

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12857

Siskiyou jumpers have gone as far as Sequoia National Park in California, however, and as far north as the Canadian line. They jump only in State and National forests.

What sort of men are the smokejumpers?

ATHLETIC EQUIPMENT

A tour of the grounds at Siskiyou would give you an idea. An outdoor athletic area contains punching bags, weights, chinning bars, a basketball court and a volleyball court.

Adjoining this area is the training area, complete with ropes, a tower, a trampoline, an obstacle course, and other training apparatus.

Physical fitness is of primary importance. The conditioning of the smokejumpers isn't just excellent; it's superb.

They have to be tough and limber to absorb the bumps and knocks of parachuting and then do the shoveling and chopping work of firefighting.

When their work is done they face a hike out of the area, to the nearest road, that might be anywhere from a half mile to 10 miles or more. On this hike they bring their equipment back with them. The longest backpack Jim can recall was 40 miles.

FIRE PACK

With a fire pack (dropped individually to each man), jumping suit, parachute, and spare chute, first-aid kit, protective hat, and canteen, the equipment weighs a minimum of 70 pounds. It often goes over 100 pounds.

It's no wonder the new smokejumpers get 20 hours of physical conditioning during their training.

They also get over 50 hours of fire-suppression training, including 3 days of guard school. At guard school they work with firefighters from the entire Siskiyou Forest.

Their training calls for 10 hours of first aid.

They get 60 hours of jump training, including tower jumps, chute manipulation, tree climbing, and chute retrieving.

NEW MEN

Sixteen new men were accepted for training this season at Siskiyou—out of 160 applicants. Jim Allen and his foreman, Al Boucher, can afford to be selective. They pick the men who appear to be the cream of the crop.

And they guess consistently well; their drop-out rate only runs about 10 percent.

We prefer men who are first-year college men," Jim said. "About 60 to 70 percent of our new men will return the following year and we like to get them early so they can stay with us for a few seasons."

He explained that when the men finish college, permanent employment usually takes them away from smoke-jumping.

QUALIFICATIONS

Men accepted for smokejumper training must have had one season of fire suppression work. They must be between 18 and 28 years old, be in sound physical health (including eyesight and hearing), and meet height and weight requirements.

Training this year runs from June 15 to July 13. By the 13th the new men will be qualified jumpers, bringing the total number of ready jumpers to 30.

They live, sleep, and eat at the base. They can be airborne 15 minutes after they are notified of a fire.

Boucher says, "Our cooks are our proudest possessions. They work 7 days a week for the whole summer and we are really proud of the meals they give the men."

Flying the twin-engine Beechcraft this season is a new man with the Forest Service, Dick Foy of 2764 Orchard Home Drive, Medford. Dick and his wife, Peggie, live next to the base.

PAY OF \$2 PER HOUR

The men themselves show an enthusiasm for the work that goes beyond the limits of the job. You know they like it when you hear that their average pay rate is \$2 an hour. It's slightly higher for the experienced men, slightly lower for the new men.

Out of this is deducted \$1 a meal and \$5 a month for quarters. Overtime is paid at the regular rate. They'll never get rich at smokejumping. But they still get men from all over the country who are anxious to train at the base. This season they have men from as far away as Iowa, but Jim said this year is exceptional for having a high percentage of men from the west coast.

The most local smoke jumper is Norm Pawlowski of Jacksonville. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Pawlowski, live at route 1, box 8. Norm is a student at Southern Oregon College.

Three of the men are from Grants Pass and the majority of the others are from Oregon and California.

SERIOUS WORKERS

The men are serious about their work, but not frightened. Allen explained that the best safety device is thorough training, and the men get plenty of that.

Jim said that smokejumper training differs from Army paratrooper training in that it's more intense, and because the men are trained to be "spot-jumpers." Guidelines on the parachutes enable them to control the direction of their descent, to a degree, and they become adept at landing where they want to rather than where the wind carries them.

Although the training jumps are made into a landing field, actual fire jumps are usually made into timber. The men carry, as part of their gear, a 100-foot letdown rope that they use to slide to the ground when their chute gets caught in a tree.

They say you'll never know what it feels like to jump until you do it yourself. All you can do is take the word of a smoke-jumper who looks around while he kneels by the open door of the plane, before he steps out into the void.

"It's a wonderful feeling," he says.

And it's a wonderful service that this group of finely tuned young men provide.

FREE ELECTIONS FOR THE CAPTIVE PEOPLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, reports from Geneva on the state of negotiations by the Foreign Ministers of the Great Powers have so far offered little hope that immediate efforts to resolve the Berlin crisis will succeed. The idea has already been taking hold that the Russians do not in fact want a settlement of this issue, but rather are using this conference to exploit known divisions in the West on resolving the Berlin crisis. It is also a matter of serious conjecture whether Khrushchev really want a summit conference. President Eisenhower has already voiced his doubts as to Khrushchev's sincerity.

Be that as it may, relations among nations are often marked by uncertainties. We do not know what tomorrow will bring. We cannot always fathom the mysteries of Soviet tactics in diplomatic negotiations. Perhaps for

some reason now unknown to us Soviet interests may require reaching some agreement at Geneva sufficient to warrant holding a summit conference. In such a case I believe we should be prepared for some tough, hard bargaining with the Russians.

During the Geneva talks the West did not clearly restate its views on the future of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. This, I believe, can be explained by the fact that the conference has been concerned with the German problem, and certainly in expressing our views on the key questions of free elections as conditional for any genuine reunification of Germany we had reaffirmed a principle which has long been a vital part of American foreign policy not only toward Germany, but also for all Eastern Europe. Understandably, the general issue of Eastern Europe did not arise since the attention of the conference was focused almost entirely on the Berlin problem. Still, the people of Eastern Europe can take heart that American policy remains fixed upon the idea set forth in the Yalta and Potsdam agreements requiring free elections in the liberated countries of Europe.

At the moment it is difficult to determine whether there will be a summit conference. Thus far, the only condition for convening a conference at this level is assurances of some success at the present Geneva negotiations of the Foreign Ministers. I believe that this is an eminently wise condition. Still, I believe that another condition should be established, and that is, the explicit requirement that the Soviet Union fulfill its obligations under the wartime pacts and permit free elections in the captive states of Eastern Europe.

One of the most recent declarations of policy on this matter was incorporated in a letter of January 12, 1958, from President Eisenhower to former Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin. In this letter Mr. Eisenhower stipulated that Russia's failure to fulfill pledges undertaken during World War II had contributed to world tensions and should be discussed at any summit conference. I believe that the President should restate this principle at this time, for I submit, that what he said then remains today, as it was then, the prevailing consensus of Congress. For the information of Congress I wish to quote the pertinent passage from Mr. Eisenhower's letter:

The second situation to which I refer is that of the countries of Eastern Europe. The heads of our two Governments, together with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, agreed in 1945 that the peoples of these countries should have the right to choose the form of government under which they would live, and that our three countries had a responsibility in this respect. The three of us agreed to foster the conditions under which these peoples would exercise their right of free choice.

That agreement has not as yet been fulfilled.

I know that your Government is reluctant to discuss these matters or to treat them as a matter of international concern. But the heads of governments did agree at Yalta in 1945 that these matters were of interna-

12858

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 23

tional concern and we specifically agreed that there would appropriately be international consultation with reference to them.

This was another matter taken up at our meeting in Geneva in 1955. You then took the position that there were no grounds for discussing this question at our conference and that it would involve interference in the internal affairs of the Eastern European States.

But have not subsequent developments shown that I was justified in my appeal to you for consideration of these matters? Surely the Hungarian developments and the virtually unanimous actions of the United Nations General Assembly in relation thereto show that conditions in Eastern Europe are regarded throughout the world as much more than a matter of purely domestic scope.

I propose that we should now discuss this matter. There is an intrinsic need of this in the interest of peace and justice, which seems to me compelling.

This is a vigorous declaration of a vital American policy. It should be reaffirmed at this time, not so much as a general statement of foreign policy but rather as a condition for a summit meeting and as such should be placed on the agenda. Should we fail to do so, we would by default infer that this policy is no longer viable and that our obligations undertaken at Yalta and Potsdam have terminated. This would, in effect, mean writing off Eastern Europe and accepting Soviet conquest of the area as the status quo. It would mean giving Eastern Europeans no hope for the future. It would mean that we would give them no other alternative but to accept communism and throw their unqualified support behind their oppressors.

It is not the sense of the American people that this should ever come to pass.

It is certainly not the sense of this Congress.

Let us, therefore, support the following resolution asking the President to repeat his declaration of January 12, 1958, as a fixed condition for a summit conference and that should ever a summit conference be held, the fulfillment of the wartime pledge requiring free elections in Eastern Europe should be high on the agenda for discussion:

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, at the Yalta Conference and thereafter, has repeatedly promised to hold free elections in the nations it holds in bondage; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. has flagrantly and continuously violated all such promises; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. has cynically attempted to explain away its utter disregard of its obligations by distorting and obfuscating the language in which they are couched; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. continues in a course of brutal repression and exploitation of the peoples under its domination, and particularly those of Eastern Europe; and

Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the United States of America shall never assent to the abandonment of these peoples to hopeless tyranny: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that in every meeting or conference of representatives of the United States with representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, at every level, the representatives of the United States should insist that the subject of free elections for the peoples under Soviet bondage be placed upon the agenda of such meeting or conference.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM BILL REPORTED

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the committee on Education and Labor reported today, by a vote of 16 to 14, a so-called labor-management reform bill.

As will quickly appear when the House and Committee of the Whole considers the bill, it is full of mistakes, inaccuracies and, in the opinion of at least a majority on the Democratic side, wholly indefensible provisions. It should be noted as of extreme significance that amongst the majority of 16 voting to report the bill, at least two Members—one Democrat and one Republican—immediately announced that they thought so little of the bill that they would introduce a new bill on Monday for consideration of the Members of the House. Another Republican announced he was against the bill but voted to report it.

In other words, there is not a majority of the committee in favor of this bill. There is a majority who voted for a procedure to enable them to attempt to write what most of the majority of the Democratic Members will consider as antilegitimate union legislation on the floor of the House.

It should be noted also that the chairman of the committee thought so little of the bill that he has not given his name to it. Under these circumstances, one can only hope that the majority leadership of the House will help many Members who have voted and who want to vote for a true antiracketeering measure as they have demonstrated by the recorded votes within the committee itself, will get the necessary consideration and support to accomplish this purpose. It can be flatly stated that the bill, in its present form, is antilegitimate union in many of its important provisions, even though containing some excellent provisions, and the warning has clearly been given that attempts will be made to make it even more antilegitimate unions. The forces who want to write an antiracketeering and union membership protection bill will need much help in the weeks directly ahead if the House is not going to be guilty of writing legislation directly adverse to the best interest of the vast majority of the working men and women of this country.

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

[Mr. BOLAND's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

EXTENDED COVERAGE AND \$1.25 MINIMUM WAGE SHOULD BE PROMPTLY ENACTED

(Mr. TELLER (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, now that our Committee on Education and Labor has reported out the labor-management reform bill, we ought forthwith to act on

increasing the national minimum hourly wage to \$1.25 and extending the wage-hour law to the 9 million working people who are now denied coverage under the present law.

I shall press for immediate consideration of these objectives by our Committee on Education and Labor. The Congress has no moral right to adjourn without enacting these objectives into law.

By what right, indeed, does the Federal Government deny to millions of workers the beneficial coverage of the wage-hour law? These uncovered workers are subject to the same Federal income tax law as workers covered by the wage-hour law. And these workers, who are denied the benefits of the wage-hour law, are as much affected by the persistent cost-of-living increases as the workers covered.

The Senate Subcommittee on Labor on July 10, 1959, reported out beneficial amendments to the wage-hour law. These amendments increase the hourly rate for workers now covered to \$1.15 on the effective date of the proposed law and \$1.25 1 year later. Coverage is extended to retail and service employees and other categories of employees not now covered.

The Senate action is modest. Our bill ought to go further. The underlying facts compel immediate action to increase the hourly rate from \$1 to \$1.25 and to extend the act to uncovered employees.

Here are some of the facts relating to employees who, because of exemptions now contained in the wage-hour law, are not covered by its provisions.

Of the total of 7 million employees in retail trade, excluding executive, administrative, and professional employees and outside salesmen, 6.8 million are not covered or are exempt from the minimum wage and overtime provisions.

The Wage and Hour Division estimates that in 1957 the number of switchboard operators in telephone exchanges exempt under section 13(a)(11) of the present law was 47,000. The total number of employees in the telephone industry in October 1957 was 766,000, of whom about 265,000 are operators. Thus, about 18 percent of the switchboard operators in the industry are exempt.

According to estimates of average employment in 1957, there were 17,000 employees of small newspapers—those with less than 4,000 circulation—who were not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, or who were covered and exempt under section 13(a)(8) of the act. This estimate excluded executive, administrative, and professional personnel and outside salesmen.

As of 1957, 100,000 employees were exempt under the seamen's exemption—excluding executive, administrative, and professional employees. About 50,000 of these employees were employed in deep sea vessels. The remainder were employed on inland waterways and on harbor craft.

Mr. Speaker, no more than short hearings will be required by our Committee on Education and Labor to prepare a proper bill on the subject. A number of Members of the House of Representatives have proposed bills for the purpose of increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and to extend the coverage of the wage-hour law. Among them is my

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12759

urgent that it is not surprising that many programs have been instituted on a crash basis with inadequate planning. Other programs, once started, had to be abandoned because of unexpected shifts in the military situation. It would indeed be a carpeting critic who would find fault with the dimes which have been wasted when the dollars have accomplished so much.

The technical assistance program, as such, is of very recent origin in Vietnam, although the Vietnamese have been receiving technical assistance from other appropriations for several years. In fiscal 1955, \$7,200,000 in defense-support funds were expended for this purpose in a wide variety of fields. The administration presentation to Congress for fiscal 1956 contemplated a \$7.5 million technical cooperation program for the three states of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, but as of late September no country allocations of this fund had been made.

The present is an appropriate time, perhaps, to reappraise the technical assistance program in Vietnam and to redirect it into basic long-range projects which will make a lasting contribution to the country's economy.

Among the projects which appear particularly meritorious are those for introducing the remarkable tilapia fish (which can be raised in rice paddies and which will greatly improve the Vietnamese diet), trachoma control and malaria control (emphasizing prevention as well as cure), and nurses training.

Among projects for which the justification is obscure are contributions to a fine-arts school, to a radio and electricity school, and to a marine navigation school. Most of the graduates of these last two schools cannot find jobs in the Vietnamese economy, and the question arises as to why such people should be trained in all three schools when other needs are more pressing.

Mr. President, I conclude by observing that here again is evidence that if the program for the assistance and development of what remains of the free world is to be successful, it must be placed on a long-term basis, with adequate opportunity for planning for the development of these areas of the world.

I regret that the Senate itself deleted from the bill, as reported by its committee, the provision which would have made planning possible in these various areas.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas.

ELIMINATION OF BRUSH AND SCRUB TIMBER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, millions of acres in Arkansas are furnishing little, if any, return on the landowners' investment. This land is blighted by brush—scrub timber which is so thick that neither native grasses nor merchantable timber has a chance to grow. The Forest Service estimates that over 60 percent of the forest lands in north Arkansas are afflicted with this condition. Similar conditions exist in many other States. So long as this land remains in nonproductive use, the economy of the affected areas will be retarded. This is a luxury which we in Arkansas cannot afford.

I may say that vast areas in many other States of the Nation are similarly afflicted; and the program of research

which I have urged the Department of Agriculture to pursue by means of the use of larger amounts of funds and greater efforts, will be beneficial to practically every State of the Union.

In recent years, small-scale efforts have been made to return this brushland to profitable use. One promising development is the conversion of the land to native grasses for grazing cattle. Many farmers and ranchers have found that aerial chemical spraying to kill the brush enables the native range grasses to grow and multiply, thus substantially increasing the grazing potential of the land. Results through aerial spraying have generally been excellent, with about a 75-percent kill within a period of 18 months. Subsequent spot spraying can bring about an almost 100-percent brush kill. I have been told that this type of chemical application will raise the animal carrying capacity of pastures by as much as 400 percent at a cost for spraying of only \$8 an acre. The experimentation which has already been carried out by individual landowners proves that there is a tremendous potential for boosting cattle production by controlling this obnoxious scrub timber.

Another possible use for brush land is in the shortleaf pines. Preliminary studies indicate that many soil types in the Ozarks and surrounding areas would support commercial pine production if brush competition were eliminated. With the increasing demands for wood products in the Nation, we cannot afford to neglect this promising source for increasing our timber inventories.

The brush elimination problem is not as simple as it may sound. The potentials of brush control have brought out many problems. Little is known about the effects of removing brush on soil conservation costs and returns for conversions on various soil types, effects on wildlife, and many other important questions. A research project designed to supply the answers to these questions has been proposed as a cooperative arrangement between the Forest Service and the University of Arkansas. This is a much needed project; and I have urged the Secretary of Agriculture to include it in the Department of Agriculture program for the next fiscal year.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture and the reply from Mr. True Morse be printed in the body of the RECORD, following by remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a subsidiary question of the overall brush control problem is whether chemical spraying to kill brush should be included in the cost-sharing practices covered by the agricultural conservation program. This type of work is included in the national program, and many States have also included it in their programs. The Arkansas ASC committee has approved cost sharing for brush control on only an experimental basis in two areas, including my home county. I hope the com-

mittee will give further consideration to trying out the practice in other locations, since the results thus far have been so promising. I understand the committee's reluctance to approve this as a general statewide practice, in view of the many unknown factors involved. The research project I mentioned earlier is vitally needed in order to supply the missing information.

I also wish to call attention to an excellent article by Mr. Leland DuVall, published in the Arkansas Gazette of July 18, in which he discusses clearly and intelligently the brush-control problem. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

CHEMICAL CONTROL OF BRUSH STUDIED (By Leland DuVall)

More persons are becoming aware of the fact that much of the land resources in Arkansas is idle. This is true particularly of northwest Arkansas but it applies to other sections of the State, too.

Large areas that formerly supported farm families are abandoned. Some land is being used half-heartedly as pastures but the grasses and legumes have to compete with weeds and persimmon bushes. It is an unequal battle and the grasses and legumes usually lose. This, in turn, means that the cattle become thinner and the farmer needs more acres to support an animal unit.

One group, representing a cross section of many jobs and professions, believes it has found a way to tip the scales in favor of the grasses at a cost that will leave room for profits. The answer is the use of chemicals for the control of brush and weeds. These chemicals are selective killers, which means they do not damage the grasses and are harmless to cattle.

NORTH AREA EXAMPLE

It has been estimated that 3,500,000 acres in north Arkansas, or about 60 percent of the forest land in that area, are producing low returns or no income at all because of the brush and weed infestation. Supporters of the chemical control method of reclaiming the land believe they have proof that the program will work and that it will show a profit.

Backing their theory are these facts:

About 100,000 acres of land in Arkansas have been sprayed to (1) kill the hardwoods to release the pines for more rapid growth or (2) kill scrub timber, bushes, and weeds to permit native grasses to produce a pasture. This has, in effect, set up demonstration plots in many parts of the State.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee has approved experimental work in Franklin and Logan Counties, on the Six-Mile Creek Watershed project, and in Washington County.

Although the ASC still has an open mind on the matter, supporters of the plan say these projects are proving successful.

OTHER STATES TRYING IT

The program is in full swing in many other States. The California State Chamber of Commerce has issued a report on work done in the State, indicating that the use of chemicals could trim considerably the annual loss of \$300 million to \$400 million.

Oklahoma has 175,000 acres approved for cost sharing last year under the agricultural conservation program and this year more than 20,000 acres are expected to be treated with the Government sharing part of the expenses.

12760

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 22

Supporters of the program say this evidence is enough to give the green light to an Arkansas program.

Hurlon Ray, range management specialist with the Soil Conservation Service, is one of the veterans in the battle for more recognition of the use of chemicals in the control of brush and weeds.

The University of Arkansas, which considered the program a long time before accepting it, now offers degrees in range management.

FEDERAL TIE SOUGHT

The movement recently picked up powerful support when Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT asked Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson to team with Arkansas in sponsoring a program of continued and expanded research aimed at finding the best way to reclaim the idle land in the State.

The Internal Revenue Service ruled early this year that expenditures for clearing brush from productive land represent "ordinary and necessary expenses" and are deductible for tax purposes under section 162 of the Tax Code.

This ruling may help tip the scales in favor of brush control in some cases where the owner was not convinced that the project could be undertaken profitably.

APPLICATION METHODS

There are several methods of application. The fastest way, of course, is the use of a plane to spray the chemicals over the areas to be cleared. On smaller operations, the work can be done with spray rigs mounted on tractors or trailers. Some persons even use hand sprays.

Dr. Lyle O. Hill, president of the Reasor-Hill Corp. of Jacksonville, said the cost of the initial treatment on hill land would be about \$8 an acre. He said it would be necessary to make "maintenance" applications after the first kill in order to prevent regrowth of undesirable weeds or brush. The annual cost of these treatments was estimated at \$1.40 an acre.

Although the program has not advanced far enough to provide accurate figures, some persons believe that after a few treatments the landowner would be able to confine his applications to the "hot spots" where undesirable weeds or bushes showed signs of a comeback.

MAY BE ACTION JULY 29

The Arkansas Planning Committee, which makes recommendations on the program each year, will meet July 29 at Little Rock and there is a good chance that the subject will be discussed. Since this is only an advisory group, the final decision will be made by the ASC committee. The committee's ruling will be included in the 1960 Handbook.

Supporters of the chemical brush control program would settle for a cost-sharing program in which the Government offered assistance to farmers who wanted to clear their brush land. On the other side of the fence, the hope is that the decision will be postponed until more is known about chemical brush control and until Arkansas gets more funds for the total farm program.

OTHER ARGUMENTS

There is some argument, of course, to the effect that the clearing and use of land now idle at a time when agricultural production is producing surpluses would be uneconomical. This group says the ASC could spend the available funds on cost-sharing projects designed to drain flooded land that is potentially far more productive than the hill land now covered by brush.

Another argument against the widespread use of sprays to kill brush and weeds on hill land mentions the danger of touching off a new cycle of soil erosion. Much of the idle land went out of production because

the topsoil washed away as a result of row cropping. The opposition group says more research is needed in order to avoid the possibility that this might happen again.

Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion was offered as a means of avoiding this danger, since it proposed additional research.

The argument has been underway for some time and the July 29 meeting is expected to show which side is gaining ground at the administrative level. But many farmers are going ahead with the program on their own initiative. Perhaps their findings will be considered as the basis for future work in the field.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
June 30, 1959.

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For many years I have been interested in finding some way to improve the productivity and usefulness of the millions of acres of brushland in the Ozarks region.

These lands are too rough or unproductive for farming or growth of tame pastures. The dense growth of stunted hardwoods on this land prevents the owner from receiving a fair return on his investment. Approximately 3½ million acres—nearly 60 percent—of the present acreage of forest land in north Arkansas is afflicted by this type of growth. This of course greatly retards economic progress in this area. The brush conditions in north Arkansas are typical of those also existing in eastern Oklahoma and southwest Missouri. There is evidence that this brushland could be profitably converted to native grass rangeland or to shortleaf pine, thus putting it to a productive use.

Small scale efforts have been made in the last few years to attack this problem. The Soil Conservation Service has actively promoted range conservation practices in Arkansas and the results have been extremely promising. The University of Arkansas has, in cooperation with the Southern Forest Experiment Station, been engaged in research in this field, to a very limited extent. Financial limitations necessitate that this research be restricted to a small aspect of the overall problem. A large scale research program is needed if the woodland resources of the Ozarks are to make a substantial contribution to the Ozarks economy.

It has just come to my attention that a project, designed to provide the needed information, has been proposed jointly by the Southern Forest Experiment Station and the University of Arkansas. Under this proposal the project would be established on a cooperative basis between the Forest Service and the University of Arkansas. Other agencies of the Department of Agriculture and the State of Arkansas would contribute their services as required. I understand that the estimated project costs will be approximately \$100,000 annually, for a period of 6 years.

This project offers much promise of leading to improved land use in the Ozarks region, with a corresponding effect upon the local economies. There are millions of acres of land which could be improved and made into productive units if the needed scientific knowledge were available. The information developed through such a project would also be applicable to many other sections of the country with similar problems.

I urge that the Department give this proposal careful study. It is vital to the Ozarks region and I hope that funds will be included in the budget for the 1961 fiscal year to implement this project.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1959.HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: We agree with the views stated in your letter of June 30 regarding the importance of finding the most productive uses for the brushlands of the Ozark region. Many of these are in northern Arkansas and bear stands of low quality timber and brush. Some are probably in this condition because of past abuses. Others are on poor soils that may be incapable of high production of either grass or trees.

In recognition that these problems cannot be solved without sound basic information, the Forest Service's Southern Forest Experiment Station has entered into the cooperative agreement with the University of Arkansas which you mention. We have a modest study now underway aimed at finding out how low-quality timbered lands can be converted to grass and the effects of conversion on the soil and water values. We agree with you that studies of this kind are needed and that results should be helpful in determining the best land use in the Ozarks.

We will give careful consideration to this project with the Forest Service during preparation of the 1961 fiscal year budget. At this time, however, it is uncertain what the overall financial requirements for the fiscal year 1961 programs may be. We appreciate knowing of your interest in the Ozark problem.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ECONOMIC WAR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it has been said, "Take away the sword; states can be saved without it."

The Communists, Mr. President, have turned this saying around. They are saying "Take away the sword; states can be destroyed without it."

And how are they attempting to do this? By the destruction of the United States and the free world economically.

And do not be disillusioned—their campaign has started. We are in the midst of an economic warfare which we cannot afford to lose. Khrushchev himself has warned us that Russia will bury us—he has told us that Russia values trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes.

In this competitive warfare the United States is in danger of losing its world markets. In fact, foreign competition is not only taking our world markets, but also our domestic markets. American industry is now operating on a limited scale. Greater operating capacity is, of course, impossible unless a greater consumer demand generates fuller use of existing facilities.

Yet in attempting to help other parts of the world help themselves, we find

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12761

ourselves frequently damaging our own economy. We have spent billions of dollars helping to reconstruct the economy of war-torn countries. We are now seeing these same countries manufacturing cheaper goods and endangering our domestic industries.

The security of the United States is essentially, Mr. President, the security of the free world. Damage the United States and its economy, and eventually the entire free world will suffer.

Soviet Russia is using trade as an instrument of its foreign policy—another instrument to help it subjugate the rest of the free world to communist tyranny, and in this fight it has no scruples. It does not give a second thought to disrupting world markets or world economic conditions so long as in the long run it can see success. And success to them can mean creating disunity among the free nations, depressing prices, and even, as it did in one European country, the use of its economic weapons to bring about the fall or subjugation of an unfriendly government.

We cannot, therefore, Mr. President, afford to wait for the fall of an atomic bomb—it may never come. While we are waiting, we may find our country being undermined by an economic bomb.

Because of the differences between the longrun interests of our country as a whole and the shortrun interests of certain producers, it is difficult to pursue a national trade policy which, while fulfilling the requirements of U.S. foreign policy, does not injure certain domestic producers.

And it is difficult to convince an individual being hurt by foreign competition that it may be wise to continue such imports. It is only logical for persons being hurt to seek the elimination of foreign competition.

Because the administration has failed to face this question squarely and courageously, we are now rattling along with a watered-down trade policy. It has been watered down so much that it is no longer recognizable as an instrument of economic foreign policy. In fact, Mr. President, our reciprocal trade program has become so unpopular that during the last Congress when it came up for renewal it became necessary for President Eisenhower to call out the first string team in an attempt to sell it to the American people.

Yet, in view of the Soviet international economic threat, it is important that the nations of the free world work together and be economically, as well as militarily, strong.

More than \$5 billion a year has been spent in recent years by our Government for economic reconstruction, support, and development of countries throughout the world. Included in this figure are, of course, funds for military support of some of these countries. We have done this because our administrations have said it is in the longrun self-interest of the United States—and maybe it is.

But one sure fact is apparent. The Communist bloc is using foreign aid and foreign trade to win control of the underdeveloped and uncommitted countries of the world. And it is contended that in

some cases their aid has been smaller and they have been more successful.

Being a monolithic state, the Soviet Union has no difficulty in carrying on foreign trade as a political weapon. Have the Russians not bought and sold products regardless of cost? Have they not wrecked price relationships, producers, and traders in foreign countries? And have they not turned imports and exports on and off solely for political reasons?

Does it not appear then that their foreign economic trade and aid policy has become more successful than ours?

Can we say that our foreign aid funds have, in all cases, been spent wisely and efficiently? Has it always been clear as to what we are trying to do? We have appropriated billions of dollars despite these doubts because we have felt that we cannot afford to gamble with our Nation's security. We have had in a sense some type of foreign aid policy. Some of it has no doubt been bad, some of it has been good. Some of it is beginning to haunt us.

Yet, with respect to foreign trade policy we are even less clear. In fact, we are approaching that point where it would be correct to say that we have no trade policy.

The American people have looked to the administration for leadership in this field and have found none. As in so many areas in recent times, such leadership, it appears, must come from elsewhere—from Congress.

It is time for Congress to face the facts. It no longer makes sense to compartmentalize our thinking as between foreign aid and foreign trade policy. We need a new approach that will combine the two into a single, comprehensive, meaningful economic foreign policy.

New thinking, a new program, and bold imaginative leadership will inspire confidence, not only among the American people but among free peoples everywhere.

Is our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act little more than nothing? At best we are doing little more in the foreign trade field than standing still. Today tariff relations have ceased to have the meaning that they had when tariffs were the principal reliance of countries for regulating foreign commerce. Today, quotas and other forms of trade barriers are usually more important than tariffs.

In the underdeveloped countries, which, for the most part, are producers of raw materials, the assurance that they will be able to sell their products year after year, at prices that will yield adequate and regular returns, is more important than the removal of a few tariffs. International commodity agreements and understandings with respect to price and income stabilization between the producing and the large buying countries would be more effective, also, than much of the foreign aid that we are scattering throughout the world. Without intending to do so, we have succeeded in giving the impression that, failing to provide open markets, we are casting a few crumbs here and there in an effort to buy friends.

We should have learned, by now, that friends cannot be bought. We ought to know that the making of friendship among peoples of different races and nationalities includes a feeling of togetherness that comes from working with each other as equals.

Markets are more important than tariff agreements.

Free trade has become more and more difficult as the countries of the world have become industrialized. Today, countries with low wages have some of the most modern machinery available. Yet, wage levels in these countries are still substandard by any and all criteria. As American capital goes abroad, as it now promises to do in Europe because of the newly established European Common Market, there will be increasing competition between foreign-made and American-made goods, both in the American market and in other countries.

The problem which is confronting us is, how we can secure the advantages of multilateral trade without wrecking existing industries and investments?

The objective of our foreign aid programs is to raise the consumptive capacity and productivity of the countries receiving aid. A step forward would be the stimulation of trade with those countries which, receiving developmental aid from the United States, succeed in raising their levels of living.

The solution I suggest lies in a system of marketing agreements which will allow us to produce and sell, while stimulating trade with the rest of the free world and among all the nations on our side. This should assist other nations in developing their resources and their productive capacity. However, while doing this we must insist that the countries being assisted shall lift the standard of living of their citizens. New markets for the goods which they will produce must be found both in their country and in other countries. But it is sheer folly to develop these countries and then have them sending goods produced with our money back into our own domestic markets.

For instance, I have heard rumors that we are prepared to negotiate loans with certain countries in Africa for powerplants. These countries are rich with bauxite. More power developed with American capital will mean, in all probability, that new aluminum smelting plants will open. This in turn may mean aluminum products being shipped into the United States or into our markets. And what have we to look forward to? A great industry will be damaged. We have a multimillion-dollar aluminum smelting plant in Evansville, Ind., which has never opened because of situations similar to this.

Let us then, Mr. President, guard against this danger to our domestic economy. In granting foreign aid, let us arrive at an agreement with the recipient country that their products, developed with aid money, will not be used to compete with our own markets. Let us help them to find new markets for the goods they manufacture. In the long run, this will benefit both the United States and its allies. In the specific case I just men-

tioned, this could mean aluminum could be marketed within these countries for housing, irrigation pipes, roofing, and other uses. After all, the yearly per capita consumption of aluminum in these countries is less than 1 pound, compared to 21 pounds in the United States.

This concept could be extended to take care of other commodities and products. I am sure that similar comparisons can be made. Most of the world goes to bed every evening in want of food and necessities. An effective, new American foreign trade policy could help lift these people from misery, could help improve their way of life. This in turn would help the United States.

I think that the concept I have tried to develop today could play an important role in a new foreign trade policy. There are thousands and thousands of untouched markets throughout the world—we must seek them out for ourselves and for our friends.

We cannot afford to postpone action. Effective action in this neglected field will accrue to our benefit and the benefit of the free world.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS REQUIRING AFFIDAVITS OF LOY- ALTY AND ALLEGIANCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 819) to amend certain provisions requiring affidavits of loyalty and allegiance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a time limitation, in the usual form in which it is prepared at the desk, be applied to the unfinished business, and I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 2 hours on the Mundt amendment, 30 minutes on any other amendment, and 1 hour on the bill, to be equally divided; and I may say to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] I will yield some of that time to him if he needs it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, those arrangements are satisfactory to me, so far as I am concerned, provided we can have a showing now to have a yea-and-nay vote on the Mundt amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us not do it at the point of a pistol. I will endeavor to have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. If I may have that assurance, I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has my assurance that I will attempt to do it.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective immediately during the further consideration of the bill (S. 819) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of loyalty and

allegiance, debate on any amendment (except the amendment of Senator MUNDT of South Dakota, on which there shall be 2 hours debate), motion, of appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one-half hour, 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.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, that the said leaders, or either of them, may from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment is pending. The Senator is advised that the yeas and nays may be requested on an amendment if the amendment is pending.

The Chair states that the debate is now under limitation of time.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the issue before the Senate is the repeal of the provision for a loyalty oath and affidavit which is a part of the National Defense Education Act which passed the Senate a year ago. The provision for a loyalty oath and affidavit was placed in the National Defense Education Act during the last days of the Committee on Public Welfare's consideration of the bill, without any discussion. It was not mentioned in the report of the committee, either pro or con.

The bill came to the floor of the Senate, and there was no discussion of the provisions until the Senator from South Dakota extended the provisions to the loan section, instead of only to the grant section. In any case, the bill passed the Senate and the House without a careful judgment being made as to whether those provisions should be contained in the bill.

The special subcommittee considering education and health matters held hearings on whether the provision should be continued, and testimony was heard from Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, and leading educators that the provision should be repealed, that it was harmful to the relations between the Federal Government and the colleges, that it threw an unjustified cloud of suspicion over boys and girls who required money to complete their education. I think all the Members of the Senate who testified, including the Senator from South Dakota, felt the present language should be repealed.

The difference of opinion between us today is as to whether there should be

a substitute, whether the language contained in the bill should be repealed and no substitute should be provided, or whether the substitute suggested by the Senator from South Dakota should be included in the proposed legislation.

I am strongly opposed to the language suggested by the Senator from South Dakota, though I am frank to say it would be preferable to keeping the language of this act as it is. Under the language proposed by the Senator from South Dakota anyone who applies for and receives money provided for in the act as a loan and who is a member of a subversive organization, contained on the list of the Attorney General, would be subject to a criminal penalty.

It would not be necessary for him, in other words, to sign the affidavit, nor would it be necessary for the college to give him an oath of loyalty. Any student could take the money, without paper work, but if he took the money and it was later determined that he had been a member of an organization which the Attorney General had placed on his list, he would be subject to a criminal penalty and a fine.

I say it is preferable to requiring colleges and universities to give an oath of loyalty to every boy or girl who applies for and receives a loan of money, and who may be hit economically. It will not be necessary for him to file an affidavit of loyalty, but he will be subject to a criminal penalty if it is later found that he was a member of an organization contained on the Attorney General's list.

The question is, Why is not that a fair compromise? Why should not a boy or a girl who may be a member of a Communist-front organization be subject to a possible criminal penalty if he or she applies for a loan to go to college, and receives the money?

I think the reason is that we do not apply it to other groups to whom the Federal Government makes funds available. We do not apply it to publishers who receive subsidies which enable them to send through the mails magazines which affect public opinion. We do not apply it to farmers who receive subsidies under various farm programs. We do not apply it to persons who own houses and who receive subsidies under Federal mortgage programs.

Why should we apply it to boys and girls who may need money to complete their education and who receive money from the Federal Government? Why should we subject them to this suspicion when we do not subject other people in our country to this kind of hazard?

I think it provides no greater safety for our national life. I do not believe there are many Communists who would apply for money from the Federal Government for this purpose. Perhaps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 10 might do so. The question is, What will serve the national interest better? Will applying this requirement only to needy students serve it better, or will applying it to all members of the community serve it better?

I do not believe Congress would be in favor of applying the loyalty oath to all Americans who need Federal assistance. That being true, I do not think we should

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6409

(Rudy) Roudebaugh, concerning the cross-country trek. The wagon train was in Idaho while this was written:

RUDY LOCKED IN JAIL WHEN WAGONS STOP IN IDAHO TOWN

(By Rudy Roudebaugh, driver of Drain Covered Wagon now traveling in Idaho)

Sunday, June 28: Mr. and Mrs. Andy Curt-right and sons Frank and Ronnie of Yoncalla were here to visit the wagon train. Also Billy Alsop and family of Yoncalla. A few people from Utah, but more from Washington and Oregon than Montana are visiting the wagon train. Janell went to Vicki Jensen's ranch and stayed all day. Ki and I stayed with wagons and passed out the letters from the Drain mayor. We had church sunrise services at 5.

June 29, 5:55: All hooked up and ready to roll, but waiting on Roy Brabham again. The weather is cloudy and cold. Ki and Janell are in bed. They didn't feel too sharp this morning. Must have been something they ate. 6:22: Going west on big, wide oil highway.

I notice after Mr. Blair left the wagon cavalcade for his home at Sheridan, Oreg., they are leading the team he was driving. Dic and Jim are walking right out this morning. 6:55: The valley here is getting narrow. 7:17: Entering Bennington; just a small town. The road is narrowing. 8:12: In rolling country. 8:49: Entering Georgetown, population 404. There wasn't many people out to see us—mostly children. 9:13: Going up a canyon. 9:38: It's starting to rain. 9:57: Stopped to rest. Been pulling a steep hill. 10:10: The elevation now 6,283. 11:13: Stopping for camp.

We were invited out to dinner by the chamber of commerce, and the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers of Camp Meade arranged the whole thing. They also took us to see Soda Springs and Hooper Park and famous captive geyser. We are 9 miles out of Soda Springs, but they came out and picked us up in cars and even hauled us firewood.

June 30, 6:01: We are heading west on Highway 30. 6:29: Leaving Bear Lake County and entering Caribou County. There is snow on the high peaks and it froze last night. Chilly in the morning. This is wheat country. Mrs. Walker (first ranch on our left) served us two plates of hot biscuits for breakfast. 8:27: Soda Springs, population 2,600. Ben and I went to the bathroom in the jail and were locked in. Have been in town 20 minutes and gave out about 250 letters from the mayor. 12:03: Leaving Soda Springs, which is a pretty place. Reminded me of Oregon with all the green grass and trees. 10:25: We're back in the sagebrush on a lava road. Arrived at camp at 10:27. We are parked right under the Great Divide where the water runs southeast into the Great Salt Lake and northwest into the Columbia Basin. We are 5 miles from Grace, Idaho. Sandals were brought to us by the Lowe Drug Store in Grace.

July 1, 5:45: All hooked up and ready to go. The sun is out bright, but the temperature is cool. 5:59: Heading up Fish Creek Road. 6:59: Passing by Central Market way out here in the sticks. Jean Marshall slept in our wagon with Janell last night. We are going through a valley that grows a lot of wheat. 8:24: Passing Lund's Post Office—that's all that is here. 8:40: Stopped to rest on a hill, the steepest we've seen since we been on the trip. 9:44: On top of Fish Divide. 9:48: Just got off the hill and we had to block our wheels to get down. 10:31: Going up a canyon. 10:51: Crossed the Portneuf River and pulling onto Highway 30. 11:16: Arrived in camp at Lava Hot Springs rodeo grounds. I greased my wagons this evening. We had free baths at the spa

pool. The chamber brought dinner out to us. Ki is on cook shift again.

July 2, 6 a.m.: Waiting on Roy again this morning. There are a few clouds in the sky. 6:05: Going west on gravel road. They have begun to hay in this narrow valley. The hills are rocky with few small trees growing in the canyons. 6:43: We are pulling on highway 30.

We passed a grandma walking and she stopped to watch us go by. I asked her to ride with us, but she declined. 7:26: Crossed over Portneuf River. 7:32: Going down a canyon. Ki is on cook shift again today. 8:29: Turned off highway to gravel road. 8:46: Going through McCannon. 9:08: We are in sagebrush country again with cactus all in red blossoms. 9:20: Crossed Marsh Creek. 9:45: Going along foothills above Marsh Creek. 11:23: Camped on the Jack Stanley ranch along Marsh Creek.

July 3, 5:50: All hooked up and ready to go. The weather is cloudy and warm. We had a little thunderstorm last night with a shower. 5:58: Here we go. Doc and Jan are doing better each day. 6:45: We are going through Portneuf. Their main industry is cement. They have a large plant. 7:30: Going up a valley about a mile wide along the foothills. Sagebrush on the hillside and hay fields on the other side. It is lightning and thundering like h—r. Boy. The rain is here. Doc and Jan are acting up. I guess they don't care for this sort of thing. Ki doesn't either. Janell is asleep so nothing is bothering her. 8:10: We are parked on Highway 30 a quarter of a mile away is the Portneuf River. The sun is coming out. 9:25: The first escort has come out to meet us. The president and some of the officers of the chamber of commerce are out here to come in with us. They are wearing beautiful Indian chief feathers and carrying a peacepipe. They came to our camp last night and gave us gifts from all the business places in Pocatello. Everything you can think of was in the gifts. Also eight water-melons.

We will be here over the 4th and have every minute planned to entertain us. Free laundry, meals, sewing machines, irons, ironing boards, baths, etc. 9:55: Entering Pocatello. 10:58: Went by a home and they came out with ice cold lemonade and cookies. 11:20: Arrived at camp at the fairgrounds. It is pretty here. Lots of trees and shade.

We just got here when Ed Duncan, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Duncan of Drain, came up to the wagons. It was sure nice to see someone that at least used to be from Drain. They furnished us with cars here to use until we left. Ed Duncan and family seen to it we didn't need one. They put off crowning the rodeo queen until the wagon train pioneers got there. This evening they put on a small rodeo for us. Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Hutchinson and family of Drain were here today. Also Heb Cogner from Cottage Grove.

July 4, 10: We went over to Ed's for lunch. They have a beautiful new home. They moved in 2 months ago. He picked onions and radishes out of his garden for lunch. The corn isn't quite ready yet. They put in their lawn 3 weeks ago and it is up and looks good. Ed said he had to water often as the sun dries the ground out fast. We had a ham dinner. It seemed good to relax in a home again.

This evening we went to a banquet at the Green Triangle, and then back to the fairgrounds for fireworks. We ended our evening going out to Ed's and visiting and drinking coffee. He has a wonderful family, three children and a lovely wife. He wants us to tell everyone in Drain "Hello" especially his parents and brothers and sisters.

Emma Lazarus

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News of July 17, 1959, commemorating the birthday of Emma Lazarus, authoress of the sonnet inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty:

EMMA LAZARUS: 1849-87

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Wednesday, July 22, we commemorate the 110th anniversary of the birth of Emma Lazarus, the beloved American poetess. Children of liberty will clasp her hand in loving memory.

Emma Lazarus is the author of the inspiring sonnet, "The New Colossus." Her message to the world, all the world may read. It is engraved on the Statue of Liberty. It is standing in the gateway of democracy.

The noble soul and human heart of Emma Lazarus are symbolized in the Goddess of Liberty. It was given to a child of oppressed generations to understand the true meaning of this liberty-loving nation; to pen the immortal lines with such prophetic pathos; to express the spirit of democracy with such eloquence; to welcome the persecuted of the Old World, to the glorious promise of the New World.

And through the years we can hear the echo of Miss Liberty's voice speaking to these pilgrims to our blessed land: As you breathe the free air of our shore homeless wanderer, reaching home, become one with us in freedom's cause, take the riches of our liberties and repay the gift of becoming one with us—an American.

The Goddess of Liberty and Emma Lazarus have become synonymous. No poet of any nation has ever received such worldwide distinction. The "Lady With the Torch" was presented by the people of France to the American people to commemorate the first centennial of American independence.

Emma Lazarus was born on July 22, 1849, in New York City. She was the daughter of an old Jewish family. The story of her literary evolution is the story of the fulfillment of the evolution of a soul. Many women of every race, many men of every race, have evinced literary ability.

But it is rarely given to man or woman to so combine the powerful poetic expression with the clear insight and courage, with the conviction and devotion, as it was in Emma Lazarus. Her poems had power. Her poems had fire.

Since Miriam sang of deliverance and the triumph of the Red Sea, the Jewish race has had no braver singer. Her songs of divine unity repeated on the lips of her own people, in all zones and continents, have been heard round the civilized world.

Her poem, "The Crowning of the Red Cock," written when the Russian sky was red with blazing hatred, is a powerful lyric worthy of the Maccabean age. Her poem, "Banner of the Jew," has the ring of Israel's war trumpet. It sounded the clarion call to all Jews to unite for human rights, for new achievements and for new glories as in the days of the Maccabees.

She was one of the pioneers of Zionism. She was one of the outstanding advocates of a Jewish homeland. It was in that cause

A6410

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 23

that her character had its fullest flowering. It is heartening to see that the same poetess who was the first to give expression for the national renaissance of her people has become the symbol of humanity and democracy. She died on November 19, 1887. She was in her 38th year.

On that tragic day no better appreciation of Emma Lazarus was expressed than that of the famous American poet John Greenleaf Whittier who wrote: "Her people will mourn the death of this woman. But they will not be alone. At her grave the tears of the daughters of Jerusalem will mingle with those of the Christians."

As long as liberty shall live in the human heart, as long as the Statue of Liberty shall remain our symbol of freedom, the name of Emma Lazarus will forever be a part of the fame of that symbol as the champion of liberty.

THE NEW COLOSSUS

Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
With conquering limbs astride from land to land;

Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand

A mighty woman with a torch whose flame
Is imprisoned lightning, and her name
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon hand
Glowes worldwide welcome; her mild eyes command

The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.

"Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp,"
cries she

With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Health and Hospitalization Program for
Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the important subject of a health and hospitalization program for Federal employees is now under consideration by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my statement to the committee on July 21, 1959.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, your committee is considering legislation relating to a health and hospitalization program for Federal employees. Among the bills before you is my H.R. 2326, to provide for Government contribution toward personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the U.S. service and their dependents, to authorize payroll deductions for participants, and for other purposes.

I am pleased that your committee has scheduled action on this long-overdue program for assistance to our Federal employees. We know that employees in the Federal service have always been underpaid; their salaries have never equalled salaries

paid by private employers for comparable work; the small pay raises granted Federal workers have never been commensurate with ever-rising living costs, and at this point, living expenses have reached a new high.

Our Federal workers, with families to support or other dependents for whom they must provide, find it barely possible to meet their financial obligations; high living costs plus high taxes prevent saving for the proverbial rainy day or the day when a Federal employee or his dependents suffer a serious illness. A critical illness requiring protracted hospitalization, surgery, costly hospital facilities and medicines, nursing care, doctors' fees, not only wipes out any little savings a low- or middle-income employee may have accumulated through great personal sacrifices over a period of years but also throws him into debt for years to come. Such a burden becomes intolerable, such worry must lower the morale and efficiency of any human being. The cost of personal health service insurance is prohibitive to the millions of Federal employees in the low or middle salary brackets, when procured on an individual basis.

The well-being and efficiency of our Federal employees must be considered and preserved if we wish to keep our Government offices and other installations operating at the peak of accomplishment and effectuality. Large private employers have for many years helped their employees to obtain benefits which this legislation would now provide for Federal employees. To refuse to give this assistance to our Federal employees is to withhold reasonable and sound protection against the high costs of illness. Surely the Federal Government owes to its employees the same consideration which private industry, on the whole, has found it possible to extend to its workers. The legislation before you provides the needed and necessary protection at a cost which employees and the Government can afford.

I urge your committee to take favorable action so that our Federal employees may be accorded this sorely needed assistance.

Nixon's Trip to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion on the trip of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON to Russia.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on the subject. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON'S TRIP TO RUSSIA

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's trip to Soviet Russia (he's due in Moscow this morning) can have almost any number of important effects and repercussions.

For one thing, the trip can profoundly affect Mr. Nixon's own political future—his chance of landing the 1960 Republican Presidential nomination and, if he gets that, of winning the Presidency.

The trip, too, may swell the already sizable stream of U.S. socialites visiting Russia—through passeth our understanding that any American should want to inhabit Russia's dowdy hotels and consume stodgy Russian

food after fuming an hour or two before the waiter brings it.

Most importantly, the Nixon trip can affect the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, which shows signs of collapse.

The Big Four powers (United States, Britain, France, Russia) have wrangled for weeks over N. S. Khrushchev's demand that the Western Allies pull out of West Berlin, which is 110 miles deep in East Germany.

TWO PROPOSALS ABOUT GERMANY

The dispute has boiled down to two proposals.

Our side wants a Big Four Commission set up, with West and East German advisers, to study reunification of Germany. The Kremlin proposes an all-German committee to work on German reunification, with Western allied rights in West Berlin undisturbed for 18 months.

The Russian scheme is one to bulldoze all Germany into the Red slave empire. Consent to it, and we'll lose probably the decisive battle of the entire cold war.

Fortunately, as we see it, President Eisenhower goes on voicing determination never to let the Western allies be pushed out of West Berlin without a fight—a first-class nuclear fight, we gather, if it comes to that. Standing firmly with the President are France and West Germany, and, at least outwardly in the last few days, Britain.

Vice President Nixon's scheduled talks with Khrushchev may conceivably help to ease the West Berlin situation.

Nixon is not authorized to make any deals with Khrushchev. But should the latter come up with concrete suggestions regarding the cold war, Nixon is to report them at once to the President, who will mastermind the next moves.

IF KHRUSHCHEV SEES THE LIGHT

Our sub-Chief Executive is a man of proved courage and political "savvy." It may be that he can convince the Red czar that the United States will not be pushed around, and is no more afraid of Soviet Russia and Red China than it was of Hitler Germany and Tojo Japan.

Should those facts penetrate Khrushchev's brain, he may well "crawl" as most gangsters do when called.

For our part, we hope Mr. Nixon will go even further in his talks with Khrushchev. We hope he will grab the offensive for the West in the cold war.

At a Warsaw news conference Tuesday evening, Khrushchev screeched and screamed about the current Captive Nations Week in the United States, as proclaimed by the President with congressional approval, to remind Americans that nine nations plus East Germany are still slaves of Soviet Russia.

ASK "KHRUSHY" ABOUT THE SLAVE NATIONS

Khrushchev's bellow was enlarged upon in a three-column article yesterday in Pravda, most important of the Russian-kept newspapers. Pravda claimed to be outraged that anybody should think people living under communism are slaves—which is exactly what all such people except the Communist bosses are.

This incident, it seems to us, points up again what many observers say: that what worries the Kremlin most in this group of restless and resentful slave nations.

The West's best single cold-war bet, say these same observers, is to agitate and propagandize in every feasible way for the liberation of the slave nations, thereby keeping the Kremlin worried and off balance.

If Mr. Nixon will hammer on this point as he talks with Khrushchev, we believe his doing so can be utilized as the opening barrage in a Western cold-war offensive which can get real results if pressed without letup.