

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by the Honorable Katharine St. George, of New York, at the Third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference, Washington, D.C., February 5-7, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this week, I have had the honor to be one of the U.S. delegates to the Third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference meeting here in Washington. The Chairman of the group, our distinguished colleague, Mrs. St. GEORGE set the note on Wednesday for a profitable and thoughtful discussion of the many problems of mutual interest to all of us in the Western Hemisphere.

Emphasizing the need for expanded trade between our countries, Mrs. St. GEORGE properly pointed out the weakness of the present Latin American trade patterns, the imbalance of our hemispheric trade and the need for common action to make trade expansion a building block for economic development and progress all over Latin America.

Mrs. St. GEORGE's remarks follow:

SPEECH OF KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, PRESIDENT, U.S. GROUP AT THE THIRD INTER-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

It is a great pleasure and honor for the members of the U.S. Inter-Parliamentary National Group to be hosts to the Third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference.

In the past, we of the Western Hemisphere have looked more to Europe and the European powers for inspiration and guidance, and this is most natural as most of us have our roots and our basic philosophies in that Continent. Unfortunately, through this atavistic policy we have neglected our own hemisphere, we have drifted apart and we have become strangers to each other.

Never before has it been more important that the Western Hemisphere be united in its determination to preserve freedom and to improve the living conditions of the millions of its inhabitants who are impoverished. Never before has it been more important that the countries of this hemisphere understand, and be sympathetic with, each other's problems and work together for their solution. Of all the subjects that need to be discussed, and understood, by Western Hemisphere conferences none is more important than foreign trade.

Although the Western Hemisphere—Canada, the United States and Latin America—have less than 15 percent of the world's population, they account for over 40 percent of its production. The proportion of its land that can be used productively is higher than the world average, and it has an abundance of mineral wealth, including coal, iron, and nonferrous metals.

Production, per capita, in the hemisphere is much higher than in the rest of the world, averaging close to \$1,500, but it is small compared with what it could be if human and material resources were utilized to maximum advantage.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE ECONOMIC GAPS

It is hardly necessary to add, before this audience, that averages and aggregates fail to portray an accurate picture and can be misleading.

Average per capita production in the Western Hemisphere is high, but parts of the hemisphere continue to lag.

Land transportation needs to be developed, and a favorable environment for the investment of domestic and foreign capital created.

These problems are not new to you, but they are problems that have thus far defied attempts at solution. The Alliance for Progress is an attempt to solve them, but it has not done so to date. It can of course be said that 10 years is too short a period of time in which to expect them to be solved. Generations rather than decades, and decades rather than years, will be necessary to get at the root causes.

IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Meanwhile, there is a very important area in which little has been done, but in which definitive action could be of vital importance in setting the stage for economic development. I refer to an expansion of trade throughout the hemisphere.

Historically speaking, much of the explanation of the prosperity and growth of the United States during the past century and a half lies in the fact that American labor and American capital have had access to a large and prosperous market within the country's own borders. Never before in world history have industries been as free to develop without having to worry about governmental barriers against their sales. The United States has been, and continues to be, the largest free trade area—in terms of purchasing power—in world history.

The example, or perhaps more accurately, the good fortune, of the United States in this respect has been noted in Europe.

The economic significance of the formation of the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association is that 13 countries have combined into 2 groups to create for themselves markets in which there will be a minimum of barriers to the exchange of goods.

It would seem that if we of the Western Hemisphere could eventually develop a vast Common Market of the West, many of our problems would cease. I realize of course that there will be many obstacles in our way and that this plan will take years to perfect and bring to fruition. But we all know that Rome was not built in a day and that the European Common Market has been an idea in men's minds since the days of Charlemagne and that the idea of a United States of Europe was written about and foreseen by Victor Hugo a century ago.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE IS UNBALANCED

Although the trade of the Western Hemisphere is large, it is not as large as it ought to be. The most significant shortcoming, as far as economic development is concerned, however, relates to the composition of the trade, rather than to its volume.

About 30 percent of all U.S. foreign trade is with Western Europe. Over 20 percent is with Canada, and about 18 percent with Latin America.

Close to 60 percent of Canada's foreign trade is with the United States. A little less than 20 percent is with Western Europe, and less than 6 percent is with Latin America.

The external trade of Latin America with the United States and Canada, together, is about equal to its two-way trade with Western Europe, each of the two areas accounting for slightly more than 40 percent of the \$17 billion total.

WEAK POSITION OF LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

Latin America's foreign trade position is less favorable today than it was before World War II. Although the value of Latin American exports increased a little more than 30 percent between 1948 and 1961, over 60 percent of the improvement was attributable to increased petroleum exports from Venezuela. If the figures for Venezuela are excluded, Latin American exports expanded by only 14 percent over the 13-year period. Thus, exports from Latin America in 1961 were actually smaller, on a per capita basis, than they were in 1948.

These facts illustrate the importance of diversifying trade and of intensifying specialization of production, in Latin America. The Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market are steps in the right direction, but there is a serious question whether the areas encompassed in their membership are sufficiently large and diversified to make possible production on a scale large enough to be economically sustainable.

It is evident that a substantial proportion of the outside assistance that has been received by Latin American countries in recent years has been canceled out by deterioration in the terms of trade. It seems to me that hope for economic development in the area lies in the direction of expanded trade and improvement in the terms of trade. A vigorous and realistic program for trade liberalization could go far toward achieving improvement in the economic well-being of the peoples of the whole hemisphere.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET (AN EXAMPLE)

The forthcoming trade negotiations in Geneva are important, not only to the United States, but to all of us in the Western Hemisphere. Together, we export approximately \$7 billion of goods to the six countries comprising the European Common Market—Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, West Germany, and Italy. It is important that we convince the European Economic Community that it keep its markets open to our exports. We need to persuade them to reduce their new common external tariffs, and to eliminate as many of their discriminations against our commerce as possible.

We in the Western Hemisphere will have a better chance of inducing the European Economic Community to adopt a liberal import policy if we present a united front in negotiating at Geneva. If a Western Hemisphere trade organization were already in being, and could speak with a single voice for the entire hemisphere, we would be in a stronger position than we now are to secure meaningful concessions. Although the six EEC countries export less to the Western Hemisphere than they import from us (\$4.6 billion, compared with \$7.2 billion), they are not anxious to lose important foreign markets.

A PROPOSAL

Let us give serious consideration to the formation of a free trade area or Free Trade Association for the Western Hemisphere. Let us include the Latin American Republics, Canada, and the United States, and have as our objective the adoption of free trade with respect to all commodities traded in within the hemisphere, gradually over a period of 15 to 20 years. I would propose, further, that as far as possible the external tariffs applied to nonmember countries by each of the members be harmonized with each other.

The success of such an arrangement will depend upon the willingness of each member to accept imports from other members. The United States, with a gross national

product rapidly approaching the \$600 billion-a-year mark, should provide an immediate inducement to other countries to cooperate.

In return for access to its own large market, the United States would have access to expanded markets throughout the hemisphere. Of even greater importance would be the advantages that would accrue from having neighbors who are becoming increasingly prosperous. A rapidly developing, prosperous Western Hemisphere would be harmonious with the interests of the United States.

Trade expansion is one of the essential building blocks of economic development. A Western Hemisphere Association would provide a powerful weapon to break the vicious circle of lack of markets, under-specialization and lack of diversification of production, underdevelopment, and low levels of living.

Finally, may I say that I am speaking as a parliamentarian and as a friend, and that these ideas are my own and do not reflect Government policies. The true parliamentarian should play his part independently for the policies in which he believes, and not become a rubberstamp for the government in power.

We all have much to be concerned about in our own hemisphere. The clouds of oppression and dictatorship hang over us all. Let us unite and keep fighting that good fight for freedom that our forefathers fought in their day, and let us maintain the freedom we inherited from them and help it to grow and prosper in a bright and progressive future.

Firmness Requested in Our Dealings With Cuba and Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, our soft, vacillating foreign policy continues to embarrass our allies and degrade our image and prestige around the world when we let two-bit, leftist, Communist sympathizers like Castro shove the United States around and intentionally violate treaties and international agreements such as the water supply agreement to Guantanamo Naval Base and permit violations of such as our Panama Canal Zone Treaty.

If we expect to remain a world opinion leader and maintain the respect of our allies, we must put some firmness and backbone in our dealings and reactions over such incidents. We will not gain respect by continuing to give in, back down, writing letters of protest as we did over the U.S. fliers who were shot down in Germany last week, or by selling wheat to the Communists and guaranteeing their credit.

Specifically, if Castro persists in refusing to supply the Guantanamo Base water in disaccord with our long-standing agreement, then we should move immediately to restore the water supply by taking over control of the supply facilities. Second, Castro hostilities continuing, we should establish a sea blockade around Cuba to prohibit the shipment of all goods to that island except medicines

and necessary foodstuffs. Further, we should initiate immediate hard-hitting negotiations with our allies to stop their aid and trade to Cuba. Admittedly, the latter would be more difficult, now that this administration has agreed to aid Communist Russia with the shipment of U.S.-subsidized wheat and other goods.

Address by the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya, of New Hampshire, Before the Pan-American Interparliamentary Conference, February 6, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was delivered at the third Inter-American Parliamentary Conference on February 6, here in Washington and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the speech was delivered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], in faultless Spanish.

The delegates from our sister republics were pleased and somewhat surprised at the Congressman's knowledge and understanding of their language. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] was a great help to us during this Conference and I feel that, as a member of the executive committee, he will serve us well in the future.

His remarks follow:

ADDRESS BEFORE THE PAN-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 6, 1964

Madam President and fellow delegates, as we gather here today in the seat of the Organization of American States as parliamentarians from the American Continent, it is most natural that we confront our common problems in a brotherly spirit with mutual understanding. The date of March 13, 1961, is the day during which a great effort was launched by the representatives of our Latin-American sister states and our late President, John F. Kennedy.

From this meeting emerged the blueprint for economic development and social progress under the name of the Alliance for Progress. Freedom, human dignity, and economic progress became the central themes enunciated in the Charter of Punta del Este.

Twenty American Republics became a collective entity dedicated to action. Each of us took inventory of our shortcomings and placed both our faults and our grievances upon the roundtable of international discussion.

It was at that time clearly understood by all that no program for economic development could succeed in Latin America unless a proper base were established in each country. That base was conceived as a launching pad from which to rocket our hemisphere to new heights of development as defined in the charter.

Each government pledged land reform, fiscal reform, and an equitable tax collection system. These assurances were given to the U.S. Congress when it appropriated the first funds for the United States contribution and participation.

Every nation understood that these conditions had to be met before moneys were to be

disbursed from the trust fund of the Inter-American Bank. Our Congress clearly embraced these conditions as vital components of the entire plan.

Today I may say that some countries have complied with these requisites while others have not. We are told that the parliaments of some nations have refused to go along with adequate land and tax reform while other nations have not had the executive leadership necessary to push and implement such programs.

Those nations which are doing their part in the Alliance are disheartened not by setbacks or by temporary failures. They are disheartened and discouraged by lack of effort, wherever it exists.

Those nations which are making progress within the Alliance are doing so only because of their own determination to do so. Those nations which have nothing to show but recurrent failure and a slipping toehold on the status quo must accept responsibility for their own inadequacies and, above all, strike out anew on the road to victory.

One point should be made abundantly clear. The United States is behind the aims of the Alliance for Progress. But, the Congress and the American people desire partnership only with those nations which have the will to initiate and carry through long needed reforms that will insure the human dignity of their own people. Let it be known that the Alliance for Progress has proven that there exist many nations in Latin America whose national fabric is jewel studded with unrelenting dedication to such high ideals.

The American people and the Congress have approached the Alliance as a brother wishing to join together with another brother in a common effort. The affinity that has already been established between the partners in the Alliance can be further strengthened. The only forces capable of piercing that affinity are unjust, agitated attacks cloaked under a blanket of inflammatory nationalism. Only when geared to the accomplishment of constructive projects is nationalism a welcome ingredient. Each member of the Alliance must examine its own contributions and then determine for itself whether national pride has been a force for construction or destruction.

On the part of the United States we have been and are providing resources in quantities necessary to help make this development plan a success. As the late President Kennedy pointed out, we provided the resources to help rebuild the economies of Western Europe against nearly equal odds.

It was then that the United States learned that any development program must be founded on a cornerstone of healthy, amicable partnership and dedicated resolve.

From March 13, 1961 to June 30, 1963, the United States has made a total of \$2,490 million available to the Alliance for Progress. Of that sum, \$403.7 million have been sent to Latin America under the food-for-peace-program. That program has fed more than 15 million people throughout Latin America.

During the current fiscal year, the United States will be channeling more financial resources into the Latin American economies. Funds will include \$430 million in new appropriations; \$95 million carried over and available to the Agency for International Development; \$130 million in new Social Progress Trust Funds and \$40 million in carryover funds available for the Social Progress Trust Fund.

It is plainly obvious that no one government could possibly undertake to singularly provide the financial resources necessary to successfully conclude so broad a program of development. A large share of the burden must be carried by private industry—both domestic and foreign. The United States, as well as many Latin American countries, has found that private enterprise can provide not only necessary capital, but also many

lacking but vitally needed skills. In the United States private enterprise has provided not only goods and services, jobs, and economic advancement, but also through a lawful and just system of taxation our Government has received indispensable revenues with which to conduct the public business. It is a similar system of private enterprise and just taxation which the Alliance for Progress envisions as the ideal for Latin American development.

During 1962, all men of good will in this hemisphere were heartened to see 10 of the 19 Latin American member countries exceed the 2.5 percent per capita annual growth rate which was to be the aim of all participants. Yet due to inadequate growth in some of the larger countries the average annual growth for all of Latin America was below the 2.5 percent figure.

It must this year be our aim to achieve and exceed that rate of growth in every Latin American participating country.

President Johnson has vigorously reaffirmed this Nation's belief and trust in the Alliance. Each nation can do no less than reaffirm its trust in the Alliance and rededicate itself to its ideals.

My fellow delegates, we are all aware that those ideals are indeed high. To approach them will require a cooperative effort of great magnitude. Our determination shall be challenged in countless ways, but let us never forget that the rewards of success are also countless. The journey will be long, but it can be made, and together we shall make it.

H.R. 9744, Explanation and Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week on January 28, I introduced H.R. 9744, a bill to terminate the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project area and plan, to restore certain property in the District of Columbia to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes. Subsequently, my bill was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Since the introduction of this measure, there has developed considerable interest in how the bill, if enacted, would be implemented. Other pertinent questions also have been raised.

In an attempt to explain the intent of my legislative proposal, acknowledge the interest being evidenced toward it, and answer the questions I have heard, I am offering these remarks. At their conclusion, I am submitting a sectional analysis of the bill.

I think it is important at the outset to establish that the general concept of urban renewal is deserving of enthusiastic endorsement. Community improvement through the elimination of slums and blight and the removal of their causes is essential to the public welfare.

Poor housing, traffic congestion, inadequate sites for commercial and industrial growth, downtown decay, and neighborhood deterioration are proper targets for improvement programs, using public and private resources. Failure to

plan and execute such programs carries a high cost, measured both in human and in economic values.

The incidence of disease, crime, and juvenile delinquency is more frequent in rundown areas than elsewhere. Blight creates greater needs for municipal services, while slum areas return less tax revenue to the municipality. The suffering brought from slum and blighting conditions is widespread and needs attention at all governmental levels.

There is, in my belief, a legitimate role for the Federal Government in urban renewal. It is to make available Federal assistance, in the form of grants and/or loans, to finance surveys and plans; to acquire, clear, and prepare land for redevelopment; and to relocate site residents. Congress repeatedly has recognized its constitutional obligation to remove a burden on the public welfare and, to that end, has enacted appropriate legislation.

Urban renewal is not without its faults, however. In fact, its administration has been far from faultless. The concept has been crippled by bureaucratic bungling, inertia, and inexperience, and relocation resistance.

By startling coincidence, Mr. Speaker, on the very day that I introduced H.R. 9744 in the interests of remedying the unfortunate utilization of urban renewal in Washington's Columbia Plaza project, there appeared in the Wall Street Journal a front-page story by Reporter Stanley Penn detailing the ills of urban renewal. It is pertinent, I believe, for me to share with my colleagues in the House, the following excerpt from Mr. Penn's article:

In some cities, projects are going ahead on schedule and making dramatic changes in slum areas. But despite a measure of progress, most of the property cities have acquired for urban renewal purposes hasn't yet been developed.

Of the 22,000 acres purchased by cities since the program began in 1949, only 6,800 have been resold to developers. Among the remainder, 6,000 acres haven't been cleared yet of old buildings; another 3,300 have been cleared but no developers have been found; and 5,900 acres are cleared and appear close to being sold to developers.

With this overview in mind, and before presenting the section-by-section analysis of H.R. 9744, I want to address my remarks specifically to the reasons which prompted—if not, provoked—my introduction of this bill.

I serve on Subcommittee No. 4 of the District of Columbia Committee. During 1963, this subcommittee spent a great deal of time conducting hearings and studying the matter of urban renewal in the District of Columbia. Within the scope of this examination came Columbia Plaza.

From the information produced, I concluded that the approval by the District Commissioners of Columbia Plaza as an urban renewal project entitled to financial assistance under the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, was improper. This resulted from the presentation to the Commissioners of documentation that was not entirely representative of fact.

Urban renewal funds under the act cited above can be made available only where evidence of slum and deteriorated conditions meet certain specific criteria, including building and environmental deficiencies. Very definite standards must be met. Further, the District of Columbia, under the Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, prescribes statutory provisions for such standards; namely, that those slum and blighted areas must be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

I believe our hearings conclusively confirmed the absence of such qualifying conditions in regard to Columbia Plaza. In fact, Board of Commissioners President Walter N. Tobriner testified before our subcommittee that had the information revealed in the hearings been known to the Commissioners when the project was approved, his Board almost certainly would have acted differently.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced the passage of H.R. 9744 can help to reorient the Columbia Plaza project along more promising and less costly lines.

The analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 9774 GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The general purpose of the bill is to extinguish the Columbia Plaza project by terminating the project area boundaries and the project plan and to provide for the restoration of the real property within the area to those former owners of the property from whom the Redevelopment Land Agency acquired the land.

Section 1: Section 1 of the bill expresses the sense of the Congress that at the time the agencies of the Federal and District Governments, which have the responsibilities in connection with urban renewal programs, were considering and making decisions regarding the Columbia Plaza area, the officials of such agencies were not fully aware of all of the material and essential facts which subsequently have demonstrated that such a project should not have been approved. Further, the Congress finds that because of the foregoing, the approval of the project contravened the intent of Congress and therefore the taking of private property in the area worked an improper hardship on the owners, and such owners should have an opportunity to reacquire their property upon payment of the amount they received plus interest from the date of sale to the date of their reacquisition of the property. Exempt from this intent of the Congress is that portion of the projected area which was acquired for highway purposes.

Section 2: This section provides that the Columbia Plaza urban renewal area, boundaries which were established by the Board of Commissioners, and the project plan for that area, later approved by the Commissioners, is terminated and of no further force and effect. All title and interest of the RLA to the real property in the Columbia Plaza area is transferred to the Administrator of the General Services Administration and he is authorized and directed to carry out provisions of the act and report to the Congress not later than 8 months from the date of enactment concerning the execution of the provisions of the act.

Section 3: Under this section the Administrator of the General Services Administration is directed to make an offer in writing, to each former owner of real property from whom the RLA acquired land, to reconvey the property to such former owner the land at a price equal to the cost of acquisition to

the Agency plus interest at the rate of 6 percent from the date the Agency paid the former owner for the land. The offer of the Administrator shall not include any part of the urban renewal area which was acquired for highway purposes. If such former owner of land accepts the offer, transfer of title and settlement shall be effected within 90 days after acceptance.

The Administrator's offer to the former landowner shall be open for 30 days. At settlement the Administrator shall deliver to the former owner a special warranty deed without any greater encumbrances or restrictions than were of record at the date of acquisition of the property by the RLA.

Section 4: In the event the former owner rejects the offer of the Administrator, the Administrator shall, within 90 days of rejection of the offer or the expiration date of such offer, dispose of the land at public auction to the highest bidder.

Section 5: This section provides that no former owner may assign his right to repurchase to any other person. However, if any former owner is deceased or is legally incompetent to act, then, the offer shall be made to his heirs, successor, assigns or other legal representative.

Section 6: This section specifically defines the term "Columbia Plaza urban renewal project."

Section 7: This section provides that the streets and alleys which were acquired by the Agency shall revert to the same status and ownership as existed immediately before acquisition by the RLA and the Administrator of the General Services Administration is directed to execute such deeds and perform such acts as are necessary to carry out such section.

Section 8: This section provides that the zoning which shall apply to the real property which is sold by the Administrator of General Services Administration shall be the same as the zoning which was applicable to the property as of January 1, 1964, except that the property shall not be subject to any provisions or conditions relating to the Columbia Plaza urban renewal plan.

Section 9: Section 9 of the bill provides that the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall transfer to the RLA all funds received in excess of the costs incurred by him in carrying out the provisions of the act.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE BILL

One of the immediate questions that arises in the minds of some persons is whether the RLA and thus indirectly the District of Columbia and the Federal Government, would lose money by such reversion of property. Inasmuch as many factors are not known and cannot be accurately projected, it is possible only to deal with existing figures and make some general estimates as to what the possible result might be in this regard.

The cost of the land purchased from the private property owners, excluding the land in the freeway area, was \$5,650,995. The latest available financial statement related to Columbia Plaza, and some costs have accrued since that date indicates that other expenditures in connection with planning, inspection, administrative costs, interests, and relocation total approximately \$1 million. Thus, the gross expenditures total approximately \$6,500,000.

The resale of the land would return \$5,650,995. The interest on the amount paid to the private landowners from the time of RLA acquisition to the date of re vesting of title in the private landowners cannot be precisely calculated. It appears that the amount of this interest would be not less than \$300,000 and might approach as much as \$500,000.

The final item involves the status of the portions of the project area which would revert to Federal streets and alleys. Since this land was taken over by the Agency

without any compensation to the Federal Government it would revert to the Federal Government without any payment. In any redevelopment program for the complete area, the code authorizes the sale of the land at its reasonable value or not less than the assessed value set upon adjoining lands. Since approximately 100,000 square feet would remain outside of the highway right-of-way, the sale of this square footage could produce to the Government an additional \$2 million. This amount plus the interest is substantially in excess of the total cost accumulated by the RLA in connection with the project.

TAXES AND SUITABILITY OF PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

If the land is reverted to the former property owners, redevelopment could be made under existing zoning law and building codes. The permitted uses for the existing zoning could result in structures which might accrue to the District of Columbia substantially more in annual taxes than the urban renewal project proposal. The objection, which opponents will interpose, are directed to the viewpoint that there would be an uncontrolled redevelopment and this would be undesirable in the area. It may be noted that Watergate Towne, immediately adjacent to the Columbia Plaza, is the most push of any developments in the city. It is subject only to the National Capital Planning Commission, Fine Arts Commission, and the zoning regulations of the District of Columbia. No one has challenged the excellence of the Watergate project free from the covenants of an RLA plan.

Washington State Statutes Preempt Proposed Federal Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for more than a week I have listened carefully to the debate on the civil rights legislation presently under House consideration. The arguments offered, both pro and con, have been most impressive and when amendments were offered I have supported or opposed them depending on how I believed each was in the public interest and would best protect the constitutional rights of all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, nothing is perfect and when this legislation goes to the other body, I am confident some of the provisions of H.R. 7152 can and will be improved. Meanwhile, I understand that every member of the Washington State congressional delegation has been receiving considerable mail from their constituents expressing concern with regard to the far-reaching effects of the civil rights bill. As a Member of Congress who has consistently opposed further expansion of Federal Government this concern is certainly understandable and in this connection, let me assure my constituents and the people of the State of Washington that our State already has laws comparable to or more stringent than those being considered in this bill.

As further proof, my colleague from eastern Washington's Fourth Congressional District asked for and received specific written assurances from Congressman WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, that the provisions of H.R. 7152 would have no effect on the State of Washington. Moreover I have received additional written assurances to the same effect from a representative of the Department of Justice in the person of Mr. Edward Guthman, for many years a well-known Seattle newspaperman. In other words, under H.R. 7152, State statutes would have priority over Federal law in my State of Washington and enforcement proceedings of civil rights laws would be by State rather than Federal officials. Mr. Speaker, this is particularly important to those of us who are fearful of the ever-expanding power of the Federal Government.

In this connection and under unanimous consent I include following these remarks the two letters previously referred to covering the matter of state preemption.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1964.
Hon. CATHERINE MAY,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CATHERINE: This is in response to your letter of January 22 wherein you seek information on statements made by a constituent in opposition to the civil rights bill.

One organization in particular has been circulating pamphlets, letters and other material in opposition to the civil rights bill (H.R. 7152) now before the House. This organization is seeking to defeat the bill by placing unfounded interpretations upon its provisions or by condemning provisions which are not actually contained in the bill as reported, but which were in the subcommittee bill.

In contrast to statements made by this organization and repeated in the letter received by you, every title of the civil rights bill is keyed strictly to the guarantee of civil rights for all Americans, Negro as well as white.

The drafters of the legislation (of which I was one) did not incorporate provisions indiscriminately for political advantage and without good reason. Each title was included because solid, well-documented proof had been presented to the House Judiciary Committee during lengthy hearings that American citizens were being denied their constitutional rights.

The bill is aimed at correcting irregularities in the right to vote, the opportunity to obtain a job, the ability to gain an adequate education, the right to receive the equal benefits and protection of Government and the opportunity to obtain reasonable accommodations while traveling in interstate commerce.

There is no doubt that the provisions of this bill will increase to some extent the authority of the Federal Government. Generally speaking, I am opposed to such increases of power. But, when basic rights of citizenship are involved and the State and local governments fail to guarantee these rights, then I believe the burden falls upon the Federal Government to take over the responsibility.

Whenever possible, the drafters of the bill have sought to surround the extension of authority with sufficient judicial and administrative safeguards. This was the case, for example, in title VI, where a recipient who

has had terminated Federal financial assistance may seek judicial review of such termination. The same may be said of title VII where a businessman or labor union cannot be enjoined from discriminatory employment practices unless and until there has been a complete litigation of the matter in Federal court where the Government must sustain the burden of proof.

In addition, the important titles on public accommodations (title II) and employment (title VII), ample provision is made for the Federal Government to defer to the States complaints where State law provides a workable forum for handling the complaints.

Thirty-two States have public accommodation laws and 25 States have FEPC laws. Washington State has effective legislation in both areas which you, of course, are far more familiar with than I. Thus, in your State, as with many other States with effective legislation, there will be no cause for the Federal Government to intrude in these areas at all.

The civil rights bill is primarily aimed at correcting abuses in those areas of the country where local authority fails to take effective action. Whenever a State or locality meets its obligations in the area of civil rights, then the right or need for Federal intervention will disappear.

In this regard the drafters of the bill have taken precaution to guard against undue intrusion in local matters by the Federal Government. Thus, Federal officials will have no authority to correct "racial imbalance" but only to desegregate public schools in accordance with the Supreme Court decisions. Similarly, there will be no authority for the Federal Government to insist upon "racial balance" in employment. All that may be done is to enjoin discriminatory employment or membership practices of employers or labor unions.

I may also add that no criminal penalties are provided for in the bill. If violations are found to exist, the Federal courts are only authorized to enjoin the illegal behavior. Thus, it may be said that States and individuals alike are given the opportunity to cleanse their behavior without any undue burdens being placed upon them.

Finally, in response to the statement in your constituent's letter that all "public establishments" would be subject to Federal regulation under the bill, I can categorically deny this allegation. Title II has been primarily limited to eating establishments, places of lodging, gasoline stations, and places of amusement.

In addition, other places may be covered if they are located within one of the above covered establishments and hold themselves out as serving the patrons of such covered establishment (i.e., a barbershop located in a hotel). Every public establishment would be covered according to a provision of title II, if State law requires segregation, but this merely codifies existing case law and such a condition exists in only the most limited areas of the country.

I hope that my response to the statements of your constituent are sufficiently detailed to overcome such fears as may exist. I do regret the length of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,
Representative to Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
WASHINGTON, D.C.
February 6, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am pleased to reply to your inquiry about what effect the Civil Rights bill now pending in the House of Representatives would have in the State of Washington. As a practical matter, the bill would have little or no effect.

You are well aware that any bona fide resident of the State of Washington can register to vote without any difficulty. Since there is no discrimination, the sections of the bill seeking to end voting discrimination would have no application in Washington.

Washington has had a law banning discrimination in places of public accommodation since 1890. Title II—the public accommodations section—of the bill now before the House specifically sets forth that a State law banning discrimination in places of public accommodation will take precedence over the Federal law. So, again, there would be no change in the existing situation in Washington with respect to public accommodation.

Since there is no discrimination in public facilities in the State of Washington, title III and title IV of the bill would have no practical application in Washington State. This is also true with respect to title VI which bans discrimination in federally assisted programs, since, again, no such situation exists in Washington State.

Title VII deals with fair employment practices. Washington has had a similar law since 1949, I understand, so there is very little likelihood that a Federal FEPC would have much application. Title VII also sets forth that where States have existing fair employment laws, those laws will remain in effect except to the extent they might conflict with the Federal law.

This covers the pertinent sections of the bill.

I am enclosing a summary of the bill and a copy of a letter which we have sent to a number of Members of Congress who have written requesting comments on extreme attacks on the Civil Rights bill by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom.

I hope you will find these useful and if you have any further questions or wish any further information, please do not hesitate to call on us.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

EDWIN GUTHMAN,
Special Assistant for Public Information.

Reasonable Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, ROBERT SIKES, recently made what I deemed to be a most excellent statement before the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate concerning the nature and scope of the firearms legislation presently under consideration.

I commend this fine statement to all my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. F. SIKES, OF FLORIDA, TO THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE OF THE U.S. SENATE, JANUARY 23, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my feelings on the subject of additional gun laws now before this committee for consideration.

During the years that I have had the privilege of holding elected office, the subject of the right of the law-abiding citizen to keep

and bear arms, as guaranteed by our Constitution, has been, and continues to be, a subject of interest and deep concern to me. It is a matter of particular moment now, because of renewed agitation for tighter gun laws.

The tragic and senseless assassination of President Kennedy quite naturally resulted in a wave of hysteria against weapons and the ownership of weapons. However deplorable this inexcusable act was, it scarcely follows that a crime committed by 1 man should cause 35 million gun owners to be persecuted. I seriously question that the legislation now proposed would have prevented the purchase of a gun by Lee Oswald or would have resulted in tighter security measures than those which were in effect.

There is already a Federal law that requires anyone selling guns interstate by mail, or otherwise, to buy a Federal Firearms License. This law further requires that every sale be recorded and this record retained on hand for a period of 10 years. This record contains a detailed description of the gun, including the name and address of the buyer as well as the serial number.

These records are available to any law enforcement officer. The fact to be remembered here is that this law is already in effect, and since the records are kept by the people in business, it does not cost the taxpayers one red cent. That this is an effective system is demonstrated by the fact that the information concerning the gun purchased by Lee Oswald was announced by the Dallas police on Saturday, the day after the assassination. The ballistic information on the bullet taken from Governor Connally, was announced on Monday. In other words, it would seem that the gun controls we already have are more effective than some law enforcement agencies of the State and Federal Government.

We do not measure loss of human life in dollars and cents. Nor would we decry the cost of a gun-control law which effectively prevented crime. Nevertheless, it is well to remember that any form of registration or control will cost tax dollars to operate and enforce. This is a burden which will be shared by all the people.

You cannot legislate against human inconsistencies. The person who shot President Kennedy was the instrument of his death; a gun is an inanimate object and by itself, can harm no one. The only people really affected by gun restrictions are the honest people. A man who needs a gun to commit a crime will get one by some method or another.

If anyone is convinced that antigun laws will reduce crime, and be a guarantee against violence and murder, then he is worse off than the ostrich. New York State has the toughest gun laws in America and probably the highest crime rate.

Great Britain, after Dunkirk, had only a few thousand small arms available in the entire country, and was requesting the people to contribute swords and crossbows for defense. This was the dilemma they faced because they did not have an armed civilian population to fall back on. Britain has tight gun laws.

During the German occupation of Norway and Denmark in World War II, the Germans were required to keep one soldier for every 10 square miles of territory because of the partisan groups' effective resistance. These people fell into the roles of guerrilla fighters easily because these were nations where gun ownership was encouraged. In other countries where government gun registration was required, the Germans had a handy list of all gun owners and were able to effectively disarm the entire nation.

When I purchase a weapon which is delivered in Washington, even though I own a Federal firearms license, I must go personally to the express office to receive it, and I must fully identify myself and sign several forms. Thus, I would assume that Washington is one of the stricter cities on owner-

ship of firearms. But during a recent period when crime increased in the United States as a whole 14 percent, crime was increasing 41 percent in Washington. Gun laws are not the answer.

In a study by the FBI made in 564 cities during August 1960, involving a total populace of 69 million people, the following statistics were compiled:

Out of 7,348 aggravated assaults, 44 percent of the offenses were committed by cutting or stabbing—24 percent by blunt objects; 12.7 percent by shooting; 12.3 percent by hands, fists, or feet and 1.2 by use of poison.

Now, if it follows that crime will be reduced or eliminated by doing away with all the criminal's weapons, then it is reasonable to assume that these weapons should be dealt with and eliminated according to their frequency of use. Since 44 percent of the above assaults were the result of cutting and stabbing, then all knives and ice picks should be registered. Since blunt objects accounted for 24 percent of the mayhem, then naturally rocks, hammers, baseball bats, rolling pins, etc., should be serialized and registered.

Under the "shooting" heading should be included all weapons which propel any objects—whether by compressed air or rubber bands.

I do not question that there is a need for improvements. My statement simply is designed to show that we can easily go too far. The National Rifle Association, the leading organization of American sportsmen, has stated that it has no objection to legislation aimed at preventing the misuse of firearms, but that it opposes general registration of firearms and proposals to license the possession or purchase of firearms by law-abiding citizens.

Specifically, the association has said that it does not oppose legislation designed to prohibit possession of firearms by persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, drug addicts, and habitual drunkards; or making the sale of firearms to juveniles subject to parental consent.

In the event this distinguished committee feels that legislation is necessary, it is my belief that the amendments submitted by Senator Dorn, which would provide notification by the shipper to the local responsible police agency when a firearms order has been placed, would provide adequate additional security and permit proper action to be taken to limit or prevent ownership of weapons by criminals, or those incompetent or irresponsible.

Now, let's look at the broader picture of firearms controls.

In recent years, seldom has a session of any State legislature or of Congress met without the introduction of at least one bill that would curtail the legitimate use and possession of firearms by citizens of good repute. The vast majority of these bills are introduced with the intention of curing some social ill, or to limit such use and possession by the juvenile delinquent and the criminal element.

While I do not take issue with the purposes for which these bills are intended, if administered correctly and given the proper emphasis, I certainly decry the efforts of some people or governmental agencies to severely limit the peaceful enjoyment of firearms by lawful citizens.

As the committee well knows, thousands of Americans who own and enjoy firearms for defense and sport now feel strongly that the continuation of this ownership and enjoyment is in jeopardy. Much of this came as the result of the assassination of President Kennedy. Before that took place, however, concern had been caused by the enactment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The contents of this act and executive policy on this

subject generated much publicity and reaction throughout the country. The general grounds for criticism have been that the implementation of this law could place the United States in a dangerous political, economic, and military position vis-a-vis the Communist bloc. In order to make it absolutely clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Act did not include the elimination of private firearms as part of the proposed disarmament program, I introduced a bill that will protect such rights of the citizen from encroachment by the Disarmament Agency. The language of my bill is identical to the one introduced by Senator HICKENLOOPER and is now contained in Public Law 88-186, amending the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. That language is as follows:

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms, by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

We consider it sound insurance in a good cause.

I have heard criticism from some quarters about allowing the free possession and use of firearms in modern American society. Arguments that this contributes to crime and constitutes a menace to free government are completely fallacious. Our forefathers knew what they were doing when they approved the second amendment to the Constitution, which states that "a well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Then, as now, an armed citizenry is less likely to be cowed by criminal elements or oppressive government. Rather than restricting freedom, the right to possess arms guarantees it by instilling independence and strength in an enlightened people.

The United States is facing a critical period in its history. The years to come will decide the desperate battle between communism and freedom, individualism and totalitarianism. If we are to win this struggle, we will need to preserve and use every element of strength that is available to us. Americans are fighting in farflung corners of the world. Some of them will survive because of lessons in marksmanship and acquaintance with firearms gained as boys in a free society. The emphasis placed on smallarms marksmanship for survival in Vietnam bears out my long-held personal belief that there is a continuing need for men in the Armed Forces skilled in the use of basic firearms. As the lawmakers for this great Nation, we would be derelict in our duties if we allowed the right to keep and bear arms by responsible, law-abiding citizens to be curtailed.

I have read the statement of Senator MAGNUSON concerning the scope of the activities of this committee and have been informed of the proceedings that occurred during your previous hearings. I am strongly in favor of the intentions of the committee to study in detail any problems that may have arisen as the result of the ease of accessibility of firearms to the undesirable elements of our society through mail-order channels. Such problems, if allowed to go unchecked, could result in further restrictions on the law-abiding citizen. If upon completion of your investigations, you deem it necessary to the continuing good of our society to recommend additional controls on firearms, I urge that the legislation be developed in the spirit of Senator MAGNUSON's statement of December 10, 1963, when he said:

"Any legislation, State or Federal, must consider the constitutional right of our citizens to bear arms. Responsible citizens have the right to possess firearms for pur-

poses of self-protection, security of the Nation, hunting, and recognized sporting activities."

Let me assure the committee that I will actively support any legislation in keeping with these thoughts—legislation that will make it more difficult for criminals or those inclined toward criminal activities, mental incompetents, drug addicts, habitual drunkards, and juveniles to obtain firearms, and which will severely penalize those persons perpetrating crimes while armed. But let me urge caution in the enactment of these laws, lest they go much further than is needed or intended.

In the April 1960 issue of *Guns* magazine, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wrote the following:

"By calling attention to a well-regulated militia for the security of the Nation, and the right of each citizen to keep and bear arms, our Founding Fathers recognized the essentially civilian nature of our economy. Although it is extremely unlikely that the fears of governmental tyranny, which gave rise to the second amendment, will ever be a major danger to our Nation, the amendment still remains an important declaration of our basic military-civilian relationships, in which every citizen must be ready to participate in the defense of his country. For that reason I believe the second amendment will always be important."

The man who wrote that was the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, the late John F. Kennedy.

Congressman Cederberg Cites Urgency in Lifting Domestic Sugar Quota Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, 10th Congressional District, in an address to Michigan sugarbeet growers and processors last Tuesday, pointed to the outstanding production job done by the Nation's sugarbeet industry in 1963, proving groundless fears of a shortage as the result of poor crops in Europe and Cuba.

However, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CEDERBERG, has also cited the urgency of early action on pending legislation to remove marketing restrictions on this year's domestic sugar crop.

These statements were part of an address by the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CEDERBERG, at the Sugarbeet Day program at Michigan State University and, because of their timeliness, I submit his address for the consideration of my colleagues in the House. It follows:

THE SUGAR SITUATION
(By Congressman ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Michigan)

Mr. Chairman and friends, it is indeed a special pleasure to be here today, and a privilege to be taking part in your Sugarbeet Day. This is the 34th consecutive year in which the university has set aside a special

day of this great annual Farmer's Week for discussions and the exchange of ideas about sugarbeets—significant recognition of the sugarbeet industry's longtime importance to our State. I am honored to take part in your program.

An outstanding feature of Sugarbeet Day—and, indeed, of Farmer's Week for all its 49 years—is the full participation of farmers in the discussions. We in Michigan may be inclined to take that for granted, for in our State there is a rich tradition of close and enduring ties between campus and farm—a tradition that goes back to the establishment, by our State legislature on February 12, 1855, of the very first State agricultural college in the United States, the college which has grown into this magnificent Michigan State University here at East Lansing.

The close working relationship between campus and farm—between the scientist in the experimental plot and the practical farmer on the land—has been a major reason for the tremendous gains in efficiency and productivity which the agriculture of Michigan has made over the years.

The precedents in this field established in Michigan have had a profound effect on our entire Nation. The Michigan idea of a State college devoted to agriculture soon spread to other States, given encouragement and impetus by the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862. The present-day efficiency of American agricultural production—the envy of the entire world—may be traced to those beginnings, which encouraged scientific research in agricultural subjects and which fostered the rapid practical application of scientific findings.

The benefits of American agricultural efficiency are not confined to agriculture; in fact, the achievements of agriculture are at the basis of and are the very foundation of the American standard of living. By continuously increasing the ability of fewer and fewer people on the land to produce more and more food and fiber, the primary necessities of life, you have enabled more people to go into the production of other things—the refrigerators, the automobiles, the television sets, and the countless other products—and to provide the great host of services, which form the fabric of the American standard of living.

About 50 years ago, when your Farmer's Week first started, one person on the farm produced the prime necessities of life for himself and only seven or eight persons living in the cities. Today, 1 person on the farm produces the food and fiber for himself and 28 persons in the cities.

This is a fact which I believe is not fully appreciated by the city dweller today, and in my conversations with city people I try to impress upon them the debt that all of us in America today owe to the technological achievements of American agriculture. And let me assure you this is not always easy to do. For with the reversal in the urban and rural population ratio of our country—with the change from a predominantly agricultural economy to an economy that is oriented largely to manufacture and trade—there has come a tremendous change in the thinking of the majority of our people. Most of you, as farmers, think of yourselves primarily as producers, and you are. But you are a minority. The majority of Americans are not farmers. The great majority of Americans today, even though they may be engaged directly in the production of some manufactured product, think of themselves primarily not as producers but as consumers. Their principal concern is how to make the paycheck stretch to cover the things and the services which they, as consumers, want to buy for themselves and their families.

This concern influences their whole thinking, and their emotional reaction to such things as farm programs. We might call it consumermindedness. It represents the way

of thinking of the majority of Americans. It is reflected, inevitably, in the Congress of the United States. This is a fact of life which I believe needs to be recognized more fully today by farmers, and particularly by those who develop farm legislative programs. A program which seems to benefit only producers and does not recognize the needs and attitudes of consumers has a difficult time in Congress today. As the effects of reapportionment are felt more completely, giving the city populations still greater representation, such programs, if any are proposed, will have an even more difficult time in the future.

The reverse is also true. A farm program which can be shown to have operated for the benefit of consumers should win support among those Members of Congress, and they are now a majority, whose constituents are primarily city dwellers and therefore think primarily as consumers.

This has special significance for you sugarbeet producers, since your success is so closely tied to the form and substance of sugar legislation.

I am convinced that the sugar program has always operated for the benefit of American sugar consumers, as well as for the benefit of American sugar producers. The law specifically states that it shall be administered so that it will "protect the welfare of consumers" as well as of "those engaged in the domestic sugar industry," and it has so been administered. We all know that in past years the sugar program has provided adequate supplies for American consumers and that prices in the United States have been no more than the average of prices in other nations around the globe, and in terms of living standards and wages and consumer income our sugar prices have indeed been the lowest in the world.

If ever there were justification for the sugar program, from the point of view of the American consumer, the justification occurred during last year, when the program was put to one of the severest tests it has received in nearly 30 years of operation.

Unusual circumstances developed in the world sugar situation which had repercussions in the American sugar market. Instead of the usual situation of a world supply greatly in excess of demand, a combination of rising world demand and lowered production in various foreign countries brought supply and demand close together—nearly in balance. This, abetted by what I am convinced was excessive speculation in so-called world sugar futures, caused an unusual rise in prices on the very thin, residual market which is called, improperly, the world sugar market.

All of this, in turn, alarmed many of our large industrial users of sugar, and they began to buy greatly in excess of their then-current needs. Naturally, this exerted an upward pressure on domestic sugar prices, since our program is geared to a steady flow of sugar to meet normal needs.

In this emergency, it was the domestic sugar industry, and in particular the domestic beet sugar industry, which, more than any other segment of the sugar economy, performed for the benefit of the American consumer—both as to rushing additional supplies on the market and as to resisting the tremendous upward price pressures.

If there had not been a Sugar Act over the years, to provide some encouragement for maintaining a domestic sugar-producing industry, there may have been no domestic industry last year. If there had not been a domestic sugar-producing industry last year, our consumers would have been entirely dependent upon high-priced and uncertain foreign supplies.

At the peak of the price distortion last May, the performance of the beet sugar industry in the interests of consumers was especially notable. Beet sugar prices in the

large Chicago-West market, where both beet and cane sugars are sold in quantities, were 3 cents a pound below cane sugar prices. And during much of the rest of the year it was the beet sugar industry, by holding its prices significantly under cane sugar prices generally, that exercised the restraining influence so necessary to keep the U.S. price to consumers from going through the ceiling.

I can readily understand why the cane sugar refiners, paying a higher price for their foreign raw sugar, felt their increases in the price of refined sugar were required in order to maintain their customary margin for expenses and profits. They would have felt obliged to raise their refined prices still more if the Sugar Act had not kept average foreign raw sugar prices on the American market lower than prices for the same sugar on the world market. Yet it is to the beet sugar industry that the great credit must and should go for resisting the strong upward pressures on price—and performing a notable service for the sugar consumers of America.

The beet sugar industry of this Nation successfully met another challenge during the turbulent year of 1963, and that was the challenge to produce. In an urgent plea to obtain more sugar for American consumers, the Government early last year assured you there would be no acreage restrictions on the planting of sugar beets during the present year, 1964, and then a few weeks later assured the industry that operations would also be unrestricted during 1965. You responded to the Government's pleas by planting more acres, and by increasing the capacity of the sugar plants to handle the additional crop.

Here in Michigan, although your acreage was already at a high level, you planted more than 9 percent more acres than you had in 1962. You were determined about this. In many cases, I know, the unusually cold and freezing spring caused some of you to lose your first planting and in some cases your second planting. But you replanted again and still again if necessary to produce the additional sugar that American consumers would need. And you took diligent care of your crop. You harvested more than 25 percent more acres last year than you did in 1962. It is my understanding that from the 1963 crop of Michigan beets between 2,900,000 and 3 million hundredweight of refined beet sugar have been produced, an alltime record.

For the entire Nation, the production of sugar from the 1963 crop of beets also established a new alltime high—in the neighborhood of 58 million hundredweight of refined sugar. Expressed in terms of the raw value equivalent, as quotas in the Sugar Act are expressed, that is 3,100,000 tons of sugar, the first time in the industry's history that production has surpassed the 3-million-ton figure.

Truly this is a splendid record, a record of stewardship, a record of outstanding performance in behalf of consumers, a record that should, if its full meaning is thoroughly understood, win friends for this industry in Congress when sugar legislation is considered this year.

For, as you know, this again is a year when Congress will be taking up the Sugar Act. The foreign quotas expire at the end of this year, and the entire sugar picture has changed so drastically, in the domestic field as well as the foreign field, in the year and a half since the law was last amended, that the Congress will want to consider changes in the domestic quotas as well.

In fact, a substantial increase in the beet sugar quota is absolutely necessary if you are not to be penalized for having responded so remarkably to the Government's plea for greater production.

Most of the sugar from the 1963 crop of beets is available for the market this year, in 1964. This fall you will again harvest a

big crop of sugarbeets, and beginning about the first of October the new-crop sugar will start to be available. This presents a problem for you and a problem for the Congress—because under the present law, your marketing quota, the limit on the amount you may sell, is only 2,700,000 tons. Yet with national production of 3,100,000 tons, you have much more than your quota available to sell—additional production that you achieved at the urgent plea of the Government.

There is now in both the House and the Senate, awaiting action, a joint resolution which would permit you to market this year all the sugar you can market from your production, regardless of your quota under the now outmoded quota pattern of the Sugar Act.

Early action is urgent so that the beet sugar companies can effectively plan for marketing all the sugar they have available, so that this sugar, which is in the warehouses and in the sugar silos here and now, which does not have to be shipped from some faroff foreign land, which is already in fully refined form and does not have to go through further processing—so that this sugar can be sold to the American consumers who need it. Early action on this resolution should be of special interest to the large industrial users of sugar because some of the foreign sugar interests have shown an inability or unwillingness to ship sugar to the United States in the quantities required during the first half of this year.

I shall, of course, support prompt action on this resolution in the Congress.

However, the joint resolution for this year will not answer your long-range quota question. This question is complicated by more elements than the simple question of this year's quota.

First, there is the high level of production which you and the rest of the industry have now achieved. You are aware that it is the established industry—not any of the new factories encouraged by the present law—which has attained the remarkable increase in production achieved in the year just ended. Only a small portion, a very small portion, of the 3,100,000 tons of beet sugar produced can be traced to the one new beet sugar mill which started operations late last summer. Much of this expansion in production by the established industry has been through increases in acreage by established sugarbeet growers and by fuller utilization of the capacity of existing factories. But there has also been a considerable investment in the expansion of existing processing facilities and there is more to come. I understand my good friend, Hugh Eldred, will discuss expansion plans of your progressive Michigan companies this afternoon.

Now all this expansion of the existing industry's production has been made in response to the urgent pleas of the Government to produce more sugar for American consumers—but it has been made without any assurance, thus far, that the acreage which has been such a significant and fundamental factor in achieving the expanded production would be protected beyond the 1965 growing season.

On the other hand, the acreage in new areas for new factories which are to go into operation this year, and in 1965, and in 1966, will be protected from cutbacks during the first 3 years of each factory's operations. For the factories that will begin operating in 1966, this protection will be carried through the 1968 crop. Thus, if the sugar supply situation should so change by 1967 or 1968 that sugarbeet acreage in the United States must be reduced in order to keep beet sugar production within the beet sugar quota, or to keep your returns per ton at a reasonable level, the brunt of the reduction will be borne by the unprotected producers, or those who

were able to increase less than others, that is, by the established industry—unless the law is changed.

The logical way, and I believe the only practical way, to provide some protection to the established growers, in the event of acreage reductions in the years beyond 1965, is to enlarge the basic beet sugar quota, and perhaps also the beet sugar industry's share of future growth in the total market, to such an extent that acreage reductions, if and when they come, will not penalize you who have met the challenge to serve American consumers during these trying times. This is the only fair and just thing to do.

It is my understanding that your industry representatives have been discussing this very thing the past few weeks. I hope you will not be too modest in your goals in this respect. Of course there will be opposition to whatever quota legislative goals you set. Most of the opposition will come, as in the past, from foreign sugar interests and their allies. But those groups cannot disprove your splendid record, nor can they match the performance in behalf of American consumers that you have achieved.

For example, some of the foreign sugar interests have displayed, this year, a strange reluctance to commit sugar to the American market at the going U.S. price for raw sugar. It seems to me that those countries whose industries failed to commit any global quota sugar to this market early this year, when they had plenty of sugar available to do so, should receive little consideration by the Congress when we hear their requests for quotas this year.

Of course I am not so naive as to believe that, simply because their record is not so plainly a record of serving consumers as is yours, that the foreign sugar interests will be less vigorous in their opposition to legislative fulfillment of the legitimate needs and goals of the American beet sugar industry. Nor am I unaware that there are sometimes forces at work in the Congress which do not seem apparent, and which are not evident in the speeches which take place on the legislative floor.

Yet I firmly believe that your case is fair and just. I believe that you can enlist the great sugar-consuming industries on your side, because you have served them well. I believe that since you have served consumers so well during a crucial year in sugar, you will find unusually widespread and favorable interest in your case in the Congress.

And I pledge to you my wholehearted personal support.

Hon. R. Walter Riehman Honored by Baptists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, we are always gratified when one of our colleagues is honored for his public service but it is particularly pleasing to me when the recognition comes to a good neighbor with whom I have closely worked and whose personal qualities have won my admiration and respect. Such was the case in the recent distinguished service award made to my good friend, R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, who has represented the 34th District of New York for over 17 years. It was given by the Onondaga

Baptist Association, January 24 last, at a testimonial dinner held in his honor.

The giving of this award clearly reflects appreciation of those qualities of mind and heart which mark him as a conscientious public servant. It is very heartening to have them recognized and applauded in such an appropriate and timely manner. I am sure this honor has brought great happiness to my colleague and served to reassure him that his dedicated and brilliant efforts have brought him close to the people he represents. The language of the citation speaks for itself but we in the Congress, who have observed the day-to-day integrity, capability, and faithfulness of WALTER RIEHLMAN, add not only our confirmation of his valuable contribution on the national scene but also, our congratulations to the people of the district who have repeatedly chosen him to represent them.

The appended text of the citation chronicles a lifetime of accomplishment and emphasizes the bond of appreciation and affection which can be developed between an able Congressman and an understanding constituency:

REPRESENTATIVE R. WALTER RIEHLMAN,
JANUARY 24, 1964

To Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, in recognition and appreciation of your leadership for 26 years in public service to the people of Onondaga County, the Onondaga Baptist Association wishes to take this opportunity to present you with this citation.

Distinguished public servant, dedicated Baptist layman, and Christian statesman, diligent businessman—all these and many other tributes could deservedly be paid to you on this occasion.

Representative of New York State's 34th Congressional District since 1947, you have served with distinction over these past 17 years. Prior to this office, you served on the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors, and as Onondaga County Clerk.

You have served on the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, as chairman of the House Military Operations Subcommittee, the Science and Astronautics Committee, the Select Committee on Small Business, and the House Administration Committee. You give careful study to the bills before the House, on which you must vote, and you work diligently to understand and interpret the issues. You are responsive to the needs and wishes of you constituency and concerned for the area and people you represent. Your decisions and voting record reflect your basic Christian convictions and your deep sincerity in upholding what you believe to be right and just.

You have been an active member of the Tully Baptist Church, and many weekends you have traveled from Washington to Tully in order to be present at Sunday worship. Your concern for Christian higher education manifested itself in your sponsorship of the CHEC leadership dinner at Hotel Syracuse at the beginning of the CHEC campaign. Your church and your Christian faith are important to you. You have a deep concern for young people, evidenced in one way by the careful manner you utilize in selecting the young men for the three armed service academies. You call together outstanding churchmen, educators, newspapermen, and men in Government, who go over the credentials of the applicants carefully, and you abide by the recommendations of this select committee in your decisions as to who shall attend West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy.

Another evidence of your concern for young people takes the form of a story. There was a young orphan boy who ran away from an orphanage. He came to your bakery in Tully, seeking work in return for a meal. You befriended this boy and took him into your home, and put him through college and seminary. He is now a minister serving Christ through the American Baptist Convention, and was at one time a minister in the Onondaga Baptist Association. And there have been others, too, whom you have helped and befriended along the way.

Your wife, Lucia Sherwood Riehman, and your two children and four grandchildren love and respect you for your distinguished service, given unselfishly.

You have been active in civic and community life, thus widening your influence as a Christian layman—in Tully Lodge, Shrine, Jesters Club, Rotary, Syracuse Press Club, and Scottish Rite Club. You are on the advisory board of the Tully branch of the Marine Midland Trust Co., and president of the Hill and Dale Country Club, as well as secretary and treasurer of the R W Shopping Center in Tully. Thus your family, church, community, civic, and social life, as well as your distinguished career as a public servant all give witness to your belief that a Christian in politics is one of the best places for a Christian to be.

We therefore honor you tonight, and are proud that you are a member of an American Baptist Church in the Onondaga Baptist Association, affiliated with the New York State Baptist Convention, and the American Baptist Convention.

"Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven." (Matthew 5: 16 (RSV)).

SYRACUSE, N.Y., January 24, 1964.

The Moment of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1964

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of our most highly respected Members of the House of Representatives is Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON of the 22d District of Ohio. As ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mrs. BOLTON has demonstrated a deep dedication to our national security and continually makes significant contributions to the work of her committee and to the work of Congress.

On Wednesday evening of this week Congresswoman BOLTON addressed the Women's Forum on National Security in Washington. Her speech is an excellent expression of good judgment.

The speech follows:

THE MOMENT OF TRUTH—ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, WOMEN'S FORUM ON NATIONAL SECURITY, FEBRUARY 5, 1964

Madam Chairman, members of the committee, members of the Women's Forum on National Security, and guests, to be here with you this morning is truly a great privilege and I thank you for the honor you have done me and the pleasure you have given.

What days these are. How different from those we had hoped for. How difficult to understand the many confusions we face with every rising sun. Yet we must meet

them with courage trying to see through the haze that all too often obscures our sun.

Perhaps a good way to look toward the future is to glance back into the past—for we know "The past is prologue."

My first winter in Washington was in 1917. Mr. Bolton was one of Secretary of War Newton Baker's aids and we lived at 1739 N Street, now a part of the pleasant Tabard Inn. It seems hardly possible now that one could meet an old school friend as I did in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue not far from the Willard and stand there and talk. But so it was before the onrush began.

Protocol was important in those days. One called formally, one was most careful. Even in 1928 when we returned to Washington with the Hoover administration one called on all the wives whose husbands ranked one's own. It was a pleasant custom and one met so many attractive women.

During that time some friends in New York sent me some counterfeit money and asked me to take it to the Treasury to have it looked into. Very timidly I did so and found myself in the hands of a keen-eyed, wholly delightful Mr. Moran who was soon to retire. I begged to be given the story when there was one and some weeks later had my curiosity and real interest satisfied. While we were waiting for the files Mr. Moran told me something of his growing concern for our country.

"Prohibition has done us all great harm," said he. "We find many of our eminent citizens are breaking the law in many ways that eventually cannot help giving the young people a sense that laws are there largely to be broken. But in addition it has established the new underground industry of bootlegging. The members of the trade are largely the Mafia and their ilk. They are paid exorbitantly, and money means power. They are men who have no regard or respect for human life nor for the country in which they live. I shall not see it," continued he, "but you will, Mrs. Bolton. They will take more and more power in higher and higher places." Look around you, ladies; was he not right?

I am inclined to believe that the era began anarchy that is abroad in the land today.

Beautiful as Washington is becoming, it has changed sadly since that day when we two women visited in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue. It has changed tragically indeed when neither women nor men are safe on the streets. It was only a few months ago that one of my own neighbors was shot to death but three or four doors away. We all know the succession of tragedies that have established a murder pattern in Boston, in New York, Chicago, etc., culminating in the unthinkable assassination of President Kennedy.

In southeast Asia heads of state have been murdered, as they have been in Africa, one of these, a truly wonderful man, because a small group of soldiers were discontented with their pay. What are we humans doing to ourselves? What has become of integrity and honor and loyalty?

Why are we permitting the very fundamental principles of our land to be twisted, now this way, now that, by people who have other principles? If I recall, it was one woman who started all the business about prayers in school that led to the somewhat misunderstood Supreme Court decision, one woman who has taken her boy—poor lad—to the West, declaring her atheism and disrupting everything. Only one Justice dissented, and I am proud indeed that he is Justice Stewart, of Ohio.

It seems to me that there is no justification for these things. Are we no longer a Christian nation, a believing nation? We gladly give all who come here the right to worship deity in whatever way they choose. But does it follow that they have the right to tear down our ways? On our coins, and now over the Speaker's chair in the House of Representatives, are the words "In God We

Trust." Whoever comes into this country knows that. If they don't like it they should keep still or get out.

But why is it that words can so confuse eight of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court that they did not uphold our very foundations? Something of great value has been lost.

Thirty-five or forty years ago a small group of men and women who had become greatly disturbed by the reading matter more and more available to the young made some exhaustive studies, which were followed by studies of the motion pictures. They found a truly appalling situation with apparently endless funds filling the newsstands and the moviehouses with constantly more destructive material which now, of course, is in everybody's living room on TV.

Once upon a time when you went to the newsstand you found Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly, St. Nicholas, and such magazines displayed. Those who wanted True Story, Confessions of a Man About Town, and more lurid ones still had to ask for them, whereupon they were brought out from way down under. Not so now. And to the magazines have been added the cheap paperbacks.

Don't mistake me. To have books at prices that can be paid easily is a tremendous boon—but there are all too many salacious volumes on the racks. There is a wonderful shop in the Washington airport that carries every sort and kind of fine book. One has to look hard to find even a detective tale. So it should be. And I must say a good word for the efforts being made by a number of the TV stations to give us increasingly attractive scientific, geographical, musical, and entertainment hours.

As I have watched these matters I have found that the Catholic Church really moved to have her people uphold decency. It has been disappointing to find volunteer censoring so ineffective.

Taking all these influence together, it would seem as if there were a powerful, well organized and financed group determined upon the destruction of the morale of the youth and the adults of the world. Are they not being tragically successful?

I think you will agree that we women as a whole do not borrow nor go into debt. Then why have we—who have had the vote for years—permitted the unbelievable extent of the national debt? Let's look at it cold-bloodedly and very factually for a moment:

In fiscal year 1965, interest payments on our Federal debt will exceed the current annual cost of keeping our entire Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in uniform.

More than five times as much will be spent in the next fiscal year for debt interest payments than for total missile procurement by the Air Force.

Interest payments will consume nearly seven times more of our taxpayers' dollars than will total Federal payments to educational facilities.

The annual cost of carrying the national debt will be twice as expensive as our 1965 outlay for the entire space program.

Interest on the national debt will account for more than five times as much as Federal expenditures for our entire natural resources program.

More than 10 times as much will be spent on debt interest than for our entire Federal health research program.

We have been told for years that Federal deficits are relatively harmless in view of the growing gross national product—the gross national product we have thrust under our noses all the time. And of course we owe it only to ourselves. And we continue the fiction of "raising the debt limit" every little while—as though that was paid attention to.

To do anything about that we women would have to get very busy and learn about all the many facets of finance. How many of

us would do this? And after we had become waywise, would we get out and do something about it? If we don't, who will?

In a wholly different area of our deteriorating position at home and abroad: We know there is confusion everywhere, especially among the young people. If we are honest with ourselves, can we keep from acknowledging that women are the keepers of the home, the holders of the keys? Here in our own country, thanks to our unwillingness really to pull our weight, discipline has been lost, respect has flown out the window, endless homes have been broken up, children are being left desolate, unhappy, with no understanding of the meaning of life—which in essence is made up of the disciplines of joy and sorrow, success and failure.

Am I wrong in believing that a nation is judged by its women? Are we American women giving other nations an image which lifts and builds strength, courage, decency, honor? I have tried to forget an experience I had years back in New Mexico at a corn dance, the shame I felt when a rather buxom blond joined the audience in short shorts, bare midriff, a bra, and a large hat that kept her neighbors from viewing a most beautiful dance. We seem to have grown so callous in the matter of dress and of behavior that one even sees occasional women in very abbreviated bathing suits up on Capitol Hill, in front of the old State, Navy building, all about town—and one shudders at the actions of both the young and the adult.

When I read that a young woman was raped just outside a Government building last week, I wonder how much she herself contributed to the man's excitement. Have you been happy over the very tight skirts and sweaters, the exaggerated bosoms? Surely not. Yet, what have any of us done to change the attitude of mind that makes and wears the current fashion? Certainly an eye for beauty would burn them overnight. To exaggerate sex in all possible ways seems to be the idea.

Let's look at the current Russian women. Yes, they are still cleaning streets and clearing away rubble—but Russia trains thousands of women as engineers, scientists, researchers, doctors and nurses, gymnasts, skaters, skiers, Olympic contenders, and I must say they put it all over us there.

Did you by any chance see a documentary film on ABC-TV not too many weeks ago? "Soviet Women." Of course, it was extremely well done—happy, busy, hard working, good

looking women, young, middle-aged, and old. The questioner said to a young woman who published a magazine: "You do not seem to mention sex." A lovely smile came over her face and she said with a quiet seriousness: "No, to us sex is a very private matter." Would we could say the same?

Perhaps I am dwelling too long upon matters that are not to our credit in this, the most wonderful country in all the world. I have not meant to, but somehow we have been given so very much of beauty, of space, of varying climates, of all material things, that one can't help wondering whether the infinite may not be tempting us with too much—to see what use we put it to. Isn't it time that we stop and look at the conditions that make it possible for there to be poverty, loneliness, even hunger, side by side with ease, comfort, opulence? What is wrong with us that we have angry rioting in our streets because all children do not have educational opportunities? Isn't it ironic that our scientific progress is increasing unemployment partly because of that lack of education and training? Are you and I doing anything about it? Are we insisting that vocational training be available to those who need it most? And that can be done locally.

And then are we moving into the larger aspects and doing something about creating jobs and more jobs and more jobs? You know as well as I do, and some of you, no doubt, better that the most essential thing in life is to have work—with it comes first of all a sense of self-respect, a fresh courage, a return of joy. Without it these things become increasingly less possible and happiness melts away as a deep bitterness takes its place.

This was not a part of the vision that conceived us nor of the dream that brought us into life. Where did we lose our way?

If this is our moment of truth, let us not fear it. Rather, let us take our courage and our faith in both hands and pray the infinite for the light with which to see the path.

Your committee gave me as my subject: "Moment of Truth." One comes to such a moment rather fearsomely, for it means facing one's inmost self, going down the stairway within one's soul that leads to the dark passage one would like to forget. Although one's hand trembles as it holds the candle so that its light shines upon the shapes one finds there, one realizes that only the acknowledgment of the truth about each one can dispel the darkness and the fear.

Is that not so of nations as well? Is this not a moment when this great country of ours that was conceived in a vision and born of a dream must gather up all her courage and examine herself as never before, that she may recapture the vision and be true to the great principles of freedom, of justice and above all else, the principles of demonstrating God's love in His world? Not an easy task, I grant you—but if we find ways to do it, it will save mankind.

Why is it our woman's task? Let me tell you in what might be called a parable:

"And it came to pass that the infinite Lord of all created this earth and set it in the heavens, putting upon man the caretaker's responsibility. Time elapsed. Upon His return He found all things in great confusion: the courses of many rivers had been changed, forests had been moved about, hills had actually disappeared. Deeply sorrowful, the infinite withdrew Himself that He might meditate upon the method by which restoration of beauty and productivity could be brought about.

"Upon His return He brought with Him woman. Upon her He had bestowed all the intelligence and the capacity He had given, man, and two things more. That she might understand both the agony and the ecstasy of creation He gave her pain. That she might bear it, He gave her laughter.

"Then He gave them to each other and said, 'The earth is in your charge, my children.'

"Gaily the man ran down the mountain-side. But the woman turned and knelt before Him, saying, 'What wouldst Thou of me, my Lord?'

"With great tenderness He replied, 'Go thou with him, give him children, watch over him, and then when the moment comes, bring him back to me.'

Surely there has never been such a moment as this in which we find ourselves. Although we know there are thousands upon thousands of fine, clean, earnest men and women in the United States and across the world, the very foundations of our life are being rocked by anarchy, by leachery, by faithlessness, by fear. What were we told 2,000 years ago? Was it not that "Perfect love casteth out fear"? What have we done to love?

Ladies for each of you, as for me and for our country, there is the moment of truth. May the infinite give us faith and hope and love, the greatest of them all, that we may fulfill His need of us.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1964

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 26: 4: Trust ye in the Lord forever; for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength.

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, whose daily blessings we frequently receive with so little of gratitude and cherish with so little of care, make us more acutely conscious of Thy divine providence.

Show us we may guard ourselves against those specters of anxiety and apprehension which seek to find lodgment in our minds as we face the adventures of an unknown future.

Help us to feel Thy nearness in the varied experiences of life, giving us guidance and courage for the demands and duties of each new day.

Grant that we may be faithful and loyal partners with all who are champions of righteousness and may none of our decisions and actions run counter to that which is just and reasonable.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8363. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REVENUE ACT OF 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.