

vent the spoliation of our forests, lakes, and other natural resources. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and to the public, for I feel, as do the editors of this newspaper that this is a vital subject deserving of great thought and attention on the part of the people.

The editorial follows:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, June 6, 1959]

CONSERVATION

Early in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, the President with the purpose in mind of breaking the strangle-hold of a small minority on the sources of wealth which should be open to the honest endeavors of all the people—under the guidance of Gifford Pinchot—embraced the policy of conservation.

The established theory in regard to natural resources was that the general prosperity of the country could best be advanced by the development of these resources through private capital, and upon this theory land was either given away or sold for a trifle.

Under this policy, over wide areas, the timber lands had been stripped bare with reckless waste; the control of the Nation's water power had to a dangerous extent passed into private hands, and the public grazing lands and the wealth in minerals and oil in the public domain were bringing enormous dividends to a few, but no returns whatsoever to the people as a whole to whom these natural resources belonged.

Under Roosevelt's administration the area of the national forests was increased from 43 to 194 million acres, the water power resources of those areas were put under Government control to prevent speculation and monopoly, and cattle raisers grazing their herds on the reserves were forced to pay for what they got.

No policy of Roosevelt's administration excited deeper public interest or sharper opposition than his efforts in behalf of conservation. His official acts and the influence of his speeches and messages led to the adoption by both citizens and Government of a new theory regarding natural resources.

It is that the Government, acting for the people who are the real owners of public property, shall permanently retain fee in public lands, leaving their products to be developed by private capital under leases which are limited in their duration and which give the Government complete power to regulate the industrial operations of the leases.

Unfortunately, although legislation enacted during the Roosevelt administration did much to promote conservation, the Nation's natural resources are still threatened today.

All over the country powerful interests, representing themselves as the majority, are closing in, bent on despoiling and obliterating every last vestige of original America. While national parks preserve less than 1 percent of our land in primeval condition, giant dams are proposed for four of them, and lumbermen demand the finest forests in the fifth.

National forests provide less than 1 percent of the Nation's cattle-feed requirements, yet embattled stockmen are asking for the forests as their private preserve. Miners and sheepmen want the national monuments. State parks are succumbing to commercial interests. Marshes are drained, lakes emptied, and predators exterminated so that wildlife suffers from unbalance.

Each year thousands of acres of timber are indiscriminately hacked and burned, the

range is depleted, soil exhausted, erosion accelerated, streams polluted, and air contaminated.

Years ago Americans who valued this original America, became alarmed at the rapidity with which it was disappearing. They started a movement for the preservation of natural resources, both economic and scenic, which has ever since been known as conservation.

The time is now at hand again for a similar battle to be waged. Thoughtful Americans must begin thinking, talking, reading, and spreading the importance of conservation.

Representative Charles O. Porter, of Oregon, Leads Fight To Improve Government Employees' Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 9, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding young liberals in the House of Representatives is Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of the Fourth Oregon District. Mr. PORTER has been waging a strong fight against extending the Government employee security program to jobs which are in a nonsensitive area.

In his efforts Mr. PORTER has had the implied endorsement of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Honorable Roger Jones, who has cast doubt in testimony on the need for such legislation. When asked by Representative PORTER, Mr. Jones said he didn't know whether the Government is faced with any emergency program, and that any undesirable employee can be discharged under existing legislation.

The well-known local columnist on Federal personnel matters, Joseph Young of the Washington Evening Star, has written an article, published in his paper of June 4, 1959, describing the effective and brilliant work of Representative PORTER in this field. Mr. Young adds—

The Oregonian certainly has become one of the committee's most valued members.

This refers to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record Mr. Joseph Young's column of June 4 from the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JONES DEALS BLOW TO SECURITY BILL

(By Joseph Young)

The bill to extend the Government's loyalty security program to nonsensitive jobs has suffered a considerable setback.

During House Civil Service Committee hearings yesterday on the measure, no less an administration spokesman than Civil Service Commission Chairman Roger Jones disclosed that he was not aware the Govern-

ment is faced with any emergency problem because of the Supreme Court decision several years ago limiting the security program to sensitive jobs only.

The question as to whether an emergency existed was asked by Representative PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, who has led the fight against the Murray-Rees bill to extend the loyalty security program to nonsensitive jobs. Mr. PORTER contends that such a law is not needed, and that if nonsensitive jobs are brought under the loyalty security program, employees should be given the right to full appeals and hearings, together with the right to know the charges against them and the right to confront their accusers.

Otherwise, Mr. PORTER feels, countless injustices could result against employees in the guise of security, such as the loss of their jobs and the failure to find other ones because of being condemned as security risks.

In response to Mr. PORTER's question, Mr. Jones said he didn't know whether the Government is faced with any emergency problem. He said he couldn't say "Yes" and he couldn't say "No." But the fact that Mr. Jones could not definitely say that an emergency existed was seized on by Mr. PORTER and other committee members who feel that no new law is necessary to prove they are on the right track.

The bill's sponsors have contended the Government is faced with a critical situation because the Federal service is honeycombed with Communists in nonsensitive jobs who could play havoc with national security.

NO COMMUNISTS

But Mr. Jones declared that he did not think any of the 100 persons who were restored to their Government jobs as a result of the Supreme Court decision (the employees were all in nonsensitive jobs) were Communists.

If they were, they could have been fired under other laws which permit firing of Government workers who are Communists, regardless of whether they are in sensitive or nonsensitive jobs, Mr. Jones said.

The CSC chief pointed out that any undesirable employee on the Federal payroll can be fired under the Lloyd-LaFollette Act. Also, a 1950 law provides for the firing of any Communist in Government.

Mr. Jones did say that the Supreme Court decision posed some problems for the Government, but he did not have time to elaborate on what they were and will return for further questioning next week.

While Mr. Jones shied away from expressing a definite opinion on the Murray-Rees bill, observers at the hearing felt that he had grave reservations about extending a general loyalty-security program to all Federal workers.

Representatives FOLEY, Democrat of Maryland, and CORBETT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, also expressed misgivings about extending the loyalty-security program to nonsensitive jobs.

It was stressed that such character defects as immorality, drunkenness, indebtedness, unsavory associations, etc., could be lumped under the term "security risk," when the character defect had nothing to do with the actual security of the United States.

Yet an employee so fired as a "security risk" would probably be ruined for life as far as getting another job is concerned, it was pointed out.

It was also stated that these employees can now be fired easily enough under regular civil service suitability regulations.

Incidentally, Mr. PORTER has done a brilliant job during the hearings in his examination of witnesses. The Oregonian certainly has become one of the committee's most valued members.

Poison in Your Water—No. 107**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Rockaway Beach (N.Y.) Wave of April 30, 1959, entitled "Reminiscing."

REMINISCING

Several generations ago there were many oystermen and clam diggers at the beach, who may now be classed as forgotten men. There was a time when Rockaway oysters grown in Jamaica Bay were considered among the best and were in great demand. The largest grower in the bay was Harmen Schmeelk, whose beds were in the bay between the beach and Grassy Point, Broad Channel.

G. Wilbur Doughty, of Inwood, was a large grower of oysters in the east end of the bay, and the Lundy brothers were the third largest growers in the lower bay.

But as sections near or on Jamaica Bay began to be built up, and sewers were constructed emptying into the bay, there seemed to be an increase in the number of typhoid fever cases. The State and city boards of health made an inspection and took oysters from all parts of the bay and had them tested.

It was found that the pollution of the waters of the bay by the emptying of raw sewage was the cause of typhoid fever, and the State and city boards of health prohibited the planting of oysters in the bay.

CLAMMERS STOPPED

Under this law, digging clams is also prohibited. Unlike the oysterman, the clam digger, without a doubt, was one of the most abused individuals known. Very frequently, the punsters took a fling at him and he was often referred to by vaudeville actors, while the general public looked down upon him as an easygoing, shiftless nondescript, whose sole object in life was to do peculiar things and digging clams when occasion required.

But this was all untrue. The clam digger possessed more than the average intelligence, ready to speak on any subject without hesitancy, and kept in touch with the outside world pretty well. As a character, he was honest, sympathetic, and kind, and he was a toiler. He found time to study the tides and to calculate on the season's catch of shellfish.

I have often spoken to some of these clam diggers and they all said they did not mind what people called them. They took the attitude of farmers and persons living in the country who did not find any offense at being called "hayseeders."

BATHING PROHIBITED

Putting the lid on oystering and clamming in Jamaica Bay also included bathing and swimming, but there are still many persons who violate the health law. Almost any day you can see scores of men, women and children taking a swim in any part of the bay. Some day when the weather is warm, just take a ride in the subway and you will notice a large number of people in the water at Howard Beach.

There seems to be as many people enjoying a swim now as there were years ago, and the health department nor the police

do not appear to prevent them from indulging in their favorite sport.

FISHING HAS SUFFERED

Pollution of the bay also has tended to make fishing less popular. Old fishermen will tell you that fishing in the bay is not what it used to be. They tell you that weakfish, bass, blackfish, and other species were plentiful anywhere in the bay. Another cause for the reduced number of fish in the bay, they say, is that the numerous powerboats now keep churning up the water. Before, powerboats became popular, sailboats glided noiselessly over the surface and did not disturb the fish.

While some good catches of flounders, porgies and the like are still being made, the gamier fish such as the weaks and bass are not as numerous.

Bankers' Role in Higher Education Loan Plan Is Successful**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by George H. Seal, president of the Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp. These bankers are to be congratulated for their worthy endeavor.

Mr. Seal's article appeared in the American Banker of May 15, 1959:

MASSACHUSETTS BANKERS PROUD OF ROLE IN HIGHER EDUCATION LOAN PLAN SUCCESS

(By George H. Seal, president, Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp.)

Throughout the United States, the commercial banks of Massachusetts are being given well-deserved credit for their part in devising and implementing "HELP" the unique Higher Education Loan Plan inaugurated in this State 2 years ago.

HELP is a creation of the Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp., organized in 1956 under a special act of the legislature, for the purpose of making bank loans available to college students on more favorable terms than had ever before been feasible. It was born of the cooperative endeavor of a self-constituted group of bankers, educators, and business leaders. They recognized the need in this highly industrialized area for an increasing flow of capable graduates in higher education.

TWO MILLION DOLLARS LOANED TO 4,000

In its first 2 years, HELP has made available commercial bank loans to more than 4,000 students, to a total in excess of \$2 million. Applicants are required to be domiciled in Massachusetts and to have completed the first year of their program of higher education at an approved institution. Loans are limited to \$500 in any one year, and a total of \$1,500 in 3 years.

The borrowers sign notes due and payable 6 months after graduation, at which time the banks renew the loans for 3 years, and set up a schedule of 36 equal monthly payments. Currently HELP loans are being made at 4½ percent, of which one-half of 1 percent is paid by the banks to the corporation as each loan transaction is completed. Approval of a HELP loan by the corporation carries with

it its guarantee to the lending bank of 80 percent of the principal amount.

MAINE, NEW YORK FOLLOW

The outstanding success of this "Massachusetts plan," as it is called elsewhere, has already resulted in two other States, Maine and New York, establishing identical or similar loan plans. Also, enabling legislation is now pending in several other States, including Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

What we have here is striking evidence of the great change that is taking place with respect to the use of loans to finance in part the cost of a college education. Writing in the May issue of IBM's Think magazine, Devereaux C. Josephs, who was chairman of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, says:

"It is not inconceivable that a few years from now the typical collegian will display, as inevitably as the street signs and pennants on his wall, a promissory note to indicate his membership in the most ubiquitous fraternity of all—Iota Omicron Upsilon. And to the sonorous Latin motto of his alma mater may be added the more familiar American slogan 'Go Now; Pay Later.'"

AT TUFTS UNIVERSITY

President Nils Y. Wessell, of Tufts University, tells us:

"At Tufts University we believe that substantially increased lending programs for college students will have to supply one of the important answers to the question of adequate income for our private colleges and universities. Only through such expanded programs can charges made to students be increased to permit in turn adequate compensation for college faculties."

The keystone of HELP's structure is the corporation's guarantee to the banks of 80 percent of the principal of each loan it approves. It is this assumption of four-fifths of the credit risk that warrants the banks in making HELP on such favorable terms.

ONLY THREE DELINQUENTS

The corporation has been exposed to the hazard of delinquents since December 1957, when some of the first borrowers were due to sign renewal notes. However, only three loans have been declared delinquent, and one of these borrowers is now making monthly payments. Equally reassuring is the fact that some 204 borrowers have repaid their HELP loans in full, on or before their due dates, to a total of more than \$76,000.

The guarantee device plays another important part in our program, of especial appeal to contributors to our capital fund. Under the terms of our agreement with the banks, each \$1,000 added to our capital fund makes 12,500 bank dollars immediately available for loans to students. I know of no more effective means of expanding the usefulness of contributed funds.

To maintain its capital fund in proportion to the rising total loans, the corporation seeks tax-exempt contributions from business corporations, foundations, and individuals. Our goal for the fund in 1959 is \$250,000, and our ultimate goal is to bring it up to \$500,000 by the end of 1961. That amount will not only provide for guarantee of loans of more than \$6 million, but will also yield an investment return approximating our modest administrative expenses, and make HELP entirely self-supporting.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY BANKS PARTICIPATE

Another feature of HELP that has contributed much to its success is the fact that its operation is chiefly in the hands of the 130 commercial banks participating in the program. Their skilled and experienced loan officers sustain the entire burden of interviewing applicants, obtaining essential in-