minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern which has already been expressed in this House with regard to the serious threat imposed on the domestic industry as a result of the overwhelming increase of textile imports to the United States. Many of us in the Congress have been hopeful that a part of this import problem could be resolved through an international agreement. We are, however, greatly disturbed that textile imports have tripled since 1961 and if proper attention is not given to this problem, the basic structure of the textile industry will be severely damaged.

One of my major concerns is the devastating effect that these imports will have on our domestic labor force if they continue to come to the United States at the present abusive rate. We are fully aware of the fact that wage rates in foreign countries are far lower than in the United States. We also know that other costs of manufacturing in the United States are much higher than in foreign countries. Since these factors are so very important in the cost structure of production, they give an overwhelming advantage to foreign mills. Then too, foreign mills have demonstrated time and time again that they can shift their textile production to the most popular and profitable textile items in the United States. This gives them a double advantage of exploiting the U.S. textile market in such a way that it has a devastating effect in the marketplace here at home.

We should also fully evaluate textile imports as they relate to our national security and defense procurement program. Textile products are second only to steel from the standpoint of defense requirements and through the years, textile products have proven to be vital and essential to our combat readiness program. Some experts have suggested that modern warfare would be of short duration because of the possible use of the atomic bomb and therefore have concluded that textiles would not have the same important status which they held in the Korean war and World War II. This theory proved to be invalid in the conflict with Korea and the same is true in the case of Vietnam. In fact, the situation which now exists in Vietnam is proof that a vast amount of manpower and equipment is essential in conducting this operation. Instead of less emphasis on textiles, they have become more important to the Vietnam conflict than any time in history, as I observed when I visited Vietnam personally in 1966. The textile and apparel industries are providing clothes, underwear, jeep covers, parachutes, tents for housing troops, supplies and equipment, and in fact, a great variety of other essential textile items, such as durable but light tropical jungle uniforms.

I am proud of the fine record and contribution which Norwich Mills, Norwich, N.Y., is making to our national defense program. This mill located in my district produces sizeable quantities of underwear for the Armed Forces. I have been advised that the total underwear industry estimates that at the end of this fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1967, they will have provided over 47 million garments to all branches of the military service. The same applies to other textile shops, small as well as large, in our district.

The textile industry should be commended for the outstanding service it is rendering in supplying essential items for defense needs. It should be pointed out that they have voluntarily dropped many of their civilian accounts in an effort to meet the heavy demands for textiles to supply military requirements. Many of these items are complicated from the standpoint of construction and are manufactured under the most rigid specifications. In an effort to meet the heavy demands of military requirements, costly adjustments were necessary within the industry, but they have come through in an exceptionally fine way and have demonstrated once again that they are a vital and essential part of our national defense operation. This record of achievement is certainly impressive evidence that we cannot, and should not, permit imports to continue their rapid rise in this country, and to such an extent that they threaten the basic foundation of this industry and weaken the ability of the textile industry to supply our military requirements.

Mr. Speaker, there is every indication that the present duty situation on textile items is not discouraging imports to the United States and it would certainly appear to be a serious mistake to reduce the duties under the GATT negotiations on any textile items. It seems to me that the basic part of this problem can be fully resolved by strict enforcement of the International Cotton Textile Agreement, and I concur that this arrangement should be continued for at least 5 or 6 years and that a similar arrangement should be worked out for wool and manmade textiles.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Star on March 10, Columnist David Lawrence discusses the far-reaching consequences of a decision by the Supreme Court to force this body to seat the ex-Congressman from Harlem, Adam Clayton Powell. Quite correctly he points out that any such ruling would be a complete reversal of the position the Court has taken for over 100 years.

Knowing the Supreme Court as I do, it is quite possible they will try to ride roughshod over the House in this matter and I think it would be well for every Member to be familiar with the ramification of such an action as delineated by Mr. Lawrence. His column follows:

POWELL CASE AND 14TH AMENDMENT

(By David Lawrence)

Adam Clayton Powell and the entire civil-rights movement have more to lose than gain if the Supreme Court should rule that the House of Representatives must grant a seat to the Harlem minister. For if the Supreme Court chooses to overrule the House of Representatives about who shall be admitted to a seat in Congress, it will be a reversal of the attitude taken nearly 100 years ago when the highest court in the land refused even to consider such questions.

To put it another way, if the judiciary should take jurisdiction and order that a seat in Congress be given Adam Clayton Powell, then the validity of the 14th Amendment, which was fraudulently adopted, could be challenged now because in 1865, when it was first voted on, certain members of both houses were denied seats in Congress. The Supreme Court has always claimed it has been without power to intervene.

Historians have never disagreed about the facts. When the War between the States ended with Lee's surrender on April 9, 1865, President Lincoln proclaimed amnesty. Yet in December 1865, when the 39th Congress convened, both houses decided to deny seats to the members from 10 Southern states, including those whose legislatures had ratified the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery. Thaddeus Stevens, the Northern leader in Congress, based his case on the constitutional provision which says that "each house shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members."

This is the same provision that was cited recently by the House of Representatives in connection with its resolution excluding Powell. Yet every person elected to Congress from the South in the December 1865 session was over 25 years of age, an inhabitant of his own state, a citizen of the United States, and was elected by the people—the sole qualifications for admission according to Powell's lawyers.

When the new session of Congress began in December 1865, it was apparent that the 14th Amendment could not get a two-thirds majority in both houses unless the South was excluded. This amendment was submitted to the states by Congress on June 16, 1866. In the Reconstruction Act, which was passed in March 1867 by the "rump" Congress, it was declared that the 10 Southern states whose legislatures had rejected the 14th Amendment would not be permitted representation until their legislatures ratified the amendment.

Again and again, efforts were made to challenge these acts of a "rump" Congress. It was pointed out that the Constitution itself said no state could be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate without its consent, that peace had come to the nation, and that there was no longer any insurrection. But the Supreme Court of the United States deliberately put the issue aside and refused to make any ruling.

The explanation given at the time—and ever since—was that these were "political" questions and that the Supreme Court felt it had no right to interfere with the way Congress operates—whom it should admit and whom it should reject.

What would happen now if the Supreme Court suddenly decides to overrule Congress and compel the admission of Adam Clayton Powell, especially if he is elected again next month? If the high court abandons its historic position that it has no authority over who shall sit in Congress, then certainly another test could immediately ensue on the validity of the 14th Amendment itself. For even the lapse of time does not alter the historic facts or the constitutional issues.

Civil-rights laws today have as their legal foundation the 14th Amendment. So a victory for Powell in recovering his seat could easily turn out to be a set-back for civil-rights movement.

The "ratification" of the 14th Amendment has, to be sure, been accepted thus far as a realistic fact by the Supreme Court, but it could be subjected to new challenges raising questions as to the propriety of the method of "ratification" actually used. If the amendment were declared null and void, a substitute would then have to be enacted and

LATAM

submitted to the States. Public opinion would doubtless favor adoption, but Congress would also have to re-examine and reenact the previous legislation on civil rights.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, next month, President Johnson will attend a meeting of the American Presidents at Punta del Este in Uruguay, to give new impetus to the Alliance for Progress.

Among the multiple interests and programs of accomplishment achieved in the years of the Alliance there has developed a grassroots, extragovernmental movement which has caught the interest of the people of many of our States as well as many of our Latin American neighbors.

It is called, Partners of the Alliance.

This concept, less than 3 years old, sprang from a desire to involve private citizens on an active program of mutual assistance. In 1966 the organization expanded its membership and scope of operations to include 31 U.S. States and the District of Columbia and 15 Latin American republics. Members include educators and students, business leaders and trade unionists, doctors and nurses, and representatives of many other professions and community organizations. At their local, regional and international meetings they exchange ideas and collaborate on projects which will promote the aims and spread the benefits of their alliance within the Alliance for Progress.

Since its founding, the program has provided a flow of three to four million dollars worth of technical and material assistance within the partnership. This exchange takes in such diverse items as high school and university scholarships, agricultural, and electrical equipment and tools.

A major share of the U.S. Partners' attention has been focused on the shipment of hospital equipment to Latin American rural areas and the implementation of impact-type projects in community development.

Most important is the growing understanding of attitudes and problems which have developed into firm friendships on a working basis.

In late 1966, the U.S. Partners formed a national association and elected their first national president—Edward Marcus, of Texas, civic leader, and executive vice president of Nieman-Marcus.

In the pervasive hemispheric scope of the Alliance for Progress, this organization is indeed small in size, but nevertheless, significant. It manifests the deep feelings of mutual friendship between the peoples of Latin America and our own and, indeed, lends substance and validity to the great overall effort of the Alliance for Progress.

This spirit of brotherhood is strong, I believe, in the general feeling in this country about the Alliance for Progress. I am pleased to count myself among the enthusiastic supporters of President Johnson's programs in Latin America, and I wish him well as he and his fellow Presidents undertake discussions to give a new phase to the alliance.

TAX CREDIT PROVISIONS OF LAIRD REVENUE-SHARING BILL—H.R. 5450

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include charts and drafts of revenue proceedings.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, when I recently took the well of the House—February 15, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages H1330 to H1349—to introduce my new revenue-sharing bill, H.R. 5450, I delivered extensive remarks on various aspects of revenue sharing. I also discussed the general failure of the current grant-in-aid approach to the problems of our States and localities. This subject is one which concerns us all, and will be the subject of further detailed discussion in the weeks and months ahead.

Today, however, my remarks will be confined to one particular aspect of the Laird revenue-sharing bill. That aspect is section 13 of the bill which provides a credit against Federal taxes on the income of individuals for State and local taxes paid.

The distinction between a tax credit and a tax deduction is a simple one. The tax deduction permits an individual to lower his net income for computing his Federal income tax liability. A tax credit, on the other hand, is applied to the total tax obligation of an individual and is treated in the same manner as if it were a cash payment on the Federal income tax which an individual must pay.

Section 13 of my bill provides an initial tax credit of 10 percent in the first year of its operation. Then, the amount of the tax credit is increased by 10 percent each year until the plan is fully operational in the fourth year and the tax credit has reached 40 percent.

Section 13 of my bill is primarily designed to return additional tax sources to the States by reducing the Federal tax burden on individual taxpayers. The tax credit section would affect the average married taxpayer with two children in the following way:

At 10 percent, no matter what the income level, every taxpayer would be better off taking the tax deduction provided for under present law. This was done in order to preclude any drain on the Federal Treasury in the first year both because of the Vietnam war and in order to give the States time to plan their own tax programs after the legislation is enacted.

Section 13 also provides that the taxpayer will always have the choice of a tax credit or a tax deduction. This is so structured that while it will benefit most taxpayers to take a tax credit, some income taxpayers would still find it to their best interests to take the present tax deduction.

I have had a table prepared which shows the effect of this new method of tax computation on a typical individual with a family of four.

At the 20-percent tax credit level in the second year of operation, the family of four with an income of $5,500 would save $15.95 by taking the credit rather than the deduction. For the same income level, with a 30-percent tax credit, the saving would amount to $47.85 for the average family of four. When fully operational in the fourth year of the program, the family would save a total of $79.75.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the table which shows the effect of the Laird revenue sharing bill's tax credit section be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Before that, however, let me point out that under section 13, when an individual's net tax obligation is less than the amount of credit which he can claim, the individual's tax obligation will be zero. Under present law, of course, he would not receive a rebate for the full amount of the credit which he has computed. This would also be true under section 13 of H.R. 5450.

Another point to bear in mind when examining this table, is that the figures for deductions are averages based on the total returns filed in that income category with the Internal Revenue Service.

The most recent complete data which is available on this subject covers calendar year 1964. It is this data on which the enclosed table is based.

The table referred to follows: