent to make them a part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The statistics referred to are as follows:

Imports of man-made fibers, fabrics and manufactures¹

Broadwoven Fabrics, in the piece (in square yards)		
	June	January-June
1961.....	3,627,212	17,376,229
1962.....	5,707,326	32,463,991
1963.....	7,284,469	36,367,440

¹ Imports of broadwoven fabrics in June were 28 percent above the same month a year ago and 101 percent above the corresponding month of 1961. January-June figures were 12 and 109 percent above the same period for 1962 and 1961, respectively.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Total imports of man-made fiber fabrics and manufactures (in square yards)¹

	May	January-May
1961.....	6,834,625	41,273,752
1962.....	12,173,865	68,651,758
1963.....	² 13,863,109	70,478,024

¹ Total imports of man-made fibers products were up 14 percent from May 1962, and showed a 103-percent rise from the same month of 1961. January-May figures were 3 percent and 71 percent above the same period for 1962 and 1961, respectively.

² Conversion factor for May: 4.6378 yards.

Sources: Bureau of the Census and Department of Agriculture.

Principal U.S. imports of man-made fibers and manufactures

Item	Unit	1963	
		June	January-June
Yarns:			
Filament yarns, having not more than 20 turns/inch:			
Singles:			
Weighing 150 denier or more:			
Cellulosic.....	Pound.....	29,859	458,328
Noncellulosic.....	do.....	5,951	70,381
Weighing less than 150 denier:			
Cellulosic.....	do.....	65,004	228,220
Noncellulosic.....	do.....	231,809	2,127,192
Plied:			
Weighing 150 denier or more.....	do.....	2,171	11,455
Weighing less than 150 denier.....	do.....	299	971
Spun yarn:			
Singles.....	do.....	57,586	183,929
Plied.....	do.....	34,955	206,632
Fabric, woven, in the piece, total.....	Square yard.....	7,284,469	36,367,440
Grey, not jacquard, total.....	do.....	2,060,336	11,269,076
Acetate.....	do.....	152,693	1,028,748
Rayon, all filaments.....	do.....	171,446	2,003,229
Other rayon.....	do.....	195,896	1,230,372
Polyamide.....	do.....	1,226,252	4,267,228
Polyester.....	do.....	257,684	2,403,339
Other fabrics.....	do.....	56,365	320,660
Finished, not jacquard, total.....	do.....	4,422,030	21,964,165
Acetate.....	do.....	89,641	204,006
Rayon, all filaments.....	do.....	2,100,689	12,268,872
Rayon gingham.....	do.....	271,800	1,583,160
Other rayon.....	do.....	1,396,496	5,528,417
Polyamide.....	do.....	9,485	209,950
Polyester.....	do.....	420,546	1,806,595
Other fabrics.....	do.....	133,373	363,165
Grey, jacquard figured, total.....	do.....	30,277	250,354
Acetate.....	do.....	20,034	116,043
Rayon, all filaments.....	do.....	2,873	6,478
Other rayon.....	do.....	7,370	29,936
Polyamide.....	do.....	0	37,098
Polyester.....	do.....	0	60,131
Other fabrics.....	do.....	0	668
Finished, jacquard figured, total.....	do.....	771,826	2,883,845
Acetate.....	do.....	105,363	324,626
Rayon, all filaments.....	do.....	66,713	343,906
Other rayon.....	do.....	349,050	1,405,969
Polyamide.....	do.....	99,847	174,060
Polyester.....	do.....	120,293	459,950
Other fabrics.....	do.....	30,560	175,334
Pile:			
Pile fabrics.....	do.....	61,800	279,724
Pile ribbons.....	Pound.....	9,653	98,845
Pile articles.....	do.....	4,333	21,060
Fabric, knit, in the piece, total.....	do.....	26,409	107,867
Acetate.....	do.....	128	1,793
Rayon.....	do.....	5,742	19,384
Acrylic.....	do.....	0	0
Polyamide.....	do.....	20,025	77,334
Polyester.....	do.....	0	0
Other.....	do.....	514	9,356
Wearing apparel, knit:			
Underwear.....	do.....	192	1,658
Sweaters.....	Dozen.....	13,022	36,172
Wearing apparel, not knit:			
Blouses.....	do.....	5,890	15,618
Dressing gowns.....	do.....	718	5,200
Nightwear.....	do.....	171	4,411
Dress Shirts.....	do.....	4,114	33,265
Sport Shirts.....	do.....	2,150	19,338
Trousers, slacks.....	do.....	4,185	23,126
Other.....	Pound.....	39,398	360,198

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15221

Principal U.S. imports of man-made fibers and manufactures—Continued

Item	Unit	1963	
		June	January-June
Wearing apparel, not knit, ornamented:			
Blouses.....	Dozen.....	620	8,248
Blouse sets.....	do.....	1	1
Dressing gowns.....	do.....	1,001	7,565
Nightwear.....	do.....	1,833	6,867
Dress shirts.....	do.....	7	307
Work shirts.....	do.....	0	0
Sport shirts.....	do.....	2,340	17,816
Suits.....	Number.....	11,952	47,206
Coats.....	do.....	332	9,691
Trousers, slacks, etc.....	do.....	135,338	1,111,995
Underwear.....	Dozen.....	1,161	6,284
Other.....	Pound.....	47,048	603,403
Miscellaneous:			
Tubings, cords, and tassels.....	do.....	11,003	47,712
Woven labels.....	do.....	30,514	194,603
Gill nets or netting.....	do.....	14,004	84,023
Nets for fishing.....	do.....	6,325	47,909
Tire fabric.....	do.....	568	11,443
Other.....	do.....	48,932	388,575

Source: Compiled by ATMI from Bureau of the Census data.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I might inform the gentleman that in the process of these negotiations a certain textile manufacturing company in my district found that it, along with certain others of the textile industry, were targets for Japanese imports. The Japanese were going to wipe out this industry. We took the necessary steps, and with the assistance of some new friends in the State Department, whom I shall name in a speech later and thank, we began to negotiate. While we were negotiating and before this agreement could be signed, the Japanese put on the oceans directly to America a shipload of textile production in order to try to sneak in, just like they did at Pearl Harbor, to sneak into this trade thing. They have done it. They will not keep good faith. They will use every trick in the trade to beat the United States. They have done it time and time again and have tricked us and will trick us again tomorrow. That is the reason why it is so important that our people realize what we are dealing with.

I thank the gentleman for talking about imports, because the American people have been led to believe that because of this trade bill and other things imports have been cut down to a certain level, but they have not been. Rather, they have been increased.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman mentioned the increase in imports and also mentioned a subject which I think appeals to all of us when he refers to the fact that many of our people who are today suffering from this import deluge are men who served their country on the battlefields, in the ships at sea, and in the air.

The balance of trade in textile manufactures has been deteriorating since 1947. At that time our exports exceeded imports by \$1.1 billion. In 1962 imports exceeded exports by \$546 million, which contributed significantly to the Nation's \$2.2 billion deficit in the balance of payments. Currently the U.S. deficit in the balance of payments is predicted for this

year to reach \$3 billion. The problems created by imports of textiles and apparel continue to be acute and will remain so unless and until the import-control programs are evolved by the Government for textiles of all fibers.

It seems to me that there are two steps that must be taken by our Government in the interest of our own economy and our own people. First, the Congress should pass cotton legislation so that American mills may buy American cotton at the same price at which it is made available for export and thus eliminate the cotton cost advantage given to foreign mills using American cotton, which imposes an unfair burden on the American textile and apparel industry.

And secondly, somewhat related to what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] said, there should be a finding, as requested of the Office of Emergency Planning, that the textile industry is vital to the national security. The OEP should act immediately on the information which was given it about 2 years ago and make an official finding that textile imports impair or threaten to impair the national security either from an economic or military preparedness standpoint.

If this was done the President would then have the necessary statutory authority to impose restraints on imports of all textiles regardless of fiber and avoid a further impairment of the national security position of our country.

I think these two things should be done by the Congress and by the executive department if we are to have justice and equity for our own American people who work in the textile plants.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the gentleman from North Carolina for this splendid presentation of one of the major problems in America. I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that every seat in this chamber is not filled with legislators. I am sure if they were here, to hear the speech and the words that my friend from North Carolina has uttered it would certainly impress and would encourage them, as he and I are encouraged to

try to do something in this area before it is too late. So I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina for again bringing to the attention of the House this important matter. I would like to impose upon his time for a few minutes to call attention of the House and of you, Mr. Speaker, to a letter which I recently received from one of my constituents, who is the head of a textile enterprise in my State and in my district, and which is the world's largest producer of cotton corduroy. This is what this friend and constituent wrote me:

I must reluctantly and regretfully advise you that your district is in considerable jeopardy as far as the economy of Haw River and Hillsboro is concerned and, to a lesser degree, Greensboro.

You may recall that I wrote you some weeks ago in connection with corduroy, which is produced in a greater volume in your district than in any other Congressman's area in the United States. I was in Washington about 3 months ago talking with Mr. Trezise and Mr. Blumenthal of the State Department. To refresh your memory, I enclose a copy of my letter of May 23 and also a clipping from our trade paper, the Daily News Record, of Wednesday, August 7. I presume there is nothing that you can do. This corduroy situation is an outrage. You are either going to have to give us our cotton at world prices, or else protect our market, and it is going to have to be done pretty fast, or you are not going to have a textile industry left. I am pointing to you because we can't get any relief from the hired hands in the executive branches. Unless our Congress puts the brakes on its crowd in the State Department and in the Agriculture Department it is going to ruin what little is still left of cotton textiles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that letter is written to me by a man who knows what he is talking about, by a man who has been raised in the textile industry, who is there on the job every day watching the withering and wilting away as a result of inaction here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, he also forwarded to me a statement from the Daily News Record and I would like to quote a portion of it. It says:

American corduroy producers have watched corduroy apparel imports spurt from 15.6 million yards in 1960 to 32 million last year. They express shock that this Government should permit imports of such quantities when they have had to curtail production of pinwale corduroys by 25 percent in the past

year. About 95 percent of the corduroy imports are pinwales.

They also point out the Japan is not only shipping huge quantities of corduroy apparel to the United States, but also sending corduroy fabrics to other Far Eastern points where they are made up into apparel and shipped to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, those are quotations from an article that appeared in the Daily News Record of August 7, 1963.

On August 14th the Daily News Record, a trade paper of the textile industry, also had this to say:

Ceilings on corduroy apparel: The final quota figure is reported to be either 21,250,000 or 21,200,000 square yards. This is a compromise between the earlier Japanese proposal for 23 million yards and the last American proposal for 20,400,000 yards.

The United States demanded item-by-item ceilings on corduroy sports shirts, raincoats, other coats, men's trousers, women's trousers, playsuits, and dressing gowns, but this was later dropped and the single common ceiling for corduroy agreed upon.

The United States also dropped dressing gowns from the list. The new ceiling is about 700,000 yards more than the actual imports into the United States in 1962.

Mr. WHITENER. I believe the gentleman said that is an article from the Daily News Record?

Mr. KORNEGAY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITENER. I would say to the gentleman that the corduroy situation is one which is grave in nature. I am sure, however, that the gentleman would agree with me that there are many other textile commodities which are riding on the same train and which are having a pretty rough roadbed on which to ride.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Oh yes, indeed. I was just preparing to say that while I was pointing out the situation in the area of textiles I certainly would not want the gentleman to misconstrue my remarks as limiting my interest to the area of corduroy. My interest, as the gentleman knows, is for the entire industry.

Mr. WHITENER. This thing which the gentleman mentions cuts across the board, from sales yarn to every type of fabric, and even the finished apparel.

In recent years—the last 2 or 3 years in particular—there has been a great influx of sales yarn into this country from Spain, Portugal, and many other countries from which our people had never expected to have any competition. The same is true of many of these synthetic fibers. I can remember when I first came to Congress most of us felt that even though the foreigners were taking our cotton textile market in great measure, we still had the synthetic or manmade fiber field pretty much to ourselves. Today that is not true. One of the big problems confronting the manmade fiber segment of the textile industry is the import of these products.

I would say to the gentleman that as we go along here, I am certainly not trying to fight a year-old battle again.

I think we are going to have to see a more realistic attitude on the part of the Tariff Commission toward the application of the plain provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 if we are to have the type of relief which the Congress envisioned for the people of this coun-

try who were injured by reason of imports. I think it is abundantly clear also that we must have relief from the price differential or cost differential now existing in the purchase of American grown cotton for our domestic textile industry. I believe we might agree that a favorable decision by the Office of the Emergency Planning finding as a fact that this flow of imports is impairing our national security situation is absolutely essential.

Those things do not seem to be propositions that any person interested in the advancement of the economy of the United States could argue about. Yet, unfortunately, it seems that certainly some of those people we hear from in the State Department as we get their briefings seem to have a greater interest in promoting jobs for foreigners than they do for our own people.

I know that the hour is late and many Members and the staff of the House are anxious to get to their homes and their families, and I certainly have no desire to keep them longer.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. Yes, briefly, although I realize that it is difficult to be brief when discussing a problem that is so important to the area which the gentleman and I represent. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I would like to say I agree 100 percent with the gentleman's statement. There are two matters that ought to be given special attention in securing relief for the American textile industry. The two-price cotton inequity should be eliminated, and this petition before the OEP should be approved. Those are two very important and vital matters which must be resolved if we are going to have adequate protection for the jobs of our textile employees.

Mr. WHITENER. Let me say to the gentleman that I am particularly appreciative of his participation. It was only a few minutes before I commenced making this statement that I mentioned to him I was going to do it. I appreciate his willingness to participate on short notice. Also may I say to the gentleman and our colleagues I regret that my presentation is not more complete. There are many other things that could be said, but unfortunately I did not have the time to reduce my remarks to writing and was compelled to speak extemporaneously.

I feel we should deal with this subject more fully on a more favorable occasion from the standpoint of available time. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] that I will look forward to doing that. I hope that he and others will join with me in this effort on behalf of one of the great industries of America, the textile industry, composed of the finest people to be found anywhere—those who earn their livelihood in the textile industry.

MINE DISASTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, much will be said, more will be written, but unless this Congress passes H.R. 23, the Small Mine Safety Act, nothing will be done about conditions that caused the recent mine disaster in Pennsylvania's hard coal regions. In less than 2 weeks millions of persons have learned that experience in Schuylkill County, in a town called Shepton.

There is no recompense for the fear, the anguish, the suffering, and the physical and mental torture of this past 2 weeks to the miners, their families, officials, and citizens of this community.

Yes, even those amongst us who have never given the production of coal a second thought have had a rude awakening. We find at this late date outmoded, dangerous, and disgraceful mining conditions simply because we value the dollar too much, we are politically expedient, or we just do not care about human life, somebody else's—of course.

We are all happy about the two men who were rescued and join in the continuing vigilance with the family of the third man who has, so far, been unable to give a clue to his condition. It could just as easy have been all 3, or 30, or 300 trapped men under similar mining conditions.

The contributions and efforts of all the persons who gave their time, their energy, their resources—both in men and material—in know-how, and in encouragement will go down in the history of the region to be added to the great wealth of folklore and stories of the deeds of the early miners in a region that has seen better days economically.

The untiring efforts of the volunteers, public officials, and the United Mine Workers, the Pagnotti Coal Co., the Corrales Coal Co., and others too numerous to mention were directly responsible for the rescue of the helplessly trapped men.

At this very moment amidst the joy of rescue of Fellin and Throne and the terrible weight of not knowing the fate of the third man, there is a burning undercurrent of unrest.

Perhaps some of it stems from the conditions that have forced almost 1,000 mines to be opened by unemployed, desperate men living in an economic void for more than a generation. Perhaps it comes from rumors and public charges that the State mine officials, officially denied, had decided to close the area; leave the men entombed for 30 or more days and then start the grim job of recovering the bodies.

Stories are told, although officially denied, of the attorney general's reported actions in seeking permits to seal off the mine before ascertaining the fate of the men known to be some 300 feet below the choked up entrance.

This shows more than anything else how perseverance and faith with the help of those who knew the mining business, literally moved mountains to save the lives of men given up for dead by cold, calculating, relentless machine age statistical Government agencies.

One wonders whether or not in our blind and oftentimes fruitless drive for more efficiency, more progress, more security, we are not losing sight of the very essence of life itself, faith, fellow-