

lower, not higher, prices for sugar. There are occasions when a Senator must think of the national interest, even if his vote may not be popular at home. But this, I submit, is not such an occasion. This bill, I argue, is not in the national interest. It is definitely opposed to the interest of all Pennsylvanians, because we want lower—not higher—sugar prices.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report, in the hope that after further consideration a bill more in the public interest can be passed.

It is said that we must have this bill immediately, lest the country be flooded with cheap sugar, since the present act which maintains the support prices has expired. But, Mr. President, in my judgment this would be something far short of a catastrophe. The long-range damage which this measure would do to our foreign policy far outweighs any short-range harm to the artificial domestic support price of sugar which would result from postponing enactment of this legislation until we can get a decent bill.

I regret that the administration has not told us why it has abandoned its original opposition to the conference report—an opposition which was widely circulated as late as this morning. I hope that on further consideration the President will decide to veto this measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report. However, I wish to say that I highly commend the conferees for obtaining the best possible bill from the conference, under all the circumstances which prevailed.

For a number of years at about this time of the year I have been subjected to the proposition that time is running out, and that unless we act at once, irreparable damage will be caused the country. Each year for the last several years, at about June 27 or June 26, there hurriedly comes before this body a sugar bill which requires passage by midnight of June 30.

I wish to be free in the exercise of my judgment, without having presented to me the argument that unless I act at once, irreparable damage will come to the Nation. I cannot understand how it is that this annual, identical coincidence occurs—that the sugar bill comes to us at a late hour, making it impossible for the Senate to exercise its voluntary, independent judgment.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the very structure of this allocation of quotas to different nations of the world creates a flood of lobbyists who not only are promised fixed fees, but also are promised contingent fees, dependent upon their success in procuring for their principals assignments of sugar sales. I do not wish to be in the position of subscribing to what I saw in a pamphlet, which was placed on my desk, about the inordinate fees—contingent and otherwise—being earned by those who have come before the committees to present the cause of the nations who are so frantically fighting for the assignment of quotas.

At one time I taught, in law school, the subject of agency; and I recall that there is a principle of law that whenever an agent is hired, on the basis of a contingent fee, to procure the performance of an act by an executive public official or by a legislative body, that arrangement is contrary to public policy, and is invalid.

In connection with the measure before us, we cannot reach into the private agreements on a contingent basis which have been made by various countries with special agents to procure the passage of the pending measure. But I will not by my vote indirectly and impliedly give approval to this nefarious practice. I will vote against this measure, if on no other basis than the fact that these countries should be told that we do not subscribe to such procedure.

To the nations which rely upon their ambassadors, I express commendation; and if I could have my way, I would give them special benefits because of that very fact.

Next, Mr. President, from the standpoint of foreign relations, our country should be able—without the involvements and entanglements which will come from the creation of these new assignments of quotas, and I understand that there are to be 12 of them—to deal freely with Cuba, if and when Castro no longer is there. But through this program of assigning quotas now, regardless of the efforts to mollify the assignments, the problem of dealing with Cuba in the event Castro no longer is there will become more complicated.

In conclusion, I commend the conferees for what was done; I think they did a superlative job. But I still believe that the allocations to individual nations are not helpful to the United States. They throw a cloud upon what is happening in the other body and what is happening in the Senate. I do not want lobbyists to laugh while I am voting to give approval to what has been done. From my standpoint, I notify them that the moment they appear on the basis of contingent fees, that very act will stamp their conduct and the conduct of their principals as improper, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I promise to take not more than 1 minute; but I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who was one of the conferees, that I hope he recognizes—as I do—that on page 4 of the report there is a provision that special consideration shall be given to the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The following language appears:

In authorizing the purchase and importation of sugar from foreign countries under this paragraph, special consideration shall be given to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

Does not the Senator from Louisiana believe that language was written in carefully, prayerfully, and purposely; and does he not agree that we do intend that special consideration shall be given to these countries?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, that is definitely intended; and it is hoped by

those who wrote this report, as well as by those who agreed to it in the conference, that this measure will be administered in such a way that those countries in the Western Hemisphere would be preferred—if that can be done—in connection with the purchases of sugar, because they have been our historic sources of offshore sugar; and also we want consideration given in this connection, insofar as possible, to countries which have been purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. On that point, the House conferees may say that the House is very anxious to protect countries which have purchased U.S. agricultural commodities, and that therefore we should have an opportunity to do this for those countries, if that is at all possible.

I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and I think he also agrees that this consideration should be given.

For myself, I wish to say that I hope it will be given, because these countries have been our historic sources of our offshore sugar, and they have also been purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities. So I believe they certainly should be given this special consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And I hope the State Department will take steps to see to it that such special consideration is given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMITHERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Maryland [Mr. BEALL and Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are also necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 110 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Aiken	Dworshak	Kerr
Allott	Ellender	Kuchel
Anderson	Engle	Long, Mo.
Bennett	Fong	Long, Hawaii
Bible	Hayden	Long, La.
Bush	Hickey	Mansfield
Byrd, Va.	Hill	McCarthy
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	McNamara
Cannon	Hruska	Metcalf
Cooper	Humphrey	Monroney
Cotton	Jackson	Morse
Curtis	Javits	Moss
Dirksen	Johnston	Mundt
Dodd	Keating	Muskie

Randolph	Stennis	Wiley
Robertson	Symington	Williams, N.J.
Scott	Talmadge	Yarborough
Smith, Maine	Thurmond	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—12

Case	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Clark	Lausche	Proxmire
Douglas	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—33

Bartlett	Ervin	Murphy
Beall	Goldwater	Pastore
Boggs	Gore	Pearson
Burdick	Gruening	Pell
Butler	Hart	Prouty
Capehart	Hartke	Russell
Carlson	Jordan	Saltonstall
Carroll	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Magnuson	Smith, Mass.
Church	McGee	Sparkman
Eastland	Morton	Tower

So the conference report was agreed to. Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1530, H.R. 8050, to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 202(c)(4) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by inserting "(A)" after "(4)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(B) Of the quantity authorized for purchase and importation under subparagraph (A), the President is authorized to allocate to countries within the Western Hemisphere, for the six-month period ending December 31, 1962, an amount of sugar, raw value, not exceeding in the aggregate 75,000 short tons, and for the calendar years 1963 and 1964, an amount of sugar, raw value, not exceeding in the aggregate 150,000 short tons."

(b) Section 202(e) of such Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to sugar exported by any foreign country to

the United States to fill any allocation made to it under subsection (c)(3)(C)."

(c) Section 207(e)(2) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any allocation made to a foreign country under section 202(c)(3)(C)."

(d) Section 213 of such Act, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "(4)" each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)(A)";

(2) by striking out "paragraph (3) of section 202(c)" in the first sentence of subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (3) and (4)(B) of section 202(c)"; and

(3) by striking out "(4)" each place it appears in the first sentence of subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)(A)".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if they were enacted as a part of H.R. 12154 entitled "An Act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the title of the bill, I should like to make an explanation of the proposed amendment. First, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am not sure that I correctly understand the amendment. If I correctly understand it, it would restore to the basic quotas 150,000 tons of sugar for foreign producers and deduct that amount from the so-called global quotas. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; from the global quotas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. From the global quotas. If I correctly understand the mathematics, assuming the Senate adopts the amendment and the bill is enacted, we shall have established permanent basic quotas of 7,000 tons more than Mr. COOLEY proposed or than was provided for in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not at all certain about the figure. If the proposal were adopted, it would operate on the same basis as is operative with respect to other countries which have been given quotas under the conference report which the Senate just considered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand the situation, the conferees took 143,000 tons out of the permanent, basic quotas assigned under the Cooley bill and added that amount to the global quotas. This proposal would take 150,000 tons from the global quotas and put it back in the basic quotas column. The net result would be, after all this debate, premium payments on another 7,000 tons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I always accept the Senator's word.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the circumstances I wonder if administration officials who denounced the Cooley bill do not now owe the gentleman on the other side of the Capitol an apology. I cannot support this proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will take the Senator's word.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin desires to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. However, the amendment of the Senator from Montana is not printed. It is difficult for the Senator from Wisconsin to draft an amendment in the time available.

If the President were to be given such discretionary sugar authority it would be greatly preferable, in the judgment of this Senator, that the quota come not from the global quota but from the national quota. In other words, there should be a pro rata reduction of the quotas which have now been provided to the various countries. Out of that amount 150,000 tons could be made available for distribution, apparently to Argentina and the Dominican Republic.

Under those circumstances the Senator from Wisconsin would be willing to support the bill. If the Senator from Montana will modify his amendment to provide that the quotas shall come from the national quotas, I will not have to offer my amendment. If the Senator is not willing to do so, however, the Senator from Wisconsin will ask the Senator from Montana if he would be willing either to hold the bill over until tomorrow, so that an amendment could be drafted, or to provide the necessary time so that the Senator from Wisconsin might have such an amendment drafted accurately by counsel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator, if it will not inconvenience him too much, will try to draft an amendment of that nature tonight, so that, if possible, the Senate can consider it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I understand the problem in this regard. I have indicated as much in the course of the debate on the conference report.

Those of us who supported the Senate position were supporting the position of the administration in the conference, when we contended that no more than about 300,000 tons should be on a premium basis, and that even that amount should be phased out over a period of 5 years. As I have indicated, the administration had no idea as to what the outcome on the conference report was likely to be.

Our friends on the House side, for reasons best known to themselves—I suppose for tactical reasons if no other—insisted that there should be no administration advisers in the room to advise the conferees on the foreign policy problems that would be created by the conference. Under the circumstances, having supported the Senate position and trimmed the House figures to the lowest point to which we were capable of trimming them, I understand that the President feels that if we are to put additional quotas in, there should be some flexibility and discretion on the part of the Presi-

dent to allot some additional quota to Argentina and perhaps to some other country within this hemisphere in order to meet the various foreign policy considerations that might confront the President and his advisers.

I point out that the House bill would have assigned quotas to various countries. They were the quotas that were carried into the conference. For example, the Republic of Peru was to be assigned 350,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 190,000 tons, a reduction of 160,000 tons. More sugar was involved in that reduction than the proposed amendment would involve, insofar as adjusting the entire quota in the hemisphere is concerned.

The Dominican Republic was to be assigned 350,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 190,000 tons, which was a reduction of another 160,000 tons.

That is more than the Senator's amendment contemplates. According to the House bill, Mexico was to be assigned 350,000 tons. That amount was reduced to 190,000 tons.

Mauritius was to have been assigned 110,000 tons. We reduced that amount to zero.

South Africa was to have been assigned 120,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 20,000 tons.

India was to have been assigned 130,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 20,000 tons.

Australia was to have been assigned 200,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 40,000 tons.

Brazil was to have been assigned 340,000 tons. We reduced that amount to 80,000 tons.

The point is that we made a reduction of 1,635,000 tons in the amount proposed in the bill that the House had passed, and we reduced the premium prices as well. While he has not personally asked me, I understand that the President has said that since the conference report made the allotment of 1,200,000 tons and added additional countries, the President would like more flexibility to make adjustments.

As a practical matter, if we were to try to do what the Senator from Wisconsin has proposed and undertake to take the proposed adjustments out of the allotments made to countries that have already an agreed quota, the House Committee on Agriculture would not consider it. It might be possible to bring about the desired result the other way around. We could give the President the necessary flexibility to assign an additional quota to Argentina, or perhaps make some increased adjustment insofar as the Dominican Republic is concerned. But, as a practical matter, if we were to try to do it the other way around, by taking a quota away from some country that the House held out for to the very end, I regret to say, the probabilities are that the House would not consider it and the House Committee on Agriculture would not act upon it if we did it that way.

I personally objected, as did my senior colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to going back to conference to consider the question. I believe that my judg-

ment in the matter is vindicated by what has happened in the Senate. We have had an all-day debate, even when the question was not raised. That being the case, it seems to me that if we would give the President the flexibility he has requested, we must keep in mind that we are working with quotas. Neither the President nor any of his advisers was consulted about what the new quotas were to be. We in the Senate were fighting for what we thought the position of the administration to be. We agreed to no more new premium quotas than we were forced to accept. The President now says, "If you are going to put new quotas in the bill, there should be some flexibility to make adjustments in order to meet what might be a bad international situation."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. There have been a good many discussions on the floor of the Senate today. I have understood that the proposed amendment to the honeybee bill would allow the President to set up the 20 million tons for Argentina and provide some additional leeway to deal with the Dominican Republic or perhaps with other countries that had not been, in his judgment, reasonably or fairly treated. Is that the understanding of the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The figures would be at the discretion of the President, and the countries mentioned would be given consideration. But the whole amendment would apply only to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that it would apply to the Western Hemisphere, but I also understood all day, during the various stages of the debate, that the amendment to be offered would take care of the Argentina problem and afford the President leeway to deal with the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the measure would give the President such flexibility.

Mr. HOLLAND. And it is so intended?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am perfectly willing to accept that explanation of the majority leader, though I shall always be glad to join in an amendment if the Senator from Wisconsin prepares one on the subject.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to be sure that I correctly understand the purposes of the Senator's proposed amendment, if he decides to offer it. In explaining it, he said that his amendment would provide that instead of taking the proposed sugar quota from the global quota, it would take the new quota from the national quota, which is subject to two interpretations I wish to establish for the record that the Senator would not propose taking the quota away from the national quota so far as it applies to the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, no. I am delighted to have the Senator from South Dakota emphasize that point.

Mr. MUNDT. The quota would come from the quotas given to foreign countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct—the national quotas to other nations, not the domestic quota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wished to clear up the ambiguity. I was sure that the Senator had that in mind.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for clearing up that point.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to ask a question of Senators who handled the conference and who are now handling the amendment to the honeybee bill. I think it is a record for the Senate to attempt to embrace a program almost before it has been adopted. The question I raise is, Why do we not show full confidence in the administration by giving the President authority to assign quotas or to negotiate the necessary international agreements with regard to all the unassigned quotas?

It is my opinion that something of that kind will have to be requested in any case, because if we go into the world sugar market to purchase sugar, I believe we shall be in violation of at least three international agreements that we have signed.

First, I think we shall be in violation of commitments we have made in the United Nations.

Second, I think we shall be in clear violation of our commitment under the International Sugar Compact.

Third, we shall be in violation of the charter of the Punta del Este Conference, which we signed most recently.

I believe that now would be a good time for the Senate to say, "We will give the President authority to reassign quotas and to enter into agreements with regard to all the quotas in keeping with our commitments under the three international compacts."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My colleague has pointed out some important developments and facts that we must face. I have in my hands a copy of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958. In article 21 of that agreement the United States as a party to that agreement has recognized the minimum sugar price which will permit a realization of the objectives to be achieved. As set forth in article 21 of the agreement, the objective is 3¼ cents a pound. The present world price is 2.7 cents a pound. We have fixed our signatures to an agreement, which has been adopted and ratified by the Senate, in which the objectives of the act, as specifically outlined in article 21, will require a price of 3¼ cents a pound. I think the Senator has made a good point, and I think an analysis of the Sugar Agreement in my hand will so demonstrate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the historic policy of the United States to maintain a fair world price for sugar.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**HISTORIC POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO MAINTAIN A FAIR WORLD PRICE FOR SUGAR**

The United States has long been a party to the International Sugar Agreement. The latest version of the agreement was ratified by the Senate of the United States as recently as 1959.

In transmitting the agreement for ratification on May 13, 1959, Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon stated the policy of the United States as follows:

"U.S. sugar producers have consistently supported the negotiations of sugar agreements in the realization that the United States should do its part to help avoid a drastic decline in the price of sugar in the world market, with its attendant effects on the sugar industries of friendly foreign countries."

In support of this policy objective, the United States has agreed under the International Sugar Agreement of 1959 not to allocate quotas for the importation of sugar into the United States to countries that do not participate in the International Sugar Agreement.

Furthermore, the United States as a party to the agreement, espouses the following principles which are set out in article 1 of that document:

"The objectives of this agreement are to assure supplies of sugar to importing countries and markets for sugar to exporting countries at equitable and stable prices and, by these and other means to assist in the maintenance of the purchasing power in world markets of producing countries or areas and especially of those whose economies are largely dependent upon the production for export of sugar by providing adequate returns to producers and making it possible to maintain fair standards of labor conditions and wages."

The United States, as a party to the agreement, has also recognized that the minimum sugar price which will permit these objectives to be achieved is 3.25 cents per pound, as set out in article 21 of the agreement.

The United States as a signatory to the International Sugar Agreement, and in its own interest and that of its friends and allies, must recognize that the present world price of sugar, at 2.7 cents per pound, is not an adequate price.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator would agree that we could adopt that kind of language and send it to conference. In the meantime there can be some consultation with the State Department, the administration, and those responsible to see that we carry out our international agreements.

**SUGAR QUOTAS—EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 8050**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended by H.R. 12154, Cuba is given a quota of 57.77 percent of the total quotas for all foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines. Based upon estimated domestic consumption of sugar of 9,700,000 tons, Cuba's quota for 1963 and 1964 would be 1,635,000 tons.

However, under the provisions of the Sugar Act, as amended by H.R. 12154, the quota for any foreign country is sus-

pending during any period during which the United States is not in diplomatic relations with such country, and a quantity of sugar equal to the amount of the suspended quota is authorized to be purchased and imported from other foreign countries. Thus, during the remainder of this year, and during 1963 and 1964, the Cuban quota of 1,635,000 tons would be available for purchase and importation from other foreign countries.

Subsection (a) of the proposed amendment authorizes the President, for 1963 and 1964, to allocate to countries within the Western Hemisphere 150,000 tons of the suspended Cuban quota, leaving a balance of 1,485,000 tons which could be authorized for purchase and importation from foreign countries under the so-called "global quota." For the 6-month period beginning July 1, 1962, and ending December 31, 1962, 75,000 tons could be allocated by the President to Western Hemisphere countries out of the 817,500 tons assigned to the global quota for this 6-month period.

Under section 213 of the Sugar Act, as added by H.R. 12154, an import fee is imposed on all sugar purchased and imported under the global quota. This fee has the effect of eliminating the premium price for sugar so imported. The new section 213 also imposes an import fee on sugar imported under the regular quota provisions in effect for the remainder of 1962 and for 1963 and 1964. However, in the case of sugar imported under the regular quotas, the import fee is 10 per cent of the full import fee for the remainder of 1962, 20 percent of the full fee for 1963, and 30 percent of the full fee for 1964. The effect of this provision is to reduce gradually the premium price for sugar imported under the regular quotas.

Subsection (d) of this proposed amendment provides that sugar imported under allocations to Western Hemisphere countries made by the President under the authority given to him under subsection (a) will be subject to the import fee provided for sugar brought in under the regular quotas and not the import fee provided for sugar purchased under the global quota. Thus, a portion of the premium price would be paid for, such sugar—90 percent for the balance of 1962, 80 percent for 1963, and 70 percent for 1964—the same as would apply to sugar imported under the regular quotas.

Subsections (b) and (c) of the proposed amendment are in the nature of technical amendments to provisions of the Sugar Act, as amended by H.R. 12154, to carry out the intent of the Senate and the conference committee with respect to the 10,000 tons of sugar which the Secretary of Agriculture may allocate to foreign countries for which no regular quota or allocation is provided in the law. Subsection (b) of the proposed amendment makes it clear that the provisions of section 202(e) of the Sugar Act, as amended by H.R. 12154—relating to countries which export sugar—are not to apply to an allocation made by the Secretary under the provision referred to above. Subsection (c) of the pro-

1962

posed amendment makes it clear that the provisions of section 207(e) (2) of the Sugar Act, as amended by H.R. 12154—relating to restrictions on the importation of direct-consumption sugar—are also not to apply to sugar imported under an allocation made by the Secretary under this new provision.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to make inquiry at this time of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin as to whether he intends to offer his amendment and; if so, how much discussion may be involved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have discussed the amendment with the majority leader. If it is agreeable, I should like to discuss the amendment tonight and vote on it tomorrow under a time limitation. In this way there would be no inconvenience to Senators, because they could go home now. We could vote tomorrow without delaying the Senate. I believe the Senator from Montana has suggested that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and that the vote come at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to reserve the right to offer an amendment also.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can we arrive at an agreement as to how much time Senators would like for discussion of their amendments?

Mr. McCARTHY. Whatever the Senator suggests. Perhaps 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senate could convene at 11 o'clock, and vote at 12 o'clock. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. MORSE. I would suggest that the leadership put off the vote until Thursday if a unanimous-consent agreement is desired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Speaking only for myself, I am completely satisfied with the Senator's statement that he expects the Argentine quota to be taken care of without fail out of this amount, and that the rest of the amount can be used in the discretion of the President, with consideration, of course, of the Dominican situation and of any other situation which the President thinks requires consideration.

Mr. KERR. In this hemisphere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In this hemisphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. In this hemisphere only.

#### ORDER FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY TO MEET DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### INCREASING SUPPORT FOR INVESTMENT CREDIT PROPOSAL

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two items which are significant as indicators of the increasing trend of support within the business and financial community for the investment credit proposed by the administration to stimulate modernization and expansion of the Nation's productive equipment.

One is an excerpt from a report by the Research Institute of America of the results of a survey it conducted among its more than 30,000 members, constituting a representative segment of American business. This report showed remarkable support for the administration's tax and tariff proposals. In particular, it showed a 2 to 1 favorable margin for an 8-percent tax credit on investment in new equipment. As the institute's summary points out, contrary to current estimates in some business and political circles, two-thirds of the responding businessmen favored the investment tax credit. Only about a quarter were opposed and about 8 percent were noncommittal.

This extensive support for the investment credit is all the more impressive, expressed as it is by a group which frankly opposed many other administration policies. The investment credit was in fact almost as widely supported as the Treasury's forthcoming liberalization of depreciation guidelines, which was favored by 79 percent of the responding businesses.

The other significant indicator is an article entitled "Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of July 2. It is written by Mr. George Shea, one of the most knowledgeable and astute observers of the American financial scene.

Mr. Shea notes, in his lucid and penetrating discussion, that the investment credit is in fact a specific technique of tax reform which effectively supplements the shorter depreciable lives and liberalized depreciation procedures to be announced by the Treasury Department within the next week or so.

There being no objection, the release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BUSINESSMEN FAVOR J.F.K. TAX AND TARIFF MEASURES BUT RETAIN OPPOSITION TO ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 26.—Remarkable support for the Kennedy administration's tax and tariff proposals was expressed by a representative segment of the American business community in a detailed poll conducted among its more than 30,000 members by the Research Institute of America. The results included a 2 to 1 favorable margin for the 8-percent tax credit on new equipment, a majority vote in favor of the foreign income section of the 1962 tax bill, opposition to a temporary tax cut now, overwhelming support for the trade bill and for the promised depreciation revisions.

(NOTE TO EDITORS.—The results of the questionnaire sent to over 30,000 business executives representing every type and size of business firm located across the country, are

attached. This tabulation of returns is the largest response ever received by the Research Institute of America in a poll of its members. The nature of the cross-section of American business surveyed and the exceptional number of responses makes this poll an unusually sensitive reflection of the attitudes of American businessmen.)

The single exception to the favorable response to the administration's tax and trade packages was the significant opposition to the provision calling for the withholding of tax on interest and dividends, which was opposed by over 75 percent of the business executives who responded to the poll by the Research Institute, the Nation's largest private, industry-supported, business advisory organization.

These results are made all the more noteworthy by the fact that the same survey, which received the largest number of responses in the Research Institute's 26-year history, demonstrated that the anxiety in the business community about the administration is extremely high, and that opposition to a number of the nontax aspects of the Kennedy legislative program was overwhelming.

Contrary to current estimates in some business and political circles the businessmen responding favored two of the three most controversial sections of the tax bill passed by the House and currently under Senate Finance Committee scrutiny; the 8 percent tax credit provision which was favored by 65.1 percent, with 26.9 percent opposing and 8 percent no opinion. The provisions for taxing of foreign income were favored by 43.4 percent, opposed by 41 percent with 15.6 percent noncommittal. On a related tax matter, the businessmen supported the administration's position by voting against a temporary reduction of corporate and personal tax rates now by a margin of 61.7 percent to 35.3 percent, with 3 percent expressing no preference. Also, only 1 out of 10 respondents expressed opposition to the coming revision of the depreciation schedules.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 2, 1962]  
APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

A curious aspect of this year's debate on the tax measure which the Senate Finance Committee is laying aside for the present has been the nature of the opposition to the proposed credit for new investment in equipment. Sources that say they speak for business, and sources that say they speak for labor unions and liberals, have both opposed it.

As passed by the House the credit would let businesses deduct from their income-tax bills 7 percent of what they spend on additional equipment. The business opponents say they would rather have a reform of the law governing the depreciation, for wear and tear of property, that may be deducted from taxable income. The leftwing opponents say that if there's any tax reduction at all it should be in the lowest brackets of individual income tax rates.

Reform of depreciation can be accomplished, basically, in only one way. That's by allowing depreciation to be deducted faster than is now permitted. Such will be the net effect of an announcement expected later this week from the Treasury, setting forth new and simplified categories of so-called useful lives of various kinds of property. It will enable businessmen to depreciate in, say, 15 years, property which previously could not be written off in less than, say, 25 years.

The argument in Congress isn't over these coming schedules. What the business group which opposes the credit wants is a law that

would give businesses even more freedom than the Treasury can grant them under present law.

Complete reform would let businesses write off facilities at any rate they liked, even writing off 100 percent of a piece of property in the year it is bought. The Government would lose revenue in that year, because the deduction would reduce taxable income more than now permitted. But in subsequent years, as long as the property was in use for profitmaking activities, the Government would gain revenue, because that property would yield no further deductions from income. Assuming no change in the number of years the property is used under either method of depreciation, the Government would neither gain nor lose in the end.

Actually, the Government, and also the economic system, would probably gain through such complete freedom. The reason is that the faster any property is written off, the less tendency there is to keep it in use after it becomes obsolete or even mildly inefficient. Then, any earlier replacement of, say, a machine would not only stimulate economic activity, but would also bring earlier income-tax revenue to the Government on the profit made by the builder of the new machine.

However, the chances of getting the Government to give businessmen that much leeway are pretty small. For one thing, the Government might indeed lose a great deal of revenue the first year. For another, many legislators would be vaguely afraid businessmen might get away with something thereby.

Thus the problem becomes one of political strategy, in which the essential difference in results between the credit or a more liberal depreciation law must be judged. Actually, the resemblance between the two is greater than appears at first sight.

The credit would work this way: A business buys \$100 of equipment. That year, after calculating its income tax the usual way, it is allowed to reduce the tax by 7 percent of \$100, that is, by \$7.

Methods of fast depreciation now available in the law let a business write off equipment more heavily in the first few years of use than in later years. For instance, one such method available in present law, if applied to a piece of equipment with a useful life of 15 years, lets a business write off in the first year one-eighth, and in the 15th year only one one-hundred-and-twentieth, of the value. The first-year deduction on the \$100 piece of equipment thus can be \$12.50, which, at the corporate tax rate of 52 percent, would save the business exactly \$6.50 in tax in that year.

Thus, the credit, which would save \$7 in tax in the year of purchase, could be looked upon as the result of extra depreciation. The amount of depreciation which would save \$7 at a 52-percent tax rate would be \$13.46.

A special feature of the proposed credit is that it would be available in addition to the full predication deductions already permitted by law. Thus, the buyer of the \$100 of equipment with a life of 15 years could, in the first year of using it, save both the \$7 through the credit and the \$6.50 through using the depreciation method described above. That's a total saving of \$13.50. And the amount of depreciation which would save \$13.50 at a 52 percent tax rate is \$25.96.

As far as the taxpayer is concerned that's the equivalent of a depreciation deduction on the \$100 facility of more than 25 percent in the first year. While technically this is not the same thing as a new form of accelerated depreciation, it has the same result.

One argument of some business opponents of the credit has been that it is a gimmick which could be repealed very easily. That's a matter of opinion, of course, the counter-argument being that tax concessions once

specifically granted by Congress are difficult to repeal.

Another argument is that the credit would be a windfall for businesses which have been planning to spend money on equipment, and thus would discriminate against those that aren't planning to spend or don't have the money. However, the same thing might be said of depreciation reform; when such a law was passed in 1954 it was made applicable only to newly purchased facilities.

And even if a new reform measure were applied to all property, businesses purchasing new facilities would get the greatest benefit from it; it would apply throughout the life of the new facilities but only to the remaining life of the old.

Complete reform of depreciation rules would surely be desirable. The question of political strategy at this time is whether half a legislative loaf is better than the possibility of getting none at all by helping the liberals fight the proposed credit.

#### DISCRIMINATION IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent days Senators have received a communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Roswell L. Gilpatric, releasing the results of a study of the shifting pattern of Defense prime contract procurement.

Boiled down to its essence the Gilpatric report, "The Changing Patterns of Defense Procurement," says the following:

First. Three out of four dollars of prime contract money awarded to universities and nonprofit research institutions were centered in five States—Massachusetts, California, Maryland, New York, and Illinois—and the District of Columbia. Over \$300 million out of the total of \$431 million awarded in fiscal year 1961 went to these five States and the District. Thirty-five percent of the total went to the State of Massachusetts alone.

Second. Of the total research, developmental testing, and evaluation contracts let in fiscal 1961—a total of \$6 million—over 41 percent went to California. New York had 12 percent. The other 48 States shared less than 47 percent of the total of this \$6 million.

As Mr. Gilpatric points out, the concentration of this RDT&E effort in California and the eastern seaboard States is of major importance because any company which has contracted or managed the research, design, development and testing work on a new weapons system—or major component—and has assembled the engineering, talent, and experience for this purpose, is obviously in an exceptionally strong position to compete for the follow-on production contracts, and for new developmental contracts, as well.

Third. The Gilpatric report stresses this latter point by listing the military prime contract awards by region and demonstrating that California alone, which had 41 percent of the RDT&E contract money, also had 24 percent of the total military prime contract awards. New York, which had 12 percent of the total RDT&E contract money, had 12 percent of the total prime military contract award money. Massachusetts,

which had 5.8 percent of the RDT&E contract money also had 4.8 percent of the total prime contract awards.

We do not have the figures from Mr. Gilpatric for fiscal year 1963, but a general idea of the Defense Department's contracting pattern can be assumed by examining the published figures for NASA's fiscal year 1963 \$3.7 billion budget request, published in Missiles and Rockets, June 11, 1962. Four States will get almost two-thirds of the NASA budget. California is scheduled to receive almost \$1 million—\$947,767—which is over one-fourth of the total NASA budget. Florida with \$543 million, Louisiana with \$395 million, and Alabama with \$341 million, account for another one-third of the NASA budget. Texas, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Maryland, and Virginia will receive over \$100 million each of the NASA budget. This leaves 40 States to share  $\frac{1}{2}$  billion of the NASA budget, with only 10 States accounting for over \$3.2 billion dollars—a very heavy concentration, indeed.

Mr. President, we are very proud in Minnesota of the great Institute of Technology at the University of Minnesota—an institute which has won worldwide acclaim in many fields, including those of aeronautical engineering and electronics.

We are also very proud of the fact that in the Minnesota area we have the second or third largest complex of electronics work—more than 170 firms, almost all of them founded within the last 5 years and almost all of them heavily engaged in both commercial and defense subcontracting. The number of people employed in the electronic industry in Minnesota by the end of 1961 had increased 75 percent over the year 1955.

It includes such giants as Remington Rand Univac, IBM, and Minneapolis Honeywell. It also includes scores of bright young firms employing a handful of engineers.

There is no question but that the meteoric rise of the electronics industry in Minnesota is directly related to the presence there of a great university and its superlative institute of technology. Even now, industry leaders have been planning with the University of Minnesota a huge new industrial research facility.

What concerns me is that in Minnesota, as doubtless in other areas of the country in which there are other great universities, the Defense Department and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have simply fallen behind the times. They have evidently taken the easy way out in the award of prime contracts, both for research and development and production.

Mr. President, I am interested in knowing why the Department of Defense feels it has to put fully half of its entire RDT&E money into California and New York. I am interested in knowing why half of the money for RDT&E contracts awarded to schools and nonprofit institutions must go into the States of Massachusetts and California.

Is it now about time that those managing the Defense Department's research and development programs recognize the

1962

### PROXMIRE AMENDMENT TO SUGAR BILL SAVES \$8,400,000

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the Mansfield amendment to the bill relating to the sugar act. The Senator from Montana's amendment provided additional discretionary quotas in the hands of President Kennedy so that the situation in Argentina and in the Dominican Republic may be handled more satisfactorily.

My amendment would have the advantage of saving \$8,400,000 for the American taxpayer in Treasury payments, and of retaining an additional 150,000 tons in the global sugar quota—to be bought at world prices and kept available for Cuba in the event Cuban Communists are overthrown. The global quota under my amendment would remain at 1,635,000 tons. If my amendment fails it will be reduced to 1,485,000 tons.

Presidential discretion to allocate 150,000 tons would be secured by eliminating the following quotas which were allocated in the conference report adopted Monday, July 2.

At the present time Australia has a quota of 40,000 tons. That quota would be completely eliminated. So would the quota for India, which under the conference report has a quota of 20,000 tons. South Africa's 20,000 tons would be eliminated, as would the 10,000-ton allotment of the Fiji Islands. The Netherlands would have its allotment of 10,000 tons eliminated. In the category of "other countries" the allotment of 11,332 tons would be eliminated.

None of the above countries is located in the Western Hemisphere. On the basis of the hearings and the debate, it seems clear to me that while perhaps a case could be made out for premium prices being paid to countries in this hemisphere or to countries which traditionally have supplied sugar to this country, a case for providing additional quotas for countries outside the Western Hemisphere is peculiarly weak.

There is at least one country in the group which is not an exporter of sugar. Wealthy sugar speculators in that country would be buying sugar from Cuba at the world price and selling the same sugar at the premium price to the United States, thereby making a windfall, hand-out, painless, unjustified profit.

In addition the quota for the Republic of China would be cut back from its 35,000 ton conference allotment to its historical base of 3,000 tons or by 32,000 tons.

No Western Hemisphere countries would be cut back, other than Canada, which is included in the above listing with a small allotment under "other countries," with the exception of three dependencies which already receive premium sugar prices from their mother countries:

British West Indies would be cut back from its present 90,000 tons by slightly more than 5 percent or by 4,668 tons.

French West Indies would be cut back from their present 30,000 tons by 5 percent or by 1,500 tons.

British Honduras would be cut back from its present 10,000 tons by 5 percent or by 500 tons.

Mr. President, my amendment would provide the President with authority to allocate to Western Hemisphere countries the 150,000 tons of premium sugar that he believes necessary in the wake of Congress' decision to continue the practice of handing out quotas to various countries.

I propose that the 150,000 tons be taken from quotas given new suppliers outside the Western Hemisphere, countries which are basically importers of sugar, and those Western Hemisphere producers who receive premium sugar prices under other preferential sugar programs.

In accomplishing what the President desires, I believe my amendment is much closer to the spirit of the administration's overall sugar policy and, therefore, superior to the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

In the first place, my amendment would save the taxpayers about \$8.4 million. The Mansfield amendment proposes to take the 150,000 tons from the 1.6-million-ton global quota, thereby reducing, by that amount, sugar upon which the Treasury is to recover the quota premium. With the quota premium today running about \$56 a ton, the Mansfield amendment would prevent the Treasury from collecting \$8.4 million. My amendment would not touch the global quota.

Second, my amendment would preserve at 1.6 million tons, the already depleted quota that would be available to Cuba. The Mansfield amendment would cut this by another 150,000 tons. I wish to add at this point, Mr. President, that some Senators may believe they are doing harm to Castro by this dissection of Cuba's U.S. sugar quota. I remind them that today Castro cannot sell 1 pound of sugar to this country. The government that is being harmed is the one that we hope eventually will replace Castro and will lead Cuba back into the free world. That government will need the economic assistance that would come from being able to sell a majority of the 5-million-ton Cuba sugar output in the United States at world market prices, or better.

Third, Mr. President, by eliminating five new quota countries and one old quota country—which is a net importer of sugar—all of whom are outside this hemisphere, we relieve our Government of the pressures that could develop from our support, through a premium subsidy, of their sugar industries.

I should like to emphasize that relieving our Government of this pressure is relieving us, not of just \$8,400,000 a year, but of a cost which will be a great deal more than that, both in the first year and throughout the years, because we know that if anything is true, it is that once a subsidy is begun and once such a commitment is made to a foreign country, it is impossible to retract it without a great deal of difficulty, and

also without running a serious risk of causing that country to become unfriendly.

I should like to discuss each of those countries for just a moment.

Australia's 40,000-ton quota would be eliminated. Australia has a Commonwealth sugar quota of 600,000 tons, 300,000 of which she sells to the United Kingdom at a premium price comparable to our own. The remainder goes to other Commonwealth countries at the world market price, plus a favorable tariff concession which comes to about 1 cent a pound. Australia sells over 150,000 tons outside the Commonwealth agreement at world prices. With a carryover of 700,000 tons, Australia could readily sell sugar to us at world prices without a premium.

India's new 20,000-ton quota would be eliminated. India has developed a domestic sugar industry which, with government aid, has aimed at getting into the export business as a means of raising foreign exchange. From 1959 to 1961, India's production rose over 1 million tons, while domestic consumption remained almost constant. Our 20,000-ton premium quota would be only an aid gesture, and I think would better be handled in foreign aid legislation. With carryover stocks of over 1.5 million tons, India could very well compete on its own for part of our global quota.

South Africa's 20,000-ton quota would be dropped. When South Africa resigned from the Commonwealth over her apartheid policies, she lost her privileges under the Commonwealth sugar agreement. By purchasing her sugar at premium prices, we would just be picking up where the Commonwealth left off—in effect, giving support to her apartheid policies, through support of her sugar industry.

Mr. President, as the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, said on the floor of the Senate yesterday, based on his expert experience in this field, this would be a very serious mistake. It would hurt us dramatically at the United Nations; and the other countries of the United Nations, especially those in Africa and Asia which have supported us in the past, and which are deeply opposed to the apartheid policies, would feel that they would have to oppose us.

Fiji's 10,000-ton quota would be eliminated. Fiji has a 1962 quota, under the Commonwealth sugar agreement, of 134,000 tons, which brings her a premium payment from the United Kingdom. This covers over 80 percent of her exports. Our 10,000-ton quota would put almost all of Fiji's sugar export capacity under preferential sales agreements.

The Netherlands would lose its 10,000-ton quota. The Netherlands position in the U.S. sugar program stems from its shipments of sugar in the early twenties. All the Netherlands' shipments up to now have been refined sugar, and apparently its quota is in violation of provisions in the recently passed Sugar Act which bar importation of refined sugar.

In addition, the Netherlands is a net importer of sugar—over 140,000 tons in 1961, of which approximately 30,000 tons were from Castro's Cuba.

Mr. President, is there any sense in that? Why in the world should we buy sugar from the Netherlands when the Netherlands is an importer of sugar and is purchasing sugar from Castro's Cuba? Does that make any sense? The Netherlands buys the sugar at the world price, but sells it to us at a premium price. I think the world of the Dutch; they are wonderful people. But talk about a giveaway. This is the grossest kind of giveaway, without any kind of rational Government policy of helping all the people. Instead, it would simply help a few producers, who, as we have seen, are enormously wealthy and are characterized by two things: high profits and the low wages they pay those who work for them.

My amendment would also take away the 10,000 tons that have been eased into the Sugar Act for Ireland. I would note, Mr. President, that the Mansfield amendment that is directed, supposedly, at helping the Dominican Republic, Argentina, and Peru, contains no less than two paragraphs that have the effect of preserving the 10,000 tons of refined sugar that are aimed at Ireland.

Apparently no one knows why the Irish, who are net importers of sugar, have come into this 10,000-ton bonus. In 1960, the latest figures available to me, Ireland imported 30,000 tons of sugar with no less than 22,000 tons coming from Castro's Cuba. For all we know, Mr. President, Ireland may be shipping us refined Cuban sugar at U.S. premium prices.

The China quota would be cut from the 35,000 tons granted in the new legislation to the 3,000 tons that China has traditionally held in the U.S. market. There is no reason to purchase additional sugar from a supplier that is as distant from us as is China, except in the case of the Philippines.

It can be said that in the case of Formosa we are very anxious that the Formosan economy succeed and that we help it. We are. We are providing enormous help, through economic aid and defense support, to the Chinese Republic on Formosa, and we should do it, in my judgment; but to provide this additional handout or giveaway, not on any rational basis, but merely because everybody else is getting it, to me makes no sense.

The quotas of the British West Indies, British Honduras, and the French West Indies have each been cut by 5 percent.

As a matter of fact, the British West Indies were cut slightly more than 5 percent.

The reductions were made on these three Western Hemisphere producers since each of them already participates in a preference market. With the granting of a U.S. quota, each would become a recipient, in effect, of subsidies from two governments.

I am submitting my amendment at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 202(c)(3) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) (A) The quotas for foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be prorated among such countries on the following basis:

"(B) From the quantity not prorated under subparagraph (A), the President is authorized to allocate to countries within the Western Hemisphere all or any portion of the quantity of sugar not prorated under subparagraph (A)."

"(b) The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if they were enacted as a part of H.R. 12154 entitled 'An Act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended', Eighty-seventh Congress, second session."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honeybees, and to amend certain provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended."

#### PROXMIRE \$247,105,000 REDUCTION IN HEW APPROPRIATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I am submitting an amendment to reduce the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The appropriation bill containing appropriations for this Department is now on the Senate Calendar, and I understand that it will be brought up in the very near future; if not on Thursday, early next week.

My amendment would reduce the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by \$247,105,000. It would cut back each expenditure in the appropriation bill to the level requested by the administration.

While my past efforts to reduce this appropriation have failed, the administration's unfortunate experience with these excessive appropriations in recent years should persuade the Congress that the time has come to blow the whistle on this deliberate extravagance.

Last year appropriations over what the President requested were not only protested by the administration. Secretary Ribicoff properly refused to spend some of the funds. Other funds were not expended because it was impossible to program the unexpected bonanza of money the Congress had forced on the administration.

On Monday the Fountain subcommittee provided the conclusive reason why the Congress should stop this excessive spending when it reported on the poor management by the National Institutes of Health and declared that "Congress has been overzealous in appropriating money for health research," with pressure for spending from skyrocketing appropriations resulting in waste.

In a personal comment, Chairman

FOUNTAIN added that, "until NIH is capable of ministering these research funds in a manner which will assure their careful and proper use, I believe the Congress should hold the appropriation for these programs at the present level, and should not in any event, appropriate more than the President has requested."

The amendment, at least in part, is in response to that advice from the chairman of the subcommittee in the House, who has taken considerable time and expended much effort to study and consider appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, and who has made this outstanding report in connection with the mismanagement of these funds.

The great difficulty is that there is no question that it is politically unpopular for anyone to vote against research in cancer, heart disease, or mental illness no matter how high. All of us feel strongly that we should do all we can do effectively to combat these dread illnesses.

However, when the administration is headed by a President who served, when a Senator, on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the Senate and who, as we all know, has great compassion and understanding and appreciation of health research, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is headed by a former Governor of Connecticut, Abraham Ribicoff, a nationally known liberal, who also has a heartfelt compassion and deep interest in these things, and they recommend a certain amount for the appropriation, it seems to me to make no sense for Congress to say that it feels even more strongly in this matter and to appropriate funds which are not requested.

Madam President, in every case the budget estimate in which my amendment would reduce appropriations is well above the 1962 level of agency expenditure, although in a few cases 1962 appropriations exceeded the budget request. The reason for that is that the Department last year could not spend a part of the appropriation, and as to the rest of the money, the administration decided it was unwise to spend it, and therefore restricted it. In spite of that, the administration requests this year are substantially larger than last year's expenditures, and these appropriations, even when cut back by my amendment, would still result in a substantial advance in Federal spending for health research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

#### THE CASE AGAINST AN IMMEDIATE TAX CUT: PRICE STABILITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the general support that we have heard throughout the country as well as in Congress for a tax cut was joined by the Governors at their conference yesterday. Of course, the Governors are extraordinarily sensitive to the needs of their States and are in important positions of responsibility and political in-



President and Mrs. Kennedy attended Mass in the morning.

Waving and cheering Mexicans, dressed in holiday attire, later lined the entire 11-mile route from the basilica to the International Airport, from which the President left for Washington. He left behind a triumph in the establishment of better relations between Mexico and the United States.

After a final farewell at the airport, Mr. Kennedy and President Adolfo López Matéos embraced in the traditional Latin American abrazo. On Friday, when they had met, they shook hands formally, and the absence of an abrazo was conspicuous.

The change from a formal handshake to an embrace paralleled President Kennedy's achievement of a switch in Mexico's attitude toward the United States from coldness to warmth and understanding.

In the talks between the two Presidents and in a joint communique issued yesterday there was no overt reference to the coolness that had developed in relations over the last few years.

President López Matéos aroused a certain amount of ire when he cautioned the foreign press to "write the truth about what has happened here in this meeting." But aside from this, there was virtually complete rapport between the two Presidents and between the Presidents and the press in general during the talks.

The harmonious discussions also provided a setback for extreme leftist elements that had attempted to have Mr. Kennedy's visit canceled.

#### PROBLEM NOT INSOLUBLE

It appeared evident that there were only a few concrete results from the visit. However, the two Presidents proved—apparently to their mutual satisfaction—that the insoluble problems of the past that had barred harmonious relations were now not as insoluble as they had seemed.

Mexico has won an assurance that President Kennedy would use his energy and authority to help solve some of her principal problems with the United States.

President Kennedy, on his part, appears to have aligned Mexico, with only minor reservations, as a strong supporter of the Alliance for Progress, which is designed to speed social and economic development in the hemisphere.

The attitude of Mexico regarding Cuba has not changed, but there appeared to have been little hope of bringing about a change even before the talks had started.

Mexico regards Cuba's Socialist ideology as incompatible with democratic principles, but she has refused to support measures that would isolate Cuba from other nations in the hemisphere.

On the Alliance for Progress, which the United States regards as its best long-range weapon for defeating any spread of revolution by Cuba or the Soviet Union in the hemisphere, Mexico agreed that the plan "is essentially a program of mutual cooperation, in which the greater effort should come primarily from the nation which is seeking its development."

The Mexican statement is expected to aid the United States in its efforts to promote the Alliance as a partnership in which self-help, rather than one-way aid, is stressed.

During the talks, President Kennedy announced a \$20 million agricultural loan to Mexico under the Alliance program.

The Presidential discussions also led to an interim settlement of the thorny problem over the Colorado River waters that are used to irrigate farmland in Mexico. The United States agreed to take measures to reduce the waters' high salt content, which has ruined many acres of Mexican cotton land.

Mr. Kennedy also pledged to use his efforts to reduce trade barriers between Mexico and the United States.

Overall, President Kennedy worked hard and consistently at advancing the idea that the revolutionary heritage of the United States was similar to that of Mexico. Observers viewed this approach as one of the factors that contributed to the success of the President's visit.

#### VISIT TO TOMBS

Mr. Kennedy and his wife began their official day early by joining in the placing of wreaths at the tombs of Mexico's two revolutionary heroes, Francisco Madero and Venustiano Carranza.

Later, as they entered the Basilica of Guadalupe, a crowd of about 5,000 worshipers broke into applause. The Right Reverend Miguel Dario Miranda y Gomez, primate archbishop of Mexico, welcomed them and later led a prayer in English for the "full success to all the efforts" made during the President's visit.

#### KENNEDY RETURNS TO UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, July 1.—President Kennedy's plane landed at nearby Andrews Air Force Base at 5:35 p.m. today after a 4-hour flight from Mexico City.

President Kennedy dispatched a thank-you message expressing friendship for Mexico to President Adolfo López Matéos while flying back to Washington.

He said their talks would provide a firm basis for continued cooperation between their two countries. He then added: "I came to meet a President and a statesman, I have left you as a friend. Viva Mexico."

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1962]

#### FIRST LADY VISITS SHRINE OF MEXICO

MEXICO CITY, July 1.—Mrs. John F. Kennedy offered a bouquet of red roses at the shrine of the patron saint of Mexico today and was enrolled into the Roman Catholic order that is dedicated to spreading devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe.

Five thousand worshipers watched as Mrs. Kennedy climbed the steps of the huge altar of the church and knelt at the top step with the bouquet of roses, the official flower of the patron saint.

She offered the flowers to Archbishop Miguel Dario Miranda y Gómez who was celebrating the Mass in honor of President and Mrs. Kennedy on their departure from Mexico.

The archbishop took the roses to the altar, blessed them and then selected three and gave them to the wife of the President. Kissing the medal that had been placed about her neck, Mrs. Kennedy was inducted as a Dame of Our Lady of Guadalupe.

#### SITE DATES TO 1531

The shrine to Mexico's patron saint was built on the site where, on December 9, 1531, the Blessed Virgin was said to have appeared to an Indian named Juan Diego.

For a doubting bishop who demanded proof, Diego put into his serape some roses said to have suddenly bloomed on the barren land. When he unfolded the serape in front of the bishop there were no roses inside, according to the story, but a picture of the Virgin. This picture is displayed in glass at the high altar of the shrine.

The archbishop addressed President Kennedy and his wife as they sat in a second-row pew:

"We pray that all the efforts made by all of you will bring understanding. We pray to assure full success to all the efforts made in the past few days you have been in the capital of our country. We pray for the peoples of both countries and to the peace of the hemisphere."

#### MEXICANS CHEER HER

The visit to church ended the 2½-day state visit by President and Mrs. Kennedy. Cries of "Jackie, Jackie," and "Viva Jacqueline" signaled the part that Mrs. Kennedy had

played in the happy capture of Mexico's capital.

Mexican women were fascinated by Mrs. Kennedy's wardrobe. She changed her dress several times daily during her brief visit, but only once did she repeat her costume, a white outfit she wore Friday and today.

There was praise today for a First Lady, who had apparently done her homework up for the trip. She impressed Dr. Eusebio Davalos Hurtado, director of the National Anthropology Institute, with questions that showed some knowledge of Mexican anthropological history. In fact, after her visit to the museum she and Dr. Davalos persuaded President Kennedy to break into his tight schedule and sneak away late yesterday afternoon for an unscheduled tour of the institute.

Perhaps Mrs. Kennedy's biggest success with the Mexicans was her decision to speak in Spanish at a luncheon yesterday of scholars, writers, and industrialists.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been concluded, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, JULY 3, UNTIL NOON ON THURSDAY, JULY 5

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock on Thursday next, the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] be acted on under a 30-minute limitation of debate on each amendment, 15 minutes to a side; and that at the conclusion of the debate on those two amendments, the vote be taken on the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, does that mean that the honey bee bill will not be considered tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will be considered or not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will not be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What will be the order of business tomorrow? I understood that probably the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, which would be eligible

huge amounts of funds into the hemisphere's economies—is giving voice to this view.

President Kennedy's trip to Mexico this weekend is a step in achieving wider political acceptance of the alliance.

#### AIMS SPELLED OUT

The objectives of the alliance, Mr. Herrera says, besides being economic, are also political "since they are designed to create in Latin America a united group of strong, independent, and progressive countries whose presence in world affairs represents a positive force in defense of man's ethical and spiritual values and in furtherance of international understanding."

Postponed consideration of the political problems inherent in the Alliance is one of its chief limitations, Mr. Herrera believes, and may impair its chances of success.

Mr. Herrera expressed these views at a colloquium on Latin America at Georgetown University this week.

#### SUPPORT NEEDED

The awakening of broad political support among the masses is a precondition for activating development policies and plans, he said. (Provisions for a public information program for the Alliance were turned down at Punta del Este months ago.)

Mr. Herrera observed that a complex set of political factors, including the fact that there are 20 separate Latin nations often going their own separate ways, determines the insufficiency of a public information program to bring about the desired climate in hemisphere public opinion.

Often, he said, when one country received a loan, persons in another country, instead of realizing the overall value of the loan to all of Latin American, carp about their own country not receiving enough:

#### COOPERATION INVOLVED

In the United States, the realization is necessary that the Alliance is a cooperative effort of all the Americas that entails reciprocal responsibilities and benefits.

Mr. Herrera urged mobilization of public opinion in all the hemisphere's countries by chief executives and political leaders, rather than just by economists, who are not particularly equipped for this sort of effort.

He urged, too, the establishment of machinery for economic cooperation such as Europe has found so useful, and which was approved at the highest political levels, such as the Organization for European Cooperation, now superseded by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the European Coal and Steel Community.

#### BANK ROLE REVIEWED

The IADB president, who is a Chilean, reviewed some of the activities of the bank in its short period of existence, which included the following projections:

At the time of termination of projects already approved by the bank and under active consideration, the number of houses constructed will be 166,336, benefiting 1,088,437 persons.

The number of water supply and sewerage systems installed will be 1,005 in 864 locations for the benefit of 16,686,410 people.

And the number of persons benefiting from projects in the agricultural field will be 724,086.

#### RESEARCH STIMULATED

IADB also has helped the alliance stimulate study of Latin American economic and social problems and preparation of national development plans (a concept many Latin countries have resisted for years).

The amount of foreign resources that must be invested in Latin America in the current decade has been determined, targets established for the rate of growth in per capita product and for improving significant indices of social conditions.

Mr. Herrera urged that in the light of recent European experience, "we must give se-

rious thought to the possibility of establishing institutions such as a Latin American parliament and executive bodies designed to carry out economic integration in specific sectors of our economy, as Europe has done with the Coal and Steel Community."

#### TRAINING MUST EXPAND

To provide a solid footing for the technological revolution Latin America needs, "We must expand our current effort to train our national labor force and raise its cultural and technical levels," he commented.

The total of Latin American technicians and professionals today is about 50,000 persons, or the equivalent of 0.24 professional persons for every 1,000 population. By comparison, the United States has a technical force of about 1,100,000, or the equivalent of 6 professional persons for every 1,000 population.

A massive effort in the technical training field is, therefore, imperative, said Mr. Herrera, to raise the number of Latin American professionals to 110,000 by 1970, or an increase of 120 percent over current levels.

[From the Washington Post, July 2, 1962]

#### MEXICO BIDS KENNEDY'S FOND "ADIOS"

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

MEXICO CITY, July 1.—President Kennedy's visit to Mexico ended today, as it began on Friday, on a wave of emotion.

Several hundred thousand persons crowded the streets to wave goodbye to the President and Mrs. Kennedy drove from the historic Shrine of Guadalupe, where they attended mass, to the airport.

The crowds today, while smaller than those on Friday that set a record here, were largely unexpected and showed no signs of being organized. They were as friendly as any a political leader could wish for.

If there was any anti-U.S. sentiment, often advertised here, it did not show in the smiling faces that greeted the Kennedys throughout their visit.

At the famous shrine tens of thousands of persons jammed the plaza to applaud the Kennedys as they entered and departed. Inside the great church itself 5,000 worshippers forgot tradition and vigorously applauded the American guests.

There were many more thousands along the entire 10-mile route through some of the poorest sections of the city to the airport, where President and Mrs. Adolfo López Matéos bade their guests farewell.

Although there is strict separation of church and state in this Catholic country the people seemed to applaud the President's choice of the Shrine of Guadalupe, the center of Catholic authority and tradition, in which to worship.

The Mexican President followed tradition by staying away from church, and no high official accompanied the Kennedys to the shrine. Mexicans said it would be in violation of the spirit of the Constitution for President López Matéos to attend mass.

But the Mexican people were delighted when the first Catholic President of the United States went to their most hallowed church.

Mexican and United States officials called the weekend visit a personal triumph—and the President took off for Washington at 11:30 a.m., Mexican time (1:30 p.m., e.d.t.) in a mood far different from that of a year ago as he returned from his Vienna meeting with Premier Khrushchev.

[The presidential jet landed at Andrews Air Force Base at 5:30 p.m. (e.d.t.). Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy traveled by helicopter to the White House.]

What the visit seemed to accomplish was not a change in the politics of either country but a change in attitude on the part of Government and people here. Difficult prob-

lems still exist and longstanding suspicions have not been entirely forgotten.

But a new basis for discussion apparently was established.

As one expert explained the situation, the Government will not feel compelled to play upon anti-U.S. sentiment but will be able to approach difficult Mexican-American problems with a desire for settlement.

President Kennedy began his day with a symbolic gesture as significant as his visit to the shrine.

He went to the Monument of the Revolution to lay wreaths on the tombs of Francisco I. Madero and Venustiano Carranza, thus identifying himself with the revolution which the Catholic church opposed and which Mexican history books say the United States has always opposed.

Then the President and Mrs. Kennedy drove to the shrine where an Indian peasant is said to have seen the Holy Mother on December 9, 1531.

Since that time the Virgin Mary has been regarded as the protectress of the Indian people and the patron saint of Mexico.

The Most Reverend Miguel Darío Miranda, archbishop primate, met the Kennedys and Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and Mrs. Mansfield at the door and escorted them to their seats.

It was at this point that the worshippers first broke into loud applause. Some shouted "viva." Then the congregation and choir sang the moving "Hymn of Guadalupe," which they sang again as the services ended.

Speaking in English, the archbishop welcomed the U.S. visitors and praised them for helping to strengthen peace and good relations between Mexico and the United States. He invoked God's blessings and said the mass was celebrated to promote friendship between the two peoples.

After the archbishop read the Mass, Mrs. Kennedy, kneeling, presented a bouquet of red roses as an offering to the patron saint of Guadalupe.

The rose is the flower of the Virgin of Guadalupe because the Indian peasant who is said to have seen the Holy Mother was admonished by Zumarraga, to whom he reported the vision, to return with some evidence. The peasant, Juan Diego, went back to the top of the hill where only cactus had grown and found roses.

The archbishop blessed the roses that the First Lady presented, took them to the altar and then returned them to Mrs. Kennedy.

At this point she was inducted into the order of our Lady of Guadalupe and the worshippers applauded for the second time. They applauded again when the Kennedys began to leave for the drive to the airport.

In contrast to the well-guarded drive into the city Friday, there were few people and no soldiers guarding the route today and the motorcade often was slowed to avoid accidents.

There were no farewell speeches at the airport, but President López Matéos embraced Mr. Kennedy as he said goodbye. On Friday, there had been only a formal handshake. Today's "Abrazo" signified the Mexican President's warmer feeling.

Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy shook hands and with several hundred diplomats and Government officials and the President was given a 21-gun salute before he boarded his jet-plane.

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1962]

#### VIVAS FOR KENNEDY END VISIT TO MEXICO

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

MEXICO CITY, July 1.—President Kennedy left Mexico today after having received the applause of crowds as fervid as those that greeted him Friday.

More than 200,000 people crowded into the area of the Basilica of Guadalupe, where the

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11631

for consideration tomorrow, following compliance with the 3-day rule, might be considered tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The HEW bill will not be taken up tomorrow.

Instead of voting on the passage of the bill on Thursday next at the hour of 1 o'clock, there will be a vote on the amendment now pending, offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, does the Senator have in mind including in the unanimous-consent agreement the usual provision about relevancy to provisions in the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. It is intended to have such a provision incorporated in the unanimous-consent agreement when it is completed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I approve of the unanimous-consent request. For clarification, I am wondering if there are to be two yeas-and-nays votes, and 1 hour of debate, a half hour on each amendment, if the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Montana might not come at 1:30 o'clock. I wanted to make certain that there would be a full half hour on the McCarthy amendment, the Proxmire amendment, and the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to clarify the Record, the unanimous-consent request was to the effect that 30 minutes be allowed on each amendment, 15 minutes to a side; to include the McCarthy amendment, if offered; the Proxmire amendment, if offered; and the Mansfield amendment, now pending; to be followed by a vote on the bill itself. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement which has been reached, the time will begin to run at noon on Thursday; and a morning hour will be held, if need be, after the disposal of the bill, as amended, if it is amended.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

## UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on Thursday, July 5, 1962, immediately after the Senate convenes, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honeybees, debate on amendments by Senators MANSFIELD, PROXMIRE, and MCCARTHY shall be limited to 30 minutes, each, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received: *Provided further*, That after the disposition of the Mansfield amendment the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will be received and printed, and will be on the table.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3840) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Carolina Power & Light Co.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

## THE CENTENNIAL OF THE SIGNING OF THE MORRILL LAND-GRANT ACT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, today our Nation is observing the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Morrill Land-Grant Act by President Abraham Lincoln. In all 50 States a total of 70 universities and colleges benefit from the provisions of that act.

Although the University of Hawaii at Honolulu, Hawaii, did not receive a grant of land such as that provided for State colleges under the Morrill Act of 1862, today it is a Federal land-grant institution and shares in the benefits from the Second Morrill Act of 1890, the Nelson Amendment of 1907, and subsequent legislation.

Earlier this spring, the University of Hawaii, now in its 55th year, held ceremonies marking the centennial year of the Morrill Act at a convocation.

The University of Hawaii was established in 1907 as the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii. Four years later, in 1911, the name was changed to the College of Hawaii.

In 1919, the territorial legislature passed a bill creating the University of Hawaii in 1920 and the charter provided for two colleges. The College of Hawaii became the College of Applied Science, and the College of Arts and Sciences was added. In 1931, the legislature combined the Territorial Normal School with the University School of Education to form Teachers College and now the College of Education.

Subsequently, the College of Tropical Agriculture was established in 1946, the College of Business Administration in 1949, the College of General Studies in 1956, the Colleges of Engineering and Nursing in 1959, and the East-West Center in 1960.

Prior to 1951, all graduate work was performed under the supervision of the graduate division, but in that year the name was changed and designated the graduate school.

The Hilo campus on the Island of Hawaii, the southernmost island in the chain, was opened in 1947. Total enrollment on both campuses exceeds 9,000 students at the present time.

The Morrill Act of 1862 provides for the endowment of at least one agricultural and mechanical college in each State. Thirty thousand acres of land or land scrip was offered each State for each Senator and Representative from that State, to be held or sold to provide for permanent endowment for one or more colleges providing education in the fields of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Until 1960, Hawaii was the only State which had not received a grant under the Morrill Act or under legislation in lieu thereof.

Prior to becoming a part of the United States in 1898, Hawaii was an independent country. Unlike most of the States, our lands in Hawaii were not initially owned by the Federal Government. Thus we have never had public lands in Hawaii, as this term applied to the Western States. Under the treaty of annexation of 1898, the public lands of the Republic of Hawaii were ceded to the United States to be held in trust for the people of Hawaii.

If Hawaii were to be treated in similar fashion to her sister States under the Morrill Act, she would have been entitled to 90,000 acres of land—30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative. But such lands were not available on Oahu, where the University of Hawaii is located, or elsewhere in the eight-island State.

In the Hawaii omnibus bill of 1960, designed to amend relevant Federal statutes so that Hawaii would be treated on an equitable basis with her sister States, a section entitled "Land-Grant College Aid" provided for an appropriation of \$6 million to the State for the support of the college of agriculture and the mechanic arts to be invested pursuant to the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862.

Congress authorized the \$6 million sum in lieu of a land grant in 1960 but only \$2,225,000 was appropriated that year. Last year I appealed to the Senate Appropriations Committee to appropriate \$3,775,000—the balance of the authorized funds—for the university. And, this was accomplished. Today Hawaii is on an equal basis with other States with respect to the Morrill Act.

I am very pleased that the University of Hawaii, originally established as a land-grant college in 1907, shares in this Federal program with 69 other land-grant universities and colleges throughout the 50 States and Puerto Rico.

Although the University of Hawaii held its centennial celebration earlier this year, I am sure that today, July 2, 1962, is appreciatively and meaningfully commemorated as the centennial of that historic act, authored by Congressman Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, providing education for all those who are able and willing to learn.

### PAN AMERICAN FLIES 100,000TH TRANSATLANTIC TRIP

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at approximately 8 o'clock tonight a jet aircraft will depart from Idlewild International Airport, bound for London, Frankfurt, and points beyond, around the world to San Francisco. This will be Pan American World Airways' flight No. 2 and it will be particularly significant because it will mark the 100,000th time that Pan American will have crossed the Atlantic.

The departure of the 100,000th flight from Pan Am's glistening umbrella-shaped terminal at Idlewild will be vastly different from the takeoff of history's first flight of paying passengers across the Atlantic on June 28, 1939.

On that day, 5,000 spectators cheered and a brass band played as 22 passengers filed out on a yacht-type pier in Port Washington Bay in Long Island, N.Y., to board the clipper *Dixie*, a flying boat capable of the then considerable cruising speed of 150 miles per hour.

That plane, a Boeing 314, flew to Marseilles, via the Azores and Lisbon, in 29 hours, 20 minutes.

The jet clipper *America*, a 600-mile-per-hour Boeing 707 that can carry 161 passengers, will be more than three-quarters of the way around the world in the same elapsed flying time.

Since the historic flight of the clipper *Dixie*, Pan Am has carried 3,590,000 passengers across the Atlantic and now operates 204 transatlantic passenger flights on clockwork schedule every week.

The jet clipper *America* will be flying one of the two round-the-world flights Pan Am makes every day as part of its service to 114 cities in 80 lands around the globe.

From New York to London, it will be commanded by Capt. Robert D. Fordyce of Locust Valley, N.Y. At London, Capt. Benjamin S. Harrell of Manhasset, N.Y., will take over the controls, taking flight No. 2 as far as Beirut with intermediate stops at Frankfurt, Munich, and Istanbul.

Captains Fordyce and Harrell were junior flight officers on the June 28, 1939, trip. Their combined flight experience equals the number of years that have elapsed since the Wright brothers first flew at Kitty Hawk, N.C.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I commend Pan American for its many pioneering accomplishments and feel certain that I reflect the opinions of my colleagues.

### GOVERNMENT, POLITICS, AND STUDENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, through the years much has been written about the influence and effects of politics upon the functioning of the Federal Government. Unfortunately, many people are under the impression that politics has nothing but an adverse effect on government, molding policies to its own end, which is thought always to be selfish.

However, it must be realized that, because of the size and complexity of our Government, politics is not only present in the Government, but essential. When a country like ours is governed by elected representatives, politics is the method by which varying views concerning vital issues are brought to light and discussed. Wherever there are people to be instructed and informed, politics plays a large part.

Students are expressing increasing interest in the operation of our Government and are now taking part, to a greater degree than ever, in government activities in their municipalities and States. Their interest is indicative of a growing realization that they will play an active part in the events of this critical decade.

Within recent weeks I have had direct evidence of their interest. Each year I invite seniors in New Jersey high schools to participate in a competition for summer scholarships in my office. Judges select the scholarship winners on the basis of their achievements in school and community, together with essays submitted by all applicants. The three students selected by the judges spend 2 weeks at my office in Washington observing at firsthand the workings of their Government.

This year, I asked the students to submit essays discussing the relationship between students and politics and government. I was interested in seeing their concept of the role politics plays in government and how they, as students would form their own ideas and actively work with groups whose views they supported.

Their responses were immediate and most encouraging. I have discovered that students do take a great deal of interest in government machinery at all levels, and many of the essays expressed a desire for more high school courses dealing specifically with the functioning and current problems of government. More than 200 seniors in New Jersey high schools wrote essays which were intelligent and surprisingly comprehensive.

Judges must have had a difficult time in choosing the final winners. The students wrote seriously, and in some cases, since they were already active in their communities, from experience.

I was once again impressed with the fact that here, in our youth, lies our country's greatest resources. We must do all we can to encourage students to develop their talents and abilities, to formulate high ideals and strong convictions, and to actively carry them out in their professions and their communities.

The final winners were Ronald Bettauer of Teaneck High School; Irvin Richter of Bridgewater-Raritan High School in Somerville; and Ronald Weinstein of Trenton Central High School. Their essays succinctly reveal much about them as students and Americans.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have the essays printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### GOVERNMENT, POLITICS, AND THE STUDENT (By Ronald Bettauer)

What will determine the political future of America? "It is just a question of how much the people know, how much they are called upon to do," answered Sam Rayburn. It is necessary "to bring them face to face with their responsibilities as citizens, or as a part of a group of citizens, or as a party, and let them know that their responsibility right now is terrific."<sup>1</sup> How are people brought face to face with responsibility? What will motivate them to fulfill that responsibility? It is a question of how much the people know. Education is the answer. Education can instill the patriotic sense of national destiny in the people, and it can enable them to recognize their responsibility to society.

Consequently, the primary political concern of the student is to educate himself. His is the task of learning history, not just of America, but of the world. He should learn about the political structure of his society—the Federal, State, and local units of government. He should be aware of the happenings in the world, and, moreover, he should have a deep concern about these happenings. In modern times diplomacy based on ignorance cannot succeed. Therefore, the student must first know his Government well, but also must be informed about other contemporary governmental systems.

The Government's prime political responsibility to the student is to give him the opportunity to learn about the Government itself. He must receive the necessary training in history, which is the foundation of the present. Without doubt, there is much to be learned from European and Oriental history as well as from American history. Political philosophy is an integral part of the history course. These fields are surely as important to our national destiny as are those mentioned in the National Defense Education Act. Why are they not included? The success of a democracy depends just as much on an educated voting populace as it does on scientists and mathematicians. The proposed School Assistance Act of 1961 would have been an assertion of Government responsibility in fields of education other than science and mathematics, for the State could have determined the allotment of its share of the aid. However, as it is, the State and local governments have the responsibility of expanding and heightening their standards to include if not a more extensive, a more intensive program of social studies—a deeper penetration into the world situation today and how it became what it is today, a deeper penetration of the problems of the United States.

Youth is the time to interest a person in the affairs of his country. Youth is the time to permanently dispel political apathy, national and international. Stimulating programs of studies in the school system are the natural means of preparation for the voting populace. The school is the institution best suited to give the student the power to discuss and define issues in the light of reason and to choose what is best. It can give him an open mind, a mind focused both on reality and on idealistic aims.

Hence, the Government, be it local, State, or Federal (whichever has the best facility to do so), is charged by the precepts of our Republic to provide the student with the opportunity to become educated; and it is the duty of the student, as a future voter, to become intimately acquainted with our political structure. It is a question of how much the people know. If the populace is educated, democracy cannot fail, for educa-

<sup>1</sup>"Sam Rayburn Takes a Look at the World," U.S. News & World Report, vol. LI, No. 15, Oct. 9, 1961. p. 68.

# Senate

THURSDAY, JULY 5, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, Maker of all things, Judge of all men, hallowed be Thy name.

As this Nation of our hope and prayer turns from the birthday of its daring advent among the established governments of the world, may the stern realities of the present beget in us mighty resolves to face without fear dangers even more formidable than those the founding patriots ever knew. We would solemnly reaffirm the reverent declaration of those who so long ago with intrepid faith stepped upon the shores of this promised land—"In the name of God, Amen."

With the sound of that great amen as our summons in these stirring new days, we would be true to the vision splendid of a redeemed earth where gnawing hunger, blighting superstition, and needless pain and misery will be but haunting memories in the day of deliverance which draweth near for all the sons of men. For this cause we set up our banners in this, Thy glorious day.

We ask it in the name of the Christ whose saving truth is marching on. Amen.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 3, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 3062. An act to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions; and

S. 3266. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended (2 U.S.C. 158), relating to deposits with the Treasurer of the United States of gifts and bequests to the Library of Congress and to raise the statutory limitation provided for in that section.

## IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

Without objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult bees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate operating under allotted time at present?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct; and that is under the order adopted on July 2.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and more if he needs it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

(Mr. AIKEN submitted an item for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, which appears therein.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time required for the quorum call will be charged to the time available to my side under the agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time remains under my control?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Nine minutes; and a total of 24 minutes remains.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer, and send to the desk, my amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Mansfield amendment, and I ask that my amendment to the Mansfield amendment be read.

The amendment to the amendment was read, as follows:

Sec. 2. (a) Section 202(c)(3) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) (A) The quotas for foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be prorated among such countries on the following basis:

"Country:	Per centum
Cuba.....	57.77
Peru.....	6.71
Dominican Republic.....	6.71
Mexico.....	6.71
Brazil.....	6.37
British West Indies.....	3.03
Republic of China.....	0.14
French West Indies.....	1.01
Colombia.....	1.06
Nicaragua.....	0.88
Costa Rica.....	0.83
Ecuador.....	0.88
Haiti.....	0.71

"Country:	Per centum
Guatemala.....	0.71
Panama.....	0.53
El Salvador.....	0.36
Paraguay.....	0.35
British Honduras.....	0.33
Not prorated.....	4.86

"(B) From the quantity not prorated under subparagraph (A), the President is authorized to allocate to countries within the Western Hemisphere all or any portion of the quantity of sugar not prorated under subparagraph (A)."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if they were enacted as a part of H.R. 12154 entitled "An Act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my amendment is offered to the Mansfield amendment. Under my amendment the 150,000 tons of discretionary sugar the administration has requested would be taken from certain national quotas, not from the global quota which had been set aside for Cuba. The global quota would be purchased at the world price; and the national quotas would be purchased at the premium price. Therefore, my amendment would save for the Treasury \$8,400,000.

Second, my amendment would preserve 150,000 more tons in the global quota to be made available to Cuba after Castro is thrown out of power. Thus, it would provide an incentive for throwing the Communists out of power in Cuba and it would provide an encouragement to the people of Cuba who want a free Cuba to seek one.

Third, my amendment would eliminate at the very start what I think is going to be a painful subsidy to maintain to countries outside this hemisphere—an artificial subsidy to countries which could not supply us in time of emergency, anyway.

This morning, I was in touch with the experts in this field in the Department of Agriculture; and they told me they approve my amendment, and believe it will work well, and say it seems to be much more than the Mansfield amendment in keeping with the basic provisions of the Sugar Act, which are to provide a sure and certain supply of sugar in the event of emergency.

### AUSTRALIA

My amendment will eliminate the 40,000-ton quota of Australia, which has a Commonwealth sugar quota of 600,000 tons, 300,000 of which Australia sells to the United Kingdom at a premium price

comparable to our own. The remainder goes to other Commonwealth countries at the world market price, plus a favorable tariff concession which comes to about 1 cent a pound. Australia sells over 15,000 tons outside the Commonwealth agreement at world prices. With a carryover of 700,000 tons, Australia could readily sell sugar to us at world prices without a premium. It seems to me that one of the obvious reasons why Australia received a quota is that Australia's lobbyist received \$20,000 in the last 12 months for representing Australia before our Finance Committee and the House Agriculture Committee.

## INDIA

India's new 20,000-ton quota would be eliminated. India has developed a domestic sugar industry which, with Government aid, has aimed at getting into the export business as a means of raising foreign exchange. From 1959 to 1961 India's production rose over 1 million tons, while domestic consumption remained almost constant. Our 20,000-ton premium quota would be only an aid gesture, and I think would better be handled in foreign aid legislation. With carryover stocks of over 1.5 million tons, India could very well compete on its own for part of our global quota. India's lobbyist will, if the bill is passed, receive \$99,000. Under his contract he may receive only \$50,000 if the bill fails. He, therefore, has \$49,000 riding in opposition to this amendment.

## SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa's 20,000-ton quota would be dropped. When South Africa resigned from the Commonwealth over her apartheid policies, she lost her privileges under the Commonwealth sugar agreement. By purchasing her sugar at premium prices, we would just be picking up where the Commonwealth left off—in effect, giving support to her apartheid policies, through support of her sugar industry. South Africa's lobbyists gets \$50 an hour. In February and March he received \$4,950.

## FIJI

Fiji's 10,000-ton quota would be eliminated. Fiji has a 1962 quota, under the Commonwealth sugar agreement, of 134,000 tons, which brings her a premium payment from the United Kingdom. This covers over 80 percent of her exports. Our 10,000-ton quota would put almost all of Fiji's sugar export capacity under preferential sales agreements. Fiji's lobbyist receives \$2,000 a month.

## NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands would lose its 10,000-ton quota under my proposal. The Netherlands' position in the U.S. sugar program stems from its shipments of sugar in the early twenties. All the Netherlands' shipments up to now have been refined sugar, and apparently its quota is in violation of provisions in the recently passed Sugar Act which bar importation of refined sugar. The Netherlands' lobbyist is a New York sugar broker.

The result is that the Netherlands can buy Cuban or other sugar on the world market at 3 cents a pound and sell to us at a 3 cents a pound profit. It

makes no sense, particularly when the quota apparently is in violation of the recently passed Sugar Act barring importation of refined sugar.

In addition, the Netherlands is a net importer of sugar—over 140,000 tons in 1961, of which approximately 30,000 tons were from Castro's Cuba.

Mr. President, is there any sense in that? Why in the world should we buy sugar from the Netherlands when the Netherlands is an importer of sugar and is purchasing sugar from Castro's Cuba? Does that make any sense? The Netherlands buys the sugar at the world price, but sells it to us at a premium price. I think the world of the Dutch; they are wonderful people. But talk about a giveaway. This is the grossest kind of giveaway, without any kind of rational Government policy of helping all the people. Instead, it would simply help a few producers, who, as we have seen, are enormously wealthy and are characterized by two things: high profits and the low wages they pay those who work for them.

## IRELAND

My amendment would also take away the 10,000 tons that have been eased into the Sugar Act for Ireland. I would note, Mr. President, that the Mansfield amendment that is directed, supposedly, at helping the Dominican Republic, Argentina, and Peru, contains no less than two paragraphs that have the effect of preserving the 10,000 tons of refined sugar that are aimed at Ireland.

Apparently no one knows why the Irish, who are net importers of sugar, have come into this 10,000-ton bonus. In 1960, the latest figures available to me, Ireland imported 30,000 tons of sugar, with no less than 22,000 tons coming from Castro's Cuba. For all we know, Mr. President, Ireland may be shipping us refined Cuban sugar at U.S. premium prices. Ireland's lobbyist gets \$35 an hour.

## REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The China quota would be cut from the 35,000 tons granted in the new legislation to the 3,000 tons that China has traditionally held in the U.S. market. There is no reason to purchase additional sugar from a supplier that is as distant from us as is China, except in the case of the Philippines.

It can be said that in the case of Formosa we are very anxious that the Formosan economy succeed and that we help it. We are. We are providing enormous help, through economic aid and defense support, to the Chinese Republic on Formosa, and we should do it, in my judgment; but to provide this additional handout or giveaway, not on any rational basis but merely because everybody else is getting it, to me makes no sense. China's lobbyist gets \$500 a month and is on a \$2,000 retainer.

## FOREIGN POSSESSIONS

The quotas of the British West Indies, British Honduras, and the French West Indies have each been cut by 5 percent.

As a matter of fact, the British West Indies were cut slightly more than 5 percent.

The reductions were made on these three Western Hemisphere producers

since each of them already participates in a preference market. With the granting of a U.S. quota, each would become a recipient, in effect, of subsidies from two governments.

The British West Indies' lobbyist gets \$20,000 a year and \$5,000 expenses.

The French West Indies' lobbyist gets \$40,000 a year, but he is handling other business for the French West Indies.

The British Honduras' lobbyist is associated with American interests which plan to build a sugar refinery if an additional premium quota is received.

To summarize, the facts are that my amendment would:

First, save \$8,400,000 by enabling us to buy sugar at the world price, instead of at the premium price, and pay the difference into the U.S. Treasury.

Second, it would preserve an additional 150,000 tons for Cuba when the people throw off the Castro yoke.

Third, it would do this by cutting off quotas outside this hemisphere. There is no excuse at all for quotas outside the Western Hemisphere. Some of these countries are anything but underdeveloped. There is no reason why we should provide premium payments on sugar to countries which could not deliver the sugar to us in the event of emergency, because they are so far away.

Finally, the fact is that the lobbyists have been the main beneficiaries of this legislation. As the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee pointed out, the lobbying on this bill has been unconscionable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial from this morning's Washington Post in support of the Proxmire amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## AS THE BEE FLIES

The Senate has an opportunity today to modify some of the most eccentric features of the newly adopted Sugar Act and thereby calm the uproar among outraged neighbors. The method at hand is irregular, but then so is the problem. Amendments will be offered to a bill dealing with the import of adult honey bees, and if this hitchhiking succeeds the President can be given discretionary power to reallocate 225,000 tons of sugar among aggrieved Latin American producers.

As it now stands, the new Sugar Act is laced with indefensible discriminations. The export of sugar is not a life-and-death matter to the Netherlands, to Ireland, to South Africa, or to the Fiji Islands—areas that have unaccountably been added to the premium price quota market. Sugar is a matter of national survival to the Dominican Republic, a prime producer whose economy is 70 percent dependent on sugar sales.

It may be that some of the protests from Santo Domingo seem overwrought and unreasonable. But Dominican unhappiness must be seen against the record of the past when Congress seemed to go out of its way to help the Trujillo dictatorship. The problem is as much political as economic, and reports from the Dominican Republic all agree that a moderately oriented government

will be in serious peril if the present Sugar Act is not modified. If a case for favoritism exists, it surely can be made for the Dominican Republic.

Senator PROXMIRE is offering an amendment that makes a good deal of sense even in the Alice-in-Wonderland realm of sugar politics. He would obtain the additional 225,000 tons by eliminating most nonhemispheric producers from the present list, by cutting Nationalist China to its historic allotment, and by deducting 5 percent from the quota awarded to the British West Indies, British Honduras, and the French West Indies. This would be far preferable to the alternate method of chopping another 225,000 tons from the already shrunken Cuban quota reserved for the time when Havana changes its course.

If the Senate accepts the Proxmire amendment, and if the House concurs, President Kennedy would be able to remedy some of the patent inequities of the Sugar Act. He could not only give a needed lift to the Dominicans; he could also restore Argentina to the list in place of the distant areas now included. Argentina, be it noted, is the only country concerned with sugar that did not have an American lobbyist; although it already has a substantial sugar export trade, Argentina was excised from the Sugar Act. Congress can take some of the sting out of ill-considered legislation by using the honey-bee bill; an improvised cure is better than none at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the difference between the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Mansfield amendment can be simply stated. Both amendments have the same general end: to authorize the President to allocate 150,000 tons in 1963 and 1964, and 75,000 tons during the remainder of 1962, within the Western Hemisphere. Both amendments proceed from the assumption that the President ought to have greater flexibility in meeting certain foreign policy objectives of the United States than was provided by the recently adopted sugar bill. But the Mansfield amendment would draw this additional tonnage from the global quota, set at 1,635,000 tons under the sugar bill; the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would draw it from quotas assigned under the sugar bill to various countries not within the Western Hemisphere. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would eliminate those quotas—indeed, would result in the elimination of all quotas for countries outside the Western Hemisphere, except the Republic of China.

I must say, Mr. President, that I have a considerable degree of sympathy with the Senator's amendment. But in my opinion the amendment, if adopted, would stand little or no chance of passage by the House of Representatives. The attitude of the House on this matter is well known. It was only after the most vigorous representations by the Senate conferees that the quotas for many countries outside the Western Hemisphere were reduced.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 2, 1962, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], one of the conferees on the sugar bill, makes note of the fact that, outside the Western

Hemisphere, there were some reductions—plenty of reductions, may I say.

Mauritius, under the House bill, was to have been assigned 110,000 tons. That was reduced to zero.

South Africa was to have been assigned, under the House bill, 120,000 tons. That was reduced to 20,000 tons.

India was to have been assigned 130,000 tons. That was reduced to 20,000 tons.

Australia was to have been assigned 200,000 tons. That amount was reduced to 40,000 tons.

The resulting bill retained the principle of a global quota, by providing that the 1,635,000 tons eliminated from various country quotas would constitute such a global quota. Further than that the House would not go, and, as a consequence, a number of countries outside the Western Hemisphere were granted allotments.

There is no reason to expect that the House would be any more sympathetic to the further reduction—indeed, the elimination—of these quotas now, than it was in connection with the basic sugar bill just passed.

Consequently, the approach I have suggested—of reducing the global quota by 150,000 tons—seems the only practical way to try to grant the President this much needed discretion. There would remain a global quota of 1,485,000 tons; the House is likely to agree to the Mansfield amendment; and the foreign policy objectives we seek to obtain in the Western Hemisphere would be more readily obtainable. I do not believe the Proxmire approach can gain acceptance by the other body, and as a consequence these objectives would be rendered more difficult to achieve. I urge the rejection of the Senator's amendment and I do so reluctantly because it has much merit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the other evening, after the adoption of the conference report on the sugar bill, I spoke briefly about the amendment of the Senator from Montana to reassure some Latin American countries that the United States will continue to buy sugar from them in large amounts.

I expect to support the amendment. But I think it is necessitated only because we have not properly come to grips with the whole subject of sugar imports from other countries.

Those of us who have been active in Latin American relations and in the Alliance for Progress are familiar with the commodity stabilization problem facing many, if not most Latin American countries. All too many of them are one-product countries, extremely dependent upon its export. Their economies lean so heavily on a single agricultural commodity or raw material that a slight shift in its price in the United States or in the world can wreck a whole nation.

It can completely undo whatever progress might be underway through the financing of the Alliance for Progress.

We recognized the importance of commodity prices in the Western Hemisphere during the work of my subcommittee, published in 1960. One of the special studies of my subcommittee was done by International Economic Consultants, Inc., on "Commodity Problems in Latin America."

It is true that one of the greatest problems of Latin America is that of diversifying the economies of its nations, one also found in many States and areas of the United States. But until that is done, we cannot underestimate the impact of price variations upon individual nations and sometimes on groups of nations.

The tenor of the report by International Economic Consultants was rather unsympathetic to commodity stabilization agreements. It indicated that too often they shelter uneconomic production and encouraged specialization instead of diversification. But insofar as the United States maintains its own program of commodity stabilization for sugar, I think it is time we opened the matter of foreign quotas to international proceedings, at least within the Western Hemisphere.

Representatives of the nations of the hemisphere are already meeting to try to work out some agreement on coffee. Other commodities which could be approached in this fashion are tin, cocoa, copper, oil, bananas, and sugar.

There is no doubt that we have a certain interest in seeing to it that American consumers of these products are able to get them at reasonable prices. It has in part been to assure American consumers of low-cost supplies of these commodities that we have been unresponsive to the idea of commodity agreements, especially where the commodity is not produced in the United States.

But sugar is produced in the United States. It is produced in the form of beets and cane. We pay a price here for domestic sugar that is higher than the world price. But we pay a premium because we have conditioned the premium upon the observance of many minimum wage and hour regulations for American workers.

This is why I am very unhappy about paying the same premium to foreign producers, as we have been doing in the past. There is all too little evidence that any of it has trickled down to the benefit of the agricultural worker in Latin America, where all too often he is little but a serf to the soil. Yet the owners of these great sugar plantations are socking their profits away in foreign banks, and now they say that if we stop their premium price and their specific allotment, the bottom will drop out of their economy and the Alliance for Progress will be a failure.

This is the whole problem in northeastern Brazil. It is the land of the great sugar plantations, the hordes of miserable farmworkers, and of Communist agitation which threatens the stability of all of Brazil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield another 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, therefore, I offer the suggestion that the United States sound out the nations of the Western Hemisphere on a commodity stabilization program for sugar. It would not be just any stabilization agreement. But I would like to urge an agreement that would tie the allotment of quotas and the payment of any premium price to some minimum wage standards. Or it might tie the allotments and premiums to provision of adequate housing, sanitation, and education for the sugar workers and their families.

These, after all, are the objectives of the Alliance for Progress. They are also the reasons why we pay our own sugar producers a premium price. I see no reason why we should not use the premium price to accomplish the objectives of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

We have made clear that funds provided out of the Alliance for Progress must be matched with some needed reforms by the recipient country. I say we should do the same with sugar quotas.

I think some of these reforms could be accomplished faster, in fact, in the case of sugar workers, if we conditioned our allotments and price premiums upon compliance with some of the same types of working conditions we require of our own producers.

I have not explored all the possibilities or ramifications of this type of sugar stabilization agreement. It may be there are some obstacles I have not taken into account.

But there is one obstacle I am taking into account, and that is the increasing reluctance many of us are feeling to paying foreign growers a premium price for their sugar when it appears to be having little or no effect upon the conditions of work in the exporting country.

This belongs in the realm of the Organization of American States, and possible even in the realm of the Alliance itself. It belongs in the realm of negotiation on what standards will be met if quotas are assigned or premium prices paid, or both.

Above all, I share the view of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that the subject of sugar quotas should be taken out of the hands of high-priced lobbyists, whose fees are so often contingent upon how many tons they are able to obtain for their foreign clients.

I address these remarks to my colleagues, to the administration, and to the officials of Latin American countries who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I say, in closing, that, in my judgment, the American people are catching up to the problem, and I think the American people are going to make clear to the Congress, before another sugar act is passed by Congress, that they are fed

up with paying premium prices to enrich the oligarchs of Latin America and their lobbyists in the United States. They are fed up at not having American money put to work in Latin America, in keeping with the objectives and ideals of the Alliance for Progress program, which is to help raise the standard of living of the masses of Latin America, so they will be and stay on the side of freedom, and not be victimized by communism. The sad fact is that much of our sugar expenditure in Latin America strengthens communism, and not freedom, because to the extent that these premium prices are not used to raise the living standards of the sugar workers, they help the Communists.

I think this will be the last sugar act to be passed by Congress unless we get some agreement which will assure that the premium prices are going to benefit the workers that raise the sugar, and not the oligarchs, who will take the profits made from exploiting the workers and invest them in Swiss and New York banks.

In my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America, I wish to make this official announcement regarding what will be my position on this problem and on similar ones.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today in the debate on the Mansfield amendment providing for increased sugar quotas to various countries, there was a limitation of debate. Therefore, I did not have an opportunity to discuss one amendment in the Sugar Act as it was passed by the Congress last week, and would also apply to the amendment that was agreed to today. I refer particularly to a statement in the conference report on the Sugar Act amendments of 1962, page 4, as follows:

In authorizing the purchase and importation of sugar from foreign countries under this paragraph, special consideration shall be given to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing United States agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to that statement in the report for the reason that in the Mansfield amendment additional sugar quotas were allocated to various countries in the Western Hemisphere and other sections of the globe. I feel it is important to note—and I think that the State Department and the Department of Agriculture should again be notified—that we are going to follow with great interest and very close consideration the operation of the amendment in making trades or in furnishing quotas for sugar to other countries. I think it is important from our agricultural and foreign aid program that we do give special consideration to these points. These sugar quota allocations are of great value to the countries where they are assigned and certainly we as a Nation should not hesitate to ask that they buy some of our surplus agricultural products in return.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to yield me 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is never a gracious task for a Senator on this side of the aisle to oppose his majority leader, but I find myself regretfully compelled to do so today.

I believe the Proxmire amendment is proper. I believe it is in accord with what the Senate did in respect to the original bill when it was passed some time ago. I believe we should not yield to the other body our unrestricted right to determine for ourselves what is the national interest.

We know that the bill as passed by the Senate pretty much eliminated national quotas. We know that the House conferees insisted, as the price for having any bill at all, on national quotas for 23 countries, many of which have not the slightest claim on the bounty of the United States. We know that this was the result of one of the most gigantic lobbying exercises in recent history.

Mr. President, an article of interest in the New York Times of Tuesday, July 3, is entitled "Secret Trujillo Papers Disclose Intense Sugar Lobbying in United States." This article takes the mask off the massive lobbying done for only one country. I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Tad Szulc, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRET TRUJILLO PAPERS DISCLOSE INTENSE SUGAR LOBBYING IN UNITED STATES

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, July 2.—Secret documents of the Trujillo dictatorship, now published for the first time, tell a story of intensive Dominican lobbying in Congress to frustrate the sugar policies of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

The documents were obtained by the New York Times in Santo Domingo from the secret archives of the late dictator, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina.

The focus of the lobbying was sugar, but U.S. foreign policy and domestic politics were involved. The lobbying was similar to the kind that lobbyists for more than 20 foreign countries have carried on here in recent weeks in connection with a new sugar bill, which went to the White House today.

This bill has already created a crisis in the U.S. relations with the new democratic regime in the Dominican Republic.

Mentioned again and again in the reports of the Trujillo agents is Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina. Mr. COOLEY is chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives and the most influential man in Congress on sugar legislation.

Mr. COOLEY was informed of the documents and appraised of their contents. He rejected any implication that his conduct had been in any way improper. It was pointed out that the documents present only the Dominican side of the picture. There was no evidence to support any charge of specific wrongdoing.

Although Mr. COOLEY's name was mentioned most frequently in the Dominican



documents relating to sugar, there were references to other members of the House Agriculture Committee, including Representative W. R. POACE, a Texas Democrat.

The names of several other Agriculture Department officials dealing with sugar matters, including Lawrence Myers, Robert Case, and a J. Murphy, were also mentioned. So were those of former Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles and Adolf A. Berle, Jr., a special consultant to the Secretary of State.

Mr. Myers heads the Sugar Office in the Agriculture Department. J. Murphy is apparently an erroneous reference to Tom Murphy, deputy to Mr. Myers. Robert Case apparently is an erroneous reference to William Case, an official in the Department's Sugar Division.

The reports cover conversations and meetings in recent years in which, the Dominican informants said, Mr. COOLEY assured them he would firmly support Dominican sugar interests, gave them advice on how to go about their lobbying and informed them of his efforts to favor Dominican sugar in the U.S. market. Sugar entering the United States under the quotas fixed by law brings a big premium over the world market price.

Even after the United States had broken diplomatic relations and applied economic sanctions against the Trujillo dictatorship in 1961, the Dominican agents remained in touch with Mr. COOLEY.

They reported—and the public record bears them out—that Mr. COOLEY worked hard in Congress for repeal of the sanctions and for reimbursement to Dominican sugar interests of a punitive tax imposed on imports of their sugar by the Eisenhower administration.

Dealing with the points made in the documents, Mr. COOLEY said he had never given Dominican representatives any advice "other than when I said they should get rid of Trujillo" if they wished better treatment for their sugar in the United States.

#### DENIES GETTING FEES

He denied he had ever received fees or contributions of any kind. There had been some conversations at his office with Dominican diplomats, he said, but only because they had no Washington lawyers at the time.

"But I told them I could give them no special advice," he said. "I cannot be responsible for what they wrote about me."

What they wrote can be summarized as follows:

In February 1960, Dr. H. E. Priester, principal financial adviser to General Trujillo, suggested that Mr. COOLEY and his family be given an all-expenses-paid vacation in the Dominican Republic, but said a direct invitation might be embarrassing to the Representative.

"The undersigned is convinced in view of Mr. COOLEY's background," he went on, "that he would not refuse any financial aid that may be offered to him to defray the expenses of his vacation in the south, without obligating him or his family to spend all his time exclusively in the Dominican Republic."

On June 22, 1960, Representative COOLEY attended a meeting in the Washington home of Marco A. Peña, head of the Dominican sugar office here, and informed his host of new amendments that were being planned for the Sugar Act.

On November 23, 1960, Senor Peña, now promoted to consul general, reported assurances from Mr. COOLEY "that he will work hard not only to put an end to the tax on our sugar \* \* \* but also to see whether it would be possible to reimburse us the sum that we have not received because of this arbitrary Executive decision."

This was a reference to a 2-cent-a-pound penalty that the Eisenhower administration had imposed on imports of Dominican sugar after Mr. COOLEY had blocked President

Eisenhower's request for authority to ban such imports.

On January 7, 1961, Senor Peña reported Mr. COOLEY "reiterated to us his previous promise of working firmly in favor of our sugar." Mr. COOLEY, according to the report, said that he had gone to New York to discuss the matter with President-elect Kennedy but that he had been unable to do so for lack of time.

On February 3, 1961, Representative COOLEY discreetly told Senor Peña that an approach to "a party suggested by a friendly person" should await official reaction to his new sugar bill, according to Senor Peña.

On February 15, 1961, Consul General Peña wired the Dominican Foreign Office that "COOLEY let us know today that he held individual conversations yesterday with Bowles, Berle, and Muñoz-Marín, and said that it is urgent to send immediately a person of the highest confidence of the illustrious superiority (General Trujillo) to treat basic aspects of the work he is carrying out together with our other friends."

The references were to Chester Bowles, who was at the time the Under Secretary of State, to Adolf A. Berle, Jr., who served as special consultant to the Secretary of State, and to Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico.

The Dominican documents were found by this reporter while studying the dictator's archives for clues to the operations of the Trujillo regime. The arrangements to examine the files were made through personal contracts several months ago, before the current difficulties over the sugar bill arose in Congress. The discovery of documents on sugar lobbying was fortuitous.

All the agents who sent the reports to the Trujillo regime have disappeared with the collapse of that regime, which occurred following the dictator's assassination in May 1960.

The present Dominican Government, therefore, bears no responsibility for the kind of lobbying activity described in the reports.

In recent weeks and months, however, lobbyists representing sugar interests of at least 22 foreign countries have been engaged in similar activity on Capitol Hill.

Speaking in the Senate debate on the current sugar bill Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, said:

"Some years ago a wise man wrote me that 'where there is sugar, there you will find the flies.' Mr. President, the lobbyists on Capitol Hill working on the sugar bill are thick as flies."

#### THE KEY TO SUGAR POLITICS

Three things explain this intense interest of the Dominican Republic in Mr. COOLEY: The complexities and rewards of sugar politics, the power structure of the House of Representatives, and the skill of Mr. COOLEY in political maneuver.

The key to sugar politics is the American consumer. Though the American housewife may not know it, she is paying a handsome premium over the world price for sugar.

The premium on foreign sugar entering this country under the quotas established by law amounts to 2.8 cents a pound, according to testimony in recent congressional hearings.

This seemingly insignificant 2.8 cents adds up to about \$650 million a year or more than \$2.5 billion in the 5-year period covered by the pending sugar bill.

The \$650 million is used by the Federal Government to make subsidy payments averaging 70 cents a hundred pounds to domestic sugar producers, for a total of about \$330 million a year.

The remaining \$220 million flows to foreign producers—those fortunate ones from the countries allotted import quotas under the sugar law.

This money is paid in competitive bidding by domestic refiners who buy the imported raw sugar at ports of entry. Domestic sugar production fills little more than half the annual demand and is limited by law. Thus sugar imported under the quotas is eagerly sought by refiners and other users, who bid up the price to the subsidized domestic price level.

The so-called quota premium, which the refiners pass on to the consumers, has been justified on the ground that it assures this country of an infalling supply of sugar at steady prices, from both domestic and foreign sources.

With \$220 million in "sweetening" at stake, the lobbyists for foreign sugar interests swam to the Halls of Congress.

The man in whom they are inevitably most deeply interested is the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, because all sugar legislation must originate in that committee.

And they are especially interested in Mr. COOLEY because he has shown himself to be a powerful and resourceful man. For years he has usually had his way on sugar legislation, not only in the House but also in differences with the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

Moreover, he has frequently succeeded in imposing his will on the Senate, where strong sentiment has grown up for abolishing, or at least simplifying, the complicated system of import quotas and premiums.

The Dominicans were given a special incentive for lobbying by events connected with the rise of the Castro dictatorship in Cuba and the fall of the Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic.

Early in 1960, after the Eisenhower administration had concluded that the Castro regime was a Soviet satellite, President Eisenhower asked Congress for authority to reduce the import quota of Cuba. Normally the United States imported about 3 million tons a year from that country.

Mr. COOLEY successfully resisted this request until July. Then Congress passed a bill that enabled President Eisenhower to cut imports from Cuba.

The Dominican Republic was one of the exporting nations that joined in the scramble for a share of Cuba's former quota.

But in August, the Organization of American States called on the American republics to break relations with the Dominican Republic and apply limited sanctions against that country because the Trujillo government had tried to assassinate President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela.

In this situation, President Eisenhower asked Congress for authority to reduce imports of Dominican sugar. The Senate gave him what he asked, but Mr. COOLEY blocked action in the House.

As a result, the administration had no choice under the law but to license for import 321,857 tons of Dominican sugar, the Dominican share of the previous Cuban quota, in addition to the regular Dominican quota of 131,000 tons.

The administration reacted, however, by applying a 2-cent-a-pound penalty on the Dominican sugar, thus depriving the Trujillo sugar companies of a substantial profit.

During this period, when the United States had no diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic, Mr. COOLEY is reported to have given assurances to the Dominican sugar agents that he would try to have Dominican exporters reimbursed for this penalty.

#### PUSHED REIMBURSEMENT

As late as last month he inserted a provision in the House version of the current sugar bill to pay the Dominican Government and one American-owned and one Dominican-owned sugar company \$22,755,367 in reimbursement of this penalty.

11844

The Kennedy administration and the Senate opposed this reimbursement provision, and it was dropped from the bill. Instead of giving the money to the sugar companies, the administration argued, a grant should be made to the Dominican Government as part of a constructive foreign-aid program.

The Trujillo documents show that the interest of the regime in the House Agriculture Committee dates to at least 1955. At that time—2 months before hearings on the 1956 Sugar Act were to open in the committee—the Dominican Government invited the entire committee and its staff to visit the country at its expense.

Representative COOLEY chose not to go, but his sister, Mrs. Mabel Downey—then a committee clerk—and his daughter and his son-in-law went.

The Trujillo archives include a letter dated April 18, 1955, written to Generalissimo Trujillo by Representative POAGE, who is vice chairman of the committee, stating that "your outstanding hospitality to the Agriculture Committee of our Congress has again strengthened the bonds which unite our respective countries."

"You, sir, are to be congratulated upon the achievements of the last 25 years."

## A SECOND LETTER

A similar letter, on behalf of the staff of the committee, was written to General Trujillo on April 20 by Mrs. Downey, Mr. Cooley's sister.

"You afforded us a rare opportunity," she said, "and we shall cherish for many years to come your thoughtfulness and generosity."

There are several references to Mr. COOLEY and his committee in subsequent years. These references became more frequent in the records for 1960, the year the Sugar Act came up again for renewal and the cancellation of the Cuban sugar quota opened up prospects of a windfall import quota for the Dominican Republic.

Early in February, Luis Thomen, Dominican Ambassador in Washington, formally recommended to General Trujillo that an invitation to visit the Dominican Republic be extended to Mr. COOLEY and his family.

The matter was referred for comment to Dr. Priester, economic adviser of the Central Bank and the dictator's financial wizard.

In a lengthy memorandum, Dr. Priester first remarked that Mr. COOLEY "is the key man in everything concerning the U.S. Sugar Act" and that he "can be considered a friend of the Dominican Republic."

He recalled their work together at a sugar conference in Tangier in 1959 and reported that at the time Mr. COOLEY had "reiterated his appreciation for the technical help given him by the Dominican representative in the development of the formula of the Sugar Act of 1956, and expressed the hope of maintaining an equally close cooperation in the next revision of the said sugar law in 1960."

## SUPPORTS GESTURE

Dr. Priester wrote:

"There is no doubt that Mr. COOLEY's financial position is not very good, and the family problem that he had to face recently in connection with the illness of his wife requires all his attention. The idea of Ambassador Thomen of inviting him, his wife, his daughter, and the latter's husband to enjoy a vacation in the Dominican Republic as guests of the Government constitutes a gesture that he will surely appreciate as a demonstration of good will."

Dr. Priester raised the question whether Mr. COOLEY could accept an individual invitation—without the whole committee's being also invited—and remarked that "it would be unlikely for Representative COOLEY to accept such an individual invitation after the Sherman Adams case."

Mr. Adams, an assistant to President Eisenhower, resigned in 1958 after it developed

that he had accepted gifts and favors from Bernard Goldfine, a New England manufacturer.

## DENIES TAKING FAVORS

The Trujillo archives made no further mention of this proposed offer. Mr. COOLEY never took a vacation in the Dominican Republic, and he denies he ever took favors of any kind.

On June 16 Ambassador Thomen reported that Mr. COOLEY was "extremely disturbed" over a bill presented by a Republican Representative giving the President power to cut sugar import quotas when Congress was not in session.

The bill was aimed at Cuba. Representative COOLEY had opposed the grant of authority to the President from the time President Eisenhower asked for it early in the year.

"I have no intention," Mr. COOLEY said publicly at the time, "of surrendering to the executive branch the responsibility and authority of Congress, nor do I intend to create a sugar czar in the executive department."

But Ambassador Thomen was able to report in the same dispatch that the Dominican Republic would benefit if Cuba's quota was cut.

"On the other hand," he said, "I have to report that Mr. Lawrence Myers of the Department of Agriculture, who has shown himself to be our good friend, said confidentially that if the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to modify the quotas to benefit North American consumers, the Dominican Republic will receive a substantial increase even if it is indirect."

Mr. Myers was, and is, head of the Sugar Office of the Agriculture Department. This office sets the consumption quotas for the United States.

Informed of this Dominican dispatch today, Mr. Myers said:

"It is completely untrue that I ever made such a commitment."

Consul General Peña's next letter, written 2 days after the one that referred to Mr. Myers, reported that after a session of the House Agriculture Committee the consul general had invited to his home Representative Cooley, Mr. Myers, and two other Department of Agriculture officials—Robert Case and J. Murphy—to discuss the problem.

He telephoned the Foreign Office that Mr. COOLEY had advised him that a new amendment to the bill would be adopted, granting the President of the United States power to redistribute the Cuban quota in a manner that would benefit, among others, the Dominican Republic.

Consul General Peña also reported that "I secured a promise from Mr. Myers, who will testify today before the committee, that he would specifically mention the Dominican Republic as a country friendly toward the United States and a sure supplier of substantial quantities of sugar."

After weeks of conflict between the House and the Senate, a bill was passed at the beginning of July. President Eisenhower immediately used his new powers to reduce the Cuban sugar quota. As a result, the Dominican Republic was granted, in accordance with the new legislation, a quota of 321,857 tons in addition to its normal quota of 131,000 tons.

## OAS ASKED SANCTIONS

In August, however, the Organization of American States called for the breaking of diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and the application of limited sanctions.

President Eisenhower asked Congress for authority to free the United States from the "seriously embarrassing" situation in which it was required under the law to import Dominican sugar.

The Senate agreed, but when Representative COOLEY blocked action in the House the special session of Congress adjourned without acting. Then the Agriculture Department licensed imports of Dominican sugar under the windfall quota diverted from Cuba and the 2-cent-a-pound penalty was imposed, thus nullifying the premium paid at the time over the world market price.

In these circumstances Consul General Peña wrote on November 23 to President Joaquín Balaguer of the Dominican Republic—then a puppet for ruler Generalissimo Trujillo—that he had established a new contact with Representative COOLEY.

He wrote that the interview had been arranged by Mrs. Asuncion Eckert, a former employe of the Cuban sugar lobbies and subsequently connected with the Dominican sugar office. Mrs. Eckert is a close friend of the Cooley family.

Senor Peña reported that "during the interview, COOLEY was very cordial, reiterating his wishes of cooperating with us." It was at that time, according to Senor Peña, that Representative COOLEY promised to "work hard" to bring about the lifting of the 2-cent penalty on Dominican sugar and the refunding of the money collected.

Mr. COOLEY was also reported to have expressed the opinion that the Kennedy administration would be "more beneficial to our cause."

On January 7, 1961, Senor Peña reported to President Balaguer that he had again seen Mr. COOLEY, "who reiterated to us his previous promise \* \* \* of requesting an extension until December 31, 1961, of the Sugar Act."

Senor Peña's letters reflect the adulation accorded Generalissimo Trujillo by those in his government.

Dr. Balaguer is addressed as "His Excellency, Honorable President of the Republic," and as "Distinguished Dr. Balaguer."

Generalissimo Trujillo is referred to variously, in Senor Peña's letters, as "the Highest Authority," and "the Illustrious Superiority." Other Dominican documents, addressed directly to Generalissimo Trujillo, bear this salutation:

"His Excellency, Generalissimo Dr. Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, Benefactor of the Fatherland and Father of the New Fatherland: Illustrious and Dear Chief."

On February 2, Senor Peña reported to President Balaguer a new meeting with Mr. Cooley in which they discussed the bill of the committee chairman to extend the existing law for 21 months, without changes. This was the solution favored by the Dominicans, who feared a change in the law.

Senor Peña quoted Mr. COOLEY as having said that "he is trying to convince the Executive of the convenience of accepting his bill in full and that he has great hopes in that sense."

Senor Peña then wrote:

"Regarding the question of approaching the party suggested by a friendly person, to which reference was made in our communication No. 111, dated the day before yesterday, COOLEY discreetly suggested that it would be prudent to wait more time until we can evaluate the reaction to his bill in high official spheres."

No identification was given of the "party" to be approached.

Less than 2 weeks later, on February 15, Senor Peña sent a semicoded telegram advising the Foreign Office of the conversation with Mr. Cooley in which he had spoken of his talks with Mr. Bowles and Mr. Berle at the State Department.

It was this telegram that reported a recommendation from Mr. COOLEY to send to Washington immediately a person enjoying the "highest confidence" of Generalissimo Trujillo to study the "basic aspects" of the activities that the Congressman was "carry-ing out together with others of our friends."

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11845

## BANK HEAD ARRIVES

Early in March such a person arrived in Washington. He turned out to be Oscar Guaroa Ginebra Henriquez, the chairman of the Dominican Central Bank.

In a letter to Generalissimo Trujillo dated March 7, Senor Ginebra wrote that immediately after his arrival he had made contacts in Washington and "in this connection \* \* \* I held a long conference with Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY."

"In that interview," he wrote, "I had the opportunity to offer very interesting arguments to Mr. COOLEY, who appreciated them, and said they deserved to be brought before the Agriculture Committee in order to forestall the imposition of drastic measures against Dominican sugar."

Senor Ginebra then wrote:

"In that sense, at the suggestion of Mr. COOLEY, I prepared a short memorandum explaining in general terms the traditional position of the Dominican Republic; the artifices that had been used to obtain arbitrary resolutions by the Organization of American States; the uncertain position of the United States before Latin America; the perverse ideas of President Betancourt which he used through Mr. Berle and Thomas Mann (then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs), and the unexpected change, as well as the rebuff made by President (Janio) Quadros of Brazil to the Department of State, by establishing definitive relations with countries of the Iron Curtain."

## A MEETING WITH LAWYERS

Senor Ginebra reported that in a meeting the following day with the Washington lawyers of the Dominican sugar interests a formula was drafted for the new sugar bill, leaving "the door open for an opportunity to obtain the sale of the extra quota of our sugar if we simply obtained an administrative decision, thus avoiding a new amendment to the law."

Senor Ginebra said that "we have succeeded in introducing new changes \* \* \* in the amendment in order to avoid any specific mention of the Dominican Republic in the powers that are being granted to the President" for cutting the quotas of other countries in the national interest of the United States.

On May 17 Senor Ginebra wrote again to Generalissimo Trujillo, advising him that hearings on the new Sugar Act would open the following day but that "I have been assured by Congressman COOLEY that \* \* \* the basic quotas of the exporting countries, including the Dominican Republic, would not be touched at all."

Then the communications to Generalissimo Trujillo ceased. He was assassinated on May 30.

Mr. CLARK. The majority leader has in fact stated, I believe—and I agree with him—that as an ideal matter the Proxmire amendment is preferable to the amendment he supports. I believe the Proxmire amendment would carry out the principle of the action of the Senate in passing the administration bill some time ago.

I say that if we ignore the situation in the House, there is not a shadow of a doubt that the Proxmire amendment represents what the administration really would like to have, if it were not concerned about acceptance of the proposal by the other body. I say that the failure to adopt the Proxmire amendment will be a yielding by the Senate of the United States to the most gigantic lobby which has hit this Congress this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me an additional half minute?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield an additional half minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am not one who believes that the other body will stage a strike against the national interest. I ask Senators to support their convictions, to do what they know is right—to support the Proxmire amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the majority leader. Like the majority leader, I believe there is much merit in the amendment suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], but I believe we must be realistic in dealing with the problem at hand.

All of us know of the difficulties which our conferees had last week in settling with the House the questions in dispute. It is my considered judgment that should the Proxmire amendment be added to the pending bill, the bill will not even be considered by the House.

I believe the bill as passed by the Senate should have been adopted insofar as foreign allotments were concerned. I think it was a grave mistake to provide permanent quotas for new countries. I also believe it was a mistake to provide permanent quotas for countries in the Eastern Hemisphere.

However, this is all behind us now. We must deal with the situation as it faces us today. It is my hope that when the Sugar Act is again considered 2½ years from now, we shall be able to study the question of permanent quotas for foreign countries more realistically. If we are to allocate quotas, I would like to see us allocate sugar quotas only to countries in the Western Hemisphere.

The main purpose of the Mansfield amendment, as I understand it, is to do justice to one of our friends to the south of us. One of the largest producers of sugar to the south of us is Argentina. Somehow, in the legislative process of writing a new Sugar Act, Argentina has been left out entirely in consideration of sugar quotas. We must take steps to rectify this situation. It is my belief that the President of the United States should be given this leeway.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time is remaining to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I oppose the Proxmire amendment, not because it is not well intentioned, but because I think that it would be a serious mistake. I agree completely with what was said by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I think the conferees should have taken the Senate bill. The Senate bill was a fine piece of sugar legislation. I was not a cosponsor of the measure, so I can say freely that I commend the Senators who introduced it. It was a good piece of legislation. As it passed the Senate, the bill was still a good piece of legislation. Therefore it should have been accepted in conference. But it was not accepted. As frequently happens in conferences, the conferees did the best they could. Time after time, it was suggested to the conferees that they leave, break up, and forget about it. To do so would have posed some very great problems, not only to the domestic sugar producers of our country, but to producers throughout Latin America who recognize an extremely attractive market. Therefore, I agree with the Senator from Louisiana in his appraisal of the Senate bill. I say only that I know the conferees did the best they could at that time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Some Senators do not have too much heart for any sugar bill. But an accusation has been made on the floor of the Senate today that if the Senate should agree to the Mansfield amendment, we would support the lobbyists, and if we should agree to the Proxmire amendment, we would defeat the lobbyists. I think the Senator from New Mexico, who is conversant with questions of agriculture, ought to answer that question for the benefit of Senators.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is absolutely nothing of substance in that charge that could be seriously regarded. The conferees did not pay any attention to the lobbyists. We tried to come as close to the Senate bill as we could. The conferees paid no attention to what the lobbyists had done. I know that those who worked on the bill recognized that we cannot stop lobbying or prevent people from discussing various subjects. The conferees were not in any way influenced by the lobbying. Agreement to the Mansfield amendment would be no boon whatever to those who are interested primarily in lobbying.

I believe I am correct in the statement that the Government of Argentina had no lobbyist of any kind here. It did not try to lobby at all. As a Senator sitting in the conference, although not officially designated as a conferee, I can say that the proposal to drop Argentina from the bill was made on the basis of representations that the Argentine Government was not now interested in this particular market; and that it had

plenty of markets for sugar elsewhere and would not be offended if it were left out of the bill. When we find that the Argentine Government is offended, I want to do something to correct the situation. That is why I support the majority leader in his amendment. I think it would be a serious mistake to leave Argentina with a cause of complaint, particularly when we included in the bill areas which I do not think should ever have been included, and which I tried my best to keep out.

In taking care of the situation in Argentina, the Mansfield amendment might lead to many other problems. Some might say, "You are going to expand the quotas." I point out that there is a strong possibility that there will be deficit areas. Deficit areas probably will correct most of the things that seem to be wrong with the measure. I have tried, as others have tried, to obtain a large quota that could be regarded as a global quota so that sugar could be used as an instrument of foreign policy and be of great value to our country. I believe we have taken a step in the right direction. If we had agreed to the Douglas amendment as originally stated, we would have taken a better step. But the Senate had to take the action that it could this year. It thereupon reduced the amount only 10 percent, whereas the President had asked for 20 percent. We did the best we could with the opportunities we had.

We should accept the conference report. We should accept also the Mansfield amendment, thus leaving in the hands of the President the opportunity to correct on a temporary basis what I think was improperly done in regard to the sugar bill.

If representations had been made to the conferees with respect to the nature of the Argentine operation, I doubt very much that the conferees would have agreed to the sugar bill. Therefore, while we have hurried a bit, I say that the Senate should agree to the Mansfield amendment, which is a reasonable amendment, one which can be handled; and that we should go on about our business and not worry about it. I know that I was not supporting lobbyists. If any lobbyist appeared in behalf of the Mansfield amendment, I do not know who he is or where he came from.

The measure is a good proposal. It should be accepted by the Senate. I hope it will be accepted by the Senate. I hope that when it is accepted by the Senate, good will be done for the benefit of our foreign policy, which might have been badly damaged by the previous adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I intend to support the Proxmire amendment. I do not believe concern for Argentina is any less on the part of those who support the Proxmire amendment than among those who oppose it. It is merely a matter of how we should handle the problem. The Proxmire amendment seems to me to represent a more suitable approach because of the saving to the

American taxpayers, who have been forgotten quite a bit during the present session of Congress. The argument has been made that the House would not accept the Proxmire amendment. I think we ought to give the House an opportunity to act upon it. If that argument should hold true, I cannot see much point in the Senate's debating the medicare proposal for a week because it is common knowledge that the House will not accept that measure.

Mr. President, I believe that the Proxmire amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the only argument made against the Proxmire amendment is that the House will not accept it. The statement of the majority leader is that it would have little or no chance of passage in the House of Representatives. Why? We agree that the amendment has merit. We agree that it makes sense. We agree that it would save money. We agree that now is the time to eliminate subsidies. It would be far more difficult to eliminate countries from the program 3 years from now. Countries named in the conference report will adapt their economy to the premium price. After they had increased wages, purchased facilities, and built refineries, it would then be extremely difficult to eliminate those countries.

We agree that the amendment makes sense from the standpoint of providing an instrumentality for the overthrow of Castro. It must be recognized that the experts in the Department of Agriculture stated, as they told me this morning, that they support my amendment. The Senator from New Mexico has said, in answer to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], that lobbyists are not a consideration in connection with the bill.

The fact is that, with the exception of the lobbyist from Mauritius, every lobbyist has prevailed in his efforts and has secured at least something in the bill as it was passed in conference. Furthermore, depending on the outcome of this amendment the Indian lobbyist has \$49,000 coming to him. If the Senate should agree to the Proxmire amendment, he would lose that amount. If the Senate does not agree to the Proxmire amendment, the lobbyist will receive an additional \$49,000, or a total of \$99,000 for the year.

Why collapse under those circumstances? The Senator from Montana says there have been no changes on this situation since the conference. The Senator is wrong. There have been changes in the past few days. The New York Times article has been spread all over the country. Yesterday I read in a Wisconsin newspaper the story about the sugar bill. A similar story has appeared in Chicago newspapers. Many Americans have been reading about the activities of Congress in respect to the Sugar Act, and realize the kind of lobby pressuring and high fees that has been going on with respect to the Sugar Act.

It seems to me that if we collapse on the measure, the Senate will have completely surrendered. Our position basically was that we should have a

2,600,000-ton global sugar quota reserve. The House figure was zero. My position is that we should stand fast for the global reserve. The position of the Senator from Montana is that we should give in and reduce the global reserve by the total amount to be set aside for Presidential discretion. I see no reason why we should not stand by our position and, if necessary, go to a conference on the honey bill. Perhaps on the basis of the conference we can come to an agreement.

At any rate, Mr. President, on the merits the amendments make sense. This is the first time in the Senate that I have ever heard as the only argument against an amendment that has clear merit is that it will not be accepted by the House. Why in the world should we not adopt the amendment on its merits and then go to conference, if necessary, and try to come back with an agreed report?

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, unless the majority leader wishes to yield back the remainder of his time, in which event I will surrender my remaining time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate now voting on the Proxmire amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now voting on the Proxmire amendment.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Sena-

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11847

tor from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 111 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Beall	Engle	Murphy
Boggs	Fulbright	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Goldwater	Neuberger
Chavez	Hart	Proxmire
Clark	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Javits	Wiley
Dodd	Keating	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Kefauver	Young, Ohio
Dworshak	Miller	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Hickey	Monroney
Allott	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Holland	Moss
Bennett	Jackson	Mundt
Cannon	Johnston	Pastore
Carlson	Kerr	Pell
Case	Kuchel	Randolph
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Eastland	Mansfield	Thurmond
Ellender	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	McNamara	
Hayden	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—33

Bartlett	Gruening	Prouty
Bible	Hartke	Robertson
Burdick	Hruska	Russell
Bush	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Butler	Jordan	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Smathers
Capehart	Long, La.	Smith, Mass.
Carroll	Magnuson	Stennis
Church	McCarthy	Talmadge
Cooper	Morton	Tower
Gore	Pearson	Yarborough

So Mr. PROXMIRE'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] will not offer his amendment. I therefore call up my amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Chair have read the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on last Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Ordered*, That effective on Thursday, July 5, 1962, immediately after the Senate convenes, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8050) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honeybees, debate on amendments by Senators MANSFIELD, PROXMIRE, and MCCARTHY shall be limited to 30 minutes, each, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received: *Provided further*, That after the disposition of the Mansfield amendment the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is my interpretation of the unanimous-consent agreement reached by the Senate on Monday correct when I state that under that agreement only the amendments to be offered by the three Senators mentioned were to be considered, and that upon the conclusion of the action on the Mansfield amendment a vote would be taken on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's interpretation is correct. The unanimous-consent agreement is limited to three amendments: The amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], which has just been acted upon; and the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I gather from a reading of the unanimous-consent agreement that an amendment could be offered, but that very likely no discussion of it could be had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time has been allocated for debate on other amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Arkansas wishes to offer an amendment, and notwithstanding the agreement reached, I suggest to him that I make the unanimous-consent request that he be allowed to offer his amendment, and that 5 minutes be allotted to each side for debate on the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, that is certainly agreeable.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Does this proposal in any way affect the limitations on the so-called medicare bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; this proposal affects only the bill now under consideration.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask that it not be read. I can explain it in a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

"(c) Section 204(a) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary shall from time to time determine whether, in view of the current inventory of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugarbeets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar and other pertinent factors, any area or country will be unable to market the quota or proration for such area or country. If the Secretary determines that any domestic area or foreign country will be unable to market the quota or proration for such area or country, he shall revise the quota for the Republic of the Philippines by prorating to it an amount of sugar which bears the same ratio to the deficit as the quota for the Republic of the Philippines determined under section 202(b) then in effect bears to the sum of such quota for the Republic of the Philippines and of the proration to foreign countries named in section 202(c) (3) (A) then in effect; and shall allocate an amount of sugar equal to the remainder of the deficit to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere named in section 202(c) (3) (A): *Provided*, That no part of any such deficit shall be prorated or allocated to any country not in diplomatic relations with the United States. If the Secretary determines that the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to fill its share of any deficit determined under this subsection, he shall allocate such unfilled amount to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere named in section 202(c) (3) (A): *Provided*, That no such allocation shall be made to any foreign country not in diplomatic relations with the United States. In making allocations to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere under this subsection, special consideration shall be given to those countries purchasing United States agricultural commodities. If the Secretary determines that neither the Republic of the Philippines nor the countries within the Western Hemisphere named in section 202(c) (3) (A) can fill all of any such deficit whenever the provisions of section 202(c) (4) apply, he shall add such unfilled amount to the quantity of sugar which may be purchased pursuant to section 202(c) (4),

and whenever section 202(c) (4) does not apply he shall apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such foreign countries in diplomatic relations with the United States as he determines is required to fill such deficit."

Reletter succeeding subsections accordingly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the amendment is a simple one. The President is given discretionary power to re-allocate to Western Hemisphere countries the amount of sugar which domestic or foreign areas are unable to market of their assigned quotas. That is all the amendment deals with.

Under the current law, such shortfalls are to be proportionately distributed to the Philippines and to all other countries having basic quotas, using their percentum entitlements as listed in the act.

Under this amendment, the Philippines would retain its prorated shortfalls, but the remainder would be distributed only to Western Hemisphere countries, taking into consideration those countries which purchase U.S. agricultural commodities.

The amendment does not go nearly as far as the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. It deals only with the tonnage which the domestic and foreign areas are unable to deliver. It is estimated that the shortfall this year will be about 300,000 tons, and next year probably 200,000 tons. But this amount will gradually diminish under the effect of the bill.

The amendment does not disturb the allocation of the basic quotas already in the law of countries outside the Western Hemisphere. It simply reallocates to Western Hemisphere countries the shortfall of the domestic areas. It would have the effect of depriving non-Western Hemisphere countries of any additional quotas because of the shortfall. That is all the amendment provides. I am quite confident it is in accord with the administration's view.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, will the Senator from Arkansas define what he means by "shortfall"?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let us take an arbitrary illustration. Assume that the beet growers of the United States are allocated 2,500,000 tons, but are unable to produce more than 2 million tons. The shortfall would be 500,000 tons. The amount below their allocated quota is what I refer to as a shortfall. The amount they cannot produce of their quota assigned under the bill would be a shortfall. Actually, in many cases throughout the years, the domestic growers, particularly in Puerto Rico and Hawaii, have not been able to produce all that has been allocated to them; but the amendment would not deprive them of any amount to which they are entitled under the law. The amendment merely provides for the disposal of the tonnage which American producers fail to produce.

I think this amendment is in accord with the administration's position. It would do no harm to the domestic beet

producers, either in Hawaii or anywhere else; and it also would preserve the present situation of the Philippines.

The only effect of the amendment is that the so-called shortfall would not be allocated to non-Western Hemisphere countries.

Furthermore, any allocation of the amount of the shortfall to Western Hemisphere nations would be at the discretion of the President. He would not have to allocate it to any nation; but he would have discretion to give it to any Western Hemisphere countries, but only within the amount of the shortfall.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been making inquiries about the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I find that there have been no shortfalls; that, as a matter of fact, there has been overproduction in the domestic beet industry during the past several years because of the limitations which have been imposed. I do not know what to say at this time in response to the Senator's statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under the new bill, their quotas have been greatly expanded. If it develops under the expansion provisions of the bill that there are no shortfalls, then the amendment would have no effect, because it deals only with shortfalls.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Suppose there be a shortfall in the beet industry, but suppose the cane sugar industry happens to have an excellent year and overproduces. Does the Senator mean that none of the shortfall could be assigned to the cane sugar industry?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My interpretation of the new Sugar Act is that it could not be. All domestic deficits automatically go to foreign growers. My amendment directs these deficits to countries in the Western Hemisphere. I would interpret this amendment to mean that it could be reallocated anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. All the amendment means is that the shortfall, both domestic and foreign, could not be allocated to a country outside the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I take it that by "shortfall," the Senator means to include both cane sugar and beet sugar?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes. I used cane sugar only as an illustration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has all time for debate expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes remain available to the opponents.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri; but, first, I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether I am correct in assuming that on the basis on which the amendment is offered, the Senator's amendment applies only to domestic production which falls short of filling the quota, and that the remainder would go to the countries of Latin America?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It applies only to countries in the Western Hemisphere. Under the present law, as I understand it, whatever shortfall developed would be prorated among all foreign countries with basic quota allocations. Therefore, the other countries—those outside the Western Hemisphere, such as Fiji, Australia, and the others—would get their percentage.

All I am trying to do—and I believe this amendment does it—is preserve for the Western Hemisphere countries the so-called shortfall, if there is one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But none of this would go to the Fijis or to Australia or to the Netherlands or to South Africa or to the other nations—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They would not get any part of the shortfall; they would get only what they are given under the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have respect for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. Does he think there would be any danger that the countries which would get any of the shortfall, later would be irritated to the point where we would have a problem on our hands if they did not get it after the shortfall was made up?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think so. The shortfall concept has been in the law, and we have had experience in the past with it, and there has never been any idea that it was a permanent quota.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It will be a gradually decreasing amount; and if there is a deficit, it will be only because there has been a very substantial increase in quotas for the domestic producers.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. What is the present status of the Philippines, and what would be the effect on them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They get about one-third of it now, and will continue to get it; the amendment does not disturb them.

Mr. CANNON. So the amendment includes the Western Hemisphere countries, plus the Philippines?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; plus the Philippines.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let us assume that a Latin American country to which an allotment has been made has a shortfall.

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Does the Senator's amendment cover that situation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not thinking of that, but it does cover that possibility. In other words, suppose Guatemala, with a quota, does not produce its full amount—

Mr. KUCHEL. Precisely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under existing law that has to be prorated, among all foreign producers with basic quotas as I understand the act. If my amendment is applied, the shortfall would be limited to the countries in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator's amendment applies only to a shortfall in the domestic production in the United States, does it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was the situation I had in mind but it would also cover foreign shortfalls.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KERR. As I read the amendment, it applies not only to the fall-out—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To the shortfall.

Mr. KERR. Very well—to the shortfall in the case of either domestic production or that of a foreign country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean if a shortfall were to occur?

Mr. KERR. If the Secretary determines that any domestic area or foreign country will be unable to market the quota or proration for such area or country—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it has a shortfall; yes.

Mr. KERR. In other words, if what the Senator from Arkansas refers to as a shortfall, and what I referred to as a fallout, were to occur, either by reason of inability of the domestic area or a foreign country—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Then that shortfall could be reallocated by the President, at his discretion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Within the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. KERR. Yes, within the Western Hemisphere. That is for any 1 year at a time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, that is my purpose. It would be impossible to tell what the shortfall would be, except year by year.

Mr. KERR. I understand; but having reallocated—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time under the control of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are not doing anything about the present shortfall arrangements of the sugar bill, except to limit its distribution to countries in the Western Hemisphere. That is the only effect sought to be brought about by this amendment.

Mr. KERR. And the fact that a shortfall occurred in the domestic area in

1964, and was reallocated to Mexico or to some other country in the Western Hemisphere, would not in any way be binding for the next year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct, particularly because there might not be any shortfall the next year.

Mr. KERR. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oklahoma is entirely correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to have the Senator from Arkansas say, "Yes; that is the correct answer."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, that is the correct answer. The only effect of the amendment is to limit the distribution of the shortfall, whenever one might develop, to countries in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. KERR. For that year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; for that year. In the following year there might not be a shortfall; or if there were one, the allocation of the preceding year is not to be regarded as a precedent in any respect, and the President will be entirely free to reallocate it in some other way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator's amendment in any way affect my amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think so. I think it is consistent with the purposes of the amendment of the Senator from Montana, in my view, but it goes a small step farther, and provides that this discretionary power of the President on shortfalls shall be limited to distribution to countries in the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, I think it is consistent with the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was my impression.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I think the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is an excellent one. It augments the amendment of the Senator from Montana, without creating a deficit or a penalty anywhere.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have this amendment adopted if the following condition be understood: that in the event it appears that this amendment would do violence to the provisions of the conference report which we adopted as to the reallocation of a domestic shortfall to some other domestic area, I would hope our conferees would be instructed to eliminate the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the amendment is so poorly drawn that it has that effect, I would agree with the Senator. That certainly is not its purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I yield back the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on the Mansfield amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 8050) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees, and to amend certain provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KERR and Mr. HOLLAND made a motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 3, 1962, was dispensed with.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

11850

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 5

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A  
COMMITTEE

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:  
Executive D, 87th Congress, 2d session, the International Wheat Agreement, 1962 (Ex. Rept. No. 6).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard William Habermeyer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN  
SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL  
AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the period July 1961-April 1962

(with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the period July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS  
AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS  
COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of May 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF RECLAMATION OF SPARE  
PARTS FROM EXCESS AIRCRAFT ENGINES IN  
DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR  
FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of reclamation of spare parts from excess aircraft engines in the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, dated June 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF OPERATIONS OF UNLIMITED  
SALES AGENCIES UNDER THE 1959 AND  
1960 COTTON PURCHASE PROGRAMS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of operations of unlimited sales agencies under the 1959 and 1960 cotton purchase programs, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated June 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SUPPLY CONTROL AND  
INSPECTION ACTIVITIES OF THE MILITARY  
CLOTHING AND TEXTILE SUPPLY AGENCY,  
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of supply control and inspection activities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, Department of Defense, Philadelphia, Pa., dated June 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ROYALTY  
CHARGES BY HAZELTINE ELECTRONICS DIVISION,  
LITTLE NECK, N.Y., UNDER DEPARTMENT  
OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of royalty charges by Hazeltine Electronics Division, Hazeltine Corp., Little Neck, N.Y., under Department of Defense contracts, dated June 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., March 8-9, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS OF  
COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Coast Guard (with

an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF A CERTAIN  
ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Wa Kwork Tak, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to the alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BY DELAWARE RIVER  
BASIN COMMISSION

A notice of the Delaware River Basin Commission, Philadelphia, Pa., signed by Brinton Whitall, Acting Secretary, giving notice, pursuant to the Delaware River Basin compact, of the public hearing relating to municipal water supply and waste disposal facilities, Federal, State, and local nonurban recreation areas, river stage and stream gaging station, and interstate water quality standards, to be held in the Pennsylvania State Office Building, Philadelphia, Pa., on July 25, 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Finance:

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

Concurrent resolution relative to the discharge petition for H.R. 3745

Whereas H.R. 3745 is "bottled up" in committee before the U.S. Congress and a discharge petition therefor is on the desk of the Speaker; and

Whereas H.R. 3745 provides much-needed increases in the pensions of veterans; and Whereas the small pensions now being received by veterans are inadequate to meet the increased cost of living; and

Whereas it is only appropriate that adequate provision be made for those who gave so much on behalf of their country: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate concurring)*, That the Members of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress are hereby memorialized to take immediate action on the discharge petition for H.R. 3745 now on the Speaker's desk; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution shall be sent to the Presiding Officers of each House of the U.S. Congress and to the members of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States.

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

*Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.*

A resolution adopted by the Church of God, of Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, protesting against the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the New York State Board of Regents prayer case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF  
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, LA-  
BETTE COUNTY, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Labette Board of County Commissioners,



personality, with ability, with knowledge, with love of man and a fine spirit of dedication to the commonweal.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mayor Celebrezze and his wonderful family as he steps into the position as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I wish him well in this new and challenging post.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of 7 days of sadness as we join in the observance of Captive Nations Week. At this short moment in history, we pause to register our protest at the Red conspiracy which has swallowed up entire nations and entire populations behind its curtain of captivity.

For the first time, the world is beginning to realize that freedom is more than a word. For the first time, the world is beginning to take note of the fact that without incentive, without motivation, man's works are meaningless.

We are seeing rifts develop in the Communist camp, rifts and schisms which Red doctrine states are impossible. We are seeing the inability of the Communist world to even feed itself adequately, much less provide its populations with the other material necessities of life which were claimed to be the reason for the creation of this doctrine.

On the other hand, we and our friends in Europe are moving forward through freedom. The Common Market is pulling together in a show of strength and vigor which far surpasses that of the Soviet Union and almost equals our own considerable productive effort.

This strength, and Soviet weakness, should give heart to those who find themselves imprisoned behind the walls of hate and hypocrisy. The trumpeting voice of freedom will destroy these walls of ignorance as completely as the walls of Jericho tumbled to the ground, never to rise again.

At least, we see hope for the cause of freedom, for the cause of those held captive behind the Iron Curtain. At least, we can offer the words that the wait will not be too long, that the day will arrive when these people who have suffered so much at the hands of their oppressors will be free and whole again.

Let us take heart in this week of mourning and look forward confidently to the crumbling of this oppressive imperialist empire and its replacement with government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

#### THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, MARYLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6759) for the relief of the Prince Georges County School Board, Maryland.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

#### BRIDGE AT CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE, N.C.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8983) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in financing the construction of a bridge at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill is scheduled for consideration under suspension this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### LAND FOR THE OGLALA SIOUX INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10485) to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 4,923.58 acres of land in South Dakota that have been used for the benefit of the Oglala Community School and have been determined excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, together with the improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation. Such land is described as follows:

(a) 1,040 acres; northeast quarter section 15; west half section 16; south half and the northeast quarter and the south half northwest quarter section 17, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(b) 180.47 acres; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 20, and lot 4, section 21, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(c) 80 acres; south half northeast quarter section 15, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(d) 36.32 acres; lot 3, section 21, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(e) 602.57 acres; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, east half west half, southeast quarter section 18; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 19, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(f) 683.81 acres; south half, northeast quarter section 13; lots 1 and 2, section 23; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 24, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(g) 960 acres; all section 8; southwest quarter section 9, north half northwest quarter section 17, east half northeast quarter section 18, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(h) 266.79 acres; southwest quarter northwest quarter, west half southwest quarter section 14, east half southeast quarter, section 15; lot 1 section 22; lot 4 section 23, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(i) 760 acres; east half section 10; west half section 11; northwest quarter northwest quarter section 14; north half northwest quarter section 15, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(j) 153.62 acres; east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter section 14, lot 3, section 23, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(k) 160 acres; southeast quarter section 14, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, after line 9, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PAYMENT OF MONETARY AWARD TO RECIPIENTS OF NATIONAL MEDAL OF SCIENCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4055) to amend the act of August 25, 1959, to authorize the payment of a monetary award to recipients of the National Medal of Science.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

#### IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 726, by direction of the Committee on Rules and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H.R. 8050, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the so-called honey bee bill which was passed by the House and sent over to the Senate. It is a noncontroversial bill in itself. However, in the other body there were some

July 16, 1962

12763

Senator MILLER added:

The problem would be greatly relieved if there was not so great a tendency on the part of the Senate Appropriations Committee to increase the appropriations approved by the House.

And in reply Senator ROBERTSON said that since the war we had increased the deficit by \$32 billion.

Every other statement in the resolution is verified by official statistics on file in the committee and open to inspection by anyone—including the columnist.

The account further relates that a member of the committee asked me if I wrote the resolution and I said:

I am responsible for the wording of the resolution.

No such question was asked and, of course, no such answer was made, as every member of the committee present on that occasion will testify. Both statements are pure fabrication.

Just as inaccurate is the statement that "CANNON snorted that the resolution was not open to general discussion."

Mr. Speaker, I hope no one thinks that after being here as long as I have, I know so little about parliamentary procedure as to make a ruling like that—or that the Committee on Appropriations knows so little as to accept such a ruling.

Even the title is misleading. The title reads "CANNON Blasts HAYDEN" but nowhere in the entire article, with all its vivid imagination—untrammelled by any regard for facts—is a blast against Senator HAYDEN mentioned.

Now a word about Drew Pearson. Mr. Speaker, I regard him as an indispensable adjunct of our de facto government. He has become an American institution. In the language of the English Parliament he would be denominated as "Her Majesty's Opposition." In ecclesiastical parlance he would be termed "The Devil's Advocate." Of course, a man who must write a column every day of the year must at times embellish prosaic annals of uneventful days with a little sensationalism in order to make them readable. But he arouses interest and sometimes throws the needed light of publicity on otherwise unnoted phases of American life and consequently is always entertaining. I take off my hat to him. And I hereby express admiration of the very efficient job he did on me.

In the language of Rip Van Winkle, May he, in the risible camaraderie of Mark Twain, Josh Billings and the Baron Maunchausen, live long and prosper.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and its subcommittees may sit this week during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special sub-

committee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to sit during the deliberations of the House today.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MAYOR ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE AS SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to praise President's appointment of Cleveland's Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to succeed Governor Ribicoff.

Mayor Celebrezze comes to Washington as no stranger. He comes to Washington as an old friend. As president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and as former president of the American Municipal Association, Mayor Celebrezze has appeared before many of the committees of Congress and is well known to most of the Government agencies.

He faces the heavy responsibilities of the new office with wide experience in State and municipal affairs. He has proven to be a tireless, dedicated leader in Cleveland and in Ohio. He will prove to be a great Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mayor Celebrezze will bring added color to the President's Cabinet. He is filled with love of humanity, and yet, if a policy position calls for firmness he can be as tough as the steel for which Cleveland is famous. His long experience as mayor of Cleveland, and as a legislator, should prove him a successful advocate of the program of the administration. Members of Congress will be pleased with his forthright, direct and no-holds-barred approach.

Cleveland is proud of the achievement of its favorite son and wishes him well on this new challenge.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Cleveland. I know Mayor Celebrezze very well and consider him a friend. I think he is one of the outstanding citizens of Ohio. He certainly will make a good administrator.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MAYOR ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE AS SECRETARY OF HEW

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, concerning Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze. I congratulate President Kennedy for his praiseworthy choice. Serving his un-

precedented fifth term as mayor of the city of Cleveland, Mayor Celebrezze has a record of progressive and sound administration. He has proven his capacity for heavy responsibilities and his tenacity and perseverance in working out difficult problems until amicable solutions have been reached. He has made a most commendable record as mayor of the thriving industrial city of Cleveland. Mayor Celebrezze is an honest, sincere, and industrious man of boundless energy. By experience and knowledge, he is eminently qualified to administer the important duties that he will assume as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I believe our Nation is fortunate to have such a man in the President's Cabinet.

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President Kennedy on his choice of the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues from Ohio [Mr. VANIK and Mr. LATTA]. They have well expressed the feelings of those who know Mayor Celebrezze. I came to know this man just a few years ago. It was my good fortune to spend a considerable amount of time in Ohio and particularly in Cleveland. I was deeply impressed with the respect and admiration that has been and is being showered upon this man. As all of us know, the task of being the mayor of any city is a difficult job. It is all the more difficult when one manages the affairs of a big, cosmopolitan center with all of its attendant problems. Cleveland is that kind of a community—typically American and the eighth largest city in the Nation. It was a good city before Mayor Celebrezze occupied the chair of the chief executive of the city. Because of him, it is a greater and better city today. Under his leadership, great plans have moved into action that will give a breathtaking and magnificent appearance to its downtown. Better housing, better schooling, greater emphasis on culture, a deep and abiding concern for the welfare of the people of the city he loves so much—these have been the hallmarks of Mayor Celebrezze's activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the decision to leave the office of mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, did not come easy to Anthony Celebrezze. His whole political life and love have been wrapped up in this great community; its history and its growth and its activities bestirred the best that was in him.

But I am confident that, despite the challenge of his native city, he saw the opportunity of greater challenge in the National Government.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress recognizes the heavy and difficult task that faces any Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the time in which we live, this job and this department daily assumes more and more importance.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Celebrezze brings to this post a wealth of experience in the areas in which this department functions. He combines the right kind of

1962

amendments—desirable, according to that body, to the sugar bill, that had just passed and that had just been signed by the President modifying and changing some of the allotments of sugar. The Senate attached that to the honey bee bill, a procedure that I personally dislike very much. However, it was done and this bill was sent back to the House by the other body asking the House to concur in the Senate amendments. I believe that the two committees that have had charge of this sugar legislation, in agreement, at least—whether in accord or not—but I understand they are in agreement to the Senate amendments to the honey bee bill, and it was brought up here at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, with an unanimous consent request that the bill be taken from the Speaker's table and the Senate amendments concurred in.

There was objection to that procedure by one Member. The Committee on Agriculture then applied to the Committee on Rules for a resolution which I am presenting here this morning to take this bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the Senate amendments. That will be the final action upon the honey bee bill and the amendments to the Sugar Act. That is the situation. I believe we are, more or less, in general accord on it. I do not think there is any objection. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, whether there was any objection in the minority of your committee—your committee was unanimous? Mr. Speaker, I am told by the chairman of the committee that the Committee on Agriculture is unanimous in its advocacy of this resolution, which will conclude our very troublesome subject of the sugar allotments.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield as much time as the gentleman may need.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want a minute.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point concerning the matter now being discussed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable misunderstanding concerning the sugarbeet culture in Ireland. In the hope of clarifying any misunderstanding that might exist, I am making part of the RECORD the following statement that I received from the Irish Export Board:

IRISH SUGAR

The development of sugarbeet culture in Ireland is described in the Statistical Abstract of Ireland, 1961, as follows:

"One of the most important changes in root and green crops since the beginning of the century was the introduction in 1926

of sugarbeets as a main crop. Until 1933 the production of this crop was concentrated mainly in counties Carlow, Kildare, Laoighis, and Wexford, which together, in 1933, accounted for 80 percent of the total crop of 15,000 acres. The acreage under sugarbeets reached a peak of 85,000 in 1945, but fell to 54,000 in 1952. In 1954 the acreage rose again to 74,000 but fell to 55,000 acres in 1955. There was a sharp increase to 71,000 acres in 1957 and with a still further increase to 85,000 acres in 1958 the acreage reached the peak 1945 level. There was a sharp decline to 69,000 acres in 1959 and in 1960 a further decline to 68,000 acres was recorded. Cork (14,600 acres), Wexford (7,500 acres), Laoighis (7,200 acres), Galway (6,800 acres), Tipperary (6,500 acres), Carlow (6,000 acres), and Kilkenny (5,500 acres) are the seven leading producing counties; together they account for 79 percent of the sugarbeet crop in 1960, while Kildare, Offaly, Waterford, and Kerry account for 16 percent" (p. 65).

The following table shows, in greater detail, the development in the past 8 years:

Irish beet sugar: Acreage and production

May 1 to Apr. 30	Sugarbeets (acres)	Sugar produced (short tons, raw value)
1955-56.....	55,298	106,000
1956-57.....	58,900	110,000
1957-58.....	70,000	132,000
1958-59.....	83,693	125,000
1959-60.....	68,454	157,000
1960-61.....	67,553	146,000
1961-62.....	78,317	199,000
1962-63.....	78,850	185,000

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

Sources: Acreage from Irish statistics; production from U.S. Department of Agriculture; estimated production (1962-63) based on acreage planted, historical yield per acre and historical sugar content of beets harvested.

The decline in acreage in 1959-60 and 1960-61 was, unfortunately, compelled, in order to hold sugar production down to the quantity which could be marketed. In 1961-62, and again in the current year, plantings of 78,000 acres were authorized. The acreages in these recent years amount to about 2 percent of the total land under tillage in Ireland. The comparable proportion of tilled land in the United States devoted to sugar crops (beet and cane), now at its alltime peak, is less than one-half of 1 percent.

The growing of sugarbeets hold a high priority in Ireland's agricultural planning, not only because of the efficiency achieved, but also because beet culture as practiced in Ireland is peculiarly adapted to the maintenance of the small family farm. Beet agriculture and beet processing have matured together, a striking example of the type of economic development which offers the greatest promise for raising Ireland's standards of living.

The Irish Sugar Co., government controlled, has developed into one of the most efficient sugar processing enterprises in the world and has played a major part in helping the beet growers develop high yields, notably by plant breeding which has developed a distinctive beet seed specially adapted to Irish conditions, efficient pest control measures, and a novel and strikingly successful harvester. Two American experts, detailed to Ireland under a technical assistance program in the early days of the Marshall plan, rendered immeasurable assistance, and for this help Ireland will always be grateful.

The high degree of efficiency achieved is strikingly illustrated by comparing the price at which homegrown sugar is supplied to the Irish consumer, compared with the retail prices which prevail in the major European beet sugar producing countries, and in

the United States. This moderate retail price has provided the Irish consumer with one of the highest consumption levels in the world.

Consumption and price of sugar: Ireland compared with leading Western European producing countries and the United States

	Consumption per capita, 1959	Retail price per pound, Jan. 1, 1960
Ireland.....	101.0	8.7
France.....	74.3	11.5
Germany (West).....	67.5	13.5
Italy.....	45.0	17.6
United States.....	103.8	11.6

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Bulletin 293, table 66; latest available data.

This efficiency has been coupled with labor standards in the refineries for above the average of other manufacturing industries in Ireland. In December 1960 (the last refining-season period for which data are published), the average wage in the refineries (converted to U.S. currency) was \$30.04 per week, compared with \$21.69 for all manufacturing industries. Out of 46 industrial categories used in Irish statistics, sugar refining was fifth highest in weekly wages paid.

The Irish sugarbeet industry can be said to have attained maturity in the 1959-60 sugar year. Despite a sharp curtailment of beet acreage from that harvested in 1958-59, production of sugar from homegrown beets reached the level of 157,000 short tons (raw value), providing a surplus over domestic consumption of about 15,000 tons, which was exported to the United Kingdom as refined sugar.

It has long been the practice in Ireland, as in many other countries, to protect export markets in manufactured products containing sugar (e.g., confectionery, baked goods, preserves, etc.), which typically encounter severe tariff and other barriers, by permitting the importation of cheap raw sugar for refining and reexportation in the form of such manufactured products. About 28,000 tons of raw sugar were so imported in 1960, and a like quantity exported in the form of confectionery products, etc.

In the 1960-61 season, domestic production from the same acreage fell off slightly, but was still ample to cover all of Ireland's domestic requirements. Stocks permitted the authorized 15,000 tons of exports to the United Kingdom. Requirements for manufacture for export increased sharply (about 20 to 25 percent above the previous year), and imports of raw sugar therefore also increased, with some rise in stocks of imported sugar.

In the 1961-62 season, delayed sowing due to weather conditions resulted in a drastic fall in sugar yield per ton of beets. The crop fell slightly short of domestic requirements, and stocks had to be drawn on for domestic requirements and to maintain exports to the United Kingdom. The high level of exports of manufactures containing sugar again was met by imported raw sugar.

For the current, 1962-63 season the crop is expected to meet all requirements for domestic consumption and for exports to the United Kingdom and the United States, and still leave a surplus.

It is interesting to note that the last contract placed by the Irish Sugar Co. for the purchase of sugar from Cuba was made in May 1959, and that the last shipment of sugar from Cuba to Ireland was made months before exports of sugar from Cuba to the United States ended. Indeed upon Castro's takeover of U.S. property in Cuba, the Irish Sugar Co. publicly announced its refusal to purchase any sugar from Cuba.

The practice of importing sugar for processing and use in manufactured prod-

ucts for export is authorized, and practiced, in the United States. Section 211(a) of the Sugar Act permits such imports, outside quota restrictions, and free of duty and tax, for reexport in the form of manufactured products.

The Irish sugar industry is now in its fourth consecutive year of plantings planned to be fully adequate to meet home consumption requirements (at a high level equal to that of the United States), with a modest surplus for export to markets which are open, and which are not based on low-priced residual tropical sugar. Only in the 1961-62 season did output fall short of domestic requirements, due to disastrous weather conditions.

Ireland has no desire to enter into the scramble to dump residual sugar on the uncontrolled international market, and, therefore, seeks only outlets which can absorb its production at the very modest prices at which it can sell profitably. It has had such a market in the United Kingdom for about 15,000 tons per year, and would be happy to be able to continue to ship to the United States at the rate of 10,000 tons per year. (An initial authorization of 5,000 tons for the first half of 1962 has been supplied.) Beyond such market opportunities, Ireland has no choice but to restrict acreage, and has been forced for some years to deny farmers any acreage allotments beyond those which can be covered by sales opportunities.

Ireland is one of America's good customers. In recent years, Ireland has been buying about \$59 million of American goods, against \$30 million in trade the other way, a favorable balance for the United States of about \$20 million. All of these purchases are on commercial terms. Ireland has had no foreign aid of any kind for over 10 years. Except for a very small program in the early days of the Marshall plan (including the technical assistance noted above which proved so fruitful for Irish beet culture), Ireland has had no assistance from the United States, and has asked for none.

Over half of Ireland's purchases here have been of agricultural products, notably tobacco (over \$13 million in 1960) and corn (almost \$6 million). Ireland's purchases of American agricultural products alone aggregate almost \$10 per capita, one of the highest figures in the world, and Ireland also purchases almost an equal quantity of manufactured products from the United States.

JULY 10, 1962.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say we are in complete accord so far as the House Committee on Agriculture is concerned. This procedure was discussed in the committee and there was no objection. Every member of the committee agreed not to object to the consideration of the bill although some of us are greatly disturbed over the procedure being followed, and we hope that hereafter this will not be a precedent. I am quite sure that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the other members of his committee will agree that this should not be a precedent—to take a bill such as the honey bee bill from the other end of the Capitol and send it back here loaded down such as this one is with an amendment which is very important. I agree that the Senate amendment is a step in the direction of the position of the House.

As I stated the other day, when we were discussing the matter under a reservation, this bill provides allotments

to the Dominican Republic and to Argentina, and makes certain provisions in reference to the allotment of deficits in the Western Hemisphere and other parts of the world. In my prepared remarks I discuss at some length the problems involved in this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a sugar quota for Ceylon?

Mr. COOLEY. No, there is no quota for Ceylon.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this honey-bee bill, sweetened up by the Senate sugar amendment, I do so out of extreme compulsion of circumstances and not from the better judgment, or the logic or the wisdom or the wishes of our Committee on Agriculture, nor of the House itself.

On April 2, 1962, the House passed H.R. 8050, a bill to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees. We had no forewarning or foreboding of what was to come, although I do recall that at the time there were some questions as to why we would restrict the importation of grown-up bees and still let their children come in. The simple answer there was that adult bees carry diseases that are not transmitted by immature bees. I wish there was so easy an explanation of this bill, as it now comes back—all sugared up—from the Senate.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, we passed the bee bill on April 2, in all innocence, and sent it along to the other body.

Then, along with consideration of general farm legislation, the Committee on Agriculture turned its attention to a bill to adjust the Sugar Act to changing domestic and world conditions and to extend the act's life beyond its expiration date on June 30, 1962.

Our committee worked for days and weeks and months on this bill. We first heard spokesmen for our domestic cane and sugarbeet producers and for domestic consumers and processors. We listened to spokesmen for the State Department present a listless argument for their global quota, world price, proposal. Then we heard representatives of sugar producers of friendly nations, principally in the Western Hemisphere, who want to participate to the largest extent possible in supplying our markets with sugar.

Everyone who wanted to be heard had a chance to be heard, openly and freely. The statements of all who testified are published in our printed hearings. And, I might add, our committee, in contrast to what took place elsewhere, spent the time available to it in studying the capabilities of the various foreign areas to serve as a dependable source of sugar supply—not in questioning the motives of the witnesses before the committee.

The administration recommended to us a system of global quotas and recapture of premiums on sugar delivered to

our shores from foreign suppliers. This was an abject departure from our successful sugar program of the past. This in effect would abandon the sugar program, as it relates to foreign suppliers, that has worked for so many years to guarantee a dependable supply of sugar, in wartime and in peacetime, at reasonable prices to our domestic consumers.

In our first executive session on the administration's bill, our Committee on Agriculture voted unanimously to reject the principle of global quotas and to reject the premium recapture proposition. We then proceeded to write a bill making specific assignments of quotas to friendly foreign suppliers, as in years past, after taking care of the needs of our expanding domestic mainland production.

Subsequently the House approved overwhelmingly the bill drawn by our committee. This House-passed bill distributed our sugar market as follows:

First. Increased the quotas for domestic sugar-producing areas at current levels of sugar consumption—9.7 million tons—about 625,000 tons and provided that those areas receive 63 percent of increases in consumption as compared to 55 percent under current legislation. The quotas for each of the domestic sugar-producing areas at the sugar requirement level of 9.7 million tons under current legislation and under the committee bill were as follows:

[Short tons, raw value]

Area	Present legislation	H. R. 12154
Domestic beet sugar.....	2, 110, 627	2, 650, 000
Mainland cane sugar.....	649, 460	895, 000
Hawaii.....	1, 117, 936	1, 110, 000
Puerto Rico.....	1, 231, 682	1, 140, 000
Virgin Islands.....	16, 795	15, 000
Total.....	5, 186, 500	5, 810, 000

Second. The basic quota was allocated in the House bill as follows:

Domestics.....	5, 810, 000
Cuba.....	1, 500, 000
Philippines.....	1, 050, 000
Peru.....	200, 000
Dominican Republic.....	200, 000
Mexico.....	200, 000
Brazil.....	190, 000
British West Indies.....	100, 000
Australia.....	50, 000
Republic of China.....	45, 000
French West Indies.....	40, 000
Colombia.....	35, 000
Nicaragua.....	30, 000
Costa Rica.....	30, 000
India.....	30, 000
Ecuador.....	30, 000
Haiti.....	25, 000
Guatemala.....	20, 000
Argentina.....	20, 000
South Africa.....	20, 000
Panama.....	15, 000
El Salvador.....	10, 000
Paraguay.....	10, 000
British Honduras.....	10, 000
Fiji Islands.....	10, 000
Netherlands.....	10, 000
Mauritius.....	10, 000
Total.....	9, 700, 000

Third. The Cuban quota of 1.5 million tons was authorized for purchase

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12767

from other countries on a temporary basis through December 1963, as follows:

Philippines.....	150,000
Peru.....	150,000
Dominican Republic.....	150,000
Mexico.....	150,000
Brazil.....	150,000
British West Indies.....	150,000
Australia.....	150,000
Republic of China.....	150,000
India.....	100,000
South Africa.....	100,000
Mauritius.....	100,000
Total.....	1,500,000

All the sugar from foreign supplies would have been entitled to a premium payment. That is this sugar would have commanded the American price and not the distressed world price.

Subsequently, the other body did not choose to follow the wisdom of the House, and it swallowed whole the global quota-premium recapture propositions advanced by the State Department. The other body held out a 2,600,000-ton reserve quota for Cuba, to be purchased in other countries—until Cuba returns to free-nation status—on a first-come, first-served basis at world prices and not at the better American price that has made ours the most attractive sugar market in the world and by which other nations have been able to maintain friendly and profitable trade with the United States. The bill passed by the other body provided for a 20-percent reduction in the premium payments on assigned quotas, which would have eliminated the premiums completely in 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, there are aspects of the proposals of the State Department and the instances of the other body, with respect to the reserve quota for Cuba, that I am unable to fathom. The State Department urged upon us a Cuban reserve in excess of 2,500,000 tons. The other body held out in conference for a larger Cuba reserve quota than the 1,500,000 tons provided by the House. At the same time the State Department was calling for an end of premium payments on sugar from foreign supplies, and the other body supported this position. Now I ask: Does a quota reserve for Cuba of any size have any meaning whatever, without the premium price in the American market? It would seem to me that those who advocate a Cuban reserve quota and recapture of premiums are not letting their left hand know what the right hand is doing. It seems to me that if we proceed to recapture all premiums any Cuban reserve becomes absolutely worthless, and we have lost a very potent inducement to the development of a free government in Cuba. The House, Mr. Speaker, set up a 1,500,000-ton reserve for Cuba, with premiums, with the thought of aiding that unhappy country to establish a firm economic base under a democratic government, when it has shaken off the shackles of communism.

We went to conference with the Senate, to adjust the differences in the versions of the legislation passed by the two Houses. We found the Senate conferees adamant, unwilling to yield to the House position which was vigorously

against global quotas and premium recapture.

In order to get a sugar bill at all—and this was imperative—the House conferees were forced to give ground, and we came out with a conference agreement.

The major provisions of the agreement on quotas and supplies follow:

First. Extends the Sugar Act to December 31, 1966, with respect to domestic areas and the Philippines and to December 31, 1964, with respect to quotas for other foreign countries.

Second. Provides that, when domestic requirements are at the present level of 9.7 million tons, the U.S. sugar market will be supplied as follows:

(a) By increasing the quotas for domestic sugar-producing areas by about 625,000 tons and in addition assigning those domestic areas 65 percent of increases in consumptions as compared to 55 percent under current legislation. The quotas for each of the domestic sugar-producing areas under current legislation and as provided in the conference agreement are as follows:

[Short tons, raw value]

Area	Present legislation	Conference agreement
Domestic beet sugar.....	2,110,627	2,650,000
Mainland cane sugar.....	649,460	865,000
Hawaii.....	1,117,936	1,110,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,231,682	1,140,000
Virgin Islands.....	16,795	15,000
Total.....	5,186,500	5,810,000

The quotas for the domestic areas were identical in the House and Senate language.

The assignments to the domestic areas are effective during the life of this act, to December 31, 1966.

(b) By assigning a quota of 1,050,000 tons to the Philippines, effective until December 31, 1966. There will be no premium recapture on the Philippine quota.

(c) By assigning quotas totaling 1,205,000 tons to foreign suppliers, other than Cuba and the Philippines, to be effective to December 31, 1964, on approximately the following basis:

	Tons
Peru.....	190,000
Dominican Republic.....	190,000
Mexico.....	190,000
Brazil.....	190,000
British West Indies.....	90,000
Australia.....	40,000
Republic of China.....	35,000
French West Indies.....	30,000
Colombia.....	30,000
Nicaragua.....	25,000
Costa Rica.....	25,000
India.....	20,000
Ecuador.....	25,000
Haiti.....	20,000
Guatemala.....	20,000
South Africa.....	20,000
Panama.....	15,000
El Salvador.....	10,000
Paraguay.....	10,000
British Honduras.....	10,000
Fiji Islands.....	10,000
Netherlands.....	10,000
Other countries.....	11,332

With respect to these foreign country quotas, there will be a cumulative reduc-

tion of 10 percent each year in the premium permitted over world prices. The import fee will be 10 percent of the difference between the world price and the U.S. price in the period during 1962 in which this provision is effective, 20 percent in 1963, and 30 percent in 1964.

(d) By reserving a quota of approximately 1,635,000 tons for Cuba when that nation again becomes a free and independent nation. In the meantime, while the United States and Cuba are not in diplomatic relations, the amount of this Cuban reserve will be purchased from any countries with which we are in diplomatic relations on a "global quota" basis with full recapture of the difference between the world price and the U.S. price, with special consideration to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

Mr. Speaker, those were the provisions of the bill finally enacted by the Congress. I was not proud of this bill. I do not believe the global quota and premium recapture propositions are good for this country nor for the good-neighbor nations to the south of us, nor for the friendly nations in other areas of the world which participate in our sugar market.

We, in conference, were forced to accept, as the price of any bill at all, a large part of the global quota and premium recapture business. Moreover, in the process and at the insistence of the conferees for the other body, we reduced—regretfully for the House conferees—the quotas for several of our good neighbors to the south, in order to meet the other body's persistence that we build up the Cuban reserve quota which can be purchased from other nations without a premium payment.

The House had provided a quota of 20,000 tons for Argentina. This was knocked out completely, and cuts were made in the House-approved quotas for Peru, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Brazil, British West Indies, Colombia, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Haiti, and some of the countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I warned at the time that this was action without wisdom and that it would cause unrest among our good neighbors to the south of us. We all know now what happened. We are aware of the voices that were raised against the bill by these good neighbors, because of the unwise action that we of this House tried so desperately to forestall.

Only in this chorus of protesting voices did the other body and the administration realize the mistake. The other body quickly picked up the nearest bill at hand relating to agriculture, and tacked on an amendment to try to undo some of the damage inflicted upon our good relations with our friends to the south.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why the honey-  
bee bill is before us today.

I abhor this way of conducting the business of the Congress—it does, indeed, make us look ridiculous—but I am pleased to inform the House that the

12768

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 16

honey bee bill, with the sugar amendment attached, represents a straightforward admission of error by the other body and, moreover, it is a vindication of the House position on the philosophy and the purpose of the Sugar Act.

This amendment by no means corrects all the wrongs in the Sugar Act extension legislation so recently passed by the Congress. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] and I conferred on Tuesday with the leadership of the House and Senate on this amendment. We wanted assurances on this bee bill amendment. Following these conferences, I received on yesterday a letter from the President of the United States. Here is the letter from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1962.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HAROLD: If H.R. 8050 should be enacted into law in substantially the same form as it was returned to the House of Representatives from the Senate, it will, as you know, afford the President authority "to allocate to countries within the Western Hemisphere, for the six-month period ending December 31, 1962, an amount of sugar, raw value, not exceeding in the aggregate seventy-five thousand short tons, and for the calendar years 1963 and 1964, an amount of sugar, raw value, not exceeding in the aggregate one hundred and fifty thousand short tons."

This sugar would be entitled to a premium payment.

It is my intention to use this authority to allocate 130,000 tons annually to the Dominican Republic, in recognition of that nation's economic dependence upon sugar and its problems of transition from the Trujillo regime; and to allocate 20,000 tons annually to Argentina. Argentina is the only Western Hemisphere nation which requested a quota but was not granted one by the Sugar Act amendments of 1962. Since the allocable amount for the remainder of calendar year 1962 is one-half the annual allocations, it is my intention to reduce the calendar year 1962 allocations to the Dominican Republic and Argentina proportionately.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The House will note that the President gives assurances that the sugar tonnage in this honey bee bill will be assigned specifically, 130,000 tons annually to the Dominican Republic, and 20,000 tons to Argentina. These are assurances sought on Tuesday by Mr. HOEVEN and myself in our talks with the Senate leadership. It is my hope that fallback sugar, that part of quotas which various countries may not be able to meet for unforeseen causes, will be reassigned in such a way, with premiums, that will further remedy the situation created among Western Hemisphere friends by the ill-starred Sugar Act extension approved a few days ago.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the President emphasizes the Dominican Republic's economic dependence upon sugar and its problems of transition from the Trujillo regime to a democracy.

In the bill passed by the House, we provided allotments aggregating 350,000 tons for the Dominican Republic—200,000 tons in permanent quota and 150,000 tons in temporary allotment out of the Cuban drawback—all at the full

premium price. The Senate assigned the Dominican Republic a quota of only 96,308 tons—263,692 tons less than the House bill—and even this small quota would have been reduced in value by 20 percent each year, until at the end of 5 years it would be worthless.

Moreover, we provided for the payment to the Dominican Republic of approximately \$23 million, representing fees collected on Dominican sugar in the last months of the Trujillo regime, and which sum now is so desperately needed by the forces struggling there to establish a democratic government. At the insistence of the other body, this provision was stricken from the Sugar Act extension bill.

That bill, as it came from conference, provided definitely only 190,000 tons for the Dominican Republic and it is understandable that the people there let their voices be heard.

I am pleased now that the President assures us that the Dominican quota will be raised, through the action on this honey bee bill, by 130,000 tons to a total of 320,000 tons—still 30,000 tons less than was provided in the House bill. There also no doubt will be some nonpremium purchases from the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other section of this bill which my committee feels is worthy of comment so that there will be no misunderstanding on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture when he allocates to the Western Hemisphere countries the short falls under this amendment. I refer to the directive of the amendment which requires the Secretary, in making allocations to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere, under section 202(c)(3)(a), to give special consideration to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

In the past our committee has tried to encourage the Secretary to follow a procedure in giving out these allocations which would give preference to those countries purchasing our agricultural commodities in addition to their normal commercial transactions. We were faced with opposition by the State Department when they took the position that there was nothing in the law that would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to use this criterion.

Last year when we amended and extended the Sugar Act we included this provision in the act, but I am sorry to say only minimum use was made of this important avenue by which we might expand our exports of agricultural commodities in keeping with the foreign trade objectives of the act.

Members of Congress have known for some time that several foreign countries have indicated a willingness to use most of the proceeds of their sugar sales in the United States to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities.

Perhaps the State Department, or at least the administration, has seen the light. This provision to which I refer was included in their draft of the amendment which the House is now accepting. So, again, I think that we in the Congress in voting for this amendment are

expressing the clear intent of this Congress and there should be no further misunderstanding on this point—that in passing this amendment to the Sugar Act the Congress clearly intends that officials of the U.S. Government and of foreign governments, understand that it is the desire of this Congress and the intent of this Congress that special consideration or preference be given in the allocation of the short falls to those Western Hemisphere countries which agree to purchase additional U.S. agricultural commodities over and above their normal commercial transactions. Therefore, the intent is that the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider and shall give preference in making the short fall sugar allocations under this section to those countries in the Western Hemisphere who submit bona fide proposals to use a substantial part of the proceeds of their sugar sales to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities.

These words should be given their normal meaning. This provision is consistent with the position of the Committee on Agriculture that countries permitted to sell us sugar, especially at premium prices, should purchase our agricultural commodities in return.

When H.R. 12154 was debated the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] emphasized that the Committee on Agriculture expected to review the record of purchases of our agricultural commodities in establishing quotas for foreign countries in the future. In its report on that bill, the Agriculture Committee pointed out that after 1963 Congress would review the temporary allocations from the Cuban reserve quota and take into consideration among other factors, the purchases by the various sugar producing countries of agricultural commodities in the United States, and will give special consideration also to good-neighbor countries of the Western Hemisphere. The amendment now before you therefore is consistent with the position taken by our committee on the original bill.

However, special consideration does not mean exclusive consideration.

In considering the need of a country for an increased quota, consideration should be given to the degree of its dependence upon sugar for the support of its national economy. Also, in the purchase of our agricultural commodities, special consideration needs to be given to the extent to which such commodities are purchased for dollars as contrasted with purchases through aid programs and for local currency.

Each time this problem has come up I have emphasized that the final determining factor must be the ability of this country to assure itself of sugar supplies. Therefore, the availability of adequate supplies in the foreign country and the ability of that country to get the sugar here promptly as needed to meet our seasonal requirements must always be the overriding bases for reallocations of quotas.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time of the House in order to make a record for the legislative history to guide the

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12769

administration of the Sugar Act in the immediate years ahead.

Now, in conclusion, I must tell the House that I am proud of this legislative body and particularly am I proud of the record of wisdom and courage we have made in dealing with this difficult and sometimes emotional problem relating to sugar.

It is my expectation that, due to the compulsions that have so warped the Sugar Act in the recent legislation—which damage is softened but by no means healed by this honey bee bill—the next Congress no doubt will be called upon to take further action in 1963, to adjust and refine and perfect this act as an instrument of profitable trade relations and friendship with our neighbors in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I shall look forward to working with you and with each Member of this House in this purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] for a consent request.

(Mr. INOUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, included in the sugar bill recently approved by the Congress and now being reconsidered in certain aspects is a little-noted provision that extends the Sugar Act controls to products containing sugar—section 206.

Because of the complexity of the sugar quota problems and the elements of controversy that arose with respect to sugar allocations and premium prices, perhaps too little attention has been given to the scope of the new provisions affecting sugar products and mixtures.

Virtually all manufactured food products contain some amounts of sugar. Obviously, it was not the intent of this committee or of the Congress to apply Sugar Act controls to all such products. It is the intent of this committee that the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture will be exercised with regard to products and mixtures that can have a discernible impact on sugar consumption and sugar prices in the United States. This authority would thus be limited to food products or mixtures which are primarily made of sugar, or in which sugar is the component of chief value, or from which sugar is commercially extractable to be sold or used as sugar. With these standards, the Secretary has sufficient authority to correct any abuses of the Sugar Act controls without intruding Sugar Act regulations into the broad field of food products that do not directly affect the sugar market.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that the majority and minority leaderships of the House Committee on Agriculture concur with the contents of this statement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as has been explained by the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], simply provides, if it is adopted, that we take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 8050, which is the so-called honey-bee bill, which some time ago passed the House and went over to the other body where they added a rider or an amendment that would not have been germane in the House under our rules to amend the present Sugar Act.

In my opinion, and I am speaking very frankly because I have seen a little too much of it recently—the violating more or less of the unwritten rules of the House—the entire procedure in connection with this resolution is somewhat peculiar. A meeting of the Rules Committee was called to consider this resolution on about 15 minutes' notice late last Friday afternoon. Because of other commitments a number of Members on the minority side of the Rules Committee could not be present at this meeting.

I do not know, of course, just what went on in that meeting of the Rules Committee, but I do know this resolution, House Resolution 726, was reported from the Rules Committee. It provides that upon the adoption of this resolution the House will have agreed to this Senate amendment, and has thereby amended, in a rather substantial way, the so-called Sugar Act which we just passed under rather peculiar circumstances only a few days ago.

There has been a great deal of controversy and discussion in the national press and elsewhere over just how that particular piece of legislation happened to be forced through Congress under draft, on the basis there was a great emergency existing, and so forth—we had to rush it through before midnight on June 30, although actually the other body did not take action on the sugar bill until after the June 30 deadline had come and gone.

I do not know just what information was submitted to the Rules Committee in connection with this resolution and its adoption, but I do know that when I came to the floor here that I—as the ranking member of the Rules Committee, in order to obtain information on the Senate amendment this particular resolution would approve—was unable to even get a copy of the Senate amendment that this resolution will make law if this resolution is adopted. In other words, this resolution would have us take from the Speaker's table and agree to the particular language contained in this Senate amendment, put on as a rider by the Senate to amend and to change the present and latest edition of the Sugar Act.

So it has been almost impossible to find out just what is in the Senate amendment. It seems to me just a bit of commonsense that any Member of the House who might be desirous of being slightly informed as to how he is voting on some subject or other like this one would like to have before him printed copies of the Senate amendment he is being asked to approve and to accept by the adoption of this resolution.

Do you know how I obtained a copy of the Senate amendment? Through one of the clerks of this body who was kind enough to go across to the Senate and get me an engrossed copy of the Senate amendment as printed, ready for the signature of the Secretary of the Senate. That was the only way I, as the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, representing the minority in this House, was able to find out just what was in this particular amendment that we are being asked to rubberstamp today by the adoption of this resolution which provides for the taking of the Senate amendment from the Speaker's table and agreeing thereto, once the resolution is adopted.

I want to say that in my opinion that is a very poor way to legislate.

What does this amendment do? I have tried to read, as hastily as I could the provisions of this amendment. There are members of the Agriculture Committee who have studied it more carefully than I, perhaps, after the Senate adopted it. But in substance, the main provision of the Senate amendment provides that out of the 1,600,000 tons of sugar to be purchased at world market prices—is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. No; 1,635,000 tons.

Mr. BROWN. And this amendment does not tell us what the rest of the allotments are unless you add it up.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not arguing with the gentleman. I agree with him.

Mr. BROWN. Perhaps the gentleman agrees it is a poor way to legislate.

Mr. COOLEY. I do.

Mr. BROWN. I think any reasonable-minded person will have to agree these things should not be done, and, as far as I am concerned, in the future I am going to object to rushing these legislative matters through without the House membership knowing what on earth they are voting on, or the Committee on Rules knowing what it is voting on, for that matter. I do not intend to stand for it any longer.

Let me get back to this amendment. It provides that 75,000 short tons of this sugar, that was supposed to be purchased in the world market at world prices will now be allocated by the President to certain Latin American countries during the balance of this year. Then 150,000 tons of that amount—the gentleman from North Carolina has just mentioned that, is—will be made available for the President to distribute as he sees fit to Latin American countries in the calendar year 1963, and in the calendar year 1964, an equal amount of 150,000 tons.

Upon that 375,000 tons we will pay a subsidy of anywhere from 2 to 3 cents a pound, according to the price of sugar on the world market. I doubt that will be a benefit, but I have never had an opportunity to read and study the way this amendment fits into the Sugar Act. I hope the members of the Committee on Agriculture, the Members on both sides of the aisle, at least those on this side of the aisle, will be able to shed some light on exactly what this amendment will do, an amendment, I want to point out to you, which could not be attached to this honey bee bill under

12770

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 16

House rules, but under the rather strange rules which exist in the other body can be placed as a rider on a bill that has no relationship in any way with sugar, the production of sugar, the purchase of sugar, or any other thing connected with sugar, except the sweetness and light that may involve honey bees.

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

Mr. BROWN. Briefly.

Mr. GROSS. This is in the nature of still another foreign aid bill, is it not?

Mr. BROWN. Well, it is a foreign aid bill of about \$56 or \$57 a ton on 375,000 tons of sugar.

Mr. GROSS. By the same token, a pretty good tariff, too, is it not?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, yes. And, of course, it is in addition to the Alliance for Progress funds we are setting up, and may be in line with the new agreement I understand is in the works to raise the price of coffee to \$1 a pound or more, to the American consumer.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any danger of this bill being rejected by the free-traders, both as to votes in the House and when it gets to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. BROWN. That I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think that there is any likelihood of a Presidential veto because it is in effect a high tariff?

Mr. BROWN. I cannot answer that question. I understand the President has asked for and insisted upon having this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows this is a honey-bee bill with a sugar rider. Sugar and honey should make a sweet combination.

What is unfortunate about this bill in my opinion is the method used by the other body in taking this meritorious and totally unrelated bill and attaching a very substantive amendment on sugar to it. While I realize that the other body is not handicapped by the rule of germaneness, I for one would like to express my personal opposition to this type of procedure. It is the same type of procedure now being used on the medicare bill and the House should soon put a stop to it.

The sugar provisions of this bill represent a reversal of position by the administration. Just 2 weeks ago the administration was plugging hard for the global purchase and complete quota premium recapture concepts of the Senate sugar bill. The House-Senate conference on H.R. 12154 reached a compromise on these issues and gave the President some 1,635,000 tons of the Cuba quota a complete general purchase basis.

Today in this honey-bee rider, the administration is asking for authority to take 150,000 tons per year, or 375,000 tons for the 2½-year duration of this portion of the act away from the annual 1,635,000-ton Cuban global purchase quota and to redistribute it among cer-

tain Western Hemisphere nations on a premium basis. As the President's letter indicates this will be earmarked in a manner similar to that in the original House bill.

The bill also gives the President discretionary authority to reallocate to Western Hemisphere nations deficits which may occur in other foreign or in domestic producing areas. It also contains a provision which states:

In making such allocations to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere under this subsection, special consideration shall be given to those countries purchasing United States agricultural commodities.

This is a provision, Mr. Speaker, that I hope the administration will follow with scrupulous care. It is a provision which I believe is extremely meritorious and can be of substantial assistance in expanding exports of our surplus farm commodities. It seems to me only just that the foreign nations which seek so avidly the opportunity to participate in our bonus sugar market should be willing to give our farmers and our taxpayers an opportunity to sell our agricultural abundance in return.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the Committee on Agriculture has considered this bill thoroughly and voted to accept it with the Senate amendment.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two points, very briefly. One, I would like to reiterate what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] said. According to my calculations, this is just simply a \$10 million add-on to the mutual security bill that this House approved last week. As I understood it, we had made allocations and identification for all of our sugar needs for 1963 in the sugar bill that the President—the compromise sugar bill—signed just last Saturday. Is that not right, could I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

Mr. COOLEY. The President signed the sugar bill last Saturday and we made certain allocations in the House that were changed in the Senate.

Mr. AVERY. The effect of the sugar bill was to identify all of our sugar needs for 1963 and several years hence?

Mr. COOLEY. To identify them?

Mr. AVERY. To provide for and to identify all of them? They were entirely compensated for in that bill; is that right?

Mr. COOLEY. In the House bill we allocated every pound of sugar, 9.7 million tons.

Mr. AVERY. My point is that 150,000 tons in this bill is in excess of our anticipated sugar needs for next year.

Mr. COOLEY. No. What happened was this: We reserved in our bill 1.5 million tons for Cuba, to go back to Cuba in the event she returns to the free world. In the other bill they insisted on reserving more than that. We ended up by setting aside 1,635,000 tons, but that was within the overall allocation of 9.7 million tons. This is not in addition.

Mr. AVERY. But the Cuban quota in the bill that the President signed would have been placed on a global basis; is that not right?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. Mr. AVERY. And to be procured at world market prices.

Mr. Speaker, we go back here to premium prices in this bill. So, the end result under any definition or construction is the fact that this is costing the taxpayers \$10 million more than it would if we had not passed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any objection to that per se, but as I said in the well of the House last week we should not spread the mutual security program into other legislation. If this is going to be a mutual security aid, let us put it in the mutual security program. Let us not tie it to the sugar program. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio, and the other Members who have spoken, that this is bad procedure and there is no precedent for such procedure in the history of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just one more thing: I think our domestic producers should view their expanded production with a considerable amount of caution. When you stop to realize—when the sugar producer stops to realize—that his expansion, although appearing to be on a sound basis at this time, this basis upon which he is expanding his production is in repudiation of the Reciprocal Trade Act; it is adverse to our balance-of-payments proposition, because every acre extra that is produced in this country will be produced at a premium price. I think the producer is in jeopardy if he concludes that there will be a continuing policy to allocate this sugar to domestic producers at a premium price; whereas sugar is going begging at the world price for half of that amount and a premium purchase will account for further deterioration of our gold reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the final outcome of the bill which the President signed allocated permanently 60 percent of our domestic production, and it further increased from 55 to 65 percent the annual increase to domestic producers. I want to make the record clear that I think our domestic producers should be extremely cautious in acreage and facility expansion. This allocation, as I see it, is in direct conflict with all the policies which have been laid down by this administration in respect to foreign trade, and I might say to some extent in the previous administration. I would hate to see them put their production and financial position in jeopardy.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN]. (Mr. LANGEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who raised some objection the other day to bringing this item up under unanimous consent, I feel impelled at this moment to offer a remark or two. It has already been identified, the very unusual procedure that is involved here.



It has been admitted that it is a most unusual manner in which to legislate. Almost everyone has expressed his feeling in this regard. May I point out to you, however, that there are some further unusual circumstances that surround this procedure and the legislation.

Let us recall for just a moment that this Congress only about 2 weeks ago passed a sugar bill that had the agreement of both bodies. Somehow or other that sugar bill did not find the approval of all the foreign countries that are interested in sugar. And so what did they do? They raised some complaints. When they raised those complaints what happened? Within a matter of less than 10 days we find these two bodies responding to those requests in a manner that is going to grant a substantial favor to them. I ask you, if you will, to compare that to the requests that have been made by the farmers throughout this Nation for the past 20 years, literally begging for the opportunity of raising a few sugarbeets and producing a little larger share of our sugar needs. As a matter of fact—and I can attest to this by my own actions—when we wrote to the Department of Agriculture and to the Committee on Agriculture, requesting some attention to this matter, and we did not get any results in 8 or 10 days; we did not get any results in months, nor did we get any results in years. As a matter of fact, and I believe the chairman has attested to this, the Department of Agriculture never got ready to offer a recommendation of any kind until they had to start holding hearings without them.

Here now is a matter of 150,000 tons of sugar and the sugarbeet growers throughout this Nation would have welcomed an opportunity by adding 150,000 tons to their quota. And they have been in the process of trying to do so, not for a few days, but they have been in the process of trying to do so for a matter of years. It is to this principle, when we think of the circumstances that surround it and the actions that have taken place, that I would surely be remiss in my duties were I not to call the attention of this House to the degree to which the American farmer had been sidetracked again.

I am wondering just how long we are going to continue to show this kind of favoritism to foreign countries at the expense of the American farmer and at the expense of the agricultural economy of this Nation, if you will.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I tried to make a calculation, and possibly the chairman of the committee has the figure in mind, of just how much it is going to cost the American housewife in paying for sugar if we pass this bill here today. I understand that 375,000 tons in the 2½-year period will be taken out of the world price quota and put under the subsidized quota.

That means an increased cost at least for the first year of \$56 a ton. I understand there are some reductions in the

second and third years. From a quick calculation here it appears that the increased cost of the 375,000 tons of sugar to the American housewife will be on the order of \$17.5 million if we pass this bill.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think he has made a significant point. In the first instance, he has pointed out the degree of the cost. Second, he has pointed out the degree to which all of us in the House are unaware of what we are doing at this moment, because we do not have the amendments before us nor do we have a complete explanation of what they do.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. According to the President's letter which was read here the other day, 130,000 tons will go to the Dominican Republic and 20,000 tons to Argentina for each of the next 2½ years.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. DOLE. In the original bill we had in the House there was a claim by the Dominican Republic for \$22 million. This is not an attempt to take care of the \$22 million, which was knocked out on the other side?

Mr. COOLEY. No, it is not.

Mr. DOLE. This claim is still pending in the Court of Claims, and this bill has nothing to do with that?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. This bill was never before our committee, therefore we had no unanimous agreement, but most of us agree. Is not this a receding from the original position taken by the administration? Did not they want global quotas?

Mr. COOLEY. This is in accord with the position taken by the House and our committee. May I point out to my friend that the sugar bill was signed on Saturday. The gentleman is aware that the quota was increased by more than 600,000 tons.

Mr. LANGEN. I am aware of what the original bill contains. I made no reference to that. The reference I was making was that here it became necessary to make an adjustment in the quotas relating to the foreign scene. I should like to ask the chairman at this point if after the passage of the bill the sugar growers had come in and said, "We do not think you have treated us right, you ought to add 150,000 tons to our quota." I am wondering whether they would have got the kind of action that your foreign countries got in this instance with regard to their quotas, and receive an additional 150,000 tons.

Mr. COOLEY. As far as I am concerned, they could make it 250,000 or 350,000. It would be in keeping with my philosophy. I do not want to take this sugar program and make a worldwide relief or welfare program out of it.

Mr. LANGEN. Your statement does not change the principle I was talking about in the least.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. In the bill that passed the House and that came back from the Senate, which we agreed on, there was a provision to prohibit net importing countries from selling sugar to the United States, but this bill provides that Ireland, even if she is a net importing country, can buy sugar from some other countries, she can buy sugar from Cuba, and sell it to us. I wonder what the reason for that is.

Mr. LANGEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. BROWN. I want to say to the gentleman that the Irish are pretty good people. I want to ask this question and I am serious when I ask this question, it is not a facetious question: Does the gentleman have any information as to whether or not any well-connected lobbyist will receive any compensation on a contingent basis for any sugar that may be purchased under this new legislation from some Latin American country?

Mr. LANGEN. Let me respond to the gentleman in this manner, that this certainly has been exposed by the press in the past several days, and, I hold before the House a newspaper article which is an example of the degree to which lobbying has been participated in and the amount of money involved is directly related to the number of tons in these respective quotas, and on the basis of that I would have to say "yes"—there must be a direct relationship here to these lobbying activities.

Mr. BROWN. Then you believe that the pocketbook of some well-connected lobbyist may be fattened as the result of the adoption of this particular amendment?

Mr. LANGEN. This could be the case.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. On the subject of sugar, there are 100,000 tons that is a windfall, of discretion of the President if all of us here realize it. There is a 100,000 tons a year production for our country in the United States. This is a windfall that three mills could be built that would take somewhere around 30,000 acres of sugarbeets. This is this much tonnage for a mill, whether perhaps, we should have an alternate provision instead of this sugar or these 150,000 tons we ought to try to trade 150,000 tons of wheat or some of our surplus commodities and if we do that, it would be quite so objectionable to our payers.

Mr. LANGEN. The gentleman's statement is quite correct. Certainly, this is the equivalent of three sugar plants within our own country, sugar plants for which there is the demand in any number of areas and which have been conveyed to us in, I suppose, a good many different instances by the respective groups that are representing the desires of the sugarbeet growers throughout the country.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has there now developed a well-heelled lobby in behalf of honey bees? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. LANGEN. I should have to say to the gentleman that my remarks have been confined to the sugar amendment. And the odd part of this is that I have not heard anything about the honey bees other than it being the title of the bill. I wonder whether someone had not ought to explore what the honey bee matter is that is involved in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I think we can both agree, it is the American producer and the American consumer who is going to be stung by this bill.

Mr. LANGEN. Yes; the American producer and the American consumer will be stung by this bill, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONTE) there were—ayes 59, noes 39.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—ayes, 196, nays 142, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—196

Abbitt	Dent	Inouye
Abernethy	Denton	Jarman
Addabbo	Diggs	Jennings
Albert	Downing	Johnson, Calif.
Alexander	Doyle	Johnson, Md.
Andrews	Edwards	Johnson, Wis.
Ashley	Elliott	Jones, Ala.
Ashmore	Everett	Jones, Mo.
Aspinall	Fallon	Judd
Bailey	Fascell	Karsten
Barrett	Finnegan	Karsh
Bass, Tenn.	Fisher	Kee
Bates	Flynt	Kelly
Belcher	Forrester	King, Calif.
Bennett, Fla.	Fountain	King, Utah
Blatnik	Friedel	Kirwan
Boggs	Gallagher	Kitchin
Boland	Gary	Kluczynski
Bonner	Gathings	Kornegay
Boykin	Gialmo	Landrum
Brademas	Gilbert	Lankford
Breeding	Grant	Lennon
Burke, Ky.	Gray	Libonati
Burke, Mass.	Green, Pa.	McFall
Burleson	Hagan, Ga.	McMillan
Byrne, Pa.	Hagen, Calif.	Mack
Cannon	Haley	Madden
Carey	Harding	Magnuson
Cederberg	Hardy	Marshall
Celler	Harvey, Ind.	Mathias
Chamberlain	Harvey, Mich.	Mathews
Chelf	Hechler	Miller, Clem
Cohelan	Hemphill	Mills
Colmer	Henderson	Monagan
Cook	Herlong	Montoya
Cooley	Hoeven	Moorehead, Pa.
Corman	Hollfield	Morgan
Dague	Holland	Morris
Daniels	Huddleston	Morrison
Davis, John W.	Hull	Murphy

Murray	Riley	Stratton
Natcher	Rivers, Alaska	Stubbs
Nedzi	Rodino	Sullivan
Nix	Rogers, Colo.	Taylor
Norblad	Rogers, Fla.	Teague, Calif.
Norrell	Rooney	Thomas
O'Brien, Ill.	Roosevelt	Thompson, N.J.
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rosenthal	Thompson, Tex.
O'Hara, Ill.	Roush	Toll
O'Hara, Mich.	Ryan, Mich.	Trimble
Olsen	Ryan, N.Y.	Tuck
O'Neill	Scott	Udall, Morris K.
Patman	Selden	Ullman
Perkins	Shelley	Vanik
Peterson	Sheppard	Vinson
Philbin	Shipley	Watts
Pike	Short	Weaver
Pficher	Sikes	Whitener
Poage	Sisk	Whitten
Poff	Slack	Wickersham
Price	Smith, Iowa	Williams
Purcell	Smith, Miss.	Willis
Randall	Smith, Va.	Wright
Reuss	Staggers	Zablocki
Rhodes, Ariz.	Steed	
Rhodes, Pa.	Stephens	

NAYS—142

Adair	Dwyer	Nelsen
Alger	Ellsworth	Nygaard
Andersen,	Feighan	O'Konski
Minn.	Fenton	Ostertag
Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Passman
Arends	Ford	Pelly
Ashbrook	Fulton	Pillion
Auchincloss	Garland	Pirnie
Avery	Gavin	Pucinski
Baldwin	Goodell	Quip
Baring	Gooding	Ray
Barry	Gross	Reece
Becker	Gubser	Riehlman
Beckworth	Hall	Rivers, S.C.
Beermann	Halleck	Roberts, Tex.
Bell	Halpern	Robison
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.
Betts	Harsha	Rostenkowski
Bolton	Hébert	Roudebush
Bow	Hosmer	Rutherford
Bray	Jensen	St. George
Brewster	Johansen	Saylor
Bromwell	Jonas	Schadeberg
Broomfield	Kastenmeter	Schenck
Brown	Keith	Schneebeli
Broyhill	Kilburn	Schweiker
Bruce	Kilgore	Schwengel
Byrnes, Wis.	Knox	Seely-Brown
Cahill	Kunkel	Shriver
Casey	Kyl	Sibal
Chenoweth	Laird	Siler
Chipperfield	Langen	Smith, Calif.
Church	Latta	Sminger
Ciancy	Lindsay	Stafford
Collier	Lipscomb	Tollefson
Conte	McCulloch	Tupper
Corbett	McDonough	Utt
Cramer	Mahon	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Martin, Nebr.	Van Zandt
Curtin	Mason	Waggonner
Derounian	Meader	Wallhauser
Derwinski	Michel	Wels
Devine	Milliken	Wharton
Dingell	Moeller	Widnall
Dole	Moore	Wilson, Calif.
Dorn	Moorehead,	Wilson, Ind.
Dowdy	Ohio	Young
Durno	Mosher	Younger

NOT VOTING—97

Flood	Loser
Fogarty	McDowell
Frazier	McIntire
Frelinghuysen	McSween
Garmatz	McVey
Glenn	Macdonald
Gonzalez	MacGregor
Granahan	Mailliard
Green, Ore.	Martin, Mass.
Griffin	May
Griffiths	Morrow
Hansen	Miller
Harris	George P.
Harrison, Va.	Miller, N.Y.
Hays	Minshall
Healey	Morse
Hiestand	Moss
Hoffman, Ill.	Moulder
Hoffman, Mich.	Multer
Horan	Osmers
Ichord, Mo.	Post
Joelson	Powell
Kearns	Rains
Keogh	Reifel
King, N.Y.	Roberts, Ala.
Kowalski	Rousselot
Lane	St. Germain
Lesinski	Santangelo

Saund	Teague, Tex.	Westland
Scherer	Thompson, La.	Whalley
Scranton	Thomson, Wis.	Winstead
Spence	Thornberry	Yates
Taber	Walter	Zelenko

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Reifel against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. George P. Miller for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. King of New York against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Curtis of Missouri against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Scranton against.

Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Glenn against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Osmer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Alford with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Joelson with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Fino.

Mr. McSween with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Rousselot.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Farbstain with Mr. Thompson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Healey with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Hiestand.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Battin.

Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Loser with Mr. McVey.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Morrow.

Mr. Evans with Mr. Griffin.

Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Morse.

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL**

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I understand on roll call No. 157 I am not recorded. I was present and voted "yea" and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

**A THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN FLORIDA**

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1824) to create an additional judicial district for the State of Florida, to be known as the "middle district of Florida," with amendments.

WASHINGTON POST

19 JULY 1962

### *She Who Gets Stung*

The final chapter of the Sugar Act controversy was written under the rubric "Importation of Adult Honey Bees" in the *Congressional Record* on Monday. The absurdity resulted from an unusual parliamentary maneuver whereby the Senate repaired some of the mischief in the sugar legislation by amending a bill on adult honey bees. "I abhor this way of conducting business," Chairman Harold Cooley of the House Agriculture Committee was moved to observe, "—it does indeed make us look ridiculous . . ."

It certainly does, but Mr. Cooley's rectitude is a bit unctuous. Everyone knows that the legislative confusion resulted from the deliberate tactic of Mr. Cooley's committee in dumping complex legislation on the floor at the last possible minute. The original House bill was so questionable, so freighted with the scent of favoritism, that the Senate adopted a far different measure. In the confusion of splicing together a compromise, inequities resulted that led to the improvised cure on the back of a bumblebee.

Let there be no mistake about the final result. Whatever virtues it may have are offset by its gaping blemishes. Countries that have never sold sugar in the United States—indeed, some that have no export capacity at all—have suddenly been brought into the premium-price American market. In effect, the legislation creates new sugar industries that can have but a single market: the United States. Moreover, under the law, a country like Ireland could conceivably refine the raw sugar it now imports from Cuba and resell it at inflated prices in America.

Let it be clear who is really getting stung. Each time a housewife buys a bag of sugar, she will be paying a surcharge to support a managed

sugar economy. She will be paying to maintain a noncompetitive domestic sugar industry that has now increased its share of the melon from 56 to 60 per cent of the total market. She will also be paying for premium-priced foreign purchases that in some cases enrich a handful of owners in places where very little trickles down to the worker in the cane field.

In the next two years, the total bill to the consumer will be over \$1 billion in the form of an indirect taxation sanctioned by Congress. And in the process, by shrinking the standby quota reserved for Cuba, Congress has riveted that unhappy island even more solidly into the Soviet bloc. It does indeed make the United States Congress look ridiculous.