

from the various committees of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Committee on Rules and Administration would be willing to make available to all Senators desiring it such evidence, or such justifications, as were made or presented by those asking for the various amounts involved.

Mr. JENNER. The committee did not have made a transcript or a record of the hearings, but I, or any other member of the committee, will be glad to give the Senator all the information that is available. All members of the committee were present on each occasion, with the exception of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], who was absent yesterday.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am particularly anxious to ascertain the justification for the so-called McCarthy resolution, which I understand has been reported this morning.

Mr. JENNER. Yes; it has been reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. That calls for an expenditure of about \$200,000. does it not?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that another resolution has been reported calling for \$150,000, for the purpose of enabling the Committee on the Judiciary to continue its investigation of communism.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. It has been reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand further that the resolution provides for an investigation of communism in schools and colleges, and of other aspects of communism.

Mr. JENNER. It does not cover those phases. It does continue the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any presentation or specific indication made as to the subjects that would be investigated by, for example, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigation of the Government Operations Committee of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is chairman?

Mr. JENNER. Yes. The Senator from Wisconsin and the chief clerk of his committee appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration and presented their entire program. At that time several Senators asked questions concerning the program, and the resolution was unanimously reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any evidence in the form of a written record?

Mr. JENNER. No. The committee did not have a transcript made. It has not been customary to have transcripts made of such proceedings.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator from Indiana recalls my conversation with him on this subject some time ago.

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. I told the Senator that I thought it would be a good idea to have a record made of such hearings, so that all Senators could be informed, when the resolutions came to the floor, as to why the various requests were be-

ing made and why they were being approved.

Mr. JENNER. I do not recall the Senator from Louisiana asking that a record be made. I recall the Senator from Louisiana saying that he would look upon such requests with a very jaundiced eye.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said I would like to see something specific in justification of the requests.

Mr. JENNER. I have been a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration as long as I have been a Member of the Senate. I have served under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is now on the floor.

There has never been a record made of the hearings. We request Senators to come before the committee with their recommendations for their respective budgets—how much is to be spent for personnel, telegraphic expense, traveling expense, and so forth.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the committee also require information as to what subjects will be investigated?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can Senators obtain for their own information a résumé of what was stated and the reasons assigned for the various amounts requested? Can the Senator provide that?

Mr. JENNER. As I have said, there is no stenographic record, but I shall be glad to go over these requests with the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is present, as are other members of the committee. I am sure that all of us would be glad to give the Senator the benefit of all the information we have.

Mr. ELLENDER. If possible, I should like to have such information before the resolutions are taken up tomorrow. It may well be that I shall have no objection, but I should like to have the information, so that the resolutions may be presented to the Senate in an orderly way. I just want to have all the information on hand, so that the Senate may make a considered and well-founded decision. I want to be sure that each of these expenditures is needed.

Mr. JENNER. I shall be glad to give the Senator all the information in my possession.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPHART (for himself and Mr. MARTIN):

S. 699. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPPHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HOVEY, Mr. MCDONALD, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and Mr. POTTS):

S. 690. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HOVEY, Mr. MCDONALD, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. POTTS, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 691. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Government personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HENNINGSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LANGRISH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MASTON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. FUSTELL, Mr. LEMMAH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MACRUSSOW, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TOWSE, Mr. PASTOREK, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 692. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ives when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 693. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; and

S. 694. A bill to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASS:

S. 695. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes; and

S. 696. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to permit Mrs. Maggie Snowle to occupy and reside on Maggie Fraction Lode Claim; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. NORTON):

S. 697. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Abs Seejubejm, Mrs. Dvora Seejubejm, Shlomo Seejubejm, and Daniel Seejubejm;

S. 699. A bill for the relief of Anthony Zahareas;

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Joseph Welz and his family; and

S. 701. A bill for the relief of Michael Cosmo Zullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 702. A bill for the relief of Maarten Van Der Toorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7. We are working toward more detailed plans to acquaint the lay and professional groups, including parents of course, with the need for prevention of mental illness and to recognize early symptoms and obtain early diagnosis and treatment.

Your deep concern so far reflected in appropriations approved is appreciated. We ask that you support legislation which will improve the treatment of our mentally disturbed fellow citizens.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. L. C. BENDISCALL,
President.

(From the Milwaukee Journal of
May 10, 1953)

**MENTAL HEALTH FUNDS SOUGHT—GOAL HERE
\$45,000**

Money to intensify the fight against mental illness is being sought for the first time by the Milwaukee County Society for Mental Health and its parent group, the Wisconsin Association for Mental Health. The goal of the statewide Wisconsin mental health fund drive, being held this month, is \$100,000, including the goal in Milwaukee County of \$45,000.

In general, the money will be used to finance education of the public about mental health problems and how to deal with them, to secure better care for the mentally ill, and for research.

Both mental health organizations are affiliated with the National Association for Mental Health, which seeks to raise \$5 million.

PREVENTION IS GOAL

Mental and personality disorders overshadow all others, both in numbers and in cost. There are about as many persons under treatment for mental illness in hospitals as under treatment for all other illnesses.

But at present the money available for research on mental illness amounts to only \$4.15 per patient under treatment, compared with \$28.20 for polio patients, \$26.50 for those with tuberculosis, and \$27.70 for cancer victims.

Mental health organizations, such as the State and county groups, combat lack of mental health by teaching why people act the way they do. They try to teach sound habits of mental health so that individuals will cope with their frustrations in socially acceptable ways. The mental health organizations are fighting mental illness by trying to prevent it.

FORMED 4 YEARS AGO

The Milwaukee County Mental Health Society was organized 4 years ago. To date it has been financed by its own membership, which numbers about 3000. It has been a working organization, with membership limited to those who will participate actively in the society's program. Members who join only to have their names on the membership roll soon are dropped.

The society has conducted panel discussions and has sponsored lectures by qualified speakers to educate the public about mental health.

For 3 years the society has conducted a mental health workshop at Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee, in cooperation with the college. The program has reached hundreds of parents and teachers—two groups especially influential in the developing personality of the child.

SPONSORS OTHER SERVICES

The county society's volunteers have visited patients at the county asylum and taken them on excursions. Other volunteers have given square dances at the county hospital for mental diseases—a form of recreation that has become recognized as a sound treatment in mental disorders.

The society has participated in such programs as alcoholism conferences. It has promoted a child-study center, a low-cost diagnostic center for mental illness, and a new

detention home. The county group wants to step up its program, working within the framework of the State organization, which it joined last year.

The State Mental Health Association plans to start a program of volunteers called gold ladies to visit and help at county mental institutions.

A training course for community mental health executives, publication of a professional handbook of mental health services, a series of industrial mental health institutes, weekly radio programs, and a research project are some of the goals of the State association.

BETTER LEGISLATION SOUGHT

The association last year was given a \$25,000 grant from a private foundation for 3 years. In the last year it has organized chapters in Sheboygan, Outagamie, Kau Claire, Dane, Marinette, and Brown Counties. It hopes to organize 12 chapters in all.

In the 18 years the State organization has been in existence it has used its influence to work for better legislation and better understanding of the mentally ill.

District Judge Harvey L. Neelin is campaign chairman for Milwaukee County. Governor Kohler is honorary State campaign fund chairman. Firemen and letter carriers in several Wisconsin communities will participate as groups in helping solicit funds.

Of the \$100,000 the drive hopes to raise, the county organizations will get \$31,000. The rest will be allocated as follows:

State association, \$36,800; national association, \$18,750; other local chapters in Wisconsin, \$12,000; fund-raising expenses, \$12,000.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 8406. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Elamath Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 231).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 1242. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 232);

H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16); without amendment (Rept. No. 233);

H. R. 1244. A bill to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 234); and

H. R. 2364. A bill to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Eina Engles; without amendment (Rept. No. 235).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 714. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken; without amendment (Rept. No. 209).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 444. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes; without amendment (Rept. 263).

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 261. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact; with amendments (Rept. No. 236).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4663. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 237).

By Mr. LANGRISH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Theodore Eugene Munagorri (Rept. No. 242);

S. 213. A bill for the relief of Isaac D. Xehama (Rept. No. 243);

S. 224. A bill for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski (Rept. No. 244);

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Jiny Ling So (Rept. No. 245);

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Angelo Guisetti Podesta (Rept. No. 246);

S. 811. A bill for the relief of Steven M. Firnicki (Rept. No. 247);

S. 816. A bill for the relief of Bruno Linder (Rept. No. 248);

S. 1516. A bill for the relief of Akemi Tepada (Rept. No. 249);

H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of Tibor Kalman Jabovicsky (Rept. No. 250);

H. R. 880. A bill for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen (Rept. No. 251);

H. R. 974. A bill for the relief of Dr. Muzaf Malek-Astani (Rept. No. 252); and

H. R. 3042. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco (Rept. No. 253).

By Mr. LANGRISH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arthur Tye (Rept. No. 254);

S. 1579. A bill for the relief of Micaeo Kristine (Rept. No. 255).

By Mr. LANGRISH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Owen Lowery (Rept. No. 256);

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Maria Neglia, Angelo Neglia, and Giuseppe Neglia (Rept. No. 257);

S. 694. A bill to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 258); and

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Stefanos A. Spiliotis (Rept. No. 259);

By Mr. LANGRISH (for Mr. McCASSETT), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 28. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 260);

S. 1249. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 261); and

S. 1668. A bill to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, Judges of United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 262).

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 300. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; with an amendment (Rept. No. 263);

S. 877. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 259);

H. R. 2277. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1928, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 240); and

H. R. 2999. A bill to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 241).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 23. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bank-

Maria Neglia and Angelo Neglia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendments were agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Neglia and Angelo Neglia."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 694) to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over. I should like to make it quite clear that I ask that the bill go over, by request, because I favor the bill wholeheartedly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

STEFANOS A. SPILIOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1262) for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after the name "Spilios" to insert "also known as Stephen A. Harrison", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stefanos A. Spilios, also known as Stephen A. Harrison, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios, also known as Stephen A. Harrison."

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1349) to amend title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, under the case of Williams against United States, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress created the Court of Claims under the power granted by article I of the Constitution. The fact that the Court of Claims is not a constitutional court raises many complications. Every case filed in the Court of Claims is a case wherein the United States is a party defendant. There appears no doubt that the Court of Claims could, therefore, have been created under article III.

The committee is of the opinion that Congress intended the Court of Claims to have been so created, and that this bill will accomplish that end. The change contemplated would permit the assignment by the Chief Justice of the United States of circuit and district judges to serve as judges of the Court of Claims, when called upon to do so. Of course, at the present time they cannot do so.

This measure would bring about what is believed to be the original intent of Congress when the Court of Claims was created.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over. The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE OF CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL SALARIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHAEFFER in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this bill is obviously a controversial measure, and one which deserves more extended consideration. I therefore ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

TIBOR KALMAN JALSOVICZEKY

The bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of Tibor Kalman Jalsoviczky was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. SUZANNE VAN AMERONGEN

The bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. MORAD MALEK-ASLANI

The bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA BOSCO LOMONACO

The bill (H. R. 3042) for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether we might have an explanation of this bill for the RECORDS. It is a very important bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think this is a measure which probably should not be passed on the Consent Calendar, and I therefore suggest that it go over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to have the recommendation of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUNDS HELD BY SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 444) to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, for the reason that when the committee considered this particular bill it was under the erroneous impression that there was a favorable report from the Department of the Interior. There was a report from the Department of the Interior which carried certain recommendations. I think further attention should be given to the bill, and I ask that it go over for that reason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

PATENT IN FEE TO LOUIS W. MILLIKEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 714) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I think there is an amendment which was proposed. It should be acted upon at this time.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is somewhat jealous of its prerogatives, and there was some question as to why this bill was not referred to that committee. I think we would have approved it, and we do approve it. I assure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that my only reason for making this statement is that I feel it my duty to protect and preserve the prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee would not have wanted to take jurisdiction of this bill had it known there was any question about it. The bill was referred to our committee. Representatives of the Post Office Department testified in favor of it. It was not our purpose in any way to take anything away from the distinguished Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee has been much concerned, as have other Members of the Senate, I believe, over the tendency to assign more and more servicemen to duties and functions which could properly be performed by civilians. I inquire of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee whether the passage of the pending bill would in any way increase the number of men drafted for necessary military service, but subsequently assigned only to postal functions which could be performed by civilians.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is a clear and emphatic "No."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.
Mr. GORE. Does the Senator think the passage of the pending bill would tend in that direction?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding, and it was the information of the committee that it would not make any change whatever in the procedures which are now being followed, and that it would not in any way make draftees or other servicemen mail clerks, when they were drafted for military service.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield further to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. To what extent are servicemen assigned to postal duties within the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that a very limited number are so assigned within the United States. The pending bill would apply principally to units at the front, where servicemen in uniform are employed in post-office work.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I shall interpose no objection to passage of the pending bill. However, I respectfully wish to call to the attention of the chairman and the other members of the committee, the glaring fact that hundreds of thousands of men drafted for military service are now performing functions which could

be performed quite as well, and in many cases perhaps better, by civilians.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That has been a constant question in the minds of members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Last year we questioned at length some of the uses that were being made of Marines. I remember that, as one example. But the best information we have is that the pending bill is primarily aimed at conditions at the front, and that it will not mean taking men into the services and assigning them merely to post-office duties. It is a bill which, if passed, will give the Army and the Air Force a little greater opportunity and more ease in handling their mail.

Mr. GORE. Then, Mr. President, I shall join the Senator in supporting the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2357) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF UNITED STATES WALL MAPS FOR USE OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, which is Calendar Order No. 315.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) authorizing the printing of United States wall maps for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "a United States wall map," and insert "the official United States wall map, published by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 30,015 copies of the official United States wall map, published by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, size 5 feet by 7 feet, of which 69 copies, mounted and backed, and 7,425 copies, not mounted or backed, shall be for the use of the Senate; and 441 copies, mounted and backed, and 22,050, not mounted or backed, shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by way of explanation of the concurrent resolution, I may say that, prior to World War II, it was customary every 4 or 5 years to print large wall maps of the United States, which Senators and Representa-

tives could distribute. That practice was discontinued during the war, because there were no new editions of the maps. The Department of the Interior is now preparing a new edition of the map of the United States.

The alert Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNRE] heard about it and suggested that the Congress take advantage of this new printing. Therefore, the preparation of these maps is not an original job being done for the Congress, but it is proposed that when the maps are impressed, we take advantage of that fact and have additional copies printed. There would be made available one mounted wall map for each Senator and Representative. In addition, it would be possible for each Senator to have in the document room 50 of these maps, which could be distributed to schools or elsewhere in his State. Seventy-five copies would be made available for each Member of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.
The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF DISPLAY OF FLAGS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OR OTHER NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 694, which is Calendar Order No. 256.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 694) to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after "United States," to insert a period, and in line 11, after the word "prominence" to strike out "of" and insert "or," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That (a) the analysis of chapter 1 of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"4. Display of other flags equal, above, or in place of the flag of the United States."

(b) Such chapter is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4. Display of other flags equal, above, or in place of the flag of the United States.

"(a) No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof: Provided, That

nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations or at any place at which any official meeting or proceeding of the United Nations is in progress.

(b) Whoever knowingly violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than \$250 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

The amendments were agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 89, calendar No. 214.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 89) to study juvenile delinquency in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, and subsequently from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments. The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were, on page 2, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

In line 25, to change the section number from "2" to "3", and on page 3, line 4, to change the section number from "3" to "4."

The amendments were agreed to. The additional amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, on page 2, line 3, after the word "violating", to insert "Federal"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "March 1" and insert "January 31", and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$44,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile

delinquency in the United States. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) determining the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (2) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (3) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (4) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

Sec. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee of subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. The Committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1954.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$44,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The additional amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I shall gladly explain this resolution. It authorizes a study of juvenile delinquency, its causes and contributing factors, throughout the country by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The purpose of the study is to suggest in a report to be submitted to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, such legislation as may be found to be appropriate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could the Senator inform us as to whether any such investigation has been conducted in the past?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. There is none pending at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any such investigation ever made in the past by this body?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what will be the scope of the investigation?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It will be primarily to furnish leadership in this field

so as to stimulate some activity in the States. In my own State of New Jersey, for example, since the introduction of this resolution, the agency having jurisdiction of this subject has offered to the Senate the services of one of the best criminologists in the country to aid in the investigation. I think we can save a portion of the committee-approved appropriation because of the voluntary aid we shall receive from the States and from the Department of Justice and other agencies of the Federal Government. I look for cooperation all along the line.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's view that the appointing of a subcommittee to investigate the subject will cause the States to follow suit and to assist in the project?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I feel very definitely that that is the case, Mr. President. I also feel that we have the responsibility of taking some leadership in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the purpose of the proposed subcommittee to hold hearings, or simply to gather statistics?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. To hold some hearings; a limited number of hearings. Of course, the subcommittee has not as yet been created. I cannot tell what the subcommittee may do; but, assuming that I may be honored with membership on the subcommittee, I certainly would want to hold hearings. The initial hearings would be attended by appropriate representatives of the Department of Justice and appropriate representatives of the States whose participation may be desired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator not say that the investigation would deal primarily with the gathering of statistics?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No, Mr. President. Statistics will be an important factor, but I think we shall receive some very informative material which will enable us to develop a program at the national level which will aid the States in developing their own individual programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice on page 4 of the report that a proposed budget was made up. Is that on a yearly basis?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No. It runs from the time of the adoption of the resolution to January 31, 1954. The Committee on Rules and Administration amended the original resolution which provided for an appropriation of \$50,000. The amount was reduced to \$44,000.

Mr. President, it is my hope that if I may have the privilege of serving on the subcommittee, we shall not use all of the \$44,000, because I think we shall receive aid from agencies of the States and from agencies of the Federal Government, which will make unnecessary the employment of all the contemplated personnel.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey that I shall be the most surprised man in the United States if such

called tomorrow. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not encouraged to believe that the plan will be rejected but I also want to make it perfectly clear that HAROLD COOLEY is opposed to the plan.

Mr. DINGELL. And so is Mrs. Dingell's boy, Johnny.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope that my colleagues will familiarize themselves again with the law, will look at the plan, and if they conclude that they are going to abdicate and turn over to this man Benson all of the great powers that he contemplates using, then I do not believe we can complain, when next we go to the public, about how he may have used these powers. If he is against this farm program, let him come in through the front door. If he wants to do away with any part of the program, let him walk in the front door and not in the back door. Let him disclose his intentions and not ride in on a Trojan horse.

I do not think those Members from farm districts will cast a more important vote during this session of Congress than the vote on this reorganization plan. As almost conclusive evidence that the Department of Agriculture is operating economically and efficiently, I need only suggest to you that for 5 months the great man, Mr. Benson, has not proposed to Congress a single, specific change. For 5 months he has searched every agency and department, and he tells us here in the good month of June, "I do not know what needs to be done." How many months will he have to stay there to find one thing wrong? I challenge him to point out one thing that is wrong and to propose a single specific change.

If any lawyer in this House can read the Reorganization Act and read this proposed plan and come to the conclusion that it is even remotely contemplated by the act, then he has a different understanding than I have of the act.

I have made this little talk to the end that it may not be hereafter said that I did not express my views as strongly as I have it in my power to express them in opposition to this pending measure, and to express the hope that every Member of this House will study this monstrous proposition which bears the misnomer of a "plan."

I am not going to be embarrassed by the fact that plans of other kinds for other departments have been adopted on other occasions. I am frank to confess I know but very little about the organization framework of the Department of Commerce or the Department of Justice, other than as is generally known by a lawyer, but I am supposed to know something about the Department of Agriculture and I take pride in the fact that I do know something about it.

This one thought and I am through: Less than a year ago, just before Congress adjourned and just before we went to our party conventions, I had Mr. Brannan, the then Secretary of Agriculture, his Budget Director, and his Director of Personnel, meet in our committee room, and I had them bring charts showing all of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture and the budget for each agency and each commission and each

bureau. After a long, extended hearing, and after the committee had propounded question after question, I turned to the Republicans on that committee and said, "Gentlemen, do any of you have any suggestions that you can make to the Secretary and his associates as to how he can improve the Department of Agriculture, how he can make it more efficient, how he can achieve more in economy?" There was not a single suggestion made.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. That was, of course, after you had turned the Secretary of Agriculture inside out?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, after we had gone into every agency and bureau in his Department, and he had achieved all the economy at that time, apparently, the other party thought he could achieve. I am not saying the Department of Agriculture is perfect. If it can be improved, I, of course, want it improved. But I want to know something about the proposed improvement before I give the Secretary the instrument to tear it to pieces.

I thank those of you who have listened to me so patiently. I hope when the vote comes here tomorrow we will have time to discuss the matter further, but unfortunately under the rules the debate will be limited to a very short time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BURNICK in three instances.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALK and to include an article from the New Leader entitled "Half Way to Moscow Is Suicide."

Mr. MACHROWICZ in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPENCER and to include an article from the Journal of Commerce.

Mr. EVINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McMILLAN and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it will cost \$373.

Mr. BAILEY and to include an article on the occasion of the unveiling of a monument of the famous Confederate general, Stonewall Jackson, at the place of his birth at Clarkburg, W. Va.

Mr. MADSEN and to include a resolution from the Polish American Citizens League of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FORD and to include a speech by Deputy Secretary of Defense Roger M. Egan.

Mr. McVey and to include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARANROW and to include with his remarks the official list of the men who lost their lives in the sinking of the Arizona in Pearl Harbor on December 7,

1941, notwithstanding the fact that it will cost \$927.

Mr. HENRY and to include a memorial sermon by Rev. Philip Gordon Scott, of Westmoreland Congregational Church, in Washington.

Mr. WINGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. KEARNS) and to include a letter from Senator SALTONSTALL.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. EENHARTER) and to include a dispatch from the New York Times of June 2, 1953, with relation to the greetings extended by the Archbishop of Ireland to the new Queen of England.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWERS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULLEN in three instances and to include extraneous matter, in one instance notwithstanding the cost is estimated to be \$364.

Mr. SMYTH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY in two instances and to include therewith extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWNSON and to include a newspaper column from today's Washington News.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. POWELL) in two instances.

Mr. ASDOSHINO (at the request of Mr. POWELL).

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an article.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. SCHEENCK) and to include an editorial.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 694. An act to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of United States wall maps for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LaCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1561. An act authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee; and

H. R. 2327. An act to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes.

1953 (?)

tornado. He suggests further that, after a tornado has occurred, surveys should be made of the area to determine the winds and atmospheric pressure drops. A standard questionnaire to be used for personal interviews as well, as substantiating photographs for further analysis of the storm would be very helpful.

It is evident that a more complete knowledge of the small-scale disturbances attending tornadoes is needed for the understanding of the nature and causes of this phenomena. Until more knowledge on this subject is obtained, tornado forecasting and tracking will continue to be uncertain. Until that time arrives, and to assist in present studies, it seems desirable to make maximum use of radar.

Many of you who were in the armed services during the war will recall that during 1942 and 1943 the meteorological services were faced with a very serious situation with regard to locating and tracking tropical hurricanes in the western Atlantic, Caribbean, and Gulf of Mexico. Under wartime conditions all of our merchant ships had been placed in convoys and the usual weather reports from coastal areas and islands were slowed down appreciably by security since all weather reports had to be coded. You will remember that the Weather Bureau, Air Force, and Navy, operating through the Joint Meteorological Committee, an agency of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, accepted a plan proposed by the Navy (since coastal areas were under the direct responsibility of the sea frontiers, including strict compliance with regulations on radio silence. It was expected that the Navy must offer some solution to the problems of obtaining weather reports for the Weather Bureau). This plan involved three courses of action. First, it was believed that patrol aircraft out on combat reconnaissance flights could furnish valuable weather reports, especially if a member of the crew were a qualified weather observer. Second, it was thought that the new, then supersecret, device known as radar could be used to give valuable information on frontal conditions and hurricanes, especially if placed in combat patrol aircraft. It was hoped that airborne radar equipment might first detect the storm and then as the hurricane approached the coast it could be located and tracked by large shore-based early warning radar equipment. The third method of locating and tracking hurricanes was with the use of microseisms, a method first proposed by Father Macelwane, director of the Institute of Technology of St. Louis University. All three methods of locating and tracking hurricanes worked out with varying degrees of success, but the combined results together with a closely knit joint hurricane weather central at Miami, Fla., resulted in remarkably accurate forecasts and warnings of these destructive storms. It is well known, by now, that this organization under the leadership of the Weather Bureau has practically eliminated the loss of life and has drastically reduced property damage as a result of the timely and accurate warnings now issued each year when hurricanes are present.

It is my opinion, in the absence of more complete knowledge of tornadoes, which we must admit at this time, that a network of radar stations should be established, first in the areas where tornadoes have highest frequency and possibly later over other areas of the United States.

I am aware of the present experimental Weather Bureau radar storm detection network which has recently been established in the Midwest and other areas. But we must remember that this is World War II equipment which has been overhauled and modified to give maximum performance within

the capabilities of radar of 1943 vintage. It may have severe limitations. There have been many revolutionary improvements in radar during the past 10 years and present-day radar equipment can furnish vital information of severe storm conditions not possible with World War II equipment.

The radar warning network should include the following equipment of the latest type:

- A. Radar storm detection equipment—CPS-9 or equivalent.
- B. Radar cloud base and top recorders.
- C. Mobile weather trucks equipped with suitable type radar.
- D. Two or three aircraft with APS-42 radar or equivalent.
- E. A weather central in continuous communication with each of the stations by radar or television relay, facsimile, teletype, radio, or telephone as necessary to provide instant relay of information throughout the network.

At least six of the present stations in the Weather Bureau experimental radar network should be provided with the latest radar storm detection equipment outlined above. When severe storm conditions are imminent the radar would be manned continuously.

Each of these stations should have radar cloud base and top recorders to obtain a continuous record of all cloud formations and cloud layers passing over each station. It is capable of recording all clouds up to 60,000 feet.

The mobile weather trucks should have, in addition to complete equipment for surface and upper air observations, suitable radar with a range of 50 to 100 miles. They would be stationed at the weather central or suitable location where they could be readily dispatched to tornado areas.

Reconnaissance aircraft would be used for aerial reconnaissance of severe fronts and thunderstorms that show evidence of producing tornadoes.

The cost of this additional equipment as a pilot project would probably amount to more than \$1 million, but the annual economic benefits and the saving of lives would amount to many times this value.

In order to implement the above plan, it would be my view that a joint committee of representatives from the Armed Services, Weather Bureau, and industry be formed to make a study and technical evaluation of such a program. The chairman of committee should be the Weather Bureau representative.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLAG DISPLAY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 694) to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the analysis to chapter 1 of title 4, United States Code,

is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"4. Display of other flags equal, above, or in place of the flag of the United States.

(b) Such chapter is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"1. Display of other flags equal, above, or in place of the flag of the United States.

"(a) No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof; *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations or at any place at which any official meeting or proceeding of the United Nations is in progress.

"(b) Whoever knowingly violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than \$250 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 3 (c) of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America,' approved June 22, 1942, as amended, (36 U. S. C. sec. 175 (c)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof; *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will there be no explanation of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do that, Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary a few questions. I assumed there would be some explanation of the provisions of this bill. As a matter of fact, I had an amendment prepared to offer to the bill.

As I understand it, this provides for the flag of the United States to take second place at United Nations headquarters. Is that correct?

Important dialogue

Mr. REED of Illinois. The proviso to the amendment is:

That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flag in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations.

That is the only place.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, it has been flown in a place of prominence and honor above that of the United States flag; is that correct?

Mr. REED of Illinois. No. It is the same.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it has been.

Mr. REED of Illinois. At the United Nations headquarters, but that is the only place.

Mr. GROSS. And why? Why should not all flags, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, at the United Nations be flown at least on a basis of equality?

Mr. REED of Illinois. They are at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. This indicates that the United Nations emblem—

Mr. REED of Illinois. No. This says that the flag of the United States—let me read it again.

Mr. GROSS—

That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor—

So that the United Nations flag has been flown in a position superior to that of the United States, and will continue to be flown in a position superior to that of the flag of the United States.

Mr. REED of Illinois. No. I think the gentleman has not read it as carefully as he might. It reads:

The practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. I find no doubletalk in this language at all.

That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor.

I emphasized the word "superior" with reference to the United Nations flag.

Certainly the flag of the United States is flown in a position of equality with flags of all other countries, but inferior to the flag of the United Nations at United Nations headquarters.

Mr. REED of Illinois. What the gentleman does is to stop and treat the comma as a period after the word "honor." He does not go on and read the rest of the sentence. He must read the sentence altogether: "In a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor."

XCCX—405

Mr. GROSS. Let me get this clear. The flag of the United States is flown on an equality with the United Nations flag at United Nations headquarters?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct. And with the flags of all other nations that are members of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. And then you say: "or at any place at which any official meeting or proceeding of the United Nations is in progress."

Mr. REED of Illinois. No. That has been taken out of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. That has been taken out of the bill under the amendment which you have offered just now and which was adopted by the committee only this morning?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. So I have the complete assurance of the gentleman that the flag of the United States is not flown in an inferior position at United Nations headquarters?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Either to the United Nations flag or the flag of any other nation?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does this provide for equal display at military establishments?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Let me read from the report by the Secretary of State:

As regards the display of the United Nations flag, the United Nations has declared that the United Nations flag, when displayed with member-nation flags should be displayed at the same height with such other flags, and all should be approximately the same size.

Thus the proposed bill would involve substantially the same problem for the display of the United Nations flag as for the flags of foreign countries.

(Mr. Gross asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman use the word "should" or "shall"?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The bill does not say "should." It says "shall."

Mr. GROSS. What about the flying of the American flag at American-controlled military installations abroad? Does our flag ever take an inferior position at military installations abroad?

Mr. REED of Illinois. No; I am told that it does not.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad you struck out the provision "at any official meeting or proceeding of the United Nations" because I never want the day to come when any kind of meeting of the United Nations is held in the State of Iowa and the flag of the United States ever takes an inferior place to the spider web banner of the United Nations.

Mr. REED of Illinois. That was stricken out in the committee today, and this bill was recommended to the House by the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I want this record to show that I insist the flag of the United States be flown in superior position to that of any flag of a foreign government or that of the United Nations anywhere in the United States, its Territories or Possessions, or anywhere in connection with United States military facilities or

personnel, including the combat area of Korea.

As far as I am concerned, United Nations headquarters is in the State of New York and therefore on the soil of the United States of America.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite interested in this bill, and I want to compliment the Judiciary Committee for reporting it out.

I believe I can say without much fear of contradiction that the first phraseology of the text of this bill was introduced by myself in the 81st Congress. Hearings were held at that time by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, but no action was taken. Since that time I have heard from people all over the United States about the necessity of defining the position of the United States flag in relation to the United Nations flag.

This was brought to the attention of the public rather forcibly in a situation that developed in the civil center of the city of Los Angeles a few years ago, where the United Nations flag was run up on the flagpole in front of the city hall above the United States flag. This almost caused physical combat—well, it did cause physical combat and a considerable disturbance in the community.

Since that time agitation has been persistent to provide something in the flag code that would put the United States flag in a position at least equal to that of the United Nations flag at the headquarters of the United Nations, but certainly superior to that of any other national or international flag in any other place in the United States.

So I repeat the context of this bill, that no person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence and honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof; and providing that it shall not make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations.

I am convinced that the force and intention of my original bill is included in this bill.

The bill before us came over from the Senate as Senate bill 694. The number is retained, but everything after the enacting clause is stricken out, and the text of the bill which was before the Judiciary Committee, which I introduced, has been substantially reproduced and substituted for it.

The thousands of people who are interested in this, and certainly the flag of the United States is an emblem of patriotism in this country, will be inspired with this legislation, in my opinion; and it is time that we take action to inspire the patriotism of the people of the United States, to remove the thought from their mind that we are

← 81st
Cont'd

←

submitting fully and without contradiction to the United Nations. The sovereignty of these United States must be preserved if the dignity of the country is to be preserved, and that sovereignty is symbolized by the flag of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I think the committee will agree and the gentleman from California will agree that the great majority of the people of this country are attached to the flag of the United States. What we want to do here is to preserve the honor and integrity of this flag of ours.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is correct, and that is what I think this bill does. I am very happy to know that the committee has taken it up and that it is before the House for action.

We Americans should wake up to the fact that we must look out for the interests of our Nation and our people while we pour our resources to save the rest of the world and risk the loss of our own freedoms and our own system of free enterprise. We can in the spirit of brotherhood and cooperation, and with the honest desire to follow the Christian principle of helping our neighbors, do what we can to help them to raise their standards of living and strengthen their defenses against the common enemy.

But we cannot look out for the interests of all the rest of the world at the expense of our own Nation and our own people. We cannot risk economic collapse and the loss of our own freedom. We cannot adopt a policy of America last while no other nation in the world has evidenced any willingness to relinquish its own self-interests in behalf of the United States.

The proud Stars and Stripes which was adopted as our national flag on June 14, 1777, has become a symbol of liberty and freedom throughout the world. And our flag is the only flag in the world that is never dipped to any individual, not even to the President.

Americans have loved and respected our flag since it first unfurled in the breeze. It has moved westward across the Nation with our pioneers. It has accompanied our troops into battle on land and on sea. It is far more to a loyal American than bits of bunting stitched into a design. It is a hallowed emblem of the spirit of America.

I have long recognized the need for a revival of honest American patriotism in our land as the best answer to those enemies of democracy who would spread the insidious lies of communism. And I believe one of the best ways we can foster a resurgence of American spirit throughout the United States is through greater display of Old Glory and assurance that no other flag shall usurp the place of honor which should be accorded in this Nation to our own flag.

I strongly urge that this bill be passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ITALIAN ELECTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the Italian elections have ended with DeGasperi's government in power by a shade. Only 50,000 votes, out of about 25,000,000 it is estimated, separated it from a two-thirds majority in the Chamber of Deputies which would have assured, literally, stable government for 5 more years.

The lesson is clear. Italy's top officials and agencies have not overstressed the danger of communism and neofascism, both of which have gained at the expense of the center parties which have devoted themselves in the interest of Italy to cooperation with the United States and the free world. As we come up to consideration of the Mutual Security Program and other measures dealing with foreign policy, let us be clear first that it is United States aid and United States friendship which have helped mightily in keeping Italy from conditions which could, after the war, have brought about the heavy representation of communism in her government.

Second, that if Italy had gone in that direction the defection of Yugoslavia from subservience to Moscow would probably not have occurred; yet this is one of the greatest blows the Communist bloc has suffered since the war.

Third, that Italy overpopulated, without basic economic resources, having eight times the present population density of the United States and less than one-third the territory available for cultivation, depends vitally upon foreign trade, foreign-capital investment, and the widest possible emigration opportunities.

Let us not forget when we consider bills to aid the President's foreign policy activities this uncomfortably close call for freedom in Italy—at a time when the ruthless opponents of free institutions in that country were able to exploit to the full uncertainties as to our country's future policy in helping free Europe toward military, economic, and political integration.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday and Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, and also to revise and extend those remarks and to include certain extraneous matter.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to be a Member of this great body for 18 years. During this entire period I have served on what is now known as the Committee on Armed Services, which has primary jurisdiction over all legislative matters pertaining to our national defense.

I would hesitate to approximate the tens of hundreds of hours I have listened to expert testimony from the Nation's military great—the many hundreds of legislative measures that I and other committee members have studied, year in and year out, relating to large and small problems of our Nation's defense.

I mention this not in order to qualify myself as a military expert. I make no such pretense. I mention it simply to indicate my very special interest in national defense matters, as well as many years of concentrated labor on national defense problems. The record will show my determination, shared by the entire Armed Services Committee, that we have a sound, well-balanced national defense. We are determined that we shall have the kind of defense that will give our people the maximum possible security at the lowest possible cost.

During these past few weeks we have heard much about the proposed \$5 billion cut in the Truman Air Force budget. I am frank to say that some of the statements I have seen in the Congressional Record and in the public press decrying this proposed reduction have "rained into the wild blue yonder." They evidence either little or no understanding of the basis for the reduction or are an intentional distortion of the facts.

One of our colleagues has even gone so far "into the wild blue yonder" as to demand the resignation of Secretary of Defense Wilson. The demand is as ridiculous as the representations made in support of it.

Of course, those of us who have had the good fortune to serve for a number of years in the Congress have become adjusted to one of the great wonders of this Capitol City. Just as the birds, the bees, and the flowers emerge each spring from their winter's sleep, in Washington the Air Force budget also bursts forth, each spring, in full flower.

It is perennial, Mr. Speaker, rooted in more than military reality. It is also rooted in politics, in emotionalism, in service rivalry, and in the evangelism of the Air Force cult which says annually that any independent analysis of the Air Force budget will voodoo the Nation.

This Air Force drive for a larger budget is an annual event. It used to be accompanied by air shows, remarkable high speed or long-distance flights and suddenly discovered enemy threats to our Nation. It offers excitement and

(1) for the larger home units for larger families will be unable to qualify under the FHA rules, even though they are eligible for FHA insurance, and (2) in view of the recent practice of FHA in refusing to grant commitments to insure or certificates of eligibility until financing is secured, the June 22, 1953, deadline as now in the bill would cut off these projects before they could possibly secure the necessary action from FHA.

Let me explain these two points that would be remedied by this amendment in just a little more detail:

1. With respect to the first part of the amendment, it would carry out the policy of section 213 of the National Housing Act to encourage larger homes for larger families. A number of the applications now pending with FHA for cooperative housing projects involve homes with 8 or more rooms and 3 or more bedrooms. Under the terms of section 213, the amount of mortgage permitted on a veterans' project involving 6 rooms with 3 bedrooms, is \$11,600 and on a nonveterans' project, \$10,800. For each additional room, an allowance is made of \$1,000 in the case of veterans' projects and \$1,800 in the case of nonveterans' projects. Under the terms of the present law applicable to the Federal National Mortgage Association, mortgages cannot be purchased where the loan exceeds \$10,000 per family residence. The purpose of this amendment is to make it possible for FNMA to use part of the remaining available funds under Public Law 243 to purchase the mortgages on the larger size family units where the amount of mortgage is necessarily higher than \$10,000 by reason of the larger number of rooms provided to meet the needs of larger families.

2. With respect to the second part of the amendment, to allow purchase of mortgages where the statements of eligibility are issued prior to September 30, 1953, instead of June 22, 1953, this provision is necessary in order to give this amendment some practical effect. For over a year, the FHA rule has been that it will not issue either a statement of eligibility or commitment unless the cooperative has a commitment for its financing. If it has such commitment, it would not need to sell the mortgage to FNMA. However, there are a number of cooperative projects pending where the cooperative has not been able to get a commitment on permanent financing, but under present FHA rules, these cooperatives cannot get a statement of eligibility or commitment. Consequently, in order to give section 12 any practical effect, it is necessary to allow a period of 3 months so that FHA can issue statements of eligibility to such cooperatives which have not been able to obtain financing commitments. This would make section 12 workable as it would make FNMA funds available to such cooperatives who have been unable to get financing from other sources. The second change, involving a later date, is applicable to projects regardless of the number of rooms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2103) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. The bill which

the Senate has just passed contained a number of very difficult, technical problems, and I want to say that we all admired the skill and fairness with which the distinguished Senator from Indiana ironed out the difficulties and disagreements and produced a bill which, while it is not major in its nature, removes a number of impediments to the development of our housing programs. We on the minority side want to pay tribute to him for his excellent work.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the able Senator from Illinois regarding the very fine and distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

PROHIBITION OF DISPLAY OF FLAGS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OR OTHER NATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 694) to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3 (c) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," approved June 22, 1942, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 175 (c)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof; Provided, That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have some questions which I should like to ask of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARTIN).

Would this bill require that the American flag be flown at a higher elevation or be of a larger size than any foreign or international flag?

Mr. MARTIN. No. Senate bill 694 would not require that the American flag be flown higher or be of a larger size. It simply requires that no foreign flag shall be flown in a position of equal or superior prominence or honor to the American flag.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The existing law, the act of June 22, 1942, title 36 of the United States Code, section 175 (c), specifies that "international usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace." Would this bill be in conflict with that section?

Mr. MARTIN. No. This bill adds a section to that act which reinforces the provisions of that act by requiring that the American flag be given the customary place of prominence and honor when flown with foreign or international flags on United States soil.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would this bill require that the American flag be flown in the place of prominence and honor at the United Nations Headquarters?

Mr. MARTIN. This bill has a specific proviso which authorizes "the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor at the headquarters of the United Nations." This is because of the special agreement we have with the United Nations under the Headquarters Agreement.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an additional statement I have prepared relative to what is known as the flag bill, and also an article entitled "Reverence for Flag Is Held a Part of Good Citizenship," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of recent date.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN REGARDING FLAG DAY AND THE PASSAGE OF THE FLAG BILL, S. 694

On June 14 we celebrated one of our most cherished national anniversaries—Flag Day.

It was on June 14, 1776 years ago that the Continental Congress accepted the original Stars and Stripes as the official symbol of the newly-born Republic.

Over the past weekend, editorials, radio programs, and speeches have resounded in practically every town and hamlet in the country—giving honor to our beloved flag, whose colors grow brighter with the passage of the years.

I thank God, Mr. President, that the pledge of allegiance to the flag is still a morning ceremony in every schoolroom throughout the land. It is in itself a prayer because of the close tie between our national emblem, and the hopes and aspirations of our people.

Embodied in those Stars and Stripes is not just brilliant color, or the silk or bunting of which it is made, but an integral part of every American, living or dead, who has fought the good fight to uphold our national honor, at home and abroad.

It personifies to us so many events and so many emotions that they can seldom be expressed, adequately.

It means home, honor, love, faith, courage, sacrifice.

It means Valley Forge and Yorktown.

It means Manila Bay and San Juan Hill.

It means Gettysburg, St. Mihiel and the Argonne, the Battle of the Bulge, and the beaches of Anzio, Wake Island, Corregidor, and Mount Suribachi, and Heartbreak Ridge in Korea.

Whether we see it flying from the top of the Capitol Building, on the mast of a ship at sea, or draped sedately beside our altars, a love of country wells up within us at the sight of it and a sense of unity and purpose pervades our hearts.

In commemorating Flag Day, Mr. President, I would like to take note of the pas-

Important

sage of legislation in both the Senate and the House in recent days.

This legislation has been made necessary by repeated attempts to lower the flag of the United States—to diffuse its stars and stripes—and replace it with the blue-and-white flag of the United Nations.

I refer to S. 694, introduced by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, which passed the Senate on June 1 and was acted upon in the House of Representatives on June 11.

S. 694 is good Flag Day material, Mr. President.

It provides that no flag shall be flown in a position equal to or superior to the flag of the United States anywhere in the United States, its Territories, or possessions. If the flag of the United States is displayed in conjunction with the flags of other nations, our flag shall be given the superior position of honor. This does not necessarily mean that the flag of the United States must be larger in size or flown at a greater height on all occasions.

One exception is made. It shall not be unlawful for the flag of the United Nations to be flown in a superior position at one location only—the headquarters of the United Nations—with all other flags being equal.

Some of my colleagues may remember that it was not too long ago, in the first flush of the United Nations organization, that American schoolchildren were urged to make copies of the United Nations flag, and housewives were urged to sew United Nations flags, as part of a U. N. propaganda scheme.

It was only a few days ago that I listened to a radio program put out by the United Nations Organization in New York, which was undoubtedly intended as indirect propaganda against congressional action on the flag bill. It began with a great buildup of the United Nations flag. Then the narrator, who is Chief Security Officer of the United Nations, was asked this question:

"Mr. Begley, in no way does the United Nations flag detract from national allegiance or anything of that sort?"

And Mr. Begley answered:

"On the contrary, I think that it has never really been raised except by some misinformed people. As an American, I certainly see no reason to bring up the subject."

I am glad to be classed with those whom Mr. Begley calls "misinformed." I have rendered years of service in the fight to defend and protect the flag of the United States, and I think there is good reason to bring up the subject now.

And the Congress has by its action indicated that it feels that the American position should be made clear. I do not believe that any of us particularly appreciate American tax dollars being spent for propaganda against legislation pending in the Congress of the United States.

Arguments came up at the outbreak of the war in Korea as to whether our men should more into battle under a world banner.

This was seriously considered—although there is no such thing as a United Nations police force—no such thing as a United Nations authority to order men into battle—and our sacrifice in Korea has been guided by the impulses which have made our Nation a refuge for the oppressed—and our flag the symbol of freedom wherever it is raised.

There is not much doubt about the source of such ideas, because the same influence made itself felt when the senior Senator from Pennsylvania first introduced the flag bill in the 82d Congress—and opposition has continued to make itself felt in the 83d Congress, though I am glad to say with less success.

The original flag bill was introduced on August 22, 1931. It was favorably reported upon by the Senate Judiciary Committee

and passed by the Senate on October 19, 1931, on a calendar call.

After passage of the bill on that date, and before completion of the calendar call, the former junior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Benton moved for reconsideration of the Senate vote. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania was not on the floor when the motion to reconsider was made.

As a result, the original bill, S. 2029, was tabled and action upon it delayed from October 19, 1931, until April 18, 1932, at which date it was too late in the season to get action in the House.

The former Senator Benton's reason for his tabling motion was that he had received a memorandum from the State Department opposing the bill, and he wanted members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to consider what the State Department had to say.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania has never seen this memorandum—and it was never, so far as I know, presented to the proper committee. Former Senator Benton's objection to S. 2029 was removed on April 18, 1932—with the comment that the reasons he believed were an impediment to the bill had been removed.

The real reason for removing the objection was that the organization of the Daughters of American Revolution, the American Legion and other patriotic organizations in the State of Connecticut had persuaded the former junior Senator from Connecticut to see the light of day.

These same vague objections began to make themselves evident when the senior Senator from Pennsylvania reintroduced the flag bill in the 83d Congress.

Letters were received by some of my colleagues from the Division of International Conferences in the State Department, to the effect that the bill would cause complications in international conferences, where the flags of all nations are placed equally. It was suggested to the Division of International Conferences that it had the privilege of testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee, if the State Department wished to express its doubts about the legislation.

When the second bill, S. 694, was again reported favorably to the Senate, and was reached on the calendar call of May 21, 1933—another objection was lodged against it. Again, some request from the State Department was made through a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

This time, I might say the objection was found to be as vague as in the previous year—and was removed. With the cooperation of the acting majority leader, S. 694 was brought up and passed by the Senate, without a dissenting vote, on June 1.

I have recounted these details only to demonstrate to what extent we have followed the will-o'-the-wisp of international cooperation—without regard to the hazards to our national life and honor that lie in wait at every turn. In the glow of our own generosity and eagerness, we permit the truths of our national vigor and sovereignty to become obscured.

It took 2 years in the United States Senate to get through a bill which merely states that we shall have the right to display our own country's flag in a superior position in our own land and on our own possessions.

It was necessary to reaffirm that the Stars and Stripes is our national flag—and may not be superseded by any conglomeration of other flags—or the flag of any political organization.

On June 2, the day after the passage of the flag bill in the Senate, the Washington Post carried an editorial referring to the bill as a piece of chauvinism—inferring that the stated purpose of the bill, "to protect and uphold the dignity and honor of the flag," was old-fashioned and provincial.

To my way of thinking, editorial comments of this sort by the Washington Post do not warrant the dignity of a reply.

In refreshing contrast is an article by David Lawrence, in his syndicated column, Today in Washington, which appeared on June 4 in a number of newspapers throughout the country.

Mr. Lawrence states in part:

"What so many cynics of these times overlook is that fighting spirit is itself closely related to national spirit and that decadence in the military forces sets in and the morale of a people begins to deteriorate when the symbols of national pride no longer stir the hearts of the citizens."

Our strength lies in national spirit—in faith in the American way of life. Whether we join with other nations for our own security, or for the protection of others less strong than ourselves, we must not permit our national institutions and our national sovereignty to be undermined by an ideology of universalism.

TODAY IN WASHINGTON (By David Lawrence)

REVERENCE FOR FLAG IS HELD A PART OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP

WASHINGTON, June 3—All the world and a goodly section of the American press recognized in the British coronation ceremony this week a deep-seated, patriotic devotion on the part of the British people to their ancient tradition. No voices were raised here to disparage the celebration as a piece of chauvinism or excessive pride in the symbols of a nation.

Yet this week when the Senate passed and sent to the House for action a bill which would forbid the display of the United Nations flag in a position superior or equal to the flag of the United States, one important newspaper hereabouts called it a piece of chauvinism and wondered whether the dignity and honor of the American flag came from such manifestations or from the valor of men who carried that flag on the field of battle.

This is a misconception which seems to have become widespread in certain circles in recent years in America—that it is somehow overly patriotic to show reverence for the American flag and that the United Nations is some kind of superstate to which the American people and, indeed, their troops must pay an allegiance higher than that given to the United States itself.

NO WORLD GOVERNMENT

It crops out in many ways. Lately some American employees of the U. N., with the support of some legal opinions by U. N. doctrinaires, have taken the position that once these employees become a part of the U. N., they are no longer responsible to any national jurisdiction as citizens.

There seems to have grown up an idea, too, that the United Nations is a world government instead of a union of sovereign governments. In the Senate a proposal by Senator BAUCUS to amend the Federal Constitution has developed a controversy as to whether agreements of a legislative character made under the treaty by which the United States entered the U. N. will supersede the laws of the United States. At one time the present Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in a public address expressed apprehension concerning this possibility.

Many of the misunderstandings concerning the true role of the U. N. arise from an overselling of the U. N. as an instrument that supposedly enforces peace. There are people in America who think of the U. N. as a governmental structure that is over and above individual governments. But their fanaticism blindly overlooks the realistic fact that today one set of members of the U. N. is arming against another set and also

Important

that the U. N. has declared Red China an aggressor and another member of the U. N.—Soviet Russia—publicly admits sending munitions of war to help the aggressor in Korea.

The spirit of a nation, indeed the morale of its fighting army, is directly related to the reverence and devotion given to a national symbol—its flag. School children are taught in the American schools to pledge allegiance to the flag. American troops pay tribute to the flag by their daily salute at sundown. The Nation's anthem is dedicated to a star-spangled banner.

What so many cynics of these times overlook is that fighting spirit is itself closely related to national spirit and that decadence in the military forces sets in and the morale of a people begins to deteriorate when the symbols of national pride no longer stir the hearts of the citizens. Just a year ago this correspondent, when in Europe, chatted one day with a high British military officer associated with NATO, and the latter expressed privately his belief that a European defense army with a single uniform would never be so soul-stirring as national divisions wearing distinctive uniforms and insignia.

TRADITION HARD TO BREAK

It is, of course, true that the theme of Germany's song, Deutschland Uber Alles, came under Hitler to typify an abuse of nationalism—a menace to the peace of other countries. But it will be noted that recently, when it came to choosing a national anthem, all political parties in West Germany insisted on legalizing that same song under which German troops had been called to battle before. Tradition is hard to break, if indeed it is wise to attempt for any reason to break the spirit of a people's patriotism.

The placing of the U. N. flag above the American flag, it might be contended, would be a harmless courtesy, but in the present atmosphere—where the tendency is to exalt a strange kind of internationalism which definitely seeks to disparage all national feelings as nationalism or mistaken nationalism—it is not similar to strengthen rather than weaken faith in the symbols of the United States and especially in its flag.

The Communists, to be sure, have an international ideology. Some of the French Communists say they are for communism above all else and above even allegiance to the French flag. A union of free nations, whether it be in the U. N. or a military alliance like NATO, will be stronger when each component member has a truly national spirit than if regard for a nation's flag is invidiously undermined by an ideology of universalism.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the purpose of acting on the nomination under the heading of "New Report."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPHART in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing the nomination of Tom Lyon, of Utah, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Lee Mohrmann Thurston, of Michigan, to be United States Commissioner of Education.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS FROM COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably seven nominations of general rank in the Army and flag rank in the Navy, and ask that they be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Also, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably 174 nominations in the grades of lieutenant junior grade and ensign in the Navy, 988 nominations in the grade of colonel and below in the Marine Corps, and 194 nominations in the grade of major and below in the Air Force.

In order to save the expense of printing this large list of names on the Executive Calendar, and inasmuch as they have already appeared once in the Record, I request that they lie on the Vice President's desk for inspection by any Senator, prior to their confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to be placed on the calendar are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Earle Eversard Partridge, 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 504 and 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Lt. Gen. Leon William Johnson, 82A (major general, Regular Air Force), to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Brig. Gen. Alvin Roubal Lueddecke, 1486A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for appointment as temporary major general in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Adm. William Morrow Fechteler, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe;

Vice Adm. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Pacific, and commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet;

Rear Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander; and

Rear Adm. Apollo Soucek, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees the nomination under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George F. Jameson to be collector of customs in customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AND SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, RELATING TO INTEREST RATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate consider S. 1993, calendar No. 390.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1993) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, with respect to maximum interest rates, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have discussed this matter with both the chairman of the committee and also with the ranking minority member of the committee and the acting minority leader.

Senate bill 1993, which was introduced by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. CAPHART), is another bill relating to the National Housing Act. I understand it ties in with legislation which has just been passed and with other legislation having a June 30 expiration date. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. The bill before the Senate is really supplemental of the bill just passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Was the bill reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question about the bill before it is passed. Does the bill provide for the issuance of bonds?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, it does not provide for the issuance of bonds. The bill continues beyond June 30 certain housing programs that would have expired. The bill also gives authority to the Director of Loans in the Veterans' Administration and also to the Administrator of FHA loans to lower the rate of interest if conditions ever reach the point where they should be lowered.